

A CASE OF POLITICAL PHILANTHROPY: THE ROWNTREE FAMILY
AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Jonathan S. Davies and Mark Freeman

University of Warwick and University of Hull, England

ABSTRACT

This article examines the attitude of the Rowntree family – and in particular its three prominent members, Joseph, Arnold and Seebohm Rowntree – to campaigns for democratic and constitutional reform in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It explores their views on women's suffrage, reform of the House of Lords and proportional representation, and their practical involvement in the promotion or otherwise of democracy in their dealings with the press, their model community at New Earswick and in the adult education institutions with which they were associated. The article argues that, in common with many other Quakers, the Rowntrees' commitment to practical philanthropy outweighed their interest in political reform, and that their commitment to the latter was, in practice, equivocal.

KEYWORDS

Quakerism, Rowntree family, democratic reform, women's suffrage, newspapers, New Earswick

Many Quakers in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have been prominently associated with the promotion of democracy in Britain, and none more so than the trustees of the 'Rowntree Trusts' – the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust and the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust – who have supported significant initiatives in the field of constitutional reform. When providing large-scale support for the Campaign for Freedom of Information, for Charter 88, for the Democratic Audit and other large-scale ventures which have aimed in some way to 'modernise' the constitutional and political frameworks of modern British life, the trustees of these bodies have frequently justified their support with reference to Joseph Rowntree's own political beliefs.¹ It is clearly important, therefore, to examine how far Rowntree himself and his family shared their philanthropic descen-

dants' interest in the reform of the democratic process in Britain.

It is difficult to generalise from the political views and activities of individuals or small groups of Quakers about the Religious Society of Friends as a whole, but it is also important to attempt some assessment of the positions taken by Friends on the main constitutional issues of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The mid-nineteenth century had seen the emergence of Friends as a significant political force: a move away from the 'quietism' that characterised the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which Elizabeth Isichei has described as, 'one of the most rapid and complete reversals of attitude in Quaker history... a manifestation of that change... by which Friends grew closer to the society in which they lived.'² This wider change in the practices and outlook of Quakers was also reflected in their increased involvement in active philanthropy and, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in particular, in the revitalisation of the Quaker peace testimony. The period was also notable for the series of political reforms that took place in Britain: Reform Acts in 1867 and 1884 extended the electorate in town and country significantly, and the early twentieth century witnessed the culmination of the struggle of women for the parliamentary franchise, and their partial victory in 1918. The emergence of democratic politics in Britain poses difficult questions for the historian of Quakerism. A denomination whose doctrine had evident egalitarian implications – emphasising the universality of the Divine Seed – might be expected to lend its support to movements towards political equality. Certainly, many historians have viewed Friends somewhat vaguely as a relatively unimportant but benignly progressive political force; this view, however, has been vigorously challenged in recent years by historians such as Pam Lunn.³ Many Quakers were extremely cautious on the issue of political reform – especially, as Lunn has emphasised, as regards women's suffrage – and this phenomenon requires some explanation.

This article focuses on the attitudes of three of the most prominent members of the Rowntree family to political democracy and constitutional reform: the cocoa manufacturer Joseph Rowntree (1836 – 1925), his son, the social investigator Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree (1871 – 1954), and his nephew Arnold Rowntree (1872 – 1951), an adult educationalist and Liberal MP for York in the period 1910 – 18. The biographies of the three men are well known to Quaker historians and need not be rehearsed in detail here.⁴ They belonged to a family that was noted for the prominent role of its members in the reform of the outlook of the Religious Society of Friends. Joseph Rowntree's older brother John Stephenson was known for his largely successful campaign to change some of the Society's more outmoded practices in the late 1850s; and his son John Wilhelm was the inspirational young leader of what Thomas Kennedy has called the 'Quaker Renaissance' some fifty years later.⁵ The family were all supporters of the Liberal party, and appear generally to have exhibited progressive political views: Seebohm Rowntree was a noted supporter of the social reforms of the Liberal government in the Edwardian period, Arnold Rowntree was a government backbencher during the passage of some of these

reforms, and other members of the family were active in Liberal politics at a local level. It may be, therefore, that members of the Rowntree family – one of northern Quakerism's most prominent – insofar as they can be seen to have formed a relatively homogenous group, held views on political equality somewhat more 'advanced' than those held by representatives of other political traditions within the Society. Nevertheless, J. P. Parry has argued, for the period 1867 – 75 at any rate, that the political views of 'mainstream' Friends were represented best by 'members of the great Quaker families like J. W. Pease in parliament, and... Joseph Rowntree outside it.'⁶

We will argue that, while the Rowntree family adopted what we will characterise as a moderate progressivism on most political issues, and were unambiguously committed to certain reforms, especially to proportional representation, they were not as 'progressive' as some historians have implied, at least not in terms of democratic reform. We will follow Parry in arguing that the traditional Quaker commitment to specific political outcomes – such as peace and temperance – together with a more holistic conception of citizenship that transcended the simple extension of political rights, between them limited the enthusiasm of the Rowntrees for democratic reform. We show that philanthropy was at least as important a field of activity for the Rowntrees – as for many Friends – as politics, and that in their philanthropic activities the family's commitment to the extension of democratic control was limited: they exhibited a Victorian paternalism that they were unwilling easily to abandon. We have discussed this tendency in more detail elsewhere, focussing on adult education.⁷ We begin the present article by rehearsing an outline of Quaker attitudes to democratic reform in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and then go on to explore the views of Joseph, Seebohm and Arnold Rowntree in more detail. We then examine the political stance of the 'Rowntree press', the newspapers and periodicals acquired and run by the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust in the 1900s and after. The Rowntrees' practical involvement in the democratic organisation of their model village at New Earswick, just outside York, will then be considered, followed by the democratic credentials of the educational settlements with which the Rowntrees were closely associated.

QUAKERISM AND DEMOCRATIC REFORM

The outlines of Friends' political attitudes have been discussed by a number of historians, but, except for the question of women's suffrage and the views on democracy held by John Bright, few have directly addressed Quaker approaches to political reform. Parry discerns a similarity in political outlook between three 'sects', the Quakers, Jews and Unitarians in the mid-Victorian period, and argues that an important feature of this similarity was that none of the mainstream political representatives of the three denominations were tied to particular stances on issues of political reform (in particular on disestablishment) by

virtue of their religion:

The political leaders [of Quakerism, Judaism and Unitarianism in Britain] had less contact with a working-class rank-and-file [than those of other denominations]; indeed, these religious groups all had a comparatively affluent membership. Also, they were not evangelical, and so tended to be far less preoccupied by a concern with sinfulness and proselytism. Thirdly, and as a consequence of both these perspectives, they were unable to respond with the same degree of enthusiasm to the development of the Gladstonian Liberal party, since they lacked both evangelical vision for political change, and the commitment infused by mass fervour. Indeed, the religious creed of none of the three sects dictated a particular position, and individual MPs behaved as they did as much because of non-religious considerations as because of religious ones.⁸

Although Parry rather downplays the continuing evangelicalism of many prominent members of the Religious Society of Friends, even in the later nineteenth century,⁹ it is certainly true that Victorian Quakers would not be associated with 'mass fervour', on this or any other matter. Nevertheless, in more general terms, Joseph Rowntree's biographer suggested that Quakers were more socially progressive than most in the nineteenth century,¹⁰ and it is clear that, in Isichei's words, '[o]verwhelmingly, though not universally, Friends supported first the Whigs and later the Liberal Party.'¹¹ Although a few moved to the Unionists after the Home Rule crisis of the 1880s, it was unsurprising to see Liberalism predominate in the nineteenth-century Religious Society of Friends as it did in other Nonconformist denominations. Moreover, there is a clear egalitarian impetus behind Quaker doctrine, which involves the obligation to seek 'that of God in every man', and a belief in what Francis Pollard, in his Swarthmore Lecture for 1932, called 'the universality of the divine potentialities in the spirit of man.'¹² This universality, in many respects at least, embraced both men and women, and although the Society itself was surprisingly slow to admit women fully into the pale of its constitution, women had from the earliest years of Quakerism often taken an important role in the ministry. Yet this egalitarian impulse was slow to make itself felt among many Friends in the sphere of political reform. With the rare but notable exception of prominent radicals such as Joseph Sturge, members of the Religious Society of Friends were not particularly distinguished by their advocacy of popular rights during the nineteenth century. In the first half of the century, many Friends positively distrusted democratic enthusiasm, partly due to the quietist philosophy that characterised the Society and partly owing to a residual suspicion of popular democracy deriving from its association with religious infidelity during the American and French revolutions.¹³ For Parry, Quakers occupied either an indistinct middle ground between radical Dissent and conservatism, or pursued different fields of interest altogether:

they distrusted radical nonconformist activity, since they were still, in general, more quietist politically than most of the other sects. Although reluctant to adopt militant positions, neither can they properly be described as conservative: rather, their political interests were primarily directed away from [constitutional issues], towards crusades for peace, humanitarianism and temperance.¹⁴

It was perfectly possible for a range of positions to be taken by Friends on constitutional issues like the franchise. Whereas Joseph Sturge declared, invoking Quaker doctrine, that '[a]s all men are equal, they are entitled to an equality of civil, religious and political privileges',¹⁵ John Bright, despite an early flirtation with radical reform politics, was not convinced by the case for universal manhood suffrage, and was particularly suspicious of the enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer.¹⁶ In the debate on the second Reform Act, Bright became, according to José Harris, one of the first Victorians to employ the word 'residuum', by which he meant a 'small class' of men who were not ratepayers and as a result should on no account come within the constitutional pale, and indeed would find it 'much better for themselves if they were not enfranchised'.¹⁷ Alan Sykes has argued that the reforms of 1867 and 1884 'reflected the continuing Victorian fear' of this class.¹⁸ This is not to say that many Quakers did not support the progressive democratisation of the British political system – and as time passed it appears that an increasing number of Friends were won over to the cause of democratic reform – but there was a diversity of viewpoints which reflect the somewhat ambiguous relationship between Quaker doctrine and political democracy.

Similarly, on the issue of women's suffrage there was a diversity of views among individual Quakers and within the Religious Society of Friends. If Quaker doctrine did not dictate a position on the appropriate extent of male enfranchisement, neither did it offer guidance on votes for women. Quakerism was noted for the extensive participation of women in Meetings for Worship and business meetings, but as Pam Lunn has remarked, the notion of women's equality in the Society in this period has been exposed as a 'pervasive myth'.¹⁹ As Thomas Kennedy has shown, the slowness of the change in the internal governance of the Society was reflected in a 'curious reticence on the matter of women's rights'.²⁰ Kennedy echoes Parry's comments on the mid-Victorian period in claiming that, among Quakers in the early twentieth century, '[w]omen's rights [took] a back seat to issues like peace and war, "new liberal" social reform, or temperance.'²¹ However, he notes that women's suffrage was 'not totally ignored' in the Quaker press.²² The disunity among Quakers was reflected in the pages of *The Friend*.²³ Many letters supporting and opposing women's suffrage appeared, including some which made the point that the debate on this question had no place in the pages of a Quaker journal. Mariabella Fry, for example, urged the Society not to take a position on the suffrage question, then immediately and unambiguously stated her own: 'the prospect of women's suffrage presents a most serious danger, not only to

women, but to the whole country.²⁴ A letter from H.S. Thompson echoed this view, arguing that '[b]ecause thousands of men are totally unfit to exercise the vote is no reason for giving it to women, many of whom are equally unfit.'²⁵ Others disagreed: Edward Grubb, for example, in the *British Friend*, which he edited, wondered, in Kennedy's words, 'how anyone brought up in the Quaker tradition of sexual equality could be other than an avid supporter of women's suffrage',²⁶ while another Friend claimed that '[w]omen's suffrage is the latest of the great world movements toward human freedom',²⁷ many of which, such as the anti-slavery campaigns, Quakers had enthusiastically supported. Nevertheless, it is probably the case that the violence and outspokenness of the Women's Social and Political Union (founded in 1906), in contrast to what Sykes calls the 'decorum and ineffectuality' of earlier women's suffrage movements,²⁸ deterred many Friends from giving more wholehearted support for the movement.²⁹ Lunn attributes Quaker equivocation on women's suffrage to three main factors: the conservatism of many wealthy and middle-class Friends, the focus on more obviously 'Quaker' concerns to the detriment of political reform, and 'the particular Quaker method of reaching corporate decisions, which was inherently slow and cautious, and tended to dampen down untoward enthusiasm.'³⁰ The suffrage question, for Lunn, 'exposes as myth the idea that Quakers, corporately, have always and reliably been a significant force for social reform' – or, indeed, political reform.³¹

THE ROWNTREES AND POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

The secondary literature gives little indication of the stand taken by the Rowntrees on issues of political and constitutional reform: this is not especially surprising, as it was rare for Joseph, Arnold or Seebohm Rowntree to take a prominent position. Joseph Rowntree, described by Parry as a 'Gladstonian',³² and a man whose biographer Anne Vernon noted his 'affection' for John Bright,³³ is generally viewed as a loyal Liberal party man, but as having rarely taken an active interest in politics. There is almost nothing in Elfrida Vipont's biography of Arnold Rowntree on his political position, although he was MP for York from 1910 to 1918 and took an active part in the debate on the Representation of the People Act in 1918; and neither Phebe Doncaster's biography of John Stephenson Rowntree nor Stephen Allott's study of John Wilhelm Rowntree offer an analysis of their subjects' political stance.³⁴ Asa Briggs discusses Seebohm Rowntree's politics, but rarely gives an insight into his views on political democracy, concentrating on the industrial democracy with which Seebohm was closely associated. Sarah Robson's biography of Joseph Rowntree's cousin Joshua Rowntree makes it clear that Joshua supported women's suffrage and greater women's involvement in civic life, but otherwise has little to say about politics.³⁵ Lewis Waddilove (the historian of the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust), Vernon and Isichei touch on politics in different ways,

but none discusses Rowntree politics in any depth. Some of this neglect may reflect the limitations of the source material: the York Liberal party's archive has fallen victim to the notorious river Ouse, and Seebohm Rowntree burnt many of his papers when he left York and moved to High Wycombe in 1936. Waddilove suggested that '[t]here would have been a lot of difficult material... [Rowntree] may have been wise in lighting his bonfire';³⁶ whether he was wise or not, the absence of papers makes the assessment of Rowntree politics more difficult.

The fragments of information that are available show that Joseph Rowntree was initially not a supporter of women's suffrage. The *Women's Suffrage Journal* reported a meeting of the Council of the York Liberal Association, chaired by Rowntree, in 1881.³⁷ The meeting was called to consider a request for the York Liberal Association to join other Associations in a deputation to Gladstone arguing for female household suffrage. Councillor Wilkinson presented the argument for joining: he 'urged the claim of women rate payers to the suffrage as a measure of absolute justice'. Rowntree, however, responded from the chair that the York Association had never decided in favour of women's suffrage, and cautioned the Council against 'rash' decisions. If the vote were given to women, he reportedly said, it could not be taken away, and invoked the authority of his political mentor John Bright, who was opposed to women's suffrage. He suggested that the Council should ask itself what was women's 'work and sphere... Is politics part of it? Would it not injure them without benefiting society?' According to the *Journal*, Councillor Wilkinson treated this view with derision, ridiculing 'the grave tones of remonstrance and alarm which had been assumed.' Notwithstanding Rowntree's view, the request to join the deputation was acceded to, and Rowntree's brother Henry Isaac and Councillor Wilkinson were appointed as the Council's representatives. There is no indication of Henry Isaac's personal views – indeed, his premature death two years later has made him a somewhat shadowy figure in the Rowntree family history – but he must at the very least have been willing to make a positive representation to the prime minister on the issue. Assuming the *Journal's* account to have been reasonably accurate, however, Joseph Rowntree clearly took a conservative line on the issue of women's suffrage in the 1880s.

Yet by 1918 Rowntree appears to have become a convert to the cause of women's suffrage. On the occasion of his golden wedding anniversary he received a tribute from the York Liberal Association, and the tribute and his response were reprinted in full in the *Yorkshire Gazette*.³⁸ In this speech, Rowntree endorsed the Representation of the People Act, which enfranchised all men over 21 and women over 30, calling it a 'very great measure'. He praised the coming contribution of female voters in terms of long-standing Quaker objectives and concerns, implying that they would deepen the concern of the electorate with peace, temperance and the welfare of children. Although he expressed himself in what some listeners may have interpreted as a rather patronising way, he does seem to have been won over to the women's cause. His view of women's suffrage reflected the Quaker unease on the subject and the

moderate line taken by Lloyd George and many other Edwardian Liberals who shared his progressivism on other social issues. He was perhaps also influenced by the somewhat more 'progressive' views of his son Seebohm and nephew Arnold on the issue. Arnold Rowntree's election manifesto for the January 1910 poll, issued jointly with the other York Liberal candidate Hamer Greenwood, pledged that he would vote for 'the enfranchisement of women and in any measure for extending the franchise to men should vote for the women being included too.'³⁹ He voted for women's suffrage on every occasion that it was brought before the House of Commons during his eight years there, and he voted against his own government on an amendment seeking to grant the franchise to women in Ireland.⁴⁰ However, his most active role in the debates on the Representation of the People Bill was reserved for his unsuccessful campaign to ensure that conscientious objectors were not disenfranchised.⁴¹ This traditional Quaker concern was more significant to Arnold Rowntree, in practical terms, than the wider question of the extension of votes to women. In common with many other Friends, he was deeply hostile to the militant wing of the women's suffrage movement, remarking in one letter that people were 'very angry with these mad women who are really ruining their cause.'⁴²

Joseph Rowntree was more consistent, and more radical, on other aspects of constitutional reform. The argument for the reduction of the powers, or ideally the abolition, of the House of Lords was made in the *Spectator* in 1871,⁴³ and this article appears in Rowntree's papers, although the rather intemperate language in which it was written suggests that he was not the author. The article certainly reflects the position he took in later years. In an letter to his son Seebohm in 1914 he wrote that the rapid reform of social conditions was undoubtedly necessary, but that 'for this quickening of the pace of legislation either the House of Lords must go or its power of delaying legislation be put in very narrow compass.'⁴⁴ In an address in 1907, on one of the rare occasions on which he made his politics public, he argued that social reformers should concentrate first on abolition of the Lords' veto and only then on more radical legislative measures.⁴⁵ In common with other supporters of the Liberal government, whose legislative programme was being repeatedly thwarted by the in-built Unionist majority in the Lords, Rowntree's concern for Lords reform was driven as much by tactical considerations as by the perceived natural injustice of unelected and hereditary government. The issue of Lords reform was also a key issue in Arnold Rowntree's successful campaign for election to parliament in the January election of 1910, during the budget crisis: he stood 'determined' that the powers of the Lords should be curtailed.⁴⁶ He was an MP when the Parliament Act was passed in 1911. Nevertheless, in a pamphlet celebrating the social reforms of the Liberal governments published in 1913, he made no mention of the opposition of the Lords and, although he endorsed a wider franchise, did not address political reform in any detail.⁴⁷ Like his uncle, it may have been that Lords reform was primarily for him a practical necessity in order to secure the social reforms that he endorsed. On the whole, however, the reform of the House of Lords was an issue on which the Rowntrees agreed, although in

common with other issues of its kind there was no obvious 'Quaker' position.

Another aspect of constitutional reform on which Joseph Rowntree and his family held apparently consistent views was proportional representation. As noted above, Rowntree regretted its omission from the Representation of the People Act in 1918; and Arnold Rowntree was similarly convinced, from at least 1912, of the case for proportional representation.⁴⁸ Thereafter, he voted consistently for amendments proposing the alternative vote, warning that the Conservatives would eventually pay electorally for refusing to support 'moderate' Liberals on this question.⁴⁹ By the 1930s, it was the Liberals who were being squeezed by the first-past-the-post system, and in 1934 Seebohm Rowntree expressed the fear that the Liberals would be practically 'wiped out' at the next election.⁵⁰ He complained that while Liberalism represented the political views of 'an enormous number of people, with this voting system they have practically no representation'.⁵¹ He believed that the emergence of the three-party system in the interwar period had made it impossible for a general election to return a representative House of Commons. Baldwin's victory with a large majority in the general election of 1924 on fewer than half the votes cast showed that the system had disenfranchised Liberals as effectively 'as if they had been deprived of their votes'.⁵² Early in the Second World War, Seebohm advocated the introduction of proportional representation as an emergency measure, in order that peace, when it came, could be negotiated with the authority of the whole nation behind it, fearing somewhat implausibly the threat of revolution or dictatorship if this measure was not carried out.⁵³ (Of course, it was not, and in 1945 the Liberal party, which four decades previously had swept to power in a landslide, was reduced to a rump of twelve seats in the House of Commons on nine per cent of the total votes cast.)⁵⁴ On this issue, then, the Rowntree family appear to have been in general agreement, and to have maintained their position over time. There were clearly sound party reasons for supporting proportional representation, but Joseph, Arnold and Seebohm Rowntree do seem to have believed in the natural justice of a more proportional electoral system. It is perhaps in this enthusiasm for electoral reform that today's 'Rowntree Trusts' can claim that their political activities mirror the progressivism of their founders.

THE ROWNTREE PRESS AND POLITICAL REFORM

The Rowntrees' purchase of newspapers and periodicals, under the auspices of the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust from 1904, was an explicitly political decision, and one which had significant ramifications for movements for democratic reform. The Rowntrees, as 'pro-Boers', had recently endured the hostility of many sections of the press, and Rowntree property at Scarborough had been attacked by a mafficking mob.⁵⁵ Joseph Rowntree argued in a much-quoted memorandum written on the occasion of the establishment of the Social Service Trust that '[p]erhaps the greatest danger to our national life arises from

the power of selfish and unscrupulous wealth which influences public opinion largely through the press (e.g. the Opium and Drink traffic, and the South African War). He went on to encourage the Trust to run its periodicals 'not with a primary view to profit but with the object of influencing public thought in the right channels'.⁵⁶ The various moral tensions attendant on the ownership of newspapers by the Rowntrees has been chronicled by Paul Gliddon⁵⁷ – especially the furore which erupted over the inclusion of betting tips in the papers – but the importance of this activity for our present purpose is that it was undertaken with an explicit political purpose in mind. However, although Rowntree expected his organs of the press to pursue a broadly reformist political agenda, he approached the matter of influencing public opinion with some unease. This is apparent in his memorandum of 1904: although he envisaged that the journalistic interests of the Social Service Trust might be extended if the experimental purchase of newspapers were successful, he also told the trustees that it should not be extended 'on such a scale as seriously to impoverish either the Religious or Social effort' of the Trust.⁵⁸ Once again, perhaps, this reflects the arguments of Parry and Lunn to the effect that political and constitutional reform continued to be of limited importance to Friends in comparison with more traditional Quaker issues.

Nevertheless, it is clearly important to examine the views of what we might loosely term the 'Rowntree press' on political reform.⁵⁹ As we are referring to the Edwardian and post-Edwardian period, the issue of women's suffrage was a prominent and controversial area of political reform addressed in the Rowntree newspapers and periodicals. In the case of the *Nation*, one of the leading radical Liberal opinion-forming journals of the Edwardian period, to which committed reformers such as C. F. G. Masterman contributed, a vigorously pro-women's suffrage and pro-proportional representation line was taken throughout the decade leading up to the Representation of the People Act. For example, in 1912 it argued that the question of the enfranchisement of women was 'over-ripe';⁶⁰ and in 1917 it praised proposals from a speaker's conference for manhood suffrage and electoral reforms including proportional representation, adding darkly that if these gains were 'purchased at the price of excluding women, we say without hesitation that we should prefer to wait for genuine adult suffrage'.⁶¹ Proportional representation was considered essential to broaden and deepen the political mind of the nation, to help younger and poorer political parties and to undermine the control exercised by the 'party caucus'.⁶² The *Nation* recognised that the proposals eventually carried in the 1918 Act were a compromise, as women under the age of 30 were excluded, but believed that once it was seen that women voting carried none of the anticipated 'dangers', then the suffrage would be further extended⁶³ – as it was only ten years later. As the Act passed through the House of Lords, the journal paid a generous tribute to the women's suffrage struggle, predicting that a time would come when the political distinction between men and women would be considered as anachronistic as slavery.⁶⁴ However, the absence of proportional representation, which had been 'struck down' by the House of Commons, was regretted.⁶⁵ It is clear,

then, that the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust provided, through the organs of the Liberal press that it owned, support for those who were prosecuting the suffragist cause, and support for a more 'modern' system of representation.

However, the Quaker-owned press in this period was beset by conflict and controversy; and during the First World War these conflicts involved the Rowntrees in a dispute over one of the key features of a democratic society: the freedom of the press. It is clear that in many respects the journalists were more radical than the Rowntree owners, and that this could and did cause tensions. The relationship between the Rowntrees and the editor of *The Nation*, H. W. Massingham, was fractious at best, and is perhaps best illustrated by a meeting of the Social Service Trust in December 1916.⁶⁶ The meeting heard that the Prime Minister had complained that *The Nation* was publishing 'personal attacks and abuse' against him, in response to which Seebohm Rowntree defended Lloyd George and complained of the 'false position' in which he himself would be placed – he was working closely with Lloyd George in this period – if Massingham continued to publish these attacks. Rowntree, revealingly, 'felt that the policy of *The Nation* was open to criticism. In war you could not retain democratic government.' Although his cousin and fellow trustee Arnold Rowntree spoke up for Massingham in this discussion, it was agreed to write to the latter reminding him that, although the journal had a right to criticise the government, it should avoid 'personal allusion'. Lloyd George, who was cautious on the issue of democratic reform, and especially with regard to women's suffrage, was also supported by the Cadbury family, who had their own difficulties with their newspapers. Henry Nevinson, a journalist with the Cadbury-owned *Daily News* and a militant supporter of women's suffrage, reported how a group of suffragists had heckled Lloyd George when he addressed a meeting of Liberal women at the Royal Albert Hall in 1908. Nevinson recorded the brutality with which these women were treated by the stewards at the meeting, as a result of which his editor, A. G. Gardiner, suspended him from his employment. Nevinson was reinstated, but later resigned when Gardiner refused to condemn forcible feeding for fear of 'offending the Cadburys'.⁶⁷ Gardiner himself eventually resigned after quarrelling with the Cadburys.⁶⁸ The example of both the Cadbury and the Rowntree ventures into newspaper and periodical publishing, then, emphasises the lack of radicalism among members of these great Quaker families, at least in contrast with those who worked for them, many of whom took a much more militant stance on issues of political reform.

NEW EARSWICK AND THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FRANCHISE

Perhaps the best means of testing the Rowntrees' attitudes to democracy is by looking at two places in which they were able to impose their ideas of what

democratic governance should be: the village of New Earswick and the educational settlements which they supported.⁶⁹ The former is important as giving the only available clues to Rowntree practice regarding the extension of the franchise. We have noted above how John Bright, Joseph Rowntree's political hero, used the language of the 'residuum' in his assertion that those who did not pay rates should not be enfranchised; and the case of New Earswick, explored below, suggests that the Rowntrees were similarly ambivalent about the principle of universal suffrage.

New Earswick was established by Joseph Rowntree: building began in 1903 and control passed to the newly established Joseph Rowntree Village Trust (JRVT), now the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, in the following year. It was – and arguably remains – an example of social engineering, a patrician attempt to build decent housing for the working classes in an environment of sobriety, but one which also promoted the virtues of citizenship and democratic community governance. In his memorandum of 1904, Rowntree, referring to New Earswick and to any other model villages which the JRVT might in time help to construct, cautioned:

I should regret if there were anything in the organisation of these village communities that should interfere with the growth of the right spirit of citizenship, or be such that independent and right-minded men and women might resent. I do not want to establish communities bearing the stamp of charity, but rather of rightly-ordered and self-governing communities – self-governing, that is, within the broad limits laid down by the Trust.⁷⁰

This somewhat ambiguous statement of the democratic orientation of New Earswick was reflected in the rather uncertain emergence of democratic governance. Lewis Waddilove, in his jubilee history of New Earswick, pointed out that universal (male and female) suffrage was introduced to elections to the New Earswick Village Council (NEVC) only in 1910, and that prior to this the Council had been elected only by (male and female) householders.⁷¹ Women could vote in New Earswick from the start – some fifteen years before the concession of the parliamentary franchise – but only if they were householders. The process of change in New Earswick is a good example of the caution of the Rowntree owners towards political democracy.

The NEVC constitution of 1907 laid down that nine councillors were to be elected from among the tenants, each householder (male and female) having one vote.⁷² The JRVT approved of this limited concession to democracy,⁷³ however, the trustees were accused by the NEVC of taking a somewhat dictatorial approach to governance of the village: the Council complained in 1908 that it 'was not having the privilege of discussing' an unspecified constitutional amendment.⁷⁴ In 1909 a village meeting proposed that adult suffrage be adopted for elections to the NEVC,⁷⁵ and only after a considerable delay, and with a number of amendments that had to be considered by a second village meeting,

did the JRVT approve this change.⁷⁶ Thus only from November 1910 were all residents aged 21 and over enfranchised.⁷⁷ At this stage a clause was added to the constitution requiring that any alterations should be approved by the JRVT. This episode shows that, in the first instance at least, the JRVT approved a constitution for New Earswick based on limited suffrage, and that the trustees – all members of the Rowntree family with one exception⁷⁸ – did not consider universal suffrage to be a particularly important principle. The initiative to change the constitution came from the village itself and not from the JRVT.

As Joseph Rowntree's comment in his memorandum suggests, he and his trustees were much more interested in the broader question of citizenship than that of suffrage. This was reflected in the organisation of a debating society in New Earswick, which held parliamentary-style debates on such diverse subjects, in 1910, as capital punishment, compulsory military service, socialism, women's suffrage and eugenics.⁷⁹ It is not clear whether the impetus behind the establishment of this 'village parliament' came from the JRVT or the villagers themselves, but its existence does reinforce the notion that political education was much more important, for the Rowntrees, than particular constitutional questions such as women's suffrage, adult suffrage, or even proportional representation. The promotion of active citizenship through educational and other initiatives lay at the heart of Joseph Rowntree's vision for New Earswick. It also lay at the heart of all other areas of philanthropic and political activity in which the Rowntrees engaged: if they were not especially concerned about matters like suffrage, they shared a deeper Quaker concern for nurturing the divine seed of the human soul by raising the working classes to full and informed citizenship.

EDUCATIONAL SETTLEMENTS AND POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

One arena in which this concern was given voice and practically addressed by members of the Rowntree family was the educational settlement movement. We have written more extensively about this elsewhere.⁸⁰ It should be noted, however, that the educational settlements, non-residential adult education institutions which grew from the Quaker adult school movement and which mimicked in many respects the social settlements of the later nineteenth century such as Toynbee Hall, were intended to be centres of practical citizenship and resources for the training of community leaders. The first educational settlements were established in 1909, and must be seen in a context of the 'new philanthropy' that characterised Victorian Britain. The emergence of the Guilds of Help, new organising charities that partially abandoned the Victorian individualism of the Charity Organisation Society and operated under an ethos that emphasised the importance of the community and the promotion of active citizenship, was a development in which the Rowntree family had an interest,⁸¹ and the same preoccupations lay behind the establishment of the educational settlements.⁸² The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (JRCT) gave substantial

financial backing to the educational settlements in the forty years after 1909. The settlements were intended to be governed democratically – to avoid the association of patronage that hung around the Toynbee Hall-type residential settlements – but in practice, in the early years of the movement the democratic governance of the settlements was conceded only with great reluctance by the philanthropic pioneers including the Rowntrees.⁸³ Like New Earswick, the settlements had parliamentary-style debating societies and classes on ‘civics’, and their members often participated in local community activities such as boys’ and girls’ clubs, social survey work and branches of groups such as the League of Nations Union; these were promoted using the rhetoric of ‘education for citizenship’, but this focus on wider political education masked a reluctance to allow the settlements’ members a full and democratic say in the running of the educational institutions themselves.⁸⁴

For the Rowntrees, the importance of the settlements lay in the fact that they provided – or attempted to provide – political, social and civic education for the newly enfranchised members of the working classes. They were responses, in many respects, to the extension of democracy, and existed, among other things, to provide the working-class electorate with training in its role as a twentieth-century citizenry. As Arnold Rowntree remarked in a memorandum in 1913,

[t]he fundamental question of the time is the education of the democracy, not only in intellect but in character, and it is an urgent necessity that this should at least keep pace with the growing exercise by the democracy of its political power.⁸⁵

His cousin Seebohm agreed: to concede democracy without promoting education was to ‘court disaster’, and a high standard of education was a ‘fundamental condition of good government in a democratic state’.⁸⁶ The spread of political democracy, then, as occurred so spectacularly in 1918, entailed an important challenge, and was not an unmixed blessing. It could be argued that the franchise had been conceded too quickly, before the public and philanthropic educational institutions that served ‘the democracy’ were able to meet the demands that the extension of democratic government placed on them. The Rowntrees and many of their collaborators in the adult education sector in the interwar period continually expressed their fear of the regimentation of national life that could result from mass politics aimed at a mass electorate. This was bound up with their fear of socialism: the JRCT noted in 1924 that there was ‘a real danger of ill-considered economic theories and proposals being encouraged in some of the Settlements’, and the trustees were glad to hear that the Educational Settlements Association was giving the matter its urgent attention.⁸⁷ Adult education could provide a bulwark against revolution, as well as addressing the apparent problems attendant on the greater availability of leisure time. Thus, for example, in 1921 Arnold Rowntree told the Co-operative Educational Conference that

The aristocratic control of industry was easier than democratic control, but the more democratic that control became the more necessary was it to cultivate the virtues of patience, understanding and tolerance, and to have knowledge at the back in order to reach the wisest decisions. They must let their great universities know that democracy and industry needed their help with that object in view, and when they had settled on their reforms they must devote attention to teaching the workers to use their increasing leisure to higher purpose than at present.⁸⁸

Even when full political rights had been conceded, therefore, the Rowntrees remained concerned about the impact of this concession. Their response was framed within the familiar Quaker context of adult education and its promotion as a community resource. The fear of regimentation – and its potential associations with the totalitarianism that had descended across much of Europe in the interwar period – was particularly important to the adherents of a denomination which placed so much emphasis on the individual and his or her conscience. The concerns of the community, for these Friends at any rate, were still to be addressed along the traditional vectors of Quaker social concern.

CONCLUSION

Rowntree politics, then, seem to have been a mixture of moderate progressivism as far as democratic and constitutional reform were concerned, and moderate conservatism, or at least ambivalence, in the field of practical democracy in their philanthropic institutions and in New Earswick. All three members of the Rowntree family considered in this article were, to an extent, influenced by a Quaker tradition which even in the late nineteenth century retained vestiges of the quietism of an earlier period, and which tended to view philanthropic endeavour rather than political involvement as the most appropriate expression of social concern. More importantly, education – and especially adult education – was the largest and most fruitful sphere of Quaker philanthropy, and it was his interest in the concept of education for citizenship that inspired Joseph Rowntree to give his wholehearted support to the expansion of settlement education in the later years of his life. In this he was influenced by wider patterns of philanthropic change in the Edwardian period. Yet this concern for political education was not necessarily accompanied by unambiguous support for democratic political reform. It appears that Joseph Rowntree’s opposition to the powers of the House of Lords was prompted as much by tactical considerations as by a genuine desire for democracy, and he was a late and still somewhat uneasy convert to women’s suffrage. Both Arnold and Seebohm Rowntree, from the subsequent generation, held what we might see as more progressive views on political democracy, but neither was eager to surrender democratic control in practice, in either the educational settlements or in New

Earswick. They spent their lives pursuing many of the interests that had been for many years traditional Quaker fields of endeavour, and democratic reform *per se* was not a major consideration: indeed, it afforded scope for the expansion of the more traditional areas of concern.

Naturally, all three men considered here were different. Their Quaker background was important, but they were not Quakers only: Seebohm Rowntree was an industrial reformer, a practical administrator who worked with Lloyd George for the war effort; Arnold Rowntree was an MP and educationalist who moved in very different circles; and Joseph Rowntree had come from a considerably less affluent background and remained all his life a provincial outsider in a way that his son and nephew did not. All, however, worshipped and had been educated in the Religious Society of Friends, a body whose own democratic credentials were complex and which embraced a considerable diversity of political opinion. In a body in which women had traditionally taken a greater public role than was usual in the eighteenth and much of the nineteenth centuries, there was still considerable opposition to women's suffrage and other aspects of women's emancipation. In a body whose doctrine rested on the notion of God in every man, there was notable reluctance to extend the political franchise to every man, let alone to women. Perhaps the system of voteless decision making that has characterised the Religious Society of Friends and its business meetings pushed the issue of more equal political representation into the background; or perhaps the class identity of most Friends was more important in determining their political stance than was their denominational identity. Whatever the case, the Rowntree family and their relationship with the spread of democratic government – both nationally and in their own projects aimed at the strengthening of active citizenship – provide a good case study of Quaker responses to the movement for democratic reform. Their experiences and views also reflect the conflicts that arose between the Victorian paternalistic instinct which they all possessed and the genuine desire to promote more widespread political citizenship. As such we can see them as exhibiting the suspicion of militant reformism and equivocation towards the extension of political rights which helped to ensure that, in Elizabeth Isichei's words, for most Friends, their 'most important contribution to the society in which they lived was probably made not in politics at all, but in philanthropy.'⁸⁸

NOTES

- 1 See for example Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (JRCT), triennial report 1997 - 1999, p. 32; Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust, *Trusting in Change: a story of reform*, 2nd edn, York: Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust, 1998.
- 2 Isichei, E., *Victorian Quakers*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 193.
- 3 Lunn, P., "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity': British Quakers and the Militant Phase of the Women's Suffrage Campaign, 1906 - 1914", *Quaker Studies* 2 (1997), pp. 30-55.
- 4 See Vernon, A., *A Quaker Business Man: the life of Joseph Rowntree, 1836 - 1925*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1958; Briggs, A., *Social Thought and Social Action: a study of the work of Seebohm Rowntree, 1871 - 1954*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1961; Vipont, E., *Arnold Rowntree: a life*, London: Bannisdale Press, 1955; [Waddilove, L.], *One Man's Vision: the story of the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust*,

- London: Allen and Unwin, 1954; Freeman, M., *The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust: a study in Quaker philanthropy and adult education, 1904 - 1954*, York: Sessions, 2004.
- 5 Kennedy, T. C., *British Quakerism, 1860 - 1920: the transformation of a religious community*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, esp. ch. 8. See also Allott, S., *John Wilhelm Rowntree, 1868 - 1905, and the Beginnings of Modern Quakerism*, York: Sessions, 1994.
 - 6 Parry, J. P., *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867 - 1875*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p. 228.
 - 7 Davies, J. S. and Freeman, M., 'Education for Citizenship: The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and the Educational Settlement Movement', *History of Education* 32 (2003), pp. 303-18; Freeman, M., "'No Finer School than a Settlement": the development of the Educational Settlement Movement', *History of Education* 31 (2002), pp. 245-62.
 - 8 Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 222-23.
 - 9 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, shows that although the evangelicalism of the mid-nineteenth century Religious Society of Friends was being effaced in the later period, there remained a number of influential evangelicals, including the founder of Woodbrooke, George Cadbury, a 'thoroughgoing evangelical' (p. 178).
 - 10 Vernon, *Quaker Business Man*, pp. 18ff.
 - 11 Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, p. 200.
 - 12 Pollard, F., *Education and the Spirit of Man*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1932, p. 68.
 - 13 Hobhouse, S., *Joseph Sturge: his life and work*, London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1919, p. 82.
 - 14 Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 226-27.
 - 15 Quoted in Hobhouse, *Joseph Sturge*, p. 76.
 - 16 See Walling, R. A. J., (ed.), *The Diaries of John Bright*, New York: William Morrow, 1931, p. 235; Hobhouse, *Joseph Sturge*, p. 86; Dunbabin, J. P. D., 'Electoral Reforms and Their Outcome in the United Kingdom, 1865 - 1900', in Gourvish, T. R., and O'Day, A., (eds), *Later Victorian Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1988, p. 105.
 - 17 John Bright, quoted in Harris, J., 'Between Civic Virtue and Social Darwinism: the concept of the residuum', in Englander, D., and O'Day, R., (eds), *Retrieved Riches: social investigation in Britain 1840 - 1914*, Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995, pp. 74-75.
 - 18 Sykes, A., *The Rise and Fall of British Liberalism, 1776 - 1988*, London: Longman, 1997, p. 110.
 - 19 Lunn, "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity'", p. 53.
 - 20 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, p. 229 n. 59.
 - 21 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, p. 229.
 - 22 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, p. 229.
 - 23 There are many more examples of correspondence in Quaker journals in Lunn, "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity'".
 - 24 *The Friend*, 17 February 1911, pp. 111-12.
 - 25 *The Friend*, 21 April 1911, pp. 258-59.
 - 26 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, p. 229.
 - 27 *The Friend*, 21 April 1911, p. 259.
 - 28 Sykes, *Rise and Fall*, p. 177.
 - 29 See Lunn, "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity'".
 - 30 Lunn, "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity'", p. 53.
 - 31 Lunn, "'You Have Lost Your Opportunity'", p. 52.
 - 32 Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, p. 228.
 - 33 Vernon, *Quaker Business Man*, p. 194.
 - 34 Vipont, *Arnold Rowntree*; Doncaster, P., *John Stephenson Rowntree: his life and work*, London: Headley Bros., 1908; Allott, *John Wilhelm Rowntree*.
 - 35 Robson, S., *Joshua Rowntree*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1916, pp. 53-54.
 - 36 Lewis Waddilove to Elizabeth Jackson, 1 March 1993, Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) library.
 - 37 *Women's Suffrage Journal* 12 (1881), p. 86, on which the following account is based.
 - 38 *Yorkshire Gazette*, 9 March 1918; see also JRF ARCH.02/4/1.
 - 39 *Yorkshire Evening Press*, 27 December 1909.
 - 40 *Yorkshire Herald*, 9 January 1913.
 - 41 See Peacock, A. J., *York, 1900 - 1914*, York: York Settlement Trust, 1992, p. 484.

- 42 Arnold to Mary Rowntree, 2 March 1912, Library of the Society of Friends (LSF). See also *Yorkshire Gazette*, 29 November 1913; Lunn, "You Have Lost Your Opportunity".
- 43 *Spectator*, 12 August 1871.
- 44 Joseph to Seebohm Rowntree, 10 August 1914, JRF BSR1980/LETTERS TO/FROM PARENTS/6(d). See also Vernon, *Quaker Business Man*, pp. 159-60.
- 45 Rowntree, J., 'Education in Relation to Civic and National Life', presidential address to the Friends' Guild of Teachers, Scarborough 1907, JRF library, L/ROW.
- 46 *Yorkshire Gazette*, 27 November 1909.
- 47 Rowntree, A., *A National Advance: the social record of the Liberal Government 1906 - 1912*, York: Delittle, Fenwick and Co., [1913].
- 48 Arnold to Mary Rowntree, 30 October 1912, LSF.
- 49 Arnold to Mary Rowntree, 5 December 1918, LSF. We should note here that the alternative vote system is not strictly speaking a system of proportional representation.
- 50 B. Seebohm Rowntree to Leland Rex Robinson, 26 May 1934, JRF BSR1980/LELAND REX ROBINSON LETTERS.
- 51 B. Seebohm Rowntree to Leland Rex Robinson, 26 May 1934, JRF BSR1980/LELAND REX ROBINSON LETTERS.
- 52 B. Seebohm Rowntree to Leland Rex Robinson, 26 May 1934, JRF BSR1980/LELAND REX ROBINSON LETTERS.
- 53 Rowntree, B. S., 'Let England Speak', n.d. [1939-40], Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York: Rowntree papers.
- 54 Eleven National Liberals, who had broken away from the Liberal party and joined the interwar National Governments, were also returned at this election.
- 55 Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, p. 254.
- 56 Rowntree, J., memorandum of 29 December 1904, in *The Joseph Rowntree Inheritance, 1904 - 1994*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1994, p. 50.
- 57 Gliddon, P., 'Politics for Better or Worse: political nonconformity, the gambling dilemma and the North of England Newspaper Company, 1903 - 1914', *History* 87 (2002), pp. 227-44.
- 58 Rowntree, J., memorandum of 29 December 1904. Although the memorandum referred to all three of the Joseph Rowntree Trusts, this section was explicitly addressed to the trustees of the Social Service Trust. All three Trusts, initially, had the same board of trustees, although each Trust subsequently diversified its membership.
- 59 The Social Service Trust spent nearly £180,000 on newspapers and periodicals before 1918, and by 1921 was associated with over 20 newspapers, including, at a national level, the *Morning Leader* and the *Star* (both of which the Cadburys also supported), and at a local level the *Northern Echo*, the *Auckland Chronicle*, the *South Durham and Cleveland Mercury*, the *Birmingham Gazette* and the *Sheffield Independent*: Gliddon, P., 'The Political Importance of Provincial Newspapers, 1903 - 1945: the Rowntrees and the Liberal press', *Twentieth Century British History* 14 (2003), pp. 27, 29, 30-31.
- 60 *The Nation*, 2 November 1912.
- 61 *The Nation*, 20 January 1917.
- 62 *The Nation*, 31 March 1917.
- 63 *The Nation*, 3 February 1917.
- 64 *The Nation*, 19 January 1918.
- 65 *The Nation*, 19 January 1918.
- 66 Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust minutes, 22 December 1916, The Garden House, York, from which the quotations below are taken.
- 67 Wagner, G., *The Chocolate Conscience*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1987, pp. 82-83.
- 68 He resigned in 1919. However, he was the author of a biography of George Cadbury, published in 1923.
- 69 We have not explored the democratic credentials of the initiatives taken by the Rowntree family in their own cocoa works. A separate article could be written about the theory and practice of industrial democracy in the Rowntree factory. See Rowntree, B. S., *The Human Factor in Business*, London: Longmans and Co., 1921; Briggs, *Seebohm Rowntree*. ch. 4.
- 70 Joseph Rowntree, memorandum of 29 December 1904, pp. 53-54, also quoted in Waddilove,

- One Man's Vision*, p. 78.
- 71 Waddilove, *One Man's Vision*, p. 82.
- 72 NEVC constitution, 1907, JRF library; NEVC minutes, 12 November 1907, JRF NEW EAR-SWICK/3/1.
- 73 JRVT minutes, 10 December 1907, JRF dry cellar.
- 74 NEVC minutes, 11 August 1908.
- 75 NEVC minutes, 15 November 1909; NEVC fourth annual report, 1912, JRF library.
- 76 NEVC minutes, 17 October 1910, 21 November 1910.
- 77 NEVC constitution, November 1910, JRF library.
- 78 T. H. Appleton, who became a trustee in 1906.
- 79 NEVC third annual report, 1911, JRF library.
- 80 Davies and Freeman, 'Education for Citizenship'.
- 81 Seebohm Rowntree spoke at the meeting at which the first Guild, the Bradford City Guild of Help, was established in 1904: Laybourn, K., 'The Guild of Help and the Community Response to Poverty, 1904 - c.1914', in Laybourn, K., (ed.), *Social Conditions, Status and Community, 1860 - c.1920*, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997, p. 10.
- 82 For the relationship between the 'new philanthropy' and adult education, see Freeman, M., 'Victorian Philanthropy and the Rowntrees: The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust', *Quaker Studies* 7 (2003), pp. 166-86.
- 83 Freeman, "No Finer School", pp. 256-58; Davies and Freeman, 'Education for Citizenship'.
- 84 The above summary naturally conceals considerable variations in the practices of different settlements. Freeman, "No Finer School", bases most of its comments on settlement governance on the St Mary's settlement in York, with which the Rowntree family and trusts were most closely associated.
- 85 Rowntree, A., 'Private Memorandum on the Present Condition of the Adult School Movement', JRF library, L/ROW.
- 86 Rowntree, B. S., 'How Shall We Think of Society and Human Relations?', p. 13, BIHR, Rowntree papers, ART/11/2.
- 87 JRCT Minute book, no. 2, minute nos. 185 (b) (quoted), 203, the Garden House, York.
- 88 *Yorkshire Herald*, 29 March 1921, press cutting in JRF ROWN.FAM.L/93/6.
- 89 Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, p. 211.

AUTHOR DETAILS

Jonathan S. Davies is Senior Research Fellow in the Local Government Centre at the University of Warwick. His main research interest is the political economy of urban policy. He is the author of *Partnerships and Regimes: the politics of urban regeneration in the UK*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

Mailing address: Local Government Centre, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, England. E-mail: jonathan.davies@wbs.ac.uk

Mark Freeman is a Research Associate in the Department of History at the University of Hull. He is working with two colleagues on a project entitled 'Shareholder Democracies? Corporate Governance in Britain c.1720 - 1844'. He is the author of *Social Investigation and Rural England 1870 - 1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003, *The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust: a study in Quaker philanthropy and adult education 1904 - 1954*, York: Sessions, 2004, and a number of articles on modern British social history.

Mailing address: Department of History, University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX, England. E-mail: M.Freeman@hull.ac.uk