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ABSTRACT

This thesis is submitted by Gordon Stewart Marino to the University of Manchester for consideration of the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 2012. It is entitled: ‘You shall be taught what you need to know, both for your soul and bodies’ (Annual Report of the Manchester Juvenile Reformatory, 1857). The Archaeology of Philanthropic Housing and the Development of the Modern Citizen.

When Frank Prochaska first published his studies on philanthropy, he provided the most in-depth scholarship to date. But this research is now over 20 years old and is ready for review. It is also a purely historical analysis, with little archaeological content. This research seeks to enhance Prochaska’s findings, using the archaeological record to evaluate, augment and further develop his findings.

A complex web of personal and societal motivations interweave through individual philanthropic activity. Most research to date ignores this interconnectedness, or relegates it to subordinate status, producing a simplistic model. This research seeks to explore the relationship between personal impulse and societal pressure, investigating the affiliation between the two in diverse case studies, both UK and international. This is accomplished through archaeological methodology, and the exploration of material culture.

The model proposed in this research provides a recognition of the complexity of personal and communal action. It draws heavily on a theoretical perspective that includes Bourdieu and Giddens. It places these theoretical perspectives within a practical and appropriate framework, to provide a robust analysis of change through philanthropic action. As such it complements much of the research of Prochaska, whilst providing a modern interpretation.
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Chapter 1 – Intricacy and Complexity

“an effort to breathe new meaning into a handful of lives long since past”

(Mrozowski 2006: 57)
1.1 Bold Claims
Frank Prochaska makes bold claims for the expansion of voluntary activity across Victorian and Edwardian Britain:

The origins of the characteristic traditions of British voluntarism may also be detected in the particular affinity and mix of evangelicalism and liberalism which emerged in the nineteenth century against the background of the problems and opportunities created by industrial and demographic changes. Evangelicalism harnessed social conscience to liberal doctrine. Much nineteenth century philanthropy may be seen as liberalism turning its mind to social conditions under religious pressure (Prochaska 1988: 24).

In his view philanthropy was influenced by social and political dynamics, driven by religious coercion. He affirms charitable activity, and its diversity, was a crucial factor often under-recognised for its significance. Prochaska goes as far as to maintain "it remains a powerful, though little appreciated, force for social stability" (Prochaska 1988: 8).

It is now over twenty years since Prochaska made these claims, and yet they remain fundamental to an understanding of the role and function of philanthropy at this time. Any scholarship of this issue must revisit such striking and elemental statements. Prochaska does qualify his assertions, by suggesting a major difficulty is the impossibility of agreeing a precise definition of voluntarism. He believes it embraces degrees of individualism, independence from the state and a desire to help others. Although usually studied through institutions there exists a personal dimension. These key issues he identifies are pivotal to any study.

As a historian Prochaska omits the dimension of material culture. A volume of data exists that would enrich these early studies, augmenting his extensive and detailed analysis. This study seeks to build on his research, illustrating the role material culture studies can play in enhancing and developing his findings. It strives to fill that void in the material culture dynamic so missing from the existing literature. It is not an attempt to challenge Prochaska’s work, but to develop and further his findings through the discipline of archaeology.

1.2 Rooted in individual lives and experiences of millions of ordinary people

Philanthropy has an extensive history. It was as a major force in medieval times (Clarke 1994; Goose 2010; Rushton 2002; Schofield 2008) and is flourishing today. It takes many forms and requires a variety of personal motivations and societal mechanisms that enables
change and evolution to take place. It involves people of all social classes as benefactors and beneficiaries. Religious and non-religious groups are involved. It encompasses individuals, collectives or organisations. It has touched young and old, involved wealthy and poor, impacted on rural and urban communities and had an influence across boundaries of race, sex and belief. The scope of philanthropy is vast, having influenced the lives of many millions.

Understanding the role of philanthropy in the past aids in comprehending the function it plays today. Philanthropy is not only an historical concept; many contemporary initiatives depend on it. It exists as an ever expanding and developing part of the UK economy, inextricably tied to voluntary work. It has received active encouragement, if varying support, from successive governments. Whilst our focus may be on the past, philanthropy has major implications for the present. Many issues currently faced by charitable organisations have been rehearsed in the past, and would be recognised by philanthropists engaged with Victorian and Edwardian state and business. The relationship between philanthropy and business, with the ethical debates generated, are not new. The volatile accord between charity and state is a recurring phenomenon, since the dilemmas faced by charitable organisations are not products of modernity. As Prochaska makes clear, when demands by the state proved too onerous, organisations “severed relations with the state and made do without its money” (Prochaska 1988: 6). It follows that understanding these issues and responses from the past, can assist with similar modern concerns. As Annie Gray makes clear “our primary concern is to look at the development of contemporary society” (Gray 2010: 34). Through examining the past, this research recognises key factors for contemporary society.

Philanthropic and charitable activity is rooted in individual lives and the experiences of millions of ordinary people. It is through examining this ordinary and mundane material culture that we understand the reality of unique lives. As Symonds makes clear “the historical archaeology of the mundane and everyday can make a positive contribution to contemporary culture” (Symonds 2004: 38), which encapsulates the approach employed in this research. This work not only has resonance with current political debate, it is at the heart of contemporary proposals for structural changes to society.
This approach provides the opportunity to place people at the heart of the study. Too often individuals are missing from the record, and I will endeavour to ensure that personal roles as benefactors or beneficiaries are central to the study. As noted earlier by Prochaska, the role of institutions is often regarded as paramount, with the clear implication that individuals are subordinate being a view often legitimised by the literature. The exceptions are usually wealthy donors or middle class providers and organisers such as Octavia Hill. The reality is that recipients are often the missing dimension from studies. Many had no real voice, whilst others were effectively marginalised. This research recognises that they are at the heart of any real understanding of philanthropy. This lack of recognition of people behaving in an informed and decisive manner is something Giddens also condemns, believing we need “a theory of action which recognises human beings as knowledgeable agents” (Giddens1984:30). Chapter Two will explore more the method by which this will be achieved.

1.3 Volume and Diversity

Much published research fails to recognise the extent of diversity. Many disparate examples of small and large charitable bodies exist, covering a multiplicity of activities, including those that campaigned on specific social issues such as The Association of Men for the Defence of Women from Dishonour, or those specifically aimed at groups of young people like The Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys. There were societies that provided specific facilities for individuals such as the Invalid Asylum for Respectable Females in London and the Vicinity, or those that provided individual assistance to a target group such as The City of London Truss Society for the Relief of the Ruptured Poor. Because of the sheer number of organisations, their often localised activity, specific responsibilities or small size, many feature little in the published literature.

However there is an extensive library of work covering more well-known organisations and specific facets of provision. Throughout this study it will become apparent that understanding local diversity is fundamental, hence many papers provide a scholastic interpretation of localised provision. In the case of ragged schools, individual sites such as Caernarfon (Lindsay 1996), London (Ridge 1986), or Newcastle (Prahm 2006) are examples of just such an approach. A common alternative strategy is to explore the work of important individuals such as Mary Carpenter (Selleck 1985), or organisations and institutions such as the Ragged School Union (Clark 1969).
There is also a large body of relevant work on the subject of workhouses. As a key means by which the poor law operated, they provide important background information. Once again local examples are found in abundance, with examples such as Liverpool (Brogden 2002), Hayfield (Powell 1999), Shropshire (Smith 2010) or Undermillbeck in the Lake District (Tyson 2006). Their working systems raise key issues about methodology such as diet (Johnston 1985), or explore tensions between local and national demands (Driver 1989). Such a backdrop facilitates comparison between this major form of pauper provision, and other more targeted schemes.

These more targeted systems include juvenile reformatories, and again studies of specific locations such as Bleasdale in Lancashire (Garnett 2008) or Manchester and Salford (Jolly 2001) demonstrate the influence locality had on both provision and establishment. As the background on workhouses can be explored, so can the ethos and beliefs that supported reformatories (Jolly 2000; Ploszajska 1994). Similar comparisons can also be made with almshouses. This work will specifically compare almshouse provision across locations as diverse as New York (Baugher 2001a) and the West Riding of Yorkshire (Caffrey 2004), with Chapter Four examining this contrast in detail. It will demonstrate the differentials that exist between national (Goose 2010), and international perspectives (Huey 2001).

The development of medical care is one of the most detailed examples of philanthropic activity. This research will make regular reference to the influence medical advances had on housing developments. Many examples could be explored such as hospitals, where once again local pride and service is significant, such as in Cumberland and Westmoreland (Brooks 2004), the House of Recovery in Manchester (Povey 1987) or the Royal Northern Hospital in London (Rinsler 2007). For many organisations fundraising was often essential, such as that undertaken at Ancoats Hospital in Manchester (Table 1), but in the case of medical institutions there was often the use of mutuality (Cherry 2000). As well as local hospitals, philanthropists were extensively involved in the functioning of dispensaries (Hartson 1963), with Peter Woodfords study of Camden dispensaries contrasting the role of provident and non-provident providers (Woodford 2001). Specialised hospitals were very much in vogue, and whilst there was a plethora of small hospitals geared towards specific ailments or parts of the body, probably the most common (and often daunting) were asylums. Whilst they can be studied through their historical development and significance (Andrews 2004), local
establishments are once again a key focus much research as in Yorkshire (Ellis 2006) and Cornwall (Hill and Laugharne 2003). An extensive literature exists exploring contemporary reporting in the media of the day (Philo 1987), the role of gender such as the experiences of female patients in Surrey asylums (Shepherd 2004), or the architecture of confinement (Smith 2007).

Within developing urban areas the concern about the free time of the working class raised great concern (Casella 2004; Marino 2010; Rosenzweig 1984, Rosenzweig 2002). One method though which philanthropists tried to influence this leisure time was through the provision of public parks (Gaskell 1980; GMAU/CCHPG 1994; Lock 2007; Morrison 2003). A similar attempt to influence leisure time was in the development of public libraries where research on Carnegie benefactions (Nasaw 2006; Carroll 2009), or the study by Michael Powell of library endowments for towns (Powell 2006) provide essential background information. Both these facilities were seen as a means of providing alternatives to the evils of alcohol and tobacco, through alternative pastimes. In the case of parks there was also the added virtue of encouraging family activities.

There are also a host of other philanthropic organisations or activities that are beyond the scope of this research. However any real understanding of the significance of such an extensive philosophy as philanthropy demands recognition of their role. Such organisations as the building and friendly societies, typified by John Benson’s study of miners in Northern England and their relationship with Poor Law Guardians and Friendly Societies (Benson 2007) are important; as are the history of individual societies (Fowler 1997). It is equally important to recognise the role and functioning of the co-operative movement, where the study by Brett Fairbairn on the emergence of co-operatives across four different countries provides a useful starting point (Fairbairn 2004). Once again localised studies are significant, exemplified by the case study in North East Lancashire (Firth 2005). A further much under represented area is the role played by Trade unions, where the work of Justin Smith and Melanie Oppenheimer is useful background, linking Union activities with voluntary action in disparate countries (Smith and Oppenheimer 2005). Such issues may be obliquely mentioned, but we often ignore other significant dimensions – the building and funeral clubs, mechanics’ institutes, sports’ organisations and worker’s benevolent societies. Rarely is the role of working class philanthropy mentioned, although Prochaska observes “though
unostentatious and uncelebrated, the charity of the poor to the poor was, according to various observers, startling in its extent” (Prochaska 1988: 28).

Much of this study is based on urban neighbourhoods, but rural communities had their own problems. Population shifts associated with new demands, created by industrialisation, is discussed in some detail in Chapter Two, but it must be recognised that philanthropy was not solely an urban occurrence. Prior to industrialisation there was extensive activity in rural areas, where work by Greenall on village friendly societies could be a useful starting point (Greenall 2009).

Philanthropy produced some of our great modern institutions. Locally the University of Manchester developed from the Mechanic’s Institute. Organisations such as Wood Street Mission played a major role in the early city, still being active in contemporary society. Many youth clubs are direct descendants of the Lads’ Club movement, working in parallel to The University Settlement Movement (Betty 1996; Bradley 2006, Bradley 2007; Rose and Wood 1995). The Manchester Royal Infirmary, one of the largest NHS hospitals in the country, started with charitable giving (Hogarth 2007). All are classic examples of important institutions developed through localised philanthropic activism.

Another set of institutions are closely related to the personal wealth of individual subscribers. Some are well known. The Cadbury Brothers (Bromhead 2000; Kennedy 2000; Walvin 1997), Lever Brothers (Jeremy 1991) and Titus Salt (Bradley 1990; Richards 1936) are all famous for housing provided. Joseph Rowntree and his charitable trust (Freeman 2004; Freeman and Davies 2004; Packer 2004) and the significant numbers of Carnegie Libraries still found across the country (Nasaw 2006) illustrate individuals with national impact. Others are not famous beyond their immediate locality, with the Reckitt family in Hull (Pietrusiak 2004), the Harris family in Preston (Snape 2004), John James in Bristol (Avery 2001), William Crossley in Manchester and his patronage of working girls at Charter Street (Chapter Four), or William Sutton in Oxford (Garside 2000). There were also myriad numbers of small local benefactors. Individuals like Margaret Fell whose bequests did so much to alleviate poverty in a small Lakeland community (Kunze 1989), or Violet Butler and her work with juvenile delinquents (Gillis 1975) are rarely recognised. Their absence from the archaeological and historical record is significant as we shall explore in Chapter Six, which will demonstrate the paucity of
literature addressing such work, when judged against the likes of Octavia Hill (Anderson and Darling 2007; Betty 1996; Darley 1990; Malpass 1984; Robinson 1998; Walker 2009).

With such a rich diversity of endeavour across the country, why does this study concentrate on the evolution and development of housing? In reality all other forms of philanthropic activity are dependent on the growth of housing. None of the libraries, hospitals, parks, youth clubs, institutes, reformatories or other facets would be needed if there was no resident population. The provision of housing is the primary need for communities. As will be demonstrated later whole new communities developed by industrialists started with housing. Housing is the core formative site type.

This research will demonstrate that findings can be replicated across diverse settings, providing more than purely localised impact. Mass migration to the Americas and Commonwealth ensured the concept of philanthropy was widely disseminated across the world. The use of an international dynamic (Adam 2002; Davis 2005; Given 2005; Goddard 2002; Hughes 2005; Lawrence 2000; Van Bueren 2002) helps provide a broader comparative basis. The international dynamic will be explored in Chapters Two, Three and Four.

Recorded or not, the motivations and key driving influences are central in providing nuanced understanding of the philanthropic movements. A sophisticated awareness must go beyond the strictly material to truly comprehend the importance of this highly influential concept. Exploiting material culture and allying it with scholarly research, enables us to unpick this complex weave of personal motivation and societal communal motivation.

This breadth of provision illustrates the sheer diversity of philanthropic activity to be found across Victorian and Edwardian Britain. Many institutions founded by philanthropists could provide the basis for a study in their own right. But such a detailed and individualistic study is not the aim of this research. Rather the emergence of patterns of activity, the overlapping of personal and communal motivations and the multiplicity of provision provides the framework within which this work is situated. Whilst this clearly places boundaries which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two, it should be apparent that no geographical, economic or social restrictions impact on the concept and practise of philanthropy. It pervaded all society having an influence and bearing on many millions of lives.
For many people philanthropy was an everyday, and for some an essential, fact of life. This was the case for both recipients and patrons – both needed the impact philanthropy gave. The financial scope is illustrated by Walker who makes the point “in Victorian Britain charitable donations exceeded public expenditure on poor relief” (Walker 2009:105). The sheer costs involved demand any real understanding of society appreciates the role philanthropy played. For some philanthropy provided a home, for others food or medical care. Many gave and continued to give throughout their life – either driven through personal religious belief, economic advantage or the opportunity to engage with powerful people.

Some of the communities we explore are marginal (Bevan 2006; Howkins 1994; Morris 1994; Robinson 1983; WA 2008). These illustrate some of the political, religious and economic circumstances of the time. They do this by making “important commentaries on the social order that was being created” (Goddard 2002: 85). The common and mundane is easily understood, whilst the different is often relegated to the margins, ignoring the impact the distinctive has. Any real study of society requires an understanding of all components, including the deviant. Marginality is a complex area with geographical, economic, social and political dimensions. Some will make themselves marginal, whilst others find it imposed. Yet these are significant and important communities. To be marginal does not mean to be of no significance (Turner and Young 2007).

This study recognises that an uncomplicated and simple analysis would fail to deal with the complexity and multiplicity of developments. In all their many and diverse forms, ranging from Unitarian belief to Utopian political, the Christian evangelical to the co-operative; the intricacy and complexity involved demands detailed examination. As Sarah Tarlow puts it:

Historical archaeologists studying that period sometimes caricature it as one of class struggle, industrialization, alienation, and exploitation, to which the only possible response is compliance (for the bourgeoisie) or resistance (for the poor and other subaltern groups). All those things are certainly important in understanding the period, and certainly we would not wish to return to the promotion of a whiggish view of nineteenth century history as the triumph of progress, but at the same time we need to incorporate into our histories alternative views, and critiques of some widespread social values, and to make room for the “other” nineteenth century of radicalism, reform, experiment and active improvement (Tarlow 2002: 316).
These ‘other’ features also require examination by the archaeologist, to truly understand the impact and significance of philanthropy.

A final reason for this research is the emergence of unique insights into developing belief and thoughts about social organisation and development (Gray 2010; Griffin and Casella 2010; Johnson 1993). Over fifty years ago Ashworth argued ‘industrial villages’ provided society with an opportunity to try out new ideas, to experiment with societal changes that reflected emerging beliefs, and in so doing provide “valuable models for future experiments and philanthropic reform” (Ashworth 1951: 378). Such experimentation is as relevant today as it was then, making an examination of the past a crucial starting point.

Matthew Johnson argues that in the past archaeologists spent much of their time “accumulating more and more information and presenting that information in more and more detail ... simply fit[ting] more and more archaeological material into the same existing classification...the end result is not necessarily a better or more accurate picture of the past in any way” (Johnson 2010: 22). For many years historians and archaeologists have developed just such a subject specific ever expanding data set of philanthropic activity, with no multi-disciplinary dimension or holistic interpretation. This research seeks to redress these key omissions.
Chapter 2 - Significance, appropriateness and manner

“mix a little philanthropy with their percentage calculations” (Builder 1869a: 99)
2.1 Five Questions

In the previous chapter five issues were identified for this research, which can be elaborated as the following questions:

- How far was philanthropy a key factor influencing social and political life in Victorian and Edwardian times?
- Is it possible to explore the influence of philanthropy through the lives and experiences of ordinary people?
- Can material culture be used as a means of evaluation?
- What were the key personal motivations and communal motivation influencing philanthropic development?
- How have such issues influenced changes in social provision?

Having identified these key questions, the methodology to be employed is explored in this chapter.

2.2 The Resources Available to the Researcher

Within this framework, four key resources exist:

- Grey Literature
- Secondary Sources
- Archival Evidence
- Material Culture

Each will be briefly discussed, exploring significance, appropriateness and the manner in which this research exploits them. This will be followed by an examination of pertinent overarching themes. First the role of people in both the archaeological and historical record, and the methods by which personal experience illuminates the realities of life. Second the advantages to be gained through interdisciplinary research. Finally the chapter will conclude with a brief discussion of the appropriate theoretical perspective that weaves through the research.
2.2.1 Grey Literature:

Within the archaeological record evidence is considerably fragmented. Much exists in the form of site reports, often the result of developer led investigations, producing the whole gamut of ‘grey’ literature. This resource is disjointed, often unpublished and can be difficult to access. The collation of this evidence can be of major significance, as Falkingham makes clear:

grey literature reports generally contain comprehensive, concrete and up-to-date information on research findings. Even when they have been officially published at a later stage, detailed information on techniques and results is frequently omitted. To obtain details of importance for research, grey literature is often the first and only source of information (Falkingham 2004: 1).

A number of methods have been employed to collate materials. Bibliographies from academic research provided references to unpublished materials, enabling the integration of ‘grey literature’ already in academic research. There are also databases that collate published reports. The database provided by the Archaeological Data Service (ADS) at York University is an ever expanding collection of materials available through the OASIS project. Similarly the Archaeological Investigations Project at Bournemouth University holds details of fieldwork undertaken in the UK. Both allow searches, enabling the identification of relevant targets. Utilising these databases provides valuable materials for research. They embrace activities as diverse as watching briefs, Desk Based Assessments, excavations, photographic recording, building surveys and geophysical analysis. Geographically they cover England (and in some cases further afield). It is also possible to identify entries on the SMR/HER, listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments and find spots.

Additionally specific publications have been included in the general ambit of ‘grey literature’. These include the Historic Towns Surveys and the Extensive Urban Surveys of both Lancashire County Council (LCC) and Cumbria County Council (CCC). These publications are extensive and growing. Whilst sometimes available online, the sheer size and costs involved in conventional publication is an inhibition to widespread dissemination. Few counties have yet completed full survey or publication. Considerable volumes are not available via the web, with a substantial number only available for consultation at nominated Council Offices. Since access is so limited, I include them within the orbit of ‘grey literature’.
These reports can provide detailed information. Not only are they compiled by professional archaeologists they also provide evidence not readily available. For example the identification of Whitehaven as the first post medieval planned town (CCC 2000a) or extensive evidence of non-conformist activity at Brampton (CCC 2000b), Wigton (CCC 2000c) and Barrow (CCC 2000d). They provide extensive and detailed typologies of housing in Blackburn (LCC 2005a), Burnley (LCC 2005b) and Carnforth (LCC 2006b). The *Lancashire Historic Town Assessment Reports* recently provided information for a new interpretation of housing across East Lancashire (Newman and Newman 2008).

**2.2.2 Academic Research:**

Academic research, often produced without the restrictions of developers influencing investigations, is another resource. Often providing a more detailed study of communities, they regularly relate the archaeology to wider social, political and economic factors. There are in existence extensive and detailed examinations of individual communities such as Low Moor in Clitheroe (Ashmore 1963), Tottington (Coupe 1977), Hillgate in Stockport (Coutie 1992), Wigan and Saint Helens (Jackson 1979; Jackson 1981), Barrow and Lancaster (Roberts 1977), Manchester (Roberts 1986), Crosby (Timmins 1993) and the cotton towns in Lancashire (Timmins 2000). These enable a detailed analysis of specific localities. For example the Preston case study in Chapter Four, includes an extensive and detailed archive of academic work. As long ago as 1858 Hardwick produced the classic account of the history of the city (Hardwick 1858), with Fishwick extending and expanding this initial interpretation (Fishwick 1900). These studies were subsequently supplemented by Clemesha’s volume (Clemesha 1912). Later contributions were rare until the 1990’s when the *History of Preston* (Hunt 1992) provided more modern detailed background. The most relevant recent publications are the volumes *Vanished Dwellings* (Morgan 1990) and *Deadly Dwellings* (Morgan 1993).

A further major source is *The Builder*, especially the period George Godwin was Editor. Godwin took the magazine in an unapologetic campaigning direction, with decent housing for the ‘labouring classes’ being an issue of particular concern. Every opportunity was taken to examine new ideas, report on current developments and expose appalling living conditions. As Tarn makes clear:
he made the magazine a forum for opinions and reports on housing and sanitation reforms constantly using its pages to expose existing conditions throughout the country and to publicise improvements and new buildings (Tarn: 1973:4).

The descriptions of living conditions in major conurbations spectacularly generated debate. They encompassed many locations, and in 1861 Godwin ran a series of articles entitled *The Conditions of Our Chief Towns* which included specific reports on Sheffield, Preston, Newcastle, Manchester, Kingston-upon-Hull and others. They provide a wealth of contemporary accounts for the researcher.

Godwin exposed the “very serious evil [of building] houses back to back” in Leeds (Builder 1860: 933), “rows of houses and factories, and courts of houses and factories” at Sheffield (Builder 1861a: 642), describes “a mass of foetid corruption” in Preston (Builder 1861b: 833). He tells us that in one part of Newcastle “drainage is quite unheard of” (Builder 1861c: 242) and that in Hull people lived in houses with “tiny forecourts” (Builder 1861d: 455).

### 2.2.3 Archival Evidence

An extensive library of archival evidence exists. For example surveys by the *Manchester Statistical Society* provide details of individual streets and communities. Their rationale was to place evidence in the public domain as a basis for campaigning. There are also national resources. Parliamentary reports provide extensive materials, evidence being received from both organisations and individuals. In particular Royal Commissions such as the *Housing of the Labouring Classes* (1885) or the *Select Committee of the House of Commons on Railway Labourers* (1846) provide detailed evidence in the form of oral testimonies, documentation, plans, charts and photographs.

Newspaper and magazine archives afford further insights, providing descriptions of events from which reconstructions are possible. In Chapter Three I refer to a party at the house of Samuel Greg. From detailed newspaper descriptions it is possible to partly reconstruct the layout and style of the extensive gardens. The same medium illustrates specific debates about philanthropy, many shaped by philosophical and political undercurrents of the time. These are explored in Chapter Three, where they are often shown to be informed by populist Social Darwinist philosophies.
Archival materials that have not been researched, or examined superficially, will be treated as primary sources. An example is the Greg Family Papers in Manchester City Archive (MCA). These papers are valuable material culture in their own right (Ball 2010). Additionally they provide a wealth of evidence about social, political and material conditions. Such documentary evidence is sometimes ignored, or at best relegated to secondary importance, with few references in the academic press, the exceptions in this case being Peers (2008) and Rose (1986). In the past an extensive debate has raged within archaeology about the extent to which written materials should be used. I believe ignoring these resources is a mistake, since they often provide a wealth of information. This is a view others share (Ball 2010; Johnson 1996; Stone 1988; Stratton and Trinder 2000; Symonds 2010). Perhaps it was best summed up by Beaudry in 2006:

This suspicion of documents, this notion that the biases of those who recorded them cannot be analyzed and interpreted but in fact will inevitably taint the researcher, is as naive as it is intuitive and unproductive (Beaudry et al 1996: 282)

This means relevant documentation will be a feature of this study.

The use of contemporary publications is used to aid understanding of the background. In Chapter Three publications such as *Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal* and *Blackwoods’ Magazine* will demonstrate debates on social issues. In the same chapter we trace, through the pages of *The Builder*, the process by which Liverpool City Council built Labourers’ Dwellings in 1867. These examples illustrate how archival evidence and contemporary literature can be significant resources for research. They are also, of course, material culture in their own right, as valid as any piece of ceramics or lithic assemblage. As Wall makes clear we need “a combination of the material culture from archaeological excavations along with historical sources” (Wall 2010: 80).

### 2.2.4 Material Culture

There already exists extensive fieldwork in the archaeological record and it is the synthesis of that which forms the key components in this study. The reason for conducting fieldwork, is to examine generated material culture. In this the archaeologist complements the work of the historian. As Ian Hodder makes clear “archaeologists in Europe defined themselves as different from historians by their concentration, not on elite texts, but on the mundane practices and residues of daily life” (Hodder 2000:21). Where original fieldwork is
undertaken, the type will vary with the context of the site and the demands of research. In the case of this study it will mainly include photographic recording, building survey and landscape analysis. Such fieldwork will be undertaken to extend existing archival knowledge, or to provide further information.

A significant portion of this study relates to buildings – existing, demolished or simply missing. As examples of material culture in their own right they are significant. Access, aesthetics, location in landscape, internal structure, use of construction materials, adaptation and intended use - to name but a few issues - are key elements of archaeological interpretation. As Hicks and Horning make clear “built structures represent a highly significant part of the material remains of the past five hundred years, the study of which deserves to be integrated with the analysis of sites, artefacts and landscapes” (Hicks and Horning 2006: 273). This research seeks to do just that.

2.3 Geographical Spread:

This study requires a defined and clearly identifiable geographical basis. The area has to be large enough to provide a critical mass of information, whilst maintaining the integrity of a recognised identity. Consequently the broad area of North West England has been chosen as meeting these criteria. Additionally “the world’s first Industrial Revolution produced unprecedented social and environmental change and North West England was at the epicentre of the resultant transformation” (Brennand 2006: 165). The research will be based upon the ceremonial counties of Cumbria, Lancashire, Merseyside and Greater Manchester. Collectively they cover a population of some 5.93 million people, with an area of 11,768 square Kilometres. This includes the northern reaches of Cumbria – with lakes, fells and isolated communities, and the industrial heartlands of Greater Manchester. There are also the seaports of Merseyside and the mixed county of Lancashire, with communities as diverse as rural Forest of Bowland and urban East Lancashire. Key industries represented include textiles, manufacturing, engineering, mining, transport, glass and chemicals.

Whilst the primary focus will be the North West of England, there is a need for comparison with studies from other UK areas, which include the West Riding of Yorkshire (Caffrey 2004; Dewhurst 1989), Nottingham (Chapman 1971), Scotland (Checkland 1980) and Essex, (Crosby 1998) plus national studies (Meakin 1965). Further comparisons could and are,
where appropriate, made across international dimensions including Canada (Schmitt and Zeier 1993), France (Moss (1977), USA (Baugher 2001a, Baugher 2001b; Lander-Birch 1981; Maniery 2002; Yamin 1997), South Africa (Malan 1997) and Australia (Bolton 2009, Karskens 1999). The methodology of this study is to utilise the North West as a microcosm of English society. In order to complete this study, comparisons will be drawn with other locations, using extrapolation to verify concepts across a broader geographical area.

This is not to argue that uniformity can be simplistically applied, but I will demonstrate that key issues can be studied in detail at one location, whilst making national and international comparisons. There is a need for local discoveries to relate to international literature, in order “to situate local experiences in contexts that illuminate global connections” (Delle et al 2000: xii). What it will not propose is a uniformitarian approach, for extrapolation and comparison are both used with caution.

2.4 Archaeology and the people of the past:

There are occasions when it is appropriate that people are missing from the record – a site report for a developer will be more interested in physical remains than the intricacies of social dynamics. Yet too often people are missing from academic literature. When they do exist in the record it is frequently the wealthy and powerful. Those who are poor, marginalised or deviant appear habitually absent. In this study we have the opportunity to place ‘ordinary’ people at the heart of archaeology, to undertake what Casella and Griffin call “democratising the past” (Griffin and Casella, 2010: 101). The opportunity to ensure the story of Joseph Sefton and his examination before Essex magistrates is recorded, with all this can tell us about living conditions for apprentices at Styal. In Chapter Five finds from an orphanage illuminate the life of Ellis Guest, and some eighty years later a similar process is undertaken by James Stanhope-Brown. It is only by looking at the lives of real people, that we fully understand the past. This concern about the absence of people from archaeology is shared by many (Matthews 2003; Nevell 2005; Orser 1996; Scott 1994; Shackell 2000a; Symonds 2003; Tarlow 1999; Trinder 2002).

There are debates surrounding sympathy, or empathy, with people from the past (Mayne and Murray 2001). For some the issue is of traditional stereotypes blighting communities (Newman and Newman 2008). Such an approach is fraught with danger, for whilst
challenging stereotypical views of the past (WA 2008), it is all too easy to become blasé and contaminate research with both a romantic and myopic eye. Life in the past was hard and demanding. Life expectancy was short (HOC 1842; Szreter and Mooney 1998). Accidents (Boyes 2005; Bronstein 2007; Nadin 2006) and malnutrition (Dye 2000) were regular visitors, as was disease (Dorling et al. 2000; Hardy 1988; Higgins 2006). These were not easy times, nor places, to live. Whilst wholeheartedly accepting the premise of Mayne and Murray, it is essential to ensure perspective when examining living conditions of the poor. To reach the conclusion that life was not too bad simply because people occasionally laughed, shared a joke and fell in love would be to demean and treat with contempt the harsh realities of life in many urban communities. What is required is a balanced approach – recognising both the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ experiences, what David Englander calls “history with a human face” (Englander 1985: 492).

Allied to this is the need to be cautious with interpretations. It is particularly important not to judge the past from modern perspectives. Personal prejudices and beliefs have to be subverted, as far as possible, or openly acknowledged. It is perhaps best summed up by Coulson who argues “mind reading across the centuries is a hazardous business, much too casually indulged in, for often the preconceptions of today are unthinkingly attributed to the past” (Coulson 1979:77). There is further the need to avoid generalisations that do little to enhance either overall or detailed understanding. Without doubt many poor were housed in appalling conditions (Axon 1919; Builder 1861a; Cooke-Taylor 1842; Kay-Shuttleworth 1832). Yet there is evidence some lived in good quality housing, from much rarely cited accounts, such as Cobbett (1830), who describes Durham Miners’ housing. A further example comes from The Royal Commission on Handloom Weaver’s who report on the existence of “good comfortable dwellings” (HOC 1840:301). Or there is the housing described in Chapter Three built by the Derby based Ruddington Land Allotment and Provident Society. This is not to make the case that housing was universally good, it patently was not. But it should act as a salutary warning to us about the dangers of making generalisations from the particular. A further danger is that a simplistic analysis arguing all workers’ housing was vermin ridden, damp and ill maintained can too often be used as a means of eliciting sympathy from the reader on an emotional, rather than intellectual level (Symonds 1999). This research will demonstrate that the housing provided by the Greg family was significantly superior to that
available in many expanding towns. These all demonstrate that workers’ housing was far more complex and diverse than many traditional writings claim. Not every worker lived in hovels or cellars.

Recognition of discrete action as a conscious choice helps in understanding individual lives. As Paul Shackell makes clear, people make choices which “are made with reference to others, and their actions, pursued within the parameters of social structures, may lead to tension and conflict. These differences requires some sort of resolution, which may mean conformity or change” (Shackell 2000b: 232). Such issues lead us naturally to the theoretical model to be employed.

2.5 Daily Routines

The development of ‘cultural capital’ emerges from early “imperceptible learning” (Bourdieu 1984: 477). Usually such learning would be instigated by the family, however in the case studies in this work it will also develop from institutions such as the apprentice house in Chapter Three or Orphanages in Chapter Five. Specifically in the case of the Warehousemen and Clerk’s Orphanage, the use of aesthetic communal motivation will be clearly demonstrated as a means of influencing child development. Bourdieu takes his argument further, believing such aesthetics become internalised. This develops a communally shared basis of taste - one that regards deviance from the accepted as unacceptable. This perspective gives weight to key issues in this study, where I will discuss decorative orphanage windows in Chapter Five, Octavia Hill’s concern with colour in Chapter Four and the aesthetics of buildings at Styal Village in Chapter Three.

Bourdieu’s own definition of habitus is “an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted” (Bourdieu 1977: 95). Its construction through the interaction of active individuals with each other and their environment is particularly relevant to the orphanages in Chapter Five, or villages and navvy camps in Chapter Three. In particular at the orphanages interaction between the individual and created physical environment of architecture is key to understanding the social goals of the founders. Here the architecture and design reinforce social, political and economic concepts. A more detailed discussion appears in Chapter Five, which also relates Bourdieu’s theories on the value of aesthetics rooted in the early experiences of childhood.
In her 2010 paper Young uses the concept of *habitus* as a framework to understand material culture within its historical context. She argues this provides “a cultural framework of lived practice rather than more conventional analysis by economics and politics” (Young 2010: 133). For similar reasons a comparable approach is taken in many parts of this study.

In many case studies we will discover individuals undertaking activities in the support of philanthropic actions that also enhance personal status and position. The gaining of rank in society is often a discrete act, an intentional aim, not simply a by-product of human action. It further demonstrates that economic motivation is often not the sole reason for people undertaking philanthropic work (Bourdieu 1977).

However there is a problem with slavishly applying Bourdieu’s theory, for his belief that certain ‘universals’ become internalised and accepted itself produces a difficulty. In many case studies the theory can be easily applied, but a possible criticism will be explored in Chapter Five. If Bourdieu’s theory means people learn limitations on their aspirations through such internalisation, then why are the managers of the orphanage spending significant volumes of money on extensive motivational architectural features?

In spite of this reservation the theories of Bourdieu provide us with a sound theoretical framework within which to pursue this study. Bourdieu’s work is extensive, and contains a remarkable consistency. As Richard Jenkins argues the history and structure of the social world dominate his work, and his concern is how such “practices contribute – without this being their intention – to the maintenance of its hierarchical structure” (Jenkins 1992: 141).

Throughout this study one of the key issues we repeatedly meet is the repetitive nature of behaviour, and the manner in which such replication of activity normalises the social system. Many of the case studies demonstrate the experiences and actions of individuals, pursuing life in a regular methodical manner, is a means by which personal behaviour is modified. This is the case regardless of whether it is the arrangements for sleeping in a navvy camp, the daily routines of apprentices at Styal Mill, or the orphans at Cheadle Hulme or Styal Cottages. It is this regularity of action, experienced through physical sensation, that is the means by which individuals react to and interpret their world. Or as Anthony Giddens makes clear “all social systems, no matter how grand or far flung, both express and are expressed in the routines of daily social life” (Giddens 1984: 36).
This work sits with other research into the roles and functions of individuals in the past. In many cases the use of agency theory to illuminate the “faceless blobs” (Tringham 1991:97) has been from an androcentric position. Much archaeological work has been conducted from the perspective of middle aged males, placing them firmly within the main orbit of consideration, “leaving the majority of society relegated to invisible, passive non-agenthood” (Dobres and Robb 2000: 13). This research emphatically does not. It recognises the role of marginalised groups through the study of the navvies in Chapter Three. It explores the lives of individual apprentices in Chapter Three and specific children are used to illustrate the functioning of orphanages in Chapter Five. It discusses the role women had in forming societies that impinged on the lives of tens of thousands of the poor in Chapter Four, whilst the urban poor are a key component of the work in the same chapter. It most emphatically deals with many sections of society often missing from the archaeological record, and not solely the middle aged male. In view of the above, this work will “proceed from a view that the past is knowable, though our knowledge is shaped by an interested present” (Stahl, Mann and Di Paolo Lauren, 2004: 4).

One final complicating factor is the approach taken to the layout of the estate developed by Samuel Greg. In Chapter Three I shall argue the estate conforms to a Foucauldian analysis. This is based solely on the physicality of the estate and concerns the geographical layout as a means of maintaining power over individual workers and apprentices. In that it is confined to the particular and not an analysis of the state’s relationship to individuals this is not problematical, but the difficulty arises with the clear acts of agency explored later in the chapter. In a pure Foucauldian analysis such an approach would be contradictory. The acts of human agency detailed in Chapter Three replicate the actions and repetitive nature inherent in Bourdieu’s theoretical perspective, as does the rest of the study. I am arguing that this element of Foucault’s analysis, based on Bentham’s Panoptic, applies in this given situation. It is not an argument this approach applies fundamentally, but a caveat.

2.6 “modern archaeology is at its heart a multidisciplinary endeavour” (Orser 1996: 311)

Whilst this research is unequivocally archaeological, it seeks to place that archaeology within broader social, political and economic contexts. The need to go beyond traditional narrow
academic boundaries, complementing the archaeological record with a multi-disciplinary dimension, is widely recognised (Karskens 2001; Little 2007; Mrozowski et al 1989).

In addition to archaeology, many diverse subjects will contribute. Examples include Accounting and Finance with the analysis of procedures developed and championed by Octavia Hill, and the influence this was to have on housing movements (Walker 2009), whilst Anthropology provides us with much of the theoretical background to the study (Bourdieu 1977, Bourdieu 1984, Bourdieu 1990; Stevenson 1982). The significance of architecture in understanding the past is a major component of the work, with the specific historical archaeology of structures (Hicks and Horning 2006), the development of modern building types and their significance to power (Markus 1992) and architectural investigations into specific communities (Chance 2007; Dellheim 1990; Kennedy 2000; Richards 1936). Classic examples of a single business being involved in Philanthropic activity and the rationale they espouse gives an insight into Business (Bradley 1990; Jeremy 1991). The sphere of education is represented by extensive work including the development of educational opportunity in the Lancashire Cotton Industry (Sanderson 1967) and a time specific study of the late nineteenth century (Sanderson 1999). The evolution of suburbia represents Geography (Bailey and Bryson 2006), along with social geography (Dennis 1984), the impact of space on institutions (Ploszajska 1994) and housing clearance (Pooley 1985). As would be expected history is well represented, including social history (Burnett 1978), specific housing studies (Gouldie 1974) and theories of philanthropy (Prochaska 1980, Prochaska 1988, Prochaska 1990). There is also significant work from leisure studies (Bromhead 2000) with research on militarism and sports influence (Girginov 2003), the Berlin Olympics of 1936 (Murray 1992) and the development of school sport (Welshman 1999). Used to illustrate contemporary perceptions, the field of literature provides excerpts from *Tess of the Durbervilles* (Hardy 1992 [1912]), *My Son, My Son* (Spring 1938) and *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist* (Tressell 2008 [1914]). It is impossible to study this period without recourse to literature from medicine where examples of hospital funding (Cherry 2000), the medical effects of poverty (Dorling et al 2000), asylums (Ellis 2006; Hill and Laugharne 2003) and specific diseases such as typhus (Hardy 1998) or scurvy (Higgins 2006) are all present. An analysis of the sociology of Bourdieu aids our theoretical analysis (Dumont and Evans 1999; King 2002), whilst Dick Hebidge looks at cultures and counter cultures (Hebidge 1979) and a
sociological analysis of material culture (Komter 2011) all assist. Issues surrounding technology (Boyes 2005; McGaw 1989) and theology (Perry 1933) are further examples of the diversity supporting this research.

To create a real understanding of the society, we need to be firmly rooted in the archaeology whilst looking beyond immediate subject confines. As Matthew Johnson says: “Archaeology does not have a monopoly on the study of the voices of ordinary people, but it does have the ability to render familiar things strange and reveal timeless things as transient” (Johnson 1999: 34). The traditional straight jacket of rigid adherence to disciplinary boundaries needs to be addressed, so that relevant disciplines can effectively contribute to understanding. Grace Karskens perhaps puts it best when she argues we now have:

> an opportunity to apply a new collaborative approach, one which sought to integrate history and archaeology, rather than maintain the artificial disciplinary boundaries which have bedevilled any real interpretation of urban archaeological sites (Karskens, 2001: 72).

A final example of the significance of studies from diverse disciplines is given by Alexy Simmons. When discussing the New Zealand War which began in 1845, Simmons argues that an over reliance on any single discipline can lead to an incomplete picture. Thus “the details of daily life as recorded in historic records do not necessarily match archaeological findings. Similarly there are gaps in the archaeological record that are filled out by the historical data” (Simmons 2010: 174). Whether discussing philanthropic housing or camps from the New Zealand War, our understanding is enhanced by the use of all relevant contributory elements.

### 2.7 In and out – the scope of the research

This work is focussed on philanthropic housing in the Victorian and Edwardian period, within the geographical and social confines detailed above. It will investigate three major personal motivations with three major communal motivations. To accomplish this, there will be three key themes which are illustrated through case studies: Housing the Workers, Housing the Urban Dweller and Housing the Impoverished Young.
2.7.1 Housing the Workers

The archaeological record details many settlements associated with industry. Hughes reminds us that copper mines on the Great Orme at Llandudno during the Bronze Age must have had a workers’ settlement (Hughes 2005). In 1981 the RCHM published a paper detailing late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries housing for workers in Frome, Somerset, reflecting a massive population increase (RCHM 1981). In Devon research was completed into agricultural labourer’s cottages (Fox 2003).

Housing workers takes many forms, and cover many disparate groups. One set are professionals - the local parson in the vicarage/manse (Gadd 2000), the schoolteacher in their schoolhouse (Cox 2006; Schwitzer 1994) or the works manager in their relatively sophisticated dwelling. There are also operatives - the mill worker in textile colonies (Timmins 2009), the miner in isolated communities (Billington 1993), the apprentices (Rose 1986; MCA), the household staff in great houses (Pooley 2009; Reid 1999; Richardson 2010; Waterson 1980), dockers (Mulhearn 2003) or farm labourer (Howkins 1992; Maudlin 2010).

In early cases housing was often provided to attract workers to isolated rural locations which had fledgling industries (Ashworth 1951). Others such as Port Sunlight (Chapter Four) or the Krupps family at Essen used good quality housing to improve industrial relations, producing enhanced output and profit. A complicating factor is that some industrialists clearly found the duality of impact appealing and throughout this study we shall continuously see a single motivation is rare. As Burnett makes clear:

In this respect employer housing often had a philanthropic aspect, favoured by ‘model’ employers who...recognized that the provision of a decent environment for their workers was both a social obligation and an economic advantage (Burnett 1978: 181).

Temporary and seasonal workers (Holmes 1998; Lewis 1981) were often housed in communal facilities, typified by navvy camps for canal, railway and major civil construction projects. These will be examined through contrasting forms and styles of camps. I shall trace their evolution from simple collections of primitive huts, to complex communities containing families supported by recreational, health and educational facilities (Meakin 1965).

The archaeology of workcamps is a small, discrete area that until recently received scant attention. In the United States there was work by Mrozowski at Boott Mill who, along with
other members of the team, produced an analysis of both the settlement and its role in the wider community. In 2002 Historical Archaeology devoted a thematic issue to Communities Defined by Work: Life in Western Work Camps including papers by Stevenson and Van Bueren (2002). Others studied related fields such as mining camps (Schmitt and Zeier 1993) or camp abandonment (Stevenson 1982). In the UK it was Historians who initiated the field, with studies of canal builders (Burton 1972), railway builders (Coleman 1968), the specific role of the Irish (Cowley 2001) and juvenile workers (Handley 1970). Serious archaeological investigations were absent until major questions were posed by Morris (1994). Others eventually followed with the exploration of specific sites (Hughes 2004, Hughes 2006; Robinson 1983), the analysis of specific building types in industrial settlements (Hughes 2005) and the emergence of communities specific to industry (Jones 1998). In 2008 Wessex Archaeology undertook the first significant excavation into a UK navvy camp for the ‘Time Team’ programme with The Navvies of Risehill Tunnell. In both the USA and Australia there has been a gradual development of research, with studies from the USA (Goddard 2002; Gray 2009) building on the extensive work of Mrozowski and his team (Mrozowski et al 1989) and Australia (Lawrence 2000; Bolton 2009) being leading recent examples.

Some have challenged the stereotypical views of marginalised groups so prevalent even today. As evidence becomes clearer, so it is apparent that these traditional views are ripe for change. Grace Karskens as long ago as 1986, with her analysis of Australian Convict Labour in New South Wales Road Gangs (Karskens 1986), started the process. This study will demonstrate that what is true for Australian convict labour, is also true for the navvies who laboured across the United Kingdom.

2.7.2 Housing the Urban Poor

The burgeoning population of manufacturing centres resulted in significantly higher population densities in towns, leading to a crisis of housing (Burnett 1986; Gauldie 1974; Tarn 1973). Whilst manufacturers rarely felt a personal responsibility for housing workers not directly in their employ, some did feel a moral obligation which was often religious, whilst for some it was political. The effect took many forms – visiting the poor, running religious/morally enhancing organisations or providing education, medical or recreational aid. Mostly cases contain a moralising influence. Lander-Birch tells us that one aim was “upgrading tenants” (Lander-Birch 1981: 417), whilst in the residences of Ocativia Hill there
were plans to “improve the occupants moral character” (Lander-Birch 1981: 417). The fact that the criteria for assistance was often “perceived moral worth” (Gutman 2004: 588), reinforces the political and moralistic undertones fashioning the process of eligibility. These attempts at modifying the behaviour of individuals will be explored in more detail later, and it will be demonstrated that such motivations occurred regularly across differing forms of philanthropy.

Form and style of housing was influenced by several factors: 5% philanthropy (see below), aesthetics, the use of the market as a financial lever and differing rates of progress in clearing the worst living conditions. The existing forms of housing for the urban poor – cellar dwellings, tenement blocks, through dwellings, courts, temporary accommodation and lodging houses will be briefly examined. The role of ‘gatekeepers’ in restricting access, differential provision according to status, physical construction and design are all key factors to be explored. Extensive demolition through clearance programmes, wide-ranging redevelopment and bombing during the Second World War has substantially reduced the volume of above ground remains available for investigation. As a result, archaeological methods can often most effectively be employed (OAN 2002a, OAN 2010; TPA 2007; UMAU 2005a, UMAU 2007).

I start with an examination of the urban poor (Huey 2001; Spencer-Wood 2001 and Baugher, 2001a, 2001b), in particular the development and role of alms houses (Howson 2008). Diverse examples such as New York (Baugher 2001a), Kings Lynn (Caffrey 2004), Whitehaven (CCC 2000f), North America (Huey 2001), or Bristol (Marochan and Reed 1959) will be used as illustrative examples. The emergence of different developers will be explored (Bryson et al 2002; Builder 1849, Builder 1899; Caffrey 2004; Gahan 1942), be they religious bodies, charitable institutions or individual philanthropists.

A detailed examination of almshouse architecture will complement the study, illustrating differentials influencing design (Caffrey 2006; Hallett 2004; Howson 2008; Builder 1849, Builder 1899). Through this study I will examine political and religious motivations that fired many Victorian and Edwardian philanthropists. In particular Social Darwinism (Chambers 1849; Piddock 2001) and opposition to it will be shown to be a key influence on political action. For some religious beliefs would be the major motivator. For others, moral obligations were of key significance.
The emergence of differing styles of construction will be briefly studied through typologies of housing in urban communities (Axon 1919; Burnett 1978; Burke and Nevell 1996; Coupe 1977; Coutie 1992; Gregory 2007; Jackson 1979; LCC 2005b; Maxwell 2009; Newman and Newman 2008; Roberts, 1993; UMAU 1999, UMAU 2002). Later development of styles will be studied, ranging from those of significance on a local level (Morgan 1990; Roberts 1993; UMAU 2005b) to those of importance on regional and national levels (Builder 1869a; Gaskell 1987; Rodger 1989). This will also reflect structural and design differences that developed between major providers of charitable housing.

A review of Preston will illustrate the experiences of living within an industrial town (Builder 1861b; LCC 2006a; Morgan 1990, Morgan 1993). The development of the town, with consequential impact on housing, will form an important element of Chapter Four. The study will contrast with other locations such as Barrow and Lancaster (Roberts 1976), East Lancashire (Newman and Newman 2008), Leeds (Rimmer 1963), Liverpool (Taylor 1971), Lancashire (Timmins 1993, Timmins 2000), Manchester (Busteed 2001; Roberts 1993), Nottingham (Chapman 1971; Murphy 1994), Stockport (Coutie 1992) and Wigan and Saint Helens (Jackson 1979).

### 2.7.3 Housing the Impoverished Young

Finally there is housing for those unable to accommodate themselves. The orphans, the lunatics, the prisoners and other marginalised groups requiring accommodation. There is a growing archaeology of institutions forming a background to Chapter Five (Beisaw and Gibb 2009; Casella 2004; de Cunzo 1995; Hughes 2005; Seary 2006; Spencer-Wood and Baugher 2001a; Spencer-Wood 2009; Zuelow 2004). The body of work available is now so large that only one aspect can effectively be explored. The archaeology of orphanages (Builder 1869b, Builder 1882, Builder 1902, Builder 1903, Builder 1904; Clarke 2004; Gutman 2004; Jacobi 2009; Maynard 2009) will be used illustratively. This will include the wider role orphanages played within Victorian and Edwardian society whilst exploring the motivators that provided both individual and communal impetus, before examining change and development.

Orphanages were institutions that operated on many differing levels (Baugher 2001a; De Cunzo 1995a), with multiple relationships both between and within groups. These included the relationships of institution to founder and wider society, inter relationships between
orphans, teachers, servants, subscribers and fundraisers. There was also a dynamic between staff and the broader economic, social and moral aims of the institution. One group is almost consistently absent from the literature, that of ‘servants’. What little research there has been comes, once again, from historians and social documenters (Horn 1975, Horn 2001; Pooley 2009; Reid 1999; Richardson 2010; Todd 2009; Waterson 1980). Many orphanages, especially large ones, employed significant numbers of staff to enable effective operation. Some servants were resident with discrete areas zoned for personal occupation, and well established access arrangements. There also existed different design standards – the more common dormitory institutions and rarer cottage homes (Gutman 2004; Ploszajska 1994), where comparisons will be made with the dual building type of housing investigated in Chapter Four.

Chapter Five will examine the archival records, buildings and grounds of the Manchester Clerk’s and Warehousemen Orphanage and School (now Cheadle Hulme School). Through symbolism embodied in the architecture, and the decorative elaboration of the setting, Bourdieu’s educational and child development theories are illustrated. They also provide the opportunity to explore theories of habitus and hexis.

During a visit to the school workmen were digging a trench that unearthed materials discarded from the kitchen. These ceramics, alongside contemporary photographs, enable a reconstruction of parts of the orphanage rarely discussed. These include areas that servants and other staff would have worked in, especially the kitchen and laundry. Contemporary photographs are also a key element of the analysis of the Styal Cottage Homes. Originally constructed by the Chorlton Union as an orphanage for pauper children, these were organised on the more radical form initially trialled at Mettray. The differential style and layout was supposed to produce a more personal and child centred experience for the child, based on belonging to a small home rather than a large institution. These diverse methods of organisation were a key debate about orphanage provision during Victorian and Edwardian times, with the two institutions reflecting the differential styles.

The chapter will also explore the implications of hidden personal possessions of an orphan at Cheadle Hulme. The finds were clearly hidden by a young child and contain several personal belongings. Enclosed in a purse enabling positive identification, there is however a major enigma concerning one of the contents. Whilst the majority can be clearly attributed, one of
the artefacts raises several questions about provenance. Further significance is gained through the same concealment strategy being discovered at Styal Cottage Homes, which had differential organisation over fifty years later. These issues are discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

2.8 “An Enormous Range of Social problems” (Checkland 1980:6)

This research has an underlying premise that common factors can be found across differing types and forms of housing. Concepts and ideas are not exclusive or restricted to single styles, locations or times, although a particular interpretation may be. The housing provided at New Lanark was both Utopian and pragmatic. Similarly the philosophy behind some housing constructed for the Urban Poor had a Utopian element additional to a practical dimension.

Checkland is astute in his assertion that “the Victorian philanthropists tackled an enormous range of social problems” (Checkland 1980:6). This provides us with a dilemma, for philanthropic activity cannot be seen in isolation. This means a full understanding of the impact of philanthropic activity in Victorian and Edwardian societies is a huge task. So whilst this work is primarily restricted to that of housing, this can not be seen in isolation from other social developments. To understand the rationale and motivation of philanthropists, requires looking beyond the immediate confines of housing.

In many communities there was the development of a range of ancillary services. These varied from educational provision – schools (Baker 1997; Green 1994; Johnston 1993; Roach 1999), institutes (Francis 2009; Waterhouse 1954) reading rooms and libraries (Harris 1979; Sked and Reid 2008; Smith and Beadle 1998); religious bodies such as churches (Innes 1998), chapels (Hawkins 2009; Wilson 2009); artistic endeavours such as theatres and art galleries (Dellheim 1990; Jeremy 1991; Moore 2004); medical facilities like dispensaries (Croxson 1997; Kilpatrick 1990; Webb 1988), pharmacies and hospitals (Jones and Rahman 2009; Prochaska 1992); and sporting facilities such as gymnasiums, teams, and stadia (Bromhead 2000; Hutchinson 2008; Parratt 1996; Wood 2005).

These are significant other areas of voluntary activity constantly overlooked. Unfortunately they fall outside the remit of this work, but it would be wrong not to recognise the huge contribution made by such areas as working class and familial philanthropy. As Prochaska
makes clear “misfortune, childbirth, sickness and death called continually on familial charity and the kindness of friends and neighbours” (Prochaska 1988:26). There was as much, if not more, philanthropic activity amongst working people, as there was by the wealthy. Many of these will have no record, such as informally organised collections after the death of a workmate, or the support for local organisations and assistance to others in the community. Similar points could be made about the whole co-operative movement or organisations such as The Quakers.

2.8.1 Personal and Communal Motivations

This research will argue that fundamental issues recur when analysing philanthropic housing. Understanding this complexity means appreciating physical location and temporal settings, but also influential personal and communal motivators. The differential between the two is essential to understanding not only the biography of particular organisations, individuals and structures. I will demonstrate in Chapter Six this is fundamental to understanding the impetus for change and development. Thus an understanding of progress within the field of philanthropy requires knowledge of both personal and communal motivations. Further it is the dynamic relationship between the two that is crucial to change. This is similar in approach to the recently articulated views of Linda Pollock in her treatise on 'kindness', where she argues ‘kindness’ “operated as a cluster concept; that is, an umbrella term that linked together a diverse array of related ideas, providing a bridge between and connective pathways through the associated attributes” (Pollock 2011: 124).

There are three key dimensions to personal motivation:

- Religious
- Economic
- Political

These three fundamental motivators operate across time and space. It is further apparent that a single motivating factor is often too simplistic an analysis, since in many cases multiple factors operate. For example the Greg family pursued an economic motivation, but with a religious foundation to their beliefs. Personal motivations reflect the belief system of an individual. Whilst an individual might work collaboratively with others who share components
of beliefs, they are essentially initiated responses to personal beliefs and experiences. They are individual in thought, and often action.

Many philanthropists fervently believed in personal religious obligations that required altering not only the physical conditions of the poor, but also their morality. Thus Prochaska argues “much nineteenth century philanthropy may be seen as liberalism turning its mind to social conditions under religious pressure” (Prochaska 1988: 24). This demanded more than the provision of decent housing. For these philanthropists change could only materialise when the moral and spiritual outlook of people altered. It was what Octavia Hill called their “mission to the poor” (Hill 1883: 3). It is significant Hill calls it her “mission to” rather than her “mission for”.

For many monied philanthropists, running in tandem with this religious motivation and fervour, was concern about an irreligious and indolent class of paupers. The potential spread of this ‘threat’, often with subvert political undertones, was motivation enough for many. Every stereotype was employed to demonstrate the dangers of irreligiosity and the potential threat. Typical of fears at the time was an article in Fraser’s magazine in 1866, which uttered the dire warning:

In the only dwelling of the indigent – in the overcrowded filthy lodging houses resonant with evil words, polluted with evil sights and smells, jostling sordid, peaceless – there is probably the minimum of religion on which human souls of Caucasian race well may live (Fraser’s Magazine 1866: 148).

As a result, many active organisations were founded by religious bodies (Carter 2001a, Carter 2001b; Gandy 2003). On occasions this tie to disparate churches and chapels was to lead to rivalries surfacing, demonstrating that “tension was obvious amongst rival sectarian groups” (Shapeley 2001: 55).

Association with a charity or undertaking charitable activity could produce major benefits to the individual. As Prochaska makes clear “celebrity status, knighthoods and quite a few votes have been given to those seen to be charitable patrons” (Prochaska 1988: 16). It could sometimes confer the ability to influence policy, or even meet royalty. The possibility of enhancing personal status both locally and nationally, provide access to networks and fulfil personal demands of a religious, economic or moral nature was also significant. Giving not
only heightens the status of the provider, it also develops an obligation on the part of the receiver (Ben-Amos 2008; Kidd 1996; Prochaska 1980, Prochaska 1988, Prochaska 1990). As Shapeley makes clear “donors cannot give without receiving something in exchange, whether it be status, self-satisfaction or any number of other possible rewards” (Shapeley 2001:48). But the ability to undertake charitable works was dependant on personal financial resources. Only those whose time was not totally claimed through the demands of work were able to take part in high profile charitable activities. Significant personal donations such as those made by Frank Crossley - estimated to have donated £100,000 to the Salvation Army alone (Shapeley 2000) - demanded substantial volumes of personal wealth. The extensive fortune of Joseph Mason meant he could finance the Birmingham orphanages detailed in Chapter Five, and in the process be viewed as an “admirable founder of this great charity” (Builder 1869b: 744).

A further approach is discussed by Mary Beaudry (2010) who reports on the interpretation of funds, a concept initially put forward by Wolf (1966), and subsequently interpreted by Villamarin and Villamarin (1992). In this individuals set aside funds (social political and religious). These are then available for future generations to draw on to enhance personal and social standing. De Cunzo also subscribes to the concept, arguing that in Delaware the development of standing amongst merchants was based on “deployment of resources, knowledge and relationships” (De Cunzo 1995b: 196). Thus social progression depended upon resources and capital that was not solely economic, but also social. The development of social capital is based on the emergence of networks which further give rise to the accumulation of religious and political funds. This produces a progression of social standing that can be gradual and inter-generational, so Crossley establishes a dynasty of wealth and social standing. A similarly generational line of funds can be seen established amongst the Greg Family in Chapter Three, and the Guinness, Carnegie and Lever families in Chapter Four.

Shapeley argues that those involved in charitable activity gained a status that made them an “elite within the middle classes” (Shapeley 2000: 19), with the public profile of individuals significantly enhanced by involvement in charitable activity, through demonstrating their worth to local communities. Such enhanced status was repeatedly reinforced through reporting in the local press and the visible support of local authorities. It was also one means
through which the self-made wealthy could enhance their status, thus becoming an integral part of the local hierarchy, with all the local and national political advantages this provided. Thus “charitable association could transform those whose names became closely and most constantly involved, into local dignitaries of the highest order” (Shapeley 2000:82). Such arguments are supported by Bielenberg who, referring to the Guinness family, explains “how lavish expenditure on conspicuous consumption and philanthropy elevated his family to the summit of British society” (Bielenberg 2003:133). They are taken a stage further by Prochaska who argues that in some cases activities took place which “blurred the boundaries between voluntary action and political reform” (Prochaska 1988: 22).

In some places significant numbers of public buildings and amenities were provided by philanthropic activity. One example will illustrate, that of Halifax in West Yorkshire. There, as well as an orphanage “the recently erected town hall…the almshouses, the public parks, the model dwellings for the labouring classes and other works” (Builder 1865:9) all fell into this category. Several of these institutions will be visited later in this study, in particular model dwellings for the labouring classes (Chapter Three), the almshouse (Chapter Four) and orphanage (Chapter Five).

Whilst political motivation may not at first be so apparent, it is a common feature of the impact philanthropic activity often had on individuals. Through forced adherence to social mores of the time, philanthropic organisations influenced and modified the behaviour and actions of individuals, ensuring conformity with established social patterns. One classic example is the rules of the Gloucester society quoted in Chapter Three, which were aimed at “the elevation of their standards of morals” (Builder 1848: 586). Other clear and overt examples of behaviour modification are to be found in chapter Four with Octavia Hill. Less explicit political dimensions, disguised by the cloak of philanthropy, can be found in the orphanages examined in chapter Five. Here, at the Manchester Warehousemen’s and Clerk’s Orphanage Annual Meeting in 1853, George Jackson speaks “in favour of the necessity of having a good middle class school” (Daily Telegraph 1853).

For some there would be social as well as economic barriers to involvement in public charitable activity. Many charities were housed in extensive and austere buildings, designed in such a manner as to display worth, power and significance. By extension these concepts were bestowed upon individuals involved in positions of authority. Further the buildings
themselves could act as a social barrier between receiver and benefactor. They provided a concrete contrast between donor and the recipient’s living experiences. For many of the poor their encounters with such structures had not been positive. Many headquarter buildings of Poor Law Guardians were ostentatious and highly imposing. The only experience many poor had with such ostentatious structures was when seeking relief – and at their most vulnerable. In the minds of many this architectural style would become associated with misery and degradation. By contrast much working class philanthropy was conducted in buildings far removed from such highly ornate official structures. Familiar locations such as pubs, clubs, wash-houses, institutes and sports pavilions were more likely locations.

Societal factors that influence change also require examination, being identified as ‘communal motivation’. Three key communal motivators operating throughout this study, either singly or in combination:

- Medical
- Moral
- Aesthetic

Communal motivators will be demonstrated to be issues individuals share with others, but they do not necessarily demand continual or slavish support for organisations or ideas. In this sense communal motivation is an aggregation of the activity of individuals, reflecting changing and adapting belief systems, producing and reproducing activity through shared belief. Such shared belief itself produces a ‘critical mass’ of support that then acts on wider society, attracting or repelling individuals. Thus whilst individuals act on the particular ‘issue’, the collective acts in support of the ‘issue’ on further individuals, establishing a recursive relationship. Nor are the belief set and established. They are fluid and changing, reflecting adapting and shifting needs and beliefs. People move in and out of circles of influence, providing dynamic momentum. Such change of personnel is often at the periphery, sometimes enabling access to individuals and ideas within other ‘issues’. There may be overlaps across these collective motivators, providing cross-fertilization of ideas and concepts. Thus collective influences, whilst being fixed for a few, for many others were constantly evolving. They reflect the collective beliefs of individuals about an issue, but only for a particular moment in time.
Medical communal motivators (Axon 1919; Dennis 1984; Hodge 1997; Timmins 2000) were based on the impact of disease and its communicability. The study will examine the significance of medical research on developing urban communities, consequent on the decline of the concept *miasma*.

Medical research and advances in medical technology had a major influence on the design of much working class housing. This research includes extensive discussion about changes in architectural design, evidenced by two significant building styles. In Chapter Four we shall see the vast majority of design and construction of philanthropic housing was in one of two forms. The open deck access type block with external water closets and communal facilities was one. The alternative was the enclosed style, where individual premises were totally self-contained, including personalised toilet and washing facilities. There was extensive debate around the different styles, often structured around medical advances. In the case of each structure common design features existed being the product of medical research. All buildings were high ceilinged, to reflect views that copious volumes of circulating air were essential. Similarly natural light was regarded as important for a healthy living atmosphere, with the result that both building styles provided large windows.

Regular visits to working class homes by the middle classes were a common feature to enhance behavioural norms. These norms were ostensibly driven by moral imperatives, but often disguised under the cloak of hygienic necessities developed from the medical driver. This overlap of communal motivation – medical and moral – was a dynamic feature motivating many of the organisations, such as those of Octavia Hill, discussed in Chapter Four. There is extensive evidence of the use of moral communal motivation (Anderson and Darling 2007; Delle 2002; Dennis 1984; Owen 1965; Wohl 1978), where morally established standards of behaviour influence aspects of architectural design.

The method of cloaking the moral driver under a more acceptable rationale is a common feature identified in research. Many undertaking philanthropic activity would adhere to a code governed by religious or moral convictions. Thus Samuel Greg in Chapter Three is governed by the moral imperatives of the Unitarian Church, Octavia Hill by the views so clearly espoused by the Kyrle Society and National Trust is met in Chapter Four with George Jackson arguing for a middle class education for orphans in Chapter Five.
The imperative to adapt behaviour is never so clearly demonstrated as in the debates about incest referred to in Chapters Three and Four. Here the dichotomy of Victorian/Edwardian thinking is most brutally exposed. Continuous debate around the issue, often without mentioning the actual word, is to be found. This offence against moral behaviour drives some owners like The Ashworth family to build multi-bedroomed property, which is not entirely successful in solving the problem, as demonstrated in Chapter Three. Many solutions were proposed that initiated a fundamental change in the relationship between individual and state, which are explored in Chapter Four.

The development of moral respectability was a major concern of housing reformers. Never was this more true than in the orphanages studies in Chapter Five. At the Manchester Clerk's and Warehousemen’s Orphanage the building itself will be shown to reinforce moral and religious concepts. The design of the structure will be shown to reinforce the underlying moral concepts the institution believed should be inculcated in its young charges. The way in which the building itself is used to reinforce acceptable behaviour, leads us naturally to introduce the field of aesthetic communal motivation.

Aesthetic communal motivation was regarded by many as important, either to display the wealth and status of philanthropists within the community, or as a reflection of the lack of available wealth of tenants by illustrating their lack of ability to pay for highly ornate and decorated buildings (Builder 1892, Builder 1900; Howson 2008; Palmer 2000; Payne 2002; Wayne 2004). In the cases of institutions embellishment was regularly used to produce “an imposing and forbidding reminder of the consequences of social non-conformity” (Ploszajska 1994: 418). The early internalisation of aesthetics and its impact, as described by Bourdieu, will be a particular focus for the study of Orphanages in Chapter Five.

In Chapter Three we will challenge some of the accepted principles of aesthetic significance in workers’ housing, in particular the view that only housing directly in the sight of the owner was regarded as worthy of aesthetic embellishment. Chapter Four will examine the role aesthetics played in the development of the ‘barrack block’ style of housing so evidenced across the emerging metropolitan areas. The difference between the two established basic styles will be explored.
The activities of Octavia Hill in providing colour and gardens as an integral part of her developments, and the reasoning, will form a significant part of Chapter Four. The gardens of the cottage homes at Styal are of equal importance, and are to be found described, in Chapter Five, where their significance will also be discussed. This will also draw a comparison between the gardens at Styal Homes and those at the house of Samuel Greg. Both these gardens are contemporary and sited within a short distance of each other, yet perform vastly differently functions. The role of garden design that enables the observation of a workforce will be demonstrated in Chapter Three through the layout of the garden of Samuel Greg.

What emerges from the above is the essential differentiation between personal and communal motivation. Motivational factors are singular and personalised, reflecting beliefs and personal ideals. They are essentially intimate. They provide the individual with the rationale for personal actions, the skeleton which can be embellished, often with the flesh of altruism. Communal motivators are based on aggregated and shared factors. They are socially generated and communally agreed. They provide a method by which societies and groups implement schemes, being about the how rather than the why. Both are essential to any real understanding of the development of philanthropy.

It should be apparent that there is an extensive range of issues that impinge when studying philanthropy. There are many forms and styles, varied beneficiaries (both providers and receivers), myriad local circumstances of influence, major economic, religious and political motivations, extensive variety of provision, aesthetic, medical and moral communal motivation plus a variety of evidence. The volume of potential examples means considerable discipline must be imposed, if the work is not to become too wide ranging and lose focus.

Similarly there are extensive resources available to the archaeologist to aid research. There has to be the same discipline when deciding the most appropriate resources to illustrate key points. There were hundreds of communities developed by companies to house their workers. The choice is extensive and a balance has to be struck. I have tried to ensure some of the more famous examples are present (Bourneville, Saltaire, Styal), but have also looked in more detail at some of the less famous sites (Vickerstown, Smithills and Batty Green) (Crosby 1998; O'Connor 1972).
There are already in existence many and varied accounts of philanthropic housing across the country. What makes this study different is the synthesis of existing multiple reports. It is this analysis of the whole that is currently missing from British archaeology. The parts have been, and continue to be, researched. The whole has not, until this research, been evaluated.
Chapter 3 – Housing the Workers

To improve the dwellings of the labouring class, and afford them the means of greater cleanliness, health and comfort, in their own homes, to extend education, and thus raise the social and moral habits of those most valuable members of the community, are amongst the first duties, and ought to be amongst the truest pleasures, of every landlord. While he thus cares for those whom Providence has committed to his charge, he will teach them, that reliance on the exertion of the faculties with which they are endowed, is the surest way to their own independence and the well being of their family

(Duke of Bedford, quoted in The Builder (1849) 7 (352): 517)
3.1 Challenging the Traditional Views

This chapter examines housing provided directly by employers for their workforce. It will explore the variety of provision with differing styles and functions across diverse cultural and historic periods. There will be cross cultural comparisons, using examples from UK and further afield to illustrate key themes. The range of evidence will include archaeological analysis, photographs, surveys, historical documents and mapping. The synthesis of academic and excavation reports with key interdisciplinary components will provide this unique view of the emerging archaeology. Specific case studies will enable more detailed analysis of key concepts, and illustrate interpretations. In particular the focus shall be on two key studies – The Greg family in Cheshire and the development of navvy and construction camps across the UK and internationally. The two major case studies will be augmented by smaller examples where appropriate.

The study of the Greg family will enable detailed scrutiny of an enclosed and evolving mill colony. By analysing the development and operation of the community, we can extrapolate key issues surrounding power. It is also possible through the changes introduced by successive generations of owners, to examine differing managerial structures. The role of apprentices will be scrutinised in detail, since their experience provide a clear microcosm illustrative of life in the mill colony.

The second major study is that of navvy and workcamps. These provide a vastly different environment, and this research is part of the relatively small body of work on the archaeology of these camps. Recent research is starting to provide challenges to traditional views. This study will evaluate these and relate them to the archaeological record. The vast majority of research in this area has been undertaken in an international setting, so an evaluation of what can, and what cannot be applied to the UK environment is an essential component. The research will cover a variety of camps, in differing locations and across time scales.

The demand for housing was to become a key component of social provision, an essential facet in the development of industrial settlements – be they in rural or urban settings. Some settlements were temporary, whilst others became permanent features. This contrast in format and style will be explored later in the chapter. The need to attract workers to an
isolated location will be the basis for our first case study. Later we shall examine how the temporary needs of housing a workforce were met, and the diversity in provision this produced.

In the rural setting there had always been tied cottages – property held by the landowner but provided to workers’ on the estate. Some were purpose built, for example the Saint Barnabas Estate in 1888 provided cottages for estate workers. They are described as having:

- a private entrance and contains parlour, living room, scullery, pantry and coal-place on the ground floor, and three bedrooms on the chamber floor. The WCs and dust bins are built away from the main building, adjoining the back way to the cottages. The two end cottages are larger, and contain four bedrooms each (Builder 1888:414).

The financial support for rural dwellings was often from local landowners, but there is one example that illustrates a differing funding regime and so needs brief consideration. In 1848 in Gloucester an organisation was formed to provide housing with gardens for local workers, within easy reach of the city. The aim was to provide three bed-roomed properties, with light, airy buildings and separate gardens, the cost of construction to be recouped within fourteen years. Of special interest were the social aims of the group, which exemplified the educational and moral dimensions displayed in so many Victorian and Edwardian housing schemes. *The Builder* tells us they were:

- the encouragement of habits of providence, cleanliness and order, amongst the occupants; the elevation of their standards of morals and self-respect, by removing them from the degenerating influences of bad society, overcrowded or unhealthy dwellings to which they are so often unnecessarily exposed (Builder 1848: 586).

What is apparent is the extensive size and volume of resources involved in this construction. These are not the hovels of popular imagery. Similar dwellings were to be erected by the Ruddington Land Allotment and Provident Society in 1845 in Derby. *The Builder* describes the premises briefly and tells us the properties (160 of them) have five rooms with a back door, garden, office, pigsty and covered cesspool. The financial support came from funds raised by the workers’ themselves and channelled through the society. Monies were raised from small private investors and funds originally invested in sick clubs. Investments were made in multiples of £5 with an upper limit on investment for any individual of £20. This use of provident funds to invest in housing and the development of temporary building societies was not unusual being a common method by which individuals could attain the aim of
communally held house building (Builder 1845a). In some cases fundraising was in part motivated by the political ideals of co-operation.

Examples of permanent fixed housing provided by employers are abundant, but were rare in Modern Lancashire before 1850 (LCC 2005a). One example was in Blackburn where the mills at Brookhouse developed large areas of housing, with some 140 properties built specifically for mill workers. By the 1860s and 1870s it is believed that the figure had reached some 13% of properties in Blackburn and Bury being employer owned (Dennis 1984). The OS Map of 1848 (OS 1848 1:1056) and Timmins (Timmins 1993) details examples of such developments. It is evident from these two sources that what emerged was the forerunner in design standards of many subsequent working class houses and communities. They comprised terraces of two-up two-down houses with backyards containing personal ash pits. Many subsequent settlements in East Lancashire were to be based wholly, or partly, on formats established in these communities. A classic example is Smithills in Bolton, an area worthy of more detailed consideration.

3.2 Chess, Drafts and Lectures

The UMAU report on Smithills Estate provides a fascinating insight into the development of a mill community which can trace its history back to the Knights Hospitallers c1200 (UMAU 1996). Ownership passed through a variety of individuals and groups until the emergence of textiles instigated irreversible changes. The post medieval period saw not only textiles, but quarrying at Brown Stones Quarry, identified on the 1849 OS Map and shown as enlarged on the map of 1895. There were additional quarries at SD 6804 1246, SD 6794 1252, SD 6838 1228, SD 6806 1226, SD 6886 1177 and associated working features in the area. Coal Mining was a key industry, with Bell Pit, two pits at Halliwell, one at Hollin Hey and another at Smithills Dean. There were also associated mining features that included housing named Colliers Row (SMR entry 1418), shafts, tram ways, spoil heaps and a road called Coal Pit Road leading to Smithills Moor mine.

Situated in the Metropolitan Borough of Bolton, the Estate can trace its lineage back to workers’ housing for Dean Mills, the community now known as Barrow Bridge. The significance of the village is its multiple stages of occupation. Originally built for workers at the mill (with some eight hundred residents at its height), the community developed as a
model industrial village by Gardner and Bazley. O’Connor states “both men utilised to the fullest extent the principles of radicalism in an age when even to consider such a course could invite disaster” (O’Connor 1972:4). It is apparent that here is an example of double motivation. Clearly Gardner and Bazley had economic reasons for their development, but if O’Connor is to be believed there was also political motivation. They believed in providing decent housing for their workers – not only as a method of increasing financial returns through increased productivity, but also as being politically appropriate. These were conscious decisions, based on this double motivation of economics and politics. When the mill closed the village went into apparent terminal decline, until a new lease of life began in the early 20th century with the expansion of Bolton’s boundaries.

The nucleus of the village began as early as 1786 when Robert Lord leased land in the area and started development of his mill. Alongside he commenced the construction of cottages for his workers, which by 1830 had expanded to include some twenty four cottages. Sites such as New Colliers Row are now in private use (Greater Manchester SMR 1418).

The original mill was a water powered spinning mill built in late 18th century, which passed through the control of various firms. The first mill was subsequently demolished and two new mills constructed on the same site. The facilities provided were unheard of anywhere else – separate rooms for eating food, provision of hot meals, newspapers in the canteen and baths/showers. These were truly radical developments and a significant forerunner of some of the facilities provided by later industrialists.

The village itself was non-sectarian with a multiplicity of community facilities. No particular religion was taught in the schools, and people were expected to attend services at their own places of worship. People of all denominations attended the school, where a basic Christian philosophy was taught. For some £3,000 an Institute was built and equipped with 950 people celebrating the opening in 1846. Schooling developed with separate teachers for boys and girls and by 1848 the school provided for the education of some 86 boys, 112 girls and 70 infants. The cost was 1½d (0.7p) per week, with all materials provided by the mill. A further development included evening classes for 300 people who lived nearby. The residents themselves founded a reading library, with subscriptions of 1½d (0.7p) per week which had fifty members, whilst Bazley provided the library with local newspapers and a
London newspaper. Bazley further demonstrated his interest in education by his involvement as an early governor and trustee of the then fledgling Manchester University.

When these holdings were sold to William Callender, a new era started. One of his first actions was to enhance the work of the Institute. Six daily and thirteen weekly newspapers plus six monthly magazines were provided. Chess and draft sets were purchased and a series of lectures by leading locals were initiated. Evening classes were developed in line with the principles of the Mechanics Institutes being established across the country. A penny bank was started to encourage savings and thrift.

The concept of housing workers then, is not unusual. It is all too easy to believe the provision of such housing demands huge tracts of land dominated by identical housing forms. But this is not always the case and there are many smaller scale examples of such provision. For example a DBA on Healey Dell in the present Metropolitan District of Rochdale, conducted by the University of Manchester Archaeology Unit tells us of Samuel Spencer (a fuller) and Thomas Hartley (a fulling finisher) listed in the 1851 census as tenants of the Old Mill. By 1871 the census return lists some six different families, by 1891 the premises are still listed but no tenants appear to be resident (UMAU 2004: 33). The real importance of this entry is that whilst significant numbers of people lived in workplace housing, much was small scale and isolated. A further example is the ubiquitous railway terrace found across the country. Individually they accommodated few people and are often to be found in isolated locations, but collectively they provided a significant source of workers’ housing. Often readily identifiable they are easily classified. For example the housing on the Settle/Carlisle line is of a style designed by the Midland Railway Company who constructed the line. This style is based on vernacular structures from the Midlands and uses materials from that geographical area. They can look strange and incongruous when placed on the North Yorkshire Moors with no attempt made to blend in with the local environment. Certainly it is likely that today such constructions would not be allowed as ‘out of character’. Not all organisations were to take such a cavalier approach to the local environment. For example Shaker communities in the 1700s often went to great pains to ensure their buildings reflected local styles (Nicoletta 2003).

Whilst it is widely accepted that certain landowners were prepared to move structures and entire villages in early England, the practice was still alive and well in the nineteenth century.
For example the Sixth Duke of Devonshire moved the entire village of Edensor that had been sited in the grounds of his house. Between 1838 and 1842 an entire new village was created, being finally completed by the construction of Sir Gilbert Scott’s new church in 1867 (Barnatt and Smith 1997). In this manner entirely new structures were created to accommodate existing and established communities. This means extra care has to be taken when using architecture as an indicator of the time a particular community has occupied a particular spot. It may be an old established community in a relatively new location.

3.3 The Debate

Traditionally there have been debates about the quality of housing provided for workers, and there is certainly a vast differential. Yet even those traditionally claimed to be of high standards can be disputed. A classic example are the Ashworth family and their mill colony near Bolton. For many years they were credited with having provided model housing on the Lancashire Moors. Certainly such views were strongly expressed by Boyson (1970) with Mathesius (1982) slightly more reserved in his judgement that the “standard seemed very high” (Mathesius 1982:123). It is the use of that word ‘seemed’ that requires further investigation. The claims of a universally high standard of housing are challenged by the more recent work of Timmins (2000), who makes the point that “whilst Boyson suggests that piped water was provided to them in 1835, Reach found in 1849 that they were not supplied with water in the interior” (Timmins 2000: 29). Timmins argues contemporary views of the Ashworth colony were questionable, based on information by visitors to the villages or statements by the Ashworth family themselves.

The widely held belief in the Ashworth family reputation was undoubtedly questionable. Certainly they were well regarded, with a status as principled employers who believed in providing high class housing for their workforce. The image projected was that of an altruistic family, who provided facilities of a high standard, having major concern for both the physical and moral environment. This belief was based on the provision of larger houses than usual in some parts of the estate, enabling the provision of more space. This meant the construction of buildings with three bedrooms, so reducing the incidence of multiple occupation by children of the same family, often young adults of differing sexes (Palmer 2005). Cook-Taylor tells us the Ashworth brothers emphasised the importance of ensuring separate sleeping arrangements for children of different sexes. This is clearly part of the
exercise of paternalistic moral control, or as they would see it moral responsibility, over residents. The real worry was the possibility of incest.

This concern about the potential for incestual relationships is an issue that haunted the Victorians. It was a concern consistently debated, albeit obliquely, by Victorian Housing reformers. Strangely enough there were no laws concerning incest in Victorian England, although they did exist in Scotland. It was not until 1908 that an Incest Act for England and Wales was passed by Parliament. In part this was a reflection of the belief systems of the Victorians. Although there was tacit private acknowledgment that such events occurred, it would have been too great a step to legislate as this would have entailed official recognition of what was a major taboo. Or as Wohl makes clear “to admit its existence publically when one roomed living was widespread was to admit that the social system itself was to blame for its existence” (Wohl 1978: 211). This is a subject we will return to and examine in greater detail in Chapter Four, when we investigate both the burgeoning Victorian and Edwardian towns and cities, and their relationship to this moral communal motivation. At this stage it is sufficient to note that it was an issue of deep concern for the more paternalistic mill owners. A view shared by the housing reformers we shall also meet later.

Such beliefs were not always replicated in an international setting. Indeed Wood tells us that at Ludlow in the USA, the concern was about members of different families sharing bed space, rather than members of the same family (Wood 2009:135). In other situations, the owners, like the Greg family, fined their workers not only for breaches of work discipline, but for infringing the moral code they imposed. As Wood points out ‘paternalism meant more than gestures of generosity. It also meant control and intrusion’ (Wood 2009: 127).

The above would seem to indicate the Ashworth family provided some high quality housing. There are though serious questions about the volume of poor quality housing they also provided, evidenced in Timmins 2000 work, based on evidence from rates books. As Timmins says “The most telling point to emerge, and given their reputation as high quality house builders, the most unexpected, is the high proportion of back to back dwellings the Ashworth’s owned” (Timmins 2000: 29). Such discrepancies between public perception and reality are not uncommon.
Throughout the country there was the provision of housing for workers, and in some cases this included the development of whole towns with wide ranging support facilities. The names of New Lanark, Saltaire, Port Sunlight and Bourneville are well known (see Chapter Four for more detailed study), but other less well known towns and villages were developed such as Silver End in Essex built by the Crittal family for workers in their window factory. At Barrow Island in Furness the Vickers Company established a new community. Prior to this they had provided wooden huts on Barrow Island, and by 1873 these accommodated some 349 people in 30 rows (CCC 2000d). At Whitehaven the Lowther family built three rows of houses at the harbour for their colliers (CCC: 2000a). During the Great War houses were built at Flookburgh for workers at the new aircraft factory (CCC 2000e). At Carnforth a new district was developed called ‘Dudley’. The new district built at Millhead received its name from the large influx of people originating from the Midlands town. These were “two-up and two-down through houses with pantry and box room” (LCC 2006b) and each had their own ash pit.

Additionally remote properties were provided by employers such as the railway terraces described earlier, often located near isolated signal boxes or sidings. These premises were not part of major developments, but with others such as caretakers, they provided a significant proportion of employer owned dwellings. Nor was such provision restricted to the emerging working class. Although beyond the scope of this study the provision of schoolteachers’ housing and that for ministers of religion was common – all housing provided for workers by employers, be they working or middle class. The detailed examination of all these sites is beyond the scope of this study, but it is important to appreciate that the development of such housing was not an isolated phenomenon, but one widely replicated in the UK and across the world.

Goddard tells us of McGill in Nevada USA, where the Nevada Consolidated Copper Company built a town that provided all occupants would require for living. Eventually this led to total control over the town, with the company providing:

- State of the art housing
- Low rents
- Full maintenance of the homes and town
- Health facilities
- Recreational facilities
- Sponsored social activities

They also exerted a strong paternalistic hold over the neighbourhood through retention of land rights. This ensured control over both activities and people within the workplace and outside it - something we shall see replicated later by the Greg family at Styal and many others.

Goddard provides a good definition of ‘the company town’, and it is possible to find examples which support this definition replicated across the UK and other countries:

model company towns were supposed to be residential settlements that contained the economic and social institutions necessary to meet most of the needs of the population and to insure that the labor force was not only nearby but healthy and content as well (Goddard 2002: 86).

Such influences can be seen throughout this study. As a result power now extended beyond the factory door and into the streets and very houses of the workers. It was no surprise that a satellite town developed around McGill, outside the orbit of company control. One of its original functions was to provide access to facilities either absent from McGill or not officially sanctioned by the company. Steptoe City provided bars, saloons and brothels for the workers who lived in McGill, though developing as a place where the direct control of the company did not extend. It was a place where workers could indulge in behaviour and activities that would have led to immediate disciplinary action or dismissal if performed in McGill. Such satellite developments are neither unusual nor recent developments. There are many examples that could be given of Roman Fort or Medieval Stronghold where the needs of workers or military were catered for in a similar fashion. Thus communities outside the immediate confines of fort or stronghold enabled the Roman or Medieval soldier to indulge in personal pleasures away from the controlling power of Lord or Centurion – an identical relationship to that of Steptoe City to McGill.

This utilisation of space is crucial to understand the manner in which employers exercised power and influenced the behaviour of their employees. The development of ‘ordered space’ allowed control to be developed beyond the immediate confines of mill or factory, to exist across all spheres of social behaviour. For the employers there was seen to be a significant
pay-off for their investment. Ordered space ensures the workforce is also ordered. The more structured and compliant the workforces, the more productive they were likely to be, leading to greater profits, illustrating the rationale for the economic motivation of many employers. Yet such ‘ordered space’ was not always uncontested. Earlier we saw the development of a whole unstructured community in Steptoe City that challenged company power. At other times workers simply took over space appropriating it for their own activities thereby changing its nature. An international example was the Eveleigh Railway Workshop in New South Wales, Australia, where workers utilised company property for mass meetings, sports and recreation (Taska 2005). As Mrozowski points out:

As expressions of company philosophy and instruments of surveillance these spaces were highly contested. Serving simultaneously as arenas of personal resistance and of company power they represented a hybrid space, a cultural veneer overlying an equally contested biophysical reality (Mrozowski 2006: 97).

It is apparent that the development of towns for specific groups of workers was an international occurrence. Locally one place stands out as a classic example of such provision. To further explore the concepts introduced above we will examine the eighteenth century Cheshire village of Styal and the community initiated by Samuel Greg.

3.4 Owners, Workers and Apprentices

There were two groups of workers at Styal, indentured apprentices and adults recruited and retained. Both made major contributions to the workforce, and many apprentices went on to become adult workers in the village, moving from apprentice accommodation to Styal village and in the process becoming fully fledged members of the Styal community. The accommodation for both will be examined, as will the way decisions taken about the landscape, the use of fines and workplace regulations impacted on the power relationships within the community.

A modern day interpretation of the motivations of the Greg family would at first sight appear to be purely economic. The Greg family owned and worked extensive holdings, including slaves on American plantations. Everything appeared to be geared towards economic primacy. They were also extensively involved in the Unitarian movement whilst supporting their workers in whatever religious observances they personally chose. The whole Greg family was intimately involved in charitable activities, and it might be argued that their
religious beliefs were also a significant motivator of their activities. It is appropriate at this point to remind ourselves of the point made in Chapter One by Coulson about “mind reading across centuries” (Coulson 1979:77). For many of the plantation owners there was no incompatibility between their religious beliefs and the ownership of slaves – indeed many believed they were performing their religious obligation by ‘civilising’ slaves and evangelising the Christian religion. There was, to Samuel Greg and others, no inherent conflict in this.

3.4.1 “demean and behave himself towards his said master” (MCA C5/5/2/102a)

The apprentices at Styal were integral to the successful operation of this relatively isolated mill community. Many apprentices were indentured from workhouses and parishes across the country – especially Liverpool, Manchester and London, alongside children from the local parish. The benefit was two way – providing Samuel with a tied workforce and ready pool of cheap labour, whilst removing the costs of young paupers from parish poor rates.

Apprentices were bound until the age of twenty one, often under indentures signed by Poor Law or Parish officials. Apprenticeship was a legal contract, with the master responsible for feeding, clothing and housing the apprentice. In return the apprentice was bound to the master and “the said apprentice shall serve...and honestly, orderly and obediently in all things demean and behave himself towards his said master” (MCA C5/5/2/102a). These words come from the earliest surviving indenture issued by the Greg family. Thomas Royley, the boy named in the indenture, was entered into the contract on May 25th 1785. The responsibilities of employers to their apprentices were often cited, with the intention of countering claims that apprentices were exploited. In an 1836 edition of The Westminster Review, the case for the master is clearly made:

It has been justly stated that where but ordinary care and humanity were exercised the apprentice system was one of great trouble and anxiety to the master who had the moral as well as the physical condition of his young people to look after – to supply all their wants – to provide medical assistance in the case of illness (Westminster Review 1836: 176).

This ‘moral as well as physical condition’ is an example of the ‘souls and body’ needs of the title. Yet the system was clearly not infallible. Apprentices were jealously guarded as a significant resource and masters would go to great lengths to retain them. But sometimes
there was an error and the Greg papers tell us of John Fox in a very difficult to read pencilled margin note from the Apprentices Stoppage Book

John Fox came from [unreadable] he was bound but was not legally transferred. He left us in the beginning of 1820 and went to his former [unreadable] at [unreadable] to whom he was originally bound apprentice (MCA C5/1 16/1).

The records clearly demonstrate that the Greg family were prepared to use the full force of the law when they thought appropriate – particularly in the case of runaways. There are cases where apprentices were imprisoned; John Yates in 1792 (MCA C5/5/2/102C) or Lucy Garner and Esther Price (MCA C5/8/22). Peers claims some ninety runaway attempts between 1792 and 1847, many of which would have resulted in the issue of warrants by the local magistrate (Peers 2008: 196). Over the years there were several changes to the law relating to apprentices. Yet they remained essentially the same as the laws concerning servants. The key components remained in force until abolition in 1875, and included:

- The relationship was contractual in law
- Enforcement of contract was through magistrates
- Breach of contract by the servant was a criminal offence with all the sanctions of the law, whilst breach by the master was a civil offence

The key issue is the third clause which demonstrates the differential in the relationship. The master could bring the full force of the criminal law on the servant/apprentice should the terms of the indenture be broken. Yet the only recourse of the servant/apprentice was through the civil courts. It is unlikely that any apprentice/servant would have the financial resources to engage a lawyer to act for them, so in effect the law as a means of remediation was closed. Since this was the only legal method by which servants and apprentices could challenge masters they were, in effect, unprotected.

The papers of Samuel Greg tell an intriguing story that illuminates the everyday life of apprentices at Quarry Bank. In June 1806, Joseph Sefton, 17 years old, ran away to visit his ill mother. In his examination before Middlesex magistrates he remarks “I had asked leave to be absent for a month of my master Mr Greg and he refused me, so I took off without his consent” (MCA C/5/8/27). Joseph’s father had deserted him when he was “about two years old” (MCA C/5/8/27) and he was raised by his mother. Born in Clerkenwell and resident in Hackney Parish Workhouse, he was bound through indenture to Samuel Greg. Joseph had no
major criticism to make of the Greg family, saying “I liked my employment very well” (MCA C/5/8/27). According to Joseph there were some forty two boys apprenticed and more girls, which accords with Greg’s oft stated views that he would rather employ girls than boys since he regarded boys as much more trouble – believing girls to be intrinsically more tractable. Although there were many more girls than boys, the girls only had one bedroom whilst the boys had three. The building survey conducted for this research (see below), clearly indicates that this was because the girls single room was considerably larger than any of the other rooms, extending the full length of the building. The rooms were whitewashed annually and apprentices provided with clean sheets every month. They slept two to a bed, and clean shirts were provided weekly on a Sunday. This was an important day since “On Sunday we went to church in the morning and to school in the afternoon after which we had time to play” (MCA C/5/8/27). Joseph is able to give us an insight into the food the apprentices were provided with:

On Sunday we had for dinner boiled pork and potatoes. We had also peas, beans, turnips and cabbages in their season:

- Monday – milk, bread sometimes thick porridge
- Tuesday – milk and potatoes
- Wednesday – sometimes bacon and potatoes, sometimes milk and bread
- Thursday – if we had bacon on Wednesday we used to have milk and bread
- Friday – (unreadable)
- Saturday – Cheese on thick porridge

We had only water to drink – tea when ill. (MCA C/5/8/27).

Joseph’s fellow absconder Thomas Priestley was thirteen years old when he accompanied Joseph on their journey. Thomas’s father was a turnkey at Newgate prison and he was eight years old when admitted to Hackney Workhouse “for about two years” (MCA C/5/8/27). Thomas had lost a finger on his left hand in a mill accident being attended by Mr Holland the surgeon at the factory, recovering in about six weeks. He confirms the apprentice house was superintended by Mr Richards and his wife and corroborates much of Joseph’s testimony. He validates that the girls slept on one side of the house with boys on the other, that they lay two in a bed with a “good many beds in each room” (MCA C/5/8/27). He agrees that they had good beds, clean sheets and white rooms, with porridge for breakfast and supper.
Thomas explains the reason he left for London was “during my illness I thought of my mother and wanted to see her. I have been in town for five weeks in Hackney Workhouse and am very willing to go back again” (MCA C/5/8/27).

The significance of these documents is they reinforce each other, whilst also supporting a large number of assertions by both archaeologists and historians. From these declarations we are able to piece together an image of the life that hundreds of young people lived – from the food they ate, the beds they slept in, the clothes they wore, the medical support they received and their day to day experiences.

These living conditions contrast with those paraphrased by Engels, describing the conditions at Basford Workhouse:

An inspecting official found that the sheets had not been changed in thirteen weeks, shirts in four weeks, stockings in two to ten months, so that of forty-five boys but three had stockings, and all their shirts were in tatters. The beds swarmed with vermin, and the tableware was washed in slop pails (Engels 2005 [1845]:287).

Whilst the conditions in Basford were extreme, the conditions in most workhouses did not compare favourably with the living conditions of an apprentice at Styal.

Joseph and Thomas would have lived in the Apprentice house on the estate, close by the mill site, and about half way between mill and village. The construction of this house was not cheap, incurring an initial cost of some £300 shortly prior to 1815. It is sufficiently removed from Styal village and Greg’s own house to ensure that boisterous behaviour would not be an annoyance to either mill owner or older worker. It delineates a physical and social boundary between apprentice and fully fledged adult, whilst maintaining the controlling influence of the daily walk to work under the eye of a watchful owner. As Rotman and Nassaney make clear, the production of such landscapes “encode messages to viewers about their makers and users” (Rotman and Nassaney 1997:42). It has its own garden which was of sufficient size to enable apprentices to grow a significant amount of their daily diet. Since the costs of vegetables were extremely expensive at this time, gardening had a financial benefit to the Greg family as well as fulfilling educational and recreational purposes for the apprentices. Such educational processes were an integral part of an apprentice life at Styal (Jones 2000).
A building survey of the Apprentice house undertaken for this study in August 2009 casts some doubt on the current interpretation of the building. The National Trust (owners) kindly gave permission for this survey, and accept there is some uncertainty about the current interpretation of the layout. My own dispute with the analysis concerns the designation of a room on the first floor as a boys’ bedroom. The site is sloping, so the ground floor at the back is the basement at the front, the first floor at the back the ground at the front and so on. The external elevation shows two bricked up features at the front of the building, clearly identified as part of the external face of this supposed bedroom. These features are easily categorised as window and door. Both share the same decorative ornamentation as other windows and doors features, and similarly their sizes equate with other equivalent windows and doors of the building. A general view of the front elevation would indicate that if both window and door were extant then the façade would have been originally symmetrical. This face abuts the main road running through the estate complex so it is probable that this was the original main façade of the building. It is also the most highly decorative façade emphasising its significance to visitors who would pass when travelling to the Greg family house. This would indicate that the currently bricked up door was originally one of the formal entrances to the apprentice house. These issues render the current interpretation problematical since entry through this door would facilitate access directly into what The National Trust claim is one of the boys’ bedrooms. This is, I would suggest, unlikely.

A further problem with the original interpretation is the location of the supposed bedroom within the complex. In the house there is only one room facilitating vertical and horizontal access through the building, whilst also enabling external access. This other room is the kitchen, and its positioning (on a path from the back of the house adjoining the lane, opposite the garden, storage spaces and privies) would indicate a major access route – probably that used by the apprentices themselves. If the kitchen did play such a role, its access features mirror the supposed bedroom (which also has three way access), raising further doubts as to its designation as originally a bedroom. No other room in the house replicates these striking access features – vertical, horizontal and external.

These features present us with a further potential reason for change in designation. If the room was originally an entrance, then there would have been two major access points enabling admittance to all levels and features of the house. Such design makes control of
entrance and egress more complex. Was the door and window of the apprentice house blocked to restrict access to a single route via the kitchen? The kitchen is the place in almost constant use in view of the extensive number of meals required. If this was the only access and exit, then it would enable almost constant observation by kitchen staff. Through such a mechanism the movements, actions and behaviour of apprentices would be under effective constant scrutiny.

Further examples of architectural design that aims to ensure access is only available through a constantly observable entrance and exit can be found. A classic study is that by Juliette Nicoletta of Shaker dwellings in nineteenth century America, which shows some similarities in design between the apprentice house at Styal and Shaker accommodation in Maine, Kentucky and Massachusetts. In each of these sets of buildings access to the house necessitated movement through an area constantly observable from the kitchen. Nicoletta describes the New Lebanon buildings in some detail and says “no-one could enter or leave the house unseen…the kitchen, of course, would have been occupied for much of the family’s waking hours since food preparation was an ongoing process” (Nicoletta 2003:367).

It is perfectly possible, and would not be unusual, for the use of rooms to change over time. This could explain the current designation of the room as a boys’ bedroom, after sealing of the window and door. But what is clear is the interpretation that it was always a boys’ bedroom conflicts with the physical evidence and must be seriously challenged.

**3.4.2. James Worrall’s Eight Shillings**

Fines and charges were not uncommon at this time and were employed by many factory and mill owners as a means to discipline their workforce (Dutton and King 1982; Engels 1987 [1845]). The Greg family were no exception to this practice, utilising a multi-functional approach to enforce authority across their estates, one component being the imposition of fines. These were levied for offences against established rules and for a variety of misdemeanours. Usually paid out of worked overtime, this meant no direct or immediate impact on the ability of employees to live their daily lives. The account of Thomas Priestly before Middlesex magistrates (above) tells us that overtime was logged and an account kept which ensured apprentices could draw on earnings when required.
Fines and offences are itemised in the Apprentices Stoppage Book and it is obvious that some of them repeat. There was clearly standardisation, a tariff for common infringements. A fine of five shillings (25p) was levied on both John Bailey (Aug 30th 1827) and James Johnson (August 20th 1827) for the offence of stealing apples, whilst Cleo Baker was similarly fined five shillings for stealing (Sept 20th 1827). There were larger fines for more serious offences with Job Barker fined a massive £4-1-10d (£4.09) on April 26th 1827, being the ‘balance forfeited for running away’ (MCA C5/1/41).

This system of fines assists in understanding the physical constructs of the estate. A standard fine for damaging a window in either mill or Apprentice house was 6d (2½p). The fines indicate that the simple formula of multiplication was applied to take account of varying number of panes damaged. Ann Kelsall was fined 1/- (5p) on August 26th 1824, Owen Williams 2/- (10p) on March 3rd 1821 and Thomas Torkington 3/- (15p) on Sept 1st 1823. This was not, incidentally, the first fine Thomas had paid for breaking windows. Yet there was a significant difference between these fines, even Thomas’s, and the fine imposed on James Worrall on May 20th 1815, a massive 8/- (40p). (MCA C/5/1/41). James’s crime was much more serious – not a broken window in the mill or the Apprentice house, but ‘to a window in Mr Greg’s house.’ (MCA C/5/1/41). The sheer size of this fine is startling but the reasons for such a large fine are complex to untangle. Was this fine a warning because the house of the mill owner had been damaged, a punitive fine? Or was the fine so large because of the differential costs involved in replacing a window at the owner’s house – and as such indicative of the variation of size and complexity to be found between windows in the mill, Apprentice house and owner’s house?

Unfortunately the records give no indication for the reason behind such an immense fine, but we know the windows in the house of Samuel Greg were significantly larger, containing many more panes, therefore being more expensive to replace. Photographs of the Greg’s house give information that assists in untangling this conundrum. Taken in the late nineteenth century they clearly show the style of window employed was similar to those in factory and apprentice house, though with a considerably more embellished and ornate surround. Yet individual panes appear to be the same shape and of comparable size. The processes employed in glass production at that time (the barrel glass process) meant there was a limitation on the size of individual panes that could be produced, meaning large
windows such as those at the Greg house would be constructed from several separate panes. Thus the windows in the house at the time of the incident could not have been one single, large sheet of glass that would be very expensive to repair. The inevitable conclusion must be either James was responsible for breaking sixteen panes (an unlikely occurrence) or the fine was indeed punitive in its intention. The fine clearly demonstrates the differential social status that is attached to buildings on the site. It is further indicative as one of a variety of means through which the Greg family maintained power over workers.

Whilst drawing no conclusions about the owner’s house itself from the evidence, Peers draws differing conclusions, making assumptions about the incident and its significance to the wider community. Peers’ belief is the action was deliberate and planned, with James either acting to prevent his indenture or to protest his “resistance to or resentment of” the mill (Peers 2008:266). Whilst these may indeed have been the motivations there is little real hard evidence to back up this assertion. Peers work details a string of acts by apprentices, all of which she claims to be motivated by a desire to escape or rebel. Whilst it would be inconceivable with the number of apprentices at Styal, and the length of time operated that there would not be acts of escape and rebellion, it does not of itself mean this particular action was so motivated. Peers claims about this particular incident appear to be purely conjecture.

Other fines were imposed for lack of care of mill materials and resources with James Pepper fined 1/6d (7½p) on March 3rd 1821 for ‘lost linen’, presumably from the apprentice house.

How this fits with the sleeping arrangements which were two to a bed, when only James was fined, is a matter of conjecture. Some of the deductions itemised in the book clearly demonstrate an alternative function of the system as a means of saving, enabling the purchase of more expensive items where needed. So on May 23rd 1825 Mary Haslendene withdrew 6/- (30p) to buy new shoes, as did Alice Powell on March 25th 1837. (MCA C5/1/41).

There were, however, some payments itemised that need no further explanation. The entry for George Hodkinson on Mar 1st 1819 is simple and straightforward - ‘dead – part of funeral expenses’. (MCA C5/1 16/1).
3.4.3 “a thriving self-contained community” (McClure 1939: 517)

Many regard Quarry Bank Mill as the centre of Greg family wealth and power. In fact this wealth and power was dependant on a diverse base. Not only did the Greg family own several mills – scattered over Lancashire and Cheshire, they also rented, owned and worked large tracts of land around Styal and as far distant as America. To see the Greg family as purely Quarry Bank Mill is to ignore a huge part of the wealth and holdings of the family. Further, without understanding how the individual components of the Styal estate complemented each other, we can never truly understand the Quarry Bank site, the Greg family or the life of those who lived there. In appreciating the inter-relationships of key constituent parts, we enhance our understanding of the whole. However, such a study is outside the remit of this work, which is specifically targeted at housing and the means by which employer’s maintained power over their workers. The full details of the estate are more appropriate to Rose (1986) than here. But we can not totally ignore the function that individual parts of the estate play in the experience of the estate workers.

The estate was intentionally developed to provide for the everyday needs of all – be they at Mill, on the land or in support services. In effect there developed a self-sufficient community. As well as accommodation such as Oak Cottages, Quarry Bank House and the Apprentice house, the Greg family also supplied the Unitarian Chapel and, at the request of some of the workers, a barn was converted by employees into a Methodist Chapel. The school was established, alongside lessons in the apprentice house and Sunday school, with an institute for lectures and performances. The village shop met most immediate needs with the vast majority of produce on sale supplied by farms from the estate. The shop was later sold to the workers themselves, subsequently becoming part of the co-operative chain in the 1930s. There was also an open air gymnasium. As McClure makes clear “it is certain that throughout the nineteenth century Styal was a thriving self-contained community” (McClure 1939: 517). Evidence of the extensive use that residents made of all elements in the estate are to be found everywhere - from the well walked steps allowing access to the mill, the worn sets and cobbles which abound, or the graffiti carved on the bridge at the back of the mill (photograph 1). I wonder just who ‘TW’ was?

What is clear is that the entire estate, whilst functioning as one contiguous unit, included several clearly delineated areas. Some of these boundaries were natural, for example the
river and hills. But others were clearly human made and assisted in developing and maintaining social stratification. There were the farms, the Mill, the Greg family house, the Apprentice block of house plus garden and village. Each performed a discrete function, each had distinct boundaries. Such delineation was not unique to Styal. Later such boundary marking was to become common place, and can be found in a variety of company towns, mill colonies and work camps. So at The Alabama Gates Camp (Van Bueren et al 1999), Butt Valley (Maniery 2002), Birchinlee, Batty Green and others, the topography is divided on practical, social and economic criteria.

The positioning of individual elements is of major significance in understanding social and political dimensions of the estate. Some of the choices were restricted by geographical and physical constraints and the laws of science. Having decided to establish the colony in the Bollin valley, there were restrictions imposed by the landscape. The availability of level ground and the course of the river placed curbs on the location of the mill. A large enough area is required to accommodate the footprint of the building. There was also the requirement to be adjacent to the river to efficiently utilise the water supply for power. To this extent Samuel Greg’s options on the initial siting of the mill were severely restricted.

The development of modern technology produced new machines, requiring more powerful and efficient water wheels and engine house (GMAC 1995). The demands of leat construction and the development of weirs and mill ponds meant Greg was further restricted as to choice. The races had to be long enough to enable adequate height to power the larger wheels. The space on the riverbank above the mill that allowed the provision of such distance was severely limited. This available land additionally had to accommodate the mill pond, races and sluice machinery. This complex set of requirements had to be completed within a relatively small area, meaning few real alternatives were available. As it was the construction led to extensive alterations to the surrounding area, resulting in land bordering a neighbouring property becoming so waterlogged Samuel Greg built a bridge to provide dry access. The development of the mill pond, damming the river, and weir construction made fundamental changes to the landscape.

The construction of mill, leat, races and pond were the only parts of the estate where Greg had such limited choices, for across the rest of the estate there were no such restrictions. Greg now had a free hand in the choice of location for his own house, the Apprentice house
and workers’ cottages. His decisions on the sites for these buildings tell us a great deal about his management strategy, and prevailing view of management theories and methodologies.

3.4.4 Parties and Good Taste

In many ways the most significant building on the entire estate was the house Samuel Greg built for himself and his family when he moved to Styal from Manchester. This was the point from which he could observe his estate on a daily basis. Decisions affecting the lives of thousands of people were made at this location. It was here that celebrations and parties were held with social differentials reinforced. This part of the estate complex delineated social standing. Wealth, power and ostentation was built into the fabric of the building and designed into the landscapes of the garden. This was the centre of power for Samuel Greg.

The function of the garden is worth some exploration at this point. As Johnson and others (Epperson 2000; Leone 1984; Leone et al 1989; Leone and Shackell 1990; Rutherford 2005) makes clear gardens have a formal function. This often acts as a visible and clear statement of status:

at all periods gardens have been more than simply lawns and beds of flowers; gardens are about power as well as plants...gardens were planted as a mediation between the elite and the ordinary, as well as between Nature and Culture (Johnson 1996: 145).

This ‘mediation between the elite and the ordinary’ is key to understanding Samuel’s house in the context of the estate. The house is integral to the estate, but also has clearly defined boundaries. This demarcation between land regularly used by all (footpaths, trails etc), and the personal space of the family, is fundamental. As Rotman and Nassaney point out, “humans use the material world to codify social relations” (Rotman and Nassaney 1997: 43).

The gardens at Norcliffe Hall (the second property the Greg family lived in) are a classic example of this form of development. The gardens are described in a newspaper report from June 4th 1878, reporting on a visit by The Liverpool Naturalists’ Field Club, the Manchester Scientific Students’ Association and North Staffordshire Field Club and Archaeological Society. The day’s activities were completed by a visit to the gardens which demonstrate:
The good taste of the Gregs, long the proprietors of the estate, whilst adding here and there a sort of finish to nature’s work, have given to these mounts and vales and slopes a most singular beauty in the arrangement of the rhododendrons, azaleas and conifers, oaks and flowering thorns which elicited many remarks of the warmest admiration (Liverpool Mercury: 1878).

This ‘good taste’ is significant. As Bourdieu has made clear, economic capital is only one form available in the construction of social identity. The development of cultural capital was possible through the demonstration of ‘gentility’, one component being through the utilisation of aesthetics. Having money was simply not enough to gain acceptance and recognition. As Young makes clear “the resource of financial capital was not enough on its own for genteel standing: it had to be conditioned by cultural capital” (Young 2010: 137).

The significance of the gardens is as a validation by the Greg family of such cultural capital. It demonstrates the Greg family clearly as not only possessing significant financial resources, but also extensive cultural assets. According to Bourdieu having such means is of itself not enough, there needs to be acceptance by others of such status displayed through ownership. Thus the ostentatious spectacle of the gardens was effected through inviting public bodies and significant individuals to visit. The audience was further broadened through consequential reporting in the media of the day. The newspaper report demonstrates to the world that the Greg family not only have significant financial but also cultural capital. It validates their claims.

Bourdieu himself used garden design as an example of the development of cultural capital. Offin Boardman, an American sailor from the War of Independence, escaped from prison in Plymouth after capture by the British. He made his way home via Europe and whilst there recorded in his diary “how impressed he was by the grandeur of country estates of the nobility” (Beaudry 2010:68). This was in direct contrast with Banham’s observations about the Sheffield steel magnate Sir John Browne and his experiences when building Endcliffe Hall. Banham observes that Sir John “lacked the visual vocabulary shared by the gentry, professionals and merchants” (Banham 2010:53). Banham argues this is the case due to the Sheffield steel magnates almost insular life, with a concentration on business rather than civic pride. The consequence of this was to rob Sheffield of the magnificent public buildings to be found in other northern towns. The social capital Bourdieu identifies was not therefore
generated by Sir John’s estate; as observed by Offin Boardman or created by the Greg family house.

The house of Samuel Greg was placed central to the rest of the estate, enabling ready observation of workers as they travelled to and from mill and home. Such positioning of the owners’ houses was not unusual at this time. Markus argues that at New Lanark “Owen’s house [was] in the centre of the site” (Markus 1992:289). International comparisons also evidence the same method of organisation. At Boott Mills Mrozowski (1991) demonstrates that workers on their way to or from the factory had to pass by the significantly superior properties of the mill agents, providing the opportunity for mill agents to observe their actions. The similarities between these cases are striking. This design enables the distance between worker/owner; the difference between personal Greg space and community space, and the observational controlling function, to be simultaneously utilised and managed. As Nassaney and Abel make clear spatial changes as a result of the factory system “served to create and re-inforce relations of economic and social subordination both in the factory and at home” (Nassaney and Abel 2000: 240). This concept is not new or unusual. The ability to control workers behaviour outside the immediate confines of the mill was recognised early on with the siting of new mills. Other owners who developed mill colonies took similar stances. “In Hyde Thomas Ashton had his own ‘charming villa’ close by the factories ...at Turton Henry Ashworth’s house lay alongside his work people’s cottages” (Dennis 1984: 50). It follows that the positioning of Quarry Bank House was not unique and relative to the rest of the estate, it is multifunctional and a fundamental aspect of design.

Greg took a conscious decision to site his house next to the mill. Quarry Bank House was surrounded on three sides by high hedges, but not at the front – screening the noise from the mill, apprentice house and Styal village, whilst allowing an unrestricted view of the path fronting the house. Not only was power concentrated in his hands, he physically built this arrangement into the landscape. It was literally a visible and unequivocal daily reminder to the workforce of his power and status. The closeness to the living accommodation of his workers further reflected contemporary beliefs about owners being an essential and integral part of the community. As Cooke-Taylor made clear, such arrangements gave:
employers opportunities of coming frequently into personal communication with their workplace and exercising a healthy control over their domestic habits and private morals (Cooke-Taylor 1842: 140).

This control over ‘domestic habits and private morals’ illustrates just how important it was to be able to influence and direct people’s behaviour at all times. It was regarded as a core responsibility in the running of a mill colony, something explicitly identified as a responsibility of master to apprentice (see above). The Greg family played this role as enthusiastically as any other powerful family did. It was exactly the absence of such regular contact through the development of a managerial class and the absence of owners (see below) that was later to lead, in the view of many industrialists, to a breakdown in the owner/employee relationship (Gitelman 1988; Wood 2009).

The fact the owner lived next door to the mill ensured millworkers who live in the village must physically pass the front door on their way to and from work. This ensured every day Samuel Greg had the opportunity to observe and monitor his workers and, more importantly, was believed to be observing them whether or not he really was. The siting of house relative to mill is significant since it enables a ‘reasonable’ distance to be established between the two, yet facilitates ready access for the owner should the need arise. Samuel Greg is here signalling his intention to play a pivotal role in the life of the village, situating himself at the heart of the community. By choosing this location for his home, Greg is clearly stating that he is involved in (and by extension controls) every aspect of life – from work, to housing, to standards of behaviour on the walk to and from work. Such statements in the landscape that legitimise authority have been identified elsewhere (Mrozowski 1991, Mrozowski 2006). Similar examples of planned developments are to be found in international settings. As an example Mrozowski tells us that the workers’ boarding houses at Boott Mills in Lowell, Massachusetts, were “efficient in plan and conveniently located within walking distance of both the mills and the controlling arm of the mill agent” (Mrozowski 2006:88).

These layout patterns are redolent with facets of Bentham’s Panopticon and Foucault. The control over many individuals exercised by a single person placed in a strategic location, the spot being somewhere observation can take place without being observed. The power to control large numbers by an individual presence, or the thought they might be present. The potential for continuous observation and the doubt this casts into the minds of the observed.
These alterations in behaviour were developed through the structural environment. All very Foucauldian: visibility, invisibility and control. Whilst the general principle of Bentham’s Panoptic plan can be applied to the estate, it cannot be applied to the mill building. There were however mill owners who did just that, the most famous example being Strut’s round mill in Derbyshire, with its wheel based design clearly fashioned on the panoptic design.

In later years successive generations were to take a less ‘hands on’ approach to mill management than Samuel did, and move the family living premises away from the immediate location of the mill, whilst remaining adjacent to the community. This process illustrates the changing attitude of owners that led to the exercise of power through a system of managers and agents. Later generations moved to Norcliffe Hall, leaving the day to day running of the mill to managers, who were rewarded by higher wages. This change in functionality had a significant impact signalling important changes, not only in the management structure of the estate. The ability of the factory owner to move home whilst estate workers remained tied to their cottages was a further indicator of different social standing. Such moves were not open to the workforce, so this relocation from Quarry Bank House to Norcliffe Hall “reinforced peoples understandings of where they belonged in the social and political world” (Mangan 2000: 205).

3.4.5 Well looked after and maintained

Having identified the ideal site for the mill it then became essential for the family to attract and retain a workforce. The 1849 OS Map of Styal (Map 1) shows an early developmental stage of the village. It is possible to identify key locations such as the Methodist Chapel (Wesleyan), the Unitarian Chapel, Oak Cottages, the Greg family House and Mill. What is apparent are the short distances between the locations. The community is compact with everything required in walking distance – housing, shops, religion and work. At this time the owner lives within the community, playing a key role in aspects of everyday life.

By contrast the 1938 map (Map 2) shows significant changes, with the cross clearly marked as the centre of the village. The designation of the school has changed – it is now solely named as ‘school’ having lost earlier prefixes. A new school has been developed in the area designated as ‘Styal Green’. The railway has arrived, and there is a station indicating decreasing isolation of the community. At the mill changes are clearly visible. The house built
by Samuel Greg has had its name changed to ‘Quarry Bank’ from ‘Quarry Bank House’. The most significant developments illustrated are the water supply to the mill. In response to the need to increase power and water flow, the construction of weirs has been completed and they are clearly marked. These engineering developments resulted in significant changes to the landscape of the area.

Whilst major and significant changes in the landscape reflect economic motivations, other changes that the Greg family had made reflect communal moral motivations. When analysing the provision of housing within a community it is important to recognise “household space is a dimension of the built environment that has implications for social relations” (Rotman and Nassaney 1997:52). Prior to 1815 the Greg family spent on average some £100 per cottage in the village. As the need for higher numbers of workers became apparent, so the spend on property increased. Between 1819 and 1831 the expenditure was some £6,000 on 42 cottages and a Manager’s House. By 1878 the Greg family owned 108 cottages housing a total of 538 people, providing a readily accessible workforce for the demands of the community.

Earlier we saw how Cooke-Taylor praised landlords who lived amongst their workers for being able to exercise power over the moral behaviour of tenants. This concern over the moral fibre of the working population was most clearly demonstrated by concerns about sleeping arrangements in many poorer homes. As remarked earlier there were many reports of older children and young adults of differing sexes sharing the same room and bed. Such things horrified genteel Victorians, being regarded as a sign of moral weakness and failing. It was widely inferred by many mill owners that one reason for the provision of workers’ housing was to reduce the incidence of such questionable moral behaviour. In fact such evidence as exists shows the impact of housing provision was negligible. As we shall see later in Chapter Three, the issue was to become a major issue for housing reformers.

The cost of construction is also of significance, especially the lack of differential between property prices. At other sites of workplace housing the differential in cost, reflecting the social status of occupants, is a significant feature with an example being Barrow Island where Vickers were one of the first employers in the North West to provide houses with electricity, when most housing still had gas lighting. This also enabled tenants to use electric ovens rather than the usual coal range for cooking (Roberts 1976:31). A more striking
example is at Saltaire where Sir Titus Salt expended £200 for over lookers’ homes compared with £120 cost for housing of ordinary workers. Such a differential is clearly absent at Styal, where there was a universal price for constructions occupied by either worker or manager. This lack of social differentiation within the costs of housing construction provides us with a rare type of development. As we saw earlier managers on the estate were rewarded with higher wages rather than differential housing. Indeed the only constructional differentiation on the estate was that between Quarry Bank House and the workers’ properties (Styal Village and Apprentice house). Unusually there was no differential created within and between different forms of workers’ housing.

The houses Greg constructed for his workers were far superior to those lived in by the average worker in the newly emerging conurbations. In Chapter Four we will look at housing in these communities in more detail, but at this stage it is sufficient to recognise the striking differences. The houses built by Samuel Greg had access to personal gardens and allotments. Rather than a communal privy, the Greg houses had individual provision. Strict controls over tenants and the admission of an occasional lodger ensured properties were free from the overcrowding so common in Liverpool and Manchester. The quality of build and the material used were also significantly superior, as was maintenance of properties.

The external decoration of the village houses is worthy of note (Photograph 2). Hughes makes the case that on many sites of workers’ housing, quality of façade depends on the relationship to the owner’s property. He argues workers’ housing often lacks ornamentation and embellishment unless specifically visible from the owner’s house. Only if in a direct sightline would owners spend money on decoration (Hughes 2004). This is a proposition supported in part by Mrozowki’s analysis of the variety of housing provided at Lowell, where he demonstrates a clear correlation between size of house, quality of construction and social status within the workers’ community (Mrozowski 2006). Yet properties at Styal defy this convention.

As we saw earlier Quarry Bank House although having an open front aspect, is enclosed by hedge and woodland on three sides. This restricts the view of the village from the house. This screening of the workers’ housing should, according to Hughes, mean cottages at Styal were constructed in a purely functional manner with little or no regard to the aesthetic motivation. Yet the facades of the houses in Styal are not unpleasant on the eye. The
brickwork is of a high standard and the proportions of the building are visually pleasing. The elevations display appropriate conformity to the norms of the age and visible external fittings were of a high standard. The layout is in a conventional manner with wide open access. There are significant avenues and roads, which were well made. The properties were well looked after and maintained. This is not simply a collection of functional buildings screened from the owner’s house such as those Hughes argues exist. Something different is happening here. Were the motivation purely economic then plain, undecorated property would be the adopted form. But here we have a dual motivation – that of the economic and Greg family religious motivations. Here Greg demonstrates a concern for the moral and physical well-being of his workers that goes beyond that needed for effective work in the mill. These are allied to the moral motivation for individual bedrooms for siblings and aesthetic communal motivation so evident across all constructions on the estate.

The development of the Railway was to have a significant impact on the Greg family personally and on the prosperity of their estate. It reduced the isolation of the community by providing ready access to both Manchester and Crewe. This reduced isolation enabled greater contact with pools of workers, but it also enabled the Greg’s to become more actively involved in local and national politics, through their proximity to Manchester and institutions such as the Reform Club. It parachuted the family into the heart of the Reform movements, exposing them to the latest ideas and debates. Economically it had a major impact since goods and raw materials no longer had to be transported down narrow lanes. In the early days of the mill coal had been procured from the nearby Poynton Colliery (McClure 1939), but the railways were to open up new markets for purchase and sale. Economically, politically and socially the railways provided new opportunities for the Greg family, which they energetically exploited.

Through this case study we have seen how the Greg estates acted not solely as an effective factory system, but how Greg utilised high quality housing and living conditions to recruit and retain his workforce. By utilising this housing provision allied to a system of fines and indentures, we have seen how Greg maintained effective control over his workforce. Comparisons with contemporary philanthropists have placed their developments within the social and political framework of the time. Such permanent settings are the accepted and established image of workers’ housing.
The changes to the Styal regime were made possible through developments in transport technology which depended on the physical construction of new transportation methods. These constructions demanded huge numbers of labourers, often requiring temporary accommodation. It is to the housing of these groups, in particular housing the navvies, that we now turn.

3.5 The Navvies

In 1994, Michael Morris published one of the first major articles on the development of Navvy Camps, calling for a detailed research agenda into these sites being currently under represented in the archaeological record. His plea was for more SMR entries and, as a further development, he posited several research questions. Not all of these are within the remit of this study, but the work undertaken here impinges on at least three key points:

- Spatial layout and use-patterns of individual structures and whole settlements;
- Archaeological indicators for social structure, hierarchy and the presence/absence of women and children;
- Cross-cultural comparisons with industrializing construction project settlements in other countries

(Morris 1994:584)

Whilst a detailed analysis of any of the above is beyond the scope of this study, we will touch on many pertinent issues, and through synthesising already existing work, can begin to explore some of the significant concerns raised by Morris in this publication and subsequent investigations (Morris 1996).

3.5.1 “I would not recommend the loss of time for the sake of all the extra lives it would save” (Purdon: 1846)

Wellington Purdon was assistant engineer at Woodhead Railway Tunnel. His remarks were addressed to the 1846 Select Committee charged with enquiring into the Conditions of Labour on the Railways. His response concerned the use of ‘stemmers’ - the rod for packing drilled holes with components for explosions. The use of copper rods was safer, with softer metal less likely to spark. But Purdon resolutely refused to change, his logic clear. It is within such a commercial framework, this set of priorities and beliefs, that the camps at Woodhead
and elsewhere existed. Safety on the great canal and railway construction projects was often governed by similar priorities, whilst later major engineering and construction works exhibited a significantly different attitude.

The early camps were dangerous places to live and work. They were often in the most desolate locations, isolated from human contact. Camps were places where violence and bullying was endemic. Drunkenness was a regular occurrence. Bare knuckle fighting a habitual form of entertainment. No one would, on face value, raise objections to such statements. But delve slightly deeper into the evidence and the issue is not so simple. Like many institutions, navvy camps changed, mutated and evolved over the years into something unrecognisable to early pioneers. Birchinlee and Risehill have very little in common. Sebastopol, Inkerman and Batty Green bear no resemblance to Burnbanks. The variation between living conditions is immense, the difference in services colossal and the experience of living in these communities vastly different. As we shall see, they are different worlds clustered under a universal name.

For over two hundred years the navvy was an essential element of the construction industry. The work they undertook has been compared in magnitude and scale to the development of the great medieval cathedrals of Europe (Coleman 1968). This often overlooked, yet significant group, made a major impact on the landscape. The image of the itinerant ‘navvy’, tramping the country looking for work is partly true but somewhat misleading. They were responsible for the emergence of words that are now in common usage; ‘navvy’ being short for navigator, ‘tramp’ for ‘on the tramp’ – the act of walking from one contract to another. They were a consistently marginalised group (Morris 1994), often isolated both geographically and socially. Such a rich historical background, and yet apart from the nomadic lifestyle, little that has passed into modern day belief stands up to detailed scrutiny. The stereotypes are ripe for challenge.

3.5.2 ‘Carcases of ragged tenements and fragments of unfinished walls’ (Dickens 1868: 92)

Dickens description of a real construction site gives a genuine insight into the havoc major engineering contracts wreaked on the land, but it says nothing of the men who worked on them. The navvies built huge numbers of major projects across the country: canals, railways,
reservoirs, viaducts, dams, motorways and many more which make a significant impact on the landscape. Whilst engineers are individually recognised for their contribution, the part played by the navvy in contemporary accounts is often only collectively recognised – and then somewhat grudgingly. As Burton makes clear “there were many commentators to eulogize the engineers who designed the canal system, but there were few who could find a good word for the men who actually dug it” (Burton 1972: 164). The same point could be applied to those who worked on other great engineering projects. Yet without navvies these major projects would never have happened. These ventures were huge – demanding substantial numbers of men to cross immense tracts of land. Their locations were often isolated and inhospitable – damming secluded valleys to provide water for a major metropolis, or crossing wild and remote moors and fells to connect communities by canal or rail.

These men needed housing, often only for short periods of time, sometimes for a matter of months, whilst other contracts involved semi permanent communities. Typically transportation projects required many short term temporary camps as construction progressed across and through the landscape, whilst static constructions such as dams necessitated communities for more extensive periods of time. Such variety of demand led not surprisingly to significant diversity in provision. Short term camps were often basic with communal housing, a population made up almost exclusively of young men, rudimentary privy provision, lack of recreational facilities, primitive or non existent medical services, unmade tracks as thoroughfares and a general lack of facilities. By contrast those camps that had longevity – up to fifteen years in some cases, had well developed facilities with schools, hospitals and recreational amenities – clearly indicating that these camps included families – women and children regarded as integral and essential to the development of the community. They had street lighting, paved footpaths, annual sports, religious services, police and well developed social structures. The impact of such construction on local communities should not be underestimated, making a significant difference to population figures, as the case at Millom demonstrates (Table 2).

In many cases navvies were in discrete camps, isolated from local population, but this was not always the case. Significant numbers of the labour force, especially on early engineering contracts, were local. This often caused havoc when harvest time came and large numbers
of workers disappeared to work for neighbours and relatives. It also meant significant numbers were billeted locally. It was only when insufficient local accommodation existed, the sites especially isolated, local village too small or other pertinent factors came into play, that camps were established. These ‘other pertinent factors’ were many and varied, but anti-Irish sentiment was undoubtedly one of them, though as we shall see later there were significant numbers of contracts with very little Irish involvement. Certainly in parts of Scotland the prevalence of Roman Catholicism amongst the Irish was a complicating factor in finding lodgings with devout Presbyterian locals, leading directly to the development of self-contained camps.

As will become apparent, there was a clear divide between employers. Those involved in developing for maximum profit, with a solely economic motivation, usually required the shortest stay and provided worst facilities. Those developing public works were often engaged in larger constructions requiring the workforce to be present for longer periods. Their motivation was usually public service, a political motivation. These workers almost always enjoyed better facilities. The reasons were twofold. There was the role of legislation following the 1846 Royal Commission, but it was also in part due to evolving social dynamics of the time. There is little doubt that investigations by the state and subsequent legislation led to greater intervention, with consequently improved conditions for workers. The changes were especially significant in the field of accommodation. But the composition of commissioning bodies also changed. Instead of development solely for private profit, the later works were public driven, financed by local authorities, either singly or as Joint Boards. This brought the developing public ethos into play. Board members of the public works were simultaneously driving through local enabling acts forcing improvements in housing, education and other social conditions in their local communities. At the same time they were involved in the building of huge public works. They were used to both moral and medical communal motivations impacting on their work in the developing urban communities (see Chapter Four). Their philosophy was shaped differently to that of earlier railway and canal developers. This differentiation is important in understanding how navvy camps developed across time. A key question for the historian might be if such differentiation was motivated by altruism or solely by dint of legislation? For the archaeologist the key issue is the fact of its existence.
The very transience of these camps can cause problems for the archaeologist. As Green makes clear the constant movement of workers looking for their next employment means they left little behind “it is easier to find places where they died and were buried than places where they lived, worked and associated” (Green 2000:151). Although Green is writing from an American perspective, it is exactly the same in the UK. As an example it is easier to find the gravestone of the navvy John Owen killed on the construction of the Settle and Carlisle railway (photograph 3), than it is to find standing evidence of the camp he lived in. Early temporary camps were often tents, ling covered round houses or turfed constructions leaving no visible surface evidence. In earlier camps such as Batty Green horse drawn carriage accommodation provided much of the original occupation. The huts at Risehill were mainly timber, but had “rough stone foundations” (Wessex Archaeology 2008:iii), whilst many others had no such base. Sometimes there were timber dormitories or bunkhouses with raised platforms that survive such as at Burnbanks. The original developments at Millom had “temporary wood and corrugated iron buildings measuring 64 foot long by 36 foot wide” (Hughes: 2006: 166). Even in the camps that existed for several years, the remains are limited, the camps often being dismantled at the conclusion of construction. The village of Birchinlee was totally relocated on completion of the Derwent Dams, and subsequently rebuilt in Yorkshire as a Prisoner of War Camp during the Great War. In other cases the camps were totally destroyed, or allowed to fall into disrepair, having reached the end of their useful life. This is especially the case when situated in isolated locations where no future use could be found for them. Such problems are not exclusively English, for in the USA at Butt Valley the camp was burned after the plant closed, many of the properties at Berwind were temporary vernacular structures which left little signature (Wood 2009) and many of the homes at Harpers Ferry were constructed by workers for their own use with no imposed layout (Shackell 2000b).

Many issues concerning work camps are replicated internationally (Maniery 2002; Silliman 2006; Van Bueren 2002), enabling effective comparisons to be made. But we must be careful in these, since although similarities do occur, there is also significant variation between parts of the globe. What is apparent is that with the exception of local geography and geology, contemporaneous camps often display notable similarities. For example the layout displays a consistency in concept that is remarkable. The Butt Valley Work camp in California has
latrines separated and sited behind the Bunkhouses whilst sufficiently close to be accessible to all the accommodation. Was this merely a matter of expediency since the majority of people on site lived in bunkhouses, or was it the fact that unpleasant side effects would be more likely to pervade the bunkhouses rather than the cottages and houses occupied by the more senior camp members? Again, international examples provide useful comparisons. At Butt Valley in the USA, Millom, Birchinlee and Burnbanks in the UK, the accommodation occupied by the more senior members of the communities was to be found on the fringes of the community – away from the more bustling and lively single men’s accommodation. These camps were the more organised, planned and developed, and it is clear that such choices of locations were deliberate acts by construction companies. The status of individuals was therefore reflected in the architectural landscape of the sites. In the case of the early camps there was such a clear distinction between the official and the unofficial that it was regarded as worthy of specific comment by Morris as “consistent with a cognitive distinction, respected by both employer and navvy, between officially sanctioned dwellings…and the peripheral self-built huts, which reflect the informality and independence of navvy culture!” (Morris 1994:578).

It is not surprising that the contents of sites display great similarities. One would expect residential sites at similar points in time might display common elements – housing differentiated by social standing, feeding/cooking structures, medical support, recreational buildings. It might also be expected that there would be some resemblance in layout. But what is striking is the incidence of similarities that exist. There is nothing new in having standard designs altered to reflect and accommodate the best use of topography, the Roman Army used just such an approach. Similarly there appears to be an almost unwritten guide for building camps, with the caveat that exploitation of the local environment is practical and encouraged. The layout of camps appears to have been influenced by three major factors:

- The function of social/class differentiation
- The most effective layout within landscape constraints
- The efficient operation of the camp

Within these three components, the vast majority of navvy camps can be effectively situated. It is further apparent that these three factors operate whether the camp was planned or developed on an ad hoc basis.
Earlier we saw how the Greg family utilised the quality of provision at Styal to attract and retain workers to their remote location. This was also the case with navvy camps such as Batty Moss (NAA 1995). Many camps were in isolated locations with no indigenous workforce. They utilised itinerant collections of navvies who were able to stand the physically tough working conditions. The best had to be retained, and latterly the provision of modern facilities became one of the principle means by which companies achieved this. Once again there are clear international comparisons. Butt Valley in California had a sophisticated sanitation system which included running water, showers in the bath house, privies, latrine blocks and medical services with a hospital and on site doctor. These were clearly developed in response to medical motivations of the time. As Maniery makes clear such provision was “a norm not an anomaly of the time” (Maniery 2002: 81). The similarities between the Greg family in England, working to recruit and retain their workforce, and the owners of Butt Valley is clear. Both were dependant on their workforce, both were in isolated locations and both used the provision of high standard facilities to attract and retain workers. Thus we are able to make assumptions about people who lived in these communities. As Spencer-Wood makes clear:

Research in anthropological archaeology and on twentieth century consumer behaviour both find strong relationships between economic roles, social stratification, and types of material culture owned by households or excavated from sites (Spencer-Wood 1987:2).

The excavation at Risehill camp in 2008 is the only excavation of a navvy camp in the UK and as such provides a unique insight. Although not an excavation of the whole site, an analysis of ‘Area One’ gives sufficient information to make tentative observations about the lives of the people there. Restricted by time (this was an excavation instigated by Channel 4’s ‘Time Team’), the final Archaeological Evaluation and Assessment Report is produced by Wessex Archaeology. Area One is identified as an area with occupation. Trenches one, two, five and eight are located in the area with trenches one and five clearly indicative of human activity and eight being the latrine.

Finds in trenches one and five validate human occupation (Table 3). Both trenches show the majority of pottery as factory produced whitewares. Decoration clearly demonstrates collection by individuals from personal sources rather than company issue. The marking of ceramics by institutions is one established mechanism employed, with a two fold rationale.
Firstly it clearly marks the owners of property in an attempt to prevent theft and later resale or personal use. Secondly it can be used to assist in the development of a ‘sense of belonging’. In particular ceramics used in everyday situations can help in such reinforcement. Examples will be shown later which illustrate this point, in Chapter Four (Charter Street Ragged School and Charter Street Working Girls’ Home) and Chapter Five (Manchester Warehousemen and Clerk’s Orphanage and School for Necessitous Children). The propensity of such finds is explained through the multi-purpose use of ceramics in the domestic setting for preparing, cooking and eating food, “for status displays and sometimes as ideological statements” (Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987:56).

This choice of materials is a key aspect of individuality and self-interest. Although the materials discovered may be from a narrow band of availability, the choices that individuals make are of significance to the archaeologist, in that they illuminate conscious decisions taken, albeit often within a restricted range. Whilst few people in camps had the financial resources to purchase high quality ceramics, there were choices open in the field of inexpensive and functional materials. As Shackell makes clear whilst people may have restricted choice, the decisions they make “shows social agency in action” (Shackell 2000b: 233).

This utilisation of privately purchased pottery raises key issues. Firstly there appears to be no attempt to systematically develop a formal ‘sense of belonging’ to the community within the camp through the use of company ceramics. In later undertakings there are clearly efforts to involve individuals in the collective, but at Risehill such attempts are significant by their absence. This is itself important since it demonstrates the social standing of the workforce viewed from the companies’ perspective. In many situations the company provided insignia marked ceramics. So in offices, canteens and headquarters the company provided embellished ceramics. The workers in the camps were clearly not regarded as significant enough to bestow resources similar to those provided to company clerks.

Do the finds indicate a desire on behalf of the workers to retain individuality within the context of short lived camps? Or is it simply a matter of convenience with the transportation of cheap portable objects being easier? This second argument is advanced for understanding the abandonment behaviour of sites by Stevenson (1982). Navvies were notoriously low paid after deductions by employers, so the inclination is to believe the significance of mass
produced white wears was economic – the best that could be afforded. A similar proposition is advanced by Bolton who believes individuals would only invest substantially in material culture if they were planning to spend considerable time at a specific location (Bolton 2009). However Given, discussing Dollys Creek, argues that “a few finer possessions gave a sense of pride and belonging” (Given 2005:58), thereby implying that individuals would protect a few precious pieces, possibly heirlooms, to help retain personal identity whilst assimilating into the community. Furthermore the nomadic lifestyle increased the possibility of damage to ceramics, either from the raucous environment of camps themselves, or when traversing often difficult terrain ‘on the tramp’. Possibly economics dictated that there was no real choice and that the cheapest and most functional was all that could be afforded. Personal belongings were not restricted to domestic ware, with the trenches also containing materials such as buttons, combs, pipes, pens etc..

Silliman (2006), when analysing the work of Beaudry and Mrozowski at Boott Mills, believes such items demonstrate people “struggling to maintain dignity and assert preferences and identities in the context of industrial capitalism” (Silliman 2006: 153). James Symonds states “individuals jostled with their plates and cups for social status and respectability in a diverse range of settings from the country estate, urban block, mining camp and whaling station (Symonds 2010:2). Spencer-Wood argues “the type of goods selectively acquired and discarded by households are strongly influenced by socioeconomic status” (Spencer-Wood 1987:3). In her analysis of food from two whaling stations in Australia, Susan Lawrence makes a similar point about the discovery of two stemmed wine glasses. Although only two pieces are found, she makes the point their discovery suggests “that someone at the station was keen to preserve some social graces” (Lawrence 2010:51). Similarities exist with the excavations at Alderley Sandhills (Casella and Croucher: 2010). All five are similar in claim. All refer to the position the individual holds within the social hierarchy of the camp, the role they play within the community. Is such a struggle demonstrated by the assemblages from trenches one and two? In short is the collection demonstrative of personal choice of materials as part of this struggle, economic necessity, or a result of their nomadic life style?

A further intriguing possibility is that suggested by Schmitt and Zeier who examined the town of Grantsville in Nevada – a mining town long since abandoned. They expressed surprise at finding relatively high status ceramic finds at the site, especially in premises that showed no
evidence of regular food preparation. One of several potential answers they posit is that of ‘the keeping of heirlooms (e.g. tea sets, ornaments) and/or the purchase of “special occasion items” (Schmitt and Zeier 1993: 31). It is possible that the prized possessions of the itinerant navvy family was a cherished piece of ceramics, and that this was carefully transported, with other items less protected and therefore more susceptible to damage, consequently being over represented in artefact assemblages.

The debate about such findings is not restricted to the United Kingdom, there are striking international comparisons. Susan Lawrence makes strong claims in her analysis of Dollys Creek in Australia about artefacts from that site. There she analyses the results of her excavation in the Moorabol mining area, where temporary camps display many similarities to Risehill. Her analysis shows many common influences – temporary accommodation, nomadic lifestyle of occupants, occupation over a dispersed area and resemblance in finds from excavation. She proposes it is the actions of individuals that shape and form the living experiences of the occupants (Lawrence: 2000). Furniture was built on the site and the excavation discovered multiple finds of cheap and easily transported ceramics.

Having reviewed the possibilities as to the meaning of such finds, and their significance in the everyday life of the camps is clear. It is that the analysis so often presented of poverty, whilst no doubt being of significance, is of itself unable to provide the whole explanation. The use of heirlooms is well documented across the academic record even in the most poverty stricken of households (Heisley et al 1997; Komter 2011; Lillios 1999; Mytum 2010). This ownership and selected utilisation of more than one set of ceramics points us in the direction posited by Gray, that the differential use of ceramic sets had a purposeful meaning and a social significance within the setting. Such arguments are well established within working class culture as a whole. But it is especially true in those camps that were temporary and housing people with a nomadic lifestyle, such as the camps in this study. For in these places there was a need to place self within, and as an integral part of the camp context, whilst simultaneously maintaining individuality. The use of such artefacts assists this process. There were expectations within communities that demanded the use of fine wares. Every household – no matter how poverty stricken – would be determined to live up to their responsibilities. This is one method by which individual and collective cultural traits are reinforced and maintained. Simultaneously there were demands of daily living within a
colony or camp, which had its own set of cultural traits to be adhered to. The differential use of heirlooms (especially ceramics) enable such duality to be met. Or as Gray makes clear “through their daily practices the residents...met the social requirements of their new environment and retained their cultural values” (Gray 2009: 242). As Spencer-Wood makes clear “gifts or heirlooms...are usually less likely to be discarded than everyday items” (Spencer-Wood 1987: 2).

The social capital of the finds at the navvy camp were important within the context of the camp, as discussed in Chapter One. The concept is further developed by Mytum when discussing ceramic remains excavated in North Pembrokeshire. Mytum argues “the ceramics on the dresser were sometimes intrinsically valuable, but many were mementoes of events and gifts from friends and relations that gave them great value within a living family” (Mytum 2010: 99). Although the excavated materials did not demonstrate large financial significance, they did show extensive social significance. To argue the objects found at Risehill are of no value because they have limited financial status totally ignores their social importance. They are items of major value in the camps and crucial examples of social capital.

Such claims are replicated elsewhere. These sites demonstrate it was not unusual for those deemed ‘poor’ to often own more than one set of crockery and dishes (Brighton 2010; Brighton and Levon-White 2006). Brighton further argues that these often include refined earthenware (Brighton 2010: 118), a point supported by others (Grant 1961; Symonds 2000; Thornton 1978). This duopoly of ceramic ownership is significant in demonstrating the investment in cultural capital by individuals, and this investment is not solely restricted to those of greater financial means. The poor also make such investments within the context of their community.

Brooks analysis of the Lake Innes Estate in New South Wales, lends further weight to the concept of ceramic displays as a way to demonstrate owners “had a higher status than the other occupants of the servants village” (Brooks 2010: 159). Here the study is of plates and saucers in the hut of a blacksmith. It is the lack of cups that has Brooks believing the most likely reason for the collection was for display. The size of the assemblage, he believes, is about enhancing the status of the blacksmith, through the enrichment of cultural capital.
The discovery of such volumes of whiteware and the similarity of finds between Dollys Creek and Risehill raises further the question of why so many parallels exist between two sites physically separated by several thousand miles.

Was the economic necessity from the nomadic lifestyle, or was this necessity imposed by personal financial limitations? Susan Lawrence clearly believes there were economic imperatives, but supports the contention by arguing choice of materials was influenced by the use of ceramics as a decorative function – contrasting this with the use of purely practical tin tableware. She goes further, believing a purely financial interpretation is something of a too simplistic analysis that ignores key factors:

Goods and buildings were intended to be functional and for people whose lives involved repeated moves, that meant they had to be easily transportable and locally produced. The minimalism that resulted can be mistaken for poverty, but such a reading is too simplistic: there are subtle indications of the accommodation of genteel comfort and even luxury, within a narrowly prescribed and meaningful definition of that term (Lawrence 2000: 155).

There is a great deal to be agreed with in these statements but such bold pronouncements can not be glibly accepted. In particular, although Lawrence ensures that the definitions of ‘genteel’ and ‘luxury’ are clearly set within a precise context, such terms must be questioned. They are relative, and Lawrence is not the only person to use the term ‘genteel’ when examining work camps – the term is used by Wessex Archaeology and applied to assemblages from Risehill. Schmitt and Zeier (1993) above make similar claims in their comments on the significance of heirlooms. But this must surely be the first time the word ‘luxury’ has been applied to a work camp. The use is difficult to comprehend in the context of a gold mine in nineteenth century Australia. But maybe this is just a quibble about terminology. Certainly the case is that findings at Risehill, although a much smaller investigation, replicate findings from Dollys Creek and other locations.

These questions about the language are far more than semantics, for there is no doubt that the material culture discovered has significance. Earlier it was demonstrated that material culture can have an importance that goes beyond financial and genteel significance. Shackell lends weight to this argument when describing how “the kinds of objects chosen and the way they are used in specific contexts, indicate power relations and the different and changing meanings associated with this material culture” (Shackell 2000b: 233). The value of
the objects found at Risehill or elsewhere lie not in their financial value, but in the choice being made, and the social significance invested in it by the new owner.

A further area of concern applying Lawrence’s findings to work camps in the United Kingdom is that of ‘locally produced’ products. No evidence exists of such mechanisms at work in the United Kingdom, especially in the early camps. Historical records indicate that some camps used tradesmen from the local community when needed. But this was external provision, rather than personal manufacturing within the community. Whilst it is obvious camp members made items for personal use, there is no evidence of any sophisticated camp economy based on the production of goods for sale within the camp. However this may be because we are not strictly speaking comparing like with like. Perhaps the reason for this differential is simply the short lived life of Risehill when compared to Dollys Creek. Maybe longer term camps do exhibit a similar internal economy. It is certainly the case that camps such as Burnbanks had a booming service economy through officially sanctioned stores, but the likelihood is that even here the vast majority of goods were imported for sale rather than made within the camp. It is also possible that the reason for the differentiation is the geographical location. The hurdles associated with delivering goods to isolated locations in the Australian outback mean that the production of some goods internal to the camp becomes a necessity. They simply can not be imported. It may be possible that future excavations reveal similar patterns, but direct excavations are so few at the time of writing that no such evidence currently exists. Within the constraints of these two caveats there are similarities between the findings of the two sites, and collectively they provide us with a useful contrast from two very different locations.

In a further complication Schmitt and Zeier (1993) warn us about potential problems with site interpretation when single site analysis is undertaken. Referring to Grantsville, they demonstrate vast contradictions in available evidence, through analysis of faunal and ceramic assemblages comparison. To combat this there have been extensive multi faceted analyses such as at Boott Mill, where multi dimensional approaches have been employed specifically to overcome these difficulties. Whilst acknowledging the warning Schmitt and Zeier give, we recognise they analysed a small sample and the difficulties they identify are not common. With an acknowledgement of the danger, and an appreciation of the inherent
requirement to rigorously examine the evidence, the conclusions drawn above would still be valid.

There are other problems with the stereotypes. Evidence from the 1871 census and other documentation questions the generally held belief that the vast majority of navvies were Irish. For example at Risehill the majority were English including quite a few locals (W A 2008). This was not unusual with a similar make up being reported at Upper Derwent (Bevan 2006). In many places where there were disputes between Irish and Scots/English workers (Lake District, North West England, Birmingham, Edinburgh), few Irish were to be found. Cohn reports on the construction of the London to Birmingham Railway line, where the manager banned the employment of Irish labourers. “Nearly every South Eastern line for which there is information shows an absence of Irish employees” (Cohn 1979:8). Brooke (1983) researched the numbers of Irish Navvies on Railway contracts across the UK and came up with supporting findings (Table 4).

The variations in percentages shown in Table 4 demonstrate that the pattern of Irish navvy presence was anything but consistent, and any claim of uniformity is far too simplistic. Brooke analysed census returns from 1841-1861 where railways were being built across England, Scotland and Wales. These returns lead Cowley to challenge stereotypical views of the Irish, stating “these findings seriously undermine the time honoured claim by the Irish in England that ‘we built the Railway’” (Cowley 2001:56). Yet it was just such stereotypes that reinforced ‘scapegoating’ of immigrant communities.

Instances of ‘scapegoating’ are to be found replicated elsewhere. Wood points out that in American workcamps the immigrant worker was often blamed by the company for poor conditions, “emphasising the connection among immigrants, violence and social decay” (Wood 2009:131). Equally important is recognition of the very real contribution the Irish navvy made to such huge construction projects. Both history and archaeology demonstrate that although the extent of involvement may have traditionally been exaggerated, the Irish did play a significant role in many major infrastructure projects. At Risehill clay pipes with maker’s marks and decorative motifs are testament to the existence of Irish workers. Marks such as DUB[LIN]/PO or the presence of symbolic harps would appear indicative of just such a presence.
3.5.3 “regimented rows of austere barrack-like buildings” (Bevan 2006:115)

At Risehill huts were arranged around the airshaft, four in total, with the 1871 census demonstrating each had between nine and nineteen residents. Huts contained a married couple and possibly their family, with the rest of the residents being lodgers. Most buildings were timber terraced, with only important buildings being constructed of stone. This almost universal pattern of construction in the UK can also be identified in later camps. This conflicts with the findings of Bolton (2009) who argues ‘Generally substantial remains made of stone or brick are associated with permanent sites, and tents are indicators of temporary settlement. Wooden structures can be associated with either, but are more common at permanent sites (Bolton 2009:321). Whilst such assertions may be possible in Australia or the USA, they do not hold for the UK.

It is clear the pattern of UK provision changes over a timescale of some two hundred plus years. This means the duration of existence which covers significant typological changes, does not enable a neat fit into simplistic categorisation. I have already shown that the earliest constructions were tents, ling huts or caravans, which rapidly evolved into wooden huts, regardless of the length of contract. Such huts became ubiquitous in the UK indicating that wooden huts were not more common at permanent sites. Their style and construction are almost uniform, the design being quick, easy and cheap to complete and erect. These communal huts were often elevated by stone or concrete supports, or the use of raised earth mounds. Timber framed with wooden floor boards, they were then weather boarded with planks. The photographs (Photographs 4) demonstrate such constructions at four different camps for railway construction in the Leicestershire area.

These are clearly temporary camps – used for the duration of individual contracts in a similar way to those identified earlier on the Settle/Cartlisle Railway. They are exactly the kind of hut Bolton would expect to be found on a permanent site in the USA or Australia. They are, however, representative of temporary camps in the UK, with such wooden constructs found on the vast majority of railway construction projects. The change to more permanent constructions in the UK came about with the large engineering and construction projects of the twentieth century, where an element of semi-permanence did start to appear. There the construction materials was either tin or, again, wood.
The huts often had single entrances with windows alongside (but occasionally windowless). Windows of course enable people to see through in both directions. Not only could the occupants see out, the managers could see in. As Nicoletta points out “windows could, of course, function as a mode of surveillance” (Nicoletta 2003:362). Of itself this does not mean the absence of windows was always a means of resisting power. But there are locations where workers have gone to seemingly great lengths to protect their privacy (McGuire:2009).

Similar buildings were to be found across the country as the great building works of the Victorian age gathered momentum. Locally one of the major engineering undertakings was between 1887 and 1894 with construction of the Manchester Ship Canal. This mammoth project was one of the largest ever completed, employing an estimated 16,000 men and being built in sections. Since the canals route included large urban areas there was often significant local housing available, but where it cut through isolated locations there was, once again, the demand for navvy camps (Photograph 5). Whilst the vast majority of workers were housed in traditional shants, married quarters were also provided, and often a range of social and community facilities. Externally the buildings conformed to the usual principles of weather boarded and felt roofed wooden construction.

A typical layout of a hut is shown in Plan 1. The plan shows the area occupied by the family, with communal area and part of the property used by lodgers. The back to back fireplaces are indicative of internal division. Such plans are based on the excavation at Risehill, but also conform to historical evidence from other navvy camps, demonstrating that this was a common arrangement. In later years unmarried workmen’s huts at the Birchinlee navvy camp had similar tripartite arrangement with a ‘Dormitory’ for hired hands, a ‘Living Room’ with pantry off for communal activities, and a third section specifically designed and named as the ‘Hut Keepers Room’. These arrangements were the norm, as Bevan tells us: “a total of 52 dormitories house unmarried workmen in regimented rows of austere barrack-like buildings facing both sides of each street” (Bevan 2006:115). Though what is significant here is that Bevan identifies that the camp at Birchinlee had recognisable streets. No such clear provision existed at Jericho, Batty Green, Sebastopol or the many other earlier camps. But they were present at later camps such as Alabama Gates (Van Bueren 2002).
The Derwent Valley Water Board who built Birchinlee developed a variety of provision, based on this tripartite system, but restricted to use by certain groups of workers. Unmarried men were separated from families, which was in stark contrast to the earliest sites where there was no formality and people pitched up wherever they wanted to. These blocks could accommodate between eight and ten men, many more than in earlier camps such as Woodhead.

Similar layouts were to be found elsewhere. In Scotland on the Hawick and Caledonian railway the Sheriff of Midlothian examined work camps, presenting his report to the 1846 Select Committee. They were built of wood and turf, had fireplaces on the gable ends, twenty foot by twelve foot, having beds in tiers. Each individual bunk was six foot long by four foot wide, each bed having two or three regular occupants. The only spare storage space for up to thirty men was the passageway between bunks and the space beneath the bottom bunk. (Handley 1970). On the Union Canal in Scotland, The Glasgow Herald of 1822 used descriptions such as “pig sty” and tells us the huts are built mostly of “rotten straw”. Clearly women and children lived on this site as children are specifically described as “healthful and frolicsome” with the women “contented and happy”. (Glasgow Herald 1822). The navvy camp for building the Aqueduct from Loch Katrine to Glasgow, like at Batty Green called Sebastopol, is described as being of turf and timber construction. There is some evidence that in some of these huts, constructed by the labourers themselves, there were no windows - leaving the huts damp and ill ventilated (Handley 1970).

Alexander Ramsay gave evidence to the 1846 Commission on the accommodation for workers constructing the Hawick and Caledonian Line. It is worth quoting part of his evidence here, as it vividly describes the living conditions:

Suppose a place...about twenty eight feet and twelve feet wide, and along one side of it, facing the door, a range of beds in two tiers, but no curtains, no separation between the beds; in short a child wishing to walk into one bed from another might scamper over the whole tier. In one bed you may find a man and his wife and one or two children, in the next one adjoining probably a couple of young men, again on top of them, another man and his wife and family, that is the sort of arrangement (Select Committee 1846:950).

Communal living at its most intimate.
The commonly held view of the violent and hard partying navvy is doubtless true – there are many recorded cases of such, but there is another side. It is not so often reported that there were unofficial agreements between navvies to look after and support workmates. In many ways this mirrors the workmen’s clubs, the burial and housing clubs, medical clubs and social clubs as facets of communal help that we shall see in Chapter Four developing in urban communities.

The evidence for the presence of women and children at navvy sites is problematical. There appears to be no set ‘formula’ that can be applied in the UK, which appear in direct contrast to the evidence found elsewhere in the world. Quoting McGaw (1989), Bolton argues that it is the presence of women at these sites that led to developments including churches and schools (Bolton 2009). She contends such provision has existed in both Australia and the United States, arguing that “the presence of such structures have been associated with the efforts of women in the community” (Bolton: 1999:335). Such bold assertions are risky, especially in the context of the United Kingdom. For here the historical evidence and such archaeological evidence as exists would not lend weight to such assumptions.

Firstly there is a presumption implicit in the statement that only women were interested in the development of religion and education. The evidence in the UK is that for many years in the earlier camps, where there was little or no female presence, there were attempts to regularise religious activity with contractors employing missionaries being well documented. Secondly, although I have argued elsewhere that the commonly held belief that all navvies were Irish is a stereotype that should be challenged, there is no doubt that in many locations there were significant numbers of Irish, with a particular high numbers of Roman Catholics. To believe that these large numbers of Catholics would have had little involvement with religion is, I would contend, not credible. Thirdly we are aware that at camps such as Batty Green the initial occupation was by itinerant workers in their own caravans. It is surely not a tenable argument to suggest none of these caravans would have contained families, indicating that right from their initial development there was the presence of families in navvy camps. It was some of these earliest camps that were the most unlawful and tough even though women were clearly present. Fourthly, I have already demonstrated that census records and evidence to Parliamentary Select Committees demonstrates the presence of women and children. Fifthly a literature exists that describes the presence of women, such
as ‘Children of the Dead End’ (McGill 1914). What is apparent is that this is a case where the American and Australian evidence can not easily be transposed to the UK.

I propose that the UK evidence demonstrates that impetus for the provision of facilities such as schools and churches, hospitals, sports and recreational facilities were guided more by the business imperatives of staff retention, and the moral code adopted by later employers, than the presence of women and children. They were motivated by financial demands, with the effect of these factors being to provide the facilities identified by Bolton and others. There is ample evidence to attribute such changes to an economic motivation. I would further argue that once such provision existed, the camps became more accommodating to families, and this was the overriding factor in the increasing presence of women and families. This is supported by numerical evidence from census returns and company documentation that shows some women and children present in early camps, whilst a significant increase correlates across time with increased facilities. A further significant point is that traditional timescales of the presence of women often ignore the small but significant presence that existed in early camps, denigrating the contributions they made. Thus the physical capacities of Rachel Hamilton (nicknamed ‘Big Rachel’) who amongst other things was a farm worker at Anniesland are ignored. Or the achievements of women like Gourouck Ellen, representative of women described by McGill when ‘the baskets that they hauled after them were cased in clay to the depth of several inches, and sometimes when emptied...weighed over two stone. The strain on the women’s arms must have been terrible. But they never complained.’ (McGill 1914: 75)

But even where we know women and children were present, this did not of itself appear to work as a civilising influence so often claimed. The Woodhead navvy camp is a classic example. Unlike most other transient camps for railway construction, this camp did have a regular presence of women and children. But their presence alone did little to quell the reputation of the navvies. The camps that appear to have been the least violent appear to be the ones that had facilities made available for leisure and support, equipped for an alternative to bare knuckle fighting and copious alcohol consumption. The presence of women and children on their own appears not to have been the major influence in behaviour modification. This may bring into question the often vaunted belief that the presence of women and children in towns was the major pacifying factor when comparing urban and
navvy dweller. The towns and cities would have the range of support mechanisms to develop a ‘whole community’, rather than almost total reliance on alcohol and other personal pastimes. Taking part in activities with the family may be a major influence on behaviour, and indeed was a major claim of Temperance Societies. It appears that it is the provision and utilisation of diverse recreational facilities that is the essential component in modifying behaviour, not the age or sex of those present.

This belief that there was nothing but violence and macho posturing in the work camps is not borne out by the evidence. At Risehill camp we have the first indication of doubt expressed in the excavation report, which concludes “evidence for the hard-drinking navvy is scarce – a few glass wine bottles, wine goblets and tumblers” (W. A. 2008:11). The excavation report goes further to challenge the stereotypical view so often found in the literature:

> the conclusions that can be drawn from the finds’ assemblages are perhaps at odds with what we know from other sources about the navvies working on the nineteenth century railway products. The living quarters at Risehill were undoubtedly simple, largely timber-built and probably Spartan in their furnishings, but the ceramic and glass vessels give at least a slight air of gentility (W.A. 2008:11).

None of which effectively challenges the volume of accepted evidence about the hard living stereotypical navvy, and the report does qualify the statements by indicating that refuse containing evidence of hard drinking could have been disposed of elsewhere on the site. But this raises the issue we come across repeatedly in this work, that of balance of interpretation from the evidence. In the past there was a general acceptance that violence was endemic and cultural pursuits rare. The findings of these results at least raise the prospect that violent pursuits were not the sole occupations indulged in by residents.

The evidence that would demonstrate differences in food consumption can also be surprising. Although little data exists from the limited excavations in the UK, Mrozowski and team provide ample dietary evidence of the lack of differentiation between the Boarding Houses of the Bott Mill complex at Lovell Massachusetts and the agents’ houses. Faunal analysis from excavations of the two sites indicate that “cuts of meat are comparable between the two sites” (Mrozowski et al 1989: 310), postulating that “the relationship between purchasing patterns and wealth may sometimes be counterintuitive” (Mrozowski et
Mrozowski does indicate that there may be reasons for this, including differential preservation in urban sites and preferences for boneless cuts, but neither of these arguments adequately explain the findings. Comparisons with workers housing in the UK are even more complex. Until similar work has been completed in a UK context such claims can not be substantiated or rejected, but it does provide a potential area for significant further research.

3.5.4 A Journey Under Constant Supervision

The layout of these camps changed over time, but always with some component of social differentiation present. In the early days there was no decisive planning – people camped where they wanted to, but what evolved was still an expression of power through exploitation of the geography of the site. Whilst in early camps it might have been a universally held belief that the siting of latrines away from communal areas was desirable, in later camps the entire camp was planned. In some of these camps the siting of latrines was specifically designed so that it not only took advantage of local topography for running water etc., but was nearer workmen’s huts than the accommodation for managers, such arrangements being replicated at camps such as Butt Valley and Alabama Gates.

The location of latrines was not the only method by which social difference was emphasised and reinforced daily. Earlier in this chapter we commented on the change by second generation cotton magnates such as the Gregg family, shifting from hands on control to a more managerial system, as owners moved to more remote locations such as Norcliffe Hall. This move enabled control to be exercised from a distance alleviating the necessity of being on site. Similar developments were to take place in the work camps and navvy camps across the world, and Banham cites examples from the world of manufacturing in Sheffield (Banham 2010). Whilst the owners were not present on the sites, their managers were, and control was exercised through them. Accommodation for managers was often found on the periphery of the complex, some considerable distance from more raucous areas. This enabled the exercise of power over the workforce, whilst not having to suffer the depredations of living directly amongst the rowdiness. At Alabama Gates, it was the isolated buildings that on excavation returned a series of buttons from more expensive and specialised clothing, indicative of higher status occupations. The summation of all the factors (excavation, finds, photographs, historical records), left Van Bueren with the view “the
segregation of the housing stock at the Alabama Gates camp appears potentially significant as a sign of divisions within the workforce” (Van Bueren 2002:37). Similar observations are made at other camps by Hamilton (2000), Given (2005) and in the case of the military Simmons (2010).

A further example is given by Susan Lawrence when she describes the arrangements of the Adventure Bay Whaling Camp in Australia, a functional camp between 1829 and 1841. Here she argues there was a distinction drawn between the elite headsmen (officers) and the boatsteerers (crew) exemplified through the camp layout. Not only had the elite headsmen their own quarters with more personal privacy, their quarters had a separate entrance and two rooms, what Lawrence calls “a luxury of private space compared to the shared barracks of the men” (Lawrence 2010: 152).

An analysis of the layout of the work camp at Birchinlee illustrates this distribution of elements and the resultant social differentiation that exists. Plan 2 clearly demonstrates the separate phases of the camp. The Workmen’s Huts are sandwiched between those of the Police station and missionary on one side, and the foremen’s huts on the other. Even in what was at the time a most progressive settlement, the workmen’s accommodation was still sited so as to be under constant supervision by elements of power – police, missionary and foremen. It would be impossible to move around the site without being observed by one of the triumvirate of authority. Furthermore, the layout demonstrates that attendance at certain recreational areas would mean a journey under constant observation, whilst other locations regarded as more wholesome could be reached without observation. Thus attending the public hall and the one pub in the village entailed observation, whilst working on the allotments did not. Gardens and allotments for working people had been championed by Octaviva Hill and their value demonstrated at such places as Bourneville (Gaskell 1980), issues explored in much more detail in Chapter Four.

This element of control was not only employed in the architecture and layout of the site, but made explicit in the rules in every hut requiring adherence by every worker on the site. There were differing rules pertinent to lodging house or married quarters, as the copy of the rules in Illustration 1 demonstrates. The rules cover such diverse issues as the provision of sheets and go into great detail about the responsibilities of tenants regarding cleanliness. They also make clear it is a major offence to conceal more alcohol than the daily allowance.
A significant change from earlier accommodation is that each lodger was provided with a bed for their sole use. It also makes clear that hut keepers can lose their property if they fail to undertake personal duties in a diligent manner acceptable to the Board.

It is apparent that control of the workforce at Birchinlee was exercised through multiple visible and tangible methods of rules, layout, geography, spatial organisation and social differentiation. Even in what were regarded as progressive settlements, the same components of control existed, as demonstrated in camps such as Butt Valley and Millom. The use of spatial differentiation and access observation at Birchinlee is similar in many ways to the methods of control discussed earlier at Styal Mill, with the choices by Samuel Greg siting parts of his complex. In both cases there is observation of workers as they go to and from work, in addition to within the workplace itself.

In this chapter we have seen examples of the various ways in which owners/contractors maintained control over their workforce. This has led us to analyse working situations covering a variety of settings, and over a lengthy period of time. One of the standard methodologies was the imposition of rules on those people provided with accommodation. A comparison of the published rules at Birchinlee, Styal and Batty Green provides some interesting comparisons (Table 5). It is clear that across time certain key factors are consistently applied in an effort to ensure the maintenance of power and control. Across significant periods of time, the same issues keep repeating, the same methodology is employed, to ensure control over those working and housed.

Throughout this chapter we have seen power being exercised over the movement and activities of workers, at differing sites and across varying time scales. This has varied from control of access to observational strategies, with often the means to complete such control constructed through the physical environment. We have analysed several examples and seen how such practices became normative. Further comparisons across national and international dynamics have enabled a detailed and robust argument to be presented that these mechanisms of control were present in both formal and informal settings. Additionally there have been comparisons that have emphasised that whilst significant similarities exist across international boundaries, care needs to exercised when such comparisons are made. There are clearly certain factors that are unique to the UK. Whilst much of this interpretation has been developed through focussing on The Greg family and the living accommodation of the
navvy in the UK, other key sites and communities have also been explored, although not in as much detail. What is abundantly clear is that there were significant changes in the style and form of provision over the timescale of this study.

The number of people directly housed through employee owned housing is a small part of the volume of philanthropic activity undertaken in the field of housing. There were major and significant other examples of philanthropic housing that need to be explored, especially those in major urban centres developing at this time. The rationale and methodology of provision in these urban communities form the next chapter in this study.
Chapter Four – Housing the Urban Dweller

If in a house of ten rooms, there are ten or more families, numbering perhaps from fifty to seventy souls, of all ages, can it be surprising that, the girls shall augment the social evil, the boys become inmates of reformatories, the father a pot-house companion and the mother a gossiping gin-drinking slattern.

(Ragged School Union Magazine, 1862: 147)
4.1 Fishergate, Fishwicks’ Yard and Highgate

It was a town of redbrick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes allowed it; but as matter stood it was a town of unnatural red and black...a town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which intermittent serpents of smoke trailed themselves for ever and ever, and never got uncoiled. It had a black canal in it, and a river that ran purple with ill-smelling dye, and vast piles of buildings where there was a rattling and a trembling all day long...it contained several large streets all very like one another, and many small streets still more like one another (Dickens [1854] 1989:26).

Dickens’ highly descriptive account of Coketown in ‘Hard Times’ provides the evocative background to much of this chapter. It was a result of rapid intense development that demands for decent workers’ housing gained momentum. Within these communities the evolution of new styles and methods of organisation were trialled, being places the impact of social and political experimentation was to be felt most acutely. This chapter explores the impact of these demands, examining conditions in developing cities and town’s, investigating type and form of workers’ housing. It will trace the evolution of design within this historical context. It demonstrates that philanthropic housing was perceived as one part of the solution, through which we chart the emergence and eventual demise of ‘5% philanthropy’. Other forms of philanthropic housing will also be examined. A variety of organisations played their part in housing these growing industrial communities. Bodies such as the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company and The Dwelling House Improvement Company, hostels for the homeless, building clubs and societies, the Co-operative housing movement, charitable trusts and shelters were all significant.

Coketown was a fictional representation of Preston. As a starting place to view conditions in industrialised towns, Preston is ideal. It is believed Preston was founded by Roger of Poitu, with the town receiving its first charter from Henry II in 1179. Post Medieval expansion took place within the original boundaries of the town, and it was not until the nineteenth century that major growth and development led to physical enlargement. Textiles were to become a major employer and by 1830 it is estimated a thousand houses were used for weaving (LCC 2006a). The arrival of coal from Wigan through the Douglas Tramways and their connection to the Lancaster Canal meant the utilisation of steam as a source of power was practical.
This gave the impetus to further industrial development so by 1856 there were seventy five mills in Preston. (LCC 2006a).

There has been limited formal archaeological investigation of Preston (LUAU 2002), what has been completed being ‘fairly small’ (LCC 2006a:14), but the historical evidence is striking. By 1844 Hodge estimates some 70% of houses had no running water, with high infant mortality, typhus and cholera rampant (Hodge 1997). Living conditions for many were grim (Axon 1919; Builder 1860; Coutie 1992; Dennis 1984; Morgan 1990, Morgan 1993; Timmins 2000).

Much of the towns Post Medieval development was piecemeal, reflecting the emergence of first hand-loom weaving and later mill developments. This often led to ribbon development around the fringes of the medieval settlement, gradually extending the boundaries of the established town. By 1869 it is estimated there were some 17,000+ properties in the borough (LCC 2006a). ‘Colonies’ of handloom weavers’ cottages continued to be built by the owners of spinning factories as late as 1830, demonstrating the impact of cotton on housing in Preston pre-dates the industrial explosion of mills. Workers in the cotton industry were regularly housed by employers whilst the number of hand loom weavers in the town was still extensive. Early eighteenth century weaver’s cottages were also constructed by cloth merchants. Some had cellars such as those at Mount Pleasant, and what has been termed a ‘colony’ was established at New Hall Lane by the Horocks company. These particular buildings are of an unusual type, with the loom working spaces situated between adjacent houses. This was a vastly different method of design to traditional cottages where communal areas were devoted to the craft, or singly occupied cellar or attic.

The standard weaver’s cottage was ubiquitous in Preston, with the vast majority following identical, or similar, design and construction. The inner core of the city was tightly packed resulting in high population density with its associated problems. Weaving in Preston was often conducted in the cellar, whilst above cellar construction was usually back to back or two-up/two-down. Morgan estimates at the height of handloom weaving there were some 640 in row and court form within the Friargate district alone (Morgan 1990), but little evidence remains (OAN 2002a). As technology developed and the factory was born this form of production was superseded, and by the 1880s most expansion was found to the North
and North East through new mill building and conversion of existing mills to fire-proofed design.

In Chapter Three we examined how some employers used the provision of housing as a means of power over their workforce. A classic example appeared in 1854 in Preston. Between 1853-4 the operatives of the factories owned by T. Miller went on strike. The strike was supported by Margaret Moore of Dale Street, through her refusal to send her children to work at the factory during the strike. Miller consequently used his power as landlord to evict Margaret Moore from her accommodation. In such a close knit community, the consequences would not be lost on neighbours and workmates. In many ways it was them, and not Margaret Moore, that the lesson was aimed at (Preston Guardian 1854).

A significant development in Preston’s housing was the evolution of four roomed, two-up/two–down properties with back passages. These were to dominate the housing of the town by the 1840s and in direct contrast to other major conurbations there were very few back to back or court dwellings. Rear access was either via long connected alleys or via ginell entrances between pairs of houses.

In 1861 ‘The Builder’ devoted a specific article to Preston. The layout was eloquently described as “the factories are piled up storey above storey and group against group, the tall chimney stacks keeping guard over all, and the squat houses of the operatives are spun out in rows around” (Builder 1861b: 833). Such form was responsible for a huge increase in population density across the town.

The article is particularly scathing about sanitary arrangements, or rather the lack of them, describing places as “vile and filthy” (Builder 1861b: 833), whilst applauding the paving of Fishergate. But not far from this lauded place is described an area of housing, Fishwicks’ Yard, containing privies and offal pits hard by living accommodation, with the slops from another set of houses running through the yard and an additional four full pits at the back. The final conclusion being that the area is “scarcely fit for human occupation” (Builder 1861b: 834). They further caution about taking decoration at face value and cite Hardmans’ Yard by the Wellington Inn. Recently whitewashed at the entrance, it is deceptive for “step past the whitewash near the street, and you will find...a monster midden pit, with privies at each end open to the front of a whole row of houses whose inhabitant’s they serve” (Builder
1861b: 834). These same residents were drying freshly laundered clothes over the pit. The rubbish from the houses was collected in the pit and sometimes lay for months prior to being carted away.

The ugliest description is of the High Street area. There a huge sewer simply ends and empties itself, forming standing effluent infected pools the length of the back of the houses. This filth eventually fills up and blocks the privies, with one local man telling Godwin it had been in a similar condition for nine years. But recently things had started to get worse thanks to the activities of the tripe company Peadar and Lever, who discharged their greasy effluent straight onto the raw sewage. As Godwin makes clear, the sewer was constructed by the Board of Health, and they decided it should stop at that point and discharge its contents into the land behind these houses. This is in direct contrast to the housing enjoyed by the wealthier inhabitants of the town in such places as Winckley Square (WYAS 2003).

4.2 Supply, Demand and Support

Between 1801 and 1851 the national housing stock doubled from 1.6m. to 3.1m. (King and Timmins, 2001:329) while between 1781 and 1851 the population of England grew from nine million to twenty million (Henriques 1979). This was in part the result of a huge influx from Ireland substantially because of the Great Famine (1845-1852) (Busteed 2001; Hickman 2005; Kenny 2003; Lee 2005), resulting, according to the 1851 census, in some communities developing an Irish population in excess of 43% (Busteed 2001; Murphy 1994). Such massive increase in both population and housing was fuelled by economics (Newman et al 2001; Symonds 2005), which led to unprecedented growth in cities and towns. There was a demand for “a regular supply of labour, in return for standardised wages and hours, and a new landless tenantry, in purpose built urban houses, emerged to fulfil this need” (Nevell 2008: 166). This in turn resulted in the movement of large numbers of the workforce from impoverished countryside to developing urban centres. This caused increasing housing density as more and more people packed into existing properties. The situation was compounded by the scale of numbers. *The Lancashire Historic Town Survey of Blackburn* puts the point succinctly:

In contrast to the middle classes the poor continued to be squeezed into an urban area that did not physically expand in proportion to its increasing population. This led
to court developments of back-to-back housing and the leasing of cellars as separate dwellings (LCC: 2005a: 38).

It is clear many fledgling communities were unable to cope with such a vast influx of people telescoped into such a short period of time. Throughout the country new industrial areas emerged, demanding both skilled and unskilled workers. This explosion of population was concentrated in these developing conurbations, fuelling decline in many rural communities. In those areas where paternalistic employers had developed (see Chapter Three), urban sprawl often swamped the existing population. Owners now had a workforce they could influence less and the power of the paternalistic owner was consequently diminished. The impact was, as Nevell makes clear “paternalism where it survived into the early twentieth century, was transformed into organised industrial welfare” (Nevell 1993: 24). Both these issues led to a disjunction between supply and demand of social support. Few mechanisms existed in the new communities where growth was too fast for existing systems to cope (Bryson et al 2002; Henriques 1979), whilst there was excess provision in some of the declining rural communities. The impact of this migration and its pattern should not be underestimated, for:

it provides a key mechanism through which urbanization and industrialization can develop, moving labour to new sites of industrial expansion, yet at the same time often creating massive problems for both society and economy potentially leading to unemployment, housing stress and social dislocation (Pooley and D’Cruze, 1994:339).

Whilst this is clearly true, the belief that social problems were solely rooted in emerging urban communities is a mistake. There is ample evidence that the impact of social change and economic deprivation was as big in traditional rural communities as it was in the emerging urban areas (Brown 2006; Hunter 2010; Nair and Poyner 2006). The changes implemented in outdoor relief, for example, had a significant impact across all communities, rural or urban (Hurren 2007). The effective depopulation of significant tracts of land had a major impact on the rural economy, especially at those times when labour was most needed – lambing and harvest. Equally many of the problems in urban communities were replicated in rural communities. Prochaska observes that whilst problems were “concentrated in the nation’s cities, the suffering was also highly visible in town and countryside” (Prochaska 1988: 34). What was significant was the concentration – higher population density leading to higher frequency of problems. For example in Chapter Three we briefly examined the
problem of incest, which will be explored in more detail later in this chapter. To think that this was solely an issue in the newly developing urban communities is to ignore the very real concerns that existed in established rural districts. In 1852 *The Builder* was to report on a design for labourer’s cottages in rural communities, designed by William Cheffins. These included “separate bed-rooms for parents, boys and girls, and is well calculated to promote the physical and moral health of the occupants” (*Builder*: 1852: 24). The concern with “moral health” was replicated later in many urban areas, where the potential for incest was a serious worry to the Victorians.

These changes can be illustrated by any range of contemporary figures - in the mid 1840s half of Preston’s houses had no piped water with some eighty per cent unconnected to sewers or drains. In early Victorian Liverpool poverty and deprivation ensured 50% of children under the age of ten died (Englander 1985). Speaking at the second reading of the *Artisans and Labourers Dwellings Bill* in 1868, Lord Chelmsford was to quote from the *Liverpool Medical Officer of Health’s Annual Report* of the “moral evil belonging to single room occupation” (HOC 1868: 192 col. 90) and “the canker which threatens to blight the most sacred bonds of the family and social system” (HOC 1868: 192: col. 901). We will return to this ‘moral evil’ later in this chapter, but it is illustrative of the Victorian and Edwardian concern for moral as well as physical need. In the same speech he quotes from the *Medical Officer of Health in Manchester’s Annual report for 1867*:

Paradise Court, forty yards by thirty contains forty-three families and consists of back to back houses, and on one side back to back cellars; contains seven privies situated in the centre of a court, in a very filthy condition, with a large ashpit between (HOC 1868: 192: col 901).

A further example of overcrowding is provided by Turnbull when referring to Carlisle, showing that as late as 1917 some fifteen per cent of houses in the city used living rooms as bedrooms (Turnbull 2005).

Earlier we explored the existence of multiple ways to interpret the impact of industrialisation on individuals. One oft cited view is that the emergence of industrialisation was, for many, a wretched time in which to live. There can be no doubt that the experience of living in these communities was an unpleasant and dangerous existence. There was poverty and hunger, disease and filth. It is also the case that many such problems existed prior to
industrialisation; there is often today what Weight calls a “romanticisation of rural life” (Weight 1994: 253). Life in medieval rural communities was also fraught with problems - privation was rife, medical care was basic, education and recreational facilities lacking with starvation an ever present threat. These problems were not created with the development of industrialisation, although they were without doubt exacerbated by increased population density. But within these communities there was also mutual support, a collective belief, humour and music. There was passion and love. The lack of recognition for these elements has been acknowledged (Dennis 1984; Mayne and Murray 2001; Newman and Newman 2008). To truly understand the impact of these changes we need to recognise that both were facets of the experience of living. It’s a matter of balance - as Cooper makes clear:

One cannot deny or ignore the extraordinary social ills that arose during the period of rapid and unplanned industrialisation in England. However there has been an ever present tendency to play down or ignore many of the positive developments that took place over this period, and to ignore the social ills that were present both before and afterwards (Cooper 2005:162).

This dilemma poses a significant debate in archaeology. How do we not lose sight of the very real difficulties that existed, whilst recognising the positive facets of life in the past? Traditionally it has been too easy to fall into the abyss of claiming that all was dreadful in the past, and miss the friendship, comradeship and shared celebrations that must have existed. The reaction against such overwhelming negativity was discussed earlier. Ultimately in seeking to redress the balance, there is a desperate need not to overstate the good when challenging the stereotype.

The most recent debate on this was fuelled by the publication of Newman and Newman’s 2008 paper which made several assertions. These included “from a nineteenth century perspective, however, poor housing did not appear the uniform experience of industrial workers in the area’s growing and embryonic towns” (Newman and Newman 2008: 190). (A similar point is made within this work, with the proviso that these are a small number of examples that can be isolated, and are most definitely not the norm.) They then proceed to list several examples of co-operative and self-help housing that was of a high standard for the time. But as we have seen in this study the number of houses so constructed is a mere fraction of that built by speculators.
Discussing Preston they argue “the issue was inadequate services not inadequate buildings” (Newman and Newman 2008: 190). This approach totally ignores the contemporary evidence from publications such as The Builder cited in this research. Additionally it was precisely the poor design of buildings that led to inadequate service provision. The initial development of the sewerage system was one of the biggest civil engineering project ever undertaken in this country. It took many years to complete and was a rolling programme of works. Many of these houses were simply not constructed in such a manner as to be able to connect to the system. This was one of the reasons for the host of legislative changes that Parliament and Local Authorities were to introduce (see later in this chapter for a discussion on Preston bye-laws relating to building). It was clearly the design of many of the buildings (especially the older ones) that was a major reason for non-connection.

In Chapter Three this study challenged stereotypical views of navvies. Making such challenges comes with an obligation to free ourselves from the charge of rewriting history. On an initial reading it is appealing to condemn those “connecting perceived poor quality housing with reduced health prospects and social, moral end economic failure” (Newman and Newman 2008: 193). But myriad studies connect poor health and poor housing, (Prunty 2001; Pruner 1969). In Victorian times there was a belief in Malthusian inspired Social Darwinism (Hawkins 1997; Lewis 1999; Stack 2000), that did equate poor quality housing with ”social, moral and economic failure” (Newman and Newman 2008: 193).

The authors use a particular form of language that is emotive and value-laden to characterise these urban places, such as “smeared with the description of slums” (Newman and Newman 2008: 193) and “the myth of the slum” (Newman and Newman 2008: 189). They argue “they are an imagined people in a mythical urban setting” (Newman and Newman 2008:183). The use of such language is problematical on two levels. Firstly it is in itself as emotive a use of language as the very usage it seeks to criticise. Such depictions themselves underline the very stereotypes the authors seek to challenge.

Secondly there is significant evidence to demonstrate that contemporary people did regard much of the accommodation as slums they were glad to get out of. Most of the clearance started significantly later than this study, in the 1950’s and 1960’s, but modern research suggests the traditional view of garden suburbs, new towns and modern housing as often
isolated and unpopular is itself ripe for challenge (Bayliss 2001; Meacham 1998). Even the much vilified tower block was welcomed by many at the time as an improvement.

One final critique of the paper is needed. The data sets are developed from the *Lancashire Historic Town Survey*, a series extensively quoted in this work. This survey only evaluates existing terraces. In an area that has undergone extensive slum clearance, the question has to be asked if the results would have been the same with the inclusion of demolished properties in the data sets, especially since the reason for many of the properties having been demolished was as being unfit for human habitation? The removal of so many properties in this category is clearly going to produce a skewed analysis. Their inclusion might, and I would suggest would, have produced findings at significant variance to those in the Newman and Newman paper. If we wish to have a true picture of life in the past, then we must include these properties in our evaluation. If we do not include them, then we have an evaluation of life as it is now, not life as it was then.

The paper by Newman and Newman illustrates the complexity and difficulty in making assumptions about the past, and the inherent dangers. What is clear is that there was a mix of accommodation, and such relative terms as “good” and “bad” are not helpful. It is apparent there were relatively isolated pockets of better housing. It is also obvious there were extensive tranches of lower quality housing.

If such huge deprivation did exist, the obvious question to be asked is why? What was the root cause? In the view of many of the wealthy, there was often only one answer. It was inappropriate actions by the poor that led to an inability to provide for themselves and families. It was the profligate, the workshy, the undeserving poor who were to blame, and it was their own fault (Jacobi 2009; Lander-Birch 1981). There was no one else responsible, as Reckner and Brighton make clear “poverty was explained in terms of personal and cultural failures on the part of the impoverished” (Reckner and Brighton 1993: 82). If this was a matter of personal failure, then such failure could and should be challenged, reformed and redressed by the individual. If it was not then the individual was failing in their responsibilities both to their family and their nation. Deficiency was not solely that of physical need – food, shelter and clothing – it was also spiritual and moral. Again here is the need to address the needs of mind as well as body. This belief provided the basic philosophical stance for many of the wealthy when dealing with the poor. It provided the religious
motivation for individuals to act. If challenges to personal poverty were to be effective, then the moral and spiritual dimension became a priority for reform. By extension, there was a responsibility on all truly religious people to support such moral and religious improvement. As individuals took more responsibility for their personal future, they would redress ‘personal failure’. For some, the saving of the soul became a priority, of more significance than the physical demands of the body, for “many ardent Christians though sensitive to disease and social malaise, were more anxious to save souls than bodies” (Prochaska 1988:37).

This “failure to save bodies” is clearly demonstrated in publications of the Poor Law Commissioners, especially reports of distress. From these we learn of Thomas Blomely in 1841 described as “a case of deep distress; nearly starved to death for want of food” (Poor Law Commissioners 1842). Such a case was not isolated and many more examples could be cited.

The media of the time were at the forefront of presenting the problems of society to the middle classes. Stories such as those of Dickens were serialized in magazines, and presented an impression of a world whereby the individual was often trapped in a situation beyond personal control, for example Oliver Twist, Hard Times or Little Dorrit. Some sections of the media were exercised about the conditions of ordinary people and the potential for mass depravity. In 1849 The Morning Chronicle was to say:

We publish this, the first in a series of communications in which it is proposed to give a full and detailed description of the moral, intellectual, material and physical conditions of the industrial poor throughout England’ (Morning Chronicle 18/10/1849)

It is interesting that the image portrayed by the media was one of concern for social aspects of life, often relegating physical needs as of secondary significance.

Whilst the early development and administration of the Poor Law is beyond the brief of this work, it is worth noting that it was during the reign of Elizabeth 1st that Poor Law Rates became compulsory. This established the principle the state had abandoned reliance on charitable provision for the poor. In 1772 parishes were allowed to provide workhouses, and individuals who refused to enter were not allowed relief. Alarmed at escalating costs of administration, the 1782 act encouraged parishes to group together into Unions run by paid officials called Guardians. Only through work could ‘outdoor relief’ be earned, with ‘indoor relief’ reserved for the worst cases. Many argued that provision of outdoor relief did little, if
anything, to assist in developing the “moral fibre of the working man” (Cole 1984:10). Such moral imperatives constantly motivated, inspired and dictated the actions of key decision makers. There was a major outcry that the provision of outdoor relief led to pauperism becoming ingrained as a lifestyle choice, with wasteful individuals scrounging off the state whilst enjoying lazy and self-indulgent pleasantries at the expense of the hardworking taxpayer. This ending of outdoor relief, whilst relieving the demands on poor law ratepayers, resulted in some 280,000 paupers in English Workhouses by 1912 (Roberts 1971: 102). Prochaska makes clear “keeping families intact and free from dependence on the ratepayer was the central plank of nineteenth century social policy” (Pochaska 1988: 33).

4.3 “support and relief of thirteen poor women for ever hereafter to continue”
(CCC 2000f: 10)

Alms were traditionally given at monasteries, whose dissolution seriously reduced charitable provision. This left a vacuum further exacerbated by enclosures forcing large numbers of peasantry from traditional lands, resulting in a consequential increase in vagrancy. The solution was the establishment of free standing alms houses (Goose and Basten 2009; Goose 2010; Howson 2008; Spencer-Wood 2001). The poor were to be institutionalised and hidden from sight, first in alms houses and later in the workhouse. This enabled the middle classes to exercise control, not only physically, but also over moral codes. The ‘punishment’ ethos was established early in the process of institutionalising the nations poor – many almshouses were also prisons, where work became a major factor associated with incarceration. They are to be found in many older, established communities reflecting the pattern of population pre urban growth, and can sometimes be identified through the archaeological record. For example Burton’s alms houses at Long Row, Bristol, were originally founded in 1292 and existed in various forms for some 650 years (Marochan and Reed 1959). As urbanisation spread, Alms houses started to appear in newly developing communities.

Yet they have been subject to little archaeological investigation. A search of the British and Irish Archaeological Bibliography in March 2011 rendered only 41 returns. This is a tiny proportion of the many thousands of properties that have existed over many hundreds of years, encompassing such a diverse range of style and function. Consequently the resources available to the archaeologist are limited, forcing a major reliance on historical evidence.
Almshouses have had something of a schizophrenic character, meeting many competing and differing needs. Whilst undoubtedly some of the provision is as above, others performed a more altruistic function within local geographical, social and economic communities. Some were provided by trade and industrial societies or charitable organisations. Yet others were provided not solely as charitable institutions but also to memorialise, commemorating the life of some great benefactor (Rawcliffe 2007), or the tragic loss of a young life. Still more were endowed by the aristocracy and wealthy families, providing a visible and enduring symbol of wealth and status (Bryson et al 2002).

Stylistically some were purely functional and of basic design; others were ostentatious and ornate, built of fine materials by first class builders - reflecting the power of their patrons. These later styles aimed to “enhance the prestige of wealthy benefactors” (Spencer-Wood 2001:119). Photograph 6 of the alms houses in Appleby illustrates the point clearly. Originally founded in 1651 they were endowed by Lady Anne Clifford, daughter of the Third Earl of Cumberland. They enabled “support and relief of thirteen poor women for ever hereafter to continue” (CCC 2000f: 10). These are the original buildings, altered and subsequently renovated in 1961, which went beyond the basic provision of housing, being ornate and decorative. They are sited at the top of the town, in a location dominating the main street that is highly visible and symbolic of power and wealth, near the castle. They reflect not only the status and patronage of Lady Anne, but also the magnificence of her power. A similar example in Cumbria is to be found at Wigton (built 1723).

But such elaborate designs are not universal. As Howson makes clear:

> By and large the vast majority of Victorian almshouses were provided in modest groupings of between five and twelve dwellings, generally single storey with unexceptional architectural features (Howson 2008: 65).

Such assertions are also backed up by others (Caffrey 2004). This differentiation is important. Howson estimates that some 30% of alms houses were constructed during the reign of Victoria, with many significantly less ornate than earlier structures.

The exception appears to be those built by employers for ex-workers, or endowed by institutions. In Chapter Three we saw how paternalistic mill owners provided housing (of variable quality) to their employees. For those whose motivation was religious or political rather than solely economic, this was a concept that in some cases continued into
retirement. Sir Titus Salt, as an integral part of his Saltaire development, provided almshouses for retired members of the workforce. These were fairly ornate, having carved initials of Salt or his wife on the gable end of each building. Whilst the majority at Saltaire were clearly motivated by economics, this could not be said to be the case with the construction of these homes for the retired. Thus the whole development had a duality of motivations. A further similar example of the provision of almshouses by employers for retired employees, is to be found in Halifax, provided by the Crossley brothers.

There were also houses constructed by the liveried and trade companies, for retired and respected members of their profession. The key word is ‘respected’ – for access to such dwellings was often after significant length of membership of trade or company, with an unblemished character. In 1849 *The Builder* reported on the new almshouses being constructed by the Master Printers at Wood Green in Tottenham, Middlesex. These are typical of the more ornate style developed for companies with significant financial resources. They were designed to house twelve people. Each house had a sitting room, bedroom scullery on the ground floor, with external gallery for access to the upper floors. In the centre of the complex was a communal room available for social occasions (Builder 1849).

Illustration 2 from *The Builder*, gives an insight into the elaborate decoration and detailed planning that has gone into the production of these dwellings. Not only are the buildings designed to give an impression of permanence and solidity – reflecting the status of the society which was also permanent and solid, they are also landscaped, set back from the lane and only approached via a garden lined drive. The high walls mean the building is semi hidden, whilst impressive towers, turrets and gables peer out over the lane – dominating the local area and indicating a building (and organisation) of worth and significance. The towers and turrets enable residents to peer over the walls and view the locality from the isolation and relative safety of the hall, viewing the vista through ornamental landscaped gardens. As is the case of the gardens of Samuel Greg discussed in Chapter Three and Styal Cottage Homes in Chapter Five, the gardens at Wood Green were extensively planted. They all provide screening from the everyday noise and disturbance of the area, whilst affording the opportunity to view the locality from a concealed location.

On the same road was another complex belonging to the Fishmonger’s and Poulterer’s Institution, designed by the same architect. Similar to the design for the Printers’ alms
houses, each resident had a ‘sitting room and scullery on the ground floor and bed room on the first floor’ (Builder 1849: 270). The buildings were equally decorative and the grounds similarly extensively landscaped. They were designed to complement each other, providing a continuous, impressive and unified pattern.

The aim was to provide a cohesive whole, with the parish church in between the two buildings, giving an uninterrupted zone of development involved in ‘respectable’ charity and philanthropy. These were houses for the retired - the peak of individual achievement by the deserving, reward for an unblemished life of service in the trade. The respectability of individual residents within the society is demonstrated through their occupation of this building, constructed using highly decorated wood and stone which gives a symbolically permanent resonance. Part of the kudos of living in such a building is that occupation of itself confirms an inherent recognition of status within the founding society. Only those of worth and standing would be allowed to live here. The location of the alms houses, on either side of the parish church, is also important, not only allowing regular access to and from the church – a purely practical consideration - it also places the housing within the same orbit as the religious centre, associating charity with godliness. In this way it reinforces the link between church and charitable provision – especially that form of charitable provision that is aimed at the deserving poor. Thus it emphasises the religious motivation by association, through placing the church at the centre of the complex. Once again access to such highly ornate and well appointed housing is only available to those deemed deserving. The gatekeepers in this instance being the founding society and current board. In her analysis of West Yorkshire Alms houses, Caffrey argues there is some evidence to support a disposition to provision for the deserving poor but it is not universal (Caffrey 2004). This is a general point, and whilst it is true access was provided purely on the basis of need, few alms houses existed that had no essential criteria for admission, be it based on trade, geography or service.

Such buildings also reflect well on the founding society. They reinforce the social and political standing of the society, its members and benefactors, developing their social capital. By association all connected with the organisation also receive a significant boost to their personal status. The building is designed to reinforce this impact, being partly dependant on the architectural devices employed to raise the status of the building into a landmark. The
communal moral motivations are at work, influencing the style and architecture of the building, so ensuring the impact of aesthetic motivations reflect well upon the organisation.

The variety of styles employed in alms houses is staggering. At Pudsey in Yorkshire in 1899, Joseph Salter endowed and built five houses on Robin Lane each with a living room, porch and bedroom pantry in a bungalow design. Each house had its own backyard and outbuildings, and was constructed of stone with ‘dark Westmoreland slate, with red roll ridge tiles’ (Builder 1899:602). In Dublin, there were a large number of houses, including The Kings Hospital, Saint Michan’s Alms houses for Poor Widows, Saint Mary’s Alms houses, Mercer’s Hospital and Alms houses, Saint Catherine’s Widows House and Fortick’s Charity House to name but a few (Gahan 1942). This indicates that the number of alms houses across the country was extensive. With such a large number of houses, many designed for individual patrons and reflecting the use of vernacular building materials and styles, it is not surprising there is an extensive variation in design and build.

One fascinating element in the evolution of alms houses was the provision of uniforms. Originally many provided residents with a uniform for continuous wear as part of the charitable duties. Some even provided basic furniture such as Crossley in Halifax, Eleanor Hirsts in Wilshaw or Marslands at Wakefield (Caffrey 2004). As time progressed the use of uniforms diminished, although periodically attempts were made to reinstate the wearing of some form of identification (Baugher 2001a). By comparison as the workhouse system developed, their requirement to wear a uniform was accomplished simply by the expedient of removing all personal clothing from those admitted to indoor relief. This demonstrated to everyone that an ‘inmate’ was in receipt of relief from the Guardians, and showed to Poor Rate Payers how their contributions were being used. Photograph 7 displays a button from the uniform of the Chorlton Union Workhouse in Manchester. It also displays sign of significant wear, demonstrating the hard labour the wearer must have experienced. Significantly, such overt displays of charity were not demanded of almshouse residents by the time this button was worn.

The symbolism of uniforms was to change over time. In early alms houses clothing was not mainly provided to demonstrate and foster membership of a community, being much more practical and often fulfilling a number of the charitable objects stipulated by founders. This was manifestly not the case in the workhouse. There the requirement was to enable public
identification of inmates, by compulsion in the wearing of a uniform. Even serviceable garments had to be surrendered to the authorities as part of the induction process to the workhouse. The clear significance being in the visual identification of those in receipt of poor relief, providing a public display of the efforts of the parish to support the poor. It is of interest that about the time workhouses commenced the compulsory wearing of uniforms, there appears to be a reduction in use by almshouses. Whether this was a resident led reaction to the stigma now associated with uniforms, or a desire to differentiate between almshouse and workhouse is a matter of conjecture.

There is no doubt that the change from Alms house to Workhouse had a major impact on the poor. For those who were too proud to ask, or denied relief, this often led to a stark inevitability. Cases are to be found across the country similar to William Pearce, a weaver of Howell’s Croft, Bolton in February 1840. The evidence of Dr Bowring, though disputed heavily by members and staff of the local Board of Guardians, was substantially supported by visiting laymen and other locals. Dr Bowring described how he visited:

A man, his wife and two daughters... who lived in a cellar; the wife and daughters are out of work; this man earned about 4s. per week by weaving. I was fetched by the neighbours, who told me the man had died of hunger. I found him lying dead on one of the looms; they had neither bed nor bedding. I caused a jury to be summoned; their verdict was, 'Died of want of food' (HOC 1841: 2).

Such stories were not uncommon and can be found replicated across the country. As background, they illustrate the very real levels of poverty and deprivation. The change from Almshouse to Workhouse has been explored elsewhere (Leivers 2009; Tomkins 2004).

Social theories of the time were to influence the style and form of provision for the poor. The most significant theory of the period radically influencing thinking about the Poor Law was Malthusian inspired Social Darwinism. This became an established and well supported belief system, demonstrating what Giddens would call a naturalisation of the present. This often defined the beliefs and actions of influential individuals, so “the influence amongst the manufacturers of a ruthlessly individualistic, Malthus-inspired Social Darwinism cannot be discounted” (Dutton and King 1992: 63). This belief held that failure to succeed – through disease, intellectual capacity, poverty or unemployment – demonstrated individuals were personally lacking, rather than the result of systemic or economic failure. This meant help
would not solve problems but rather exacerbate them. The Social Darwinist movement believed “charity, giving alms and almshouses or workhouses only prolonged pauperism and prevented the natural course of evolution in which the unfit should not survive” (Spencer-Wood and Baugher 2001a: 6). The forces of the market should be allowed to operate unfettered, and those who succumbed would be the unfortunate by products of a system that was unalterable and natural. This was serious political motivation directing individual action.

But acceptance of Malthusian views was not universal and was regularly challenged. In 1817 an article was to appear in the Quarterly Review which challenged the assumptions. It is littered with terms such as “mistakes”, “dissatisfied” and “erroneous conclusions”. Yet the same article does lend some support to Malthusian ideas, especially those elements of the argument that refer to populations and the influence of the Poor Law:

Our Poor Laws, as now administered, are neither more nor less than a standing bounty on increase...by supporting at the public expense those fathers of families who could not support themselves, even whilst single, by labour (Quarterly Review 1817: 400).

Social Darwinism was a key facet of intellectual and political debate that developed the distinction between deserving and undeserving poor. In Tess of the Durbervilles, Tess “felt quite a Malthusian attitude towards her mother for thoughtlessly giving her so many little sisters and brothers, when it was such a trouble to nurse and provide for them” (Hardy 1992 [1912]: 46). The reader in 1912 would have recognised the thoughts expressed by Tess as being part of mainstream intellectual thought, and Hardy has no need to explain the significance of Malthus to his audience, it being accepted they will understand the concept. As Firth makes clear “the poor were thus circumstances because of their perceived morally reprehensible lifestyle” (Firth 2005: 101). Later we will see how such concepts became physically manifest in the construction of buildings. Via the archaeology we will see how such ideas acted as one of several means of effective managerial and social authority. At this stage it is sufficient to note the existence of the phenomena as a reflection of beliefs. It led to vagrancy becoming criminalised, with the result that “equating poverty with criminality justified segregation and incarceration of the poor” (Spencer-Wood 2009:118). Similar distinctions can be found across the world with major reports illustrating parallel impact in
places as diverse as Adelaide, Australia (Piddock 2001) and Falmouth, USA (Spencer-Wood 2009).

This differential between the deserving and undeserving poor, and its relationship to philanthropy, is classically illustrated by articles in *Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal*. On February 24th 1849 a front page article was published entitled ‘Reaction against Philanthropy’. In a long and detailed exposition the author challenged the effectiveness of philanthropy across a variety of social activities – prison reform, hospitals, housing. Having asserted that “the idle in all their various forms is a tremendous drag on the social machine” (Chambers 1849: 114), they then proposed a rather startling concept. This was the regular stoppage from the wages of those working of a small amount. This would provide support for those temporarily unemployed through no fault of their own, something it viewed as “so painful a feature of our present social conditions” (Chambers 1849: 114). The journal is especially insistent that the development of such a scheme should have no impact on the Poor Law and its operation. The distinction here is clear and evident between those who are undeserving where the appropriate mechanism is the workhouse, and those deserving where the appropriate mechanism is assistance directly from those in work. This not only differentiates economically, it also does so socially.

This approach was to change little for many years. Some 29 years later *Chambers Edinburgh Journal* was still attacking philanthropy. By 1878 there were suspicions that some charities were becoming self-serving for patrons. It was also argued they could be doing more harm than good. Chambers was at the forefront of the argument, championing the cause. The journal challenged the basis of organised charitable giving, arguing that in some instances the charities were actually fostering the problems they claimed to be relieving:

> The worst of it is that charitable distribution being elevated into a trade discourages habits of self-reliance, and creates the pauperism it is professedly designed to alleviate (Chambers 1878: 449).

Further, the inherent argument in Social Darwinism of personal responsibility chimed with the Christian ethos of many Victorians and Edwardians. Personal responsibility to God was to be demonstrated on the judgement day, when individuals would answer personally for their lives and actions. Thus there was an inherent responsibility on all Christians to ensure the poor were able to answer God in a manner that would not damn their soul. To this end the
devout Christian had to work to develop traits of self-responsibility, so removing the stain of indigence.

This economic element is key to not only how philanthropy was viewed by those opposed to it, but also by many actively promoting it. The economic dimension of success dominated evaluations of the impact of schemes. “As with so many other programmes designed by philanthropists in the nineteenth century, the efficacy of the programme was demonstrated through labour” (Bates 2009: 151). Indeed there is some evidence to demonstrate that such economic factors had a further impact. Rose analysed the photographs taken of Barnardo Ragged School entrants and concluded that efforts were made by families to hide the ‘ragged’ nature of clothing as much as possible. Her conclusion was that “families were highly aware of the moral implications of 'raggedness', and were concerned to demonstrate an understanding of the forms of respectability” (Rose 2009:136).

To those unwilling to accept the doctrines of Social Darwinism fell the political challenge of proving it wrong. One way was through the establishment of societies to prove that the poor and impoverished could be changed into ‘respectable’ members of society. This involved the provision of opportunities to ‘prove their worth’. One example will suffice, an organisation we will meet later again in this chapter. ‘The Society for Improving the Conditions of the Labouring Classes’ was involved in diverse activities to promote such ‘improvement’ and eventually became involved in housing. As can be seen from its name, the organisation was primarily concerned with improving conditions for labouring people – making them better, model citizens through access to better conditions. By their very existence they challenged and refuted the basic tenents of Social Darwinism, whose adherents believed such interventions were doomed to failure.

These views significantly impacted on housing and other elements of urban living. Many individuals found in them an impetus to promote change. Their involvement in social and political activities and movements was one way to influence policy. Others were more directly involved with specifically targeted organisations such as Civic Leagues, the Children’s Country Holiday Fund, Metropolitan Public Garden’s Association or the Family Welfare Organisation. Through such local bodies it was possible to become involved with influential national organisations such as the Charities Organisation Committee, and begin to influence national policy. Such moral motivations were to influence significantly developments.
4.4 The New Initiatives

Urban areas saw the development of myriad number of programmes to improve the physical environment of housing and the behaviour of those inhabiting it. There were legislative changes designed to improve material conditions of housing stock, many strenuously resisted by vested interests. The emerging differential in style of provision was to be found rooted in two distinct bodies, each developing their own individual form of design.

One style was championed by several companies, being an austere building style utilising basic materials in construction. There is no attempt to develop cultural capital here. This included organisations like The General Society for Improving the Dwellings of the Labouring Classes (established 1851), and The Dwellings House Improvement Company (established 1857). Their buildings were more open plan with shared and communal facilities for tenants. They reflected one view of the medical evidence that believed the answer to disease prevention was to enable maximum air circulation. Large rooms with high ceilings, open staircases that allowed extensive air circulation and external washing and toilet facilities were the ideal to strive for.

The other common basic design was championed by the Improved Industrial Dwelling Company (established 1863) who had more financial resources and so built larger. They also had a differing design standard. High quality materials were used in construction and blocks were more ornately decorated, utilising the latest (if cheapest) forms of decorative embellishments in vogue, reflecting the aesthetic motivations of the time. Their buildings were less Spartan, for example the use of extensive plaster rather than simple painting of brick walls. Buildings were also more self-contained. Again there were the high ceilings allowing air circulation, but there were individual entrances to flats with smaller communal access areas. WC’s and cooking facilities were internal with fewer communal areas in the blocks.

This dichotomy of design was to encompass the vast majority of dwellings constructed by charitable and philanthropic companies during Victorian and Edwardian periods. They polarised thinking about design. As more and more companies came into existence, they lined up behind one or other of the models, with the vast majority following the more austere open plan design. Certainly construction of open plan blocks was cheaper, so there
has to be a question about whether the reason for this choice was fired by economics. As we shall see in Chapter Five, a similar dichotomy was to develop with the provision of orphanages.

Yet in spite of all these developments support for philanthropic housing was still at a low level, with many attempts made to interest people through financial incentives (5% philanthropy) and political pressure. When Prince Albert became personally involved by lending his name to cottages for the labouring classes, significant people began to take notice. At the Great Exhibition in 1851, the Model Houses in the name of The Prince were displayed (Illustration 3). Originally the approach to exhibit was by the Society for Improving the Conditions of the Labouring Classes, being turned down on the grounds of the size of the exhibit. It was only the personal intervention of the Prince Consort that ensured they were constructed, subsequently becoming one of the major attractions of the event. There was no problem with the size of the exhibit once royalty lent their name.

The properties involved the provision of flats in a design that could be replicated to provide multiple units on the same site, thus increasing housing density whilst reducing costs. All four flats are separate with their own entrance, but there is a shared approach to individual doors through a communal entrance area and staircase. These access arrangements are typical of properties that were erected by the Society. The façade is decorated and pleasant, giving an impression that is far removed from many barrack block buildings designed to house the urban poor. They therefore demonstrate the influence of the aesthetic motivation.

The buildings had a somewhat chequered career and patchy influence. Within the UK there were a significant number of accolades and vociferous praise, but no actual houses were ever constructed. The Society would later comment that the major interest in their plans was to be from the continent, where their ideals came into fruition through the physical construction of such dwellings. Yet the impact on housing in the UK was negligible.

Buildings that did make it beyond the drawing board reflected the views of the building company in key aspects. In many ways architectural features and aesthetics were imposed on the tenants. Peabody Trust premises internally contained painted brick walls, since they believed plastered walls and wallpapers were hiding places for vermin. The use of wooden floors reflected the belief that wood was more durable and less easily damaged than
alternatives. They held a belief this would dramatically reduce the inevitable considerable damage caused by tenants. These discrete design choices developed “a severely practical model, and one which involved a very low opinion of working class interests and expectations” (Gaskell 1987:33).

Access to many of the new properties was scrupulously controlled ensuring that often the provision of housing for working people was restricted to the better off sections – clerks, police officers and those in regular employment. The ‘gatekeepers’ took many forms. Octavia Hill, and her “inexorably moralistic individualism” (Owen 1965: 386) argued there were two significant issues which caused poor housing – the behaviour of unacceptable tenants and the behaviour of unscrupulous landlords. By establishing their own property owning companies based on the 5% profit margin, the latter was avoided. The former was avoided primarily by the selection of tenants and then by weekly visiting. So:

Hill opposed charity and impersonal block dwellings, stressed self-help, cleanliness and respectability, and insisted on regular rent payments and a system of personal visits to tenants from her co-workers (Rodger 1989:46).

Rodger makes the point that the selection system, which was a key component in Octavia Hill’s philosophy, itself stigmatised some since they were unable to gain access to blocks constructed by philanthropic housing associations. Such a view is echoed by Dennis (1984).

From the outset Hill worked at improving the austere environment of many of her properties. At Paradise Place she established plants. In Freshwater Place she constructed a play area for children. She was especially critical of plain whitewashed walls and monotonous décor of Barrack Blocks built by the major housing companies in early developments. She developed open spaces and plots of gardens/lawns as at Red Cross. She argued “colour is intended to be a perpetual source of delight” (Hill 1884: 743) and “paint the walls, lighten them, brighten them, for the love of colour is a human instinct” (Hill 1884: 744) These aesthetic influences were in direct contrast to the monotony and drab uniformity of early developments by the major trusts. Such actions also challenged assertions that costs should be kept to the minimum at all times, disputing arguments advanced by Blashill (below).

Organisations like the Kyrle Society were to become influential in providing the impetus for decoration. Their work in hospitals and other public places was well known and was often
referred to by Octavia Hill in her passionate pleas for greater decoration of homes. The society was specifically targeted at improving the tastes of the labouring classes by providing exposure to art and small gardens. It described itself as desirous of “to bring the refining and sheering influences of natural and artistic beauty home to the people” (Art Journal 1881: 95).

A further problem of many philanthropic blocks appearance was that people simply did not like them. Earlier we explored the reasons behind minimal decoration and embellishment. The impact was that many blocks were designed in a simple and utilitarian manner in order to reduce costs. Such philosophical starting points inevitably led to standardised, uninspiring and repetitious buildings. The effect was to produce strikingly uniform constructions, and ones that were not welcomed.

Gauldie (1974) argues that there are two distinct phases in such architecture:

- spare and grim because to be anything else might be seen to be encouraging the poor to take advantage;
- a later stage when the wealthy feared the poor less and could pander a little to their likes and dislikes.

Whilst this is at first an attractive notion, it is flawed. In the first place it is far too simplistic. It ignores the impact that moral/medical and aesthetic motivations had on developments, as outlined in this study. It also pays little attention to developing mores and styles of architecture within the broader social aspect of the second period of Victorian Britain. The latter part of Victoria’s reign was to see the eventual triumph of Gothic in developments by the great public bodies of the time. With many public buildings reflecting this more ornate style, surely the latter blocks are simply reflecting the widespread public consciousness? If the second stage Gauldie claims was a universal, would this not be reflected in an enthusiasm for more widespread charitable giving, resulting in greater financial resources being available for philanthropic companies to utilise? Would not some of this extra finance be used to reflect social conventions of the time, such as more ornate style? Could this not be part of the reason for changing design style identified by Gauldie? There are then several serious problems with Gauldie’s analysis. The changes did happen, but for reasons far more complex than those claimed.
A further area of debate that influenced design was contained in the medical press. Great strides had been made in understanding the nature and transmission of disease, and many leading campaigners for reform in housing came from medical backgrounds. The reports of the various Medical Officers’ of Health were seized upon by campaigners as evidence they needed to press their claims. Whilst there was unanimity about the nature of the problem, there was often discord about the appropriate methods of tackling them. Everyone agreed new or adapted housing was the key – but the architectural designs to be employed led to bitter and protracted debate. There was in particular conflicting beliefs about build typologies, and the consequential philosophy to be employed in design. There developed the two different styles identified above: the more communal with some shared facilities - and the self-contained style.

Whilst both companies were London based, the differences between the two had an influence across the country. The first issue for any developer was to decide which approach to adopt. Both had their champions and supporters. There were further disputes that impacted on architectural design. The size of rooms was debated long and often – obtaining the maximum potential for air circulation whilst reducing the costs of construction to the lowest level was continually debated. The architect Henry Roberts consistently argued room should be at least 7 foot 6 inches high, and ideally 9 foot, to enable effective circulation of air. Henry Darbishire was architect to the Peabody Trust and felt that working people had a natural aversion to ventilation, so it needed to be surreptitiously built into the construction.

In 1862 the *Ragged Schools Union Magazine* reported on Model Cottages displayed at the International Exhibition of that year. Once again there is a major concern about room size and the opportunity for air to circulate freely. They describe the ground floor as having a room available for multiple use (sitting room/ bedroom) of some 12 foot by 9 foot and two bedrooms 12 foot by 9 foot and 12 foot by 10 foot. They make the point that ventilation exists in all the rooms to a high standard. These homes were designed by the *Cottage Improvement Society* who worked both in urban and rural areas, developing plans and prompting the concept of good housing. But all this was to be done whilst enabling what they determined as a fair financial return for investment.

Octavia Hill did so much more in the field of housing than just renovate or build, being described as one of the most influential women in Victorian Britain (Darley 1990). Although a
detailed study of her life is outside the remit of this work, it is essential to understand that Hill was not only active in campaigning for housing reform but also other activities, such as the Kyrl Society and the establishment of The National Trust (Bell 1942; Gaze 1988; Jenkins 1995; Murphy 2002). She used her considerable contacts to lobby for major housing reform, eventually giving evidence to the *Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Living Conditions of the Working Class*. Yet the criticism levelled not only at her, but at many Victorian and Edwardian reformers is “the feeling that for them reform was something to do to the poor, rather than with or through them” (Anderson and Darling 2007:48). This relates to an important point. The functioning of Octavia Hill and the organisations she was involved with (Housing companies, National Trust, Kyrle Society etc.) could be seen as active agents within society. In this context “societal institutions become structures through the agency of individuals and collectives, at the same time that agents are structured by and exist within them” (Dobres 2000: 133). This then a dynamic relationship.

Certainly Octavia Hill divides opinion. Some regard her as a power for good in Victorian times – altruistic, concerned, devoted to her tenants and developing ideas and methods that are still relevant today (Clapham 1987; Hollis 1979; Power 1987; Robinson 1998; Whelan, 1998). Whilst others regard her as a busy body, interfering and overbearing at best, or autocratic, despotic and snooping at worst (Harris 1992; Malpass 1984; Owen 1965). Undoubtedly Hill regarded “strict governance and discipline, underpinned by comprehensive information on the character of individual tenants” (Walker 2009:181) as essential to her project.

Yet she did have a significant impact on the development of philanthropic housing, with her influence reaching far beyond London. The mill owned by Hugh Beaver at 66 Jersey Street in Ancoats, Manchester, was to fall out of use as a mill by 1891. At this stage the premises were bought by a combination of local businessmen, chaired by Henry Simon. They developed the old mill into housing for local working people, basing the structure on the philosophy of Octavia Hill (UMAU 2005b). They constructed 141 dwellings of various sizes, with the largest running the full width of the building, but having a width of only nine feet. The OS map of 1908 clearly identifies the building, now renamed as ‘Jersey Street Dwellings’ (Map 3).
The Jersey Street dwellings realised a capital return of 4%, less than most and not significant enough to attract investors who were after a reasonable profit. Yet it was successful in attracting private funding for a larger scale operation in Gorton. In the case of this experiment, medical motivations appear to have been at the forefront of the design. Separate water closets were installed at the end of each floor, with automatic flushing facilities to ensure constant cleanliness. Balconies were not to run the whole length of the building, but to be separate, ensuring isolation was possible in the case of illness. Separate baths were provided for the use of residents, and each property had their own sink and running water. Although the developers hoped the idea would spread further, there appears to have been little impact, beyond the Gorton extension. The design of Jersey Street Dwellings was heavily influenced by one of the key emerging major influences, medical advances, but such points were a constant issue of contention.

4.5 Squalid and loathsome wretchedness

Although there is variation across the country, common typologies of housing can be identified, yet developing a rigorous typological analysis of housing in emerging Victorian communities can be fraught with dangers. Variations in methods of construction, architectural design, functionality, decorative features, use of raw materials, size and many other variables can overwhelm any such attempt. As a result the typological analysis in this study will be restricted to a comparison of key conventional forms of housing ignoring many of the more complex sub-divisions. These are:

- Cellar dwellings
- Court Dwellings
- One up/One down and Two up/Two down
- Common Lodging Houses
- Back to back housing/through housing

Cellar dwellings were to be found across many of the locations in the study area. Watching briefs (UMAU 1999 and 2002), clearly demonstrate the presence of nineteenth century cellar dwellings in Blackburn, as does the Historic Town Survey (LCC 2005a).
This form of housing was notorious - in Gibraltar (Axon 1919), Manchester (Roberts 1993), or Bury (Coupe 1977), conditions were amongst the worst in the country. The Medical Officer of Health for Manchester, James Philip Kay, published his classic study of conditions in 1832, which became the yardstick by which other surveys were measured. This publication was to promote the existence of cellar dwellings in public consciousness. Kay was damning in his descriptions:

the houses, in such situations, are uncleanly, ill-provided with furniture; an air of discomfort, if not squalid and loathsome wretchedness pervades them; they are often dilapidated, badly drained, damp (Kay Shuttleworth 1832:28).

A number of such properties went through phases of development. Spacious and well-appointed artisans’ dwellings were often divided meaning cellars could be rented out to provide a significant increase in rental income, effectively doubling the population density of an area for minimum capital outlay. The emergence of such properties can be used as an indicator of evolving social and economic demand within a locality. For example near Arkwright’s Mill in Manchester was Angel Street, an area that evolved from pleasant artisan property into multiple occupation, lodging houses and cellar dwellings. The ‘Time Team’ excavation of Arkwright’s Mill also examined Angel Street, where this division of properties is clearly visible, emphasising the scale of economic changes within the locality. The report of the excavation is clear about the process involved:

the increasing need for individual homes for families as demonstrated in trench four where what was once a two room dwelling was divided into two single rooms dwellings by the insertion of a corridor (WA 2002:22).

Cellar dwellings were to be found across the city, and Manchester was particularly slow in eradicating this form of housing. Whilst other towns and cities were taking power through permissive Acts of Parliament, Manchester steadfastly refused to take any significant action. In spite of constant and incessant urging by Kay-Shuttleworth, the city was amongst the last to act. Evidence exists demonstrating cellar dwellings were a significant element of the housing stock in Preston (LCC 2006a), Manchester (Builder 1896; OAN 2005), Wigan (Jackson 1979), across other communities within the North West of England (Brennand 2006) and further afield such as Nottingham (Chapman 1971) and Halifax (Webster 1988).

But cellar dwellings were not a product of industrialisation. In many cases the ‘evils’ of industrialisation existed prior to economic developments - they were compounded by the
process rather than invented by it. For example, Taylor estimates that some 9,500 people lived in cellar dwellings in Liverpool as early as 1797 (Taylor 1971), whilst Rimmer describes the use of cellars in early Leeds as dwellings (Rimmer 1963).

The Court Dwelling was similarly a form and style of housing to be found in most urban locations. In 1997 Nevell published details of an excavation by South Trafford Archaeology Group in Altrincham, arguing 'some of the worst living conditions could be found in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century workers’ housing to the west of the old Market Place, Altrincham' (Nevell 1997).

The cottages (Plan 3) were single dwellings at the northern edge of the figure, with communal courtyard to the South bordered by stables to the East. The unsanitary conditions are illustrated by the proximity of the well to a group of privies, as indicated by red dotted line. Such an arrangement would be likely to encourage the easy spread of disease. The arrangement was not unusual and is illustrative of court dwellings that existed across the country. Other examples could be quoted from such places as Burnley (LCC 2005b) and Carnforth (LCC 2006b). The replacement of such properties was predicated on medical evidence.

The eradication of Court dwellings was usually by permissive or enabling legislation – usually Council or Police Acts, which applied to specific designated localities. The acts placed conditions on builders that became more rigorous and demanding with successive Acts. Restrictions on the minimum size of court access, the smallest communal area permissible per unit of housing and other such demands seriously reduced the available space for housing, thus reducing the numbers of properties that could be developed on any given site. An example of such development is to be found in the changes at the land bounded by Fortune Street, New Allen Street, Chapman Street and Division Street in Manchester. The changes introduced by the council involved the demolition of premises on Division Street and New Allen Street. The extra space created “shows the improvement effected by demolishing six houses, forming separate yards and a new nine foot passage” (Simon 1929:27).

Eventually the point was reached that court development became no longer financially viable, with the construction of terraces providing a higher rate of return. This was a
piecemeal change with no national strategy, giving rise to a patchwork of local regulation across the country. This is an issue we will return to later in the chapter.

Most speculative housing was designed in the one up one down, or two up two down form (WYAS 2004). These various styles are demonstrated in the plans of housing from Stockport reproduced in Plan 4 from the work of Heather Coutie (Coutie 1992). Further examples were excavated by UMAU in 2006 when the area for the new Humanities Building at Manchester University was investigated and the remains of one-up/one-down houses were discovered along Tuer Street (UMAU 2006).

Numbers 1,3,5 and 7 Adcroft Street in Stockport, long since demolished, provide us with a useful illustration of this building style. Coutie further analysed cellar use concluding they were industrial workshops on a small scale. This form of terraced housing also evidenced stylistic uniformity of fascias and other architectural features. Uniformity was often in the form of representing past vernacular tradition. Burke and Nevell remind us that in Tameside the “vernacular tradition of stone in the uplands and brick in the lowlands was largely adhered to” (Burke and Nevell 1996: 61). Another example is the cotton towns of East Lancashire which had a preponderance of Accrington Brick. The new technology that enabled the production of this cheap mass produced building material was to hasten its dominance of use as the nineteenth century progressed.

In the Angel Meadow area of Manchester, cartographic evidence demonstrates the growth of housing. Analysing the OS Map published in 1849 and comparing it with Adshead's 1851 map, individual street names are recorded, and these can be used to ‘benchmark’ further growth. In addition to the housing there is also the growth and development of relevant support services within the community, for example Saint Michael's Church, Saint George's Chapel, Ragged Schools and public houses. The area had evolved into a community. The district also contained significant numbers of a further type of housing that existed in major towns and cities across the country - lodging or boarding houses. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine in any detail this development, but the numbers were significant (Marino 2007). Angel Street alone had fifteen properties described in Trade Registers as 'Common Lodging Houses', giving some perspective on their scale of existence. Some of the premises were multiple occupation, on occasions up to ninety residents. The photograph (Photo 8) clearly demonstrates the volume of residents that could be housed in such
provision. Across the country many examples of this style of property existed - one estimate suggesting the number of residents in 1832 to be some 5,000 in Manchester, 2,500 in Leeds and 80,000 in London. (Burnett 1978).

Back to Backs are a further key housing type that existed in huge quantities across urbanised areas (AOC 2000; Arcus, 2005; Sheeran 1986; WYAS 2007). The excavations by UMAU at Loom Street clearly show back to back properties. Both the plan (Plan 5) and the photograph (Photograph 9) clearly illustrate standard layout, showing external double brick course walls, with internal single course dividing walls between properties. Cheaper to build than individual components, such an arrangement did not make for pleasant living conditions. Building such houses not only reduced the number of bricks used by constructing one thickness internal wall rather than two, it consequently reduced the costs of labour. Since such walls were usually covered with plaster, the opportunity to use sub-standard bricks and to have the work undertaken by apprentices, was often too great a temptation for speculative builders. When the plaster on such walls is removed the paucity of quality is clearly displayed. They were also noisy, and the problem of vermin was ever present. The number of such houses is staggering. Newman estimates that by the 1890s some 10,000 back to back houses existed in Manchester alone (Newman et al 2001).

Back to Back and Through Housing were to be found extensively across the country in developing Victorian towns and cities. Over time the passing of local bye-laws also impacted on this style, leading to the development of the through house, which removed flimsy internal walls traditionally separating front and back properties.

Back to backs were synonymous with appalling living conditions, with “developers saving on land costs by building back to back properties, which meant that privies would often be located out on the street” (Hylton 2003: 152). The density of construction meant a lack of moving air, whilst the location of privies often meant regular overflows emptied directly onto streets. Such conditions fuelled medical motivations, becoming a major argument in the housing reformers armoury.

The attempt to prevent miasmic disease was to lead to the development of the through house – effectively separate houses within a terrace, each containing a through landing/porch. In Manchester these were latterly actively encouraged by the City Council.
Alterations effectively removed the party wall between properties leaving two separate properties as one complete unit. Such an attempt to “increase the ventilation in the domestic dwellings of Manchester was seen as a way of halting the spread of diseases such as cholera” (Gregory 2007:27).

As housing evolved, speculative builders were constrained more and more in the type, form and style they were able to construct - not only economic imperatives impinged but also national legislation, regulations and local bye-laws. These enforced minimum standards effectively provided piecemeal improvement of construction such as room size, higher ceilings (usually a minimum height of 8 feet 6 inches), larger windows, timber floors and less steep stairs.

Willis Street in Salford was a two bed-roomed terrace constructed in the second half of the early nineteenth century. It had two downstairs and upstairs rooms. Front rooms measure 3m by 3.04m with back rooms 3.4m by 1.8m (Burnett 1978). This specific house further illustrates rear area build utilised to contain an individual toilet. Similar developments can be found further illustrated in the work of Burke and Nevell (1996). This was a significant step change in the evolution of housing in urban contexts. Further examples of the influence of bye-laws could be cited, so in what is now Tameside, bye-laws were introduced that stipulated minimum areas for yards, windows and the height of ceilings (Burke and Nevell, 1996). These came about as a result of pressures and arguments from housing reformers, citing emerging medical research.

These later developed as through terraces rather than back to back, enabling the emergence of significantly larger buildings. For example in Oldham where houses had an average floor area of 450 square feet, this evolved into some 760 square feet (Burnett:1978). Similar changes can be found across the country and were not confined to the North West – they were influenced by, and therefore part of, national developments.

4.6 ‘Ardwick knows less of Ancoats than it does about China’ (Cooke Taylor, 1842:12)

“All the way from Ancoats to Hulme there was not a tree, not a shrub, not a twig to be seen. Soot-caked buildings, shut shops, the occasional cracked melancholy of a church bell, an air soaked with moisture” (Spring 1938:49). So wrote Howard Spring describing his hero
William Essex’s journey on a winter’s night through Victorian Manchester. We are provided with a compelling and forceful description of the minutiae of everyday experience through the book and central characters. Spring clearly demonstrates the gulf between rich and poor journeying from Ancoats to Hulme, “enthralled by the evidences that passed me of a world of unimaginable wealth and splendour. From their great houses that lined the road all the way between Fallowfield, Withington and Didsbury the Kings of Cotton came on their way to Manchester” (Spring 1938: 15).

Similar descriptions are found in many novels set in Victorian and Edwardian periods. Contemporary accounts also portray the realities of living in many of these communities. Burnett informs us that air pollution in Blackburn meant no grass would grow in the local churchyard, the air being “loaded with carbon” (Burnett 1906: 62). Other examples are visually represented through the work of painters such as Valette.

Marcus (1974) explored the interpretation of Engels’ views of Mancunian workers’ housing. Describing the paucity of sanitary provision and overcrowding, added to the construction methodology and materials used, Marcus reaches the conclusions that:

The outcome of this number of converging circumstances has been the building of working class houses that last for about forty years: the houses themselves have their own life cycle, which is on average only slightly longer than that of the industrial working people who inhabit them (Marcus 1974:195).

Engels also investigated the housing working people lived in. As a contemporary description of housing conditions in the emerging metropolis, it is of value, within limits. He describes the community of Little Ireland as populated by people “sunk to the lowest levels of humanity” (Henderson and Challoner: 1958:71).

Cooke Taylor’s statement clearly demonstrates the gulf – economic, social and political if not geographical, that had developed between the inhabitants of the same city. The case here is Manchester – but it could be any urban environment. This distance grew in the burgeoning urban centres, partially as a result of outward migration by the wealthy away from the urban core – leaving these unhealthy districts for colonisation by the emerging working classes (Englander 1985). As Thompson makes clear:
The working people were virtually segregated in their stinking enclaves, and the middle classes demonstrated their real opinion of the industrial town by getting as far out of them as equestrian transport made convenient (Thompson 1963: 355).

The disparity between rural and urban areas were clearly evidenced in 1842 by the *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Classes*. This emphatically demonstrates the variation in average life expectancy between rural/urban communities and social standing (Table 6).

The wealthy middle classes, under the guise of organisations such as the Manchester Statistical Society, organised extensive and detailed surveys of parts of the city. They conducted research, published papers and forwarded periodic reports to anyone prepared to listen. This gave the ability to play the role of concerned citizen, and in so doing fulfil their ‘moral responsibilities’. As an archive these documents are priceless, providing a wealth of evidence from some of the worst housing in the city. They also help to document “the phenomenal expansion of Ancoats” (OAN 2010:7).

This demonstrates a dichotomy clearly impacting on those keen to expose poverty and the social dynamic generated. It contrasts most keenly with their personal migration outwards from urban cores, ensuring a safe distance existed between themselves and the conditions they report on. This enables the maintenance of physical isolation, whilst demonstrating care and concern over poverty.

This aim was never so clearly demonstrated as in de Tocqueville’s notes in the margin of his Journeys published in 1835, where he says:

Charitable Society - Provident Society. Effort of the middle class to keep the direction of the lower classes and to establish links with them (de Tocqueville [1835] (1958:10).

The demand for this was, as demonstrated by Prochaska (1988) in Chapter One, partly a response to requirements of personal religious beliefs, and partly a reaction to failings of the established church to impact on large sectors of the poor. This distance was, in the view of de Tocqueville, a result of the local clergy. He believed many to be more concerned with evangelisation than the needs of ordinary working people. In his view some of the established church clergy “seemed to do all in their power to alienate the goodwill of the people” (de Tocqueville [1835] (1958:57).
4.7 Artisans, Buildings and Police

Many Acts of Parliament were passed during the Victorian and Edwardian period, impacting on the development of housing. Not all were welcomed, or particularly well thought out. Whilst the *Artisans’ Dwellings Acts* of 1869, 1875 and 1879 were no doubt well intentioned, their financial impact was often greatly resented. At a meeting in 1880 a committee of Vestries and District Boards in London met to complain about the working of the acts, which they called “impolitic and ruinously extravagant” (Cowan Tracts 1880:15). Although they had many complaints, their single most vociferous one concerned the financial loss being borne by Poor Law rate payers as a result of the Act. They instanced some examples, showing the loss on various sites, reproduced in Table 7.

This financial loss was regarded as too high to be borne by the Poor Rate. But the report of the meeting makes clear there was more than a financial rationale for opposition to the acts, there were political dimensions to dissension. The conclusions reached number nine, but the primary conclusion, number one, states:

> that no class of citizens has a right to dwellings or sites for dwellings at the public cost; that only imperative considerations of Public Health can justify the outlay of the public money for such purposes as those of the Artizans’ Dwellings Act (Cowan Tracts 1880: 14).

This very powerful statement clearly demonstrates there were philosophical and political, as well as financial reasons for opposition to the Acts. It was a response by those members of the community who believed the state did have a direct role to play in housing. This was a direct challenge to those whose political motivation argued for direct public involvement in housing.

But the veracity of these figures was immediately disputed. The *Morning Advertiser* in 1881 was to take issue with the findings. On October 29th 1881 they published their interpretation of the Select Committee into the working of the Act. The financial elements of the findings were somewhat different to those advanced by the Vestries and District Boards. In a direct challenge to the figures in Table 7, the surveyor of the Peabody Trust, Mr R Vigers, who is described as someone who “can have no desire to exaggerate” (Morning Advertiser 1881:8) puts the total cost of the works at some £148,000 after all relevant elements are taken into
consideration. The paper makes clear where it stands as to the advantages or disadvantages of such a financial commitment:

We think Mr Vigers’ opinion must commend itself to all thoughtful persons, especially when we bear in mind, that the proper housing of the masses means a reduction in disease, pauperism, and crime, a result, if only in a financial sense, worth fifty times the supposed loss to the ratepayers (Morning Advertiser 1881:8).

Whatever the realities of the financial costs, it is clear that there were disputes raging about both the economic and political basis of the Acts.

It was not only those with a vested interest such as members of Vestries (who were often also developers), that were critical of the trusts. Even some of those who might be expected to be supporters were sometimes disparaging. *The Ragged School Magazine* was to take a disapproving stand on some of the Trusts in 1875, especially the financial return they were making on properties. Associated with this was a clear condemnation of their letting policies, believing “they were not expected to accumulate sixteen per cent on their capital by the letting of their model dwellings to safe and comparatively well off tenants” (Ragged School Union Magazine 1875:274). The criticism of the lettings policy – not only of the Peabody Trust but other Philanthropic Companies, was one that was rehearsed often by housing reformers. Some sections of the reform movement felt the societies were playing safe by only admitting tenants who they knew could afford the higher rents of the associations. They believed this was doing nothing to alleviate the real problems of housing in urban areas. The statistics appear to demonstrate some support for this argument, as shown in Table 8.

Another key aspect of the legislative attack on poor housing were local bye-laws. Earlier we saw how individual acts and bye-laws were used to place restrictions on local builders. Such acts as the 1880 *Preston Improvement Act* were to have a radical impact on the design and construction of local housing. This act ensured that access to the back of new houses in Preston was effectively provided for through legal compulsion to provide back road access. This enabled effective servicing of the yards. Such a simple requirement was to have a major impact on the construction of new properties in Preston, with the development of through housing in terraces linked to serviceable and accessible back yards becoming common.
Earlier on we explored the significance of understanding these bye-laws and their relevant dates. We also investigated why such regulations are important for the archaeologist, with their consequent introduction of variation in build across the country.

In 1862 Preston introduced just such bye-laws, which were summarised by Morgan (1993). They include:

- Every new street should be at least 30 feet wide.
- Every dwelling house should have an open space exclusively belonging to it of at least 150 square feet.
- Rooms should be at least 8 feet high.
- Every habitable room should have at least one window, equal in area to one tenth of the floor area and half of it to open.
- Drains should be of glazed stoneware, connected to the sewers with watertight joints, and constructed so as to keep the sub soil dry.
- There should be foundations of rammed clinker at least 12 inches deep beneath the floor of any house built on maiden soil.
- Water closets should be ventilated; and their situation and construction should be approved by the local board.
- The position and construction of cess pools and ashpits should be approved by the local board.
- The surveyor should have the right to say how streets, sewers and drains were built, to inspect them before they were covered over, and to forbid any house being occupied until he had approved it.

These are far reaching and extensive restrictions on builders, backed by the full force of law. They had a significant impact on the development of new housing, changing both style and design. Tracing these changes through the architecture enables us to identify the differing phases of development in an area. Certain types of housing were illegal after the passing of these acts, so relative seriation of building styles and typologies is possible through local building regulations and bye-laws.

Local bye-laws could have an impact but only within a given locality. So in 1842 the Liverpool Building Act gave the City Council powers over new construction, including the imposition of minimum sizes for the width of passageways between houses. In 1864 they made back-to-back housing illegal and legislated so courts had to have an open end. Although back-to-
back houses were now illegal in Liverpool, they were still being constructed in many parts of
the country. This is crucial to the archaeologist since it would be imprudent to apply
construction dates based on typology, without first addressing the impact of local, as well as
national legislation. The existence of so many bye-laws across the country, with so many
local variations, makes interpretation far more complex than first appears.

These actions had little impact on philanthropists who built colonies for their workers, since
these philanthropists often built to a much higher standard than speculative builders. The
influence they had on the development of housing styles and planning in town is of some
interest. The vast majority of developments in green field or rural sites consisted of
individual cottages. The cost of land was much cheaper than in urban areas, with land itself
more plentiful. This meant instead of large barrack style blocks of flats, individual cottages
were constructed which gave people access to gardens, something rarely replicated in urban
cores. At Port Sunlight (Illustration 5), Lever Brothers developed an estate and plant,
planned as an integrated whole to complement each other. The cottages at the village were
built in groups and designed to be spacious, pleasant places to live. Externally they were a
significant contrast to the blocks being developed in urban areas, yet the internal layout
displayed several similarities. The aesthetic motivations were often to the fore in such
communities, with the impression the whole created regarded as a major factor in
development. Although the cottages at Port Sunlight were two storey, the allocation of floor
space was significantly similar to the Barrack style – as was the case at Bournville.

Additionally plans demonstrate that housing was not the sole form of building occupying the
site (Illustration 6). In both Bourneville (Plan 6) and Port Sunlight (Plan 7) there is
considerable and extensive extra development (Bailey and Bryson 2006; Bromhead 2000;
Chance 2007; Dellheim 1990). At Bournville, where the development is close by the works,
there is the provision of men’s recreation grounds, girl’s recreation ground, wood and park.
At Port Sunlight, where the development is not so directly linked to the works, a whole
community developed, providing for all needs of residents. In addition to housing we find
seven allotments and gardens, football ground, art gallery, two play areas, church,
recreation ground, bowling-green and school. The 1953 publication by Lever Brothers
celebrating the success of Port Sunlight, talks about sporting opportunities as:
Greens, Courts and Courses, sports ground and pool are busy places at Port Sunlight on long, light evenings and at the weekend. In this aspect of village life fitness and fun are twin aims which are pursued with enthusiasm (Lever Brothers 1953: 60).

This was a community, one that catered for the educational, recreational and spiritual needs of all. It is also worth noting the publication calls Port Sunlight a ‘village’, with all the associations that conjures up of a country idyll. The link between work and urban lifestyle is distanced both physically and metaphysically.

These self-contained communities were a direct challenge to existing conditions within towns and cities and to those who argued nothing could be done to challenge established problems of overcrowding, social evils and poor economic returns. The communities were not only built with first class materials, they were also visually attractive, with great attention paid to aesthetic values. In the case of the 1894 school at Port Sunlight, savings were made in construction costs by the employment of Lever Brothers own builders – presumably enabling the use of higher quality materials to be offset against reduced building costs.

Similar provision was to be found not far away in Birkenhead, where properties were to be developed by the Birkenhead Dock Company, who “have taken into consideration not merely profit and loss, but the comfort of the inmates and the welfare of their neighbours” (Builder 1845b: 220). The motivational claims of the company are significant since they make an explicit assertion the reason for development was not only financially sound (making a return of 10% on investment), but also established a complex that developed ‘good neighbours’. There was an explicit social mechanism at work, one similar in intent to that proposed by Octavia Hill. In addition to housing, the company envisaged a school and “handsome churches” (Builder 1845b:220). The buildings themselves were open staircase access, large and airy internally with specific drying areas in the roof space. They were provided with gas and running water, which The Builder felt were certain to improve the behaviour and habits of tenants. Such claims were familiar from housing reformers, which had Godwin’s Builder as an enthusiastic supporter. But it also betrays the underlying belief with the ultimate aim to change the behaviour and activities of working people, so they more reflected those of the middle classes. The buildings are described as “handsome”, even “imposing”, to differentiate them from alms houses.
4.8 30,000 meals and 100 clogs

Earlier in this chapter we briefly discussed the distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, making clear that such contrasts were to be found embodied in the physical as well as social construction of institutions. It is to this point, and one particular illustration of how it is embedded in philanthropic creations, that we now return, although other examples do exist (Bayliss 2001; Serjeant 2006).

The example is a building that started life as a Ragged School, serving a densely populated city centre community. Alongside other Ragged Schools in the area it provided basic education, and moral/spiritual guidance for young people of the community. It was supported by wealthy local philanthropists who provided both financial and in kind assistance. As a building it was striking in size but could in no manner be described as lavish - its impressiveness arises from scale rather than elaboration, being functional rather than decorative. To this well established institution another one was, literally, grafted on. Additions to existing buildings were made to establish the Working Girls’ Home, and although both institutions shared the same plot and benefactor, and very occasionally clients, that was the limit of contact. From the outset, they were designed to be very different institutions, and this differentiation was reinforced through the construction of the component parts of the complex (Illustration 7).

The home was on Charter Street, Manchester. William Crossley was a motor manufacturer, well known for philanthropic acts across the city. Involved in numerous activities, he long held the view that the best prospect for the working girls of the city was to remove them from their home environment. He was amongst the main subscribers and motivators behind the development of Charter Street Working Girls’ Home. Not to be confused with the trade of prostitution, these working girls were local young women who had ‘respectable’ jobs, but who lived in appalling home conditions. This new establishment enabled them to retain community links, whilst living in vastly superior conditions (Marino 2007).

There were individual cubicles for the girls, with a large recreation room specifically for their sole use. Shared use of a communal kitchen, individual bathrooms, larders and pantries, hot and cold running water and effective sewage disposal was provided. The windows were large and well-constructed to be both light and reduce draughts, with modern gas lighting installed.
throughout. This was a very different experience to that of most people living in the host community of Angel Meadow.

The ground floor was occupied by Charter Street Ragged School and this was a totally separate institution housed within the same building. The contrast between the two was stark, symbolising the distinction between the deserving poor (working young women) and undeserving poor (children in the Ragged School). They each had separate entrances, one had large painted glass windows whilst the other had small plain windows, one had stairways with carpets and decorated wooden banisters whilst the other was plain concrete steps. One had wallpaper on plastered walls whilst the other was painted tile. One had a plain entrance whilst the other had a highly ornate mosaic in the building entrance (Photograph 10).

The building housed what was, in many ways, a holistic approach to providing for the various needs of the poor. As well as the Ragged School and Working Girls Home, there was also a medical mission that in 1899 had over 10,000 visits, they provided annually some 30,000 meals and hundreds of clogs. There was the Sacred Song Association, magic lantern shows and old folks’ tea parties. The religious element to the work was seen as vital and essential to the motivation of the organisation.

This dichotomy of design was seen as essential in establishing and reinforcing the differing approaches to the ‘deserving’ (Reinarz 2007) and ‘undeserving’ poor. The girls in the home were poor but engaged in respectable occupations. They had climbed onto the social ladder of decency. They were clawing their way out of the appalling social conditions in Angel Meadow, working hard professionally and personally. They deserved support. By contrast the children in the Ragged School, by dint of their age, had yet to demonstrate any such achievement. Their family had failed to show determination to change lifestyle and move away from the ravages of Angel Meadow. Until such time as evidence to the contrary was presented, the children were the products of the undeserving poor and should be treated as such. As Constantine makes clear “it was commonly feared that children not contained within conventionally constructed and properly-performing families were a danger to society as well as to themselves” (Constantine 2008:1). The parents, reflecting Social Darwinist philosophies elaborated earlier, had been judged wanting meaning their families were not entitled to the same support as the working girls’.
The construction of these buildings clearly involved considerable expense, and these costs were a major and significant component of the arguments surrounding provision – by philanthropists or state. The role of the architect in this debate was clearly summed up by Blashill in *The Builder*;

> All we can do as architects is to exercise the most rigid economy in planning, in fittings and in finishing’s, with a good deal of reserve in the design of elevations...An opportunity of designing a working man’s dwelling is not the occasion for experiments which might be tried, in his absence, in the house of a colonial millionaire (Builder:1900a:155).

This financial issue was one that impacted on housing developments across this period. In the debate that followed the presentation of Mr Blashill’s paper, there was general agreement with his line – with Mr Owen Fleming arguing “architects had to put up these buildings so that they could be made to pay” (Builder:1900:155), whilst Mr Lane asked about the economics of schemes already constructed.

A further means of raising necessary finance was through Joint Stock Companies. As a vehicle for economic development these were established means of providing finance to house working people. At Redhill in London one was paying a 5% dividend in 1862. At Hastings another was established in 1857 with a capital of £12,000 managed to provide 100 homes within five years. The Hastings company was based on the ideas of canon Girdlestone and named the Hastings Cottage Improvement Society. Unlike the prevailing fashion for wholesale land clearance and development of barrack style blocks, this society was dedicated to refurbishment and renovation in rural locations. By 1884 they were housing nearly 1,000 people in some 250 houses, whilst managing to pay a dividend to investors annually between 5 and 6%. In some ways this was similar to Octavia Hill in London. However a significant difference between the two was that whilst Octavia Hill employed a strict recruitment policy for tenants, the Hastings Company was willing to consider the very poor for tenancy. The gatekeepers here had vastly differing criteria. In fact their aims specifically prevented them from considering those deemed self-sufficient. Yet like other philanthropic organisations they had concerns about acceptable behaviour and were not averse to evicting what they regarded as unreasonable or non-conforming tenants.

This debate about cost was to become inextricably entwined with architectural thinking. Other issues such as medical concern about external staircases and open landings were also
present, as were aesthetic considerations, but whenever the development of workers’ housing was considered the economic debates are always present. Economies of scale were one method commonly employed by architects to reduce overall costs, hence the development of multi-storey buildings. Fitting extra accommodation onto the same sized footprint enabled more rents to be returned and lowered the per capita cost of land. Other savings were made by reduction of ornamentation and using cheaper raw materials. The design of space as a functional necessity became more important than any concern with aesthetics – until challenged by the likes of Octavia Hill. Certainly this was the case with those buildings constructed within the ‘public’ sector, where financial pressures were paramount. Similarly it was also the case with the philanthropic companies that raised their finances through the market – the 5% philanthropists. However this was clearly not the case when philanthropists paid totally for a project, especially a project close to their heart such as Charter Street Home. It is apparent that considerations of cost at Charter Street were not the dominant factor – first rate materials were used, as was extensive decoration – all components singularly missing from public authority and 5% philanthropy schemes.

So why, then, was there this dichotomy? Those architect’s sharing Mr Blashill’s views believed in cost reducing design. As there was the occasional ‘no costs spared’ construction which flew in the face of such accepted beliefs, the answer lies in the complex weave of rationale behind construction.

The Ragged School was built solely as a response to need in a local community, being motivated by the religious beliefs of the benefactors. Whilst donors might wish to be associated with the principles embodied in such a building, there was no attachment to the actual construction itself. It was purely a visual symbol of conformity to personal religious obligation. In the school the ceramics were marked. The rationale behind such markings (developing a sense of community and prevention of theft) were discussed in the previous chapter, and both appear to be relevant in this context. Indeed clogs were provided for the winter and collected back in during summer, being clearly marked with ‘not to be pawned’. No such stamped ceramics or other objects in everyday use have been identified from the working girls’ home. Here we have a clear demonstration of different perspectives the same managers had of the varying clientele using the building – the Ragged School children who could not be trusted and the working girls who could.
The Working Girls’ Home was a chance to be associated with something much more significant. The communal motivations were more complex than that of the Ragged School. This was not only salving conscience, it was going further. By the extensive use of high class materials, the aesthetically pleasing interior, use of the most modern appliances, Crossley was ensuring that he was forever associated with one of the great charitable works in the community. This building, in this community, was much more than functional, it became monumental – a key focus for people within the local area, as Crossley knew it would. The building and its help would be remembered, as would the benefactor who supported it. This construction would cement Crossley’s reputation as not only a great local philanthropist, but also as an arbiter of style and aesthetics. It was his largesse and reputation that was commemorated in the brick and stone of the building. The twin principles of helping both the poor and his personal reputation are inextricably bound together in the construction. Marilyn Palmer reminds us that the great manufacturers of cotton and wool used extensive decoration to emblazon many of their splendid mills – citing Arkwright, Lister, Salt and others (Palmer 2000). This stamped their name on the landscape to leave a lasting legacy. Such is also the case with Crossley and the girls’ home.

Another key issue touched upon in the previous chapter was the concern of reformers about different sex siblings sharing the same room. This was a common situation in many places due to the prevalence of single room accommodation and overcrowding. It is an issue previously discussed in Chapter Three with the Ashworth family developments, where the comments of Cooke-Taylor illustrated concern about the moral welfare of the poor. Overcrowding was still rampant in rural communities (Griffin and Casella 2010), being the ‘moral evil’ referred to earlier in this chapter. Yet early Victorian society was apparently unwilling to take real action to remedy what they condemned. Wealthy Victorians were more than willing to emote about the perceived horrors of incest, but not so concerned as to back reforms that cost hard cash.

Reformers were unstinting in their collection of data to support their case that incest was a potential problem. Although rarely specifically mentioned there are many examples of statistics collated which appeared to support the inferred contention. When the Saint Pancras Home Improvement Society acquired property intended for redevelopment, the previous tenancy books produced further evidence. Some examples they reported included:
- Nine people in a single room
  - Man and wife
  - Sons aged 15, 13, 6 and 3
  - Daughters aged 18, 4 and 1
- Eight people in a single room
  - Man and Wife
  - Sons aged 14, 8, 5 and 3 months
  - Daughters aged 12 and 3 (Source: Simon 1929)

Whilst incest is not specifically mentioned, the publication of such figures added to sensibilities and concerns about the incidence of its existence.

It was not until 1908 that an *Incest Act* was introduced in England and Wales, and by that time opinions were altering. The Victorians had been obsessed with maintaining the privacy of the household with the belief that what happened in the house was a personal family affair. By 1908 attitudes were dramatically changed, with the introduction of the Act. Regulation passed from family to State as “The Victorians acting through the agency of law equated sin with crime and made private sexual morality the business of the State” (Wohl 1978: 200). Even though there was opposition to the act (Sigel 2005) there was a realization that the taboo needed to be addressed. Incest was a taboo because it struck at the heart of stable family life – the cornerstone of middle class Victorian beliefs and values. It challenged the norms of households, threatening the very basis on which the Victorian family was built. Although criminalisation of incest impacted on individual morality, it did nothing to alter the balance in the housing market – something many reformers regarded as one of the root causes of the problem (Kuper 2002; Morris 2009)

The issue was to be referred to, in an indirect manner, across the contemporary literature and architectural solutions to the ‘problem’ are to be found suggested on many occasions. In 1862 the magazine of the Ragged School Union reported on a meeting of *The Costermongers*, discussing financial difficulties inherent in developing workers’ housing. In
response to the paper by Mrs Fison, there was a suggestion that bedrooms should be large
and tall with partitions, thus reducing the costs of developing three physically separated
rooms. One section would be for the parents, one for the female children and one for the
male children. It concluded “no proper training in modesty or decency...could possibly be
given unless right arrangements were made” (Ragged School Union 1862: 146). In
describing the existing conditions they claimed often “a single room will contain father,
mother, sons and daughters without a partition to preserve the common decencies of life”
(Ragged School Union 1862: 146).

The imperative to deal with what was regarded as a shocking situation meant there was a
rash of change. The moral motivation resulted in extensive pressures on political powers to
pass the Incest Acts, and this criminalisation was significant in two ways. Not only did it
break the taboo surrounding discussion of the issue, it also broached the long held belief
that what went on inside a house was of no concern of the state. As Prochaska observes “to
most people the home was not only a refuge from the cares of the world but a place of
relative freedom” (Prochaska 1988:12). This act significantly changed the relationship
between people and state. The Incest Acts directly challenged traditionally supposed
freedoms, bringing the State formally not only into the home, but into its most private area,
that of the bedroom. It enshrined the sovereignty of parliament, over the private sexual
activities of its population. It is of interest that nothing was apparently done to ensure this
act was implemented in the notorious navvy camps described in Chapter Three. Presumably
people who existed in these camps were regarded as not worthy of the effort.

4.9 “too numerous and too repressive” (Gouldie 1974: 135)

For those who felt the state should play a greater role, there was one obvious body that
could take up the responsibility for housing the local poor. It was not long before Local
Authorities became involved in the provision of housing, in direct conflict with those who
opposed direct state involvement. Garside observes “there is evidence as early as 1906, the
Local Government Board was using a variety of legal and financial devices to prevent Local
Authorities from facilitating the work of the potentially powerful Sutton Model Housing Trust”
(Garside 2000: 742). When councils did try to enter the sphere, the procedures they adopted
often mitigated against speedy development. A small example of such a problem is to be
found in Liverpool and can be traced through the pages of *The Builder* between 1867 and 1896.

In 1867 Liverpool City Council organised a competition with a £200 prize for the design of Labourers’ Dwellings, and some seventy-four sets of plans were initially submitted. Local legislation (*The Liverpool Building Act*) was the key issues for deleting some of the entrants, and conformity to the legislation meant the vast majority of designs were for cottages. After initial consideration the number of plans acceptable was reduced to three (Builder 1867a). Interest was so intense that in the subsequent issue the editor returned to the competition giving more explicit details of each of the final designs, the number of plans having for some unexplained reason increased from three to ten. That such time, expense and energy was being spent on this competition is clearly indicative of the importance the Council attached to the proposals (Builder 1867b). Having described the plans in some detail, the publication then rails against the Council for the time taken to reach a conclusion, and the way competitors had been treated. They end with the final sobriquet “it seems doubtful whether the dwellings will get further than the plans” (Builder 1867b: 903).

The next part of the story was a curious twist, with the scheme by Mr John Reeve reported in *The Builder* of December 21st 1867 having been adopted. This baffled the editor, since the capital return would be only 4%, with the city engineer estimating costs to be far higher than the architect. The report ends with the damning findings that “it is quite a mystery why this plan should have been selected” concluding “should the selected plans be adopted, labourers’ dwellings will still have to be built” (Builder 1867c: 921).

On February 6th 1869, *The Builder* can report that the buildings are “now nearly ready for occupation” (Builder 1869a). It is with self-congratulatory delight they report on being proved right, with the plans of John Reeve being, “a modest and carefully planned set of drawings” (Builder 1869a: 98), having finally been replaced by those of “Messrs. Redman and Hesketh whose plans on further investigation, appeared likely to yield larger accommodation and consequently return for the sum to be expended” (Builder 1869a: 98). Liverpool’s labourers’ finally had their new dwellings. Similar self-congratulations were to be found in 1895 over the competition for the Styal Cottage Homes (see chapter Five).
The dwellings themselves consisted of six blocks, four of five storeys and two of three storeys. There were 146 tenancies available in the scheme, and in the 1869 report the scheme had double the number of applicants to available properties. There were varying forms of accommodation, each containing a kitchen and scullery, with one, two and three bed roomed properties. The traditional dispute between the two forms of build was succinctly compromised. On one side the access to houses was from an open staircase, whilst on the other side this was enclosed and contained shared WC facilities. Gas lighting was provided with the exception of the stairs to the basement level flats. The finances were such as to expect a return of 5½ %, against Reeve’s 4%. Although commenting that this is still a small return on investment, The Builder overall feels it reasonable that:

Those who undertake to provide for the labouring population in our towns, dwellings where life may be in some degree an enjoyment, and not a mere fact of existence, must be content for the present to mix a little philanthropy with their percentage calculations (Builder 1869a: 99).

Although there were problems with this development, these were the first of their kind in Liverpool, and The Builder goes on to commend the Council, hoping they will be prepared to provide many more such premises, having learnt lessons from these first efforts.

In fact Liverpool were to emerge at the forefront of the development of Municipal Housing. They opened Saint Martin’s Cottages in 1869 and by 1918 the Council owned some 2,895 properties (Pooley 1985). In particular the Council used powers under the 1890 Housing of the Working Classes Act. Demand for dwellings was high. Granting of a tenancy involved a report from the City Director of Health “usually involving a night visit to ascertain levels of overcrowding and the separation of the sexes in sleeping quarters” (Pooley 1985: 79). Again this concern over incest was to the fore if not specifically articulated.

Other Local Authorities learnt from the Liverpool debacle, and ensured they did not emulate the example. There were other significant developments, pioneered by Local Authorities. One example was in Salford in 1894 where the City Council opened their Model Lodging House (Photograph 11) at a cost of £14,850 for 285 lodgers, being latterly described as “valuable evidence of a neglected aspect of social and architectural history” (Morgan 1996:1). Currently a Grade II listed building, a survey was completed for the at risk register on January 10th 1991, after the building had finally closed. The construction was a four storey
building, with sleeping accommodation on the upper three storeys. The lower level had communal facilities providing for the everyday requirements of tenants. There is differential provision delineating segregation between staff and lodgers, with staff facilities on the wings, and lodger’s facilities in the centre. On the left the specific areas for staff include kitchen, sitting room, scullery and WC, with its own access separate from the main entrance. On the right some areas are clearly identified with the prefix ‘lodgers’ so differentiating them from those designated for staff (plan 8).

In Chapter Three we examined how status and control were reinforced through differential access within a property and the same methodology can be observed in the layout of the Salford buildings. The manager had his own house, adjacent but not physically part of the model lodging house. Even when the architect (Borough Engineer Joseph Corbett) has to ensure access to basic services, such as water, there is a clear delineation between lodgers and establishment – for example in the laundries. Both laundries required access to water, so are sited close together obviating additional construction costs. There is a clear distinction between the two laundry rooms with each having individual access, whilst the establishment laundry links directly to the linen store. Further, lodgers have no direct access to the scullery or crockery store, although they do have access to the crockery room. Such arrangements enable close supervision of the use of easily portable or damaged materials. It also provides the institution with the power to provide, or withhold, access to key resources necessary for effective functioning and daily life – realistically the power of control (Delle 2002; Foucault 1979; Lawrence 1996; Pellow 1996). This use of boundaries to demarcate between those of differing status within an organisation is widely recognized – what James Delle calls “the geography of power” (Delle 2002: 342).

Levels Two, Three and Four of the Salford Model Lodging house (Builder 1894) tells us there are individual cubicles of sheet metal construction. These cubicles were manufactured by Faulkener and Company of Hersham in Surrey for the cost of seven shillings and sixpence. Such a bill would mean costs would be recovered within the first fifteen nights of occupation. Each floor contained 48 individual cubicles, furnished with wooden doors. Internally there was a fixed bed and hooks for clothes, with no other internal facilities provided (Morgan 1996). According to The Builder, each cubicle had its own window to facilitate natural light.
and ventilation. However the plans for the upper stories, and the building analysis completed on behalf of Salford Council, demonstrates this is not the case.

The individual cubicles form two distinct groups, the pattern being replicated on each wing and floor. The vast majority of cubicles flank external walls, with the windows associated with each cubicle allowing natural light and some control of individual temperature. But not all cubicles were positioned against walls providing the advantage of windows. On each floor were sixteen cubicles arranged in a central block. This meant residents in central cubicles were unable to control temperature and had no direct access to natural light. These are of prime significance since the building fails to provide for two key aspects of medical advice consistently advanced for the design of residential accommodation.

Communal washing facilities, urinals and WC’s were provided in an external tower at the end of each floor, ensuring residents were protected from disturbance. Each floor had a ventilating flue system which was simply pipes running the length of the building, on the basis that air would flow from one end to the other. The grills are still clearly visible on external walls (Photograph 12). Whilst there is no direct evidence of major heating being provided, oral histories provide some evidence of hot pipes running across the ceiling providing some warmth. However this would have been uncontrollable by inmates, as would draughts from the ventilation system. There was an external metal fire escape. In his analysis of the building, Morgan makes clear

> From the comparative survey of the dormitories of the model lodging houses it is apparent those of Salford House were inferior to the others in almost every respect except their sanitary facilities. Their construction was not fireproof, only two thirds of the cubicles were against external walls...ventilation was primitive and beyond the control of lodgers; and the heating system was probably inefficient (Morgan 1996: 13).

Such a building would be a substantial landmark for the local community. At four storeys tall it would have been higher than surrounding premises, was emblazoned with Council crests and occupied a significant site. Externally the building was utilitarian in design, whilst possessing minor decorative features such as Queen Anne revival detailing and an overall Gothic feel to the design. It was constructed from red brick and had some terracotta decoration complemented by blue slate roofing tiles. These factors alone would mark it out as a building of difference within the community. It would also be a clear symbol to the local
population that Salford Council was serious about housing, being actively engaged in ‘doing something’. The building therefore fulfils a dual purpose - firstly the functional provision of accommodation, secondly a visual display of overt political and social power. Such duality of function has been remarked on elsewhere in this study.

Elizabeth Pauls argues that if we are to engage seriously with architecture, then we must appreciate both “the built environments, and the individuals who built and used them” (Pauls 2006: 70). The number of individuals who use and encounter constructs can be huge, as can the variety of personal experiences they bring to interpretations. This diversity ensures that buildings and other constructs have a multi-variable significance, and that whilst there may be many common experiences and interpretations, there is always a complex weave of experience, emotion and interpretation surrounding any construction. Each personal experience shapes and develops our relationships with the building. Interpretations are not fixed, they change and mutate according to personal factors, experience and perceptions. This is not to argue that each interpretation is individualistic, for there are clearly common meanings and significances. Similarly, one individual may have many varied, and sometimes conflicting or overlapping set of relationships with the same construction. Such multi-various relationships change and mutate according to significant external and internal stimuli. Some will be new, others will be revisits of established beliefs embodied in the structure.

These various interpretations can play on the subtle nuances of individual beliefs and experiences, to provide a changing and multi-level understanding. In many cases the multiplicity of function was recognised in the design brief for the architect, and so multiple meaning was established at the earliest stage of the buildings life. Buildings always have to be functional, to serve a particular purpose for which they have been constructed. But they will also have further roles and functions. This could be to enhance the prestige of the builder or owner, to develop a sense of community pride or to demonstrate wealth and power.

Buildings are like other forms of material culture not fixed in time, but change and adapt to differing circumstances. Technological or social change can mean new demands are placed on existing buildings with remodelling necessary. Differing periods have varying styles and tastes in decoration. Building materials may, after construction, be discovered to be hazardous and so require major alteration. Each of these changes will develop the
relationship users have with the building, changing their perceptions. New functions can require significant changes to the fabric of the building. So in the case of the Salford Model Lodging House, it has recently been refurbished to modern standards as the property now has a new lease of life as luxury flats (Photograph 13). Over the length of its existence Salford House must have had many complex relationships with different users. Board members, staff, councillors, technicians, lodgers, building workers, trades people, surveyors, archaeologists will all have differing set of values and varying relationships to the building.

Within the building the design and layout influences our experiences. Decoration may be used to ensure public areas are clearly demarcated from restricted ones - the more functional areas being devoid of elaboration. Signs and non-verbal symbolism will be used to demarcate the accessible and non-accessible. The choice of furnishings can demonstrate different status with selection of materials for decoration and construction clear indicators of target clientele for a specific area – the choice of high class and expensive materials usually being restricted to those locations accessible to high status users. Similarly quality of workmanship can demarcate along levels of status (Payne 2002). The building itself, then, can influence users and their experiences. It is possible for a single person to have multiple relationships with the same building.

The restriction of access to particular parts of the building, through which power and control can be exercised, has been remarked upon previously. Nassaney and Abel believe building space “is a means to create, reproduce and transform social relations” (Nassaney and Abel 2000: 253) whilst Delle believes:

"Material spaces will be designed and created with the intention of introducing specific behaviours. These behaviours in turn are designed to create or perpetuate a set of social relations (Delle 1998: 40)"

This control results from the ability to access, through decisions about who can and who cannot access, what Pellow describes as “who is to be included or excluded” (Pellow 1996: 215). The decision making operates because, as Orser argues “people interacting with the world...create spatial relations” (Orser 1996: 141). This dimension of spatiality “is really about ordering relationships between people” (Hillier and Hanson 1984:2). For example the differential access for servants and family in the large house.
Such issues of demarcation and spatial control were not restricted to Salford. At Glasgow in 1892 some £8,000 was spent by the Glasgow Workmen’s Dwellings Company on a site in the old town. The buildings were even taller than those at Salford being six storeys. Lower floors were rented to the Glasgow University Settlement, with rental income defraying part of the annual running costs. In a remarkably foresighted plan the lower levels were constructed to enable cheap conversion into living accommodation at some future date. The rest of the building was constructed as dwellings with three forms available

- 17 1-bed roomed properties
- 40 2-bed roomed properties
- 1 1-bed roomed property (for the caretaker)

The size of rooms were within the remit of the Glasgow Police Act (local bye-law). Access to individual flats was from communal balconies with specific drying and washing areas on flat roofs. W.C.s were shared between two flats and gas was available should tenants want it. There was little decoration of the building but *The Builder* described the overall impression as “a successful effort to obtain some picturesque effect in an essentially utilitarian structure” (Builder 1892:303). What is clear, even from the short description in The Builder, is that demarcation existed in this building. The resident caretaker, representing authority in the building, has the largest flat. They not only have power as the ever present face of the authorities, but this power is recognized and reinforced through the provision of space.

The existence of this power is perhaps best illustrated by the words of Octavia Hill. Having taken control of a block of flats, the question she asks herself is not how can the tenants operate, but rather “on what principles shall I rule these people” (Hill 1871:458).

This attempt at ‘control’ of people was one of the main reasons behind the comparative failure of the model dwellings concept. There were often too many demands placed on tenants. Life was tough enough, without restrictions on your everyday activities by the landlord:

The rules which forbade noise and demanded temperance, regulated the hanging out of washing but insisted on cleanliness, refused house-room for work tools and storage for goods but required regular rent paying were too numerous and too
repressive...the required standards of virtuousness, docility and respectability excluded many (Gouldie 1974: 235).

Sometimes these demands were to place too great a strain on the reciprocal nature of philanthropy as gift giving, appearing to be too high a price to pay. As Shapeley observes “recipients had to be grateful, respectful and acquiescent” (Shapeley 2001:49), demonstrating such attributes in their daily contact with others. This was the ultimate promotion of respectability (Richard 1989). When demands became too one-sided, the relationship failed.

But not all philanthropic organisations were so motivated. An example given by Frank Prochaska is the *Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor*, founded by Thomas Bernard, which he describes as “rather less preoccupied with religious conversion and the reformation of working class manners and morals” (Prochaska 1988: 32).

Prochaska points out that the controlling influence was not solely directed at those from poor backgrounds. As he makes clear, in the institutions founded for relief and support of those from the more wealthy strata of society who found themselves reduced in means, there was often a similar denigration of personal value and worth. It appears that those in positions of power were concerned with the development of moral correction regardless of the social background of inmates. As he points out “often in unfamiliar surroundings and subject to moralizing and petty regulation, the genteel inmate must have felt some of the humiliation that the poor often complained about” (Prochaska 1988: 39).

So what, then, was the net impact of this vast wave of philanthropy that burst over the new, bustling towns and cities? No one could argue it ‘solved’ the housing difficulties caused by such huge and rapid growth of population. The number of houses they constructed or renovated was a small part of total housing stock. Yet there is no doubt that for many individuals housed, this was a significant improvement in personal living conditions.

It is at another level that the real significance of the Housing Companies, Octavia Hill and John Ruskin, the Building Societies and clubs, the Co-operative movements all influenced and changed urban housing. They successfully challenged the perception that nothing could
be done to alleviate the housing problems of the age. They changed opinions, challenged perceptions and demonstrated alternatives. It was this rejection of established views that is the greatest legacy of the philanthropic housing movement. Their success should not be measured by bricks and mortar, but in vision and progress.

Throughout this chapter we have been studying the housing of families or adults, and those who, although often restricted, had some element of choice. There were others, who by dint of age, had no such choice. It is to the housing of these that we now turn – to the housing of the impoverished young.
Chapter 5 - Housing the Impoverished Young

By interrogating the nature of life inside these austere monuments, we are actually exploring the underlying integrity of Western society itself (Casella 2009a:32)
5.1 Church and State

In previous chapters we explored the emergence and evolution of philanthropic housing in settings ranging from housing workers to the growth of Victorian and Edwardian towns and cities. One consequence of this startling population growth was the number of orphans. To Victorian sensibilities, driven by religious beliefs and tempered by economic realities, this posed a particular problem. The answer, as in so many other cases, lay in the emergence of a philanthropic approach, one which manifested itself through myriad organisations. There was clearly a religious element to many of the orphanages that were founded. The church was a major provider, as it had traditionally been, of support for foundlings and orphans (Murphy M 2002). There was also the state – resulting in a patchwork of provision across the country. Although beyond the remit of this study, it is also important to note there was extensive child emigration, especially to the colonies, sponsored by both state and charitable sector (Constantine 2008; Daniel 2007; Hadley 1990; Langfield 2004). Such a trade started in the early Seventeenth Century (Coldrey 1996) and continued throughout Victorian and Edwardian times (Bates 2009). For those unlucky enough not to make contact with the above, the future was often even less pleasant with infanticide (Arnott 2002; Kilday 2010; Watson 2008; Woodward 2007) or murder at a later stage of childhood (McDonagh 2003) always a possibility.

In this chapter we will examine a variety of orphanages in diverse locations, but with a heavy emphasis on the North West of England. In particular we will examine two case studies, which draw on differing funding strands – both mechanisms discussed previously in this study – charity and state.

Archaeologists have started to develop an analysis of institutional life that reflects a more person-centred approach, dealing with the lives of real people, rather than simply artefacts, plans and assemblages. The varying claims and counter-claims surrounding the difficulties inherent in this approach were discussed in chapter Two, ‘2.4 Archaeology and the people of the past.’ At this stage it is sufficient to reiterate my beliefs that there is a need to repopulate archaeology with people, in such a way as to avoid the charge of supporting an emerging revisionist archaeology.
Extensive work has been undertaken on the archaeology of many institutions, for example prisons (Bush 2000; Casella 2001, 2009b; Dewar and Fredericksen 2003; Garman 1999; Morrison 2001), hospitals (BA 2005; Dawson 1979; OAN 2002b; UMAU 1997, 2003) asylums (Piddock 2001, 2009; Seary 2006; Spencer-Wood and Baugher 2001), and workhouses (BA 2003; CAU 2001; OA 2006). But there has been little study of the provision devoted specifically to the care of children, except as sub-categories. There are reports about the development of children’s wards in hospitals, but no report on a children’s hospital per se in a UK context. Children are often mentioned as part of the ‘total’ system of workhouses, but the studies invariably then concentrate on adults, or the social role, or adult resistance strategies. Mangan has continuing research into Catholic orphanages, but this is from an explicitly historical perspective. It is from this starting point that this chapter specifically has as a major component the archaeological study of orphanages, whilst dovetailing resources available from other disciplines as discussed in Chapter Two.

Whilst there is a paucity of specific child centred research in archaeology, there is an extensive library in other disciplines that can be drawn on. Julia Jacobi’s 2009 study of orphanages across Europe (Jacobi 2009), Thomas Safley’s detailed examination of the Dutch orphanage at Ausburg (Saffley 2005) and the historical images of children detailed in Hugh Cunningham’s work (Cunningham 1991) provide some historical background.

5.2 Children and the reformation of morals

The position of children in Victorian society was a complex one, and their relationship to the adult world is particularly intricate. As Bates makes clear the philanthropists “developed a classification system that was essential to the distribution of charity, but also a complex affair determined by age, education and employment” (Bates 2009: 144). In a world where “the reformation of ‘morals’ was arguably the key problem of social policy” (Ploszajska 1994: 413) young children needed nurture and support, the inculcation of moral values (Driver 1993). Again we have an indication of the significance of both ‘soul and body’. Religiously motivated social skills and actions were to be developed within supportive networks wherever possible. For older children the requirement was the development of skills necessary to ensure survival and independence. Children required isolation from ‘bad influences’, which could be inappropriate families or social settings (Dekker 2001, Shore 1999). This was all in the context of a developing belief that the child should be free from
the rigours of labour (Parr 1980). Such developments as Foster’s Elementary Education Act in 1870 played a significant role in changing attitudes to the role children played in society. The subsequent development of compulsory attendance at school alongside systematic rises to the leaving age reinforced this changing perception. By 1900 there was almost universal attendance at school throughout England (Sanderson 1999).

The position is further complicated by changing definitions adopted by philanthropists. Just one example will suffice to demonstrate the impact this has. For those involved in the emigration of children, the age at which someone was classified as a child altered. As Bates makes clear:

As philanthropists worked to extend their services to the needy, childhood became a larger category that extended from babies to “Older Youth” – a subcategory which, in point of fact, included 21-year-old adult males. Indeed, until the twentieth century over 50% of the “children” aided by Barnardo’s were over 14, that is, the age at which poor-law assistance for children was terminated (Bates: 2009:147).

The clear implication of this is the need for care when the term ‘child’ or a derivative is used from contemporary Victorian literature. In fact the definition needs to be taken with care more because of modern adaptation than Victorian use. Many of the household names we associate with Victorian children’s philanthropy (for example Barnardo’s and the National Children’s Homes) started their involvement with older young people that might today be called children. It is shifting modern perceptions that we must guard against when making interpretations.

The previous chapter discussed the role of alms houses in the provision of housing for the poor. As we saw then, the variety of provision was extensive, with one of the key providers being liveried and trade companies. It is these same companies that were also often involved in the provision of orphanages for the children of deceased members. One of the major case studies in this chapter will be the orphanage provided by the Manchester Warehousemen and Clerks’ Society, now better known as Cheadle Hulme School. It will be possible to contrast the provision of alms houses (Chapter Four) and orphanages (Chapter Five) by similar providers. It will also enable us to trace the changing focus of attention from orphanage to school. Not far from Cheadle Hulme we return once again to Styal, the
location of our first major case study in Chapter Three, with the apprentices of Samuel Greg and family. This is the location of the second significant case study in this chapter. The Chorlton Union in Manchester built cottage homes for orphans in the village of Styal. The cottages were occupied at the same time the Greg family were active at their colony at Quarry Bank, so a comparison between the apprentices of The Greg Family (Chapter Three) and the inmates of the Cottage Homes (Chapter Five) will be possible. The cottage homes now form part of HM Prison, Styal.

Regardless of orphanage finance, what becomes apparent is that funders expected more than solely the provision of food and shelter. They were insistent on behaviour modification, to enable the production of respectable members of society. To this extent they echoed the statements of Octavia Hill (Chapter Four) in her desire to adapt the behaviour of working people towards her personal concepts of acceptable citizenry. They were in the business of developing ‘model citizens’, and many had an almost Utopian zeal about their projects (Ploszajska 1994). The allying of relief through housing with the development of acceptable forms of behaviour, lies at the heart of the rationale for the Victorian Orphanage. The aim was to produce independent, self-reliant adults who were no drain on further resources – either charitable or state. As Wall argues, children “came to be regarded as responsibilities who had to be educated for their future role as citizens” (Wall 2010: 82). A truly Utopian vision.

Many philanthropic institutions were dependant on multiple income streams, often the benefactions by the wealthy, subscriptions from the local community, or the support of political (Trade Unions especially) or other organisations (liveried companies for example). Where no such benefactors existed the state would provide through the local parish and later Boards of Guardians. So common was the functioning of poor laws and guardians in this respect, that Charles Dickens Book Oliver Twist is subtitled The Parish Boys’ Progress. Many orphanages were to physically develop as a result of a bequest, or a major fundraising effort. Two factors influenced new construction and adaption. Partly it was planned – often the result of continuous and extensive fundraising efforts by Trustees. In this instance plans were previously laid and the fundraising often came after the concept. Bequests (a significant source of income to charitable organisations) came in two forms. Sometimes as a result of fundraising activity targeted towards a specific target. Sometimes donations were
unexpected, and real problems could arise when bequests were made with specific conditions attached. Few institutions could afford to turn away large donations, and certainly there was an understandable reticence to deter potential future benefactors, even if current restrictions were onerous for the institution.

Thus many building complexes developed over time, sometimes demonstrating a bewildering variety of styles and showing evidence of changes in the philosophy behind planning. For example Hope House Orphanage at Ipswich (Builder 1902) added buildings at a cost of £800. These included the conversion of an existing room into a playroom and the provision of an extra lavatory on the ground floor. On the first floor an additional dormitory was added, meaning an existing dormitory could be converted to a work room. This work did not increase the size of the institution, but enabled it to operate in a more effective and efficient manner. It demonstrates that as extra financial resources became available orphanages could develop either in size or scope, but such development did not always mean numerical expansion. Such developments could mean reorganisation and improvement to existing facilities, such as provision of a playroom. Many orphanages were not static organisations, but growing and developing establishments.

A further more drastic example of such changes was that of the Royal Caledonian Orphan Asylum which moved from its traditional home in London to Bushey in Hertfordshire during 1901. They had already demonstrated willingness to adapt to changing circumstances, this being the third site the orphanage occupied. Wanting to develop further and finding the existing site restrictive, the trustees took the decision to move some distance from its traditional location. Such moves were brave steps at this time. In an interesting aside, the old site was bought by London County Council with the express aim of providing a hostel accommodating some 1,400 working people. This would be in the form discussed briefly in Chapter Four and is interesting that a site whilst changing ownership and target user groups, would still be used for housing the poor.

Yet others were founded by organised bodies (Clarke 2004; Maynard 2009). The Manchester Clerk’s and Clerks Orphanage and School for Necessitous Children (now Cheadle Hulme School) was founded after a visit from those establishing just such a school and orphanage in London. The aim was to build a national institution, and the original appeal was for investment from Manchester towards construction. Having heard the appeal and decided the
principle was good, a decision was taken that if such a need existed in London, then it was also needed locally. Instead of subscribing to the National scheme, plans were made to establish a local school and orphanage. Such a plan had extensive support across the city, mainly from individual subscribers, but also from industrialists and merchants. Their support often came in the form of patronage, or in kind. On occasions it came in the form of legacies and bequests. Many of the firms who subscribed had representatives on the board, and the list reads like a *Who’s Who* of the Manchester Victorian Industrialists. John Rylands, local banks and S and I Watts were all heavily involved. The Manchester Athenaeum provided rooms for meetings free from the usual rental. Manchester City Council provided free office accommodation at the Town Hall, then on King Street.

After initially funding pupils in various local schools, the construction of their own buildings were completed at Cheadle Hulme on the outskirts of Manchester. The choice of rural location was significant. Originally places had been bought at existing schools in more urban areas, but the choice was “like many other urban institutions [to move] to a country location. Rural sites were argued to provide a natural antidote for the worst social ills of cities” (Ploszajsk 1994: 426).

The current buildings were opened in 1869 at a lavish ceremony with the number of pupils expanding from 15 at opening to 246 by 1884. The larger premises allowed for more orphans to be elected and an enlarged day school started to flourish. Further extensions to the building were soon needed and in 1871 there was a new gymnasium whilst in 1875 the infirmary was constructed. 1876 saw further major extensions completed extending the dining hall, new laundry/wash house and swimming baths. 1881 saw the addition of a new teaching block with a hall, four extra classrooms and a science laboratory. These are significant extensions over a short period of twelve years, indicating a thriving institution. The school and orphanage were both now full and operating in state of the art premises. These alterations were also noteworthy in that they significantly altered the focus, with the school becoming a more and more substantial part of the institution (Richardson 2005).

One method by which finances were raised was the subscription system. Subscription ensured admission to the school, with the added advantage that subscribers could be sure their children would be cared for if they died. The subscription forms offer a fascinating insight into some subscribers’ families. In one case in 1944 the subscriber was serving in the
armed forces as a Major. He had, however, previously worked as a clerk at the LMS railway in Manchester. Although he was 36 years old, his wife was only 24 and they had no children at the time of the subscription. Clearly this was someone who served in the Second World War and wanted to ensure that if anything happened to him then any children might be provided for, either at the school or orphanage. In 1926 there was a further example, a young man who had a child only 5 months old. Whilst admission to the school might be the prime reason for subscribing the effective insurance policy, at a time of major social unrest, must also have been attractive.

Other institutions were founded and supported entirely by the efforts of individual philanthropists (Jones 1995). Two classic examples of such orphanages, provided by an individual bequest, are those established by Joseph Mason in Birmingham, and the Crossley Family in Halifax.

In Chapter Two reference was made to the orphanage constructed by the Crossley family (John, Joseph and Sir Francis) in the West Yorkshire town of Halifax. It was finally completed in 1865, the first attempt having been abandoned when only the ground floor and exteriors had been completed. Consequently the subsequent architects (Paull and Aycliffe of Manchester) had to work within constraints imposed by the partly constructed building. On completion the orphanage was to provide accommodation for a total of some 450 children – 200 boys, 200 girls and 50 infants. The total cost (exclusive of land) was some £50,000 (Builder 1865). It was constructed on the outskirts of Halifax on the site of Skircoat Moor.

By 1928 the Abstract of Accounts and Report was to record that boys remained until the age of 16 or 18, and girls until 16/17/18, which was significantly older than many comparable institutions. Subjects taught included English Language and Literature, History, Geography, Latin, French, Maths, Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Drawing, Singing, Piano and Violin, Handwork, Needlework, Cookery, Swedish Drill and Manual Instruction. Once again the place of Religion was central to both ethos and admission. As late as 1928 the information provided to parents made clear “a preference is given to orphans...of parents who have been in full communion with a Non-Conformist church or who have been regular communicants of the Church of England” (Crossley and Porter Home and School 1928: 40).
A ground floor plan is to be found in *The Builder* from January 7th 1865, which contains no plans of other floors. The building appears to conform to standard design features. There is clear delineation between facilities for boys and girls – separate playgrounds, bathing, toilet accommodation and school rooms. The staff accommodation is located separately from the pupils, with the masters’ drawing and dining rooms located towards the front of the building alongside the committee room. Separate servants’ rooms are provided to service staff and main dining halls. The hall for the main dining room is located close by the cook’s room and steward’s offices in a traditional layout.

However there is some concern as to the accuracy of the plan, especially the designation of a kitchen to the rear of the building. Whilst the main kitchen is clearly marked in the centre of the complex, near the dining hall and other relevant ancillary accommodation, this small kitchen appears isolated from any relevant ancillary support. In fact it is surrounded by the girls’ bath, girls’ convenience and a dressing stage (presumably for the girls if the marked access is to be believed). The room even contains small cubicles according to the plan. The most likely occurrence is that this is an error in the drawing of the plan, that no such kitchen ever existed and that this area is part of the adjacent girls’ conveniences. This would also mean the design of the girl’s wing accurately mirrors the design found in the boy’s wing. Whilst other information about the orphanage is not available, it does appear to conform to the standard form to be found in many public buildings of the time, with many similar design features being found in Joseph Mason’s orphanage in Birmingham.

Mason’s orphanage was reported on in *The Builder* in 1869, where he was described as the “admirable founder of this great charity” (Builder 1869b:744). Joseph Mason had already established several small orphanages in the Birmingham area, but decided it was time to provide something more substantial. It was to accommodate 200 girls and 100 boys, and the claimed cost was some £60,000. This figure is disputed by *The Builder* who estimated the real total cost to be nearer £32,000. This cost differential is important since the greater claimed expenditure would enhance the social standing of Mason in the Birmingham community. It is also a warning of the potential difficulties inherent in reading from historical documentation.

To be admitted children had to be under the age of nine and both parents had to be dead. Children could remain in the orphanage until fourteen years old (boys) or eighteen (girls).
The different expectation of the sexes, and consequent provision for, was made explicit in the deeds of the charity:

Children shall be brought up in the habits of industry...the girls’ be instructed in sewing, baking, cooking, washing, mangling and in all ordinary household and domestic duties, and in other useful, knowledge with a view to there being fitted to become useful members of society in those positions in life it may please God to call them (Builder 1869b:744).

The list is explicit and lays down clearly what the founder saw as the preparation for adulthood that girls would need. It is of interest that The Builder provides us with an extract that details the girls’ curriculum, and makes no mention of any stipulations in the deeds for the boys’ curriculum.

The building itself, designed by Mr Botham, was of gothic design (Illustration 4), and set in extensive landscaped grounds. It was three storeys high, and elaborately decorated. In addition to dormitory accommodation for each sex and administrative offices, there was also accommodation for staff, a chapel, infirmary, dining room/kitchen, laundry, nursery, library and classrooms. This was a substantial, well planned and appointed building. As such it made a statement about the provision for orphans, and about the commitment Joseph Mason had to the cause. A similar public presence was described Garman and Russo who argued the architecture from the Smithfield Asylum “projected a firm ideology of patriarchy and paternalism” (Garman and Russo 1999: 120). Thus the building not only did direct service to orphans, it also enhanced the status and standing of Joseph Mason, enabling him to build up personal cultural capital, as did the inflation of building costs uncovered by The Builder.

The motivation in this case was clearly moral. There is no doubt that Mason believed there was a desperate need to provide for the large numbers of orphans on the streets of Birmingham, something he had already established a reputation for. It is clear he spent considerable sums of his personal wealth on developing and supporting charitable activities across the city. His motivation is demonstrated in the deeds by which he established the orphanage:
All religious instruction given in the orphanage shall be confined to the Holy Scriptures in the authorized English Version...and that no catechisms, formularies or articles of faith...shall be taught to the children (Builder 1869b: 744).

It is absolutely clear that religion is to be at the heart of orphanage daily life. It is also abundantly clear that the Anglican religion shall be the central pillar of belief. Nothing other than pure, clear established church would be tolerated.

This religious motivation is often to be found central to the provision of orphanages, as was demonstrated in earlier chapters of this study. In 1904 *The Builder* was to report on the development of a new Chancel in the British Seamen’s Orphan Home at Brixham (Builder 1904) which was connected directly with the school part of the building. Here is a clear demonstration that the religious life of the orphanage was central to everyday experiences within the community. The building is physically connected as part of a complex, not an addition at some distance. This physical connection serves to reinforce the significance of religion as integral to the life of the community. Many subscriptions to chapel construction came from the maritime community, hence the presence of this chapel clearly demonstrates that for many donors religion was a key motivational factor. This reflects the role religion has traditionally played in the life of those connected with the sea,

Those who had no real connection with seafarers could demonstrate personal piousness by discharging religious obligations to the poor, through making a donation to the construction of this building. This reciprocity of gift is a common factor found within charitable and philanthropic sectors. This is exactly the same point made in Chapter Three about the relationship between master and apprentice (although there enshrined in law), and in Chapter Four about tenants in accommodation provided by Octavia Hill and others. The reciprocal action for the tenant was to behave in a manner acceptable to the owner of the property, through conforming to the owner’s moral and social beliefs. Here then was the moral motivation in operation. It demanded conformity, by apprentice or tenant, to a set of social values dictated by mill owner or landlord. Housing was only provided in return for conformity.

Similarly at the well received Juvenile Reformatory at Redhill Farm School opened by the Philanthropic Society of London in 1849, religion was a key aspect of life. The reformatory was regarded by many as a success - an open reformatory with no perimeter walls, based on
a house rather than dormitory system. The founding fathers had researched the latest ideas well and based their institution on the then legendary French institution at Mettray. Here, the first building completed was the chapel, once again placing religion at the heart of the community. Residential accommodation for the inmates was of the “utmost plainness and simplicity” (Ploszajska 1994: 422), whilst the chapel had an “imposing presence in the landscape [which] endorsed the inculcation of religious habits which was a fundamental part of boys’ training at Redhill” (Ploszajska 1994: 422). It was significant that the chapel was the only place that all residents came together and shared communal time, heightening the significance of religion within the everyday life of the child. Similar example of such functionality is to be found in the workhouse system (BA: 2003).

The concepts espoused at Mettray were to have a significant impact on the development of several institutions within the UK. In particular the siting of institutions that challenged deviant juvenile behaviour in rural locations was to be adopted by many distinct and different bodies (Jolly 2000). The use of a relatively isolated location was to remove the child from the corrupting influence of what was often still regarded as an unnatural environment, the city. Thus Manchester established their juvenile reformatory in Blackley some miles from the then city, with Liverpool founding theirs at Newton-le-Willows. A further reformatory was established at Holme House Fell on the Bowland Fells of Lancashire. Although the rural location of these buildings was a similar feature to Mettray, they were all organised dormitory fashion.

This development of common methodologies of action, the resultant habit forming style that reduces the need for independent action “creates a substantial and secure social environment” (Jenkins 1996:128). This may not require any conscious activity, eventually becoming internalised and habitual. When several community members start to share these common internalised beliefs and means of operation, there develops institutionalisation. A system develops where the potential for deviant behaviour can cease to occur – the dominant behavioural trait develops from ‘this is the normative way things are’ to ‘this is the only way things can be’ (Jenkins 1996:128). Thus institutions reinforce their existence and reduce challenges by individuals.

The religious motivation was not always so explicit but sometimes of a more implicit nature, being recognised not in foundation, but in articles of government, daily rules or custom and
practice. At Cheadle the orphanage/school prided itself on not being tied to any particular sect, but there was a reference to religious activity explicitly written into the articles of government. There were, after all, very few secular institutions in Victorian and Edwardian Britain. Such underlying principles were replicated in the formal school rules. As late as 1937 these stated “The Holy Scriptures shall be read daily by the children of the School” (CHS 1937:3). The rules explicitly prohibited “sectarian and denominational catechism” (CHS 1937:3), the principal being enshrined in school belief since foundation. So when in 1857 John Arthur Potter left the school, there is something of a quandary. The Executive minute book of September 1857 formally records the fact that Potter is leaving the school. It also notes that he could keep his clothes but must leave behind his bible and prayer book. An appended handwritten pencil note of an apparent much later date, opines the view that Potter may have left to attend a catholic seminary. The executive minute book of May 4th 1857, clearly states that “all classes of religious belief are eligible for admission” (CHS 1857). Whether John Arthur Potter left of his own (or familial) volition is a matter of conjecture. But what this incident does suggest is that in a Victorian Orphanage, there was no escape from religion.

Similarly it raises the relationship between the catholic church and those many established philanthropic societies managed and organised by people from the established orders. Examples where all Christian denominations are welcomed, with the exception of Catholics, abound. A classic example was in the East End of London where the Raynard Mission operated among the poor. Here Ellen Raynard (founder) “instructed her missionaries to work with members of all faiths, with the exception of Catholics, whose influence in London alarmed her” (Prochaska 1988: 49). Such beliefs obviously became the incentive for the foundation of many Catholic charities.

Such incidents were replicated in not only local, or even national settings. Marta Gutman studied the Congregate Orphanage in Oakland, California. Here “in principle the non-sectarian association welcomed any woman or child deemed deserving of relief, but most were white and protestant, and all were expected to join in prayers and services” (Gutman 2004:590). This similarity across overtly non-religious foundations is striking. It was also an issue in the provision of some alms houses documented in Chapter Four. To the outside world these bodies were non-religious, catering for all in need. Behind the high perimeter
walls there was clear and discernible religious socialisation taking place. This could have provided the motivation for some of the donors and subscribers. Here was ostensibly giving to an organisation that served all in need, regardless of their background – on the surface a truly altruistic act of benevolence. Yet only those who counted knew that behind the scenes there was a religious rationale to all that happened. You could salve your conscience safe in the knowledge that souls were being saved through your actions – the unbelievers and godless being brought to salvation through the impact of your most generous benefaction, whilst publically you demonstrated all were helped regardless of religious conviction.

Although many orphanages were established not by individual or state, but by organisations, similar key issues are replicated. In the previous chapter the role Liveried Companies and Trade organisations played in the development of Alms houses was discussed, and they were just as active with orphanages. At Bridlington the Yorkshire Foresters Orphanage and Convalescent Home was formally opened in 1899. Costing approximately £2,500 to build the construction utilised similar ventilation methods to those detailed in the Salford Model Lodging House (Chapter Four). Exhibiting the ubiquitous sex differentiation in build, there were six dormitories providing a total of forty-six beds with separate staff accommodation. As tradition dictated offices and dining facilities were on the ground floor with servant quarters in the attic areas. The building was decorated with stone dressings and roof slates. With black wood floors and pitch pine joinery the building must have been an impressive sight.

Previously the admission criteria applied by Liveried Companies and Trade organisations for Alms houses was exercised through gatekeepers who allowed access based on exemplary records of service to the organisation – effectively a demonstration of individual status as a member of the ‘deserving poor’. Similar criteria were regularly applied in the admission of children to orphanages. In 1891 a clear demonstration of such criteria was evinced by the Home Secretary. After distributing prizes at the Annual prize giving of the Police orphanage at Twickenham he gave an address where he “observed that no child was eligible [for admission] whose father was either dismissed from the force or ‘allowed to resign’” (Observer 1891:5). This statement clearly demonstrates that admission was based not solely on membership but also adherence to established standards of morality and behaviour deemed socially acceptable.
5.3 Symbolism, Stained Glass and Swimming Pools

The philosophy behind the Cheadle orphanage (Manchester Warehousemen and Clerks) is somewhat complex to untangle, whilst appearing superficially simple. Ostensibly this was clearly a Christian foundation, but not one specifically allied with any particular form, being non-denominational. At the Annual meeting of the school in 1853, Mr George Jackson was to argue the “necessity of having a good middle class school” (Daily Telegraph 1853). Two weeks earlier he had informed the world that they had now started “the first steps in the practical working of the society, which was a great philanthropic institution” (Manchester Guardian 1853). Such public statements appear to indicate the school/orphanage was motivated more by economic issues than religious ones. This tolerance of all religions, whilst maintaining its broadly Christian approach, was reinforced a few years later in an undated letter pasted into the institutions Executive book on the date May 4th 1857, which stated “the institution is based throughout upon the broad principles of liberality and philanthropy... all classes of religious belief are eligible for admission” (CHS: 1857). The clear impression is that officially the school/orphanage saw itself as broadly Christian, whilst helping those who required its services regardless of their particular form of religion practised. Although the 1857 quote leaves open the breadth of acceptable religious diversity, this was written within the context of Victorian Britain.

This religious element of life is to be found clearly expressed through the architecture of some of the buildings at Cheadle. The orphanage school would never claim to be secular, but would proudly lay claim to being non-denominational, although the case of Potter (above) might lead to some disputation about this. Within the buildings on the site there is extensive religious symbolism present. In the upper rooms of the main block that were originally servants’ quarters, the newels at the top of the stairs have a cross cut into them (Photograph 14). Whether this is for pure decoration or of religious significance is open to conjecture. This is clearly not graffiti for the meticulous nature of the carving would indicate a craftsman’s skill and expertise. The use of such a craftsman would indicate that the carving was an officially sanctioned act, or at least one unofficially sanctioned.

Repetitiously around the main block is the Star of David. As has already been noted this is a Christian foundation, there being no Jewish benefactors or legatees indicating no link to organised Jewish religion. There is similarly no connection through the architect to the
Jewish religion. The regularity of this style of decoration is something that has puzzled staff at the school for some time. No research has been able to identify a definitive reason for their presence, or any symbolic rationale. But it is clearly a religious symbol used to decorate the central most significant building on site. The symbolism may refer back to the earliest Christian writings in the Old Testament, and the role of Christ as the Messiah. But this is no more than speculation, as no evidence has yet been unearthed to explain the significance of these unexpected religious motifs.

A further building that reflects this religious symbolism is the second Victorian swimming bath, still in use today. Externally the windows would fool many into believing they belonged to some chapel. The lancet like windows with leaded glass and stone sills/decorative features could be attributes of many religious buildings. At each gable end a roundel is set high above the pool. Near the apex of the wall it cascades light into the body of the pool. The overall impression, even today, must be of swimming in a converted church or chapel. The roundels dominate the gables with tall lancet windows running the length of both sides of the building (Photograph 15). The effect is added to by the hammer beamed roof and vaulting arches that encompass the main windows. Religious architecture is clearly expressed in this swimming pool. The use of water as a religious symbol is well established. Christian baptisms admit people to the faith through the use of water, and in many denominations this is accomplished through total immersion. The use of water as a metaphor for washing away sin is well established in the Christian church.

The common location for symbols of religious affinity is surprisingly absent at Cheadle. The memorial plaques to the dead of the two world wars bear no religious symbols. Even the cover of the programme for the dedication service of the panel for the Great War has no religious symbolism, although it contains significant religious content. There is a nationalist appeal with the words of Kipling printed on the cover:

Who stands if Freedom fall;
Who dies if England live?

Here religious fervour is replaced by patriotic passion. This is a similar form of representation to that of the cenotaph in London, where religious symbolism is missing from Lutyen’s design, similarly being replaced by patriotism.
A further issue about the plaques is unusual. The plaque for the Great War (1914-1919) contains the names of some 62 ex scholars who died, whilst the Second World War (1939-1945) contains some 48. The ratio between the two wars is usually much higher with the number of casualties from the Great War sometimes exceeding those from the Second World War by a ratio as high as 3:1.

Such patriotic fervour can further be traced through the painted glass windows in the main hall. The scenes depicted in the windows display an England that would have been very different to the experiences of many of the children. The background to the windows is the rural idyll so beloved by the Victorians and Edwardians. Hills, fields and many shades of green form the background to the images of idealised boys’ and girls’ taking part in healthy, playful activities. In one window flying above triumphant boys is the Union Flag, dominating that most English of healthy outdoor boys’ games, cricket (Photograph 16). As the victorious boy is chaired by his supporters, the flag dominates the good, solid virtues that are displayed and reinforced through the symbolism of the window.

In other windows the images of children display an idealised state of the English child. Both boys and girls are shown at play, in outdoor activities that are associated with good, upstanding members of the community. These children are stylised images of the child every Victorian wanted. The girls have high cheekbones and a stunning porcelain beauty. They wear flowers in their hair as they dance around the maypole, holding hands and smiling in a beguiling manner (Photograph 17). The boys have blonde/brown tousled hair and raise their caps in salutation. They have piercing eyes. Brilliantly coloured blazers contrast with the gleaming cricket whites they wear (Photograph 18). These images are of the idealised middle classes, reflected through their children. Whilst some of the children at the institution would have been from just such a background, many were not. Those at the school were the daughters or sons of warehouseman and clerks (though there appears to have been fair latitude in that definition), with some being orphans. They came from across the North of England including large numbers from developing urban centres. The background, images and activities depicted in these windows would have been alien to many of the children in the institution. This was another world, but one the Victorian’s cherished.

Completed in 1920, these windows were a later addition that continued to reinforce the virtues inherent in the ‘good’ child on a daily basis. They were in the line of sight of the
children every day, at every meal. They provided the colour in the room, drawing the child’s eye to feast upon this riot of decorated glass. They are classic examples of Octavia Hill’s forthright statements about the role of colour (see Chapter Four). Their very presence reinforced key messages at every meal. For these windows extol the virtues Victorians thought so essential in the raising of children. They were a visual metaphor for the type of child that would be an asset to society. The message was to work hard and play hard and you too could be a model citizen, an asset to the nation. This is what you should aspire to. The fabric of the building was used to reinforce the social values of the time, values the institution wished to foster.

Mealtimes were significant since they were the only occasion when all children and professional staff were present. Further, all sectors of the staff would be represented as kitchen staff and servants would also be available to distribute food etc.. As such this was a major event in the daily life of the institution. Not only practicalities impinged on design – the hall had to physically hold the number of children and staff, access had to be safe and efficient and services had to be provided to kitchen areas which had to link through serving areas with the hall. There was also an issue of social power. Di Zerega proposes the experience of meals “reinforced the family ties and the moral values of home life” (Di Zerega 2010:83). They had the same impact at the orphanage, reinforced through design – what Di Zerega calls “a secular ritual” (Di Zerega 2010: 83).

It is apparent that dining is a means by which cultural capital can be developed and enhanced, and that this is a key component in the development of social status. Hence the dining room becomes essential to understanding this process. Here “the impulse to gobble [has] to be educated out of every generation of children” (Young 2010: 134). This is where, superficially at least, a key facet in the development of ‘gentility’ is developed and reinforced, the significance being to bolster the arguments advanced by George Jackson in 1853 cited above.

Additionally tableware was marked with the name of the school/orphanage (Photograph 19). The stamping of such items has been discussed elsewhere in this study (Chapter Three - navvy camps and Chapter Four – Charter Street Ragged School and Working Girls’ Home). It is clear the likelihood of potential theft was not the prime consideration in such a closed and insular institution. Here the overriding aim is the reinforcement of belonging, marking the
plate orphans eat off with the institution’s name. The name of the school is therefore ever present as an integral part of the key communal activity of the day. As the meal proceeds the name of the provider is gradually revealed as more and more food is consumed from the plate. The repetitious nature of every meal, every day, acts as reinforcement. At the conclusion of the meal, presumably feeling full and well fed, the name of the provider stares up from the plate. This is clear reinforcement of the role the institution plays in your life.

Photograph 19 is part of an assemblage of materials found in 2011 by workmen excavating a major drain at the school. They were part of a cache that included several hundred sea shells and a small but significant range of broken ceramics. Being excavated by workmen no secure context exists to assist evaluation of the remains, but it is apparent from the finds that this was a collection of kitchen waste. As well as the shells and plates there were also the remains of food jars and stone bottles. The assemblages complement the historical records of the food ordered and provided at the school, confirming the known diet.

In Chapter Two we alluded to a potential problem with Bourdieu’s beliefs that some ‘universals’ become totally internalised and accepted. Part of the difficulty is the argument that this leads to learning by the individual what is possible to achieve, and by extension not possible, a limitation on aspiration. Whilst a superficial analysis of the messages advanced through the windows might appear to contradict this there can be little doubt these windows are intended to be inspirational to the children. How then are these windows and their hidden messages compatible with Bourdieu’s theories about learned and internalised aspiration?

Two examples should suffice to demonstrate the way in which visual symbols in the home impact on cultural development. The work of Harold Mytum analyses the significance of Welsh Dressers in internalising shared cultures and beliefs through constant visual impact. He argues the colour and scenes on plates displayed on Welsh dressers were “able to symbolise through its ceramics the aesthetic and cultural values of Wales” (Mytum 2010: 99). Similarly Brooks argues that transfer printed ceramics were often a means of developing national and cultural identity (Brooks 1997, 1999). If daily viewed ceramics could be used in such a way as to develop and reinforce cultural and nationalistic beliefs, then the daily viewed window could too.
The windows need to be placed within the broader framework of the child’s experience at the institution. The exposure to the windows, and their message, is two or three times daily at mealtimes. But this time is a fraction to the exposure to the aims of the orphanage across the rest of the day. Here other components are loaded hourly, every day reinforcing the messages. Thus the nature of the school curriculum; the relative status of servants, masters, board, visitors and orphans/children; or the impact of the daily routine, would all serve to give a different impression that could limit the aspirations of the child.

Jenkins argues social identity develops alongside childhood learning being consequently an essential component of primary socialisation. These childhood identities “are more robust and resilient to change in later life” (Jenkins 1996:21). This supports Bourdieu’s proposal that the value of aesthetics in the early years are key in the development of identity and demonstrates once again the influence of the aesthetic motivation. Although the concept of *habitus* is not ideal, it fulfils a useful role in explaining the complex relationship between aesthetics, individual and child. Relating the social functioning of individuals (personal internalisation) with the collective (institutional norms) and most significantly embodied.

Additionally Bourdieu’s concept of *hexis* would simultaneously be in practice, the way significant staff move, their bearing, body language. As Jenkins explains “it is in bodily hexis that the idiosyncratic (the personal) combines with the systematic (the social)” (Jenkins 1992: 75). It provides the bridge between the personal world and the world shared with others, what Bourdieu himself called “a permanent disposition, a durable manner of standing, speaking and thereby of feeling and thinking” (Bourdieu 1977: 93). *Hexis* would be in operation simultaneously with the influence of aesthetics within early childhood – reinforcing and supporting each other. Between them they provide the environment in which “the practices of actors and their interaction with each other and with the rest of their environment” (Jenkins 1992: 75) would coalesce to develop *habitus*.

The reproduction of these learned and internalised actions would reinforce the social development of the child. They would provide the framework around which social constructs would be developed. Thus the buildings repetitious religious architecture internalised by the child from the earliest of ages, and habitually reinforced through daily exposure, reinforces the views of religious orthodoxy. Similarly the stained glass operates as a visual metaphor,
constantly reinforced and so internalised, of the need for habits that enable the attainment of the aesthetically perceived ideal.

Bourdieu elucidated his concept of ‘symbolic violence’ in 1970. Here he claims individuals in positions of power can impose a system of culture and behaviour on others, in a manner that feels and appears legitimate. Such acceptance in turn leads to further reinforcement of the imposed culture. The constant reinforcement and legitimisation of imposed culture acts to hide the real power dynamic that exits. Such a system can be seen in several ways in which power relationships within the orphanage works. It can help in explaining the multi-dimensional manner of many of these relationships and their legitimisation by inmates and staff. Thus the overt aim of Cheadle Hulme was to provide a middle class education regardless of religious belief. Yet the subversive aim, as clearly demonstrated by the architecture, was to provide for the moral and religious development of the child as central. The acceptance and legitimisation of power through such an imposed culture enabled maintenance of social standings. This is a similar power process to that discussed earlier at the Congregate Orphanage.

Bourdieu goes further, arguing that the prime reason for educational activity is that of supporting such an imposed cultural norm, developing support for the norm so it endures long after the experience of formal education is complete. Therefore the imposed culture continues to replicate and impose itself on future generations (Jenkins 1992).

This clearly demonstrates the amalgam of factors impacting on the child, whilst there is a further significance. For the managers the limitation of childhood aspiration is fundamental to developing the upstanding members of society they aimed for. Yet although this is the underlying aim, it was not an objective that could be vociferously enunciated. The public expression had to be of an institution whose goal was to develop the aspirational child, with no limitations. Thus there is a duality of function operating, which the windows demonstrate. The institution therefore fulfils its intention of producing limited expectations in the child, whilst appearing to the outside world as limitless in aspiration. In this manner Bourdieu’s theories about the limitations of aspiration are demonstrated at the orphanage (Bourdieu 1990). Whilst the impression of aspiration is present, it is in effect seriously circumscribed by the daily routine of the institution. Whilst Bourdieu’s theories have been criticised (Dumont
and Evans 1999; King 2002; Mutch 2003; Schatzki 1997), they do provide insight into the relationship between the architecture, the institution and the child.

But such features were not restricted to the orphanage at Cheadle. As will be apparent from the above examples, orphanages shared common elements of architectural design. The one built at Stockport by the estate of Sir Ralph Pendlebury for some £10,000, demonstrates many of the same facets of design as that built by Joseph Mason, the Warehousemen’s and Clerks or the Seaman’s Orphanage. It was designed by J W Beaumont of Manchester, and whilst it provided care for only a few residents, it was extensively involved in outdoor relief. Along with other orphanages it comprised of separate girls’ and boys’ accommodation and entrances, large dormitories for the children and smaller living facilities (described as parlours) for staff. The use of dormitories as a means of accommodating numbers of children in the most economical manner is a standard feature of design, to be found replicated across orphanages and other cases where children live together, for example boarding schools and juvenile detention centres.

The photograph from the Manchester Warehousemens and Clerk’s Orphanage demonstrates a typical dormitory arrangement (Photograph 20). The cramming of as many beds as possible into available space by utilising the central part of the dormitory is similar in arrangement to that described in the Model Lodging House in Salford (Chapter Four). In the case of the orphanage, the only space available for personal belongings is a box kept under the bed. The photograph also demonstrates that beds abutting the wall have curtains facilitating some small element of privacy, whilst those in the centre of the room have no such provision, and hence no privacy. It is a matter of conjecture as to the disposition of beds to residents, but traditionally in schools older children were rewarded with greater privacy due to seniority.

5.4 Ellis, pen nibs and almanacs

It was in a dormitory such as the one illustrated that we find material culture that most closely illustrates the emotions and feelings that a young orphan might have to deal with. During renovation work of the dormitories, the workmen were to find the personal belongings of a child named Ellis Guest. These were concealed under the floorboards, presumed by the archival staff of the school to have been hidden by Ellis and never
recovered. Ellis was a boarder in 1872, and we know the finds are his property since his name was burnt into the leather of the purse. Whilst some things are known about Ellis, his personal belongings illustrate significant events in his early life the literature does not show. School records indicate that he became an orphan scholar upon the death of his father.

The brown leather purse (Photograph 21) measures approximately 10cm. by 5cm., having tooled edges and is of brown leather. It is embellished with the inscription ‘E W Guest, 1872’. It was recovered from under the floorboards of the ground floor boys’ dormitory, in the location of the bed occupied by Ellis. A detailed examination displays no marks that would indicate removal by vermin. The location of the purse and absence of marks would indicate this was a deliberate act by Ellis, or possibly another, to hide these possessions. Why he never recovered them is a matter of conjecture. Maybe Ellis did not have time to recover the objects when he was leaving the school? Possibly he felt he had outgrown them when he finally left having completed his external examinations. Perhaps he forgot their very existence. It is feasible that they were not actually deposited by Ellis himself, but by another pupil in the school, and that Ellis was never aware of their location. This last possibility suggests scenes of intense personal grief and the possibility of charges of theft with the ramifications this would have in such a closed community. But all this is, and can only be, conjecture. There is no evidence to support any of these potential scenarios. What is clear is the finds are invaluable in providing us with a unique insight into some of the key personal possessions of a boarder.

Within the purse were a pen nib (Photograph 22), some photographs of Manchester (Photograph 23), a mini almanac (Photograph 24) and a wedding ring (photograph 25). Ellis was a Manchester boy, so the photographs of well-known scenes would have been a constant reminder of home, the scenes being major landmarks from the city that contrasted vividly with the rural Cheshire setting in which he found himself. These scenes included the ‘new’ Town Hall, the cathedral, cathedral gates and the Assize Courts, all impressive and significant constructions. Comparing Ellis’s cherished photos of Manchester with the rural idyll of the stained glass windows described above, illustrates the clear physical contrast the young boy would have experienced.

Pen nibs were cherished objects in a school situation. As anyone who learnt to write using one (the author) will tell you, they are notoriously complex things to master, especially as a
young child. They demand care and attention, and after time the soft metal of the thin gold covering moulds itself to the individual style of handwriting. This is the reason why even today so few owners of fountain pens will lend their pens to others. The pen nibs become over time unique to the individual. Handwriting improves when using a pen nib that has been previously worn in. In an age when punishments for untidy handwriting were severe and by today's standards callous, it is not surprising that Ellis tried to ensure his pen nib remained personal. Quite simply in some schools preserving the integrity of your nib could save you a thrashing, although Cheadle Hulme appears to have officially sanctioned corporal punishment less than others. However the meting out of such punishment for 'bad handwriting' would have been the informal kind, unlikely to have been officially sanctioned. No wonder Ellis regarded it as something to keep safe as part of his most cherished possessions.

In addition handwriting is an essential component of identity, a visible sign of difference and therefore extremely important. At a time that most people used handwriting as the main means of communication after speech, it was even more significant. People recognised an individual through their handwriting, especially in a school setting, thus using writing as a means of identifying individuality. In a place where the opportunity to emphasise individuality was sorely lacking (uniforms, standard haircuts, communal activities, shared dormitories and collective organisation) handwriting was one of the few ways individuality could be demonstrated in a socially acceptable manner. A large volume of school time was dedicated to the development of handwriting, raising the significance of writing within the organisation, with the ability to write well regarded as a significant achievement, rewarded by prizes at formal school events such as prize-giving's. The significance of good quality writing was therefore of great importance within the school community. We know Ellis went on to achieve well, passing the local Oxford/Cambridge examinations and to do this demanded high quality handwriting. Additionally the school had serious links with clerking, the profession Ellis was to follow later in his life – an occupation that at that time demanded high quality handwriting. Both of these issues would have added to the importance of handwriting for the young Ellis.

Despite extensive research through *The Pen Room* in Birmingham, it has been impossible to discover the provenance of the nib with any certainty. It is marked as a product by G W
Hughes, a Birmingham maker who did not produce nibs for any other manufacturer. For some inexplicable reason Hughes and Company did not mark either pen nibs or their catalogues with dates. The experts at the museum date the nib as approximately 1890s. This is very significant since it means the dating on the purse is wrong, the expert opinion is wrong, or the nib was a later addition to the purse. Since Ellis had left the school by the date of the proposed manufacture, the dating, if accurate, seriously raises the involvement of a third party. The 1872 date on the purse is a time Ellis was at the school, leaving in May 1875. Since Ellis had left the school by the date of nib manufacture, it strengthens the possibility of the involvement of a third party at a later date. The enigma will probably never be resolved, but it does not detract from the significance of the finds. Nor does the possible involvement of a third party alter the significance of the pen nib, all it does is to change the identity of the individual concerned about their handwriting. Reuse of a hiding place is not an uncommon event.

The mini almanac bears no additional marks by Ellis and is in remarkably good condition. It lays flat and shows some sign of wear but not extensive. Dated 1867 it is some five years earlier than the date inscribed on the purse. This almanac is of major significance. 1867 was the year that Ellis’s father died – the almanac was therefore an emotional personal reminder. This raises its significance to the most personal artefact of the whole collection. It commemorates the event that led to Ellis being present in the orphanage, as well as being a reminder of the most traumatic experience of his young life to date. It is an intensely personal, and moving, possession.

The ring is assumed by the archival staff to be his father’s wedding ring, presumably given him as a keepsake by his grieving mother. It is of a size that would indicate it was a male ring, and is a simple band of gold, in the style and design so common for a masculine wedding ring. It contains no decoration or precious stones. Its physical features therefore indicate it was a male ring, with the likelihood being that it was owned by his father. As the oldest male child in the family, the giving of the ring recognises his status. This would obviously have immense personal emotional value. It would probably be the loss of this more than anything that would have disturbed Ellis. This was probably his only direct contact with any belongings of his dead father. For a young child its loss would have been harrowing.
These factors combine to raise the significance of what is at first sight a collection of small artefacts. The potential for fear, maintenance of individuality and the significance of writing within the school coalesce to raise the status in the eyes of Ellis. The intensely personal commemorative nature of the artefacts is of intimate significance. It becomes an important and symbolic collection. As White and Beaudry make clear “it is the ‘small things’ that often offer the greatest promise for understanding the multi-faceted aspects of identity” (White and Beaudry 2009: 213).

In the study of the Phoenix Indian School in the United States, Gibb and Beisaw (2000) examine sanitary pits, finds indicating that children did not wholly accept the American identity being offered but “incorporated their Indian identity with elements of the ‘school learned’ American identity” (De Cunzo 2006: 180). Thus components of the original identity of the child were retained through positive acts of human agency by the child, just like Ellis, when retaining keepsakes from his home city.

The contents of the purse tell us a great deal about life in the orphanage in 1872. These special possessions are a visible statement of what was important to Ellis – his hometown, his wish to do well at his work and the commemoration of his dead father. The loss of these intensely personal belongings must have been devastating.

5.5 Separation and Fusion

The separation of domestic staff from others in institutions is well documented. Standard architectural design provided servants’ accommodation in roof spaces, reminiscent of grand Victorian houses. The differential between professional staff and clients (children) is similarly reinforced. In orphanages professional staff (matrons, teachers, managers) separation is accomplished by separate living quarters either in or close by main buildings. Such a system operates across other spheres at this time, as illustrated by the location of managers near or within communities of workers, or the apprentice house at Styal accommodating the house manager (chapter Three). In Chapter Four we again came across such demarcation with the Salford Model Lodging House.

A further example of such distinction is found at Nicholls Hospital in Manchester. There the superintendent was provided with separate accommodation to the children’s living space. This meant that the manager was always adjacent to the home, whilst the physical distance
ensured personal private space could be protected. As Nicholls developed, a corridor was constructed enabling immediate contact should it be required. Such developments illustrate the institution adapting to changing demands. Additional to the physical barrier at Nicholls, decorative features of the manager’s house emphasised the differential social standing of manager and resident. This ornate decoration is important as “ornament should express a buildings position within a social hierarchy” (Scalzo 2009:56). Instead of flush windows common to the hospital dormitories, the manager’s house contained extensive bay windows. The main building was designed with plain sash windows, whilst the manager’s house had decorative leaded glass, several still surviving as seen in Photograph 26. But there is a uniformity of design across all structures – the same brick is used, lintels and sills are similar, roofs are of similar pitch and a basic gothic style permeates the whole building.

Similarly administrative functions, which usually had their own suite of offices, were often ornately and almost ostentatiously decorated. The main offices of the Manchester Poor Law Board still exist on Fountain Street in Manchester and are extensive and expensively constructed buildings, of the latest architectural fashion utilising high quality materials from the time. Similarly Board Rooms are often extensively furbished – be they for poor law offices, municipal baths (Marino 2010) or orphanages. The Board Room and administrative facilities at Pendlebury Orphanage were “a handsome apartment 30’ by 20’ lighted from the outside by two double lighted windows and a large bay in all of which are window seats of oak, with carved panel backs” (Builder 1882: 499). It can be reasonably assumed that both servants’ quarters in attics, and dormitories on the first floor, did not contain window seats of oak with carved panel backs. Interestingly the article describing the new Pendlebury Orphanage devotes approximately 70% of its space to detailed descriptions of the Boardroom, with the rest being used to describe the endowment, grounds, facilities for pupils, staff and servants.

At Cheadle the accommodation clearly demonstrates venting within the roof to enable circulation of air through attic rooms. The attic space was originally utilised for live-in servants, later redeveloped in the 1950s to provide dormitory accommodation for sixth form male boarders until the 1980’s. Deep set windows provide some light but it is limited, and the space was fairly dark even at noon during a visit. Since noon would be a peak time for servant activity, such lack of light would not be regarded of major significance. The simplicity
of wall decoration demonstrates that this was accommodation benefactors and others who needed to be impressed would be unlikely to visit. The whole area is plain and functional - a place for sleeping rather than socialising. Few, if any, boarders would venture up to this high location, until such time as conversion. Stories abound from ex-pupils detailing surreptitious activities on the flat roof accessible from these quarters. Several places are conveniently hidden from the view of prying eyes by chimney stacks. It is unlikely that sixth form boys would have been the only residents to have discovered the advantages of such hidden isolation. In an institution that gave servants little free time coupled with extensive hard work, the opportunity for private time – with another or on your own - would be unlikely to have been passed up. These flat roofs would make an ideal place for servants and sixth form alike to indulge.

These differentials are to be found across most orphanages and reflect the demarcation believed essential to preserve Victorian social structure. Whilst the motivation for such premises might be religious or political, the essential ambitions were often similar, the development of autonomous individuals able to make their independent way in society, without being a burden to the state.

All such buildings exhibit the need to commemorate the founder. Legacies could be substantial, although not precise in measuring the volume of philanthropic giving (Owen1965). Yet they can give us some vital information. Prochaska claims significant differences in donations between men and women, with women leaving by far the larger total and percentage sums (Prochaska 1980). Plaques and boards abound both internally and externally. In those institutions financed by legacies and bequests the lists of donors are often displayed around the school on high quality boards, often with gilt writing. Usually highly polished wood or carved stone are found in abundant quantities, and in older institutions they appear liberally around the premises, enabling the tracing of the school’s history. Thus there are large legacy boards in rooms at Cheadle Hulme School that were originally main communal areas, and have now been converted into teaching accommodation. Perhaps the most ostentatious local commemoration is to be found at Nicholls, where an obelisk of polished marble is located near the main entrance to the hospital (photograph 27). It not only commemorates the young man who the hospital was founded to commemorate, but unusually other members of the family have dedications.
added. In this respect for many years the memorial was an ongoing project, one that was reinvested with significance and importance with the inscribing of every additional name.

One of the original providers of orphanages were the Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffaloes (RAOB), and their involvement was to cause concern and disputes within the organisation until they finally ceased to be involved in the mid twentieth century. They specifically avowed religious and political motivations, with the RAOB providing several institutions across the country. There is no doubt several key figures in the ROAB also held important positions within church and state. Although collective actions by the RAOB might not have involved religious motivations, it is clear that for many their personal lives and actions were often governed by religious beliefs. So although the motivation of members of RAOB boards might have been overtly non-religious, in practice personal motivations are likely to have been extensively religious. One example of the numerous RAOB orphanages will illustrate.

In 1900 land was donated to the RAOB for an orphanage at Aldridge. Financial problems meant work was not started until 1903, when *The Builder* informs us that the site of three acres allows room for further expansion, and that wherever possible “passageways have been avoided” (Builder 1903: 46). There were to be communal dining areas, and as was common at the time all other areas were strictly separated by sex – with specific master and mistress rooms as well as the ubiquitous separate dormitories and sick provision. The building was set back some thirty feet from the main road and extended to the length of some ninety-eight yards - this was no small construction. The debate in Chapter Four about internal or external communal facilities for housing was clearly settled in this construction, with external water closets for both staff and orphans. The aim was to provide accommodation for some forty “inmates” (Builder 1903: 46), and the total costs were in the region of £1,957. The complement of staff identified included teachers, matron and maids to ensure the efficient running of the organisation. What is clear is that orphanages provided by the R.A.O.B. conformed to standardised norms.

### 5.6 Creature comforts and laundries

Many orphanages were extensive and imposing institutions requiring large numbers of staff to maintain the running of building and extensive grounds. For some this meant employment of local people who lived at home. For others, staff were employed and housed within the
institution. This was the zenith of domestic service, where even middle class families often employed domestic service around the home. Large buildings such as those inhabited by the wealthy, or asylums, hospitals, workhouses and orphanages would have considerable numbers of both internal and external staff to service them. Whilst large numbers of young people were employed in such positions, there is remarkably little detail known. As Waterson argues:

of all types of employment during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries domestic service was the area least scrutinised by philanthropists and by Royal Commissions, least well recorded in diaries, letters and the press (Waterson 1980:2)

This leaves archaeologists and historians with a real problem. The volume of evidence available is significantly less than for other groups.

Whilst Waterson is correct about the volume of material available, organisations did exist to aid servants. The Girls’ Friendly Society Central Registry, The Guild of Dames of the Household, the Domestic Workers’ Union, the Metropolitan Authority for the Befriending of Young Servants, the Working Women’s Guild, London and Provincial Domestic Servants’ Union, the Domestic Workers’ Union of Great Britain and The Women’s Industrial Council to name but a few. Each had their niche role in the lives of numbers of Domestic Servants – some more successfully than others.

It was this last organisation, The Women’s Industrial Council that undertook a survey of servants in 1913, the results of which were published by Butler in 1916. The survey was based on returns from servants, male and female, across the country. Her results produced findings on the manner in which service was perceived by the servants themselves, and as such provides a wealth of information. But there are some difficulties interpreting results. Butler is capable of making value judgements based not on the results of the survey, but heavily influenced by personal beliefs and experiences. Untangling these personal biases from the returns is complex but essential to any real understanding. For example the book is full of statistical returns (selected by Butler) to illustrate her points, and often these can be checked against the tables. But occasionally Butler will make a comment that appears totally unrelated to any statistical analysis, such as:
the daily servant of the present is apt to be the least efficient of her class, and her position offers obvious difficulties with regard to cleanliness and in temptations to small forms of dishonesty (Butler 1916:56).

Butler does not elucidate further on what these forms of dishonesty might be, or the potential problems with cleanliness. Similarly there is no explanation of why such faults might be more common amongst day rather than live in servants. There is also no explanation as to why the situation is one of the present, rather than the past, and what has caused such changes.

Butler also makes several claims which in a modern context might seem exaggerated. She contends one of the main attractions to domestic service was “creature comforts” (Butler 1916: 43). Since we know that at Cheadle (and many similar places), there was no heating in attic bedrooms, this does sound somewhat difficult to believe. Yet we are aware many houses of the poor were unheated, especially at times of severe financial pressure. The report reveals that only some five out of six hundred returns intimated they were required to share a bed with another servant. The physical quality of the quarters was also an area of great concern to many servants. Lady Willoughby de Boke is quoted in the report as saying “servants’ quarters are sometimes disgraceful in their darkness, lack of ventilation and sanitary conveniences” (Butler 1916: 105). Whilst we know the servants’ quarters at Cheadle were ventilated, we also know they were dark, but there was sanitary provision located on the same floor. Oral evidence from those who visited the quarters after adaptation for sixth form boarding indicates they were very cold in winter.

Such demarcation of access was not solely restricted to the poorer members of society. There were also social restrictions placed on the wealthy, even within their own home. One area of workers’ housing that has not been analysed in any depth in this study due to lack of space, is the accommodation of those ‘in service’ to large Victorian and Edwardian houses. Whilst the demarcation of spatial access by servants above stairs is widely accepted, a whole sub-structure of status and demarcation exists below stairs. The differential status between servants is broadly acknowledged, the relationship between butler and parlour maid for example is well documented. But often forgotten, or ignored in academic writing, are the restrictions on below stairs access for house owners. As Marshall and Willcox observe “the most exclusive part of the house was therefore below stairs. The kitchens, scullery, butler’s
pantry and servants’ quarters were effectively out of bounds to the family” (Marshall and Willcox 1986:59).

Things are, however, slightly more complex. Although in many institutions and houses the servants had open access, this is not a universal. The difficulty is that the access servants had, even when it was across the whole building, was restricted by time. It was only at certain intervals that servants had access to public areas, or at particular events. Thus servants would be expected to be present in a dining hall for preparation, cleaning, laying tables and other such jobs. They would also probably be in attendance during the serving of food and in the cases of homes sometimes of drinks. Finally they would be involved in the clearing away of the remains of the meal. But in many places they would be absent at other parts of the meal. Thus the access by servants whilst often unrestricted territorially, was often restricted temporally.

Horn reports on two classic examples where servants were never to be seen, except on occasions specifically sanctioned by house rules (Horn 1975). The rules of the Third Lord Crewe were such that servants should only be seen at chapel. But surely one of the most bizarre was the rule implemented by the then Duke of Bedford in 1893. In these any female servant he met after noon would be instantly dismissed, since he believed their work should be completed by this time.

Servants were assisted in many of their duties by the latest labour saving devices. The photograph of the laundry at Cheadle Hulme (Photograph 28), explains a great deal about the mechanization of the laundry process, and the servants role, where we see two servants using large mechanical washing machines. Unfortunately the photograph is undated, but the mechanical nature of the machines would point to either the end of Victoria’s reign or early Edwardian. The machines are of huge industrial size to cope with the volume of clothing/bedding and furnishings that would be generated by such a large institution. Their power is externally provided, presumably by an engine, with the system of wheels with belts shown clearly linking shafts to individual machine. A host of pipes and valves run throughout the laundry, whilst in the background is a large hooded sink with steam rising. To the left is a basket for carrying smaller items to be cleaned, whilst the large trolley to the right of the photograph indicates the volume of laundry that would be moved. The laundry was a dedicated area with stone flagged floors for ease of cleaning and hard-wearing surfaces that
were able to cope with constant spills of water and detergent. The staff can be seen wearing long aprons to provide protection from both water and cleaning materials.

A similar insight into the working lives of the servants is to be found in another undated photo of the laundry (Photograph 29), probably contemporary with the first since the servants are wearing similar dress. Here the flooring appears partly stone flags and partly tiled, with a large table dominating the foreground. Again baskets of washing are piled around the edges of the room, whilst a huge volume of materials are piled to the left indicating the sheer scale of laundry handled. To the right are lockers with individual labels on – their use is uncertain since they appear to be too long and thin for completed laundry, but they could be drying cabinets where clothes were placed on hangers and heated air circulated. This would appear to be the finishing or starting area of the process since the only machines visible are in the background, and work undertaken in this area appears to be done by hand. The lighting in this photograph demonstrates a large light source, presumably large windows, lighting from the left hand side. In both photographs there also appears to be lighting from above as if from skylights.

Earlier we made reference to differential access arrangements for servants and family in the great Victorian and Edwardian homes. Similar forms of demarcation would be in operation across the orphanage and school. In order to facilitate the smooth running of such a large organisation, servants would be afforded access across the whole building and grounds. Such access, whilst theoretically allowed, would not be practically exercised by ‘professional’ staff. For example few of the teaching staff would ever venture into the quarters housing servants’ accommodation, kitchen or laundry areas. Presence in such areas would be deemed to compromise their professional position and standing within the institution. The rigidity of such differentiation was often regarded as essential for the maintenance of status. This is similar to the separate areas for staff and inmates at the Salford Model Lodging House discussed in Chapter Four, or the separation of military officers and men in Chapter Two discussed by Simmons (2010) at Te Awamutu. In all cases, to compromise this distance – physical and social – would be unthinkable, threatening power relations deemed essential for the maintenance of discipline and control.

Commonality of features is to be found across philanthropic provision. The differential decoration between managers and ‘others’ (Nicholls and Cheadle Hulme), the marking of
items for everyday use (Charter Street and Cheadle Hulme), the commonality of rules (Birchinlee and Styal) are but a few we have come across in this study to date. In an even greater similarity, the dispute between the two forms of philanthropic housing in the emerging city and the orphanages is apparent. One company favoured barrack blocks that enshrined individualism whilst the other was based on shared and communal facilities. One had individual access whilst the other was the forerunner of the 1960’s deck access high build. In a similar way the dichotomy between two standard styles of orphanages is strikingly similar.

In echoes of barrack block housing, where two great design strands were in constant contention (see chapter Four), the housing of young people in institutions similarly had two contending philosophies identifiable through architecture. The dormitory design that has dominated the early part of this chapter was one such model, while the more informal family house design (often designated cottage design in England) was the other. The differences are not only architectural, but are important because they reflect differing philosophical perspectives.

There was clearly a dynamic behind the alternative design of the cottage home, clearly to be seen in an international setting (Gutman 2004, Jacobi 2009). The introduction of this more ‘family orientated’ style of design was to be found across many institutions, especially those concerned with the welfare and development of children. So orphanages (City and County of Bristol Guardians of the Poor 1898; Goodbody 1979, Goodbody 2002; Morrison 2002) and juvenile reformatories (Ploszajska 1994), were often at the forefront of this new design.  

5.7 “A more complex picture emerges” (Gutman 2004: 583)

The form of buildings based on large dormitories afforded little opportunity for privacy, being the main reason servants and sixth form alike exploited accessible roof spaces at Cheadle. This lack of privacy was traditionally the case for younger pupils, with dormitories often having significantly more beds per room than those of older students. This increased ‘population density’ further reduced the opportunities for privacy available to smaller children. The traditional design also militated against spontaneity, developing a more formalised conformity of behaviour within the shared community of the dormitory. This often produced institutionalised individuals who subsequently found life outside the institution
difficult. Emil Hirsch was one of the first critics of large impersonal institutions – orphanage, asylum, hospital, and reformatory – a view that was to be articulated more widely in the later twentieth century. Such criticisms were eventually to lead to the mass closure of many large institutions, and major changes in the way we treat young, old and ill.

Hirsch himself had critics, in particular latter day detractors included Gutman, who claimed Hirsch ignored the very real efforts made by some staff to develop and foster close interaction with their young charges. Many claimed their work with former orphans demonstrated the real psychological perspective was too often drowned out by an over emphasis on architectural analysis, form and layout. Gutman argues that when “physical artefacts [are] integrated into the social welfare history and the experience of children who lived in “adopted homes” are taken into account, a more complex picture emerges” (Gutman 2004: 583). Architecture alone gave an incomplete view of the realities of institutional life, and could not be treated in isolation. Such a stance must resonate with archaeologists, echoing our concern for the interaction of multiple elements of material culture. In the wider community the debate was to have a major influence in the UK, where the contrast between locations such as Cheadle Hulme and Styal was to become a central focus of dispute.

Although a volume of evidence exists that demonstrates lack of privacy, institutional conformity and rigid discipline, there were no doubt tender and supportive moments. It is a further illustration of the realities of life being more complex than previous interpretations might have chronicled. In an echo of the issues debated in Chapters One (Newman and Newman (2008)) and Chapter Two (Mayne and Murray (2001)), there is a need to ensure that whilst past interpretations are challenged, they are not done so in a manner that produces a revisionist archaeology.

Hirsch’s followers were not the only ones to question the function and effectiveness of large institutions. As Gutman makes clear, in the United States regulatory bodies expressed their concern about “very large facilities called barracks or warehouses” (Gutman 2004:30). This raises two significant points both connected with language employed and the implications broached. Terminology from military (barrack block) and economic (warehouses) sources to describe dormitory orphanages had connotations that many challenged, especially relating to provision for children. To some the language implies the method, and the ethos couched in militaristic or economic terms was problematical. These perceived large scale impersonal
organisations contrasted strikingly with personal and familial living, illustrating the dichotomy between cottage home and dormitory. Secondly the term ‘barrack block’ had specific associations within the UK context. As seen in Chapter Five the term was used in a disparaging manner by critics, in particular relating to large housing companies (Sutton Trust, The General Society for Improving the Dwellings of the Labouring Classes and The Dwellings House Improvement Society). Thus on either side of the Atlantic pejorative language was being used to demarcate between impersonal and intimate homes.

A classic example of smaller homes within a large organisation was to be found not far from where this research started at Styal. Accordingly it is to these homes for orphan children built by the Chorlton Union, that we now turn our attention. The buildings are still in existence and use, although access is severely restricted due to current use as HM Prison Styal. The homes operated until 1956, being subsequently used as an open air school by Manchester City Council. Later some of the buildings were used by the nearby Bollin Cross School until 1963, when they ceased use as an educational institution and opened as HM Prison Styal for women.

The Cottage homes at Styal were originally conceived as a suitable location to house orphaned workhouse children. The Chorlton Union was one of the largest in the country, having a major workhouse at Nell Lane in Manchester, later to be designated Withington Hospital. There were initially fourteen buildings housing some 300 children, with a further set added in 1903 when the institution enlarged to 450 children. Along with the cottages were a significant number of ancillary buildings, housing facilities for the orphanage. These eventually included a hospital, school for exclusive use of the orphans, swimming pool and recreation hall for sports activities, administration offices and chapel. These were in addition to functional buildings such as stores and on-site laundry.

From examining contemporary photographs, it is clear individual homes were distributed along a main road. The homes have homogeneity of architectural design, constructed from red brick with rectangular sash windows. They are set back equidistant from the road affording individualised lawns and small gardens, arranged in neat rows parallel to the road. Large gable ends display external chimney features. The homes are all two storeys.
This general design is replicated across all buildings in the complex, with use of standard building materials. The school (photograph 30), although much larger than individual homes, is constructed of the same brick and demonstrates similar architectural features. Although the windows are larger, they are the same multiple sash windows similar to the design in individual homes. Despite the estate being a self-contained community, the school is still surrounded by walls and railings including a substantial locking gate. Unlike schools in urban locations this would be unlikely to be a concern about security, since access to the whole estate was closely controlled via a gatekeeper’s lodge from the main road in Styal. This lack of need for security indicates the railings are there to provide a controlling function through restricted access to members of the community, rather than restricting access to those not members of the community. These railings were about internal control and power manifested through restrictions on access within the community.

The front of the school has a large playground, presumably surfaced in some manner. This is more than a slavish application of standard design features. The whole community is set in rolling Cheshire countryside which afforded many large open spaces available for children to play. Yet the area for play during school times is strictly demarcated by railings, walls and establishment of a specific playground. Children’s play was thus regulated across time and space. At certain times the school was an appropriate, and indeed compulsory, location for play. Whilst at other times it was deemed an inappropriate area, since out of school sessions the playground was inaccessible. This control of movement and access by members of a community to designated areas, is an issue we have met earlier with the apprentices at Styal (Chapter Three).

The planting/landscaping across the site is also significant. As stated earlier, individual homes had open vistas and wide lawns facilitating immediate access to the road. This ensured buildings were constantly monitored by members of authority who constantly patrolled the site. The location of trees and large growing shrubs was conveniently located to ensure that visibility of the cottage homes was never compromised (Photograph 31). Only low growing or regularly pruned shrubs were permitted in front of individual homes. Examining photographs it is apparent that whatever direction one approaches a home from, it is constantly visible with no major obstruction. Similarly the school, recreation room and swimming baths also have unobstructed views. This indicates that maintenance of grounds
must have been regarded as a high priority across the estate. The only photograph of the superintendent’s house is however different, with much larger shrubs shielding it from the view of the main road. Whether this was a deliberate attempt by the superintendent to maintain privacy and status is debateable since this is the only contemporary photograph available. It could just be that the photograph was taken the day before pruning of the vegetation. With no collaborative evidence it is difficult to be certain but what is clear is that this solitary photograph displays a major contrast with the landscaping of other properties on the estate.

One of the few buildings that can still be seen from the main road is the chapel. This was a significant structure in the community, worship being a major feature of each week for the children at the school. As well as Sunday attendance, there were specific services tailored to certain days of the school year – from thanksgiving after the Second World War to annual harvest festival services. Architecturally it follows the same style as found across the site, with the addition of stucco facing on gable ends providing a more decorative feature. Not surprisingly, of the major buildings on site, this is the sole one which demonstrates continuity of use.

These differences between the architecture of the two orphanage styles had a major influence on the behaviour and actions of residents. Smaller, more intimate relationships were able to develop in the cottages and were regularly commented on as being one of the major selling points to potential backers. However construction and maintenance costs were significantly higher, with this argument readily exploited by those who supported the dormitory style of construction.

Regardless of design there were common experiences, a significant problem being that of personal privacy, something commented upon earlier. Although the cottage home provided greater scope for privacy, there were still issues surrounding personal space. Any large community restricts the chances for individuals to experience time alone, and whilst the dormitory style provided the least opportunity, the cottage home was still restrictive. At both sites there were opportunities afforded by the buildings themselves – the roofs and chimneys at Cheadle School and the stables at the Cottage Homes. Both case studies were set in substantial grounds, within rural locations. The Styal homes afforded the opportunity of engaging in unsupervised activities within Bollin Valley and Carrs Wood, whilst Cheadle
Hulme is surrounded by extensive countryside. Both afforded the opportunity for engaging with the surrounding areas in pursuit of solitary time.

This lack of privacy also had further implications, very often linked to a lack of security for personal belongings. An interesting example comes from the experiences of James Stanhope-Brown who was a resident of Styal orphanage (Stanhope-Brown 1989). In a mirror of the story of Ellis Guest, Stanhope-Brown describes the lack of security for important personal possessions. Whilst in the sanatorium, he recalls wishing he had an alternative to hiding marbles and conkers “in secret hiding places” (Stanhope-Brown 1989:72). When his father visits and gives him a present, Jimmy Brown tells us “I had taken the wise precaution of hiding my new Gyrocopter in my secret hiding place, thus ensuring my dad’s gift would remain my best and only possession” (Stanhope-Brown 1989: 84). The tactic used to preserve personal belongings was hiding them in cavity spaces between the walls of the home. Stanhope-Brown recovered his personal effects unlike Ellis Guest, yet both used the same method to ensure the safety of prized personal possessions within an enclosed community. Although these two styles of buildings were dissimilar, in some cases the influence on individuals was parallel. Ellis Guest and James Stanhope-Brown, although separated by many years, utilised the same tactics to protect their important personal possessions.

This chapter has enabled the comparison of two distinct styles of orphanages, their methods of organisation, and the personal and communal motivations that influenced their establishment and development. The cultures that developed have been closely related to the architecture employed, using the theoretical perspectives of Bourdieu. Individuals have been used to illustrate specific aspects of the experience of living in orphanages, as well as an examination of the role and function of groups and their cultural norms within the institutions.

In this chapter we have analysed how two specific case studies illustrate continuity of concepts explored within earlier chapters, the significance of this continuation demonstrating commonality across differential circumstances. In Chapter One I argued ’it is essential to discover if, the findings in this research can be replicated across more than one setting’ and this chapter adds further to earlier findings that replication does exist. In particular this chapter demonstrates that similar to the two housing styles developed by housing companies
explored in Chapter Five, there were two distinct styles of orphanage design. Additionally the chapter shows how within the different designs of orphanages, there were analogous methods employed by different children (Ellis Guest and James Stanhope-Brown) to safeguard personal belongings. Additionally the individual actions discussed in this chapter illustrate the role individual agency played in the construction of sub-cultures within the orphanages. Such agency is replicated across other chapters, being discussed within navvy camps in Chapter Three. Likewise the differing providers of accommodation such as the Alms houses in Chapter Four have been shown to demonstrate this dichotomy. Such instances provide further evidence of replication across the multi-various case studies within this research.

Having explored multiple case studies, it is now appropriate to draw key conclusions, and see how the five key questions raised in Chapter One have been addressed. Throughout this work each chapter has concluded with a brief exploration of the contribution it made to understanding key aspects of philanthropic housing. A more detailed analysis of these points is now due, providing the synthesis first identified as required in Chapter One. Such a conclusion will be provided in Chapter Six.
Chapter 6 - Conclusion

If central government’s reluctance to spend money on social problems was a stimulus to philanthropy, so too was the relative weakness of local government during most of the nineteenth century. In the rapidly changing, and for many deteriorating, social environment it fell to a host of voluntary societies to intervene in the relationship between benefactors and the needy (Prochaska 1988: 35).
6.1 Inter-related complexity

The significance of this study has been in examining the management of poverty across the UK in the Victorian and Edwardian periods. It has drawn from local, regional, national and international contexts, to exploit both breadth and variety. It makes evident that whilst regional and national peculiarities exist, underlying themes replicate across boundaries. Similar key motivations are found across the USA at Alabama Gates, North West England at Styal and Dolly’s Creek in Australia. Forms of housing investigated include such diverse styles as navvy huts, orphanages, apprentice houses and barrack blocks. Benefactors may be wealthy industrialists, friends, workmates or gold miners. Beneficiaries include apprentices, industrial workers, the unemployed and children. Individuals could be benefactors, beneficiaries, or in some cases both. I would contend such diversity of evidence is the strength of the study.

6.2 The Five Questions

In this chapter I return to the five questions identified in Chapter Two, and demonstrate how individual case studies relate to these fundamental issues. This will then develop into an augmentation of the research by Prochaska, leading to an assessment of the manner in which archaeology can extend and enhance traditionally accepted views based on his work. A discussion on the role and methods by which behavioural modification functions, in particular the reflexive mode through which it operates, will be followed by further implications for research that follow on from this study. These five key questions are:

- How far was philanthropy a key factor influencing social and political life in Victorian and Edwardian times?
- Is it possible to explore the influence of philanthropy through the lives and experiences of ordinary people?
- Can material culture be used as a means of evaluation?
- What were the key personal and communal motivations influencing philanthropic development?
- How have such issues influenced changes in social provision?

The specific questions will be addressed in turn and related to case studies across this research.
How far was philanthropy a key factor influencing social and political life in Victorian and Edwardian times?

Within this work the numbers of individuals involved and the scale of examples given clearly demonstrate that for large numbers of people philanthropy was a key component of their lives. Activity occurred across both rural and urban communities, encompassing a range of provision such as Alms houses (Chapter Four), with specific case studies from both rural (Samuel Greg in Chapter Three) and urban communities (Octavia Hill in Chapter Four). Charitable activity across time demonstrates an extensive tradition of provision, from the early operation of the Poor Law (Elizabeth 1st) to Styal Cottage Homes in the 1950’s. Age-specific provision demonstrates diversity from pensioners (Alms houses in Chapter Four) to Orphans (Chapter Five). The work of many academics, including Goose (2010); Greenall (2009); Hughes (2004); Prochaska (1980, 1988, 1990, 1992); Tarn (1973) and others demonstrate the extent of previous research into philanthropy.

Both benefactors and beneficiaries stood to gain from the development and growth of philanthropy. For benefactors there were often significant financial returns. Samuel Greg (Rose 1986), Sir Titus Salt (Richards 1936) and the Ashworth family (Timmins 2000) in Chapter Three, all developed noteworthy businesses whilst becoming extensively involved in philanthropic activities. Success and fame often facilitated access to powerful people. Examples of the influence individuals came to exert on social and political processes have included Octavia Hill (Chapter Four) and Alexander Ramsay (Chapter Three), both invited to provide evidence to Parliamentary Select Committees. A further example of the exercise of personal power was Prince Albert, with his intervention to ensure model housing was displayed at the Great Exhibition (Chapter Four).

For beneficiaries the significance could be vital, possibly ensuring personal survival. In Chapter Four we examined the destitute state of many of the nation’s urban poor, and its dire consequences (Cole 1984; Ellis 2006; Freeman 2005; Pooley 1985). For those who eked out their existence, philanthropy could mean the difference between life and death. This was especially the case for those unable to provide for themselves by dint of infirmity (Clarke
2004; Gahan 2002; Murdoch 2001) either living in Alms houses or community (Chapter Four); or youth in Orphanages (Chapter Five).

In the case of alms houses, although sometimes altruistic in intent, places were often allocated on the basis of long-standing service to, and earned cultural capital within, either an economic organisation or existing social community. So Titus Salt rewarded respected members of his workforce with alms houses at Saltaire (Bradley 1990; Richards 1936). Likewise liveried companies rewarded years of loyal service and membership to a trade (Builder 1849). The ability to secure accommodation in alms houses often required conformity, since dismissal from employment not only incurred immediate financial impact, but potential long-term devastating consequences with loss of old age provision. The importance of a place in an alms house often grew with the age of the individual, as older workers neared retirement age and personal thoughts turned to finishing work. Thus the impact was differential on the workforce, being of less significance to younger workers. More established workers had also had the time to build up a greater store of cultural capital within the organisation.

Not only numbers of people but extent and diversity demonstrates the volume of philanthropy across this period. In Chapter Two we itemised some of the involvement by philanthropists, from housing the growing urban poor (barrack blocks, mill colonies), medicine (hospitals, dispensaries, asylums), recreation (libraries, sports facilities, art galleries), educational provision (ragged schools, mechanics institutes), religious bodies (churches, chapels), and myriad other developments. In every town, pre and post industrialisation, wealthy benefactors can be found supporting many of these, and similar, projects (Lander-Birch 1981; Prunty 2001; Rosenzweig 1984; Shapeley 2001).

The geographical spread further illustrates the extent of philanthropy. Some provision existed in small isolated villages, such as the work of Margaret Fell (Kunze 1989) examined in Chapter One. Some occurred in small towns through organisations like the Hastings Allotment Society reviewed in Chapter Four. With the emergence of industrialisation, the influence spread, including the founding of large house building societies (Chapter Four), and the construction of works colonies (Chapter Three). Such growth is replicated across international boundaries as identified at Dolly’s Creek in Australia and Steptoe City in the U.S.A., both discussed in Chapter Three. Philanthropy was a worldwide phenomenon.
Whilst the numbers benefitting from the development of such housing was never high (Gauldie 1974; Tarn 1973) the impact on those it did affect was significant. Numerically, estimates vary, but it is generally accepted that the total philanthropic housing stock was in single percentage figures. Yet as I have shown, its influence should not be measured solely by the volume of individuals housed. For those it did house it became a major aspect of their lives, yet for many successive generations there was a greater impact. It was the experiments conducted by these early philanthropists that significantly influenced later forms of housing. Whilst the numbers directly affected by employers and housing companies, liveried companies and charities was never huge, the future impact was extensive.

I believe the above case studies provide credibility to the claim philanthropy had a major impact, influencing the social and political life of Victorian and Edwardian periods across the globe.

Is it possible to explore the influence of philanthropy through the lives and experiences of ordinary people?

In the debate about the lack of individuals in archaeological research I follow the precedent set by others (Casella 2005; Matthews 2003; Mrozowski 2006; Nevell 2005; Orser 1996; Scott 1994; Shackell 2000a; Symonds 2003; Tarlow 1999; Trinder 2002). I endeavour to demonstrate that archaeology is about people, whose presence is crucial to any understanding of the past. The number of individuals, whose stories are included in this research, makes it clear that the lives and encounters of ordinary people patently are a means through which the past can be examined, and accurately portrayed.

In Chapter Three the two apprentices Joseph Sefton and Thomas Priestley appear (MCA). Their testimony before Essex magistrates, after absconding, provides us with extensive evidence of living conditions at Styal Mill. It enlightens us about the working day, apprentice house, number of apprentices, food, clothing and free time. Further insights are provided by records of Ann Kelsall, Cleo Baker and Mary Haseldene, who are depicted by entries from the stoppage book. The punitive punishment of eight shillings on James Worral helps with understanding the house Greg lived in, through allying evidence from fines with glass making technology. It is linking the historical evidence with the material culture of the glass panes that facilitates the unravelling of this enigma. The available technology of glass making is
fundamental to understanding the significance of the size of the fine imposed. Together the evidence from these apprentices provides us with a vibrant picture of living, working and dying at Styal Mill.

A group often missing from the archaeological record is the navvy, with in particular the female navvy often overlooked in both archaeology and history. In redressing the balance in Chapter Three, we find the life of Gourouck Ellen described by Patrick McGill, as one who had “hacked and gashed her knees so that they looked like minced flesh in a butcher’s shop window” (McGill 1914:76). McGill describes the looks of the women he worked with saying they “had a sorrowful look in [her] eyes, as if too many weary thoughts had found expression there” (McGill 1914: 285). The renowned Rachel Hamilton also appears, one of the most famous female navvies of her time, who worked in locations as diverse as brickworks and farms in Scotland.

Starting from the key questions raised by Morris (1994), and fusing the small volume of historical research that has recently been completed, doubts begin to surface about traditional stereotypical views of navvies. These challenges are then bolstered by the one excavation undertaken in the UK at Risehill, then allied to other research such as Alabama Gates (Van Bueren 2002) in the USA, Dolly’s Creek (Given 2005) in Australia, whaling stations (Symonds 2010) and Boott Mills (Mrozowski 1991). This more extensive set of information enables a synthesis of research to develop, with archaeological investigations challenging the traditional views of the navvy, being extensively discussed and corroborated in Chapter Three.

The desperate conditions that existed for the poorest in society are illustrated in Chapter Four, where the case of Thomas Blomely, who starved to death, is reported to the Poor Law Commissioners (Poor Law Commissioners 1842). Or there is the case of William Pearce from 1840, with the testimony of Dr Bowring (HOC 1841:2). The description of his impoverished home with meagre belongings and hungry family, demonstrates the intensity of poverty at the time. Many thousands of similar cases are to be found in the records, but Thomas is highlighted to illustrate that poverty was tangible, and happened to real people. I use these examples purposefully as a method to identify the consequences on real lives.
Octavia Hill (Bell 1942; Darley 1990; Whelan 1998) is present in Chapter Four as she passes amongst the poor of London, imposing her own behaviour modification as a means of social manipulation. We discover her involvement with organisations concerned with ‘improving’ activities, from the Kyrle Society to the National Trust. Her association with philanthropic work brings her to the attention of leading decision makers, a result of which her influence grows considerably. Hill would have applauded the works of William Crossley in Manchester (Manchester Faces and Places 1900), who regularly funded charitable works across the city. His financing of Charter Street Working Girls’ Home (Chapter Four) is especially significant, illustrating as it does the major distinction between deserving and undeserving poor. The activities of both Hill and Crossley take place against the backdrop of constant and insistent calls for action by reformers such as George Goodwin. As editor of *The Builder*, he led a vociferous campaign highlighting the worst examples of poverty and destitution in major towns and cities (Builder 1860, 1861a, 1861b, 1861c), reported in Chapter Four. His insistence on publishing articles illustrating alternative building styles and forms of improved housing (Builder 1845a, Builder 1888) demonstrates reformers were no small and isolated group. They were a powerful force in their own right.

In chapter Five we explore the life of one orphaned boy through the personal possessions of Ellis Guest. The belongings discovered hidden under the floorboards at Cheadle Hulme enable us to understand more about this young child’s early life. The enigma of the pen nib, the almanac from the year his father died, along with other personal materials, illuminates this child’s life in a way documents alone never can. I also examine how, over a hundred years later, the same means of protecting personal belongings is replicated by James Stanhope-Brown, this time at Styal Cottage Homes (Stanhope-Brown 1989).

The current debate about the role of individuals and revisionist archaeologies is discussed in Chapter Two. I make my position clear that too often a negative view of past life in poor communities has developed that needs redressing. My concern however is that revisionism is today almost habitual, often hiding the realities of life behind the veneer of the undoubted fun and pleasure that did exist, so regularly producing a skewed perspective. Sometimes a version of the past is presented that omits poverty, disease and early death. Such a portrayal would not be recognised by people inhabiting navvy camps, apprentice houses, barrack blocks in Victorian cities and orphanages.
Bourdieu would argue that individuals emerge from many diverse influences, whose impact is to develop social, cultural and symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1984). Such capital is clearly defined and buttressed through social interaction, which in turn leads to reinforcement, acceptance and consequently internalisation. As a result, people become accustomed to behave and conduct themselves in a particular manner. This pre-disposition then further bolsters and authenticates the existing environment. This study has demonstrated numerous examples of such a process, with orphans at Cheadle Hulme School (Chapter Five) and apprentices at Samuel Greg’s (Chapter Three) direct examples. Samuel Greg accomplishes this with apprentices through the school system, rules and regulations plus the law of the land. Similarly Social capital was one of the major issues Octavia Hill utilised to differentiate between those acceptable for tenancies and those not, employing behaviour modification techniques explicitly designed to enhance such capital. Finally the orphanages in Chapter Five were unashamedly orientated towards the development of cultural capital, as a means of ensuring success upon graduation from the closed environment of the institution.

The comparison of the environment and influences in Chapter Three, between Styal and Navvy Camp, also demonstrates the development of behaviour appropriate to discrete social settings. This process of behavioural adaptation is the same regardless of place – whether rural Cheshire in an orphanage or windswept North Yorkshire in a navvy camp. Thus internalisation of socially appropriate behaviour that reinforces the status quo becomes validated.

Throughout this work I have endeavoured to populate the research with people, rather than a preponderance of inanimate objects (Blackford 1996; Sked and Reid 2008; Turner and Young 2007). It is all too easy in archaeology to produce research concentrating on stratigraphy, potsherds, levels and assemblages; whilst forgetting these are techniques to research and interpret the lives of people. In the light of this, wherever possible, individuals have been used to illustrate both key points and relevant asides.

**Can material culture be used as a means of evaluation?**

This research is based unequivocally on material culture, since such an approach enables us to evaluate and explore conditions that shape behaviour, whilst recognising its reflexive nature. It is in the layout of grounds at Styal mill and village that I provide evidence for
management of the workforce. I demonstrate how decorative features and choice of materials at Oak Cottages in Chapter Three permit challenges to the assertions of Hughes (Hughes 2005) that owners only utilised decorative features on workers’ housing when directly in sightlines. Chapter Four demonstrates how two distinct styles of barrack blocks became the norm, with the influence of design being pivotal.

Material Culture has also been used throughout to illuminate the lives of individuals. Chapter Three includes a challenge to traditional stereotypical views of navvies. This challenge is clearly based on finds from the Risehill excavation (WA 2008). The use of heirlooms at Risehill that transmit social capital is an important feature discussed in some detail. The same chapter provides evidence from finds at Dolly’s Creek (Lawrence 2000) that support many of the same conclusions. A comparison of site construction such as Sebastapol and Jericho with Birchinlee and Burnbanks in Chapter Three, demonstrates differences in material construction, layout and organisation. The use of materials to determine the permanence of camps is contrasted between international and UK settings, through a comparison of Butt Valley (Maniery 2002), Alabama Gates (Van Bueren et al 1999), Dollys Creek (Lawrence 2000) and Railway Camps in Leicestershire, such as Chetwode, Cosby, Flecknoe and Barley Fields.

Despite the differences of available materials influencing construction methodology, there still exist significant issues that can be shown to replicate across these differential sites. Thus the construction of the tripartite hut appears imitated across many distinct sites and locations, as evidenced in Chapter Three through a comparison of sites across the UK. Within camps layouts that encouraged observation of workers are clearly identified, with discussion in Chapter Three across Shaker encampments in the USA (Nicoletta 2003), Boott Mills in the USA (Mrozowski et al 1989), Birchinlee in the UK (Bevan 1999; Robinson 1983) and Whaling Stations in Australia (Symonds 2010). This system of observation is further demonstrated across time within the same country, with the available access routes for workers and apprentices at Styal established in the eighteenth century, comparable to available routes for recreation in twentieth century Birchinlee (Chapter Three).

Whilst differences might exist caused by dependence upon local resources, there are still comparative issues. Thus the miner’s camps at Dollys Creek (Lawrence 2000) in Australia might not have access to the same raw materials the railway camps in Leicestershire had.
Yet even with differential materials and consequent construction methodologies, it is still possible to discern comparative features within the built environment. The navvy camps at Risehill (WA 2008) were made of dissimilar materials to those used at Steptoe City, yet the significance as examined in Chapter Three are clearly shown to be similar. Finds from Risehill, especially heirlooms, are present as they are at Alderley (Casella and Croucher 2010). The nature of these finds may be different, reflecting differential access to wine glasses and porcelain decorative materials, but this in no way diminishes their significance. Whilst questions of global export and local provision might influence the particular nature of material culture found, both sets of finds demonstrate patterns of belief and belonging. Although form might be different, relevance to individuals is similar. Regardless of the distance between these sites, similarities and patterns are readily discernible.

Extensive consideration of materials from the Manchester Warehousemen and Clerk’s School and Orphanage in Chapter Five included a detailed study of buildings (windows, decorative features, layouts), that demonstrate both functionality and influence on behaviour. These are compared to equivalent components at Nicholls Hospital in Manchester, an orphanage of similar date. Here the architectural style replicates many of the key issues at Cheadle. The differential decoration of the house of the manager demonstrates status within the institution. Stages of construction are clearly identified, as is the provision of commemorative materials – the obelisk at Nicholls and the endowment boards at Cheadle. The finds by workmen at Cheadle give an insight into crockery, foodstuffs and table wear used at the orphanage. The personal belongings of Ellis Guest enabled an extensive exploration of everyday living. The enigma posed by the pen nib has, as yet, to be resolved, although I do intimate several potential scenarios.

A contrast between the architecture of the orphanages at Cheadle Hulme, Joseph Mason’s Orphanage in Birmingham (Builder 1869b) and Styal is used to illustrate the differing philosophies that existed about the care of young children. Within these differing styles the claims made by the adherents of the home styled orphanages are challenged by Gutman (2004) who examined similar designs in the USA. In Chapter Five I also challenge these claims, through a comparison of the actions of Ellis Guest and James Stanhope-Brown. Ellis hiding his personal belongings demonstrates a desire for both privacy and safety, with these demands supposedly addressed by the cottage home architectural style. The evidence of
Stanhope-Brown (1989) replicating the actions of Ellis, clearly refutes any such claims. When allied to Gutman’s extensive research, the impact of the more compact and supposedly personalised institutions remains under doubt.

Throughout this work it is the materiality of objects that have demonstrated significance. In both the main case studies of the orphanages in Chapter Five the hiding of personal possessions and belongings by both James Stanhope-Brown and Ellis Guest is critical because in both cases the objects hidden were of personal significance. In a very real way both represented absent fathers, providing a tangible link with families outside institutional walls. In a similar way the heirlooms at Dollys Creek, Alderley and Risehill also represented belonging beyond immediate communities, embodied through material culture. These objects provided a physical, material manifestation of belonging. Thus, through materiality, archaeologists extend the initial understanding generated by Prochaska and other historians. As Mrozowski claims archaeology can use this materiality to “breathe new meaning into a handful of lives long since past” (Mrozowski 2006: 57).

Chapter Five contains an analysis of the role religion played in the emergence and daily routine of orphanages. There I suggest the architectural features at Cheadle support and bolster the religious foundation of the institution, assisting in developing a belief system to be sustained throughout life. Religious factors were constantly reinforced and became a key component of the lives of children. This is the teaching of what is believed needed for the soul as well as body. Comparisons are made with other similar institutions such as the Raynard Mission (Prochaska 1988) and Joseph Mason’s Orphanage in Birmingham (Builder 1869b), both studied in Chapter Five.

As Anthony Giddens points out “routine is integral both to the continuity of the personality of the agent as he or she moves along the paths of daily activities, and to the institutions of society, which are (my emphasis) such only through their continued reproduction” (Giddens 1984: 60). This is similar to Bourdieu’s internalisation of aesthetics, with the role this plays in the development of the child and subsequent adult. It is not only the repetitive nature of the experience, but the internalisation of such coded messages that perpetually reinforce the development and maintenance of the status quo.
All this indicates a wealth of material culture acting as a viable and effective method to enable the exploration and evaluation of the role of philanthropy. Further, these examples demonstrate that the use of archaeological approaches can extend and broaden Prochaska's historical analysis, as I originally suggested in Chapter One.

**What were the key motivations influencing philanthropic development?**

It has been a major contention of this work that there exist three key personal motivations for philanthropic housing:

- Religious
- Economic
- Political

nevertheless the rationale behind the provision of philanthropy is far more complex than the impulse of a single motivation. Additional to key personal intentions were communal movements, whose influences acted simultaneously alongside one or more of the personal motivators. It is this intricate weave of personal and societal factors that produce the inherent complexity.

Three key components of the communal movements can be identified as

- Moral
- Medical
- Aesthetic

Many existing studies ignore this complex interplay of personal and communal factors, or relegate it as of secondary importance. I would contend the interface between these key issues, and developments induced, is crucial to understanding the involved and intricate relationships at work.

We started our research with case studies of communities that required the availability of a workforce (Bevan 1999, 2006; Hughes 2006; Mrozowski et al 1989, Mrozowski 2006; Van Bueren 2002) and the actions taken by owners in both attraction and retention. Ranging over sites as diverse as the Greg family at Styal in Cheshire (Rose 1986), Smithills estate near Bolton (UMAU 1996) and the Lowther family at Whitehaven (CCC 200a), the research demonstrated that regardless of location, major similarities existed between such
settlements. The international dynamic in Chapter Three was supported by examples such as Steptoe City in North America (Goddard 2002) and Dollys Creek in Australia (Lawrence 2000). In all of these cases, the main motivator for the establishment of communities was economic. This was also true in the study of work camps. Through using International comparisons I demonstrate the existence of differentials (for example wooden construction as a signifier of longevity) is complemented by significant discernible similarities.

Patterns of organisation are examined across permanent communities such as Styal and Smithills, augmented with temporary communities such as Risehill and Millom. I appraise demarcation based on status, power relations reflected in layout and architectural style with differential use of materials. Each of these key issues replicates across both national and international boundaries. The economic dimension is shown as a significant motivational force in these communities – none of the locations identified would have existed without such monetary influence.

There were philanthropists who believed economic benefits existed to employers from providing ‘good’ working conditions, a classic example being Port Sunlight on Merseyside. In Chapter Four I looked at the village especially the various supporting mechanisms Lever Brothers initiated. The company themselves believed “to be able to concentrate on making a success of their jobs people need freedom from worry – this was the principle that Port Sunlight pioneered in giving security against ill-health, short-time and old age” (Lever Brothers, 1953: 58). The provision of such devices are found replicated across many locations (Caffyn 1986; Scott-Baxter 2002; Seed and Wolf 1984; Shackell 1996; Whittle 1852), resulting from a series of dynamics (Collins 1999; Heeley 1986; Johnstone 1981; Marino 2010; Morgan 1988; Popo 1991; Smelser 1959; Stearns 1976; Wyborn 1995),

There is little doubt there were significant differences between providers who had, or had not, an altruistic outlook. The early almshouse movement was very different to latter building companies. Many almshouses were founded by wealthy individuals or organisations to meet local community need (Kunze 1989; Goose and Basten 2009; Leivers 2009; Marochan and Reed 1959), although some provision developed with restricted and closely controlled admission policies, usually through liveried companies or charitable organizations (Builder 1849; Goose 2010; Tomkins 2004). In the case of these foundations, the economic motivation was somewhat less important than a desire to alleviate poverty – having being
established by foundations and endowed with significant financial capital. There was often no profit motive involved – costs only had to cover maintenance and future development.

The emergence of housing companies providing for workers in urban communities operating by raising finances on the market, was clearly an economic model. Although there was often initial capital from philanthropists (Peabody, Guinness and Sutton Trust for example), further investment was required from the market, producing the emergence of 5% philanthropy. This concept demanded a twofold rationale for profit – to meet the financial returns of shareholders, and to provide resources for future development. Investors would not deal with companies providing smaller returns than average. If market finance was to become a significant factor in providing housing for the poor, as many argued it should be, then developments had to be managed within the constraints of the market. As Tarn makes clear the prevailing argument was “it was far better to provide a tolerable tenement which will pay, than a perfect one that will not” (Tarn 1973: 73).

The cost of land in cities was expensive so solutions were needed to reduce financial pressures, enabling the essential 5% return on capital. Some savings could be made by using cheaper materials, but this alone failed to achieve required economies. The only way societies reached targets was by increasing population density, either through reduction of floor size or taller buildings. As Octavia Hill observed in 1884, “certainly it has of late years become impossible to build houses of moderate height for the land is set at a price calculated on the assumption that many stories will be built” (Hill 1884: 750).

The scope for reducing the footprint was further severely limited by contemporary debates in medical literature concerning ventilation and circulation of air acting as a preventative of disease (Cunningham and French 1998; Dorling et al 1991; Kilpatrick 1990). Medical claims were concerned with the volume of air required for a healthy environment, rather than floor space. Hence reducing footprints whilst meeting medical imperatives, meant replacing smaller floor space with higher ceilings, resulting in an increase in the height of buildings. Such overlapping demands had a major impact on architectural design – and it was through this combination of economic and medical pressures that the development of the ‘Barrack Block’ emerges. Plainly decorated repetitive form, high density tall housing became synonymous with large philanthropic housing companies. In Chapter Four we discussed examples that met this format such as Redhill in London, and compared them with those
based on alternative methods of funding, such as the Hastings Allotment Society which provided individual cottages.

Self-help had a political dimension, one that was about challenging existing mechanisms used to address the housing problems of the poor. It could be argued methods employed to ‘control’ people through the use of philanthropic activities was of itself an inherent political act. Certainly there was a belief that the provision of improved housing was a means of ensuring the poor were less likely to challenge their lot. The development of the mill colony was not solely about ensuring a workforce was readily available, it was also about making certain they were retained. This was often accomplished through an element of behaviour modification due to the establishment of ‘acceptable’ conduct. The economic demands of the plant necessitated rules and regulations to ensure effective and profitable management. This then develops further behavioural change that results in direct political acts as some workers accede whilst others resist. Thus motivation can transmute from economic to political through the enforcement of rules and regulations, the layout of the estate, support for religious observance and when deemed necessary the full force of the law. In Chapter Three the legal standing of apprentices is discussed, demonstrating behaviour modification through imposition of a set of standards of conduct prescribed by employers and enforceable by law.

Similar methods also worked well for Octavia Hill, becoming a key constituent of the systems and customs established by her organisation (Anderson and Darling 2007). When tenants failed to conform to set standards it resulted in punitive action including eviction. These norms were policed through the small army of middle-class women whose role was not solely to collect rent, but to advise, support and ultimately inform on tenants (Bell 1942). Support and assistance would be provided by visitors to ensure occupants internalised and embraced standards expected in properties managed by Hill. Failure to adjust and change could mean eviction. This then became a political act for all involved. For the tenant conformity to the established order, lending itself to maintenance of the status quo, became essential in retaining their home. For the philanthropist the adoption of behaviour that was deemed ‘acceptable’ meant ensuring the internalisation of middle class values by working people. For the state, this meant acquiescence to behaviour that would not challenge the established order.
There is also the political dynamic of the role played by women in Victorian and Edwardian Society, and throughout this research I demonstrate that women were active across a range of philanthropic activity. Not just Octavia Hill (Darley 1990; Malpass 1984) with her personal campaigns (Hill 1871, 1883, 1884) and activities beyond UK housing (Robinson 1998; Walker 2009). There were also organisations women were heavily involved with such as the Women’s University Settlement (Betty 1996) or their influence on the built environment (Darling and Whitworth 2007). Hollis provides us information about the role of women through analysing documentation (Hollis 1979) whilst the role of women in service is discussed in Chapter Five, including the contemporary views of Butler (Butler 1916).

The prime social intention of the orphanages examined in Chapter Five, ensured standards of behaviour by individuals that were morally and socially acceptable within contemporary society. Behaviour modification though architecture was a key process supporting such conformity, so ensuring the internalisation of middle class values and traditions identified by George Jackson with his speech reported in Chapter Five. They would furnish productive members of society, individuals who would not challenge the established order but accept their role, whilst striving for advancement within socially imposed boundaries. Victorian and Edwardian fear of the child not in an established family or regulated institutional setting provided the rationale.

A further example of the moral impulse was the extensive (although often only alluded to) concerns about incest detailed in Chapters Three and Four (Kuper 2002; Morris 2009; Sigel 2005; Wohl 1978). There are numerous entries in tracts, reports and articles that refer to the need for separate rooms for siblings. This ‘problem’ was not solely reserved to the developing urban sprawl of the city. As I made clear in Chapter Three there were serious attempts by the Ashworth family and others to meet the challenge, usually with little success. The Victorian dilemma about the state through regulation invading the home and especially the bedroom, is identified in Chapter Three, being discussed further in Chapter Four.

Considerable debate took place between reformers about the significance, or otherwise, of building aesthetics. Most architects and developers believed the provision of a functional building was fiscally more important than its appearance. Octavia Hill was not satisfied with such purely cost based arguments. Although she considered the market should provide
investment for new or adaptive housing, passionately arguing construction costs should be kept to a minimum, she also fervently believed in ensuring living conditions were pleasant. This conviction was partly fuelled by her opinion that a key function of housing was to modify aberrant behaviour. If the ultimate aim was to change the actions and habits of people, the environment of the new houses had to be different from the old, and this was equally as important as weather proofing. If a house was pleasant then the company could exert pressure on tenants to conform to established standards, ultimately reserving the right to terminate contracts for non-compliance. Examples are to be found in Chapter Four where Red Cross (Hill 1884) and Paradise Place (Hill 1884) are detailed, where I also examine and dispute the specific claims by Gouldie about the significance of phases of construction (Gouldie 1974).

The impact of shared medical belief is to be found throughout this research, from the discussion in Chapter Two on institutions, to the exploration of orphanage dormitories in Chapter Five. In the same chapter the laundry at Cheadle Hulme is discussed, whilst Chapter Four reveals the impact commonly believed medical imperatives had on housing developments, and in particular their influence on the barrack block. Taller rooms, larger windows admitting more sunlight and open spaces for children to play were important developments, spurred on by communally adopted medical influences.

Reports by Medical Officers’ of Health provided support to George Goodwin and his campaigns in The Builder (Chapter Four). This then generated further belief in and support for the medical imperatives. Eventually a ‘critical mass’ of support coalesced behind the new initiatives, until they ceased to be matters of debate and became established fact that influenced subsequent design standards. A detailed example of such a process is described in Chapter Four with the designs of the Cottage Improvement Society.

In any act of philanthropic work there are many influential key features for consideration, as well as a multiplicity of localised and minor issues. As has already been noted this interplay is not static, but dynamic. At any time one or more multiple concerns may be dominant. Some factors only impact for a short time whilst others remain constant. For this reason a ‘snapshot’ of either personal or communal motivation does little to explain the justification behind individual acts of philanthropy. It is the unravelling of this complex multiplicity of factors, over a linear development of time, which is required to provide a full understanding.
of the rationale behind the smallest act. Thus we often have a very real imperative allied to personal needs and gain, especially spiritual and social.

**How have such issues influenced changes in social provision?**

Crude attempts at social engineering led to a common criticism of much of the philanthropic movement. If people were not prepared to internalise the middle class values, ethics and ideals of the philanthropists, then they were often marginalised or debarred. The use of housing as a blunt approach to behaviour modification was a key factor in the political dimension discussed in Chapter Four. Those who could not accept this different scale of values were not accepted as tenants by most providers. But they had to have homes of sorts. As Gauldie makes clear:

> so those who were resistant to the effects of middle class influence were those who continued to cause overcrowding by their insistence in remaining in the centre of their own communities, in touch with their own culture, unpatronised and unhelped (Gauldie 1974: 217).

There were those who found it socially desirable to remain outside the mainstream. For them it was a strategic decision, and those who made this choice would be debarring themselves from access to the vast majority of available help.

Incessant campaigning on diverse fronts, by assorted individuals, was to impact on housing provision across the Twentieth Century. The activities of George Goodwin, Octavia Hill and others raised the public consciousness of poor housing. The emergence of the first Local Authority Housing, with the example of the Salford Model Lodging House (The Builder 1894; Scott 2001) detailed in Chapter Four, coincided with a drop in confidence in the ability of both private and philanthropic sectors to adequately provide for national needs. This demand for housing and the failure of contemporary solutions ensured a massive expansion in the role the state played in provision, especially after the Great War.

Many new housing estates were based, at least in part, on earlier philanthropic beliefs, replicating the experiments of philanthropists. In an echo of the earlier barrack style blocks uniformity became the fashion, with standard designs and colours schemes rigorously enforced. Many estates were ‘policing’ as effectively by council rent officers as they had earlier been by Octavia Hill’s army of middle class volunteers. Failure to conform to set standards could just as easily lead to eviction. Medical and aesthetic beliefs influenced
architectural design standards, especially after the Great War, where hitherto rarely provided facilities such as individual gardens and communal open spaces became regular features. The provision of state housing for employees was to continue through to the 1980’s where the nation continued to provide for its own employees – especially the military, police and fire services.

It might be fair to argue that philanthropists confronted small localised housing issues such as those at Hastings examined in Chapter Four. It is certainly the case that whilst individuals benefitted from their actions, the numerical impact on the nation’s housing stock was minimal. The real significance was the challenge to beliefs that nothing effective could be done about housing problems. Reformers not only challenged this belief, but demonstrated the quality of provision that could be made. They proved that for a small economic outlay higher quality housing could be provided, through the adoption of good architectural design. This movement confronted traditional means of thinking, assisting George Goodwin and other reformers to reposition housing up the political agenda. The real impact of the philanthropists was to be found in the emergence of the post Great War Housing Estates, the later adoption of Parker-Morris design standards and the immense benefits these developments were to bring to millions of individuals across this country.

6.3 Prochaska re-evaluated

Prochaska argues “at the level of human contact, in often tragic circumstances, the idea that philanthropy can be reduced to a form of middle-class social control, unresponsive to the genuine grievances of the poor, is not only inadequate but insensitive” (Prochaska 1988: 52). In the context of daily contact between many reformers and clients this is an admirable statement, seeking to redress previously outlandish claims. Certainly there were many selfless individuals who had genuine and deep sympathy for the poor they worked with. But this research has demonstrated that there were often more complex factors in play than individual relationships or personal belief. It is possible to applaud the actions of individuals, whilst maintaining a critical understanding of the larger economic and social environment they operated in. Many individuals were active in alleviating the impact of poverty (Bradley 2006; Hurren 2007; Marino 2007), but such accomplishments were often localised (Englander 1985; Hogarth 2007; Mulhern 2003; Snape 2004) and rarely had significant impact over the long term. There was as much effort, if not more in some cases, expended
on behaviour modification as there was on feeding and clothing the poor. The priorities were
sometimes variable and confused, reflecting this diversity of both personal and collective
belief.

Further this research has demonstrated that one of the key aims for many involved in
philanthropic activity was not only to engage with challenging the impact of poverty, but in
many locations to engage in behaviour modification to make ‘better’ and ‘more worthy’
individuals (Nassaney and Abel 2000; Nicoletta 2003; Taska 2005). To some extent this
undermines Prochaska’s beliefs that claims concerning social control being simplistic are
themselves open to question. It is clear from the work of Samuel Greg (Chapter Three),
Octavia Hill (Chapter Four) and the founders of the Mettray orphanage (Chapter Five), that
they, along with many others, were engaged in conduct variation. They developed clear and
discrete activities aimed at altering the social and moral behaviour of individuals. That these
actions were underlying concepts, steering the everyday patterns of activity, lends weight to
the argument that there was a coercive endeavour to change people. In Chapter One I
demonstrated how Prochaska himself claimed philanthropic activity was a means of
stabilising society, the influence being often underrated. Such stabilisation was achieved
through behaviour modification, be it called social control or not. In this sense this research
very clearly develops Prochaska’s claims detailed in the 1980’s.

Certainly there is a great deal of original work by Prochaska that is still relevant today. As
stated in Chapter One his work is an historical analysis, and one of the key aims of this study
was to use the archaeological record as a means of both authenticating the current validity
of his early work whilst enhancing and developing it further. This study has enabled us to
extend the findings of Prochaska, through the utilisation of archaeological techniques not
available to the historian. The examination of navvy camps in Chapter Three has added to
the existing historical record (Bevan 2006; Burton 1972; Coleman 1968; Green 2000; Morris
1994, Morris 1996). Utilising the only excavation of a navvy camp in the United Kingdom
(WA 2008) with archaeological investigations from international settings (Lawrence 2000;
Taska 2005; Van Bueren et al 1999, Van Bueren 2002) has enabled a more dynamic
understanding of these marginalised communities to emerge.

The emergence of large towns and cities has long been an area of interest to historians,
where extensive research exists to expand the findings of Prochaska (Checkland 1980;
Gaskell 1980; Jackson 1981; Pruner 1969; Shapeley 2000). Much historical research provides background for Prochaska to explore. Understanding is further enhanced through use of archaeological analysis, enabling more detailed insight to emerge. Thus I use the Salford Model Lodging House (Builder 1894; Morgan 1996), through a building analysis, to develop understanding of the original role Local Authorities played in the provision of housing within the early modern town and city.

These two examples demonstrate how this archaeological study adds to and complements the historical analysis promoted by Prochaska. The use of a multi-disciplinary approach, heavily rooted in archaeological techniques and material culture studies, has enabled us to both validate, and extend, the original research of Frank Procahska.

6.4 Implications for further research

During the course of this work several areas have occurred that could benefit from further research. Some directly relate to charitable and philanthropic movements, others impinge tangentially on the aims of this research, but remain worthy of further exploration. They are beyond the immediate scope of this study, but could provide useful complementary evidence to the student of philanthropy.

In Chapter Three the exploration of navvies is based upon the archaeological excavation at Risehill, allied to historical evidence. It has raised significant issues concerning the public perception of this marginalised but important group. The claims made make this an area ripe for further exploration. In particular further excavations are required to enlarge upon the assertions in this paper, that the traditional views of the navvies are stereotypes formed from later judgemental attitudes. Many potential sites exist around the country, with no investigations having taken place into canal and railway sites other than those cited in this research. Additionally little work has been taken into the major engineering works undertaken by civic authorities, such as dams and bridges. From the 1950s and 1960s there has been no systematic appraisal of the motorway network, or large construction projects such as power stations. All these constructions required large numbers of modern day navvies, often living on site. The paucity of the archaeological record means such a project has numerous possibilities, both typological and geographical. The historical record, especially that available through individual companies, would complement these further
excavations, to reinforce and develop the revised view of this most critical group from the past.

I have dealt in some detail with the provision of help for the young, especially through orphanages. A complicating factor is the differential use of the term ‘young’ by organisations, and it might be an appropriate further area of research to investigate the impact this has had on the historical record. The term is regularly used by many organisations, but the ages during which an individual is classified as a young person varies significantly, as demonstrated clearly in Chapter Five. This can lead to confusion and a clarification around the issue would seriously assist both future archaeological and historical research.

The differential provision for orphans has led to many claims about the efficacy of such institutions as Mettray. The claims by Gutman (2004) about the impact cottage homes had are an indicator of further potential areas of research. In this chapter I ally the claims of Gutman with the evidence of Ellis Guest and James Stanhope-Brown. This similarly challenges many of the established claims that the cottage home style was a significant improvement on the dormitory style of provision. A detailed study of this could have significant implications not only for studies of the past, but for the future organisation of institutions.

Finally extensive research has already been completed on the role, function, style and experiences of living in almshouses. There is a large literature, referred to in Chapter Four of this study. One issue I raise that is worthy of further consideration is the phasing out of uniforms. Was this a reflection of a growth of workhouse provision and its insistence on uniforms, so a stigma became attached to uniforms from philanthropic institutions? Was the abandonment to emphasise differential status between almshouse and workhouse? What timescale existed for this change, and how does it relate to workhouse development? When was the phasing out of crested tableware and replacement of finely tooled cutlery with enamel handled materials? What implications did these changes in material culture hold for inmates, unions and overseers? How did the changing social outlook at this time influence material culture, and what was the manner in which the powerful responded to such changing circumstances?
6.5 Conclusion

This work started with a major case study of young people in Styal, the apprentices at the community established by Samuel Greg. It concluded with the study of another group of young people in the same village, the orphans in the Cottage Homes. Certainly for some of the time both these communities would have coexisted in the small Cheshire Village, within a short distance of each other.

The role played by people we have met in this study – be they apprentices, navvies or orphans; living in camps, alms houses or orphanages; has often been one over which they have had little choice. In each of these situations, philanthropy has not only acted to provide an improved existence or the means of survival, but has imposed behavioural norms in return. External agencies – mill owner, liveried company or Board of Guardians have operated rules and conventions that those in receipt of provision have had to adhere to. Failure to adopt the norms demanded has led to eviction such as the case of Margaret Moore in Preston (Chapter Four), or punitive fines such as those on James Worrall (Chapter Three). What has been apparent throughout this study has been the various means which authority used to influence behaviour.

This manipulation has not, however, always been so crude. We have discovered the use of architecture and style in Cheadle Hulme to influence young children. There the religious symbolism and ornate stained glass windows were used as a means to aid the internalisation of ‘desirable’ forms of behaviour. The beliefs of Octavia Hill in providing light and colour for her tenants, claiming everyone has a right to aesthetically pleasing environments, led to the creation of gardens in some of the meanest and most begrimed parts of London. But this came at a price – that of conformity. Similarly the offer of a place in an alms house – be it by liveried company or paternalistic owner, demanded compliance with established rules.

Frank Procahsaka made many claims for philanthropy, and large numbers of them have been proven by this research to be just as relevant today as when first made. But one claim, above all, is clearly demonstrated across the case studies. In Chapter One I quote Prochaska stating “it remains a powerful, though little appreciated, force for social stability” (Prochaska 1988: 8). This is a clear indication of the role philanthropy played providing social constancy across space and time. It was achieved through coercion and behaviour modification, both
continuously illustrated throughout this paper. Provision was made, but only with the adoption of ‘acceptable’ standards. When alternatives were provided that did not require acceptance of established norms, it was at the most meagre level, to ensure body and soul remained together. Anything beyond very basic provision demanded conformity to standards imposed by the benefactor. This in consequence provided a stable society with dependency reinforced through compliance. Whilst such actions did not create an underclass, it did little to tackle its growth and development. Philanthropists generally only gave to those who would conform.

Thus help came at a price. Those unwilling to change were refused support or help. Often need was not the overriding rationale for provision, but behaviour. This verifies the position of Prochaska that ‘social stability’ is fundamental, and should be seen as one of the primary rationales in the evolution of philanthropic organisation and giving. Prochaska is right, but his greatest argument is often the most missed. It is about power. Through such mechanisms the state managed the poor and relegated the deviant to the extremes of society, thereby providing stability and the opportunity for the state to prosper. The title of this study truly reflects the perspectives of many involved in philanthropic work at this time. Throughout this research it has been clear that the soul was equally as important as the body, and that it should be regarded as central to the works of the many philanthropists encountered.

This research has endeavoured to synthesise the existing evidence in a manner hitherto not undertaken. It seeks to discover relationships between various elements of philanthropic housing, placing findings within a scholarly environment to stimulate further research. The findings are illustrated through diverse case studies that include regional, national and international dynamics. A detailed study of the works of Frank Procashka has enabled a review of his ideas and their modern day relevance. Finally the role of power and behaviour modification has proven to be a dynamic force operating across all case studies.
Gazateer of sites in text
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Gates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Los Angeles Work Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldridge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Built by Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Location of excavation by South Trafford Archaeological Group of working people’s housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancoats</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District of Manchester – location of Jersey Street Buildings, conversion of old mill into workers’ housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Meadow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District of Manchester – location of Angel Street Excavation and Charter Street Working Girls’ Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardwick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage and Hospital</td>
<td>Nicholls Hospital in Manchester, provided school and orphanage for Manchester children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley Fields</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Leicestershire Railway Construction camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Lancashire manufacturing Town, especially shipbuilding. Use of Barrow Island to develop worker’s colony for shipbuilding company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Bridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Site of workers’ housing from Dean Mills in Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Worker’s housing estate built by Vickers Engineering, Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basford Workhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Workhouse</td>
<td>Description paraphrased by Engels of Parliamentary report into workhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batty Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>One of several navvy camps in Yorkshire as part of Settle/Carlisle railway construction –Ribblehead Tunnel and Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwind</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Temporary work Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchinlee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Reservoir construction camp, Derwent Valley dams, Derbyshire – also known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkinhead</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Development by Birkenhead Dock Company of Housing for its workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city in Midlands. Location of Joseph Mason’s orphanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Gates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Major investigation into USA camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batty Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Settle/Carlisle railway workcamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwind</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Temporary workcamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchinlee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Major Dam Construction Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkinhead</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Site of worker’s Housing built by Birkinhead Dock Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Lancashire town and manufacturing centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District of Manchester. Location of Manchester Juvenile Reformatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Lancashire cotton town and manufacturing centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Mills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Manufacturing Plant</td>
<td>Extensive and prolonged excavation of plant and associated community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourneville</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Model Village</td>
<td>Model village in Birmingham built by Cadbury family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridlington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage and Convalescent Home</td>
<td>Located of Yorkshire Forester’s Orphanage and Convalescent Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major port and city. Site of Alms house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District of London. Location of the British Seaman’s Orphan Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Mill in Blackburn, Lancashire, where workers’ housing developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnbanks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Workers village built during construction of Haweswater Reservoir, Lake District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town in Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butt Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Work Camp in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Terminus of Settle/Carlisle railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnforth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>New district called ‚Dudley‘ built as workers‘ housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheadle Hulme</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage and School</td>
<td>Manchester Warehousemen and Clerk’s Orphanage and School final building site. Still in use as school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetwode Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Leicestershire Railway Construction camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coketown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Mythical industrial town in Dicken’s ‘Hard Times’, based on Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosby Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Leicestershire Railway Construction camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Manufacturing Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County in North of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Manufacturing town in Midlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollys Creek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Workcamp</td>
<td>Temporary mining Camp, Moorabolool, Victoria, Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eire</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>King’s Hospital, Saint Michan’s, Saint Mary’s, Mercer’s Hospital, Saint Catherine’s and Fortick’s Charity Almshouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edensor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village whose location was moved by Sixth Duke of Devonshire to ensure clear view for new estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endcliffe Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Manor House</td>
<td>Home of Sir John Browne, Sheffield Steel magnate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Home of the Krupps family industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County in South of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveleigh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Workshop where workers’ utilised company land for communal use such as sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishwick’s Yard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Located in Preston, UK. Described in 1861 edition of The Builder as containing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flecknoe Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>Leicestershire Railway Construction camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flookborough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Housing built during Great War for aircraft factory workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frome</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town in Somerset, seeing great expansion prior to industrialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District of Bury, Lancashire. Location of some of the worst housing in District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Development by Glasgow Worker's Development Company and Glasgow University Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantsville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Nevada mining town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Parish Workhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Workhouse</td>
<td>Residence of Joseph Sefton prior to being apprenticed to Samuel Greg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Crossley Brothers Workhouse. Crossley Brothers Orphanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper's Ferry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Work Camp</td>
<td>Temporary Work Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Cottage Improvement Society base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healey Dell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Home of Samuel Spencer and Thomas Hartley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme House Fell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Juvenile Reformatory</td>
<td>Location of Lancashire Juvenile Reformatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Orphanage in Ipswich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and port in Yorkshire, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkerman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>One of several navvy camps in Yorkshire built as part of Settle/Carlisle railway construction – Ribblehead Tunnel and Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Hope House Orphanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>One of several navvy camps in Yorkshire as part of Settle/Carlisle railway construction – Ribblehead Tunnel and Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lynn</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town in East Anglia. Site of Alms houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>County Town of Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and manufacturing centre in Yorkshire. Large concentration of poor housing and cellar dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and port in North West. Labourer's Dwelling competition. Location of Saint Martin's Cottages. Large concentration of poor housing and cellar dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Street in Ancoats, Manchester. Site of excavation by UMAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Moor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Lancashire Mill Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bott Mills – Massachusetts, continuing archaeological investigation of workers’ housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Manufacturing Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town built for workers by Nevada Consolidated Copper Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>2,3,4,5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and manufacturing centre in North West. Large concentration of poor housing and cellar dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mettray</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Model orphanage influencing cottage home style in UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village developed to house workers at Iron Ore mines/factories, Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and manufacturing centre in North East England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lanark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Lanarkshire workplace famous for its manager – Robert Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lebanon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Shaker community in Maine, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city in USA. Site of Alms houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton-le-Willows</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Juvenile Reformatory</td>
<td>Location of Liverpool Juvenile Reformatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norcliffe Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Second generation home of the Greg family at Styal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city and manufacturing centre in Midlands. Large concentration of poor housing and cellar dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Cottages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Workers’ housing constructed by Samuel Greg at Styal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Congregate Orphanage in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Court</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Court identified in Manchester by Medical Officer of Health in annual report and quoted in House of Commons debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Location of Indian School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Sunlight</td>
<td>3,4,6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Workers community built by Lever Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Major manufacturing town in Lancashire. Large concentration of poor housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudsey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Location of Joseph Salter’s Almshouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Bank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Estate of the Greg family in Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynard Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Outreach mission located in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Octavia Hill scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Juvenile Reformatory</td>
<td>Location of model Juvenile Reformatory in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risehill</td>
<td>2,3,6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Tunnel</td>
<td>Tunnel in Yorkshire investigated by ‘Time Team’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Caledonian Orphanage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Originally located in London, later moved to Bushey in Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Labourer’s Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Helens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>developed by local land allotment and provident society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Model Lodging Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltaire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Mill community built by Sir Titus Salt in Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>One of several navvy camps in Yorkshire as part of Settle/Carlisle railway construction – Ribblehead Tunnel and Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>North Yorkshire – terminus of Settle/Carlisle railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Major city in Yorkshire. Large concentration of poor housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Model community built by Crittall Engineering in Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithills Estate</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Housing Estate in Bolton, Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe City</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Workers community developed in response to company controls established at McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Cheshire town, extensive cotton and hat manufacturing trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styal</td>
<td>2,3,5,6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village where Samuel Greg sited his cotton mill and Chorlton Board of Guardians established cottage homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styal Cottage Homes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Cottage Home orphanage for the Chorlton Board of Guardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>London District</td>
<td>Location of Master Printer’s Almshouse. Location of Fishmonger’s and Poulterer’s Almshouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Cotton community near Bury, Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Thomas Ashworth’s model housing village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twickenham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>Location of Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Location of Marsland’s Almshouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Site of Alms house. Colliers housing constructed by Lowther family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Manufacturing Centre in Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshaw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Location of Eleanor Hirst’s Almshouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Green</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Alms house</td>
<td>Location of Printer’s Almshouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Navvy Camp</td>
<td>For construction of Manchester/Sheffield railway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 1

**Benevolent gifts to Ancoats Dispensary/Hospital, Manchester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gift £</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>James Jardine</td>
<td>Endowed Jardine Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>n/k</td>
<td>James Oliver’s family</td>
<td>Outpatients Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Rothwell family</td>
<td>Endowed Rothwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>n/k</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs J Oliver in memory of their son killed in Great War</td>
<td>Enlarged out patients department, ECG rooms and Pathology Laboratory established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Lord Cawley in memory of three sons killed in Great war</td>
<td>Endowed Cawley Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Public Appeal</td>
<td>Extra 100 beds, extra operating theatre, separate casualty block and enlarged x ray and pathology laboratory, permanent massage department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Medical Association (1929)
Population of Millom Parish 1841-1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>2115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hughes 2006
### Finds per Trench at Risehill Excavation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pipes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 4

**Number of Irish Employed on selected Railway Constructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>% Irish Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>England/South East</td>
<td>South Eastern – Tunbridge Wells – Hastings Line</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>England/Midlands</td>
<td>Oswestry and Newton</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>England/Wales</td>
<td>Shrewsbury/Welshpool (part)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Vale of Neath</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>England/North</td>
<td>Border Counties</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Inverness and Rosshire</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Brooke 1983
### Comparison of Rules across three establishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules about</th>
<th>Batty Green</th>
<th>Birchinlee</th>
<th>Styal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over who lived there</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of huts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy of power in hut</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominent displaying of rules</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible dismissal for breaking rules</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in premises</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of premises</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Life expectancy across England, 1842**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>GENTRY</th>
<th>TRADESMEN</th>
<th>LABOURERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutlandshire</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House of Commons 1842, Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Classes
## Costs/Loss on Philanthropic Housing Sites, London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cost £</th>
<th>Sold to Peabody Trustees for £</th>
<th>Loss £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordbury</td>
<td>83,554</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>75,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Wild Street</td>
<td>119,125</td>
<td>15,575</td>
<td>103,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear Tree Court</td>
<td>19,225</td>
<td>5,986</td>
<td>13,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitecross Street</td>
<td>371,245</td>
<td>34,272</td>
<td>336,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Pye Street</td>
<td>74,313</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>56,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitechapel and Limehouse</td>
<td>66,604</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>56,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>734,066</td>
<td>91,305</td>
<td>642,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cowan Tracts 1880
### Block Dwellings in London and their Inhabitants 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Owner</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Better Paid</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic or semi philanthropic</td>
<td>72,441</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Trading Companies and private owners with at least four blocks</td>
<td>69,598</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owners or unknown landlords</td>
<td>45,131</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers housing their workpeople</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>189,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Booth 1891: 245
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Birchinlee Village Rules

DERWENT VALLEY WATER BOARD.

BIRCHINLEE VILLAGE.

RULES AND REGULATIONS
RELATIVE TO
WORKMEN'S HUTS

RULE 1.—No Lodger to be admitted to a hut without producing a ticket
issued by the Don't House-keeper or a Doctor's Certificate.

RULE 2.—The licence to every hut shall be designed to accommodate 8
lodgers and must not be over ridden by 4 in any case. Two lodgers may be
put up to the bed of each hut. The hut must be provided with a separate bed.

RULE 3.—Each new occupant of a bed shall be provided with clean sheets,
pillows and bed-liner, which shall be changed once a fortnight, or cleaner of
the Village Superintendant at his discretion.

RULE 4.—The hut shall be swept out and dusted daily, and regularly
scrubbed with hot water and not only once a week, or cleaner of the
Village Superintendant at his discretion.

RULE 5.—No beer, spirits, or other intoxicants shall be permitted in the
hut beyond the quantity which the hut-keeper and his wife lodger is permis-
sed to possess for daily consumption.

RULE 6.—All lamps provided in the huts to be safety lamps of
standard gauging made with metal reflectors. Any lamps not provided will be
charged to the expense of the hut master. In the case of gaslight lamps a neat
lamp box must be kept on the usual shelf, and no agates shall be used in the
place of the lamps provided in each hut. Petroleum of the
best quality only shall be used.

RULE 7.—All refuse ashes &c., must be emptied into the bins provided
for the purpose which must be carried to the edge of the road for collection on
work days as the Inspector may appoint. Each dweller will be supplied with
a number of the bins to which it belongs and the hut-keeper will be responsible
for the same.

RULE 8.—The second understand that the sanitary arrangements connected
with the huts shall be kept in a perfect state of cleanliness and that he will permit
no one to use the same. The.hut master and his wife shall be inspected at all
reasonable times by the Inspector, and any irregularities which shall be
found shall be reported to the Board with a view of seeing that the rules and
regulations of the Board are observed. No changes of the Board in the state of
sanitudes and repairs.

RULE 9.—Any hut-keeper who shall refuse to give up his hut from his bed for
more than six months without obtaining permission from the Village Superintendant
who shall have the power to remove any person in his absence from the hut to
maintain the hut from being used by another person. Any hut-keeper who is discharged
or leaves the hut, shall be liable to pay the rent for the period of his
occupation to the Board, and a second offence after warning will be followed by summary
summary.
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As well might the army of Lilliput lift up Gulliver, as all these philanthropic schemes succeed in getting the crushed giant of poverty on its feet.

(Fraser’s Magazine 1866:153)
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