

Voluntary Action History Society

- Recent Papers
- Call for new papers



Voluntary Action History Society

Institute for
Volunteering Research

Facts & figures on
volunteering in the UK

Research summaries

Voluntary Action
journal

News from the
Institute

Voluntary but not Amateur: Philanthropic Responses to Poverty 1847-1854

This paper aims to discuss philanthropic responses to poverty in relation to the work of the House of Charity for Distressed Persons in London 1847-1854.

The House of Charity was founded in 1846 by members of the Oxford Movement – including Gladstone and fellow members of a Tractarian lay brotherhood known as the Engagement – and opened its doors on 11 January 1847. It was situated in Soho, initially in Rose Street and after 1860 in Greek Street, and indeed is still to be found there today, as the House of St Barnabas in Soho.

Before examining the work of the House of Charity in detail, I propose to establish a framework for that examination by discussing the criticisms levelled at Victorian philanthropy. It had a bad press in the twentieth century and was heavily criticised in the latter half of the nineteenth. This is particularly true of philanthropic responses to poverty. We are all familiar with the phrase 'cold as charity' and the image of wretchedly poor people being hauled before panels of the well-to-do, well fed and coldly judgmental. From a twenty-first century perspective, philanthropy is seen as essentially amateur, disorganised, poorly co-ordinated and self-serving; benefiting the donor rather than the recipient.

The charges laid against Victorian philanthropy focus on: the effects of relying on volunteers; the inability to plan long term because of the financial uncertainty caused by dependence on donations; the lack of co-ordination between different institutions; the absence of casework; the indiscriminate nature of much charitable giving; the philanthropist's ignorance of the circumstances of those they sought to help; and the demoralising effects it had on the poor, encouraging them to become dependent on handouts rather than developing the virtues of thrift, self help, industry and providence, held in such high esteem by so many Victorians. I intend to focus on the criticisms of the amateur and disorganised nature of Victorian philanthropy, in particular the absence of casework and the ignorance of the philanthropists.

The accuracy of these criticisms as applied to the House of Charity will be assessed in the light of the evidence contained in its prospectuses, case books and committee minutes. I hope to demonstrate that elements of professionalisation, especially in terms of casework, can be detected in the work of the House of Charity as early as 1847, long before the advent in 1869 of the Charity Organisation Society, which is generally credited with pioneering this

approach.

Much of my research has focused on the families who were admitted to the House of Charity. The family, defined as one or both parents and dependent children, was an important client group for the House of Charity. Between January 1847 and February 1851 it is known that 487 cases were admitted. Of these, 103 were families.¹ The families ranged in size from a mother and one child to both parents and eight children. The family is, therefore, a statistically significant group. However, the importance of the family to the House of Charity goes far beyond mere numbers. The family was a very potent image for members of the House of Charity, as the House aimed 'to offer to those who are sunk in the depths of temporal, and frequently spiritual, wretchedness the example of the discipline of a Christian family'.²

There seems to have been an unspoken assumption at this early stage in the House's history that the best solution to the poverty of poor families was to keep the family unit together. This was graphically demonstrated by the fact that families admitted to the House were kept together, whereas in the workhouses husbands were split from wives and parents from children. The House was proud of this, and an appeal for funds in 1854 made specific mention of its desire 'to provide accommodation for the reception of a larger number of whole families for whom in the present House only two rooms can be allotted'.³

Having set the scene, we should now look at the aims and objectives that lay behind the foundation of the House of Charity and at how those founding principles were put into practice, with a view to assessing whether the accusations made against Victorian philanthropists are justified.

The House of Charity had two principal objects: 'to afford temporary relief to deserving persons specially recommended or selected'⁴ and 'to enable persons whose time is much occupied by professions or other active duties, as well as those who have leisure, to co-operate in works of charity under fixed regulation'.⁵ Under the heading 'Selection of Cases' in the Original Laws of the institution, it states that 'Those persons only will be admitted for relief who bring with them satisfactory recommendations or are ascertained to be fit objects on careful inquiry by the Council or Officers of the Institution.'⁶ Recommendations would be accepted only from those who had the means to ascertain the true merits of a case, such as parochial clergy, district visitors, medical men and the officers of institutions used to discriminating between common vagrants and the deserving poor.

From an Explanatory Statement it is clear that much discussion had preceded the framing of the Original Laws. This statement reveals that 'great difficulty had been found in attempting to define, prior to actual experience, the class of cases which it may be prudent to deal with in the proposed House.'⁷ At first the House had proposed to take in the 'casual poor' in urgent need of a night's lodging and food, as well as recommended cases for a longer period of time. However, on the advice of the Mendicity Society and the Charity for the Houseless Poor, 'the wisdom of postponing this part of the proposed operation became quite evident'⁸ and the House was persuaded to leave the wandering poor to the public authorities, the Mendicity Society and the Charity for Affording Night Shelter. It confined itself to providing relief to the deserving poor, on the grounds that:

it requires little consideration to perceive the great care requisite to avoid the evil of encouraging indiscriminate applications; as on full consideration of the working of existing charitable societies and of the Poor Law, it has been decided not to attempt to deal with what are commonly called the 'casual poor'.⁹

The House was still anxious, however:

not to define too minutely at the outset the class of cases to be relieved, in order that no poor persons really in want of food and lodging who, by temporary aid in the House, might be enabled to provide for themselves elsewhere, may be shut out by an arbitrary rule.¹⁰

Its main aim was 'to rescue those who are received from dropping down into hopeless destitution or pauperism or from betaking themselves to systematic vagrancy.'¹¹

The House identified five classes of cases to be admitted: in-patients discharged from hospitals; out-patients unable to work and in need of food, quiet and rest and unable to obtain them without assistance; persons dependent on those who by accident or sudden disease have been taken into hospital; persons suddenly and by no fault of their own thrown out of work, as in the case of a fire or the bankruptcy or death of an employer; persons who come to London in search of friends or work and are unable to find either; and persons especially females whose health requires a short respite from laborious work though they cannot afford the loss of wages which it would involve. It also proposed to take cases recommended by the Mendicity Society and other institutions as being in need of continuous relief and individual attention for a period of time.

Nonetheless, the House was still concerned 'to leave the selection of cases open as long as possible, that the limits of the Charity might not be prematurely defined, and that the fullest scope might be afforded for the Council to benefit by the lessons of experience.'¹² Indeed, shortly after the House opened, two new classes of person were added to those eligible for admission: 'persons having no friends in London and waiting either for the means or the opportunity to emigrate'¹³ and 'persons for whom an asylum is desired, in which they can be received on probation, before they receive further assistance towards recovering a position which they have lost by misconduct'.¹⁴

The founding members of the House were firmly committed to the principle of personal service and the belief that charity was not simply a matter of giving alms to the poor. Under the heading 'Serving Members' in the Original Laws, they assert that:

it is a fundamental principle of the institution that its ordinary working shall depend on the personal services of such of its members as are ready to take part in its active duties and that those only who enter into an engagement to be responsible for their share of such duties shall be eligible to be members of the administrative body.¹⁵

It was not necessary to make a financial contribution in order to become an Associate Member. The House wanted to be 'open to all who are ready to promote the pious and charitable designs of the institution by their personal services as well as by alms of however small an amount'.¹⁶ Nonetheless, it was far too canny to turn away potential sources of funds, and contributions were welcome from everyone, not just those who wanted to become Associate

Members.

There were three categories of Associate Member: those prepared to offer personal service, corresponding members and contributors. All members were asked to pray for the Association and for blessings on those who entered the House of Charity. Individuals seeking election as an Associate Member were asked to complete and sign a pro-forma letter indicating which category of Associate Member they wished to be, whether they would send an annual subscription, make a donation or collect contributions and what the amount thereof would be. As the name implies, contributing members were responsible for obtaining funds. Corresponding members were important in providing links with other institutions – especially if they already had connections with other charities in London or the country – in obtaining information about specific cases and in helping to provide for people when their time came to leave the House. Personal Service required the member to give time and attention to inmates in a variety of ways ‘such as examining into applications, admitting and discharging cases, attending in the House at meals and in the evening, reading to the sick’.¹⁷

The founders of the House of Charity were therefore firmly committed to the principle of personal service, based on the belief that ‘considerate treatment and personal sympathy’¹⁸ were even more important than the temporary provision of food and lodgings if those in distress were to be encouraged to provide for themselves and rescued from ‘impending and irretrievable pauperism’.¹⁹ As a result, the relief offered by the House consisted of ‘food and lodging, and other needful temporal assistance accompanied with spiritual counsel and comfort, and such offices of personal kindness, advice and instruction as each individual may require’.²⁰ Although the House was open to all denominations, it was firmly rooted in ‘the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England’,²¹ and inmates were required to attend morning and evening services daily. A bell was rung at 7.15 am and 9.45 pm to signal a quarter-hour silence for private prayer. Indeed, underlying all the activities of the House of Charity was the desire ‘to bring the persons so relieved . . . under the influence of Christian ordinances’.²² There was, however, a pragmatic recognition of the fact that:

*it is almost impossible to rouse them [the destitute] to a sense of their spiritual responsibilities, while their temporal condition is so degraded and wretched; or to improve their condition without much personal attention, patience and discrimination.*²³

The picture which thus far emerges of the House of Charity at the beginning of its long history is far removed from the stereotype depicted by those critical of Victorian philanthropy. The House did not want to duplicate the work of the Poor Law authorities and existing institutions. It did not want to be indiscriminate, but was aware of the need to inquire into the personal circumstances of individuals requesting relief to ensure that they would benefit from what the House had to offer. In addition, it was prepared to work with other institutions and benefit from their advice and experience. The House’s prospectus states that ‘the Council will endeavour as far as possible to act in concert with other societies of a similar charitable nature and with individuals engaged in relieving the wants of the poor.’²⁴

Although the House showed a proper Victorian regard for the distinction

between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor, its approach was leavened with compassion and humility, as demonstrated by the desire not to be too prescriptive at the outset but to learn from experience. Clues to its liberal interpretation of who qualified as 'deserving poor' are provided by the addition of those who had lost a post as a result of misconduct to the list of those eligible for relief. Agreeing to be elected as an Associate Member was a serious undertaking, as indicated by the existence of the pro forma letter. Many of the Members were prepared to spend not only money but vast amounts of time and energy in the service of those admitted to the House. It appears that they were trying to strike a balance which was entirely professional in its outlook.²⁵

So far so good. The intentions of the founding members are laudable and, as indicated, plenty of evidence can be found to counter the accusations of the critics of Victorian philanthropy. We must now look at how these aims and objectives were put into practice. Between 1847 and 1854 the Council met twice a week, on Tuesdays and Fridays, to consider applications for admission to the House. Not all applications were granted.²⁶ Sometimes individuals were sent away with money for lodgings while further enquiries were made. Sometimes they were rejected outright as being unable to benefit from what the house had to offer: for example, if they were very ill – although in these cases the House would often apply for them to be admitted to a hospital or other appropriate institution.²⁷ Those applicants who were successful were only admitted after their character, causes of distress and prospects were considered. Once admitted, cases were assigned to Associates, who would take an active and personal interest in them, raising money, helping them to find employment and passing on requests for assistance to Council meetings. They were supposed to stay for a maximum of a month, but this could be prolonged in special cases.

Everyone was expected to share in the work of the House and to comply with its rules. Any infraction of the rules was supposed to result in dismissal. Inmates were encouraged to go in search of employment 'and such of the children as are fit for it are sent to adjacent parish schools'.²⁸ In the early days there was a rota of visiting members, who recorded their comments in the Visitors Book. They were expected to visit twice daily and to hold personal interviews with the inmates. They were also allowed to admit urgent cases provisionally. In addition, all Associate Members were allowed, and encouraged, to visit whenever they wished. The twice-daily official visiting appears to have fallen into abeyance by 1854, although the Case Books and Minute Books provide ample evidence of the continued personal involvement of the Associate Members in the welfare of those admitted to the House.

One of the best ways to assess how far the founding principles of the House of Charity were put into practice is to analyse some of its work with poor families, and in particular those families who chose emigration as the solution to their poverty. The Council received a letter from Lord Lyttleton, one of its Associate Members and Gladstone's brother-in-law, in July 1847 suggesting that 'where there was no infirmity of body or mind',²⁹ they should look to the colonies for employment rather than trying 'often uselessly'³⁰ to find them places at home. He goes on to write that 'the demand for labour in Australia is very great and the wages high'.³¹ It is clear from the case books that the House acted on Lord Lyttleton's suggestion: in an appeal for funds dated 1854 it reports that:

very many have been aided to emigrate singly and with whole families – some

*to the United States but most to the British Colonies – in which branch the House has been much aided by HM Emigration Commissioners and latterly by Mr Sidney Herbert's Female Emigration Fund.*³²

The House had written to Sidney Herbert in December 1849 agreeing to 'help with female emigration by admitting select cases for a short time prior to embarkation'.³³ The first families to be admitted under this scheme were Mrs Legge and child and Mrs McDonald, her three daughters and sister. Mrs Legge was admitted without demur on 19 March 1850. However, the Council was reluctant to admit the McDonald family, because 'the shelter of the House' had been offered to Mrs McDonald on a former occasion 'but in vain'.³⁴ The Warden was instructed to inform Sidney Herbert, who must have prevailed upon the House to reconsider its decision, as the McDonald party were admitted on 30 March 1850 and remained until 24 May 1850. The House also subscribed one guinea per annum to the Colonial Labour Office 'by means of which most of our emigrants in the "Invicta" have been supplied with places'.³⁵ Between June 1848 and February 1851, 32 out of 103 families admitted into the House said they intended to emigrate. Twenty-seven eventually did so, although one family returned after a couple of years. Eleven went to Australia (mainly Adelaide), six to the Cape, five to America, two to Canada, one to New Zealand and two to unknown destinations. The reason why so many went to Adelaide was that the first Bishop of Adelaide, Augustus Short, was the brother of one of the most active of the Council Members, Lt Col Charles Short. In the case of emigration, we see the House working in concert with other organisations and individuals to the benefit of its clients.

Families wishing to emigrate were usually admitted only after they had secured an assisted passage from the Emigration Commissioners. Thus Richard Geoghean and his three daughters were refused funds to emigrate because the House 'could not except in very special circumstances provide the whole of the passage money'.³⁶ There are many examples in the Minute Books of families wishing to emigrate being advised to apply to the Emigration Commissioners for assistance and to re-apply to the House if successful. An example is Mrs Ward, a widow with two children, who applied for admission on 16 January 1849 with a view to emigrating to Australia. She was given 2/6 from the alms box and advised to apply to the Emigration Commissioners and inform the House of the outcome.³⁷ She was finally admitted to the House on 13 March 1849, having secured the promise of an assisted passage from the Commissioners.³⁸

Once families were admitted, the House would help them to raise the balance of their fare and put together the 'outfit' that was an essential requirement for all emigrants. The House had an emigration fund, and this was at the disposal of the Council, who decided on appropriate cases for assistance. Each case admitted was assigned to an Associate, who would decide the sum to be paid for an outfit. This was not to exceed £5 unless there were special circumstances, which must be presented to the Council before extra money could be given. Subscriptions were often raised to help particular families; money was sometimes given to redeem clothes or tools that had been pawned before entry into the House; and clothing was given to help complete emigrants' outfits, taken from the supply of second-hand clothes kept for that purpose. The Minute Book records that steps were to be taken 'to obtain supplies of cast off clothing for the use of emigrants'.³⁹

The Members of the Council were also anxious to ensure that the emigrants' spiritual needs were catered for. At the beginning of December 1848 they asked the SPCK to provide every emigrant leaving the House with a Bible and a prayer book. The receipt of these items is recorded on 29 December 1848. The House also gave limited assistance to families who wanted to emigrate but had not been admitted. The Minute Book for 3 October 1848 records the case of a poor shoemaker who was deferred until he obtained a free passage. On 31 October 1848 he was given £1 from the emigration fund, 'appearing respectable and in need of the assistance'⁴⁰ because he was about to emigrate with his family. Similarly, Ann Jardine, wife of a poor carpenter, was given £1 from the emigration fund because she and her family were due to sail for Sydney the following week and she was well recommended by the Matron of St James' Infirmary.⁴¹ The example of emigration amply demonstrates the nature of the personal service performed by Associate Members of the House of Charity and their commitment to those they were seeking to help. An indication of the pleasure they took in achieving a result is provided by the following extract: 'A somewhat better dinner than ordinary was recommended for the inmates on Sunday on the occasion of so large a party emigrating the next day.'⁴²

To illustrate how the House of Charity worked in practice, and to assess the evidence for the existence of a casework approach, I shall now look at some of the cases in greater detail.

Case Study One

Samuel Boddington with his wife and three children, recommended by Col Short, were provisionally admitted on 25 August 1848 pending the agreement of the Westminster Board of Guardians 'to receive him at the end of a month in case of his failing to find employment whilst here'.⁴³ The Guardians wrote agreeing to take the family at the end of their month in the House. They supported the Boddington family's application for relief, stating that 'circumstances over which they have no control have brought them to poverty' and that 'his case attracted the sympathy of the whole Board'.⁴⁴ The family was pauperised through lack of employment. Mrs Boddington had been a housemaid before her marriage, and her former employers had done what they could for the family, including allowing them to live in an unlet cottage. Samuel Boddington had been a whitesmith and had a certificate of good conduct from his former employers; he was willing to do any sort of work to earn a living either in this country or by emigrating. A special emigration fund was set up and administered by Col Short. The family was allowed to stay in the House while they applied for an assisted passage to Australia. They obtained this and were outfitted by the House. The family was given 5/- 'pocket money' from the emigration fund and sailed to Adelaide on 4 December 1848.⁴⁵

This case is interesting for a number of reasons. It shows the degree of co-operation between the House and the Poor Law authorities, the care with which information was gathered about those seeking help and the flexibility with which the rules of the House were interpreted: the Boddingtons were allowed to remain in the House even though they did not have the promise of an assisted passage, and they were allowed to stay beyond the supposed maximum of a month presumably because it was clear by the end of the month that the case would have a successful conclusion. This happened very frequently. Some might argue that this flexibility is evidence of a lack of professionalism and that the House did not adhere to its own rules. I suggest that it is evidence of a mature

organisation: throughout its literature the House stressed the need to respond according to individual circumstances, and right from its foundation it was anxious not to exclude anyone who might be helped by defining its rules too rigidly.

Case Study Two

John Smith and his wife and child were admitted on 13 March 1849 on the recommendation of the Rev E.N. Dickenson, a curate from Deal, who had encouraged them to emigrate and had raised the necessary funds for their passage to the Cape. Smith had worked in Deal for three years as a baker, but had left for London after his father's death because of disputes about property. He worked as a baker in London for some years, and then for the Post Office for ten years, but lost his job because he was unable to cope with heavy duties. He returned to Deal to seek help from well-to-do friends but none was forthcoming. The Case Book entry speculates that his problems were caused by his ill-temper and perhaps his drinking. He had made an imprudent second marriage to a much younger woman which had added to his troubles. His conduct was not satisfactory. He returned to the House drunk and was insolent to the Matron. He was discharged on 31 May 1849. The Warden wrote to Mr Dickenson to ask whether Smith's 'gross misconduct' should lead to the forfeiture of his passage. Mr Dickenson asked the Warden to inform the Commissioners, who did not think it necessary for him to forfeit his passage. His wife and child were readmitted for a few days before they sailed to the Cape. However, the family never reached their destination. The Case Book records that 'this poor man died on board ship at Gravesend. He was ill for four days with cholera.'⁴⁶ The Commission returned the passage money to Mrs Smith, who returned to Deal.

This case shows the more judgmental side of the House of Charity. Drunkenness always resulted in dismissal from the House, although it often continued to provide assistance to the family and sometimes to the person dismissed. As a result of this incident, Col Short on 5 June 1849 proposed the addition of a special rule relating to the intoxication of inmates and the forfeiture of emigrants' passages and outfits, and this was adopted on 8 June 1849. This may provide ammunition for those who would argue that the House of Charity was a typically amateur, disorganised set-up making up the rules as it went along. Another way of looking at the incident would be to say that the House was evolving in the light of experience.

Case Study Three

John Sharpe and his wife and two children were admitted into the House on 10 September 1849 prior to emigrating to the Cape. Difficulty in finding work had made Sharpe decide to emigrate. He obtained an assisted passage and was admitted into the House so that 'his very slender allowances might be not further drained'.⁴⁷ He had previously worked in Camden Town and was very well known to Mr Hannan, who readily assisted him at the request of the House, giving him a good character. His wife was an excellent needleworker. They were given £1 10/- from the emigration fund to make up their passage money. They promised to pay any money they later received for their passage into the emigration fund. The Case Book records that they were 'very grateful for all that had been done for them'⁴⁸ and that they took a letter of recommendation with them. On 4 October 1850 the House received a letter

from John Sharpe informing it of his success at the Cape. On 8 October 1850 Sharpe's sister Ellen applied for help to join her brother. The Warden agreed to write to the Emigration Commission on her behalf and she stayed in the House on her way to the ship. On 26 April 1852 John Sharpe came in person to the House. He had left his family in the Cape to be supported by his wife's needlework because he had found the work too hard. He had returned via India where he had worked as a servant in a gentleman's family. He was now earning 25/- a week working for his former employer. He 'went away with the intention of sending money to his wife to bring her back to England'.⁴⁹

This case shows how contact was often maintained between the House and its former inmates over a considerable period of time. From the former inmate's point of view there might clearly be an element of self-interest in this, but it does show that the philanthropists associated with the House of Charity were far from ignorant of the circumstances of those they were helping and far from shallow in their involvement – even if, as in this case, things did not quite turn out as expected. It also shows the importance to the House of Charity at this early stage in its history of keeping the family unit together. Whether John Sharpe and his family were ever reunited, and whether he had any real intention of sending them money, we will never know, but he was certainly urged to do so by the House of Charity.

The reliance of the House of Charity on volunteers and voluntary donations may confirm the view of twentieth-century critics that Victorian philanthropy was irredeemably amateur. In all other respects, however, the House was founded on lines that could only win the approval of the most hardened critic, whether from the nineteenth or the twentieth century. The founders were well aware of the need to co-operate with other institutions and to target their relief so as to be effective and not pauperise the recipients, and they believed in the necessity and value of personal service. From a twentieth century perspective, the philanthropists responsible for setting up the House of Charity may appear to be guilty of the far more heinous crime of being self-serving, particularly given that the second object of the institution was to provide themselves with the means to be charitable. Their overriding concern with the spiritual welfare of the inmates may grate on present-day sensibilities. However, the amount of time and energy those early founders were willing to devote to the families admitted goes a long way towards negating that criticism. It could be argued that, rather than being self-serving they were God-serving. If it is accepted that one of the main criteria for judging the professionalism of a charitable institution is the knowledge it has of the personal circumstances of the individuals it seeks to help, there is no doubt that the House of Charity between 1847 and 1854 was highly professional and that the boast contained in its appeal for funds, that 'the experience of nearly seven years has fully tested the soundness of the principles on which the charity is based'⁵⁰ is to a large extent justified.

References

1. The real figure was much higher than this. However, the casebook containing entries between 14 February 1851 and 20 January 1853 is missing.
2. Flintshire Record Office, Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, House of Charity Explanatory Statement of the Principles, Constitution and Objects of the Above

Named Institution read at a General Meeting of the Association held on June 27th 1846.

3. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.

4. Flintshire Record Office, Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, House of Charity Prospectus, 11 June 1846.

5. Ibid.

6. Original Laws of the House of Charity Agreed to at a Meeting of Committee held on June 11th to be Submitted to a General Meeting for Confirmation on June 27th 1846.

7. Flintshire Record Office, Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, House of Charity Explanatory Statement, June 1846.

8. Ibid.

9. Glynne Gladstone Mss 1668, Prospectus, 11 June 1846.

10. Ibid.

11. Glynne Gladstone Mss 1668, Explanatory Statement.

12. Ibid.

13. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.

14. Ibid.

15. Original Laws, 11 June 1846.

16. Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, Explanatory Statement.

17. Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, Prospectus, 11 June 1846.

18. Ibid.

19. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.

20. Original Laws, 11 June 1846.

21. Ibid.

22. Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, Explanatory Statement.

23. Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, Prospectus, 11 June 1846.

24. Glynne Gladstone MSS 1668, Prospectus, 11 June 1846.

25. There is evidence that there were other organisations which anticipated 'the principles and methods . . . of later casework bodies, notably the Charity Organisation Society': for example, the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association, founded in 1843, the Central Relief Society, founded in Liverpool by William Rathbone in 1863, the Edinburgh Society for Improving the Condition of the Poor, founded in 1867, and the Society for the Relief of Distress, established in London in 1860. These are cited by Owen, D., *English Philanthropy*, pp. 143 and 219.

26. See the case of Dennis MacCarthy in the House of Charity Council Minute Book, 9 February and 12 February 1847.
27. See the case of Jesse Green in the House of Charity Council Minute Book, 21 December 1847.
28. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.
29. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 23 July 1847.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.
33. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 22 December 1849.
34. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 15 March 1850.
35. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 6 November 1849.
36. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 6 April 1850.
37. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 16 January 1849.
38. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 13 March 1849.
39. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 25 July 1848.
40. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 31 October 1848
41. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 14 November 1848
42. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 2 February 1849.
43. House of Charity Council Minute Book, 22 August 1848.
44. House of Charity Case Book, 25 August 1848
45. Ibid.
46. House of Charity Case Book, 13 March 1849
47. House of Charity Case Book, 10 April 1849.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. House of Charity Appeal for Funds, February 1854.

Other papers produced by the Society:

- ▶ Spirit of Friendly Rivalry? Voluntary Societies and the Formation of Post-war Child Welfare Legislation
Read

▶ The Origins of Flag Days
Read

▶ Voluntary Action of Membership Organisations: Countrywomen Organise their Own Education
Read

▶ The English University Settlements 1884-1939: A Social Movement Becalmed?
Read

registered charity no: 1044549

Voluntary Action History Society,
c/o Dr Justin Davis Smith,
Institute for Volunteering Research,
8 All Saints Street,
London N1 9RL.
UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 7520 8900
Fax: +44 (0)20 7520 8910
E-mail: Instvolres@aol.com
www.ivr.org.uk/vahs.htm