



WT

RE-ENVISIONING THE BRITISH STATE IN A TIME OF CRISIS:

A CRITICAL REVISITING OF THE BALLIOL
CONNECTION OF TEMPLE, TAWNEY AND
BEVERIDGE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

TEMPLE BOOKS



William Temple
Foundation

**Re-envisioning the British State
in a Time of Crisis:
A Critical Revisiting of the Balliol
Connection of Temple, Tawney,
and Beveridge for the 21st Century**

Temple Books No. 1

Sign up for our free newsletter at williamtemplefoundation.org.uk

Follow us on Twitter [@WTempleFdn](https://twitter.com/WTempleFdn)

© William Temple Foundation 2023

Cover image from [Flickr](#)

ISBN: 978-1-7393180-0-0

Authors

Chris Baker

Chris Baker joined the William Temple Foundation in 2001 as Development Officer, before becoming Director of Research in 2003. He completed his doctorate on religion in English New Towns at the University of Manchester in 2002, where he taught urban and public theology until 2009. Chris holds the post of William Temple Professor of Religion, Belief and Public Life at Goldsmiths, University of London.

Simon Skinner

Simon Skinner is Keen Fellow and Tutor in History at Balliol College, Oxford, Lecturer in History at Oriel College, and Associate Professor at the University of Oxford. He is the author of *Tractarians and the 'condition of England': the social and political thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford, 2004) and numerous articles on nineteenth-century religion and politics.

Stephen Spencer

Stephen Spencer is Adviser on Theological Education at the Anglican Communion Office in London, supporting theological colleges, seminaries, and educational programmes across the world. Prior to this he was vice principal at St Hild College (a theological college) at Mirfield in West Yorkshire. He has published several books and articles on William Temple, the most recent of which is *Archbishop William Temple: A Study of Servant Leadership* published by SCM Press in July 2022. He has also published study guides on Anglicanism, Christian Mission and Church history. He is currently editing the official Lambeth Conference 2022 report.

Matthew Grimley

Matthew Grimley is Mark Reynolds Fellow and Tutor in History at Merton College, Oxford, and an associate professor of history at Oxford University. He is the author of *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (2004) and co-editor of *Redefining Christian Britain: Post-1945 Perspectives* (2007) and *The Church of England and British Politics since 1900* (2020).

Lawrence Goldman

Lawrence Goldman was educated at Cambridge and Yale and taught modern British and American History for three decades in the History Faculty at Oxford where he was a Fellow of St. Peter's College. He was the Editor of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 2004-14 and then the Director of the Institute of Historical Research in London. He is the author of books on the history of workers' education, mid-Victorian social science, and a biography of the socialist and historian, R. H. Tawney. He gave the centenary Scott Holland

lecture on Tawney in 2022, now published in the International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church. His latest book, *Victorians and Numbers*, a history of statistical collection and interpretation in the 19th century, was published by Oxford University Press in 2022. He is at work on the biography of Charles Booth, the Victorian social investigator and businessman.

Maria Power

Dr Maria Power is a Senior Research Fellow in Human Dignity at the Las Casas Institute for Social Justice, Blackfriars Hall, University of Oxford where she is the Director of the Human Dignity Project. She is also a Senior Research Fellow of the William Temple Foundation. Maria is the author of *From Ecumenism to Community Relations: Inter-Church Relations in Northern Ireland 1980-2005* (Dublin, 2007), *Catholic Social Teaching and Theologies of Peace in Northern Ireland: Cardinal Cahal Daly and the Pursuit of the Peaceable Kingdom* (Abingdon, 2021) and *The Bible and the Conflict in Northern Ireland*, (Abingdon, forthcoming 2024) and the editor of a number of collections of essays, including *Building Peace in Northern Ireland*, (Liverpool, 2011), *Violence and Peace in Sacred Texts* (London, 2023) with Rev. Dr Helen Paynter (Bristol Baptist College), *Catholic Lay Societies in Britain* (Woodbridge, 2023) with Dr Jonathan Bush (Durham) and *Human Dignity Across the Islamic and Catholic Traditions*, (London, forthcoming 2024) with Dr Afifi al-Akiti (Oxford) and *The Far Right and Its Claim to Christianity*, (London, forthcoming 2024) with Rev. Dr Helen Paynter (Bristol Baptist College). Maria is frequently to be heard on Radio Ulster's Sunday Sequence programme and publishes regular blog posts on topics relating to justice and peace.

Victoria Turner

Victoria is finishing her PhD in World Christianity at the University of Edinburgh. She is the editor of SCM Press 2022 *Young, Woke and Christian: Words from a Missing Generation* and is author of multiple academic articles. She is a member of the United Reformed Church and she works in the areas of mission, ecumenism, justice and peace-building.

Anthony Reddie is the Director of the Oxford Centre for Religion and Culture in Regent's Park College, in the University of Oxford. He is also an Extraordinary Professor of Theological Ethics and a Research Fellow with the University of South Africa. He is the first Black person to get an 'A' rating in Theology and Religious studies in the South African National Research Foundation. This designation means that he is a leading international researcher. He is a prolific author of books, articles and chapters in edited books. He is the Editor of *Black Theology: An International Journal*. He is a recipient of the Archbishop of Canterbury's 2020 Lambeth, Lanfranc Award for Education and Scholarship, given for 'exceptional and sustained contribution to Black Theology in Britain and Beyond'.

Simon Lee

Simon Lee is Professor of Law, Aston University, and Emeritus Professor of Jurisprudence, Queen's University, Belfast. He was a Brackenbury Scholar at Balliol College (where William Temple studied, a little earlier), Oxford, and a Harkness Fellow at Yale Law School.

He became Rector of the ecumenical Anglican-Catholic Liverpool Hope University College, Vice-Chancellor of Leeds Metropolitan University, Chair of Level Partnerships, Executive Director of the Cambridge Theological Federation and a Fellow of St Edmund's College, Cambridge. He was awarded honorary doctorates by Virginia Theological Seminary in 2011 and Liverpool Hope University in January 2016.

Editors' Introduction

This tract consists of a collection of papers given for the occasion of the conference, '*Re-envisioning the British state in a time of crisis: a critical revisiting of the Balliol connection of Temple, Tawney and Beveridge for the 21st Century*'.

80 years ago, the Beveridge Report set out the ideas which we associate with the Welfare State. Also in 1942, Archbishop William Temple had published his Christianity & Social Order, with a similar manifesto in an appendix. 40 years earlier, Beveridge and Temple had been undergraduates at Balliol, together with R H Tawney, before each lived and worked in Toynbee Hall in London. Each was influenced by the Master, Edward Caird, who was himself associated with the Idealist philosophy of Balliol's T H Green. Beveridge and Temple were writing, of course, in wartime. As our age grapples with Russia's war in Ukraine, with the after-effects of the pandemic, with the environmental and cost of living crises, with multiple challenges around equality, diversity, and inclusion, and with the breakdown of trust in political leaders, Balliol and the William Temple Foundation held a symposium in November 2022 for the 80th anniversary of these publications by William Beveridge and William Temple. It explored various themes including: the influence of Idealism & Ideas; did the Balliol ethos of the Victorian and Edwardian eras make a difference to UK society after the Second World War; are there lessons for the 21st century?

Chris Baker, Editor

Ryan Haecker, Editor

Preface

The William Temple Foundation was honoured that Balliol College, Oxford, kindly hosted a conference in partnership with us on the 80th anniversary of William Temple's *Christianity & Social Order* and of William Beveridge's famous Report, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, widely regarded as a founding document of the welfare state. Temple and Beveridge had been students together at Balliol, along with another influential figure in the twentieth century's drive towards equality, R H Tawney, forty years earlier. It was good of the Master to welcome us personally. One of her predecessors, Andrew Graham, joined us for the whole day and she spoke of the inspiration of another Master, A L Smith, in welcoming Workers' Educational Association summer schools to Balliol a century ago. Exploring this tradition together was illuminating for the Foundation as we are committed to pioneering partnerships which open up lifelong learning and the public square. As a former Balliol student myself, this was a special day of reflecting on the legacy of earlier generations. I am grateful now to the editors and fellow contributors for this opportunity to share papers from the proceedings in the spirit of Temple, Beveridge and Tawney through promoting freely accessible lifelong learning.

Professor Simon Lee (Balliol, 1976-1979)
Chair of the Board of Trustees of the William Temple Foundation
29 March 2023

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Authors | i |
| Editors' Introduction | iv |
| Preface | v |
| | |
| 1. Simon Skinner - Faith in Doubt: The Greenian Moment | 1 |
| 2. Stephen Spencer - Beveridge, Tawney and Temple: A common vision? | 9 |
| 3. Matthew Grimley - Christianity and Social Order in Context | 16 |
| 4. Lawrence Goldman - The British State and its Limits, 1870-1945: Tawney, Temple and Beveridge Compared | 20 |
| 5. Maria Power - The Urgent Need for Social Justice in Northern Ireland | 28 |
| 6. Victoria Turner - 'Can We Imagine Again?' Re-Envisioning the British State in a Time of Crisis | 31 |
| 7. Anthony Reddie - The Balliol Legacy Remembered | 35 |
| 8. Simon Lee - Balliol Influences: How One College Lost An Empire And Found A Common Wealth Of Ideas | 41 |
| 9. Chris Baker - Afterword: Legacies and Welfarism | 52 |

1. Simon Skinner

Faith in Doubt: The Greenian Moment

This paper explores the general intellectual, but also the more narrowly institutional, nineteenth-century context for the now-canonical thought of Temple, Tawney, and Beveridge. In particular it seeks to problematise the familiar relationship between welfarism and its ethical context, and to suggest that the construction of religion-to-welfare as a moment in British secularisation seriously distorts its religious contexts.

The European nineteenth century is, of course, typecast as the age of secularisation,¹ and certainly it was the empirical laboratory in which secularisation's theorists established the canon that modernisation and secularisation were coterminous.² The German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies, whose *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* of 1887 – best translated as 'Community and Society', and a founding text (one might almost say, scripture) of modern sociology – famously and influentially argued that the shift from the close-knit rural community to the loosely associational, materialist, educated, leisured society of the modern city, was necessarily inimical to religion.³ For most of the twentieth century, religious sociology – from its founding fathers, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber, through its American midwife, Talcott Parsons, and to a succession of its twentieth-century redbrick practitioners, pre-eminently perhaps Steve Bruce – was premised on the inevitable decline of religious belief and participation in modern, western societies.

And to lurch from sociological hypothesis to historical observation, certainly in Britain that process is apparent. For all the church extension and missionary endeavours of the early Victorians, by the 1880s it was clear that a mass unskilled working class had grown up outside the institutional horizons of church or chapel. Growing affluence, new types of mass leisure, such as the music hall, football, cycling clubs, pigeon-fancying and so on, dominated the limited leisure hours of the working week. And in working-class political culture, of course, the emergence of the trades unions – we can date the TUC from 1866 – and the working men's clubs which accompany them, represent an obvious alternative to the

¹ See for example Owen Chadwick's classic *The Secularization of the European Mind in the 19th Century* (Cambridge, 1991); also D. H. McLeod, *Secularisation and Western Europe, 1848-1914* (Basingstoke, 2000).

² See for a discussion Steve Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford, 1992), idem, *Secularization: In Defence of an Unfashionable Theory* (Oxford, 2013); also Rik Pinxten and Lisa Dikomitis (eds.), *When God Comes to Town: Religious Traditions in Urban Contexts* (New York & Oxford, 2012).

³ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Abhandlung des Communismus und Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen* (Leipzig, 1887); the lightly revised second (1912) and subsequent editions notably bore a different sub-title, *Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, or 'Basic Concepts of Pure Sociology', which captures the sense that secularisation theory had become canonical. It was translated into English in 1955 as *Community and Association* (London, 1955), mostly thereafter as *Community and Society* (East Lansing, 1957; New York, 2002), but sometimes recently as *Community and Civil Society* (Cambridge, 2001).

communal offerings of organised religion. The need for new missionary initiatives to try to penetrate these irreligious working-class environments is reflected in the foundation of the Salvation Army in the east end of London in 1865, with its pub visiting, and what its founder William Booth called its ‘soup, soap, and salvation’ approach to alcoholics, opium addicts, and prostitutes. By the end of the century, amid the cultural introspection of the *fin de siècle*, Christians widely recognised the almost hopeless task of inculcating the gospel among urban societies where the disciplines of older kinship communities no longer existed.

But perhaps especially in British historical writing an emphasis on the top-down intellectual factors has been at least as influential as one on the bottom-up, social factors: the Victorian narrative of faith and doubt is familiar to all of us. If the new environment of the western industrial city was somehow inimical to religiosity, so also were the Enlightenment, rationalist, geological pebbles in the pond, rippling outwards into what Matthew Arnold famously called ‘the sea of faith’. From the 1840s, the spread of biblical criticism from Germany to Britain saw the bible treated not as the infallible word of God but like any other ancient text, and therefore amenable to philological analysis. David Friedrich Strauss’s *Das Leben Jesu Kritisch Bearbeitet* (*The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*) of 1835 scandalised Europe in its treatment of Jesus as a historical figure and of the miracles as myths;⁴ its 1846 translation into English by none other than George Eliot⁵ was calmly described by the evangelical 7th Earl of Shaftesbury as ‘the most pestilential book ever vomited out of the jaws of hell’,⁶ a dustjacket quote to which we surely all aspire.

Of course, what has come to be thought of as the biggest intellectual factor is geology, Darwin, and scientific materialism in general. We should not exaggerate the immediate impact of the publication of the *Origin of Species* in 1859;⁷ nor imagine that Darwinism set up insoluble tensions between biblical literalism and science; most educated late-Victorian Christians – we think of Charles Kingsley⁸ – comfortably assimilated the theory of natural selection as the divine mechanism by which God had set nature in motion. Nevertheless, Darwinian ideas and the general expansion of science’s horizons dealt obvious blows to religion’s explanatory monopoly, to the bible’s status, and to the churches’ authority. Man was no longer the product of special Creation but one species in a natural world whose richness was now being taxonomized. In the famous Oxford evolution debate, which took place at what is now the University Museum of Natural History in June 1860, only months after the publication of the *Origin of Species*, the evolutionist Thomas Huxley (of Balliol) was teased by Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford and son of the great anti-slavery campaigner, who asked him, if he was descended from a gorilla, whether it was on his father’s or his mother’s side – with Huxley famously replying, that he would sooner be descended from an ape than from a bishop.⁹

⁴ David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet* (Tübingen, 1835-36).

⁵ It was translated by George Eliot / Marian Evans as *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined* (3 vols., London, 1846).

⁶ Gregory W. Dawes, *The Historical Jesus Question: the challenge of history to religious authority* (London, 2001), pp. 77-79.

⁷ Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London, 1859).

⁸ Piers J. Hale, ‘Darwin’s Other Bulldog: Charles Kingsley and the Popularisation of Evolution in Victorian England’ in *Science & Education*, vol. 21, 7 (2012), pp. 977-1013.

⁹ Ian Hesketh, *Of Apes and Ancestors: Evolution, Christianity, and the Oxford Debate* (Toronto, 2009).

The great deposits of our ‘faith and doubt’ literature seem to affirm the contemporary sense of this contraction of religiosity. In his mid-century poem ‘Dover Beach’, Matthew Arnold famously wrote that:

The sea of faith
Was once, too, at the full, and round earth’s shore
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl’d;
But now I only hear
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
Retreating to the breath
Of the night-wind, down the vast edges drear
And naked shingles of the world.¹⁰

In prose, Edmund Gosse’s *Father and Son* of 1907, graphically sub-titled *A study of two temperaments*, is the classic account, from a critical Edwardian son, of his distinguished botanist and Plymouth Brethren fundamentalist father, Philip Gosse, whose 1857 *Omphalos* had insisted that fossils were planted at the Creation to test man’s faith – a raging against the dying of the Old Testament light.¹¹

But of course, secularisation, like all orthodoxies, came to be questioned. For a start, later generations in religious history and sociology have properly insisted on a rudimentary distinction between secularisation and dechristianisation. Much of what exercised contemporaries was properly speaking the latter: the measurable decline of religious observance – bums on pews. Dechristianisation is quantifiable and incontestable: the religious census of April 1851, unique to this day in its head-count of denominational attendance, and recording that 61% of the population did not attend church or chapel on Census Sunday, shook the Victorian worldview, compelling a new wave of evangelising initiatives designed to colonise the heathen slum *In Darkest England* (in the title of the famous work of 1890 by the earlier founder of the Salvation Army, William Booth).¹² But decline in church attendance is not the same as contraction in personal religiosity, something less susceptible to easy historical reckoning. Historians have found it harder to interrogate the religious interior – something we will pursue in miniature shortly.

More recently, the persistence in attitude surveys and opinion polls of an obdurately high degree of religious belief – with 72% claiming to be Christian in the crassly-worded 2001

¹⁰ Matthew Arnold, ‘Dover Beach’ (lines 21-28), in *New Poems* (London, 1867), though it is thought to have been written c. 1849-51.

¹¹ Philip Henry Gosse, *Omphalos: An Attempt to Untie the Geological Knot* (London, 1957), i.e. two years before the *Origin of Species*; see also Edmund Gosse, *The Naturalist of the Sea-shore; the Life of Philip Henry Gosse* (London, 1896).

¹² William Booth, *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (London, 1890).

Census, though 59% in the more carefully worded 2011 one¹³ – has encouraged historians to question the dominant secularisation thesis. The best-known and most recent form of revisionism – in insisting on dating it so much later – is Callum Brown’s famous book of 2001, *The Death of Christian Britain*, which challenged the view of secularisation as a classically nineteenth-century process, and insisted that it was a catastrophic and abrupt cultural revolution starting in the swinging 1960s, when new media, new gender roles and the moral revolution decisively challenged people’s conception that they lived Christian lives.¹⁴ More widely of course, and perhaps above all, the globalisation of our perspectives – the extension of our conceptual horizons beyond the Europe from which so much early sociology was extrapolated – has left the notion of a modern world-historical secularisation in – sometimes, smoking – ruins.¹⁵

So far, so predictable: orthodoxy and revisionism, as academics seek to justify their existence. But in writing about the late-nineteenth century, and its intellectual bequests, how do we navigate this dichotomy between faith and doubt? How do we acknowledge the tenacity with which a post-Darwinian intellectual generation overwhelmingly actually retained their conviction of a divine scheme, without subsiding into a bumptious and altogether implausible repudiation of secularisation? One obvious dimension of this is attention to the question: what was the relationship between the decline of religion and the rise of welfarist thought in the late-nineteenth early twentieth centuries?

Most writers on this question have certainly assumed that one simply gave way to the other, neatly mapping the emergence of welfarist thinking onto religious decline. Beatrice Webb, in her celebrated autobiography, *My Apprenticeship* of 1926, famously wrote in her own case in the 1880s of ‘a consciousness of a new motive; the *transference* of the emotion of self-sacrificing service from God to man’.¹⁶ In September 1884 Webb began a new diary volume with the line: ‘our harmony as moral beings is impossible on any other foundation but altruism’.¹⁷ The immediate outcome was a dedication to philanthropy, as she began work with C. S. Loch’s Charity Organisation Society (COS) among the poor of Soho.

Now, twentieth-century historians of welfarism’s origins have pounced on this alluring notion of ‘transference’ from religion to a philosophical Idealism, a mutation from religious to secular social activism in the 1870s and 1880s. Evangelicals especially had premised their piety on good works – we think of slavery abolitionism, district visiting, temperance – and if the divine spark flickered then social service could provide an alternative conduit for its philanthropic impulses. And at the epicentre of this Idealist moment is always the figure of the Oxford don Thomas Hill Green, who died in 1882.¹⁸ Green’s was an extraordinarily

¹³ Religion in England and Wales 2011 Report, Office for National Statistics.

<<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/religion/articles/religioninenglandandwales2011/2012-12-11>> (Retrieved 4 April 2022).

¹⁴ Callum Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800-2000* (2nd edn., London, 2009); and for a discussion Jane Garnett, Mathew Grimley, Alana Harris, William Whyte and Sarah Williams (eds.), *Redefining Christian Britain: Post 1945 Perspectives* (London, 2006).

¹⁵ Robert W. Hefner, ‘Religion and Modernity Worldwide’ in Peter B. Clarke (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 152-71.

¹⁶ Beatrice Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (1926; Cambridge, 1979 edn.), p. 130; my emphasis.

¹⁷ *The Diaries of Beatrice Webb*, ed. Norman Mackenzie and Jeanne Mackenzie (4 vols., London 1982-5), entry for 8 Sept. 1884, vol. 1. p. 119.

¹⁸ A. J. M. Milne, *The Social Philosophy of English Idealism* (London, 1962); Melvin Richter, *The Politics of Conscience: T. H. Green and his Age* (London, 1964); Andrew Vincent and Raymond Plant, *Philosophy, Politics and Citizenship: the Life and Thought of the British Idealists* (Oxford, 1984); Geoffrey Thomas, *The*

influential and active life: he served on the Taunton Commission into national education in the mid-1860s; he was the first Oxford don ever to be elected to the city council, in 1875; he campaigned for franchise extension; he was Vice-President of the UK Temperance Alliance; he supported women's education and women's admission to Oxford; he was a sponsor of workers' education, supporting the university extension movement which began in the 1870s; he devoted himself to the cause of school education, most famously founding the Oxford Boys' School in 1881, which in its time educated an eclectic gallery of British cultural icons ranging from T. E. Lawrence to Ronnie Barker. That building still stands, just opposite Gloucester Green; it's still known colloquially as the OBS; and it is now, by happy chance, home to the Oxford History Faculty.¹⁹ *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice* (if you seek his monument, look around). Green therefore seemed to personify the social activism of late-Victorian do-gooding. And of course, much more broadly, in his moral-philosophical writings he effaced the negativism of John Stuart Mill's liberalism,²⁰ constructing an ideal of positive liberalism, in which freedom was properly measured not by absence of restraint, but by presence of opportunity²¹ – thereby effecting what Noel Annan has called 'the conjuring trick' by which progressives might have the confidence to roll out the service state.²²

Green died aged just 45. But his influence on a generation was immense and of course on this occasion we might dwell on the extraordinary institutional context of all this. Green himself, who took a First in Greats but a third in what this author is bound to think the more exacting papers in Modern History, taught all his adult life at Balliol College, Oxford. The Charity Organisation Society, into which the young Beatrice Webb poured her 'transferred' energies, was presided over by Balliol's Charles Stewart Loch, the devoted pupil and friend of Green. Bishop Charles Gore, and Archbishops Frederick and William Temple – both of them, a very different 'Father and Son' – were all at Balliol, Gore and Temple junior both deeply influenced by Green's example and writing. The first university settlement, Toynbee Hall, was inspired in 1884 by Green's pupil and admirer Arnold Toynbee, or 'Apostle Arnold', as he was known. 'It is no exaggeration to say', pronounces the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 'that the majority of those who worked on and supported the early twentieth-century welfare state reforms, for example W. H. Beveridge, R. B. Morant, Llewellyn Smith, Ernest Aves, W. J. Braithwaite, J. A. Spender, Max Beer, R. H. Tawney, and Clement Attlee, all had university settlement experience – most at Toynbee Hall – and were influenced by its culture of civic idealism and social duty.'²³

Above all, of course, 'the Greenian moment', as Denys Leighton has called all this,²⁴ was translated directly into high politics early in the next century: the prime minister who presided over the great 'New Liberal' welfare reforms of 1908-14 – old age pensions, labour exchanges, national insurance, the 'People's Budget' the best known – was Herbert Asquith,

Moral Philosophy of T. H. Green (Oxford, 1988); Peter P. Nicholson, *The Political Philosophy of the British Idealists: Selected Studies* (Cambridge, 1990).

¹⁹ Andrew Vincent, 'Green, Thomas Hill (1836-1882), philosopher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11404>> (Retrieved 22 Feb. 2023).

²⁰ John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (London, 1859).

²¹ Ben Wempe, *Beyond Equality: A Study of T. H. Green's Positive Freedom* (Delft, 1986).

²² Noel Annan, 'Misconceptions of Freedom', *The Listener*, LXI (Feb. 1959), p. 323, and quoted in Peter Weiler, *The New Liberalism: Liberal Social Theory in Great Britain 1889-1914* (London, 1982), p. 14.

²³ Andrew Vincent, 'Green, Thomas Hill (1836-1882), philosopher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11404>> (Retrieved 22 Feb. 2023).

²⁴ Denys P. Leighton, *The Greenian Moment: T.H. Green, Religion and Political Argument in Victorian Britain* (Exeter, 2004).

who said ‘I owe more than I can say’ to T. H. Green, his former tutor.²⁵ Green’s *Lay Sermons*, or his *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation* were therefore connected to pensions and national insurance by the most intimate intellectual ancestry. Since William Beveridge, architect of the later welfare state, was Master of University College, Oxford at the time of the eponymous 1942 Report, he has rather oddly receded from commonplace memorialisation at Balliol, but Beveridge was of course at Balliol before serving as Sub-Warden at Toynbee Hall.²⁶ And if we are tracing an institutional arc, we might add even that the person who succeeded in getting the government to change the word ordering of the 2011 Census, so that religion no longer enjoyed normative statistical status, and that denominational affiliation was something you opted into – thereby of course significantly diminishing the percentages of the professedly religious – was the Chief Executive of the British Humanist Association, the Balliol graduate Andrew Copson.²⁷

It is via that sort of arc – via Beatrice Webb’s tidy notion of ‘transference’ from the religious to the secular – that’s Green’s analysts have written of him creating welfarism as ‘a surrogate faith’ (the sub-title of an influential analysis by Melvin Richter).²⁸ And this notion of welfarism as a ‘surrogate faith’ for the religiously disinherited is a commonplace of the literature. Social scientists, who have written extensively about Green as well as about welfarism, love this model.²⁹ And it is a seductive inverse correlation, with faith sinking and welfarism rising, like opposing buckets from an altruistic well. But history is messier, and the most elementary attention to Green subverts such a model in his case.

Matthew Arnold, whose gloomy poetry is held to capture the *zeitgeist*, and Thomas Huxley, who coined the term ‘Agnostic’, were also Balliol men.³⁰ But their troubled attitude to religion ought not to be thought characteristic of this milieu. What made Benjamin Jowett important was his determination to preserve the university’s and indeed the Church’s influence not directly via the great men of its Senior Common Rooms but indirectly via the potentially great men of its Junior Common Rooms. Jowett – and his confederates such as Green, and Archibald Campbell Tait, later Archbishop of Canterbury – despised the *odeum theologicum* in the previous generation, with Tractarian and Evangelical church parties battering each other to impotence, and therefore forfeiting influence in the counsels of an expanding and pluralising political nation.³¹ This is Jowett’s particular significance: he wanted to reform and thereby to revitalise a university education in order to train the rising generation. If the clergy were losing their formative role in national life to parliamentarians and to councillors, to civil servants, colonial administrators, and to schoolteachers, then the university must be rendered fit for the purpose of inculcating critical and right (that was, Christian) thinking in those new service professions. This was the reason for Jowett’s deep investment, for example, in the training of recruits to the Indian Civil Service.³² William Beveridge, we might note, was born in Rangpur, the son of an Indian Civil Service officer. Hence, in Jowett’s and in Green’s Balliol – and they are buried alongside each other, in St

²⁵ H. H. Asquith, *Memories and Reflections, 1852-1927*, ed. A. Mackintosh (2 vols., London, 1928), vol. 1, p. 19.

²⁶ Jose Harris, *William Beveridge: A Biography* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 59-97.

²⁷ Andrew Copson, ‘If you’re not religious, tell the census so’, *The Guardian* (28 Feb. 2011).

²⁸ Melvin Richter, ‘T. H. Green and his Audience: Liberalism as a Surrogate Faith’, *The Review of Politics*, vol. 18, no. 4 (1956), pp. 444-72.

²⁹ See n. 18.

³⁰ Thomas Huxley, ‘Agnosticism’, in *Collected Essays* (9 vols., London, 1893-5), vol. 5, pp. 209-62.

³¹ Peter Hinchliff, *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion* (Oxford, 1987), esp. chs. 6 and 7.

³² Judith Brown, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia* (Notre Dame IN, 2009), pp. 10-14, 25, 36; see also Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire: The Last Lost Cause?* (Oxford, 1986).

Sepulchre's Cemetery, in Jericho, Oxford – academic brilliance was of course encouraged, but so was character, leadership, duty, and public service.

Above all, if we are to put T. H. Green at the epicentre of nascent welfarism, as the principal ideologue of new thought about the relationship between the state and its citizens – and the literature emphatically does – then we need simultaneously to acknowledge that to crowbar Green and contemporaries such as Jowett into a 'surrogate faith' model is monstrously to distort his own thought and the essence of religion to it. Green's hugely influential, lifelong consistent, and later published *Lay Sermons* set out his vision of Christianity in which, as his biographer Andrew Vincent has put it, the 'incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Christ must inform the ordinary day-to-day lives of humanity'. There is a keyword: 'immanence' – not imminent, soon to happen, but immanent, where the divine is manifested in the material world (the opposite if you like of transcendence). Green preached of God's immanence in everyday duties; he wanted to change a religion based upon dogma into one that was coincidental with what he called the 'Christed self' of the ordinary citizen. 'Green took this to be the essential message of St Paul's writings ... In this indwelling God, symbolized in Christ', he thought he had found not a despairing retreat from the religious to the secular sphere, but an indestructible bridge between them.³³

Another canonical piece of faith and doubt literature captures this, though not perhaps as generally understood. *Robert Elsmere* (1888), by Mary Augusta (Mrs Humphry) Ward, was for a time the most famous novel in the world (it was heavily promoted in America by Henry James). Ward famously captures in the novel both the crisis of faith; and in particular Green's religious and moral influence on his pupils. It follows the fortunes of the young Elsmere, going up to an Oxford college in the 1870s – a thinly disguised Balliol. Ward was related to both the Arnold and the Huxley clans – this was a world she knew well. Elsmere takes holy orders in the Church of England, but experiences a crisis of faith, resigns his living, and goes to work with the poor in the East End of London. The book was dedicated to Thomas Hill Green; it paraphrases long chunks of his *Lay Sermons*; and it is now routinely deployed to illustrate the 'transference', the 'surrogate faith' of our post-Christian welfarists. But Elsmere was not Green! Green was realised in the separate character of Professor Grey, whose exemplary Christian piety sets a standard which Elsmere himself is unable to sustain.³⁴

Later generations – we might put Asquith himself in this category, Toynbee, and Beveridge – were quite capable of course of adopting and developing a welfarist model from different or non-religious motives. But we miss the nuances in contexts if we back-project later secular outlooks or political preoccupations onto a project which actually had luminously Christian premises and was conceived not as the negation but as the realisation of Christian social values through the state and its agents in response to unprecedented challenges. Max Weber famously argued in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* that Protestantism (in particular of course Calvinism) had been an essential component to the development – in its European form – of capitalism, but that once generated, capitalism acquired a locomotion all its own; so too, perhaps here, we might think of British welfarism, after specifically religious

³³ Andrew Vincent, 'Green, Thomas Hill (1836-1882), philosopher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11404>> (Retrieved 22 Feb. 2023).

³⁴ Mrs Humphry / Mary Augusta Ward, *Robert Elsmere* (London, 1888); see John Sutherland, *Mrs Humphry Ward: eminent Victorian, pre-eminent Edwardian* (Oxford, 1900).

ignition in late nineteenth-century Britain, acquiring a locomotion which took it far beyond any distinct ethical alignment.

2. Stephen Spencer

Beveridge, Tawney and Temple: A Common Vision?

The influence of William Beveridge, R. H. Tawney and William Temple on post-war British society was undeniably significant. Beveridge laid down much of the core administrative architecture of what became known as the Welfare State; Tawney worked hard within and beyond the Labour Party to ensure that it set about creating this kind of state when it came to power; and Temple not only coined the term ‘Welfare state’ in 1928, giving it specific definition in his writings³⁵, but during the war years did much to win over ‘middle England’ to the whole idea of comprehensive state provision, a section of the population whose taxes would have to pay for it all. He did this through publishing his slim *Christianity and Social Order*, a Penguin Special paperback outlining a programme of post-war reconstruction including replacing the slums with decent homes, education for all to the age of 18, a living wage for every worker, the right of workers to have a voice in the conduct of industry and the right to two days of rest in seven.³⁶ The book went on to sell 139,000 copies and was read by many more as it was passed from person to person in the armed services and wider community. He then led a campaign of speaking events across the country to build public support around his proposals, receiving much attention in the national press.³⁷ Taken together these were a remarkable set of influences coming from three figures who had been undergraduates and friends together at Balliol College in the early 1900s. So, given this, we can ask if these three figures shared a political vision of enduring significance. Secondly, given the need today for the state to re-commit itself to serving the welfare of all its people, is that vision transferable to our time?

It is a good moment to ask these questions because 2022 is the 80th anniversary of the publication of both *Christianity and Social Order* and the Beveridge report. This year is also the centenary of Tawney’s delivery of the lectures that became *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*.³⁸ This paper will concentrate on answering the first question and let the discussion of the other papers address the second.

Beveridge and Temple³⁹

The first signs of a common vision are not promising. When Temple arrived at Balliol College he joined a poetry and philosophy discussion group and in a letter to his father precociously described Beveridge as ‘the ablest person present’. But after Beveridge had

³⁵ Temple 1928, pp. 169-70.

³⁶ Temple 1976, p. 97.

³⁷ Spencer 2022.

³⁸ Tawney 1938.

³⁹ This section draws on my ‘A Tale of Two Williams: William Temple and the William Beveridge Report’, *Crucible: The Journal of Christian Social Ethics*, July 2022, Norwich: Hymns Ancient and Modern

expounded his consequentialist view of morality, Temple wrote in the same letter that ‘I am more violently convinced that he is wrong than I was before I heard his excellent defence of his views’ (Iremonger, 48). It cannot be assumed, then, that they shared the same fundamental beliefs. Indeed Jose Harris, Beveridge’s biographer, reports that Beveridge adopted a form of ‘positive agnosticism’ at this time, similar to the views of Thomas Huxley whom he greatly admired. ‘The God of the Old Testament he dismissed as tribal and barbaric, no more worthy of worship than the gods of the Norse sagas. The doctrines of the trinity and eucharist he believed were arbitrary, allegorical, and irrelevant to “practical religion”.’ Furthermore, ‘he was infuriated by the tendency of broad churchmen like his friend William Temple to assume that “every good man is necessarily and unconsciously a Christian”’.⁴⁰

However, the differences between the two can be seen to narrow through two formative influences. The first was the Scottish philosopher and Master of the college, Edward Caird. He called on the undergraduates to fulfil the duties ‘of the station in which we stand’, so that this present world may have ‘its worth deepened... item by item, with all the elements that constitute it multiplied a hundred-fold in value, raised to a higher spiritual power’. Caird warned his listeners, though, that this ideal world would only be realised ‘with persecutions’.⁴¹ Beveridge and Temple became caught up in this progressive yet challenging optimism, though Beveridge was less impressed than Temple by Caird’s philosophical Idealism, finding it too generalised. Caird also pressed the undergraduates ‘to go and discover why, with so much wealth in Britain, there continues to be so much poverty and how poverty can be cured’.⁴² Both Beveridge and Temple later affirmed the impact that this had on them. Harris writes that Caird’s example ‘undoubtedly reinforced Beveridge’s youthful belief in “earnestness” and “social morality” against the Oxford fashion of the day.’ Harris adds that it was ‘at least partly from Caird, and from the philosophical tradition of which Caird was an exponent, that Beveridge derived his conception of society as an “organism”, which was to be an important feature of his ideas on social reform’.⁴³ The same can be said for Temple, who would later dedicate his magnum opus, *Nature Man and God* of 1934, to Caird.

The second formative influence was the Settlement Movement, which the chaplain at Balliol, E. J. Palmer, put Beveridge, Temple and Tawney in touch with. The university ‘settlements’ were in the East End of London and in other slums around the country. The key figure was Canon Samuel Barnett who founded Toynbee Hall in Whitechapel in 1884, one of 40 settlements set up before the First World War, to bring students from Oxford and Cambridge to stay for a period of time in order to encounter the reality of poverty. The aim was to help create a national community across class divisions and to do this by creating collegiate communities in places like Whitechapel in which local people could access a range of educational and vocational courses and so help them be trained for leadership.

It is significant that in 1895 Samuel and his wife Henrietta Barnett had rejected the principle of discrimination in charitable giving, the separating of ‘the deserving’ from ‘the undeserving’ poor, with charity going only to the first of these. Instead, they argued that the state should provide for all pensions and housing and make society equal by redistributive taxation. All of this made a huge impression on the visitors from Oxford. Beveridge moved there after Oxford, against the wishes of his father, becoming sub-warden of Toynbee Hall in 1903. Temple spent time there as well as at a medical mission in Bermondsey. Tawney and

⁴⁰ Harris, p. 65.

⁴¹ Caird, p. 70-1.

⁴² Harris, p. 76.

⁴³ Harris, p. 77.

Clement Attlee also worked at Toynbee, which was highly formative for their future careers: 'Toynbee Hall did much to create a socially sensitive political leadership for the twentieth century' (Wilkinson, p.34). They all adopted what Harris calls a 'civic moralism', a clue to their future commitments and work.

Temple was part and parcel of all this. He would later marry Tawney to Beveridge's sister, with Barnett preaching. Temple and Tawney remained close friends throughout their lives. There is also evidence that Beveridge and Temple supported each other in later years, such as when Temple was setting up a research project to investigate unemployment in the mid-1930s, a project which produced the widely welcomed report *Men without Work* of 1938. As Temple was setting up the research Beveridge advised him and his working group to concentrate on long term unemployment. He also devised a sampling method and framed the questions for the survey which informed the report.⁴⁴ Furthermore, they joined forces in 1944 to plan new provision of adult education.⁴⁵

Most important of all, when Beveridge's report was published, Temple became a defender and advocate of its proposals, chairing meetings in 1943 in which Beveridge expounded what it said. Temple defended the report against critics who believed its proposals would curtail freedom through an increase in the state's control of its citizens. In a letter to an irate Major Guy Kindersley, stockbroker, and former Member of Parliament, who believed the Beveridge report would imperil the liberty of the citizen through creating an 'omni-competent state' Temple argued that its provisions would actually 'increase actual liberty, for it seems to me that the primary necessity for effective liberty is security as regards the basic consumer goods... I believe that by a deliberate ordering of the economic basis of life we can greatly increase personal freedom.'⁴⁶

Beveridge, for his part, can be seen to move closer to Temple's outlook in the way he introduced a spiritual dimension to his proposals. This can be seen in the famous 'three guiding principles' section of the report. The first principle proposed revolutionary change and then the second alluded to a famous Christian text:

The second principle is that organisation of social insurance [the main topic of the report] should be treated as one part only of a comprehensive policy of social progress. Social insurance fully developed may provide income security; it is an attack upon Want. But Want is one only of five giants on the road of reconstruction and in some ways the easiest to attack. The others are Disease, Ignorance, Squalor and Idleness.⁴⁷

Beveridge, then, pictured society as on a journey and now at a point where revolutionary and comprehensive reconstruction is possible. However, there are a number of 'giants' along the road who will prevent that from happening. This alludes to John Bunyan's classic text about the spiritual life, *The Pilgrim's Progress*. In this text the central characters, Christian and Christiana, are on a journey towards salvation and must negotiate many threats and temptations, most dangerous being the four giants Giant Grim, Giant Maul, Giant Slay-Good, and Giant Despair. They must be slayed, and, in a similar kind of way, Beveridge wants not only 'Want' (i.e. hunger and poverty) to be slayed by social insurance, but 'Disease' to be

⁴⁴ Grimley, 176.

⁴⁵ Iremonger, 573.

⁴⁶ Temple, F., pp.91-2.

⁴⁷ Beveridge 1942, 6.

defeated by national health care, 'Ignorance' by comprehensive education, 'Squalor' by the clearing of slums and the building of new homes for all who need them, and 'Idleness' (i.e. unemployment) by state schemes for full employment. These personifications suggest that more is needed than addressing certain practical issues: the whole condition of society must be changed, which means addressing its moral and spiritual dimensions as well.

Beveridge's third principle shows another indicative connection with Temple:

The third principle is that social security must be achieved by co-operation between the State and the individual. The State should offer security *for service and contribution*. The State in organising security should not stifle incentive, opportunity, responsibility; in establishing a national minimum, it should leave room and encouragement for voluntary action by each individual to provide more than that minimum for himself and his family.⁴⁸

Beveridge was not, then, advocating a state collectivism in which the state presides over every aspect of the citizen's life. The individual was to be given the space and freedom to serve with responsibility and to contribute to society in voluntary ways. Free co-operation was to be at the heart of the relationship, something that he would emphasise more and more in later years.⁴⁹ This was one of the reasons he provided for remaining a Liberal rather than joining the Labour Party.

Temple *did* join the Labour Party for a time but shared Beveridge's commitment to liberty at the heart of society. In a key passage in *Christianity and Social Order* he wrote that 'there is in each a worth absolutely independent of all usefulness to society. The person is primary, not the society'. So 'the State exists for the citizen, not the citizen for the State.' This means society must be so organised that people can freely express their own personalities through deliberate choice: 'it is the responsible exercise of deliberate choice which most fully expresses personality and best deserves the great name of freedom'.⁵⁰

Beveridge summed up his report's proposals in the following revealing way:

It is, first and foremost, a plan of insurance — of giving in return for contributions benefits up to subsistence level, as of right and without means test, so that individuals may build freely upon it.⁵¹

So the free agency of the individual is again affirmed as the aim of the plan. State benefits for every citizen will come out of contributions by every citizen, a two-way exchange, preserving the agency and independence of the citizen in relation to the state. This is again very close to Temple's view and shows that while they differed in their religious beliefs when it came to their political principles, and the practical policies that flowed from them, there was clear and compelling convergence.

⁴⁸ Beveridge 1942, italics mine.

⁴⁹ See Beveridge 1948.

⁵⁰ Temple, W., 1976, p. 67.

⁵¹ Beveridge 1942, p. 7.

Tawney and Temple⁵²

But this claim of convergence around a communitarian liberalism must be tempered slightly when Tawney is brought into the frame. For in terms of political principles Tawney took a slightly different route. Tawney as a historian, political activist and educationalist advanced some positive arguments about what a just society would look like, not least in his 1931 book *Equality* in which he aimed ‘to narrow the space between valley and peak.’⁵³ What is wanted is,

“the pooling of [the nation’s] surplus resources by means of taxation, and the use of the funds thus obtained to make accessible to all, irrespective of their income, occupation, or social position, the condition of civilization which, in the absence of such measures, would be enjoyed only by the rich.”⁵⁴

While some progress had already been made, he saw that, in 1931, much greater public expenditure was needed, above all on health services and education. He concluded that ‘though the ideal of an equal distribution of material wealth may continue to elude us, it is necessary, nevertheless, to make haste towards it, not because such wealth is the most important of man’s treasures, but to prove that it is not.’⁵⁵

This, then, is a strong argument in favour of substantive social equality expressed in economic terms. It represents the heart of Tawney’s prescriptive social thinking. At the same time he was sometimes dismissive of the notion of equality of opportunity, stating passionately that under certain conditions it amounts to little more than ‘the impertinent courtesy of an invitation offered to unwelcome guests, in the certainty that circumstances will prevent them from accepting it.’⁵⁶ Thus not only is equality of opportunity distinct from social equality but sometimes comes into conflict with it. The differentiation and grading upon which equality of opportunity works can itself be anti-egalitarian.

This shows Tawney out of line with Chares Gore, the theologian and bishop who inspired him in so many other ways, and behind Gore, with T. H. Green, the patron of Balliol’s civic moralism. J. H. Muirhead, student and advocate of Green, in his lectures on Green’s political teaching, stated that Green ‘would have retained the phrase “equality of opportunity” despite recent criticisms of it. The “opportunity” which was to be equalized was the opportunity not merely to *have* and to be happy, but to *do* and to realise.’⁵⁷ So a common tradition is to be found on this topic, with roots in Green’s philosophy and Gore’s mature writings, and Temple was part of this, as seen in his bishop’s ‘charge’ to his Manchester diocesan clergy, published in 1925 as *Christ in his Church*:

“The one true form of Equality politically is equality of opportunity. That this form of Equality should be established is an indispensable condition of social justice, and for this reason we ought to do all in our power to provide equal education facilities for all classes in the community.”⁵⁸

⁵² Material from this section is drawn from my ‘R. H. Tawney and Anglican Social Theology’, *Crucible: The Journal of Christian Social Ethics*, January 2018, Norwich: Hymns Ancient and Modern.

⁵³ Tawney, 1975.

⁵⁴ Tawney 1975, p. 169.

⁵⁵ Tawney 1975, p. 291.

⁵⁶ Tawney 1975.

⁵⁷ Muirhead 1908, p. 84.

⁵⁸ Temple 1925, p. 82.

The last clause is important because it implies a large-scale reform of the education system. Temple was questioning the discrepancy between state education and the private education of the ‘public schools’. All educational institutions must be brought up to the level of the kind of education that Temple himself had enjoyed as a child. It is a simple, very bold, and radical proposal that Tawney would have supported. So while his advocacy of equality of opportunity shows some divergence with Tawney, the practical outcome of their views was not so far apart. Furthermore both Tawney and Temple had a lifelong commitment to worker’s education, being regular lecturers at Workers Education Association evening classes in different parts of the country and in being successive presidents. Tawney also described Temple as a ‘natural equalitarian’.⁵⁹

Temple’s wide ranging and deep proposal for educational reform was reiterated in Temple’s most famous book, the 1942 best seller *Christianity and Social Order*. One passage shows both his distance *from* and closeness *to* Tawney’s views in *Equality*:

“...apart from faith in God there is really nothing to be said for the notion of human equality. Men do not seem to be equal in any respect, if we judge by available evidence. But if all are children of one Father, then all are equal heirs of a status in comparison with which the apparent differences of quality and capacity are unimportant; in the deepest and most important of all – their relationship to God – all are equal. [So] Why should some of God’s children have full opportunity to develop their capacities in freely-chosen occupations, which others are confined to a stunted form of existence, enslaved to types of labour which represent no personal choice but the sole opportunity offered?”⁶⁰

This anger, recalling Gore as well the tone of many passages in *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*⁶¹, led Temple to reiterate his call for widespread and deep educational reform when the war was over. This he did in his second policy recommendation in the final chapter of the book, entitled ‘The Task Before Us’: ‘Every child should have the opportunity of an education to the years of maturity, so planned as to allow for his [and her] peculiar aptitudes and to make possible their full development.’ Temple added, hopefully, that this education ‘should throughout be inspired by faith in God and find its focus in worship.’⁶²

On equality, then, Tawney stood at a tangent from Temple and Beveridge. While in other respects he shared their outlook, his advocacy of substantive social equality showed him developing it in a distinctive direction. On the other hand, they all shared anger at the harsh inequalities of British society between the wars and could unite over calls for wholesale reform, especially of the educational system. Tawney and Temple were especially committed to opening up educational provision for workers and contributed in a great many ways to the WEA and other initiatives throughout their adult lives.

In the end it is this shared commitment, passionate and lifelong, that gives the clue to the nature of the political vision common to the three Balliol friends. Such commitment echoes down the years and calls us, in very different contexts, to find ways of embodying it today.

⁵⁹ Tawney 1945.

⁶⁰ Temple 1976, p. 37.

⁶¹ Tawney 1938.

⁶² Temple 1976, p. 97.

References

- Beveridge, W., 1942, Social Insurance and Allied Services, H.M. Government Printers, news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/19_07_05_beveridge.pdf.
- Beveridge, W., 1948, *Voluntary Action: A Report on Methods of Social Advance*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Caird, E., 1908, *Lay Sermons and Addresses delivered in the Hall of Balliol College*, Glasgow, 1908
- Grimley, M., 2004, *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, J., 1997, *William Beveridge: A Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iremonger, F., 1948, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer, S., 2022, *William Temple: A Study in Servant Leadership*, London: SCM Press.
- Tawney, R. H., 1975, *Equality*, (first published 1931), London: Unwin Books
- Tawney, R.H., 1938, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (Scott Holland Memorial Lectures 1922, first published 1926), Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Tawney, R.H., 1945, 'William Temple – An Appreciation', *The Highway*, January 1945, p.45.
- Temple, F. (ed.), 1963, *Some Lambeth Letters*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Temple, W., 1928, *Christianity and the State*. Lectures. London: Macmillan, 1928
- Temple, W., 1976, *Christianity and Social Order*, first published by Harmondsworth: Penguin Special, 1942. New edition London: SCM Press, 1950. New edition: London: Shephard-Walwyn and SPCK, 1976, with Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Edward Heath and Introduction by Professor R.H. Preston.
- Wilkinson, A., 1998, *Christian Socialism: Scott Holland to Tony Blair*, London: SCM Press.

3. Matthew Grimley

Christianity and Social Order in Context

When William Temple died prematurely in October 1944, it was an occasion for national mourning. But the Bishop of Durham, Hensley Henson, while paying tribute to him in his diary, wrote that ‘I think he is *felix opportunitate mortis*, for he has passed away while the streams of opinion in Church and State, of which he had become the outstanding symbol and exponent, were at flood, and escaped the experience of their inevitable ebb.’ Henson’s comment was characteristically contrarian and catty, but he was making an interesting suggestion, that 1944 might be the high-water mark of the Temple project. In this article, I want to explore this by placing Temple’s 1942 book *Christianity and Social Order* in its wartime context, and to discuss a particular wartime moment in Autumn 1942. I’ll go on to explore whether Henson was correct to predict that these ideas would recede.

Christianity and Social Order was written in 1941, and published a few months before the Beveridge Report in 1942; it was a bestseller, selling at least 139,000 copies as a Penguin Special. Although thinking about reconstruction had been going on since the very outbreak of war in 1939, it had intensified in 1941-2. In January 1941, Temple held the Malvern Conference which brought together various Anglican luminaries including the detective novelist Dorothy L. Sayers and T.S. Eliot to investigate how the church could contribute to reconstruction. In January 1942, Sir Stafford Cripps returned to Britain from his spell as ambassador to Moscow, and Temple became Archbishop of Canterbury the following month. Cripps, who at that time was a non-partisan politician (having been expelled from the Labour Party at the start of the war for advocating an anti-Fascist popular front) was at the height of his popularity, registering very high approval ratings as a potential PM, and his speeches seemed to be mobilizing Christian opinion in support of reconstruction. In September 1942, Cripps and Temple addressed a rally in the Albert Hall, the first of a series of events Temple held under the title ‘The Church Looks Forward’. Cripps told the audience that ‘it was for the church to provide the moral force and the driving power for social and economic development.’ Temple told the rally that ‘the Church had both a duty and a right to declare the principles which should govern the ordering of society’. And Temple made some controversial proposal that as banks were becoming a monopoly, they should be brought under public control. The Albert Hall Rally brought the following outburst in his diary from the millionaire Conservative MP, Chips Channon:

The old Archbishop, heaven knows, was foolish and wicked enough; but the new obese one is positively dangerous! He now preaches socialism from a platform he shares with Cripps! ... Is England mad or doomed; or is it as well that the revolution should come from the top, rather than the bottom? Almost everything that I loved has disappeared in under three years.

Later in 1942, the Beveridge Report was published, and Richard Acland founded the Common Wealth Party, which appealed to Christian socialists, and which enjoyed fleeting success in contesting and winning by-elections against the coalition parties. So *Christianity*

and Social Order needs to be seen in the context of these interconnected radical initiatives in 1941-2, and of a particular moment of popular enthusiasm for political change and social reconstruction in Autumn 1942.

What is striking rereading *Christianity and Social Order*, though, is how cautious Temple's proposals were. Although he was keen to vindicate the Church's right to intervene on social questions, he had got his fingers burnt doing this in the past. On the first page of *Christianity and Social Order* he recalled how, when he and a number of other bishops made a rather ill-judged intervention in the miners' dispute in 1926, the Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, asked how the bishops would like it if he referred the revision of the Athanasian Creed to the Iron and Steel Trades Federation? After 1926 Temple became much more reticent about making political interventions, and began to argue, as he did in *Christianity and Social Order*, that the Church's job should be to lay down general principles (or 'middle axioms', as they were subsequently termed). Temple had also seen the dangers of trying to speak on behalf of the Church at the 1941 Malvern conference, when his attempt at drafting agreed conclusions had led to a dispute. This explains the rather odd structure of *Christianity and Social Order*, where the detailed proposals were relegated to an appendix, in which Temple claimed to be writing in a personal capacity. He was even tempted to omit this appendix altogether, until he was dissuaded by Keynes and Tawney, who had read the draft.

There were also other reasons for the cautious tone of the proposals in *Christianity and Social Order*. Temple recommended several things which were to be part of the post-war settlement, including raising the school-leaving age, family allowances, and house-building, as well as others that were not, like representation of labour on boards, and public works schemes to deal with unemployment. However, most of Temple's proposals emphasised state *regulation* rather than state *ownership*. Strikingly, Temple didn't advocate common ownership of industry in *Christianity and Social Order*. Common ownership had been the main bone of contention at the Malvern Conference of 1941, when the radical Liberal MP Richard Acland had submitted a motion saying that the vesting of the nation's main industrial resources 'in the hands of private owners is a stumbling block ... contrary to divine justice'. This had been opposed by other attendees, and was toned down by changing 'is' to 'may be.' In *Christianity and Social Order*, Temple said that he would not advocate common ownership because it was necessary to find ways to channel what he called 'right self-interest'. 'Communal ownership would entirely close one channel to it and open others – especially the road to the bureaucratic aristocracy which is an evident feature of the Russian system.'

Although Temple supported the Beveridge Report when it was published a few months after *Christianity and Social Order*, he was also cautious about state welfare. He had inherited from the T.H. Green tradition of British idealism a belief that welfare provision should promote active citizenship. During the 1930s, he had instigated and chaired a major enquiry into unemployment, which produced the 1938 *Men Without Work* report. The types of assistance for the unemployment that it commended were almost extensions of the settlement tradition – for example, residential communities in South Wales. While supporting state benefits for the unemployed, it expressed concern about their impact on self-reliance and self-respect. In 1944, the final year of his life, he said in a radio broadcast that 'there is a real danger that in our time, people may regard the state as a universal provider of pensions and social services rather than as a channel through which their own service can be rendered.' Temple supported Beveridge's report because it seemed to promote active citizenship by its principle of universal contribution.

Indeed, Temple's own conception of the welfare state was specifically meant as a rejoinder to the over-mighty state. Temple had been the first person in English to use the term 'welfare

state' in his 1928 book *Christianity and the State*. But he used the term in quite a specific context, arguing that the Great War had been a conflict between two conceptions of the state. On the German side had been the 'power-state', 'the idea of the state as essentially power – power over its own community and against other communities'. On the Allied side was the welfare state, the idea of 'the state as the organ of community'. This initial usage of the term 'welfare state', then, didn't denote state welfare provision. A welfare state was simply a state which acted as an organ of community. His inter-war writings on politics like *Christianity and the State*, bore the influence of pluralist thinkers like J.N. Figgis, the Edwardian Anglo-Catholic priest who had defended the rights of associations (e.g. churches and trades unions) against the state. During the second world war, Temple revived this idea of the power state against the welfare state in *Citizen and Churchman* (1941). It's probably true that the Second World War made Temple envisage a larger role for the state than he had done in the 1920s and 1930s. For example, Lawrence Goldman points out that he was willing to allow the state to co-ordinate adult education, leading to an uncharacteristic disagreement with Tawney. But he still emphasised that the state must be subordinate to the community. While he acknowledged in *Christianity and Social Order* that there would have to be planning in a post-war society, he insisted that it would need to be 'planning for freedom', a term he borrowed from the sociologist Karl Mannheim.

So we can see that Temple's version of the welfare state was not as statist as is sometimes supposed. How far did it get implemented after the war? The most obvious areas where Temple was successful was education, the main area (along with family allowances, which he also supported) that was legislated on by the coalition before the end of the war. Here Temple was able to secure the continuation of the dual system of schooling (which was put on a sounder financial footing in exchange for some reduction in the Church's control over schools). But Temple had always had a broader conception of educational reform than many Anglicans, and in the debates leading to the 1944 Education Act, he was prepared for the Church to cede some of its privileges, in order to exert a wider influence over education, particularly the teaching of RE in all schools, and the compulsory daily act of worship. He also believed that secondary education was more important than religious education. 'I may be putting this very crudely,' he said in a letter to a friend, 'but I believe that our Lord is much more interested in raising the school leaving age to 16 than in acquiring an agreed religious syllabus'. The school leaving age wasn't in fact raised to 16 until 1973 but it was raised to 15 in 1947.

In other respects, though, the post-war welfare state was more bureaucratic and centralist than Temple had envisaged, and some of his circle expressed misgivings about it. Temple's friend, A.D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol who became a labour peer in 1945, commented in that year that 'however much we think the role of the state ought to be increased, however far we move from the laissez-faire state, there are some things which the state should never do, or at least never do alone'. William Beveridge made the same point, writing a report in 1948 to argue that the voluntary action was still essential and one of the 'distinguishing marks of a free society'. Stafford Cripps, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, preached a sermon at St Paul's Cathedral just before the 1950 election, in which he noted the 'danger' that with the extension of public control 'the administration may become mechanical and impersonal, and that the individual may lose all sense of spiritual responsibility for the corporate acts of his society.'⁶³ Tawney shared some of Temple's ambivalence about nationalisation, alluding in 1952 to 'the danger of top-heavy bureaucracy and remote control'. Clare Griffiths has pointed out that 'one way of looking at the development of the welfare state, planning and economic

⁶³ Cripps, Stafford, *The Spiritual Crisis: A Sermon Preached in St Paul's Cathedral*, 13. Year?

interventions after the Second World War is to think of this as the outcome of a contest between the prospect of a centralized, bureaucratic system run by experts on behalf of the public, and a more participatory, bottom-up, politics.⁶⁴ In this contest, Cripps, Lindsay and Tawney were instinctively on the side of bottom-up politics, as Temple had been.

The vision of community that Temple espoused, was also challenged by wider post-war social and intellectual changes – first affluence, and then the rise of the counterculture and identity politics. Temple and co were paternalists gendered idea of the male manual worker, and this was still present in Christian socialist writing in the 1940s which idealised the ‘common man’. This Victorian view of the working-class was challenged by post-war changes in class structure such as deindustrialisation, the switch from blue-collar to white-collar work, and the feminisation of the workforce. It was also challenged by the expressive youth culture of the 1960s and 1970s; in his 1973 survey of the counter-culture, *Youthquake*, the radical Anglo-Catholic priest Kenneth Leech lamented that ‘the Christian socialist movement is more or less extinct, and there is no authentic left-wing movement of any significance in Britain which derives its inspiration from Christian theology.’

This turned out to be a premature obituary for Christian socialism. The economic crises and unemployment of the late 1970s and 1980s led to a revival of interest in it. Edward Heath provided a preface for the 35th anniversary edition of *Christianity and Social Order* in 1977. More surprisingly, in a lecture that year, Margaret Thatcher approvingly quoted Temple’s dictum that “the art of Government, in fact, is the art of so ordering life that self-interest prompts what justice demands”. During the 1980s, Anglicans continued to espouse an ideal of national community, sometimes using it as a reproach to the Thatcher governments. But this idea of community was now more pluralistic. The 1985 *Faith in the City* report on the inner cities, subtitled ‘a call to action by church and nation’, recognisably stood in the Temple tradition, but also addressed the question of what community meant in a religiously pluralistic society, concluding that ‘our responsibility to the community is one that we also share with other religious bodies’.⁶⁵ This religiously diverse landscape wasn’t something that Temple envisaged when he asked ‘what right has the Church to interfere?’ In the 1990s and 2000s, New Labour also drew on the Christian socialist tradition, but combined it with a commitment to multiculturalism – to a vision of society as a series of communities rather than a single national community.

Speaking at the Malvern Conference in 1941, Archbishop William Temple lamented that the younger generation ‘do not know of the great tradition of Christian social teaching associated with the names of Ludlow, Maurice, Kingsley, Westcott, Gore and Scott Holland. The world must be reminded of it if the tradition itself is not to fade’, he enjoined. I’m afraid that the same fate has now befallen Temple himself. I’m used to history undergraduates not having heard of him, but slightly more striking is that his name elicits the same blank reaction from Anglican ordinands. This is inevitable with the passing of time; Temple is as remote from young people today as Ludlow, Maurice and Kingsley were in 1941. However, I still urge them to read *Christianity and Social Order*. It’s a salutary corrective to the inward-lookingness of a lot of contemporary Anglican debate. While some parts of it have dated, others remain fresh. And unfortunately, some of the social ills tackled by Temple in the book, such as poor housing and low wages, are now back in our midst.

⁶⁴ Griffiths, Clare, ‘The politics of neighbourliness: social democracy on the home front in Britain during the Second World War’, in Hans Schattle and Jeremy Nuttall (eds.), *Making Social Democrats*, 87.

⁶⁵ Church of England Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City: a call to action by Church and nation*, 61.

4. Lawrence Goldman

The British State and its Limits, 1870-1945: Tawney, Temple and Beveridge Compared

Given the number and variety of people from Balliol College, Oxford - both students and dons – who played a role in the early development of the British welfare state, it would be easy enough in this short essay to focus on the college alone and its remarkable ability to generate a distinctively progressive culture and atmosphere between the 1860s and the First World War.⁶⁶ But having written about the friendships between three of the most notable Balliol undergraduates in this era in a previous essay on R. H. Tawney, William Temple and William Beveridge, I want to use this opportunity to look outwards and beyond Oxford.⁶⁷ This will make it easier to emphasise the variety, rather than the similarity, of views held by members of the college in relation to the expansion of the British state and the reform of society in this period. Some of that variety is caught in differing reactions to the English working class when Balliol students encountered working men and women in different social settings at this time, which will form another theme in this essay, therefore. By taking a wider approach, it may be possible to better understand the legacy of the college and attempt an assessment of the relevance of that legacy today.

In 1902, while they were undergraduates at Balliol College, Oxford, R. H. Tawney and William Beveridge founded an essay society for ‘the writing of papers on social questions from a matter of fact and as far as possible practical point of view’.⁶⁸ Tawney read a paper on the ‘Taxation of Site Values’ at its only recorded meeting in June 1902, no doubt killing-off the group just as it was established by the sheer tedium of the subject.⁶⁹ The story is evidence that both these young men were in earnest; but also that Balliol students in general, then as now most probably, had far better things to do than listen to each other reading papers on social ills and their solution. We should not run away with the idea that Balliol was a hotbed of progressive thought and endeavour from top to bottom, therefore. Tawney and Temple, for example, were also members of a large circle of Balliol undergraduates led by the charismatic student Arthur Collings Carré, a sort of Wildean figure who took his own life in sad obscurity

⁶⁶ John Jones, *Balliol College: A History 1263-1939* (Oxford, 1988).

⁶⁷ Lawrence Goldman, ‘Founding the Welfare State: Beveridge, Tawney, and Temple’ in Goldman (ed.), *Welfare and Social Policy in Britain Since 1870. Essays in Honour of Jose Harris* (Oxford, 2019), 44-59.

⁶⁸ William Beveridge to Annette Susannah Beveridge (mother), 24 Feb. 1902, Beveridge papers, British Library of Political and Economic Science (BLPES), London School of Economics, Bev/2/A/49.

⁶⁹ Lawrence Goldman, *The Life of R. H. Tawney. Socialism and History* (London, 2013), 21.

some years later. Relations within the group were intense, precious, flirtatious and homo-erotic; certainly not serious, nor remotely political.⁷⁰

Yet many others were nothing if not serious when they came to Balliol. At the 1912 Workers' Educational Association Summer School, the third to have been organised and held in the college, Temple preached at St. Mary's, the University Church, in the morning, and acceded to the request of some of the students – mostly working men attending WEA classes in their home towns and cities during the year – that he answer their questions after dinner in the hall in Balliol. He spent a heroic four hours defending Christianity and the Church of England from a gathering of workers who 'was critical if not actually hostile'.⁷¹

There is an important point bound up in this second anecdote: that in thinking about Balliol and British society in this era we are dealing with two elites rather than one only. On one side we see a generation of college students whose Christian faith was ebbing and who were seeking some sort of recompense, outlet, or substitute in political and social projects: helping their fellow men and women, but now in a secular context.⁷² Meanwhile, among an elite of working-class scholars, whom they taught and with whom they interacted in various new organisations, they met men and women, mostly at work in skilled occupations, and usually from a Christian non-conformist background, who had also lost their faith, and who were seeking a new kind of spiritual enrichment and satisfaction through secular learning, discussion and self-cultivation: adult education, in short. On both sides, there was a spiritual quest for what all described as 'a higher life' – for self-improvement through study. How Balliol men responded to this elite of workers tells us a good deal about their attitudes to the state, its expansion, and its reform.⁷³

The period we're examining saw the development of the party politics, ideologies, and many of the social interests that have shaped British history ever since. This was the era of the consolidation of a middle-class Conservative Party, based on urban property holders, small as well as large, located in the new suburbs springing up on the fringes of British cities, so-called 'villadom'. In the mid-Victorian decades, these groups had tended to vote for the Liberal Party because they favoured and gained from the economic and political reforms, notably free trade, that Liberalism then denoted. By the 1880s and 1890s they were voting Conservative to preserve those same gains and advantages, as they still do.⁷⁴ The development from the 1880s of a so-called New Liberalism entailed the rejection of the classical liberal laissez-faire ethics that had dominated the political economy of mid-Victorian Britain. The emergence of New Liberalism split the Liberal Party philosophically, and that split was made real during the First World War when Lloyd George became prime minister after the ousting of Herbert Asquith, another product of Balliol in this era. Thereafter British Liberalism was reduced to the small centrist grouping it has been ever since.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, the rise of a political Labour movement, beginning in the 1880s, culminated in the first two Labour governments, albeit minority administrations, in the 1920s. Although some Balliol men of this era would have styled themselves as 'socialists', the early Labour

⁷⁰ Ibid, 19.

⁷¹ F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters* (Oxford, 1948), 84. Albert Mansbridge, *Fellow Men: A Gallery of England 1876-1946* (London, 1948), 49.

⁷² A. G. L. Haig, 'The Church, the Universities and Learning in Later Victorian England', *Historical Journal*, 29, 1, 1986, 187-201.

⁷³ Lawrence Goldman, 'Intellectuals and the Working Class 1870-1945: The Case of Adult Education', *History of Education*, 29, 4 (2000), 281-300.

⁷⁴ James Cornford, 'The Transformation of Conservatism in the late-Nineteenth Century', *Victorian Studies*, vii, 1, Sept. 1963, 35-66.

⁷⁵ Trevor Wilson, *The Downfall of the Liberal Party 1914-1935* (London, 1966).

Party was anything but socialist in orientation, policy and self-description.⁷⁶ It is best seen as seeking to represent working people directly, and to promote working-class communities and their interests, a stance that might be described as ‘undogmatic labourism’. From now on, working people would represent themselves in politics rather than be represented by people from a different class and social background. Nevertheless, the founders were strongly influenced by an ethical anti-capitalism, and many Balliol men were under the influence of similar ideas, thus making possible a relationship between the university and workers.⁷⁷ Oxford would educate a new working-class leadership for the responsibilities of office, a role described and analysed in the so-called ‘1909 Report’ that was the product of a joint committee of dons and workers, and which was written-up by R.H. Tawney. This was the blueprint for the tutorial classes movement launched jointly by Oxford and the WEA.⁷⁸

Oxford graduates and tutors responded in different ways to the changes and social challenges of these decades. T. H. Green, White’s Professor of Moral Philosophy in Balliol in the 1860s and 1870s, is usually understood to have been a transitional figure who emphasized the social context and communal obligations of liberalism, though he never sought to break free from pre-existing conventions of individual self-sufficiency and responsibility, nor envisaged a greatly enlarged state.⁷⁹ William Beveridge, at Balliol between 1899 and 1903, is best described in the Edwardian era as a New Liberal, and he remained a Liberal for the rest of his life. He was an unsuccessful Liberal parliamentary candidate and eventually sat as a Liberal peer in the House of Lords.⁸⁰ Conversely, his lifelong friend and brother-in-law, R. H. Tawney, was a genuine socialist, perhaps better called a Christian Socialist, and certainly a Labour man to his core from the early years of the 20th century. He stood four times as a Labour candidate for the Commons in the years after the First World War, and failed on each occasion. A little later to study in Balliol, G. D. H. Cole became the deviser of Guild Socialism, in vogue through the First World War and into the 1920s. It would have given workers control of their industries through the formation of representative bodies based on the model of medieval guilds and was designed as an alternative to both the private ownership of business and state control of enterprises.⁸¹ Across that great divide that separates Balliol from St. John’s College, Oxford, to its north, Sidney Ball, who played an important founding role in the WEA, was the leading Oxford member of the Fabian Society.⁸²

However, we should not forget that great philosophers could be educated in Balliol, adopt the idealist ethics that then dominated the college, but become leading public critics of the growth of the state. Bernard Bosanquet was such a man; an undergraduate at Balliol in the 1860s; a fellow of University College, Oxford in the 1870s; and the author in 1899 of the seminal text, *The Philosophical Theory of the State*. But he was also the leading light of the Charity Organisation Society and a man who opposed what he called the ‘rough and mechanical’ indiscriminating reforms of the Edwardian era, which included free school meals, state old age pensions, and child endowment for widows and deserted wives, as well

⁷⁶ Ross McKibbin, ‘Why was there no Marxism in Great Britain?’, in McKibbin, *The Ideologies of Class: Social Relations in Britain 1880-1950* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 1-41.

⁷⁷ Lawrence Goldman, ‘John Ruskin, Oxford, and the British Labour Movement 1880-1914’ in Dinah Birch (ed.), *Ruskin and the Dawn of the Modern* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 57-86.

⁷⁸ Lawrence Goldman, *Dons and Workers. Oxford and Adult Education Since 1850* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 117-27; Goldman, *The Life of R. H. Tawney*, pp. 60-3.

⁷⁹ Melvyn Richter, *The Politics of Conscience. T. H. Green and His Age* (London, 1964)

⁸⁰ Jose Harris, *William Beveridge. A Biography* (Oxford, 1997).

⁸¹ A. W. Wright, *G. D. H. Cole and Socialist Democracy* (Oxford, 1979).

⁸² Ernest Barker, ‘Politics and Political Philosophy’ in Oona Howard Ball (ed.), *Sidney Ball: Memories and Impressions of ‘An Ideal Don’* (Oxford, 1923), 224. Mary Stocks, *The Workers’ Educational Association: The First Fifty Years* (London, 1953), pp. 28.

as free medical treatment for the working classes where that could be obtained.⁸³ Other figures changed their politics and views over time. Arthur Acland, educated at Christ Church and sometime Bursar of Balliol in the 1880s, was a founder of the Oxford extension lectures programme in the 1870s and then a Liberal MP and minister after 1885. His commitment to the working class and his criticisms of the Liberal Party for neglecting its interests, led him leftwards into the Labour Party during and after the First World War.⁸⁴

As these different individual responses suggest, there was no single Balliol or Oxford view of the state or of the right way to reform British society: dons and undergraduates covered the spectrum of social responses and movements. Some were drawn to traditional Christian mission in the slums. This might be said to have impelled Arnold Toynbee, ‘Apostle Arnold’, in the 1870s.⁸⁵ Balliol men were to the fore in the founding of University Settlements like Toynbee Hall in 1884, where a secular form of social activism took root, seeking to bring leadership and culture to the poorest districts of the city. Toynbee Hall was a more intellectual and sociological endeavour, encouraging its residents to work with, and to study the poor.⁸⁶ Other colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, however, founded traditional missions to try to re-Christianize the old slums, and convert the new suburbs. The Trinity College, Cambridge Mission in Camberwell, South London, was founded in 1885 to lead in spreading the gospel to the expanding and godless suburbs, the first of several Cambridge colleges to work south of the Thames. It never really succeeded in that, however, though it drew a lot of college men to Camberwell and enjoyed good relations with the local community. It became a general social centre, as opposed to a religious institution (and still supported by Trinity College) in the 1960s and 1970s.⁸⁷

Others followed the example of T. H. Green in engaging in secondary education, whether as school governors, as Green became at the King Edward VI foundation schools in Birmingham and at the Oxford Boys’ School (now home to the Oxford History Faculty), or as teachers themselves, as William Temple became when he was headmaster of Repton School in the years before the First World War. Green saw education as the vital means by which to achieve both individual fulfilment and social cohesion and solidarity, crucial requirements for a society reaching beyond classical liberal individualism. Adult education, meanwhile, was always synonymous with Balliol. First came the movement known as University Extension, beginning in 1878. Green himself attended and introduced the first ever Oxford University Extension Lecture in Birmingham in that year – and it was in Birmingham on account of Green’s pre-existing associations with the city.⁸⁸ The Oxford extension programme was remarkably successful, educating up to twenty thousand students a year, many of them middle class women, in classes taught by peripatetic tutors sent out by the university. But reaching workers specifically and providing them with an education for their new social and political roles, was more difficult. From 1903, Balliol men worked in partnership with the new Workers’ Educational Association, which had been founded by the autodidact scholar, Albert Mansbridge.⁸⁹ He needed and received institutional support and money from Oxford and Oxford men. The WEA made it possible for graduates from the

⁸³ William Sweet (ed.), *Bernard Bosanquet and the Legacy of British Idealism* (Toronto, 2007)

⁸⁴ Goldman, *Dons and Workers*, pp. 37-45.

⁸⁵ Alon Kadish, *Apostle Arnold: The Life and Death of Arnold Toynbee 1852-1883* (Durham, NC), 1986.

⁸⁶ Asa Briggs and Anne Macartney, *Toynbee Hall. The First Hundred Years* (London, 1984)

⁸⁷ Lawrence Goldman, *Trinity in Camberwell. A History of the Trinity College Mission in Camberwell 1885-1985* (Cambridge, 1985). K. S. Inglis, *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England* (London, 1963), ch. 4.

⁸⁸ Goldman, *Dons and Workers*, pp. 31-33.

⁸⁹ Bernard Jennings, *Albert Mansbridge and English Adult Education* (Hull, 1976), pp. 3-7.

universities, especially from Oxford, Cambridge and London, to teach and simultaneously to learn from, working-class scholars.⁹⁰

Once again, there was no uniform response from the Balliol men who met the working class through these arrangements. Beveridge tended to treat them as a disembodied, abstract ‘problem’ for solving, which he did brilliantly as in his book *Unemployment: A Problem of Industry*, published in 1909. It was based on his research into the defective market for labour in London, caused by lack of information about job vacancies, which Beveridge hoped to rectify through the establishment of labour exchanges. For Tawney, however, a period of three years at Toynbee Hall after graduating led to his discovery that he had more sympathy for, and could be of more use to, the industrial working class in Lancashire mill towns and North Staffordshire pit villages, than to the casual workers, drifters, and the unemployed of the East End. When the young David Marquand, subsequently a Labour MP, Oxford college head, and the biographer of Ramsay MacDonald, interviewed Tawney on his 80th birthday in 1960, he asked him what had made him a socialist. Tawney replied,

Going out into the world and meeting people. But not the working people in the East End: they were a subservient lot. The working people in Rochdale: they were proud and they told you what they thought.⁹¹

And there is this, on the same theme, from Tawney’s *Commonplace Book*, an occasional journal which he kept for three years before the First World War:

One whole wing of social reformers has gone, it seems to me, altogether astray. They are preoccupied with relieving distress, patching up failures, reclaiming the broken down. All this is good and necessary. But it is not the social problem, and it is not the policy which would ever commend itself to the working classes. What they want is security and opportunity, not assistance in the exceptional misfortunes of life, but a fair chance of leading an independent, fairly prosperous life...⁹²

As Balliol men discovered, there was a world of difference between men and women in industrial towns and cities who were proud of their craft skills and of the working-class organisations they had helped to build and sustain, and the unskilled poor in London.

Balliol men adopted different political and professional styles, in accordance with their temperaments and ideological orientation. Christianity was the medium for Temple, of course, though he was a very rational and philosophical Christian whose journey towards holy orders was seriously impaired by his genuine inability to accept the idea of the virgin birth and Christ’s bodily resurrection. It required the sympathetic intervention in 1908 of the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, and carefully composed words, to get him over and beyond that fundamental hurdle and into his priest’s cassock in the following year.⁹³ Beveridge was the bureaucrat, the administrator, a man with a high degree of *insensitivity* that allowed him to get things done. He rarely stopped to consider the personal impact of his

⁹⁰ Goldman, *Dons and Workers*, pp. 103-62.

⁹¹ David Marquand, ‘R. H. Tawney. Prophet of Equality’, *The Guardian*, 26 Nov. 1960.

⁹² *R. H. Tawney’s Commonplace Book* (eds., J. M. Winter and D. M. Joslin), (Cambridge, 1972), 10 June 1912, 13.

⁹³ Iremonger, *William Temple*, 106-16. William Temple to R. H. Tawney, 24 Jan. 1905, Tawney Papers, BLPEs, TV/31.

actions on others. He never suffered from self-doubt. Resourceful, conceited, ambitious, and very clever, he made institutions work effectively, but at a cost to those in them, and around him. Tawney, by contrast, was lacking in an ordered mind – he was a man who crusaded and who *felt* his politics, and who focused not on social and political mechanisms for doing good, but on changing people. Tawney was a critic of bureaucracy, Fabianism, and most aspects of programmatic and state socialism. This is from his *Commonplace Book* for December 1912:

The attitude of governments to social questions is wrong, profoundly wrong. But it is wrong because the attitude of individuals to each other is wrong, because we in our present society are living on certain false and universal assumptions... What we have got to do first of all is to change those assumptions or principles. This is where I think the Fabians are inclined to go wrong. They seem to think that you can trick statesmen into a good course of action, without changing their principles, and that by taking sufficient thought society can add several cubits to its stature. It can't, as long as it lives on the same spiritual diet. No amount of cleverness will get figs off thistles. What I want to do is to get clear in my mind what those moral assumptions or principles are, and then put others in their place.⁹⁴

Given these differences, it was inevitable that Balliol men should have had different attitudes to the state. One example of this was the dispute between Tawney and Temple in 1944 over the future of adult education. Tawney would not attend the conference Temple convened in Oxford early in that year because he continued to see adult education as a self-governing and a self-directed movement, whereas Temple's conference was premised on the conflation of the Board of Education and the WEA in the post-war period, and on the largesse of the state in providing funds and structures for adult learning.⁹⁵ Tawney is best understood in many contexts as a late-Victorian voluntarist for whom the WEA was a model of the good society. He was not by nature and instinct a believer in the benefits of government. According to Gerald Aylmer, the historian of the seventeenth century state in England and Tawney's last doctoral pupil, Tawney was a Democrat before he was a Socialist, which is unsurprising since it took until 1918 – by which time Tawney was 38 – for all working-class men, and all women, to get the vote in Britain.⁹⁶ The formative period of his life and career was taken up with what Tawney saw as fundamentally democratic causes, most notably the education of a new generation of working people for the power they would hold in the future. Meanwhile, we should note Beveridge's conception of an essentially contractual relationship between workers and the state, based on the contributions paid-in to fund the benefits paid-out. Beveridge may now be known as the 'architect of the welfare state' but what he really designed was 'the insurance state'. They are different things and in the drift from one to the other may be found many of the reasons for the 'crisis of the state' we are revisiting today.

In the essay previously referred to that I published in 2019, I called these three men 'founders of the welfare state'. Temple first coined the term 'welfare state' in 1928, and used it again in 1941 in opposition to the Nazi 'power state', while Beveridge is inextricably linked to it

⁹⁴ Tawney, *Commonplace Book*, pp. 45-6.

⁹⁵ 'Conference on the Provision of a Genuine System of Adult Education, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 11-12 Jan. 1944' (known as the 'Archbishop's Conference on Adult Education'), Temple papers, Lambeth Palace Library, vol. 22, ff. 220-350. William Temple to R. H. Tawney, 6 April 1944; R. H. Tawney to William Temple 17 Feb. and 10 Aug. 1944, ff. pp. 328, 308, 330.

⁹⁶ Goldman, *The Life of R. H. Tawney*, p. 173.

through the so-called Beveridge Report (*Social Insurance and Allied Services*) of 1942.⁹⁷ But on reflection, I would now argue that Tawney, at least, was not a founder of the welfare state in any direct sense but an educationist in the tradition of preceding Victorian and Edwardian educationists, most notably Michael Sadler who had led Oxford University Extension in the 1880s and 1890s before going into government and then becoming Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University. Sadler became the leading educationist of his generation and, like Tawney, he was focused above all on the improvement of secondary education, playing a large part in the development of the 1902 Education Act. He had been an undergraduate at another Oxford college, but only over the wall to the east that separates Balliol from Trinity College.⁹⁸

I hope the differences between these Balliol men is evident in my remarks, therefore. There was no clear Balliol style of social service or a single attitude towards the state. Many of the college's graduates left Oxford with a developed social conscience but it was not the same conscience in each case. They had undoubtedly been encouraged to focus their talents, their faith, and their learning on the problems of the cities. But there were many different ways in which that could be done. This is not to lessen or depreciate Balliol's contribution to social change in any manner: it is merely to argue that there was no uncontested Balliol view in this period. We should be celebrating the diversity of Balliol's social activism, not its homogeneity.

That said, like so many aspects of the past, the ideas of early-twentieth century Balliol men have, in my view at least, only limited relevance to our present policy dilemmas. Tawney understood this: when his publisher asked him to write a new version of his book *Equality* for the 1950s, he rightly demurred because the situation had changed so radically in the twenty years since its publication in 1931. As he pointed out, it would need an entirely new book to analyse the changes in welfare provision, industrial ownership, and social aspirations since 1939, not just an update. 'Even the preface', he wrote, 'sounds like a voice from beyond the deluge'.⁹⁹

A recent re-reading of Temple's *Christianity and Social Order*, published in 1942, has reinforced this. It undoubtedly captured the moment in wartime, but it seems delightfully antique now, a period piece quite lacking in relevance. It lays out a bureaucratic future for the economy, full of regional boards for this and national offices for that. It is premised on a Britain of large-scale manufacturing and extractive industries – coal, textiles, shipbuilding, engineering, steel-making, railways. The structure of present-day British capitalism where most of the jobs and all the possible growth lie in 'small and medium-sized enterprises', and where our future relies on innovations in digital and other recent technologies, is now so different. We depend upon entrepreneurs with a new idea and skills to match that idea; Temple saw only the traditional capitalist and owner who had to be prevented from grinding the faces of the poor and watering the workers' beer. Temple saw such men – and they were all men, of course – as the problem; we now admire 'start-ups' and those who take risks to establish them, entrepreneurial women as well as men.

Although Temple disavowed outright socialism as his inspiration in the book, he describes a regulatory state in which private ownership and enterprise are squeezed, apparently for the

⁹⁷ K. and J. Petersen, 'Confusion and Divergence: Origins and Meaning of the Term "Welfare State" in Germany and Britain, 1840-1940', *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 23, 1, Feb. 2013, 37-51; G. M. Stefan, 'European Welfare in a Historical Perspective: A Critical Review', *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, vol. 7, 1, 2015, pp. 33-4.

⁹⁸ Linda Grier, *Achievement in Education. The Work of Michael Ernest Sadler 1885-1935* (London, 1952); Michael Sadleir, *Sir Michael Sadler: A Memoir By His Son* (London, 1949).

⁹⁹ Tawney to Sir Stanley Unwin, 20 Nov. 1949, Tawney Papers, BLPES, TV 12/2.

public good. There are aspects of corporatism, especially in education and industrial policy, and an assault on the idea of private property in land and business: these are to be communal resources for the benefit of all. There is no consideration of incentives, therefore: why found or build a business under this regulatory regime? And although Temple disavows bureaucracy, the regulation could only be achieved and enforced by armies of clerks and officials policing economic life. It would – and it did – fail across Europe and the Soviet Union by the end of the twentieth century. *Christianity and Social Order* is a brilliant exposition of social Christianity which still resonates and impresses, and a crucial historic text. It is suffused with an essential spirit of service, and with the moral imperative to care for fellow men and women, that cannot fail to move a sympathetic reader. But Temple's suggestions for the reordering of the British state, admittedly offered with humility and caution in the book's final chapter entitled 'The Task Before Us', are almost certainly redundant.

If this is the case, what can we take away from a study of these men and their generation that might still have relevance? I think it is caught in Tawney's comment in the *Commonplace Book*, quoted earlier, that he sought to change men and women rather than to change social mechanisms, policies, and institutions. That would inevitably fail: only individual moral transformations would succeed. This is what the *New Statesmen* wrote, with great insight, in an editorial tribute to Tawney in 1962 on his death:

Tawney understood the nature of capitalism as well as any Marxist... Yet... he continued to insist that socialism was fundamentally about human behaviour. He rejected the fallacy – shared by the Webbs and the communists – that a change in the machinery of government was itself enough to change men.¹⁰⁰

The issues that move young people in the Balliol Junior Common Room today are much more likely to focus on sexual and environmental politics than matters affecting the everyday life and struggles of ordinary people. Those struggles consumed Tawney as he went from town to city to town – Rochdale to Manchester to Chesterfield to Longton in the Potteries – teaching industrial history and economics between 1908 and the autumn of 1914, when he volunteered for war service in the army. But insofar as today's Oxford students focus on the need to change behaviour – on not driving and flying, on curbing one's carbon footprint, on encouraging cultural diversity and on recognising sexual difference – I think they come close to Tawney's idea that a better future requires, above all, the moral reformation of individuals. As Tawney put it so concisely, the Fabians may 'tidy the room, but they open no windows on the soul'.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ 'A Man for All Seasons', *New Statesman*, 19 Jan. 1962.

¹⁰¹ Tawney, *Commonplace Book*, p. 51.

5. Maria Power

The Urgent Need for Social Justice in Northern Ireland

Although there has been a good deal of conversation in the media about Ireland reunifying as a result of the Brexit protocol, that is unlikely for the next 5 to 10 years so I will take this opportunity to discuss the problems facing Northern Ireland and the ways the churches can speak into the moral vacuum that has emerged there. I'll commence, however, by stating some of the principles outlined by Temple in *Christianity and Social Order* that I argue should guide the approach of churches in the region:

1. The state exists for its citizens, not the citizens for the state.
2. We do not as Christians have a blue print of an ideal social order; we are led to look at the present situation in the light of our Christianity understanding of life and identifying those aspects which particularly offend it and say 'this won't do'.¹⁰²
3. 'In other words, we must state the principles of Christianity loudly and clearly and point out breaches of them using the platforms that we are given.'¹⁰³

For me, this means measuring everything by the standards set for us in the teachings of Christ. John 10.10 tells us, 'I came that you may have life, life in its fullest.' This means that the dignity of the human person, and human flourishing (that is creating the conditions that allow everyone to become the person that God made them to be) should be at the centre of all our judgements of the actions of the government of the United Kingdom (and I say that because it is Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Sadly, because we have been subjected to 40 years of market capitalism, human dignity and human flourishing are nice ideas but even politicians who loudly profess their faith actively damage the chances of all but the most privileged. That is why we, as churches, must stand up and loudly proclaim the preferential option for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised. This doesn't mean that we ignore people's most basic needs (such as food and heat) and stop providing the emergency cover that the government has come to rely on whilst it abdicates its responsibilities to its citizens. No, rather it means that we mobilise all the considerable talent in our pews and we become a church that proclaims Christ's message of love both through the provision of desperately needed charity, and by holding the government to account for its failure to create a society in which everyone has what they need and the chance to flourish and become who God meant them to be.

¹⁰² Paraphrased from *Christianity and Social Order*.

¹⁰³ Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, 1976 edition, introduction, p. 15.

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland is on the brink of returning to serious violence again. There have recently been several terrorist incidents, one including a kidnapped man being forced to drive a vehicle full of fake explosives to a police station. Additionally, the root causes of the conflict there: poverty, marginalisation, and alienation are worse now than they were in 1968 when the initial conflict erupted. This is partly because of the anti-poor policies, such as the two-child cap, implemented by the Tory government. But it is also the result of lack of governance in the region: despite the provisions of the much-lauded Good Friday Agreement, the DUP are putting their political ideology above service and are refusing to serve with Sinn Féin who won the recent elections. Over the past decade, Northern Ireland has been ruled from Westminster more often than it has been ruled from Stormont. The consequence is state paralysis. Nothing can get done. Vital services such as housing, health and education are barely being run, and the civil service is having to step into the void to maintain even the most basic level of governance. Naturally this deficit of services will likely have an impact on the poorest and most vulnerable. In the area of housing for instance, the Housing Executive are unable to sort out disputes between neighbours in a timely manner leading people to turn to paramilitaries for help with the resultant suffering. New figures from the Trussell Trust show almost 31,700 emergency food parcels were given out during the April to September period – 25% more when compared to the same period last year.¹⁰⁴

So where are the churches in all of this? Well, they're there providing aid and assistance, but the leadership is not speaking out as loudly as it should. But when I feel angry about this, I realise that I am also the church, I am part of the people of God and therefore, my baptism has given me the mandate to act. And because we are all made in the image and likeness of God, he has given us the tools to act in different ways what I call the Charisms of Social Justice. Each way is equally vital as through such an approach both the symptoms and the causes of an issue are treated. It is only then that the conditions needed for human flourishing can be achieved.

I define these charisms as follows: *Prayer* is the foundation stone of everything that we do as Christians. It is also a useful tool in challenging socio-economic deprivation as it changes the person praying as well as the person being prayed for. By asking people to pray for something specific, we shape people's knowledge and understanding of a situation.

Immediate assistance is vital to building the Kingdom of God. People die if they are left to become malnourished; children cannot learn if they are excluded from school; and victims of domestic violence need shelter from their abusers. *Accompaniment* means helping people to change their lives by showing them how valuable they are and constantly helping them to fulfil their God-given potential. In doing so, we empower them to make decisions for themselves and challenge the systems and people that have abused them. *Structural change* asks us to overcome the abuses of power that lead to socio-economic deprivation, it is the deep-seated transformation that will take generations to achieve but is ultimately necessary for the outworking of God's plan for humanity.

There can be no doubt that society is broken creating the structural injustice that has led, in Northern Ireland, to a violent conflict that claimed thousands of lives, and left tens of thousands of people with life changing injuries both physical and psychological. Post-conflict

¹⁰⁴ The Trussell Trust, Stop UK Hunger, "Almost 1.3 million emergency parcels provided in last 6 months", 10 Nov 22. <<https://www.trusselltrust.org/2022/11/10/almost-1-3-million-emergency-parcels-provided-to-people-across-uk-experiencing-hunger-over-past-six-months-as-cost-of-living-emergency-drives-tsunami-of-need-to-food-banks/>> (Accessed 5 April 2023).

Northern Ireland is little better, with many left behind, unable to benefit from the peace dividend that was promised to them in 1998. Such a situation prevents human flourishing and denies people the dignity that is their due. But we can only deal with the issues facing society by taking a holistic approach, such as the one suggested above, working *with* the most marginalised to create solutions rather than making decisions for them. If our expression of church was to take such a form, it would mean that the teachings of the preferential option for the poor, solidarity, and subsidiarity could work in a creative tension to bring about the transformation necessary for the Kingdom of God to start to become a reality. It would allow us to hold the State to account.

6. Victoria Turner

‘Can We Imagine Again?’ Re-Envisioning the British State in a Time of Crisis

It's easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism.

- Mark Fisher¹⁰⁵

This quote stems from Fredric Jameson and Slavoj Žižek, but was made famous by Mark Fisher, in his *Capitalist Realism- Is there Really No Alternative*. Fisher's seminal work illustrated how imbedded capitalism is in our society- displacing the beauty of the useless and solely concentrating on profit and productivity. To the point where we could not imagine anything else, or anything better.

‘The structure of life as we knew it before the war has already been profoundly modified. How far do we want to restore it if we can? In which respects is it desirable that it should be changed in its inner principle?’¹⁰⁶

William Temple on the other hand, in his *Christianity and the Social Order*, pointed towards a new way. In this short paper I compare our post-covid society to Temple's, getting ready for his context post the Second World War. I argue that the act of imagining a new social order is essential and a skill we have lost today.

Ideas and imagining is powerful. In fact, I argue that creative imagining is an act of resistance. I recently listened to a talk from Dr Walaa Quisay at an Issachar funded conference in Edinburgh. Her talk was entitled ‘Beyond Al-walā' wa Al-barā': Ethnographic Notes on Loyalty and Fraught Fidelities in Egyptian Prisons.’ The most powerful aspect of her talk was her discussion of prisoners meeting in the most abhorrent of conditions to teach each other political theory, languages, and worship together. The guards would try and break this up, even moving men to different prisons- putting political activists with murders for example, but the resistance through the form of thinking would begin again.

Similar to the men in the barren Egyptian prisons, George MacLeod, the founder and leader of the Iona Community, for whom Temple and his circles were a great influence, wrote to his mother whilst serving in World War 1,

¹⁰⁵ Mark Fisher, *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative* (Winchester, UK: Zero Books, 2009), p. 1

¹⁰⁶ Temple, 1942, 62.

I have heard it said that a man comes out of this war with a very real religion or no religion at all [...] personally, I think any man who sees this war, must come out with a very real religion or cut his throat!¹⁰⁷

The same year, 1917, he wrote, ‘we are going to have some fun after the war. People discuss *revolutions* here.’

MacLeod suffered a major breakdown during the war after a mission to Greece, and when the doctor was removing bullets from his insides George reported he was ‘also concerned about the State of my inside’, by which he pointed towards his mentality or perhaps his soul. In an article due to be published in the *Journal of Scottish Archives* I discuss how the war brought MacLeod close to faith and in solidarity with the working classes. It was his ability to think about a new society, with the whole society of men represented- something the privileged Winchester and Oriel College educated MacLeod had not had exposure to, that pushed him through the war and shaped his character post service.

So why, at the death of Queen Elizabeth, during the height of austerity and the worst poverty this country has seen in decades, was dissent of the continuation of the Crown met with arrests- arrests on known peacemakers and young people? And why were Free Churches, built on traditions of dissent, gleefully participating in her funeral, rather than taking to the streets in support of those practising their democratic right? More significantly, how is it, that after Covid-19, which saw us revive a respect for the ‘lowest’ of workers, have we not escaped from the evils of individualistic capitalism, the Capitolocene as coined by Joerg Rieger.

Francios de Verges, in her ‘A Decolonial Feminism’ asks what the world might look like if viewed through the eyes of an undocumented female migrant cleaner. She’s ignored, invisible to society. Perhaps she cleans London’s finance sector, early in the morning to enable profit for the monster- Steinbeck’s accurate term for the bank or economy that has a mind of its own – but also warned about by Temple in ‘Christianity and the Social Question’.¹⁰⁸ She is only seen perhaps to be taken advantage of, touched by bosses aroused early in the morning and looking to exploit her in one more way than her lowly paid wage, which is probably even outsourced to a company who holds her passport.

When cases like this come to the media’s attention we pretend to be surprised and have empathy with the woman. We are glad for the justice system that might prosecute the man- but there will not be enough evidence (of course), and she’s not a national so she won’t report it anyway, but it’ll enter our mind, for two minutes or so, and we’ll forget it until the next solitary case is reported the next day. If ‘law exists to extend freedom’, as stated by Temple, why were the women who were mourning the murder of Sarah Everard in London met with more violence than seen at a typical England football match. Why is the finance worker - investing in unethical companies that exploit people across the world not subjected to the law, but the undocumented migrant, exploited at every turn, is subject to being called an ‘illegal’ person herself?

Margaret Thatcher popularised the myth that class was/is dead in Britain. Industry, and the base trades, she and her supporters voiced, were not the future. The future was in finance.

¹⁰⁷ MacLeod, George Fielden, (1895-1991), Baron Macleod of Fuinary, Church of Scotland minister, National Library of Scotland Archives (Acc.9084).

¹⁰⁸ William Temple, ‘Christianity and the Social Question’, p. 58.

The goal was for the poor to lift themselves out of poverty, out of their context and class and into the circle of ‘winners.’ A similar rhetoric exists today with popular memes circulating that say,

You will lose a lot of friends when you get serious about your goals.
That’s why a lambo has 2 seats and a bus has 30.

Temple held that ‘no man [sic] is fit for an isolated life,’ but we should think communally in our politics and economics. The goal, preached Temple, was not to elevate oneself above and despite others, but instead profits should only be claimed when earned by service to the community (p.57). Consumers should be treated as part of the process of production, he claimed, not as only a means to the end of profit.

In 1950 a group of young industrialists in the Christian Workers’ League came up with a similar idea in a form of *status confessionis* is that they presented to the Iona Community. By this time they were bemused with their Labour government that they did not believe had kept their promises for a new society. We see obvious resonances to Temple with their claim that,

For workers every worker is called to be a son of God. He is a brother of Christ. His whole being- body mind and spirit must be used in his work. To use merely his physique is to make him merely a machine and deny God’s Spirit in him.

A man’s work must be part of the work of God whose purpose is to satisfy the needs of all His children. Work merely for profit or selfish gain is not God’s work.

The materials used in work must be used with care and reverence. They are God’s gifts to men for their use not for their appropriation or misuse.

Of course, we also read in Isaiah 62: 8-10 (NIV),

“The LORD has sworn by his right hand
and by his mighty arm:
“Never again will I give your grain
as food for your enemies,
and never again will foreigners drink the new wine
for which you have toiled;
but those who harvest it will eat it
and praise the LORD,
and those who gather the grapes will drink it
in the courts of my sanctuary.”

Isaiah’s vision of the new Judea was one of fair produce and simple justice. Love, nor justice, are shown to workers in a call center, dehumanized with a script and timed for their productivity, or Amazon delivery drivers, not even able to take bathroom breaks and unable

to unionize while their elusive shareholders take home record profits. Workers have been turned into machines. To be clear, one can only become a billionaire through exploitation. When we are celebrating business ‘success’ we are really celebrating the fracturing of society and human relationality to one another.

Finally, I quickly want to think about where our gazes lie. Temple distinguished between industry and the State, believing that the State was responsible for the rights of workers where the industry would suffer (p.64). But this was on condition of them creating just profits. We live in a society that has fully accepted the capitalist myth that there is not enough to go around, and so we accept the idea of a trickle-down economy. Rather than our gaze fixing on the structures and rhetoric that hold up this system we are encouraged to focus on individual actors. Temple, in his publication, does not “out” anyone for past wrongs. Rather, he concentrates on themes, ideas and possibilities. We do this biblically too, by concentrating on Pontius Pilate or King Herod rather than thinking about the Roman Empire that Jesus battled against. Our Empire today is illusive, but by laughing at our multiple prime ministers like a reality TV show- or literally with politicians on a reality TV show (Matt Hancock on I’m a Celebrity Get Me Out of Here)- we let the life-sucking structures of Empire escape the critique of the Kingdom. Laughter can for sure be a form of protest, but without a vision of where the protest will lead, it functions more as a form of exhaustion. Or a kind of ‘dope’ to use George MacLeod’s language, or perhaps Marx’s opium of the masses, a fleeting escape from the reality that seems more dystopian than the higher goal of the relational - let alone the rational.

In our post-covid world, that began to reveal how we are reliant on each other, and our world, we could do well to remember our Christian call to display love through justice and encourage our society to demonstrate their humanity through political engagement for the good of their neighbor.

Biography

All William Temple references are from William Temple. *Christianity and Social Order* (London: Penguin, 1942).

Christian Workers League Document from *Iona Community Collections. Glasgow* (Plenary Papers, 1950-54).

Fisher, Mark. *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative* (Winchester, UK: Zero Books, 2009).

MacLeod, George. *Notes from the George Fielden, (1895-1991), Baron Macleod of Fuinary, Church of Scotland minister, Correspondence and Papers (Acc.9084)* archive at the National Library of Scotland.

Quisay, Walaa. ‘Competing Theodicies: The Rabaa Massacre and the Problem of Suffering,’ *Political Theology* (Vol.23, 6, 2022), pp.576-593.

Rieger, Joerg. *Theology in the Capitalocene: Ecology, Identity, Class and Solidarity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2022).

Vergès, François. *A Decolonial Feminism*. trans. Ashley Bohrer (London: Pluto Press, 2021).

7. Anthony Reddie

The Balliol Legacy Remembered

My response to the Balliol legacy enshrined in the legacy of Beveridge, Tawney and Temple is a dialectical one. On the one hand I applaud the vision and commitment to change and social transformation that is embodied in the legacy of all three of these hugely gifted individuals. It can be argued that Beveridge, Tawney and Temple are architects of modern post war Britain. The construction of the Welfare State, the National Health Service and the belief in a new public dispensation for support of and for those on the margins, whether socially or economically, owes a great deal to these three visionary figures.

As the son of Caribbean migrants of the Windrush Generation, whose Father was an active trade unionist in his 32 years living in the UK and who named me after the famed Labour socialist MP, Tony Benn, I am clearly on the correct side of the political divide to appreciate the pioneering work of this triumvirate of greatness. I applaud all that has been accomplished by these brilliant Balliol men.

Yet, even though I applaud what these men achieved, I am mindful of the privileges imbued in these individuals that permitted them to exert such a powerful hold on the imagination and outworking of public policy of post war Britain. These were three privileged White men who studied at one of the most elite and distinct of Oxford colleges.

One of the key ways of exploring this fundamental sense of privilege endowed and embodied in these three men can be seen by recourse to a very small thought experiment. Imagine three Black working-class women sat on a park bench in Handsworth, inner city Birmingham (as opposed to three White men sat in the JCR at Balliol college, in Oxford university) discussing their hopes and visions for Britain in the future. Can one imagine in what universe these working-class Black women would be able to envision a world where their views, hopes and intentions would eventually be realised as social policy? The truth is, it would be a stretch to imagine this scenario being realised, notwithstanding the improvements in social mobility, in terms of working-class progress and developments. It is interesting to note that the increased ethnic and cultural diversity within the Conservative party front bench is not a sign of this scenario being enacted, as the economic and class background of the most of the leading lights, including our present Prime Minister, represent social and economic privilege every bit as pronounced as the three White men being celebrated as representing the Balliol legacy.¹⁰⁹

Differentiation between Privilege and Responsibility

In this brief response I want to differentiate between the privileges of ‘whiteness’ that is embodied in these three pivotal figures and their sense of responsibility and service that saw them transform post war Britain, entirely for the better, I should add. It is my hope that as we

¹⁰⁹ I explore the differences between diversity and social justice in the following blog. [Anthony Reddie: Similar but Different – Modern Church](#)

seek to learn from this legacy, we will be able to differentiate between the need to deconstruct the privileges of whiteness and the continued need to celebrate the ethics of service and selflessness exuded by Beveridge, Tawney and Temple.

In using the term ‘whiteness’ I am referring to the lens through which we see the world and how social and economic relations are organized for the benefit of white people. In *After Whiteness*, Willie James Jennings critiques the phenomenon of whiteness, arguing that the conflation of European mastery, White male, colonial power and the internalization of notions of White superiority become the means by which epistemology is developed.¹¹⁰ Jennings illustrates how Whiteness became conjoined with patriarchy and colonialism to unleash an ethic of mastery, self-sufficiency and control, as the defining elements for what constitutes notions of development and progress. Jennings’ work, which is aimed primarily at theological education, distils the means by which the production of knowledge and pedagogical insights on the craft of ministry, have been informed by coloniality and Whiteness. Jennings is clear that this analysis is not about White people per se. Rather, it is the epistemological underpinning of a set of theo-cultural constructs, systems and practices that govern how theology and education operate in the West and which inform our ways of being and our praxis.¹¹¹

In charting out the epistemological framing of this work, Jennings outlines the intentionality of this text as that which is seeking to reform and reconceptualize the very nature of theological education. In outlining what is at stake he writes, ‘The argument for cultural sovereignty in theological education grows out of collapsing the struggle against whiteness into a struggle for personhood. This is understandable, given the ways whiteness has historically destroyed a reality of people for so many groups.’¹¹²

One of the many great insights I take from this work was the extent to which a cult of mastery, self-sufficiency, and top-down notions of patrician control, all executed under the aegis of whiteness has stymied the emotional and intellectual agency of people racialized as White as much as it has traduced those racialized as the ‘other’. While the context of this symposium was much wider than that concerned with Theological education, there can be no doubting the utility of thinking about whiteness as it relates to these three men and the Balliol legacy that they embody. To talk of whiteness exuding a cult of mastery, self-sufficiency and top-down notions of patrician control, one could hardly find three better candidates for the lived expression of the basic tenets of this phenomenon.

In critiquing the phenomenon of whiteness, I am not seeking to traduce Messrs Beveridge, Tawney and Temple. Rather, it is to at least remind us of the privilege that enabled them to move so seamlessly from the dreaming spires of Oxford university to the heart of the establishment, be it the Church of England, the civil service and British politics.

In the second part of these brief reflections, I want to consider some of the key points of learning that emerge from the legacy of these great Balliol men.

¹¹⁰ See Jennings, Willie James, *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging* (Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 2020).

¹¹¹ Jennings, *After Whiteness*, pp. 23-156

¹¹² Jennings, *After Whiteness*, p. 10.

Patrician History

One of the features of this moment in history – 1942 – is that it tells us about the patrician view of the world that was still commonplace. These three men represented the apex of British society. Their privilege education allied to their whiteness and masculinity enabled them to turn formative learning experiences in Oxford university, particularly within the Balliol college JCR, into social and cultural policy in post war Britain.

In understanding the power and influence of Messrs Beveridge, Tawney and Temple, we need to consider the phenomenon of the ‘Hierarchy of Credibility’. Social science scholars have often spoken of a ‘Hierarchy of Credibility’. This refers to a ranking of intellectual power in which people’s accounts of truth are attested to according to their place in social and ecclesial hierarchies.¹¹³ So, Bishops are more ‘reliable conveyors of truth’ than Priests, who in turn are more reliable than lay people. Educated lay people are more reliable than uneducated ones.¹¹⁴ My essential dictum on defining ‘power’ has always been “who can get something done if they think it should happen?”. This is often linked to their place in the hierarchy. Formal learning, qualifications, authorised training, social networks, patronage and metaphysical ordination and separation all contribute to developing hierarchies of credibility, in which some people are recognised as being reliable conveyors of truth and others deemed less so.

The Hierarchy of Credibility dominates most social institutions and is based on the conflation of intellectual mastery and knowledge acquisition, which then leads to issues of power. ‘Hierarchy of Credibility’ refers to a ranking of epistemological power in which people’s accounts of truth are attested to according to their place in social and ecclesial hierarchies.¹¹⁵ A simple dictum of people’s place within the Hierarchy of Credibility can be discerned in terms of who can get things done. Who gets to turn an idea, good or otherwise, into policy? Whose word or accounts of truth are believed and affirmed? Certainly, we can see that Messrs Beveridge, Tawney and Temple, these extremely talented and intelligent men were able to ‘get things done’. My issue in this paper, is not to question what they got done, but the limited prism of power and influence that enabled them to act when others, for example, ordinary working class UKME people would never have such opportunities and mechanisms to do so.

It is my hope that as we reflect critically but sympathetically on the legacy of these three figures and the influence of Balliol college as the wider context that formed the consciousness of these individuals, we are also mindful of the hierarchical and patrician nature of the privileged construct from which they emerged.

¹¹³ Herbert P., Altrichter, Peter & Bridget Somekh *Teachers Investigating their Work* (London: Routledge, 1993).

¹¹⁴ I realised the moment I attained my PhD in March 2000 that I had climbed up a rung of the ladder of ‘Hierarchy of Credibility’. A few weeks after my achievement had been announced in the *Methodist Recorder* (The weekly independent paper of the Methodist Church in Great Britain) I was invited as maybe the first Black British born lay person to become a member of the Connexional ‘Faith and Order’ Committee of the Methodist church. Of course, I have no way of knowing if there is any direct correlation between the invitation and me gaining my PhD but given the prestigious nature of this committee in the Connexional life of Methodism at the time (the Committee has since been reformed so I am told, so that it no longer feels like an Oxbridge post-graduate seminar) it would seem highly improbable if there were no links between the two.

¹¹⁵ See Altrichter, Herbert P., Posch, Peter & Somekh, Bridget, *Teachers Investigating their Work* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Postcolonialism

Beveridge, Tawney and Temple all emerged into public life against the backdrop of the British empire. The work reached its zenith at the tail end of the epoch of empire, in which Britain's imperial gaze was narrowing. Writing as a descendent of enslaved Africans and whose parents were born in the midst of the British empire, in the crown colony of Jamaica. They were born as agrarian subalterns. Of the famed three, Temple, in particular, represents the very epicentre of British imperialism given his ascent to Canterbury. R.S. Sugirtharajah, the doyen of Postcolonial Biblical hermeneutics, once noted that the relationship between British Christianity and empire is one that has been suffused with a collusive sense of mutuality.¹¹⁶ For both the Christian faith and imperialism, and the regimes that connote the latter do so on the basis of presuming themselves to be superior to the phenomenological entities they seek to usurp or supplant. Speaking with particular attention to the question of empire, Sugirtharajah writes:

Empires are basically about technically and militarily advantaged superior 'races' ruling over inferior and backward peoples. When imperial powers invade, the conquered are not permitted to be equal to the invaders. This was true of all empires, Roman to British and American. The basic assumption of superiority is never questioned in their writings.¹¹⁷

The superiority of Britain is built upon a bedrock of Christian inspired notions of exceptionalism in which God has set apart the British, particularly, the English to occupy a special place in the economy of God's Kingdom.

These three Balliol men represent the kind of elite White male leadership who helped to run the British empire, an empire predicated on superiority and elitism. There is no doubt that Beveridge, Tawney and Temple represent the more benign and constructive representatives of British imperialism given their respective commitments to progressive socio-economics and politics. I am enthralled by all three men, having studied them during my undergraduate studies in the courses exploring the interface of Christianity and socialism. And yet, without wishing to be an overly cynical postcolonial refusenik, Black liberation theologian, I want to reflect for a moment on the world in which these three men were formed.

All three men were born in the 19th century, during an epoch of British unbridled imperial power. If one could climb in the minds of Beveridge, Tawney and Temple, I wonder to what extent their visionary work have ever imagined Black or other postcolonial bodies like myself when they were envisioning a new Britain, free from poverty, want and squalor? While my suspicions might seem a touch harsh or unwarranted, one only needs to reflect on the Brexit vote and the continued concerns over the preponderance of non-White bodies in the UK to understand the sense of why I am reflecting on the tacit whiteness that underpins this whole Balliol college legacy phenomenon.¹¹⁸ In my role as the Director of the Oxford Centre for Religion and Culture, within Regent's Park college, I am often at pains to remind colleagues

¹¹⁶ See R.S. Sugirtharajah *Postcolonial Reconfigurations: An Alternative Way of Reading the Bible and Doing Theology* (London: SCM press, 2003), pp. 143-161.

¹¹⁷ R.S. Sugirtharajah *Postcolonial Reconfigurations*, p. 147.

¹¹⁸ For example, see the media coverage surrounding the most recent census results and the 'fact' that in some of our urban conurbations white people are in the minority. See the following link for one news item reported in a right of centre broadsheet. [Census results: White people now minority in London and Birmingham \(telegraph.co.uk\)](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/ukpol/1211111/Census-results-White-people-now-minority-in-London-and-Birmingham.html) See also chapter 1 of my book *Theologising Brexit: A Liberationist and Postcolonial Critique* (London: Routledge, 2019).

that I am not only the first Black person to be a faculty member, but I doubt anyone who founded the college in 1810 in London had someone like me in mind when they did so. I suspect this is the case even more so for Balliol than it is for Regent's Park college.

New Ways of Being

In the final section, I want to outline an alternative vista for how we conceive the radical socio-economic and political changes envisaged by and the concomitant legacy of Messrs Beveridge, Tawney and Temple. Going back to the very brief thought experiment of three Black working-class women sat on a park bench in Handsworth, inner city Birmingham, I wonder how we might characterise their world views? As a postcolonial, Black liberation theologian, my scholarship has consistently sought to reconceive how we think about epistemic knowledge, particularly that which is often termed 'Transformative knowledge'.

As bell hooks¹¹⁹ has observed, transformative knowledge can give rise to new, distinctive forms of thinking, which as a corollary, can assist in re-shaping one's perception of reality that is not conditioned or silenced by the top-down, patriarchal frameworks of imperialism and androcentric discourse.¹²⁰

I wonder how repeated attention to the experiences of Black women would help shape public policy as opposed to privileged white men? In what ways might this lead to differing understandings on what it means to be British? How might they help us reconceive the Balliol legacy and the significance of these three pivotal figures in shaping Britain?

Womanist Theology is an approach to talking about God in light of the experience of being a Black woman¹²¹. I.e. in a world governed by White men like these Balliol men, to be a Black woman is to struggle with what many scholars have called tri-partite oppression. That is, to be a Black woman is to be *Black, a woman and poor*. Most of the Black women in the world are indeed *Black* (which is seen as good as a curse given the how 'Blackness' is often perceived. How many positive terms associated with the word 'Black' actually exist? To state the obvious, as Black women they are also *women* (in a sexist world, this is also a curse) and they are *poor* – again another curse. So, Womanist Theology seeks to reassess issues of power in the world and to re-think religious traditions, in light of these three factors. In terms of social analysis, it is an attempt to locate within texts, practices and policies, liberationist themes that can be used in order to liberate and bring about self-esteem and dignity to all oppressed peoples. There is a particular concern, of course, for those who are oppressed on the grounds of 'race', gender and poverty.

¹¹⁹ The preferred spelling of her name – her name is never capitalised.

¹²⁰ bell hooks *Teaching to Transgress: education as the practice of freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 93-128

¹²¹ Womanist theology is the theological articulation of God as understood through the lens of the experiences of Black (predominantly African-American) women. It seeks to address the tripartite jeopardy of being Black, female and poor in the wealthiest nation in the world. Significant womanist theological texts include Jacquelyn Grant *White Women's Christ and Black Women's Jesus* (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989), Delores Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 1993), Kelly Brown Douglas, *The Black Christ* (New York: Orbis Books, 1994); Emile Townes, *Womanist Justice, Womanist Hope* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993); Renita J. Weems, *Just a Sister Away: A Womanist Vision of Women's Relationships in the Bible* (Philadelphia: Innisfree Press, 1988); Katie G. Cannon, *Black Womanist Ethics* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), Stacey-Floyd-Thomas (ed.) *Deeper Shade of Purple: Womanism in Religion and Society* (New York and London: New York University press, 2006) and Monica A. Coleman *Making a Way Out of No Way: A Womanist Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress press, 2008).

The world envisioned by Womanist Theology is one that critiques the focus on private and personal morality as opposed to structural injustice as the means for understanding the impact of poverty on those at the bottom of the social ladder. The work of activist Black women, often informed by a Womanist ideology has sought to use a multi-dimensional analysis to explore the intersectionality of racism, sexism, poverty and homophobia.¹²²

The outworking of Womanist theology seeks to create a collectivist framework in which those on the margins, those often ignored and traduced are placed at the centre. This approach to social change, is one predicated on a collective act of will where there is solidarity with all those who considered the 'least of these', as envisaged in Mathew's gospel.¹²³

This image of social change is not drastically different from that envisaged by Beveridge, Tawney and Temple. Clearly, Black liberationist work as outlined by Womanist Theology is underpinned by religious model of socialism in which justice for the poor is at the root of its social ethics. The fundamental difference between the two lies in the sense of equity that enables those who are the marginalised and the oppressed to be proponents of change and not simply the recipients of it. I.e., patrician notions of change are critiqued in favour of more egalitarian forms of knowledge, policy making and practice.

In conclusion, there is a great deal to admire in the legacy of Beveridge, Tawney and Temple. We owe these three visionaries a great deal. But the future should and must be one shaped by a more diverse set of figures and not just the patrician world of white privilege.

¹²² See Pamela R. Lightsey *Our Lives Matter: A Womanist Queer Theology* (Eugene, Origen: Wipf & Stock, 2015).

¹²³ See Matthew 25: vv. 31-46.

8. Simon Lee

Balliol Influences: How One College Lost An Empire And Found A Common Wealth Of Ideas

1. Introduction: 1942

On 1 December 1942, the Beveridge Report¹²⁴ was published to public and international acclaim¹²⁵, often being credited as the founding document of the Welfare State¹²⁶. Beveridge did not like that term. In his radio broadcast the next day, he called it a ‘security plan’ and talked about ‘being well’.

William Beveridge tells us early in his 1955 memoir *Power and Influence* that he was inspired by Edward Caird, the Master of Balliol at the turn of the twentieth century, who told Beveridge and fellow students to ‘discover why, with so much wealth in Britain, there continues to be so much poverty, and how poverty can be cured’¹²⁷.

One of his friends ever since those days, Archbishop William Temple, had published his own influential book, *Christianity and Social Order*, earlier in 1942, again to huge sales and appreciation¹²⁸. In various writings, he also praised Caird as his main inspiration. Temple had coined the term ‘welfare-state’ in the 1920s, in contrast to ‘power-state’.

Caird himself spoke frequently of ‘welfare’ and of the ‘common good’. Although ‘welfare state’ was not a term which Beveridge liked to be applied to his own work, it remains a defining characteristic of the United Kingdom and the promise of the welfare state to come was a great encouragement in the midst of the Second World War.

2. Was there a Balliol Tradition of thinking creatively about the Well-Being of the least privileged in Society and, if so, did it stretch back 40, 80, 200 or 250 Years?

Earlier in this 80th anniversary year, I discussed the influences of their Balliol student days on Beveridge and Temple, their friend and contemporary R H Tawney and, from an earlier generation, Arnold Toynbee.¹²⁹ This quartet all contributed to the intellectual foundations of

¹²⁴ Beveridge, W., 1942. *Social Insurance and Allied Services (The Beveridge Report)*. London: HMSO

¹²⁵ [Beveridge report - archive 1942 | The Guardian Foundation](#) | [The Guardian](#)

¹²⁶ [Sir William Beveridge announces social reform plans - BBC Archive](#)

¹²⁷ Beveridge, W., *Power and Influence*, 1955, p9.

¹²⁸ [The Church And Social Problems - British Pathé \(britishpathe.com\)](#)

¹²⁹ Simon Lee, ‘A Balliol quartet and the welfare state: Temple, Beveridge, Tawney and Toynbee’. *Theology*, 125(4), 252–257. <<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0040571X221106453>>

the welfare state. A distinctive shared experience by Beveridge, Temple and Tawney was that they were all encouraged to follow their Balliol years by living and working at Toynbee Hall, in Stepney, in the East End of London, where they witnessed the poverty of which the Master of Balliol, Edward Caird, had spoken.

This paper is a sequel, as further questions abound: is it just that Beveridge, Temple and Tawney were exceptional, a once-in-a-century-or-two phenomenon, was this ethos distinctive to Balliol, is Balliol a good role model, how does all this tally with Balliol men's involvement in some of the worst examples of imperial power-state governance, at its best how did this ethos work, and does it have any relevance to contemporary crises?

In brief, the answers begin by observing that there were many other talented students who were less famous, or not known at all, whose lives show that they too were influenced by this Balliol culture. Indeed, all students at any college or other educational institution are affected by their experiences. The ethos will not be received or applied in the same way by all students, even at the same college at the same time.

As a graduate from the neighbouring college of Trinity, Saint John Henry Newman, observed in a prayer composed at Maryvale, Birmingham, in 1848,

'God has created me to do Him some definite service. He has committed some work to me which He has not committed to another. I have my mission. I may never know it in this life, but I shall be told it in the next. I am a link in a chain, a bond of connection between persons.'

For non-believers, there are other ways of making the point that part of growing up is discerning how best to make a contribution to society. The same college ethos would not lead people to the same roles in life but to seeking their own opportunities to make a difference in that broad spirit. Beveridge and Temple had privileges and a sense of their own destinies but they also worked hard. It was part of Beveridge's personality, for example, to be persistent in persuading others to give him roles which he then expanded to fit his own agenda. Both Beveridge and Temple worked tirelessly after those 1942 publications to communicate their ideas to the wider public, from broadcasting to addressing big and small groups in diverse locations, even in the middle of the war.

They did imbibe a pioneering spirit that was palpable in Balliol in their student days forty years earlier, which in turn had evolved from the college's radicalism in the nineteenth century. Yet each educational community will have its shortcomings, especially when judged by the values of later ages, such as Balliol's limited intake, with no women admitted from 1263 to 1979. Nevertheless, each will have something positive to offer all its students.

Balliol did have a special connection to the Indian civil service which is associated with the worst aspects of empire but the better side included Indians coming to Balliol in the second half of the nineteenth century, where they had particular pastoral care from Toynbee and later from a distinguished lawyer, Sir William Markby. Beveridge and Tawney were themselves both born in what was then India. Beveridge wrote revealingly about his parents' Indian experiences in *India Called Them*. Judith M Brown has written a scintillating account of the

Indian and British students at Balliol who were destined for the Indian civil service.¹³⁰ I would welcome further insights as to whether Beveridge and Tawney interacted with these fellow students. Before their time, Jowett often escorted Cornelia Sorabji into Balliol's Hall for dinners and concerts. She became India's first female lawyer. She was studying at Somerville but her brother was at Balliol. The stories of the college's contributions to India are complex but Jowett and others knew that India was important and needed to be governed better, eventually through self-rule, a point also grasped by Beveridge's father, a judge in India.

To apply Temple's distinction back in time, the Empire needed to evolve from a power-state to a welfare-state, and then it needed to give way to, or be extinguished by, national demands for self-rule, evolving into a network or partnership of mutual influences, known now as the Commonwealth. The well-being of all peoples, we have learned, includes self-determination.

There is value in comparing and contrasting how a good idea like the welfare state becomes a reality, how an out-dated idea such as the Empire is overtaken by new realities, and how the ethos of a college spreads its influence. To adapt the short-hand¹³¹ title of an eighteenth century example of a Balliol graduate's influence on the word, Adam Smith's 1776 *The Wealth of Nations*, there was a wealth of ideas emanating from Balliol. Was it coincidence?

If a distinctive ethos proves to be successful then it becomes, over time, less distinctive as other colleges recognise that strength and seek to emulate it. This happened with certain aspects of the Balliol ethos, such as the scholarships seeking outstanding students from more diverse, though still limited, backgrounds. There was not so much copying of its direction towards understanding the causes of, and the search to eradicate, poverty but there were other Oxbridge colleges and individuals who were themselves pioneers in the university settlement and workers' education movements.

Indeed, since Caird was encouraging students to be original, critical thinkers, they might have questioned whether finding a 'cure' for 'poverty' was the only object of their quest for improvement in the life opportunities of the least privileged. In accompanying actions, particularly the emphasis on hosting summer schools for working people in support of the workers' extension movement, Caird and Balliol were ahead of others in addressing another giant evil, described by Beveridge in 1942 as 'ignorance'. This work continued in expanding educational opportunities. A later Master, A L Smith, was very active in this regard and then Lord Lindsay, on completing his own time as Master, proceeded to serve as the founding vice-chancellor of what became Keele University.

This essay concludes with my broader reinterpretation of the underlying issue. Nevertheless, in its general thrust, the Caird dictum and the overall Balliol ethos of Beveridge's and Temple's student days can both be applied to the crises which beset us in the 2020s and will persist into the 2030s and beyond. In a sense, therefore, this essay opens up two hundred years of 'Balliol Influences'. The ethos associated with the Caird era derived from the leadership of a previous Master, Benjamin Jowett, who was a student and then a fellow in the 1830s. A forerunner of William Temple as a 'red' archbishop, on the side of poor workers and their families, was Cardinal Manning, who came up to Balliol in the 1820s. Fifty years later, and still fifty years before Temple's use of 'welfare-state', Manning used the term

¹³⁰ Judith M Brown, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia*, University of Notre Dame Press, 2009, Ch 1.

¹³¹ The full title is *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*

‘welfare’ in 1874, declaring that, ‘... in everything of private life and in domestic and civil and political life, we have but one common interest – the welfare of our common country.’ (Manning, *The Dignity and Rights of Labour*, Mechanics’ Institution, Leeds, 28th January, 1874).

Just ahead of the 250th anniversary of perhaps the most famous publication by a Balliol alumnus, *The Wealth of Nations*, it is worth recalling that in Adam Smith’s earlier work, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1859), he states that,

‘he is certainly not a good citizen who does not wish to promote, by every means in his power, the welfare of the whole society of his fellow citizens.’

Listening to Beveridge’s broadcast to the nation on 2nd December 1942, or Temple’s lighter speech at the Albert Hall earlier that year, behind the privilege of the clipped accents and the patrician tones, there is a common wealth of ideas which are about promoting the welfare of the whole society. In 1942, in the midst of war, these prophetic voices spoke, one from a secular and the other from a religious viewpoint, in the spirit of a Balliol ethos which can be traced back through the ages. Before we consider whether it can be passed forward to address today’s multiple crises, the next question is whether it really stretched across the student cohorts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

3. Is it simply that Beveridge and Temple were exceptional?

One response to what might be regarded as Balliol exceptionalism is to presume that Beveridge and Temple were just one-off or two-off geniuses, which would be a form of Beveridge-exceptionalism or Temple-exceptionalism. Yet the idea that, on the cusp of the twentieth century, Temple and Beveridge might be atypical success stories is untenable. They were indeed talented, going on to win fellowships at other colleges. Yet Temple was not necessarily the most successful Archbishop of Canterbury in his own family, let alone his own college. Four of the six Archbishops of Canterbury between 1868 and 1944 were Balliol graduates: Tait, (Benson), Frederick Temple (father of William), (Randall Davidson), Lang, William Temple. Temple’s immediate predecessor, Cosmo Gordon Lang, had gone to university in Scotland at the age of 16 before taking a second and third undergraduate degree at Balliol and was then a Fellow of All Souls. Neither Temple nor any of the other archbishops was as influential as Balliol’s Canon Henry Scott Holland in developing Christian socialism although Temple was outstanding in presenting those ideas to the public.

Balliol alumni also included significant Catholic converts from Cardinal Manning, who attended the First Vatican Council in 1870, to Cardinal Heald, the only rowing Blue to attend the Second Vatican Council, despite the ban on Catholics being admitted to Oxford. That was only lifted by the Universities Test Act 1871, and Manning still dissuaded Catholics from going to Oxford for the rest of his life, the next two decades, fearing that it would imperil their faith. In between those two cardinals came Fr Gerard Manley Hopkins SJ, Fr Thomas Byles (likely to be Balliol’s next saint, as a hero of the Titanic) and Mgr Ronald Knox (translator of the Bible and Oxford chaplain).

Some students were judged to have ‘failed’ and some died without any recognition of their talents in life after Balliol. Even then, though, this does not mean that they did not apply what

they had learned at Balliol or that we in turn are untouched by their legacy. In 1988, the then Master of Balliol, Anthony Kenny, wrote a book about two Balliol students, one in the first half of the nineteenth century and one in the second, who died in relative or absolute obscurity:

‘The education of the two men, reading classics and philosophy at Balliol, was almost exactly the same, despite the generation’s gap between them.

‘Both of them during their Oxford days came under the influence of the same people...

‘Both men in their undergraduate days were regarded as persons of enormous promise; each, in his day, was described as being the most intelligent student at Balliol. Both men were regarded by the friends of their college days as having failed to live up to their promise. The stigma of failure, indeed, attached to both of them throughout their lives. {One} was an academic drop-out who was unable to find and keep any suitable job until he was thrust into one by his friends across the distance of an ocean... {The other} was regarded by his friends as having thrown away his talents, and by his colleagues as a difficult eccentric who was a misfit in each of the offices to which he was posted.

‘... The two men never met, and {the latter} was only a schoolboy when {the former} died.’¹³²

The reputations of these two poets, Arthur Hugh Clough and Gerard Manley Hopkins, have grown after their deaths. It is a mistake to think that the only successful alumni of any college are those who glide into prominent public roles, or even those who are recognised in their own lifetime.

If those examples are deemed too highbrow, it is sometimes the simplest expression of faith or wider truths that has the greatest impact. I would recommend taking seriously a twentieth century pair of Balliol characters who played significant roles in bringing religion into popular culture, one from the first half and one from the second. Hardly anyone seems aware that these two were at Balliol but their unique styles of touching the hearts, minds and souls of all ages and backgrounds is widely acknowledged. Although they were in different eras as students, in later life they became friends. The composer Sydney Carter matriculated in 1933 and the broadcaster Rabbi Lionel Blue matriculated in 1950. There are more obvious twentieth century faith leaders from Balliol, such as Shoghi Effendi, leader of the Ba’hai faith for decades, or Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie, but, as Blue said of Carter, his ‘One More Step Along The World I Go’ has summed up all religions in language which every schoolchild can understand. Rabbi Lionel Blue wrote at the age of 74 that he was still trying to fathom the significance of his Balliol years over half a century earlier. Blue was much more influenced by fellow students, not only at Balliol, than by the College authorities. In later life, he invited Carter to attend his sabbath gatherings and when Alzheimer’s meant that Carter could not recall his own compositions, Blue would visit him at home and start singing them, encouraging Carter to join in, and then slipping quietly away. The answer to another of Carter’s hymns, which he called carols, also often sung in school assemblies along with ‘Lord

¹³² Anthony Kenny, *God & Two Poets*, Sidgwick & Jackson, 1988.

of The Dance’ and ‘One More Step’, ‘When I Needed A Neighbour, Were You There?’, is yes, Lionel Blue was there for his friend.

It is, therefore, my belief that it is worthwhile to consider the nature of this Balliol ethos and the way less well-known characters continue to interpret and apply it to make a difference in society.

4. What are the common elements Beveridge, Temple and other students have taken from Balliol and how was this ethos transmitted?

Caird had confidence that Balliol students would make a positive difference in society. In my judgement, there are four aspects to that:

- (a) their selection in the admissions process which begins with a student, their family and their teachers settling on an application to Balliol;
- (b) the way their studies and thinking were encouraged and honed;
- (c) the opportunities put to them for their next steps,
- (d) the focus put, and the example given, on the important matters to which they might direct their talents in the long run.

Earlier Masters, not only Jowett but Jenkins, had transformed the applications process to competitive examinations with funded, open scholarships. Balliol was still narrow in its intake, but it was becoming broader in the range of schools from which it took students.

How did it work, though? How did a lesser-known character than Beveridge or Temple take on board this ethos from lesser-known tutors than the Master? The unsuccessful lawyer but successful novelist, Anthony Hope (Hawkins), author of *The Prisoner of Zenda* set in a fictional country he called Ruritania, quoted the sermon by Jowett on the death in 1892 on Mont Blanc of Hope’s philosophy tutor, Nettleship:

‘I do not suppose he will be forgotten by any of his pupils. Twenty or thirty or **fifty years hence the memory of him will come back to them**, and they will speak of him to the Oxford of another generation’.

Nettleship won all the prizes except for a First in Finals, left hardly any published work, but was for Anthony Hope, who studied with him in the early 1880s,

‘the inspiration which Jowett disciplined. ‘Nettleship **‘taught me to seek truth – and never to be sure I had found it** – and that it was to be adumbrated, but never more than that, in the human mind – *umbræ et imagines*. From him too I learnt too to look for the points in which great teachers and philosophers agree, not those in which they differ (though indeed the latter are more easily handled by examiners and examinees)... he pursued these high themes with not a trace of pose, of mystic airs, or prophetic rhapsody - **just quietly and earnestly, an investigator like yourself ... listening with zest to what we told him ...**’

Fifty years on from Jowett's prophecy in 1892 takes us, of course, to the year of these Temple and Beveridge publications, in 1942. If Nettleship had lived, he would have tutored them but whoever tutored the famous and the unknown in Balliol's Victorian and Edwardian eras had the same approach as described by Anthony Hope. The Balliol ethos, in other words, was not only about a preferential option for the poor; it was also about how to make a difference, how to search for answers and how to be balanced between confidence that your answers are significant and openness to the possibility of better answers being proposed by others.

So how did other students born in the nineteenth century apply lessons from Balliol in their later lives? The example I would give is Bolton King, a practical idealist who applied that Balliol ethos in the wider world. He matriculated in 1879 and followed a First in Classics Moderations in 1881 with a First in History in 1883. He was present at the meeting with Canon Barnett in November 1883, with Anthony Hope Hawkins and Cosmo Gordon Lang, which determined to create a university settlement in London. In January 1884, he was elected secretary of the committee which determined to establish what became Toynbee Hall and was then secretary to the fund-raising committee. It opened that autumn, with Bolton King enrolling the students and living there himself, with the formal opening in January 1885. Jowett asked Canon Barnett what he would do with Bolton King, 'the best History student of his year'. Barnett answered, '**Show him how to make history.**' This he did, in at least two senses. Bolton King formed the Toynbee Travellers' Club, which took men and women from the East End abroad for the first time in their lives, on meticulously planned educational tours of Italy. He conducted an unsuccessful experiment in cooperative farming on his family's land back in Warwickshire, and he served for twenty years as the Director of Education for that county, transforming the schools there. So he made history as a pioneer of travel abroad for working people and as a pioneer of what would later come to be called comprehensive education. He also wrote Italian history, making it in that sense, directly influenced by Jowett hosting Mazzini in Balliol.

6. Lessons from Beveridge, Temple & Tawney: a duty beyond privilege

Beveridge, Temple, and Tawney were privileged but more significantly, they imbibed a sense of duty, determined to use their talents to benefit the less privileged. In the current haste to remind others of their privilege, there is a risk of losing sight of the point that many of them recognised the greater duties that arose to those who received opportunities.

Moreover, even the privileged have their challenges. Tawney fought in the First World War. He was both physically injured and traumatised by the experience. Temple suffered from the debilitating condition of gout all his life. Beveridge would nowadays be described as neuro-divergent.

They worked hard, for decades after their student days. All three were married, Beveridge only in his sixties, but none of them had any children, so perhaps they had more time to devote to their work. There are other forms of commitment to family life, however, which can take time and take their toll. Beveridge, for example, wrote to and received from each of his parents very long letters every week until their deaths.

All three had that Toynbee Hall experience. All were committed to workers' education beyond Toynbee Hall. They shared a fascination with committees and reports, they were each prophetic voices in the midst of crises, they each championed free learning, supporting refugee scholars, and voluntary associations.

They were not identical in their experiences. For example, Tawney travelled extensively abroad and moved to work in the North before coming back to Oxford and London. Temple moved between bishoprics in Manchester, York and Canterbury. Beveridge, however, worked in London and Oxford, albeit with trips abroad and a brief foray into life as a Liberal MP for a Cumbrian constituency.

Nor would they, or any other alumni of Balliol or of any other college, be identical in their solutions to the challenges facing society. That is not the aim or the outcome of any progressive educational community. Nevertheless, it is my contention that this Balliol ethos has a relevance today.

7. How can these Lessons be applied to Contemporary Crises?

Beveridge identified five giant evils, 'want, ignorance, disease, squalor, idleness'. With some of those evils, his report did little else other than name them. Even then, he sometimes meant something else by them to the meaning taken by the public. In particular, his sense of 'squalor' seemed to be bound up with a sense that the country needed new towns planned by Beveridge. Still, it was this magical turn of phrase which captured the imaginations of the public in wartime. He had articulated in memorable language what the people wanted. Charles Dickens, of course, had spelled out the first two on the foreheads of the little boy and the little girl in Scrooge's dream 99 years earlier in *A Christmas Carol*. So it was not the originality of the ideas or the details of solutions but the rhetoric, the rallying call, and the timeliness of the appeal which made such a difference.

Nowadays, we tend to talk of crises rather than evils. The five giant ones are perhaps these:

1. Environmental crisis
2. Cost of living crisis
3. Health (after-effects of pandemic & lockdown, NHS) crisis
4. Russian war in Ukraine crisis
5. Breakdown of trust &/or confidence in government's competence and decency (or the actual breakdown of competence and decency, thus explaining why it is rational not to have any such trust or confidence)

There may be more crises of particular relevance to reflecting on Beveridge, Temple, Tawney, and Balliol's ethos and legacy:

6. Culture wars
7. Perceived breakdown of faith groups' self-confidence & place in society
8. Educational institutions losing their way.

There are many other evils or crises or challenges which we face, as well as many opportunities. At its best, an education is not confined to analysing crises which we are already enduring but will give us the inspiration to anticipate the coming issues. For example, the historian F M Powicke, giving a series of valedictory lectures in Balliol Hall after the Second World War, recalled his first experiences in that setting, at the end of the nineteenth century, listening to A L Smith, who became Master of Balliol in the First World War:

'My first recollections of Balliol Hall, after I came up in 1899, are associated with A L Smith ... I see from an old note-book that it was in my first term that I attended his lectures, famous in those days, upon Political and Social Questions. Perhaps they were intended for freshmen... He provided his hearers with a printed syllabus of twelve lectures, questions, and authorities. This little pamphlet is in itself an historical document for it shows how a wise observer, fifty years ago, looked at life about him in its historical setting. The subjects were the Poor Laws, Federal Government, State Interference, the Law of Population, Democracy, Socialism (two lectures), Census and Statistics, Taxation, Local Government, Ideals, the Land System, in the order in which I have read them ... Nearly every matter which is now an immediate practical problem is anticipated. He made these things part of the 'politics' studied in the Schools of Literae Humaniores and History, long before the School of Social Studies was thought of. He was lecturing in a Balliol that was still the Balliol of T H Green and Arnold Toynbee, though Green died in 1882 and Toynbee, still under thirty, in 1883. It is worth while to note, in this connexion that R H Tawney was a freshman in Michaelmas Term 1899 and that William Temple followed him from Rugby to Balliol in the following year; also that in the years ahead, A L himself was to be converted to an enthusiastic support of the new movement in adult education inspired by Albert Mansbridge and made effective by Tawney and Temple.'¹³³

8. Balliol Influences: Missions of Hope

Pope Benedict XVI said that after the great Pope John Paul II, he came as a humble labourer in the vineyard. After the giants of yesteryear, such as Temple, Beveridge and Tawney, what could my generation do?

Speaking for myself, one example is that I adapted their model of writing reports in a time of crisis. Instead of being on a committee, leading the drafting, or being the sole author, of an official report, in the style of Beveridge, Temple and Tawney, I was involved in establishing an unofficial yet inclusive process which led to a report but it was the process itself which had an impact. This was in Northern Ireland. My involvement came about through my

¹³³ F M Powicke, *Three Lectures*, Oxford University Press, 1947, pp. 7-8.

appointment as professor of jurisprudence by Queen's University Belfast in 1988. This was, I am sure, due to the influence of my first tutor at Balliol in 1976, Chris McCrudden, an alumnus of Queen's who did not then want the professorship there which he now has. In 1989, Peter Brooke of Balliol became Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Patrick Mayhew also of Balliol succeeded him but was already the Attorney General, Sir Brian Hutton of Balliol was the Lord Chief Justice, and David Simpson who played rugby with me for Balliol was working against them for Sinn Fein (unless he was a double agent). In 1991, when political talks and even talks about talks were collapsing, some of us thought we needed listening about listening. With my friend, the journalist Robin Wilson, I was the co-founder of a citizens' movement, Initiative 92, which established the independent Opsahl Commission, funded in large part by Quaker charities. It was open to submissions from all-comers, held public hearings around Northern Ireland, and produced a report¹³⁴ in 1993 highlighting the need for 'parity of esteem' which became the leitmotif of the peace process.

A second example is that, after the first IRA ceasefire in 1994, I left Northern Ireland in 1995 to lead what I renamed as Liverpool Hope University College. We celebrated the 25th anniversary of that name change by reflecting on the serendipity of hope and what I call the peripheral vision of a university.¹³⁵ These are the messages I took from my time at Balliol, reinterpreted for the late 20th and now the 21st century, applied in different parts of these islands, always with a focus on widening participation in lifelong learning and on encouraging others to hone their critical faculties and to understand the virtue and the value of hope. Ultimately, what the socially excluded are excluded from is a sense of hope. The five giant evils and all the current crises threaten to leave us with a sense of hopelessness. Universities and faith communities have responsibilities to counter that.

Both these illustrations bring us back to that Balliol ethos. I have indicated that it started with the admission process. In my case, that meant entrance examinations in November 1975, followed by two admission interviews in Balliol in December 1975. In addition to being asked about Law by Joseph Raz and Donald Harris (Paul Davies was in Yale on sabbatical), I was interviewed by the Politics, Philosophy & Economics dons, not because I was in any doubt about my choice of subject but because they marked the 'Modern Studies' papers (in my case, History and Economics, as well as General) and were determining the scholarships. Alan Montefiore asked if the General essay paper was fair. I said it was. He said in that case, would I like to answer questions I had not attempted in the exam itself? I could not see the logic in that but I was in the presence of some great logicians so I said yes, I would have a go. Presumably, they were looking to see whether I had been prepared for specific issues and had struck lucky in the exam.

We settled on two questions, one on whether nudity in public should be prohibited or allowed by law and the other on the purposes of a university. I slightly expanded my answer to the former in my first book, *Law & Morals*. I would have answered it in the exam hall had it not been for the particular example which scared me. I have attempted to answer the latter in an essay for that book on Hope which will be published in 2023 but arose from a seminar in November 2020. On that day in 1975, my halting answer, that a university was about the pursuit of truth or excellence, was mercifully interrupted by another interviewer, Steven Lukes, who gave a passionate answer that surely it was about a man (this being the era of only male students at Balliol) and a book. This was also wrong, in my opinion, as even then I realised that there was more to university life than studying on one's own, but I did not like to

¹³⁴ Andy Pollak, Opsahl Find URL to Opsahl Report

¹³⁵ Lee & Markham, *The Serendipity of Hope* (forthcoming, Pickwick, 2023).

say so. The questioning mercifully moved on to Economics, as it so often does in life, in this case with Andrew Graham, later a Master of Balliol, as the benevolent questioner.

Almost fifty years on, I think that my answer about the purpose of a university was not so bad after all. A hundred years earlier, Anthony Hope was learning in Balliol from Nettleship who, as we saw above, **‘taught me to seek truth – and never to be sure I had found it’**. Our promotion of inclusive grassroots dialogue in Northern Ireland was also in that spirit: **‘I learnt too to look for the points in which great teachers and philosophers agree, not those in which they differ’**, which we broadened out to encompass looking for agreement among all-comers in Northern Ireland.

By the 1970s, when Christopher Hill and then Anthony Kenny were the Masters of Balliol, the messages were not as explicit as the mission or commission given to Temple, Beveridge and Tawney by Caird. The influence which I took, though, was a variation on that theme by Caird, to discover why, with so much hope abounding in the world, there continues to be so much hopelessness, and to explore how we can live out the idea that to hope is not to dream but to turn dreams into reality.¹³⁶

¹³⁶ Suenens, 1977, explained in R. John Elford, *The Foundation of Hope* (Liverpool University Press, 2003).

9. Chris Baker

Afterword: Legacies and Welfarism

The time has now come to offer an appreciation of all the contributors to this digital volume, but especially our four keynote speakers: Stephen Spencer, Lawrence Goldman, Matthew Grimley and Simon Skinner. All are world-leading academics in their fields, primarily social and political historians with expert knowledge of the late 19th and early to mid-20th Century, with Stephen combining an acute understanding of the intellectual ideas of this era with some key theological perspectives. We are extremely grateful for the quality of their papers offered for both the colloquium and this first Temple book.

We are also grateful to our respondents who attempted to land the Balliol legacy in their own current experience of the issues now confronting the wellbeing and stability of the diverse peoples living on these isles. Beveridge's five giants, in a nod to John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, that needed to be slain by the envisioned post-war welfare state were Want, Disease, Squalor, Ignorance and Squalor. They are still manifested in palpably worsening ways in our current society. They are intensified to levels of global and existential concern by other contemporary 'giants' such as systemic racism, misogyny and homophobia, climate change and the new spectre of returning global conflict.

The time has also come to see if there are any threads or themes that can be pulled together from this wide array of expertise perspectives and experiences, that answer the question posed by the title of our colloquium and hence, this digital publication: namely the extent to which the resources and ideas reflected in the Balliol tradition of Temple, Tawney and Beveridge offer us any resources and frameworks by which to re-envision the British state in the present era of crises.

Welfarism as sublimated secular Christianity

To my mind, two main themes coalesce across all the contributions to this volume. First is the idea of welfarism as a sublimated secular expression of Christian religion, expressed and developed by intellectual giants like T.H. Green as a response to the decline in biblical and doctrinal authority in wider society which can be traced to the middle of the 19th century. Simon Skinner expertly brings these historical themes together and rightly raises the issue that the Christian impetus behind the welfare state has been ignored or forgotten in such a narrative. The question implicitly raised by Skinner's piece is the extent to which this matters, and therefore the extent to which it can or should be retrieved. Both Lawrence Goldman and Matthew Grimley from their different historical perspectives suggest a firm 'No', at least on the question of retrieval. For Goldman the social and cultural conditions

have changed radically from the elitist audiences from which Temple's message emerged, as well as the industrialised and heavy manufacturing basis of society out of which his policy ideas came. He praises *Christianity and Social Order* for its beautiful distillation of Christian social ethics and theology that were relevant to the time, but questions the extent to which this now reaches a wider audience – both inside and outside theology.

Grimley begins his analysis with a contemporary tribute to Temple on the occasion of his untimely death in 1944 from the Bishop of Durham, Hensley Henson, who suggested that Temple's passing was *felix opportunitate mortis* – i.e., that he died when the streams of opinion for which he stood on both Church and State were 'at flood... rather than at their inevitable ebb'. For Grimley there are a variety of reasons why Temple is almost now completely forgotten in both history and ordinand seminars. These include the demise of Christian socialism in the 60s and 70s. It also includes the more bureaucratic and centralised version of the welfare state that emerged, rather than the more organic and mutually constructed one that both Temple and Beveridge envisaged, but with which they became inevitably tagged. Stephen Spencer outlines with great and helpful clarity the combined impact of the thinking and ideas of these Balliol men, especially on issues of equality and freewill – both where they converge, but also where they diverge. His conclusion is that whilst the vision of these three men, and the Balliol tradition in which it is steeped, is enduring, he is uncertain as to the extent that it is transferable.

Legacies and Influence

The second theme to emerge is the question of legacy. The idea of legacy in many contributions haunts this volume, as all our contributors, but especially our panel of Maria Power, Victoria Turner, Anthony Reddie and Simon Lee, wrestle with the question of the extent to which the ideas and milieu that emerged from Balliol are transferable to our current age. Do they provide us with useful resources we can deploy in the vital task of re-envisioning? The issue of legacy is unfolded in three ways over the course of this colloquium.

First, there is the question of Balliol as a college, and its tradition of what Goldman calls 'social activism'. Not only did this legacy lead directly to the formation of the Welfare state from the thinking of Temple, Beveridge and Tawney, but these minds were clearly cultivated in turn by the likes of Green, Caird and Jowett. Simon Lee creates a complex and nuanced genealogy of thinking and deep relational ties based on his personal recollections as a Balliol alumnus. This genealogy takes us in into later generations through the likes of Sydney Carter and Rabbi Lionel Blue in the 50s and 60s, but also Lee's own public work (from his background as a lawyer) as the co-founder of the citizens' movement called Initiative 92, which in turn established the Opsahl Commission, which in 1993 produced a report based on public submissions held all over Northern Ireland. This in turn, in no small way, paved the way for the Good Friday (or Belfast) agreement, signed between the British and Irish governments in Easter 1998. Lee distils the longevity and evolution of the Balliol tradition of social activism and social justice to the words of Antony Hope, author of *The Prisoner Zenda* who recorded being told by his philosophy tutor Nettleship that he 'taught me to seek truth – and never be sure that I had found it'.

But as Anthony Reddie astutely points out, almost every one of these names cited in these accounts is a white man from a comfortable or even elite background. Whilst this can be explained by the fact that Balliol was an all-male college up until 1979, it nevertheless puts a serious question mark over the type of legacy that institutions like Balliol wish to promote in the future. For him, whilst the legacy of public service and selflessness epitomised by ‘Messers Beveridge, Tawney and Temple’ is immense and important to celebrate, it can only be done so alongside a critical interrogation of whiteness and the Empire on which it was founded.

Reddie’s critique also brings us to the second dimension of legacy that is a common thread in this volume – namely the legacy of Tawney, Temple and Beveridge themselves. For Reddie, their legacy will only be secured for future generations according to the extent to which their ideas are valued alongside the critical question of ‘Who gets a turn in deciding the ideas and agendas for policy delivery in today’s society?’ This needs to be done in such a way that it breaks the ‘limited prism of power and influence’ that enabled the Balliol Three to act when others could not. How might a welfare state for Britain today look if you paid attention, he suggests by way of a thought experiment, to three Black working-class women sitting on a park bench in Handsworth, inner-city Birmingham? It would represent says Reddie, a hypothetical outworking of womanist theology which is a black liberationist work underpinned by a ‘religious model of socialism in which justice for the poor is at the root of its social ethics’.

Both Maria Power and Victoria Turner see some ongoing value in the Temple tradition of thinking – but perhaps more in framing the broad trajectories of religiously-rooted public engagement rather than the application of specific policy ideas. Power takes Temple’s precepts of Christian social order and applying them to areas of public life where they are being breached, as a basis for a Catholic approach to peace-building and equality in post-Brexit Northern Ireland. Here, tensions and violence, long-simmering under the surface, are now coming to the expression of more explicit threat. Her Charisms of Social Justice based on Prayer, Immediate Assistance, Accompaniment and Structural Change are an important contribution to current debates. In similar vein, Victoria Turner looks at the intellectual and political influence of the Temple tradition on the likes of radical thinkers from the Scottish tradition such as George McLeod, founder of the Iona Community. But also, more broadly, she is drawn to Temple’s passionate injunction to re-imagine the social order on the lines of deep justice, wellbeing and equality for all. Turner sees this call particularly needing to resonate in the area of economic justice and women’s rights. In a tactic similar to Reddie’s, she invites us to see the world through the eyes of an undocumented female migrant cleaner and ask what does the safety and dignity of women in general feature look like in our current debates about the sort of society we want to build.

In conclusion one could say that the respondents are generally more positive about the legacy of Temple (if not so much Beveridge and Tawney) than the historians, seeing in this approach to public theology some clear lines of thematic engagement that create the impetus for new thinking and practice in our current troubled times. This may be saying something about the different hermeneutical lenses through which the Temple at al. tradition is being viewed.

The final part of the legacy agenda that emerges from this publication is the legacy of religious thought itself on political and economic life. Arguably the Tawney-Beveridge-Temple era represents a high watermark for religious influence on public policy in modern times. The welfare state is a product of Christian theological imagination, even though that is often forgotten. The *Faith in the City* (1985) report into urban poverty and social inequality in the mid-1980s is perhaps the closest we have got to the watermark since then. However although that report achieved much attention at the time for its perception as an anti-Thatcherite call to urban justice, very few of its policy recommendations were carried out. It's perhaps fair to suggest its legacy is still operating in the work of government sponsored initiatives such as Near Neighbours, which emerged from the work of the Church Urban Fund, established immediately after the *Faith in the City* report.

The narratives around religion and belief and their role in shaping the politics and policies of our country in our current era are contested and complex due to the increasing plurality of our society. There are simplistic narratives based on the latest Census figures for example, designed to highlight a narrative around the decline of those who identify with a religious tradition (by which they mean Christianity in the UK) and therefore the assumption that the voice of religion in politics will, and indeed should, diminish in significance. But as the recent case of the leadership for the Scottish Nationalist Party shows (March 2023), religion was a highly salient factor in the way the future of Scottish politics and society was debated. The one candidate without an obvious religious affiliation, but with the clearest message on Scottish Independence (Ash Regan) polled the lowest by some margin. The rest of the vote was split more or less evenly between a practising Muslim man (Humza Yousaf) committed to socially progressive agendas and a practising Christian woman (Kate Forbes) who espoused more socially conservative views but who also was the most economically literate of all three candidates.

In other words, religiously affiliated candidates were able to face in both directions on social issues whilst at the same time deploying deeply pragmatic approaches to governance and economics. Even more significantly the rather simplistic narrative surrounding the election, that one's beliefs or views should not influence one's political decision-making – which is naïve in the extreme – and only seems to be a problem when it comes to religiously-held beliefs – was challenged by both candidates. Kate Forbes argued that she was entitled to allow her faith to influence her policy decisions provided she was transparent about the processes involved, and that she respected all decisions reached by a democratic majority. However, this respect needed to be based on the assumption that the rights of all minority groups to voice their opinions are upheld equally.

Religion therefore (and perhaps paradoxically) remains a powerful force in the way that politics and policy are shaped in the context of the plurality of our society, in which we are becoming more complexly religious, more complexly secular and more complexly both. Religion is likely to continue to play a major role in re-envisioning the British state, not least because the two intersectionalities that bisect religion the most comprehensively (i.e., poverty and diversity) will continue to grow in significance, not diminish. The legacy of Balliol on issues of social equality is likely to remain strong provided it can enlist the necessary diversity and plurality of Britain as a whole to its cause. The legacy of Temple, Beveridge and Tawney is more difficult to discern but likely to decline. It seems most powerful as a general call to pay attention to how social orders are constructed and the political and

spiritual importance of always imagining well-constructed alternatives that combine deep vision with political acumen. But even this might be under threat as the folk memory of these thinkers inevitably declines.

Again, many thanks to all who contributed to this volume, and the very profound and strategic debates it has clearly provoked. I for one, would be delighted if Balliol and the William Temple Foundation, with other partners, could pursue these important conversations with diverse participants from all walks of society in summer schools, much as the Master explained during our colloquium was pioneered by the College a century ago.



William Temple
Foundation

Thank you for reading.

‘Temple Tracts’ are short, free-to-download books from the William Temple Foundation, presenting engaging analysis on key debates in religion and public life. Find out more and download the other books at:

williamtemplefoundation.org.uk/temple-tracts

Sign up for our free newsletter at williamtemplefoundation.org.uk

Follow us on Twitter [@WTempleFdn](https://twitter.com/WTempleFdn)

© William Temple Foundation 2023