The term 'threefold social order' is one that has little or no resonance in the Britain of the late 1990s, outside of Anthroposophical circles. Although the concept has never been particularly well known, it was perhaps better known by the general public in the years between 1920 and 1950, when it was also actively promoted by intellectual tendencies outside the Anthroposophical movement. The purpose of this article is to initially examine the activities undertaken around the concept by the Anthroposophists, as taken over the whole period - they were the largest tendency advancing the notion, and then to examine the other tendencies and the ways in which they also pursued the idea, and to examine the connections between the tendencies.

Briefly, what is the concept of a threefold social order? The argument can be summed up as follows; society in reality consists of three elements: economics, politics, and the cultural or spiritual realm. All three spheres of society should be recognised and allowed to maintain the appropriate autonomy. The various arguments indicated the "boundaries", as it were, of the different spheres, although there was often an indication that to some extent the distinctions were analytical. This is made very clear in a passage in "Charles Waterman's" The Three Spheres of Society where he compares his task with that of a lecturer on physiology singling out the nerve or vascular system when nerves and veins are present together throughout the body. "Similarly, although on the conceptual level we can and must speak severally
of the spiritual sphere, the political sphere, and the economic sphere, we never encounter one of them alone." (2)

From a general characterisation let us turn to the specifics of the Anthroposophical viewpoint. The most important source for this is Rudolf Steiner's book *Towards Social Renewal* (3), written in 1919. This book appeared at a time when Steiner was highly active in advancing the concept of the threefold social order in the German speaking area of Europe. There were Leagues to advance the idea formed in Germany and Switzerland, and journals were published in their interest. A number of Steiner's books on social issues appeared at this time. (4)

Steiner's scheme conforms broadly to the overview of a threefold social order given above, and is outlined in the second chapter of *Towards Social Renewal*. Steiner here defines the three different spheres of society. The first is the economy, which is concerned with all aspects of the production, consumption and circulation of commodities. The second is the sphere of civil rights, or political life. This concerns all aspects of the relations between human beings which derive from purely human sources. Finally, there is the sphere of spiritual life, which concerns the natural aptitudes of each individual (spiritual as well as physical). (5)

It is worth noting a couple of points that illustrate graphically the ramifications of Steiner's definitions. The first is in respect of industrial conditions; "I have attempted to show in this book how hours and conditions of labour are matters to be
dealt with by the political rights-state. All are equal in this area due to the fact that only matters are to be treated in it about which all men are equally competent to form an opinion." (6) Thus, matters that might immediately appear to be economic, are, according to Steiner, actually political, showing the care needed in working out the practical meaning of the definitions he gave. The second is the matter of education. For Steiner this was a part of the sphere of the spiritual, and accordingly he argued that "The administration of education, from which all culture develops, must be turned over to the educators. Economic and political considerations should be entirely excluded from this administration." (7)

Steiner outlined his arguments for the structuring of the spiritual and economic spheres as follows; "... the spiritual life requires free self-administration, while the economy requires associative work." (8) The second part of this quotation points us to the fact that Steiner argued for a reconstruction of economic life on the basis of economic associations of producers and consumers. In the political sphere, the principle would be democracy. This outline can be summarised as follows; "socialism for the economic life, democracy for the life of rights, and individualism for spiritual life." (9)

Was Steiner's vision was a socialist one, as is implied at least for its economic aspects, by the above quotation? The system was certainly vigorously opposed to any type of socialism that
proposed nationalisation of the means of production as a general social solution; this would see the power of the political sphere extended into the realm of the economic. And certainly, any socialist programme for education that involved state control over curricula, or indeed state employment of teachers would also be against the tenets Steiner was laying down. Moving towards a more central question, however, did Steiner envisage the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production? The answer is that he appears not to have done, but that he did wish to severely limit its scope. The following quotation shows his thinking on this matter:

Contemporary socialism is thoroughly justified when it demands that the modern facilities which produce for the profit of individuals be replaced by others which produce for the consumption of all. However, the person who fully recognises this demand cannot come to modern socialism's conclusion: that the means of production must pass from private ownership to common ownership. Rather, he will come to a quite different conclusion: that what is privately produced through individual competence must be made available to the community in the correct way... The task of the future will be to find, through associations, the kind of production which most accords with the needs of consumption, and the most appropriate channels from the producers to the consumers.(10)

Steiner goes on to argue for a legal arrangement in which productive enterprises would only remain connected to a person or a group for as long as such a connection is justified by their abilities. So, he argues not for common ownership of the means of production per se, but rather for circulation of the means of production, putting them into the hands of those who can best use them on behalf of the community.(11) When Steiner talked about socialism in the realm of economic life, perhaps he was pointing
to this arrangement and his advocacy of economic associations.

To summarise, Steiner advocated a social order which embodied the principle of liberty in the cultural sphere, fraternity in the economic sphere, and equality in the political sphere. (12) It was this social viewpoint that Steiner's British followers sought to popularise, starting in the aftermath of the First World War. (13).

The first phase of activity by British Anthroposophists can be identified as the period between 1920 and 1922. In this period, an organisation, the Threefold Commonwealth League, was in existence, and the League published a journal, The Threefold Commonwealth, between December 1920 and Feb/Mar 1922. (14) Documents in the Rudolf Steiner Library, London indicate that at the time the journal started, there were about 150 members of the League. (15) This League was active in a period prior to the formal formation of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain in September 1923, this formation being part of a general reorganisation of international Anthroposophy.

The journal dealt with a number of issues. It discussed general anthroposophical issues, including eurythmy and Waldorf education, as well as examining social questions. It noted forthcoming lectures, and occasionally carried lecture reports. It examined in some detail the ideas of the Webbs, as expressed in A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain, and those of G.D.H.Cole, as outlined in Guild Socialism Restated. The guild socialists advocated a two-fold social order, with a
split between a political parliament and an economic parliament based upon self-governing industrial guilds. This had been their view for nearly ten years by 1921. The Webbs had opposed guild socialism when it emerged as a "rebel" movement in the Fabian Society shortly before the First World War, but in the book that was being examined, they switched tack slightly and started to advocate a "social" parliament that would sit alongside the political parliament. One can, accordingly, see why the anthroposophists would wish to engage this type of argument in debate, always stressing that they did not feel that such thinking went far enough, in its failure to advocate three rather than two spheres.

In general, one might suggest that the orientation of the journal was towards socialist and labour opinion. The review of Cole's book argued that the threefold commonwealth could be seen springing up unawares in the thought and tendencies of social life. This was true of the socialist movement in Britain, which the review suggested was more practical and empirical than in, say, Germany. (16) (This mirrors an argument adduced in some comments made about the Webbs, when the threefold commonwealth was argued to be not a scheme or system but rather a "...way of social thought and action..." (17). It was something that might live in the thought and purpose of every individual and thus find expression in many different ways.) The final issue of the journal, in Feb/Mar 1922 gives some support to this view. It announced a conference on Spiritual Values in Education and Social Life, to be held in Oxford in August 1922. It was hoped
that G.D.H. Cole would lecture, and it noted J.R. Clynes, J.A. Hobson and R.H. Tawney as some of the supporters of the conference, at which Steiner was to speak. One of the joint secretaries of the conference was Arnold Freeman. He had been noted in a the previous edition as the Warden of the Sheffield Educational Settlement, and as someone who had worked with Cole and Sidney Webb. (18)

There was at least one good reason for the orientation towards socialist and labour opinion on the part of anthroposophists at this time; this was that some socialists had been paying attention to what Rudolf Steiner had been saying on social issues. A striking example of this, from the period just before the formation of the League, is a review of Steiner's Threefold State (now published as Towards Social Renewal), in The Guildsman, the monthly official organ of the National Guilds League (NGL), in June 1920. The NGL was the sole organisation of Guild Socialists in Britain at this time, and the joint editors of the journal were G.D.H. and Margaret Cole. The review was by the journal's regular reviewer, "Hussein", in his column "The Sign of the Book". The column concerned was sub-headed "Lenin and Steiner", and bracketed Steiner's Threefold State with Lenin's Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky. "Hussein" noted of Steiner's book that it was "... of considerable interest to Guildsmen. It has in common with the Guild theory the conviction that a satisfactory ordering of the life of Society, is possible only on the basis of a recognition and discrimination of social functions." (19) "Hussein" noted that
Steiner was advocating a threefolding of society, and that accordingly his proposals were quite different from Guild Socialism, and also that they represented an attack on the notion of State Sovereignty and also on German State Socialism. Interestingly, "Hussein" concentrated some attention upon the question - considered above - of Steiner's attitude to private property. His conclusion was that "I rather like the elasticity that this method [ie Steiner's, MGT] secures, while I hate the profit-making method to the continuance of which Steiner seems to have no objection,...". (20) "Hussein" felt that Guild Socialists could devise non-profit making forms of industrial administration that also had the elasticity of Steiner's proposals. The writer concluded: "Steiner can, I think, reasonably be called "unpractical"; but there are undoubtedly good ideas for Guildsman in his book, and I hope we shall make haste to steal them." (21)

The League and its paper appear to end their activities in the Spring of 1922, and with the conference we apparently see some anthroposophists moving on to an educational project. (Although, perhaps paradoxically, Rudolf Steiner actually lectured on his social viewpoint at the Oxford conference, and in an introduction to the most recent edition of these lectures Rudi Lissau notes that "This was the last time that he formulated his social ideas, and the only occasion when he did so before an English-speaking audience." (22).) This point is of some interest. A contemporary anthroposophist, Gilbert Childs has recently noted in a discussion of Steiner's activity around the Threefold Social Order in the years following the First World War that;
"It is certain that by mid-1919 Rudolf Steiner had come to realize that the Threefold Social Order was unlikely to become reality in the foreseeable future, and that as more time went by this would become less and less likely. The realistic alternative was to prepare as far as possible future generations for what he considered to be historically necessary and inevitable, namely the threefolding of society, co-operation or opposition notwithstanding. The vehicle for this preparation was quite clearly the educational and socialization processes."(23)

This suggests that the moves being made by some of Steiner's followers in Britain mirrored the activities of Steiner himself, who, as Childs shows, started to work on what has become known as Waldorf education immediately after his period of active espousal of the Threefold Social Order. Childs' account is interesting for our purposes, in that it shows the extent to which Waldorf education, perhaps the most generally well known of anthroposophical enterprises, is very strongly connected to the considerably less well known concept of the threefold social order.

Before moving on to a subsequent phase in anthroposophical promotion of the threefold social order, it is interesting to note that at the time of the Threefold Commonwealth League Steiner's ideas were discussed in a prestigious British journal, namely the Hibbert Journal. This journal, described on its cover as a Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology and Philosophy was a sort of academic journal, though perhaps also owing something to the nineteenth century tradition of "heavy" journals such as the Edinburgh Review. In its edition of July 1921, there appeared an article by Steiner entitled "Spiritual Life - Civil Rights -
Industrial Economy" (24). This was a statement of Steiner's threefold social order vision, and was, in fact, taken from the journal of the Swiss League for the Threefold Social Order, the Soziale Zukunft.

Nine months later, in April 1922, a response to this article appeared, simply called "The Threofold State", by Professor J.S. Mackenzie, a hegelian philosopher from London. Very early on in the piece Mackenzie notes that "The fundamental principle that is involved in it [i.e. the threefold social order, MGT] appears to me to be a sound one...". (25) Mackenzie's article is interesting for a number of reasons. It adopts a generally friendly tone towards Steiner's proposals, though arguing that they need a different presentation in England. It accordingly presents an alternative scheme for a British threefold order, based upon the reform of the House of Lords, and drawing upon the work of an American author, H.H. Powers. At a theoretical level, it compares Steiner's arguments to Plato, and also to the then contemporary Indian writer, Bhagavan Das, who advanced schemes for social reconstruction - especially in his book The Science of Social Organisation - based upon the Manu code and other aspects of Vedanta philosophy. Das, a Theosophist, was subsequently highly regarded by the circle around Dimitrije Mitrinovic, one of the groups of advocates of a threefold social order examined below.

One upshot of the publication of these articles in the Hibbert Journal was the adherence to anthroposophy of Arnold Freeman.
Freeman was earlier noted as the Warden of the Sheffield Educational Settlement (26). Freeman had, in fact, set this body up prior to his becoming an Anthroposophist. Born in 1887, Freeman was a student at Oxford University and, according to his obituary in an anthroposophical journal, a crusading socialist there (27). He had in fact met Steiner in Munich in 1913, but was not at that stage moved to become an anthroposophist. According to Charles Davy's obituary of Freeman, it was Freeman's reading of the *Hibbert Journal* article by Steiner that actually convinced Freeman of the claims of anthroposophy (28), and in 1924 he joined the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain. In 1923, Freeman had stood as a Labour candidate at the general election, in the Sheffield Hallam seat, coming a rather distant second to the Conservative victor, F.H. Sykes. The Sheffield Educational Settlement published a journal, *Facts and Dreams*, and Freeman published an article in it on "Fabian Socialism, Guild Socialism and the Threefold Commonwealth Idea" (29). This was an examination of the Webbs' *Constitution*, Cole's *Guild Socialism Restated* and Steiner's *Threefold Commonwealth* very much along the lines of the material noted from *The Threefold Commonwealth*, though perhaps with the advantage of a closer personal connection with the socialist material. Freeman was a stalwart anthroposophist until his death in 1972, and will be mentioned again below.

A further sustained phase of anthroposophical activity for a threefold social order came in the 1930s and centres upon an organisation called the Threefold Commonwealth Research Group.
(the "group" hereafter), which lasted for a number of years, and left behind some record of its activities in anthroposophical journals, and also left a number of pamphlets arguing for the anthroposophical concept of the threefold social order. Various people were involved in this group who also carried the anthroposophical strand of argument for a threefold social order on beyond the Second World War, and brought it into contact with other strands of threefold social order advocacy.

The first sign of the activity of this group was a notice of its first provisional conference in November 1933, which appeared in the journal Anthroposophical Movement (30). A subsequent report indicated that the group originated from a series of papers and discussions held under the auspices of the Arts, Social and Crafts Club, presumably of the Anthroposophical Society. The report on the conference was by "A.O.B.", which might well have been Owen Barfield (31). The notice for the conference had indicated that lectures would be given by George Kaufman and Walter Stein. In the chair was to be D.N.Dunlop, general secretary of the Anthroposophical Society. The conference notably had a session on Social Credit. This was a topic that excited certain anthroposophists. This can be seen in the favourable comments on Major C.H. Douglas in D.E.Faulkner-Jones' book The English Spirit, of 1935 (32). Owen Barfield had examined the economics of Major Douglas, the progenitor of Social Credit, in an article for Anthroposophy in autumn 1933 (33). In the course of a scrupulous comparision of the two writers, focusing in particular on their views regarding wages, Barfield noted that
"Douglas is, for instance, one of the few English writers who have quoted from the Threefold Commonwealth in their works. He has addressed a Group of the Society [i.e. Anthroposophical Society, MGT] at the London Headquarters. Moreover, several members of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain have been personally interested in Social Credit for many years." (34)

In April 1935 Anthroposophical Movement published a paper given at a conference of the group held in Manchester in early April. (The dates suggest that the paper was published prior to delivery). The paper was given by G.L. Rowe, and proposed a structure for the group and its work. He suggested local groups, co-ordinated by a central committee. The local groups would choose their path of development for a year, and the central committee would plan a conference presumably drawing upon the work undertaken by the local groups. He did not favour a separate publication, and wished to avoid endorsing specific reforms not derived from anthroposophy. He argued: "We are learners: we are not qualified to legislate for the world, and anyone can see that we are not." (35) Rowe's comments about a publication are interesting, because an attempt at a Bulletin had actually appeared in 1934. This was clearly meant as an internal document, and the bulk of its contents were an article by George Kaufmann which was very obviously written with an anthroposophical audience in mind. Only one issue, that of August 1934, appeared. (36)

Whether Rowe's plan of work materialised or not is unclear. For the remainder of the period before the outbreak of the Second
World War we can note two aspects of the work of the group. Firstly, it held a number of conferences, rather on the lines of the one held in Manchester in April 1935. Secondly, it published a series of four pamphlets expounding anthroposophical views on social questions, most likely in 1936 or 1937.

Looking firstly at the conferences, discussion at them focused on both issues such as the role of the group (discussed at a conference in the Sheffield area in May 1936) and on more general issues. The Manchester conference in April 1935 considered Lloyd George's idea for an Economic Council, education, the administration of justice, and milk production. At a conference, again in the Sheffield area, in autumn 1936, which appears to have been rather wider than the others noted, in that members of the group, other anthroposophists and indeed some non-anthroposophists were all present to discuss the Social Future, Arnold Freeman suggested that individual anthroposophists could be involved in the Popular Front. How did the group see its own role? G.L. Rowe's report of the May 1936 conference suggested that at least one of its priorities was preparing for the task, suggested originally by Steiner himself, of rewriting Towards Social Renewal for "...local and contemporary needs...". To conclude on the issue of the conferences, who was attending them? The complete attendance list for the May 1936 conference was published in the Anthroposophical Movement, and the following names from that list are interesting: Charles Davy, D.E. Faulkner-Jones, Arnold Freeman, George Kaufmann, Oliver Matthews, Owen Barfield.
The publishing project resulted in the production of four pamphlets. These were: *Towards a Rational Democracy*, by G.L. Rowe, *Law, Association and the Trade Union Movement*, by Owen Barfield, *Christianity and Communism*, by Charles Davy, and *New Ways of Thinking about Social Problems*, by Gladys Mayer. These all appeared under the group's imprint, with the address of Rudolf Steiner House given on them, and all were undated. However, a clue as to their dates of publication can be garnered from the fact that they were also published as articles in *Anthroposophical Movement* between November 1936 and August/September 1937. They appeared each month, with every issue in that period featuring an article consisting of contents of one or other of the pamphlets.

These appear to have been the main activities of the group. However, it might be possible to see the group and its various initiatives as the forerunner of one of the most interesting examples of anthroposophical activity for a threefold social order in the immediate post Second World War period. This was the publication of a book called *The Three Spheres of Society* by "Charles Waterman". This appeared in 1946, and rather than being a shortish piece of self-published material, it was a substantial (294 pages) production, published by the London firm of Faber and Faber.

Who was "Charles Waterman"? The pseudonym hid Charles Davy. Davy was born in Exeter in 1897, and he died in 1985. An obituary in an anthroposophical publication (42) indicates that he
had been briefly at Oxford, but that he had switched to the London School of Journalism, a move that presaged his career, in that he went on to work for the *Yorkshire Post*. He was based at its London office until shortly after the outbreak of the Second World War, when he went to Leeds to write leader columns for it. At the end of the war, he returned to London to work in an editorial position on *The Observer*, staying there until his retirement, after which he continued to do some work on its correspondence column. He came into contact with Anthroposophy in the 1930s and remained a convinced anthroposophist until his death. (His son, John, who predeceased him, was also an anthroposophist and also worked for *The Observer* for some time, as its science editor.)

In his obituary of Arnold Freeman, Davy indicates that Freeman paid him a visit in Leeds—presumably some time during the Second World War—and from the discussion they had emerged the idea for *The Three Spheres of Society*. (43) No doubt this is factually correct, however a reading of *The Three Spheres of Society* might also recall the stated priority of the Threefold Commonwealth Research Group, namely the production of a sort of contemporary and British restatement of Rudolf Steiner’s 1919 statement on the threefold social order. Davy’s book, which certainly cannot be briefly summarised schematically, is an elegantly written work, rooted in a broad understanding of the Britain that was emerging from the war years. It draws upon an impressively wide secondary literature in its attempt to develop an alternative vision of a Britain reconstructed along the lines of a threelfold social order.
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The book is particularly useful in fleshing out some of the ideas presented in a rather stark form in *Towards Social Renewal*. The chapter on Economic Associations is useful in indicating the way in which Steiner's vision of economic life in the threefold order might be implemented in the British situation, using interesting and familiar examples, such as the coal industry. Likewise, chapters dealing with Health and Education also flesh out the anthroposophical vision in a useful way. It may well be suggested that for a good many years after 1946 this book would have stood as a useful commentary on Britain from the standpoint of the threefold social order idea, and perhaps a more useful starting point than *Towards Social Renewal* in this respect. It is now clearly dated, but even so the qualities of this book should be apparent even to those who disagree with its outlook completely.

It is interesting to note the dedication of the book: "To the friends who have helped me in writing this book, especially G.A., A.B., O.B., A.F., A.C.H., and D." (44) It could be surmised that these are: George Adams, Adam Bittleston, Owen Barfield, Arnold Freeman, A.C.Harwood and Dorothy Davy. If this surmise is correct, we have already established that three of the six (Adams - previously known as Kaufmann - Barfield and Freeman) were involved actively in the Threefold Commonwealth Research Group with Davy, and one may suspect that Dorothy Davy was at least aware of the group and its activities. In this sense, one can see *The Three Spheres of Society* as the result of a phase of
anthroposophical activity around the idea of the threefold social order.

This is as far as we will travel with specifically anthroposophical initiatives towards the threefold social order. This should not be taken to mean that such activity ceased in 1946. It continues to the present day. A recent article in an anthroposophical journal, New View, more widely distributed outside the anthroposophical movement than some of the anthroposophical journals previously quoted, shows that at least two groups are working on threefold social order questions at the time of writing. One is called Directions for Change - active under this and a previous name for four years - and the other the Threefold Social Order Study Group, active for eighteen months prior to the publication of the report, which noted a joint meeting that they had held. The threefold social order remains important to an anthroposophical movement that is now perhaps larger in Great Britain than it has ever been.

Turning now to the other intellectual trends advocating the threefold social order, we will start by examining the Order of the Church Militant (OCM). It is arguable that in its latter phase this was really an anthroposophical group, however its distinctive origins mean that it merits separate consideration. The OCM was founded in 1936 as a result of a split in the Catholic Crusade, a Christian Socialist body founded in 1918 by the Rev. Conrad Noel, the "Red Vicar" of Thaxted. Broadly speaking, the Crusade - an anglican, not a Roman Catholic body - was the furthest left of all Christian Socialist bodies in inter-
war Britain, with some of its priests belonging to the Communist Party of Great Britain. It split in 1936, with a group centring on Noel forming the OCM, apparently on an anti-Stalinist basis. (47) (It is certainly the case that some of the pioneers of British Trotskyism in the early 1930s had connections with Noel and the Catholic Crusade, notably Stewart Purkis and Noel's biographer Reg Groves.) (48)

One of the key figures in the OCM - as he had been in the earlier Crusade - was the Rev. Jack Bucknall, at the time of the split a curate at Holy Trinity, Sneyd in the Potteries, whose vicar, Rev Harold Mason was another OCM priest. (In 1937 Bucknall became vicar of Milton, also in the Potteries, which post he held until his death in 1954.) Bucknall was to become the key figure in the OCM when it split again in 1944. The split resulted from an effort to establish a clear ideological basis for the Order. The split had been presaged by an announcement in the June 1943 edition of the group's journal, The Church Militant, which indicated a number of areas of difference in the Order, and which noted that leading figures on both sides had been asked to put forward views. The result was a pair of statements by Rev Jim Wilson (who had also previously been vicar of Holy Trinity, Sneyd) on the one hand and by Bucknall and his co-thinker the Rev Hugh Benson on the other. By the January/February 1944 edition of The Church Militant the issue had been decided, and the Order had decided to place its main emphasis in the existing situation on the following four points (derived from the earlier statement by Bucknall and Benson):
A Christian Social Order which will be threefold as elucidated by Rudolf Steiner.
The exposure of the false socialism of Russia.
The clear strategy of revolution which may entail violence.
The promulgation of spiritual science as the exposure of the false materialistic science of today.(49).

(Spiritual science is an alternative term for anthroposophy for Steiner's followers)

The OCM was still in existence in August 1954, when the final issue of Church Militant appeared. This issue was a memorial to Bucknall who had recently died, Benson officiating at his burial. By this stage the anonymous writer noted: "The championing of Anthroposophy is all important to us...".(50) In fact Bucknall had been raising the issue of anthroposophy in the pages of the journal and its precursors from October 1933 onwards. In that month's Catholic Crusader he noted his attendance at a workers' school held by the (anthroposophically influenced) Christian Community in Essen during July and August 1933. While he had been there the Nazis closed the school down. It had been examining the Threefold Commonwealth ideas of Steiner.(51)

The OCM in the years in which it advocated the threefold social order appears to have been a small group based in the working class part of the Potteries that Bucknall served as vicar. There may have been a few supporters in other parts of the country. It should be borne in mind that the Catholic Crusade at its height was a small body, with a peak of around 200 members.(52) The Order was the inheritor of one of the most distinct traditions in
British Christian Socialism, and thus its advocacy of a type of anthroposophical social thinking is in itself of interest. Was the adoption of Steiner influenced ideas an aberration? An argument could be made that, in fact, there was a good deal of internal logic in this development. The Catholic Crusade's Manifesto, written by Noel, had been published in Spring 1918. Its second paragraph started: "If you believe that every man should master be of his own life in freedom, spiritual, economic, political...".(53) Here we can see the same type of threefold vision, right down to the same three social elements, that Bucknall would also find in Steiner. Trinitarian thinking suffuses the work of the Noel tradition; Noel's 1939 book Jesus the Heretic has a prologue entitled "The Blessed Trinity as the Basis of a New World Order".(54) Perhaps Bucknall can be seen as having simply taken this trinitarian approach further in his advocacy of anthroposophy.

The OCM does not appear to have had any great degree of contact with the other currents advocating a threefold social order. This is somewhat surprising, at least in respect of the main body of anthroposophy, with which one might have expected some evidence of contact. (Bucknall recommended books by Steiner and anthroposophists in his various articles, and he did so with no regard to the split in British anthroposophy that existed between 1935 and 1970. Thus in early 1944, at the end of an article on "The Threefold Commonwealth"(55) he suggests further reading by both Arnold Freeman - a leading member of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain as we have seen - and also by T. Gordon...
Jones, a member of the small splinter body called the General Anthroposophical Society (English Section). This split will not be examined in this article.) Bucknall also, towards the end of his life wrote at least one piece for the Anthroposophical Society bulletin, *Anthroposophical Movement*. (The October 1953 edition; Vol.XXX, No. 10. The subject was of a religious nature.)

There were, however, other trends of thought that also advocated a threefold social order which did have contacts with the anthroposophists, as well as having developed a number of independent initiatives and ideas of their own. The first to be examined here was the Mitrinovic circle. This term will be used for a number of organisations and informal networks that gathered around the Serbian philosopher Dimitrije Mitrinovic, resident in England between 1914 and his death in 1953.

Mitrinovic animated a number of organisations in this period. He was behind the original British society advocating Adlerian psychology, initially called the International Society for Individual Psychology and known later as the Adler Society, he had a hand in the formation of the Chandos Group, and he inspired the New Europe Group and the New Britain Movement. The New Europe Group had a degree of longevity, lasting from 1932 to 1957. The New Britain Movement was a political comet that lasted from late 1932 to early 1935, attaining a fair degree of popularity in 1933 and 1934. Indeed, the New Britain Movement (NBM) was possibly the largest organisation that advocated a threefold social order, and certainly its weekly journal, *New Britain*, the best selling journal ever to advocate the threefold
social order. By November 1933 the NBM had groups in 47 towns around Britain, and 30 additional groups in the London area. Seven weeks after its first edition, published on May 24th 1933, the weekly newspaper had a circulation of 32,000. For a number of reasons, by 1935, the NBM was dead. From then on, although some formal organisations were continued, Mitrinovic largely concentrated on working informally with a group of associates. After his death in 1953, his associates formed the New Atlantis Foundation to continue his work. The foundation still exists today.

This is not the place to examine Mitrinovic's life in detail. This has been done in Andrew Rigby's excellent biography, *Initiation and Initiative*. Neither can a detailed description of the various bodies connected with Mitrinovic be given here. What can be attempted is an examination of what the Mitrinovic circle meant by the threefold social order, and also an examination of some of their activities in pursuit of it.

Perhaps the best place to look for evidence on this score are the Manifestos that the NBM produced during its brief life. Two such were published, the first, "New Britain Manifestos. The Social State", appearing in *New Britain Quarterly* for January-March 1933, and the second, "A Statement of Aims of New Britain", in the Autumn 1934 *New Britain Quarterly*.

Looking at the first of these texts, we can note that as with Anthroposophical approaches, the three spheres of society are identified as the economic, the political and the cultural.
Once these spheres gain the needed autonomy from each other, then a society in which equality, liberty and fraternity were embodied properly could come into existence, with liberty the leitmotif for the cultural sphere, equality for the economic, and fraternity in the political. A similar claim was also made in the anthroposophical model, but as can be seen by comparing these claims, the Mitrinovic circle reversed the embodiment of equality and fraternity as compared with Steiner's approach.

It is worth noting that in this manifesto the NBM specifically claimed that it was arguing for a Guild Socialist approach in the economic sphere: "The distribution of authority and function can only be achieved under a system of Guild Socialism adapted to modern conditions of mechanized industry." (58) Notable also, in the discussion of the political sphere, is the stress upon regional level devolution. The manifesto makes clear that it envisaged a regional level of government for Britain. Finally, it envisaged a cultural chamber to deal with questions of general human well being, noting that "In this age of mechanization, mass production, and standardization, such a Cultural Chamber would be a safeguard of human values... That state will be free in which the community is enabled to establish standards of cultural value which can direct political and economic policy, instead of being dominated by them." (59)

Much of the argument of the first manifesto was reiterated in the second. There were some slight adjustments, such as the vesting of the power to issue currency with the Political (or Civic)
Chamber, rather than the Economic, although the Economic Chamber retained a right of recommendation. Also worthy of note is the statement: "That the government should consist of representatives of all three chambers ..." (60). In an earlier statement - an editorial in the New Britain weekly of March 7th 1934 - the body that included members from all three chambers had been called "The Senate" (61). In fact, the term 'Senate' became a central part of the Mitrinovic Circle's thinking, becoming seen as a necessary sociological function - rather than simply an institutional term - in an era in which hierarchical leadership was no longer workable. Work around the concept of Senate became, in the post-Second World War period, the most important aspect of the circle's activity, and was done in an informal setting, away from the public eye. (See Rigby's Initiation and Initiative, chapter 7.)

The second manifesto also indicated the need for "...the rapid transference of the ownership of the means of production to the community." (62) (This transfer was to be accomplished on the basis of compensating current owners.) Guilds were again advocated, and the manifesto also argued:

That owing to the introduction of the machine displacing human labour, the means of livelihood must be supplied to citizens, irrespective of a share in production, by means of a universal citizens' allowance, which by liberating them from economic necessity, will make their contribution to social service voluntary and creative. (63)

This statement is interesting when set alongside the interest on the part of at least some anthroposophists in the Social Credit proposals of Major Douglas. However, the main inspiration for
the NBM's arguments regarding monetary reform was the work of Frederick Soddy, rather than Douglas. (64) Soddy, a Nobel prize winning physicist who had been a pioneer of nuclear physics with Ernest Rutherford, was a frequent contributor to journals associated with the New Britain Movement.

This suggests an interesting parallel between the thinking of the Mitrinovic circle and that of the anthroposophical movement. In 1988, Harry Rutherford, a co-worker of Mitrinovic's from the time of the NBM onwards, recalled that "There was a maxim in the New Britain movement which went 'Labour free service of citizens, maintenance free gift of the community' (65). Clearly, this maxim led to the policy of the universal citizen's allowance. However, it is also a maxim that strikingly echoes Rudolf Steiner's 'fundamental social law', enunciated in his 1911 pamphlet, *Anthroposophy and the Social Question;*

> In a community of human beings working together, the well being of the community will be the greater, the less the individual claims for himself the proceeds of the work he has himself done; i.e., the more of these proceeds he makes over to his fellow workers, and the more his own requirements are satisfied not out of his own work done, but out of work done by the others. (66)

(Steiner clarifies shortly after stating this law - central to the practice of, for instance, the Camphill Community Movement- that "The important point is, therefore, that working for one's fellow-men, and the object of obtaining so much income, must be kept apart, as two separate things.") (67)

The Mitrinovic circle, then, advocated a vision of the threefold
social order that is clearly comparable to that of the anthroposophists, but which had a number of subtle differences from the anthroposophical view as well. Let us note these differences, recalling also that there was a distinction regarding the appropriate sphere of society for the realisation of equality and fraternity already seen, and also the pointing to the need for "Senate". Firstly, there was a stronger tendency towards a clear socialist commitment. Whilst, as we saw, Steiner regarded his system as implying socialism for the economy, we saw that there was a degree to which one could question quite what he meant by this. By contrast, there was a continuing commitment to socialism on the part of the Mitrinovic circle. In the NBM manifestos this involved a stress upon Guild Socialism as the appropriate modus operandi for the economy, and also the need for the community to acquire the means of production. As late as 1984, Harry Rutherford was reiterating the commitment to socialism, however, he warned that it should not, according to Mitrinovic, be mistaken for a class struggle view, or for political structures or even theories about the economy. Rather, it was fundamentally seen in terms of radical changes in human consciousness. (68)

A second notable difference is that the Mitrinovic circle drew upon a wider range of sources for their viewpoint. An examination of a document produced by the circle some decades after the death of Mitrinovic, which includes some retrospection, indicates the importance to the circle of figures such as S.G. Hobson, the Guild Socialist, Frederick Soddy, Sir Patrick Geddes the geographer
and botanist, (all personally involved in Mitrinovic inspired organisations), and Alfred Adler the psychologist. Steiner is also mentioned in this text, though not specifically in the context of the threefold social order. However, several copies of both the 1920 and 1923 editions of *Towards Social Renewal* can be found in Mitrinovic’s library (now housed at the J.B. Priestley Library, University of Bradford). Coupled with this, one can find discussions of Steiner’s social thinking in *New Britain* weekly, for instance in an article by Karl Polanyi of the 1st August 1934 on ‘Rudolf Steiner’s Economics’. By contrast to this, the anthroposophical approach tended to focus on Steiner’s view alone.

Despite these differences, which were arguably fairly minor in comparison to the similarities, in the post-Second World War period there were some interesting examples of contacts between the Mitrinovic circle and anthroposophists. The main manifestation of this can be found in the participation of anthroposophists, including many named in the account of anthroposophical activities for a threefold social order, in events organised by the Mitrinovic circle. Three organisations can be mentioned in this connection. The first is the Renaissance Club of London, which existed between late 1945 and mid-1965. Starting in February 1947 several anthroposophists gave a number of lectures at this club, whose activities seem to have largely revolved around lectures. So, in 1947, 1948 and 1949 we can find such figures as Charles Davy, Owen Barfield, George Adams and Gladys Mayer addressing the club on a variety of
Of a more "activist" nature perhaps, was the British Renaissance Initiative, which seems to have been an organisation functioning in the late 1940s. It organised a series of forum discussions in 1948, including one on "The Threefold Social Order" (September 29th) at which the speakers included "Charles Waterman" (i.e. Charles Davy), A.C. Harwood and the Rev A.D. Belden, the latter a long time associate of Mitrinovic. (A fortnight later - October 13th - a discussion was held on "National Senate of Great Britain". No anthroposopists spoke at this meeting.)

Finally, the New Europe Group was still active in 1950, promoting series of lectures. Its autumn series in 1950 was split into three subsections, the second of which was on the Social Proposals of Dr Rudolf Steiner, and which featured lectures by Oliver Matthews, Ernst Lehrs and Walter Johannes Stein, all significant figures in the world of anthroposophy.

All this suggests that there was close contact between the Mitrinovic circle and the anthroposophists in the years following the Second World War. This appears to have flowed from a meeting between Charles Davy and Winifred Gordon Fraser, a key co-worker of Mitrinovic's and also, for instance, chair of the British Renaissance Initiative meeting on the threefold social order. This may have been at a conference on Existentialism. From this meeting resulted personal contacts between Mitrinovic and his circle with the leading anthroposopists, most already mentioned but also including Karl König, founder of the Camphill Community.
Movement. Mitrinovic himself had heard Steiner lecture in Munich prior to the First World War and had a detailed knowledge of his work, a fact attested to by the contents of his library at Bradford. (71) Karl König, it might be noted, was, according to Rigby, one of the three doctors (the other two – Ralph Twentyman and Morris Robb – were members of the Mitrinovic circle) who attended Mitrinovic in the last week of his life. (72)

Finally, we might turn to the impact upon activities towards a threefold social order made by Patrick Geddes and his followers. Geddes (1854-1932) was a polymath whose interests and activities covered a wide span. Technically, for much of his adult life he was the Martin White Professor of Botany at Dundee University (1888-1919), an appointment perhaps notable today for the fact that he had no degree of any sort, and that he only had to be present at Dundee for one term a year. However, Geddes was also a notable pioneer in areas such as Sociology and Town Planning. He accumulated a number of "disciples", among the most important being Victor Brandford, Professor C.B. Fawcett, Professor H.J. Fleure and Lewis Mumford.

One of the notable features of the Geddesian approach to social phenomena was his invention of "thinking machines". These consisted of sheets of paper folded into a pattern of three columns by three columns and then filled with factors to be related. Ultimately Geddes produced a "machine" that comprised four such sets of nine, the "36", which comprehensively represented his approach in graphic form. (73) Regardless of the ultimate value of these 'machines', and at least Mumford came to
have serious reservations about them, one of them at least was
important in the relationship between Geddesian thought and
trends towards a threefold social order.

In respect, firstly, of Geddes himself, we might note that he was
personally connected with the Mitrinovic circle and with at least
one follower of Rudolf Steiner. The connection with the
Mitrinovic circle was an important one; he was invited by
Mitrinovic to be the first President of the New Europe Group
(74). It is clear from his correspondence that he had a brief
but intense relationship with the Mitrinovic circle in the final
year of his life. He first mentions the circle, in the shape of
the Adler Society, in his letters to Mumford in March 1931, when
he notes "I was most stirred up in London by "(Adler) Society of
Individual Psychology" - by far the most living group I have
found - & for long !"(75) (Interestingly, Geddes had first met
Mitrinovic as far back as 1916, when they had been introduced by
Philip Mairet, a meeting that produced no significant result, to
Mairet's chagrin.)(76) The Mitrinovic circle continued to honour
the memory of Geddes, printing a statement of his views as the
"Sociological Legacy of Patrick Geddes" in the New Britain
Quarterly for Autumn 1934, and in 1972 David Shillan giving that
year's New Atlantis Foundation lecture, Biotechnics which
examined Geddes' thought.

How did the thought of Geddes and the Mitrinovic circle converge?
To see the connection, we need to return to the 'thinking
machines', and in particular the one that Geddes believed to
cover sociology. This involved a trinity: Place-Work-Folk. The machine elaborated the connections between the three elements, that were derived to some extent from the work of the French sociologist Frederic le Play. Once again, in this trinity we are back with the elements that have been common to the schemes for a threefold order that we have examined: Politics (Place), Economics (Work) and Culture (Folk). David Shillan, in his lecture on Geddes, connects this triad with what he calls the biological triad of Environment-Function-Organism,(77), an important point given the Mitrinovic circle's stress on the importance of creating an organic order for humanity,(78) although the Mitrinovic circle may well have also seen psychological aspects to the Place-Work-Folk triad.

The Mitrinovic circle also were drawn to the federalism that Patrick Geddes espoused ("..seek to renew the ancient tradition of Federation between the cities, regions, dominions.") (79) Harry Rutherford has commented that "Mitrinovic conceived that both political and industrial organization should be truly organic and not hierarchical." (80) He goes on to note that "The political principles which embody the true nature of an organism are those of devolution and federation." (81) The Mitrinovic circle's vision embodied an argument for devolution and federation of the three spheres of society and within those three spheres. So, it is fairly clear that there was a strong basis for the collaboration of Geddes with the Mitrinovic circle.

However, did Geddes himself espouse the threefold social order, so central to the thought of Mitrinovic and his co-workers? It
would appear that in so many words he did not. However, Charles Purdom, who had close connections with Mitrinovic, (82), suggests, in effect, that Geddes did advocate something rather similar. Purdom expounded his version of the threefold social order, (which drew heavily on the Mitrinovic circle approach), in The New Order, a book published in 1941. In this the three spheres of society were, as usual, politics, economics and culture. However, Purdom used the term The State to refer to politics, Society to refer to economics, and The Nation to refer to culture. He claimed that "I owe the conception of 'state,' 'society,' and 'nation' to Sir Patrick Geddes, with whom I became acquainted in 1919 when he was old: ..." (83). However, Purdom makes no reference to his 1919 meeting with Geddes in his autobiography, so it is difficult to assess his claim. He certainly respected the views of Geddes in town planning matters, as a very complimentary reference in his autobiography shows. (84) We do know from Mumford's letters to Geddes that Purdom, an important figure in the British and International Town Planning and Garden Cities movements, was known to Mumford and Geddes. (85) We also know that Geddes lectured in London in July 1919 on the "Devolution and Federation of Cities" (86), and it is certainly possible that Purdom may have been present at this occasion. Accordingly, we cannot accept uncritically Purdom's statement. What is more, there is a fact that may suggest that he was wrong in his assertion.

This takes us on to a consideration of the connections between Geddes and the anthroposophical movement. Geddes' link here was
with one particular member of that movement; Gladys Mayer, a British anthroposophist. Mayer had, in fact, been a "disciple" of Geddes prior to her involvement with Steiner. From the letters of Geddes and Mumford, we can be certain that she was in the Geddes circle by 1921 at the latest. (87) From Boardman's account of the life of Geddes it would appear that Mayer became interested in anthroposophy following a visit to the world headquarters of the movement at Dornach, Switzerland, the Goetheanum, which she made after visiting Geddes at his College des Ecossais at Montpellier, France in 1925. (88)

Mayer subsequently produced a pamphlet in the Threefold Commonwealth Research Group series of 1936 to 1937, called New ways of Thinking about Social Problems. In this she outlined her views on the intellectual convergences between Steiner, Geddes and Goethe. Despite her evident attachment to anthroposophy, it is clear from this pamphlet that she continued to regard Geddes as a significant and important figure. ("Sir Patrick Geddes, whose name is not nearly so widely known as it should be...".) (89) Indeed, she claimed that Geddes had attained heightened powers of perception; not, she argued, to the extent that Steiner had, but Geddes had similar abilities of 'living-picture thinking' as had Goethe. (90)

Aside from any intrinsic interest her pamphlet may hold, Mayer's work tends to call Purdom's assertion into some degree of doubt. This is because she devotes a section to the notion of the threefold social order, and starts it by asserting that Geddes
saw life as a drama played out between two opposing forces, which she claims he dubbed Temporal and Spiritual forces. (91) It would seem rather unusual for Mayer to overlook the opportunity to enlist Geddes into the ranks of advocates of the threefold social order had she been aware of the State-Society-Nation formulation. Clearly, though, this cannot be a definitive argument regarding Purdom's assertion.

Geddes, as was noted earlier, accumulated a group of "disciples", many of whom continued to use his approach, or at least aspects of it, following his death. A number of these continued the connection with the Mitrinovic circle into the period after the Second World War. So, for instance, two weeks after the New Europe Group/British Renaissance Initiative forum discussion on the Threefold Social Order noted above, there was a similar forum discussion on National Senate of Great Britain, on the 13th October 1948. The speakers at this were all close associates of Mitrinovic. However, records indicate that one of the speakers in the discussion was Professor C.B. Fawcett. (92) Fawcett was the author of Provinces of England, an argument for regional government published originally in 1919 in a series edited by Geddes and Victor Branford called The Making of the Future. (It was subsequently republished in 1960.) This book envisaged an England of 12 provinces in what would be a federal state, such devolution overcoming certain problems consequent upon "Home Rule All Round" (ie parliaments for Scotland, Wales and Ireland).

Moving on to 1950, it was above noted that the second of the three series of lectures organised by the New Europe Group in the
autumn of that year was to be on Steiner's social proposals. The third was to be on the Sociology of Geddes, and featured lectures by Jacqueline Tyrrwhitt, whose *Patrick Geddes in India* appeared in 1947, F.Y. Thompson, and Alexander Farquharson, a former co-worker of Geddes'.

It is possible that at the meetings of the New Europe Group and British Renaissance Initiative mentioned members of all three of the main streams of thought examined in this piece - the Steiner, Mitrinovic and Geddes streams - actually came together and discussed their respective views. The activities of the Mitrinovic orientated bodies in this period seem to be very deliberately drawing upon ideas emanating from Steiner and Geddes, and an attempt to get those working in their traditions to engage in dialogue would not seem inconsistent with the broad thrust of the Mitrinovic circle's approach towards a fundamental social change. (Although it should be understood that the Mitrinovic circle thought in world terms, and situated their efforts in the face of what they believed to be a major world crisis.)

In conclusion, it can be said that this piece shows that there was a considerable amount of activity promoting the idea of a threefold social order in Britain between 1920 and 1950. With the brief exceptions of the New Britain Movement in 1933 and 1934 and (possibly) the anthroposophical activities in the early 1920s, this activity did not make any great impact on public opinion and was largely carried out by small groups of highly
committed activists. Indeed, some of these activists were involved for virtually the entire period examined, notably the anthroposophist Arnold Freeman.

In the pre-Second World War phase of activity it is notable that there was an orientation towards Guild Socialism. This was seen in respect of the anthroposophists in the early 1920s, with the addition in their case of some interest in the then changing views of the leading Fabians, Beatrice and Sidney Webb. This orientation to Guild Socialism was clearly also the case with the Mitrinovic circle. Indeed, following the break up of the New Britain Movement in 1935, a successor body called the House of Industry League was founded which specifically campaigned for Guild Socialism. In this body S.G. ("Sam") Hobson, perhaps the person most entitled to the accolade of founder of Guild Socialism, played an active part, having come into contact with the Mitrinovic circle - and developing his thought as a result - in 1932.(93)

This orientation made sense at the time. The Guild Socialist movement had made a substantial impact in the decade straddling the First World War. Persons interested in social questions were likely to have been aware of it in the 1920s and 1930s. Also, the Guild Socialists advocated a process of bifurcating parliament (and in this they were joined by the Webbs in the early 1920s) that could serve as a useful comparison for the threefold order advocated by the groups examined in this piece. By the late 1940s and early 1950s, however, the Guild Socialist movement was only a memory.
By the early 1950s, with the onset of the Cold War the outlook must have appeared bleak for the advocates of the threefold social order. The Geddes stream retained some vitality at an academic level, especially in the USA thanks to the influence of Lewis Mumford, though his growing reservations about aspects of the Geddes approach have been noted. The Mitrinovic circle appears to have largely concentrated upon the cultural side of its activities from the early 1950s onwards, and this was manifest in the Renaissance Club of London which continued to attract a high calibre of speaker until its demise in the mid-1960s. (94) The circle did establish the still active New Atlantis Foundation following Mitrinovic's death in 1953 to continue his work, and in recent years its main activities have been publishing ventures. It has placed Mitrinovic's library in the J.B. Priestley Library at Bradford University, where it is accessible to readers. The Order of the Church Militant finally appears to have ended some time following the death of Rev Jack Bucknall in 1954.

Even amongst the anthroposophical movement, much the largest of the remaining groups advocating a threefold social order, there seems to have been little specific promotional activity around the issue of the sort examined above, from the 1920s and 1930s. There are a number of journals in the Rudolf Steiner Library concerned with the idea dating from the mid 1960s and mid 1970s (95). Work does seem to have continued within the movement around the idea, as evidenced by the existence of an Institute
for Threefold Studies at Emerson College, the running of study
groups with some successful conferences (96) and the growth of
some work on economic issues. However, threefolding seems to have
started to return towards the centre of anthroposophical
attention in the late 1990s. A reading of the journal New View,
which started in late 1996, indicates a growing concern — or
perhaps a return to such a concern — for the idea and its
ramifications for anthroposophy and its organisations. However,
this is beyond the scope of this article.
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