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Abstract

Ideology and the Early Victorian Novel:
A Study of Tory Radicalism in the 1830's and 1840's

By
Michael Davis Youngblood

This thesis examines the social and literary pressures and contexts which shaped the early Victorian topical novel. It surveys the coherent intellectual system of Tory radicalism, as worked out in print and in life from 1826 to 1855. Precipitated in the late 1820's, Tory radicalism possessed two central elements: a thorough critique of political economy and a staunch defense of protectionism. Although pervasive in several key popular movements of the time, Tory radicalism did not enter the novel unaided. The criticism of the novel effected this entry by conceiving of the novel as a participation in reality. The 1830's ended with critics openly admonishing writers to join in contemporary movements in their novels.

John Galt responded to these demands and to his own ideology in The Member. The protagonist of the novel, Archibald Jobbry, conforms to the Tory radical type of the self-interested M.P. The main action of the novel is Jobbry's normative evolution from self-interest to disinterested performance of duty. Once his evolution is complete, Jobbry serves as a spokesman for Tory radicalism. The factory novels of 1839, Frances Trollope's Michael Armstrong, Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna's Helen Fleetwood, and the anonymous Simon Smike similarly focused on character development. Each of them featured the secular conversion of a character from ignorance to fully committed activism in the cause of Factory Reform. Explicit in these novels is the tension between the novelist's duty honestly to represent human nature and his partisan commitment to an ideology. Benjamin Disraeli developed Sybil around the Tory radical diagnosis of the "Condition of England Question" of the 1840's, only to retreat into the jejeune remedies of Young Englandism. Similarly he undermined the acute Tory radical diagnosis by resorting to the romance narrative pattern. Each of these topical novels incorporated Tory radicalism comprehensively; in addition to the doctrines, they possessed the characters, images, and lived patterns of Tory radicalism.
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter One</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Personnel and Doctrines of Tory Radicalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Two</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;True to Nature&quot;: The Demand for Realism in the 1830's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Three</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Novel and the Pressure to Conform: The Case of The Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Factory Novels of 1839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disraeli and the Condition of England: The Tory Radicalism of Sybil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Memorial of Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustrations

"TREMENDOUS SACRIFICE!" 93-94
"Candidates Under Different Phases" 184-85
"Table of Medical Opinion and Testimony" 240-41
"Mother! Dear Mother! open your eyes upon us!" 252-53
"THE HOME OF THE RICK BURNER" 295-96
"YOUNG ENGLAND'S OLD HABITS" 319-20
### Abbreviations

#### Novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Author and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S           | Disraeli, Benjamin. *Sybil: or The Two Nations.*  
| SS          | *The Factory Lad: or, The Life of Simon Smike; Exemplifying the Horrors of White Slavery.*  
  London: Thomas White, 1839.                     |
| HF          | Tonna, Charlotte Elizabeth. *Helen Fleetwood.*  
  London: Seeley and Burnside, 1841.               |
| MA          | Trollope, Frances. *The Life and Adventures of Michael Armstrong, the Factory Boy.*  
  1840; rpt.  

#### Contemporary Periodicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ath.</td>
<td><em>The Athenaeum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
<td><em>Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td><em>Edinburgh Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td><em>Fraser's Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td><em>Fleet Papers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent's Mag.</td>
<td><em>Gentleman's Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td><em>Leeds Intelligencer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td><em>Leeds Mercury</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td><em>London Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td><em>Metropolitan Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMM</td>
<td><em>New Monthly Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td><em>Northern Star</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td><em>Quarterly Review</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For modern periodicals and journals I use the standard abbreviations of the Modern Language Association's annual International Bibliography.
Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to several libraries and their patient, obliging staffs: the London Library, the British Library, the British Newspaper Library, the University of London Library and its Goldsmith's Library of Economic Literature, the National Library of Scotland, the John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester, and the Perry-Castaneda Library of the University of Texas at Austin. The municipal libraries of Bradford and Manchester were unfailingly hospitable. Valeria Allport and Renuka Watson of Bedford College Library were invaluable in securing obscure works through interlibrary loan.

I am grateful to the Trustees of the Broadlands Archives for permission to consult and quote from the diaries of Lord Shaftesbury.

Marion Fleisher of the New Statesman graciously allowed me to consult the file copy of The Athenaeum at an awkward time. Leo Cooper, Director of Seeley, Service, and Cooper answered my inquiry about the archives of Seeley and Burnside. Nigel Cross, Archivist, gave me free access to the splendid archives of the Royal Literary Fund.

Within the University of London I am indebted to Dr. J.S. Bratton, Dr. J.A. Turner, and Professor F.M.L. Thompson for commenting on the first draft of chapter one, and to Professor Inga-Stina Ewbank for commenting on the first draft of chapter six, which I have omitted from this version of my thesis.

My greatest intellectual debts are to Professor R.J. Kaufmann of the University of Texas at Austin and to Professor David J. DeLaura of the University of Pennsylvania, who first kindled my interest in Victorian England and then sustained it through the long labor of revising this thesis.

My greatest, and continuing, personal debt is to my parents.
Introduction

The early years of the Victorian age (1830-1855) number among the most profoundly disturbed of the nineteenth century. The intense, near revolutionary disturbances of these years, which began with the Swing riots and culminated in the Chartist fiasco at Kennington Common 1848, influenced conspicuously the course of the English novel. They interfered with the novel's myopic concern with pre-1815 history and with fashionable life, focusing it as well on the events and issues of the day. Leading as well as obscure novelists began to depict and to seek remedies for the most urgent of them in a myriad of novels. The most notable include Disraeli's Coningsby and Sybil, Mrs. Gaskell's Mary Barton and North and South, Kingsley's Yeast and Alton Locke, and Dickens's Hard Times. Variously labelled as political novels, social or social-problem novels, novels with a purpose, romans à these, or Tendenzromane, these works are distinguished by an overt preoccupation with contemporary social, economic, and political issues, particularly those engendered by industrialism. However labelled, these works are clearly linked by an emphatic response to their troubled milieu et moment.

Although the Victorian novel in general remained in critical limbo until redeemed by such New Critics as F.R. Leavis and E.K. Brown after the War, these insistently topical works received intelligent attention as early
as 1903. In a classic study, The Social Novel in England 1830–50, Louis Cazamian permanently located them on the critical map. Cazamian identified two sweeping social and psychological movements which dominated the early Victorian period: utilitarian individualism and idealistic interventionism. The works of Disraeli, Gaskell, Kingsley, and Dickens, among others, were part of the latter movement, a reaction against economic individualism which included Chartism and such disparate intellectual elements as the Romantic poets, Carlyle, the Oxford Movement, and Ruskin. The social novels supported this movement, Cazamian argued, by accurately informing an ignorant ruling class of the condition of the working class. He repeatedly remarked "how useful Sybil, Mary Barton, and Alton Locke were in disseminating information."³ By disseminating information the novels helped to arouse the dormant social conscience of the ruling class and thereby to promote needed social and sanitary reforms. Cazamian's notion of the social novel as an important source of information has strongly influenced subsequent critics. Kathleen Tillotson, for one, explicitly adopts his notion in her own classic study, The Novels of the Eighteen-Forties; Sybil, Yeast, and Mary Barton "were intended to open people's eyes to certain evils of the time. The ignorance they enlightened was indeed widespread in the novel-reading public."⁴ Tillotson adds that the protagonists of Sybil and Yeast were "shown as explorers coming upon savage tribes" and extends the metaphor to the
novelists themselves; they acted as scouts, crossing the frontier into "unknown" England and returning to publicize their discoveries.\textsuperscript{5}

Investigation of the sources of Sybil and Yeast has confirmed the authoritative view of Cazamian and Tillotson. Through meticulous sifting of Parliamentary reports and other contemporary documents, Sheila Smith and Martin Fido conclude that Disraeli and Kingsley borrowed heavily from them in order to present an accurate picture of working class life, rural as well as urban.\textsuperscript{6} As Smith states unequivocally, "Both Disraeli and Kingsley used the unpleasant facts of Blue books to convince their readers that the problems they discussed were both real and urgent."\textsuperscript{7} Nevertheless, the established view of the topical novel as a valuable source of information has been effectively challenged on two basic grounds. As early as 1948 a distinguished historian, W.O. Aydelotte, dismissed the factual information of such novels as "spotty, impressionistic, and inaccurate."\textsuperscript{8} He advised the historian to seek his facts from more conventional sources. Recently Michael Jefferson endorsed Aydelotte's position after a thorough analysis of the economic beliefs and factual content of the topical novels. He contends that in many ways they "are seriously misleading on the economic and social realities of the time."\textsuperscript{9}

Furthermore, the supposition that the novels informed an ignorant reading public is also suspect.
Following a line of thought that began with G.M. Young, Roger Wallins shows that the information purveyed by the novels, where accurate, was already widely known to early Victorian readers through leading periodicals. In over a hundred articles published before the first topical novel, Wallins reports, these periodicals "recognized the social evils in urban life and, through their discussions of the bluebooks, of private investigations, and of parliamentary proceedings, communicated their concern -- and very detailed information -- to their readers."

Hence, the established view of the topical novel is no longer adequate; it does not comprehend either the faulty information of such novels or the widespread knowledge of the facts that they supposedly reveal.

Responding to the inadequacy of the established view, post-war critics have largely reinterpreted the topical novels as propaganda. Arnold Kettle, Arthur Pollard, Sheila Smith, and John Lucas recognize that it contains a substantial amount of information about the condition of the working class -- often the most dramatic and least typical details recorded in blue books -- and that this information is strictly subservient to the novelist's extrinsic, preconceived purpose. His purpose is to arouse the conscience of the reading public to eliminate the chasm which gaped between rich and poor, master and man -- the "two nations" which constituted early Victorian England. In common with the other critics, Pollard identifies the "very inspiration out of
which these novels issued, namely, an intense sympathy with suffering mankind and a strong desire for amelioration of the human condition. The evil thing that separates, the baffling isolation of man from his fellow men, is what all these novels attack." As propaganda designed to elicit an intense moral and emotional response, these novels needed to reach the well-informed reader of leading periodicals in addition to the common reader; both must be aroused by more or less reliable information, moral preachments, and other means before the crucial work of amelioration could come to pass.

By reinterpreting the topical novel as propaganda, these critics reveal its principal weaknesses as well as its governing purpose. In his important article, Arnold Kettle describes this variety of realistic novel as "social-problem" novels because they reduce a "living complex of forces and people" to a mere problem, capable of solution. Kettle detects an unfortunate note of abstraction in these novels, a limitation of artistic and emotional involvement. He detects also a note of didacticism; they tend to preach overtly instead of communicating their message through a representation of the total richness and complexity of human life. Consciously elaborating on Kettle's view of the "social-problem" novels, John Lucas finds in them a failure of realism because a "halt is suddenly called to the attempt at imaginative honesty and a political attitude
quickly wheeled forward in its place. 14 Lucas contends that these novels conscientiously examine the lives and interrelationships of their characters, plumbing the conflict between the rich and poor, master and man so thoroughly that their ultimate irreconcilability, the "abyss" of class hatred, becomes apparent; whereupon they retreat into the stock belief that a "brotherhood of united interests" would be a sufficient remedy. Indeed, Lucas comments that the reduction of a living complex to a problem, first identified by Kettle, becomes fully evident in these novels only when they retreat into the recommendation of brotherhood. Such recommendation "must damage the novel's essential freedom, its integrity," Lucas concludes. 15

From different angles Kettle and Lucas approach a fundamental difficulty inherent in the topical novel. The difficulty arises from the nature of the realistic novel, the topical novel being one variety of it. In the words of George Levine, the realistic novel "entails a very large openness to experience -- a rejection of prejudices, a comprehension of the not-self, a capacity to see without flinching and to place the reader inside the attractive and unattractive as well." 16 For the realistic novel the full and honest depiction of human experience is a categorical imperative. However, the early Victorian topical novel often deliberately evades this imperative, as Kettle and Lucas argue; it seeks to elicit a moral and emotional response from the reader.
even if this entails at times distortion, exaggeration, and simplification of experience and fact. For this variety of realistic novel, the extrinsic purpose of reconciling the "two nations" is usually paramount, not fidelity to things as they are.\textsuperscript{17}

One critic in particular, Sheila Smith, focuses closely on the tension in such works between the "novelist's prime duty, honest exploration of human experience" and the desire to demonstrate a thesis, to preach, or to arouse the reader.\textsuperscript{18} Smith acknowledges that the novelist often gives priority to his purpose rather than to observation of human behavior. Unlike Kettle and Lucas, however, Smith does not think this choice of priority either permanent or inevitable; on the contrary, she argues cogently that the topical novel can accommodate the honest rendering of experience and fact without abandoning its thesis or purpose.\textsuperscript{19} Indeed, she proposes that the urgency of a pressing contemporary problem can give "a directing purpose to the book and help to give it unity and significant form."\textsuperscript{20} By concentrating on a small portion of the human plight, she adds, the novelist improves his chances of imaginatively recreating it. Therefore the topical novel can succeed in balancing its tendency to become pure propaganda with the realistic imperative of honestly portraying human experience and fact. Attainment of this balance is the implicit optimum for the topical novel, which is not inherently bound to either abstraction or
retreat into a stock belief formed by class prejudice.

Writing at the same time as Smith, Barbara Hardy reaches virtually identical conclusions about the realistic imperative and ideology rather than purpose or thesis. In The Appropriate Form, Hardy finds that, in novels by Defoe, Charlotte Bronte, Thomas Hardy, and E.M. Forster, "there is a single and simplified belief which excludes much of the varied causality to be found in life, which is metaphysical in nature and has precise moral consequences." She finds a varying tension between belief and multiform life that closely resembles the tension between purpose and life noted by Smith; ideology as well as purpose can supercede the obligation faithfully to chronicle human nature. Furthermore, like Smith, Hardy insists that novelists can effectively reconcile ideology and realism; such novelists as DeFoe, Brontë, Hardy, and Forster write true novels, not tracts, in which character and action are more than merely illustrative. Robinson Crusoe is a prime example of this reconciliation. Hardy shows that Defoe organizes the novel with the traditional Christian "rhythm" of conversion, that of the prodigal son. Dogma determines the relationships between beginning, middle, and end; governs the temporal movement of the narrative; and defines not only morality, but also the hero's motives and actions. Nevertheless, Hardy contends, "There is no tension between ideology and truth but the story has sufficient substance to convince and interest the
It is important to recognize that, in accepting the reconcilability of ideology and reality, Hardy affords the literary critic scope for evaluating the relative success or failure of the ideological novel. He can assess the effectiveness of the novel in maintaining the "solid verisimilitude of external acts and facts" while embodying its sacred or profane ideology. This is a valuable contribution and one should not underestimate it. It is also important to recognize that Hardy opens another possibility for the interpretation of the topical novel. This possibility provides the point of departure for the present study. Behind the extrinsic purpose which figures so prominently in the topical novel lies, I suggest, an insistent contemporary ideology, construing ideology as a coherent system of ideas expressed in a distinctive idiom and adopted by at least one social group. The material and political conditions of the early Victorian period gave birth to a multitude of remedial ideologies, which were often accompanied by tumultuous popular movements. These ideologies ranged from the anti-capitalism of working class Radicals, disseminated in the unstamped and Chartist presses, to Philosophic Radicalism, to the popular political economy of the ascendant middle class, to the embattled protectionism of the gentry. Diverse in range, they were also far-reaching in actual impact; they shaped and helped to articulate such popular campaigns as those...
for Parliamentary Reform, the Factory Movement, the Anti-Poor Law Movement, Chartism, the Anti-Corn Law Movement, and the Public Health Movement. Indeed, little in the public life of early Victorian England lacked the impress of ideology.

Certainly the topical novel did not lack the stamp of ideology. Each of the topical novels addressed the urgent material and political conditions of the time and at least one of the popular movements intent on remedying them. As the novelists addressed these conditions and movements with aroused consciences, they brought ideology with them. Kingsley's Christian Socialism in Yeast and Alton Locke, and Disraeli's Young Englandism in Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred are familiar examples of ideology in the topical novel. Ideology served important functions in these and other topical novels. It helped the novelists simply to make sense of and to assimilate the often contradictory, emotionally charged mass of information available about the complex realities of the period.25.

As Sheila Smith, Martin Fido, Roger Wallins, and others show, the novelists learned about contemporary conditions rather than from first hand experience. These sources were multitudinous: Parliamentary papers, which were available to the public from 1835 on; Hansard and other records of speeches; periodicals of all sorts, from the Quarterly Review to The Times to the British Labourer's Protector and Factory and Child's Friend; pamphlets, tracts, broadsides, and
newspaper reprints; the reports of the Central Society of Education and the London and provincial statistical societies; and the proceedings of the statistical section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Without an organizing ideology, the sheer bulk of these readily available sources could overwhelm the novelists, leaving them more bewildered than enlightened. Hence, the information which appears in the topical novels is not raw fact, as Cazamian and others who emphasize this aspect infer; on the contrary, even before it entered the novels it was already ideologically selected and shaped.

The preselection and preshaping of fact illuminates one of the fundamental characteristics of ideology. Ideology mediates not only empirical fact but in addition all other modes of reality -- economic, psychological, and so on. It constitutes the worldview of its possessor, a worldview shared, perhaps with individual or local variations, with his social group. This worldview may formulate models of actual and potential economic relationships, of classes and other social divisions, and of political organizations. These models are especially relevant to the topical novelists, who obviously could use to good effect the stock characters or ideals that they specify. Disraeli, for example, included in Coningsby and Sybil the Young Englanders' stock type of the philanthropic manufacturer, a latter day version of the medieval lord of the manor. Millbank and Trafford
are straight from the pamphlets of Lord John Manners. The relevance of ideology to the strategic elements of the novel is wider than this example allows. As Barbara Hardy indicates, ideology may determine characters and character development, action, theme, value, setting, imagery, and the implied narrator and his pronouncements. As ideology can enable the novelist to assimilate the multitudinousness of his world, so it can inform the strategic elements of his fictional structures.

Several leading early Victorian ideologies enlisted the allegiance of various novelists, shaping their perceptions of reality and informing the strategic elements of their works. Much more than Christian Socialism, Young Englandism, or the anti-capitalism of the Chartist novels, I believe, Tory radicalism influenced topical novelists and their writings; Tory radicalism and its literary influence are the subjects of the present work, a case study of the relationship of ideology and the novel. Tory radicalism is a modern term, coined by Cecil Driver for the staunchly protectionist, traditionalist, and Evangelical Anglican ideology embraced by the disparate social groups which were most injured by the material and political conditions of the time: handloom weavers, operatives, unskilled workers in Northern England, agricultural laborers, and the Ultra Tory gentry. One eminent Tory radical, Richard Oastler, succinctly confessed his secular creed in 1841:
A Tory is one, who, believing that the institutions of this country are calculated as they were intended, to secure the prosperity and happiness of every class of society, wishes to maintain them in their original beauty, simplicity and integrity. He is tenacious of the rights of all, but more of the poor and needy, because they require the shelter of the constitution and the laws more than the other classes. A Tory is a staunch friend of Order, for the sake of Liberty; and, knowing that all of our institutions are founded upon Christianity, he is of course a Christian; believing with St. Paul, that each order of society is mutually dependent on the others, for peace and prosperity.

Determined to preserve the economic, political, and religious institutions of England in their original integrity, Tory radicals placed themselves in the awkward situation of opposing two of the central tendencies of the age. On the one hand they opposed the Liberal Tories, Peelites, and Liberals who represented the ascendant middle class and espoused its "scientific" ideology, political economy. On the other hand they could not condone the political programs of the Radicals and Chartists, which sought fundamental changes in the constitution they revered. As I show in chapter one, Tory radicals formulated incisive responses to these two currents of the "spirit of the age." They articulated a critique of political economy which systematically exposed its doctrinal inadequacies and its pernicious practical consequences for the working class and the landed gentry. They also steadfastly defended the venerable policies of
protectionism, arguing that experience, from the Tudor era to the Napoleonic Wars, had shown them to be essential to general prosperity and class harmony. The defense of protectionism and the critique of political economy emerged as Tory radicalism in the 1820's under the pressure of Huskissonian economic liberalism; Robert Southey, Michael Thomas Sadler, and the Blackwood's circle were instrumental in formulating them. In turn Sadler, Oastler, Lord Ashley (later the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury), William Busfeild Ferrand, George Stephen Bull, Joseph Rayner Stephens, and many others acted on them when they instigated and led the Factory Reform Movement, the Anti-Poor Law Movement, and the resistance to the Anti-Corn Law League. Tory radicalism played the leading role in these vehement popular movements, which left their mark on the topical novel.

Numerous early Victorian topical novels, from Frances Milton Trollope's *Jessie Phillips: A Tale of the Present Day* (1842-43) to Dickens's *Hard Times* (1854), addressed these popular movements, if only peripherally. Several novels unequivocally brought with them the instigating and guiding ideology of the movements. As chapters three through five show in detail, these novels included John Galt's *The Member: An Autobiography* (1832), Mrs. Trollope's *The Life and Adventures of Michael Armstrong, the Factory Boy* (1839-1840), Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna's *Helen Fleetwood* (1839-41), the anonymous *The Factory Lad; or, The Life of Simon Smike* (1839), and
Disraeli's *Sybil; or, The Two Nations* (1845). The relationship of these novels to Tory radicalism is exceptionally rich; it involves virtually all the possibilities canvassed above from character development to imagery to authorial pronouncements. It provides a significant illustration of the theoretical relationship of ideology and the novel. In Galt's rather neglected novel, *The Member*, Tory radicalism informs each of the strategic elements. Archibald Jobbry, M.P. represents the self-interested, irresponsible M.P. which Tory radicals constantly disparaged. Jobbry's development from the narrow pursuit of self-interest to selfless performance of duties, conforms to the accompanying Tory radical desideratum of moral reform. The changing significance of the image of disease is a clear index of Jobbry's development. Furthermore, when he at last becomes a responsible M.P., Galt employs him as a spokesman for the ideology, unambiguously stating its positions on leading current issues. Character, character development, imagery, and overt statement, hence, embody Tory radicalism in *The Member*. It is probably the first early Victorian ideological novel.

The three factory novels of 1839 offer a much more complex character development which is nonetheless thoroughly ideological. Neary two years before the initial efflorescence of Victorian religious novels, they established conversion as a central element of fiction. They uniformly depict a secular conversion to activism
in the cause of Factory Reform, whose pattern is that of
the conversion actually lived by two committed Tory
radicals, Richard Oastler and Mrs. Tonna herself. In
few contemporary novels is lived experience so effectively
enmeshed with ideology. In addition the three factory
novels recapitulate key segments of the critique of
political economy, particularly the doctrine of economic
necessity. However, in expounding this and other doc­
trines, the three novelists succumb to the greatest
weakness of topical fiction. They stress Tory radical
doctrine to the detriment of the fiction. They disrupt
the action of the novels, animate and deflate characters
with startling abruptness, and intrude to state themselves
what their characters could have stated more effectively.
Furthermore, by intruding so openly as implied authors
in their novels, the three create debilitating tensions
between their aristic duty honestly to represent fact
and experience, and their fervent ideological commitment
to Factory Reform. These constant intrusions sharply
lessen the effectiveness of the factory novels.

In contrast, Disraeli's Sybil has been considered,
from its first appearance, the most effective statement
of Young Englandism, surpassing easily the awkward
justifications of that short-lived party. However,
Disraeli advanced in Sybil, as he overtly did in the
House of Commons and elsewhere, the Tory radical analysis
of the condition of England. In perfect conformity to
Tory radicalism, he attributed the severe agrarian
distress of 1843-44 to the baneful policy prescriptions of political economy, and the equal woes of the industrial North to the abdication of the aristocracy and Parliament. Political economy and the abdication of the ruling class converged to divide England, Marney as well as Mowbray, Wodgate, and the mining districts, into "two nations," the rich and the poor--an idea expressed repeatedly by Tory radicals from 1829 on. Each of the novels included in this study, therefore, embodies Tory radicalism strategically. Indeed, their ideological burden is as great as that of Robinson Crusoe, for example, and they illuminate at least as effectively the complex relationship of ideology and the novel.

Although ideology dominates these novels, it does not exclude other contemporary influences, particularly literary ones. Indeed it would be altogether incorrect to imply that Tory radicalism not only dominates them but also engendered them by itself. On the contrary, I suggest, literary pressures created the very possibility of the early Victorian ideological novel, which Tory radical novelists were among the first to detect and to exploit. Contemporary reviews were foremost among these pressures, at least until the advent of such powerful circulating libraries as Mudie's and W.H. Smith's. Publishers and novelists alike were acutely sensitive to reviewers' judgments, especially when printed in leading quarterlies or in such "trade" journals as the Literary Gazette and the Athenaeum. As R.A. Gettman shows in his
study of the House of Bentley, publishers competed in the acquisition, wholly or partly, of journals in order to secure favorable reviews of their works. They also sought to disseminate widely short "puffs" or eulogistic notices of works, which could forestall or mitigate unfavorable reviews and promote sales. Novelists were keen on puffs, urging their publishers to distribute them and often, like Mrs. Gore, G.R. Gleig, and W.H. Ainsworth, writing them themselves. Novelists assiduously cultivated reviewers as well in hopes of ensuring laudatory comments.

Given the potency of reviewing in the 1830's and 1840's, novelists heeded carefully the demands which reviewers, and presumably the common reader, made on the novel; they reacted quickly to current changes in critical demands. The competitiveness of the literary marketplace left them no other option. As I show in chapter two, critics demanded of the novel at the outset of the 1830's the faithful representation of a moral and normal reality; following the example of the Waverly novels, the best historical novels excelled in their representation. As the 1830's advanced, critics began to demand of the novel an even more graphic realism. They valued it as a document, capable of literal acceptance and use; optimally it was to be half fact, half fiction. Hence they reviewed novels as they did biographies, travels, histories, and treatises on political economy. Later in the 1830's, reviewers insisted on an even more rigorous commitment
of the novel to contemporary life; its realism was to be absolute. The novel was actively to participate in contemporary life by addressing current issues and conditions, by expounding a definite political or ideological view of them, and by exhorting the reader to embrace this view. The novel was considered to be an exemplary pamphlet whose qualities as fiction were almost inconsequential beside its effectiveness as propaganda.

As these critical demands evolved in the 1830's, novelists endeavored to comply with them. In response to the early demand, perceptive novelists composed works which were overtly documentary, relying on personal knowledge and public information. John Galt's two Canadian novels numbered among these documentary works. In response to the later demand, novelists openly expressed ideological views on urgent issues and conditions, and frequently elicited rebuttals from reviewers and novelists with different allegiances; the common assumption was that the novel was an appropriate forum for such nonfictional discussions. The Member, the factory novels of 1839, and Sybil conformed to this later demand. The cumulative effect of the ever more stringent demands for realism was to place an almost intolerable burden on the novelist. In order to compete successfully in the literary marketplace he was obliged to render his writings factual and ideological. However, as a novelist he was also devoted to the art of his chosen form, the use of language, structure, character in line with literary
tradition, not social pressures. He was locked into a continuous struggle between literary and social pressures, striving for the balance which produced such praiseworthy works as Robinson Crusoe. All too often the early Victorian novelist succumbed to the social pressures which promised financial rewards and brought literary mediocrity, or worse.

When straitly confined to ideology, as the principal means of ensuring the desired participation in life, the early Victorian novelist often acquiesced to his situation by producing a work which was purely ideological, devoid of any vitality. He committed the error, noticed by Barbara Hardy, of neglecting the faithful depiction of human nature by adhering rigorously to ideology and ideologically selected fact. Paradoxically, the critical demands for ever more graphic realism betrayed the novelist into writings which overlooked simple human nature and therefore failed badly. For example, in Mary Ashley, the Factory Girl; or Facts upon Factories (1839), Frederick Montagu announced that his aim was to refute Mrs. Trollope's account of the Factory question in Michael Armstrong by "placing fairly before the reflecting portion of society the true bearing of the case." From the vantage of middle class Liberalism Montagu ruthlessly rehearsed supposed facts about factories to the exclusion of true versimilitude. His characters are cardboard, their speech leaden, their actions improbable and disjointed. His lugubrious
production answers faithfully to the demand for participation, but becomes in the process a mere pamphlet in the guise of fiction. His failing was that of Harriet Martineau's Illustrations of Political Economy: ideology excludes instead of accommodating reality.

Other early Victorian novelists rebelled against the stringent demands while ostensibly conforming to them. The insistent pressures of critics and the marketplace induced some novelists to cleave to literary tradition all the more staunchly. They embodied in their most ideological works the venerable narrative pattern of romance, whose comedic resolutions are plainly artificial and non-participatory. The literary coexisted, rather uneasily, with the ideological. Furthermore, for these and other novelists, the pressures which constrained them could liberate their deepest desires and most intense energies, channeling them to the creative imagination. As George Levine importantly observes on several occasions, the "energy, the power, and, finally, the structure of the great realistic novels depend on the imaginative vision, informed by need and desire, struggling with apparently intractable materials." When liberated by these pressures or materials, the imagination acts paradoxically. Instead of spontaneously creating new literary forms, it habitually focuses on the most established and conventional, on romance in particular. Levine adds that the "energies of romance and wish and dream find their way into ..."
the fictions of almost every major writer in the 'realistic' tradition." Thus the demand for participation in reality can engender a rebellion which turns to romance doubly, as an assertion of literary tradition and as a focus of imaginative energies.

Romance entails on the writer a specific narrative pattern and a set of moral polarities. The narrative pattern is immemorial: the young pauper leaves home and enters a profession, undergoing a difficult initiation; he or she prevails over the adversities of at least two series of adventures only to succumb to the evil machinations of the villain, who is always defeated in the nick of time; then the hero or heroine inherits title, estate, and fortune, marries and lives happily every after. This pattern is so conventional that one can reduce it to a fixed sequence of actions: initial situation, expulsion, initiation, adventures, malefactions, reversal, retribution, and restoration. In an otherwise densely ideological novel, the romance narrative pattern usually produces debilitating incongruities. A novel whose working class hero or heroine is committed to the economic and political advancement of his or her class can scarcely end by awarding title, fortune, estate, and noble spouse without grave incongruity. As I suggest in chapters four and five, this is precisely the case with Michael Armstrong and Sybil; their comedic resolutions are so incongruous that the reader suspects the validity of their Tory
radicalism. Ultimately, then, the critical demand for ideology as a participation in life leads to a strikingly unrealistic narrative pattern, which undermines in turn the ideology itself. Over-zealous demands for graphic realism prove to be self-defeating.

Romance also entails on the novelist an invariable moral: the good rewarded, the evil punished. One of the characteristics of romance is the polarization of character and setting in terms of these moral categories. As Northrop Frye contends in his seminal studies of romance, "characters turn into imaginative projections, heroes becoming purely good and evil; romance avoids the ambiguities of human life, which is a mixture of good and evil. Hence the novels which embody romance in rebellion against stringent critical demands for realism simultaneously repudiate realistic conceptions of character. There is an inherent conflict between the impulse toward realism and the impulse toward romance which arises from it. Romance also polarizes settings into ideal and abhorrent, light and dark worlds which are symbolic and conative rather than realistic. The unrealistic settings and characters of Michael Armstrong and Sybil have been attributed by modern commentators to ideology whereas they clearly belong to the reaction against ideology as a participation in life. Romance produces many of the distortions and improbabilities in these and other topical novels which are usually ascribed to ideology or purpose.
While some novelists rebelled against increasingly strident calls for greater realism by turning to romance, others conceived of new literary forms which enabled them to preserve the art of the novel while satisfying the marketplace and reviewers. John Galt avoided romance altogether in The Member by adhering to the mode which he developed in Annals of the Parish, the first of his major Scottish novels. Fictional autobiography allowed Galt to create character through a consecutive series of recollections which required neither plot nor narrative pattern. Indeed Galt had learned painfully of both the dangers of romance and the illegitimate pressures exerted by publishers when writing Sir Andrew Wylie and the historical novels of the 1830's. Galt enhanced his chosen mode with a self-imposed "rule of art": "to bring impressions on the memory harmoniously together." By relying on personal experience and documented facts in his compositions he amply satisfied the intensifying demands for realism.

In sum the present work examines the literary as well as social pressures and contexts which enveloped the early Victorian topical novel. It surveys, for perhaps the first time, the coherent intellectual system of Tory radicalism, as worked out in print and in life from 1826 to 1855, and then uncovers its manifestations in The Member, the factory novels of 1839, and Sybil. Character, character development, imagery, action, theme, value, setting, and the implied narrator in these novels are determined by
the precepts and desiderata of Tory radicalism. Ideology is writ large in them. Equally, this work examines the demands of reviewers and publishers for increasingly exact realism, first documentary, then participatory. Their demands led the novelists discussed here to embody their deeply-held ideological beliefs in fiction. Moreover, they reacted to such demands as did greater realistic writers after them, namely, by reasserting nonmimetic literary tradition and technique. Mrs. Trollope and Disraeli turned to romance, which produced serious distortions in their works. Galt alone held true to his established artistic practice and rule, creating perhaps the second best novel, after *Oliver Twist*, of the 1830's. By examining the literary and social pressures active on these novels, this work intends to illuminate the complex relation of ideology and fiction, and to contribute to our understanding of the early Victorian novel. 42
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Chapter One

The Personnel and Doctrines of Tory Radicalism

While economic historians have thoroughly examined the personnel and doctrines of political economy, social historians have rather neglected Tory radicals and Tory radicalism. Admittedly, there are exemplary biographies of several key Tory radicals and equally able studies of the two social reform movements which they instigated and led, but there is no adequate survey of this leading ideology and its adherents. Indeed, no such surveys exist of early Victorian Evangelicalism, protectionism, and other important related topics. Because of this singular neglect of social historians, the present study must undertake briefly to explore the major personnel and doctrines of Tory radicalism. This brief exploration will open the way for detailed investigation of the role of Tory radicalism in the early Victorian novel.

As Adam Smith was the father of political economy, so Robert Southey was the father of Tory radicalism. Avowedly a High Tory, Southey nevertheless anticipated Tory radicals repeatedly in his writings. Like them he valued the welfare of the working class above all
earthly things, denounced capitalists, manufacturers, and political economists, and ardently supported social reform; he was fully as Anglican, protectionist, and traditionalist as they. "If he was a conservative," reflects Geoffrey Carnall, "he was of the same school as Sadler, Oastler, and Lord Ashley." He was very much one of their school, strongly supporting two of the three, Michael Thomas Sadler and Lord Ashley. Southey explicitly endorsed Sadler's views, calling him in 1829 a "right-minded man, starting from the right point and aiming at the right mark." He heartily approved of his two books: in 1828 he commended Ireland: Its Evils and their Remedies, and in 1830 he exulted over Sadler's refutation of Malthus in The Law of Population: "It ought to make Malthus do justice to himself with a rope. . . . Sadler has now shown to demonstration that his facts are false and his deductions consequently as fallacious, as the practical results to which he would lead us are abominable." Southey corresponded directly with Lord Ashley, tutoring him in the ideas and images of their common ideology. In a letter of 1833 he reminded Lord Ashley of a famous image in Sir Thomas More: "Was I not right in saying that Moloch is a more merciful fiend than Mammon? Death in the arms of the Carthaginian idol was mercy to the slow waste of life in the factories." Ashley learned well from his mentor. Speaking to the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of Factory
Children in the same year, he remembered "those who sacrificed their children to Moloch, but they were a merciful people compared with Englishmen in the nineteenth century." He later confessed his debt to Southey and pronounced a parting benediction on him: "Well, may God bless him, and his, in this life and the next, for the mighty good his works have done. I owe much, very much, to them; and I especially remember his Book of the Church, his Colloquies, and Moral Essays." Southey not only anticipated Tory radicalism, but also played a part in guiding one of its foremost exponents.

Prefigured by Southey's writings, Tory radicalism emerged decisively in 1826. The leading contributors to Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine collaborated on the preface of that year, producing the first declaration of Tory radicalism. John Wilson, William Maginn, David Robinson, and John Galt staunchly defended the "laws and principles of the old system—the system of the fathers and founders of our liberties, our strength and our dominion." Equally, they opposed the Liberal Tory enactment of the prescriptions of political economy:

The changes of the Ministry have had the most sweeping practical operation; they have destroyed some of our most valuable laws and systems; they have altered the circumstances and shape of society; they are hostile to the old and true principles of the country; they are pregnant with mighty evils.

Alarmed by these unjustified changes, they longed for an "effective opposition" in Parliament to challenge them
and to inquire into their effects on the nation. In the absence of such an opposition, they vowed to contest the policies of Liberal Toryism unilaterally. Their resistance to political economy and their defense of the old protective system remained the two principal concerns of Tory radicalism until its demise in the mid-1850's; both concerns are explored in detail later in this chapter.

From 1826 on the Blackwood's circle zealously developed this young Tory radicalism. Their zeal even recruited a frequent contributor to the High Tory Quarterly Review, Edward Edwards. In 1829 Edwards offered William Blackwood several articles on social topics which were "generally too decided and strong in their opposition for the preferred armed neutrality of the Qu: Rev." He wanted especially "to dwell upon the practical effects which the free trade system has produced upon the condition of the industrious classes." In addition to Edwards, Robinson, Galt, William Johnstone, Samuel O'Sullivan, and William Mudford expounded Tory radicalism in the late 1820's. Robinson's articles were outstanding: he conceived the most cogent justification of the protective system found in nineteenth century Britain and incisively critiqued the main doctrines of political economy. Blackwood himself singled out Robinson as the source of his journal's growing popularity. "My magazine, however, goes on flourishing, and the sale is increasing," he confided to his younger son in 1826. "Mr. Robinson's
articles on Free Trade, the Corn Trade, and have done a
great deal for it. In the early 1830's Robinson,
Johnstone, and Galt dropped out of the circle for personal
reasons, but Wilson carried on the ideology, ably defend­
ing it in an important article on the factory system.
In the late 1830's and 1840's Alfred Mallalieu and Robert
Sowler also upheld Tory radicalism in articles on the
factory system, the New Poor Law, and the issue of free
trade. Despite the contributions of Wilson, Mallalieu,
and Sowler, Blackwood's largely abandoned Tory radicalism
after 1834 in favor of the orthodox Toryism represented
by Archibald Alison. On the death of William Blackwood
in 1834, control of the journal devolved on his sons,
who promulgated their own orthodox views.

Several other periodicals rivalled Blackwood's in
zealous advocacy of Tory radicalism. The advocacy of
Fraser's Magazine from its commencement in 1830 was
predictable. Maginn edited it and tried to recruit his
former Blackwood's colleagues, succeeding with Robinson
(from 1832 to 1837), Galt, Mudford, D.M. Moir, James
Hogg, and others. Writing with his Blackwood's
persona, Sir Morgan O'Doherty, Maginn forthrightly con­
fessed in 1831 his Tory radical faith: "I am anti-free
trader -- anti-economist -- anti-Malthusian, in several
senses -- anti-humbug -- anti-speechmonger -- anti-hack
statesman -- anti-liberal." Together with Maginn,
Galt, Robinson, and Robert Benton Seeley were the
principal commentators on social issues in the 1830's.
Seeley's part among the Fraserians is noteworthy because he was a close friend and biographer of Sadler, a confidential advisor of Lord Ashley, the publisher of Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna's periodicals and books, and, at least by 1842, a constant contributor to the Standard newspaper. When G.W. Nickisson became proprietor and editor in 1841 or 1842, George Robert Gleig became assistant editor and perpetuated the Tory radical line.

Stanley Lees Giffard, editor, and Maginn, assistant editor, espoused Tory radicalism in the Standard from its commencement in 1828. They consistently denounced the "quackeries of the political economists" and the "ruin they have wrought in England, and the further ruin which continuance of acting upon them must produce." Lord Ashley privately testified to the efficacy of the Standard in promoting Tory radicalism. In 1833 he advised Giffard of the status of the pending Factory Act and, in 1838, praised him for his sustained support of Factory Reform. Factory children, Ashley wrote, "have ever found in you, from the time their cause was first maintained, a true and most powerful advocate; and the present happy attitude of the question is not a little owing to the ability and unwearied perseverance exhibited by you on this subject." In the North the Leeds Intelligencer under Robert Perring and William Hernaman paralleled the Standard, providing Sadler, Oastler, and W.B. Ferrand with a forum for their principles and campaigns. Indeed, so frequently did
the *Intelligencer* open its pages to these and other Tory radicals, the *Carlisle Journal* was led to claim that Sadler, with Sir William Beckett, had purchased it in order to publicize their convictions.26

As the overlapping contributorship of these periodicals suggests, they advocated Tory radicalism with great uniformity. *Blackwood's* and *Fraser's* openly regarded the *Standard* as a high authority. David Robinson habitually drew Blackwood's attention to the *Standard* 's views in their correspondence,27 while Fraser's praised the "firm, consistent, and able *Standard* (edited by Drs. Giffard and Maginn, two as profound scholars, on every subject, as are to be found in any country in Europe)."28 In turn the *Standard* freely praised them. In 1829, for example, it commended one of Johnstone's articles as "of a degree of excellence unusual even in *Blackwood*."29 It rehearsed Johnstone's arguments, printed a long excerpt, and rebutted the criticism of adversary newspapers. Similarly, the *Standard* reprinted in full the first editorial of Fraser's.30 The *Leeds Intelligencer* was equally fulsome. It held that Blackwood's was "to those who attend to national affairs, what the Stock Exchange is to monied men ... while 'Radicals' and 'levellers' and 'Liberals' stand in awe of Blackwood's powerful talents and influence, the friends of the constitution and the Throne derive from its pages consolation for the past, and are inspired with additional hope and fresh courage for the future."31
It thought as warmly of Fraser's, reprinting Maginn's attacks on the Reform Bill and on Martineau's Cousin Marshall. By means of such frequent cross-references, these periodicals succeeded in expounding Tory radicalism consistently to a very wide audience.

All of these journals steadily repeated the call for an "effective opposition" in Parliament, first voiced in the seminal Blackwood's preface of 1826. They constantly criticized the economic régime of Liberal Toryism and exposed its harmful effects on the body politic, but could detect no solid Parliamentary echo. Instead of attempting to generate extra-Parliamentary pressure on the unresponsive senate, they adopted the strategem of exhortation in the hope of instigating a Parliamentary group to oppose the Liberal Tory Ministry. Ambition and principle are powerful mistresses, and a group of disenchanted Ultra Tories soon answered the call. Sir Richard Vyvyan and Sir Edward Knatchbull were its leaders, and the Duke of Newcastle, the Marquess of Blandford, Sir Robert Inglis, and Michael Thomas Sadler among its more prominent members. Joseph Planta, the notorious Tory agent, described this group as "moderate Ultras" and provided his party masters with a specific list of them, which Robert Stewart reprints. David Robinson soon detected this group and happily announced that a "party, perfectly independent of Ministers, and differing from them in general creed, has formed itself into something like
an Opposition, or rather the nucleus of one, in the House of Commons." Blackwood sent Vyvyan a copy of the issue, which provoked the latter's unsolicited confirmation:

The article upon "An Opposition" proves that its writer is quite aware of the state of parties in the House of Commons. There has been no opposition of any importance since the death of Lord Londonderry and those gentlemen who occupy the benches upon which former oppositions have sat, seem to be little more than misplaced adherents of government -- I hope, however, that some spirits may be found who think that the real interests of their country are of more importance than the advancement of a set of men with whom they may be associated or the personal favour of a prime minister.

He wrote again to urge Blackwood to print an article on the state and prospects of the country in the next issue of "Maga." Had not the Quarterly been the ministerialist organ, Vyvyan wrote, "we should not have been obliged to rely upon your exertions alone in defense of what we think honest, constitutional and statesmanlike views, but as you stand alone, maintaining the cause of truth against a host of weak and base men who attempt to sway the public mind through the periodical press, we must rely upon you as our champion." Robinson counselled this new Opposition to use Parliament as a forum from which to disseminate their right views and to contest the ruinous policies of Liberal Toryism. They had very much to do, he thought:
Here is general policy to oppose, which has been proved to be ruinous — here are changes and innovations of the most perilous character to resist — here are the prayers of distressed masses of the community to support — the operations of new laws and systems demand rigid examination — national suffering imperiously calls for enquiry into its causes, and for remedy — the abuse of power has to be withstood, and the profligacy of public men has to be scourged — and the throne, the Church, the constitution, the laws — in a word, all the best possessions of society in regulation and feeling supplicate for champions.

Robinson's counsel was rather descriptive than prescriptive. This loosely organized group of Ultras had already begun to demand Parliamentary enquiries into the distress of industries affected by free trade. On 13 April 1829 Richard Fyler moved for a committee to enquire into the state of the silk trade. On 26 May Vyvyan intended to move for an enquiry into the extent and causes of the distress of agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial interests, but could not as the House did not meet. On 12 June Michael Thomas Sadler presented a petition on the distress of Blackburn, provoking a short, sharp debate on it. On 4 February 1830 Sir Edward Knatchbull challenged the King's Speech for wrongly describing the current troubles as limited. And Edward Davenport moved for a general enquiry on the state of the country on 16 March 1830, triggering a major debate which lasted for several days. All of these efforts failed; the government, led by Peel, then Home Secretary; Vese...
Fitzgerald, President of the Board of Trade; and Huskisson, defeated all motions for enquiry. Frustrated by these successive defeats and convinced that decisive reform was needed to change the complexion of Parliament, the Ultras combined with Whigs and Radicals on 15 November 1830 to bring down Wellington's government.

Sadler surpassed all the Ultra Tories, including Vyvyan, in supporting the various motions for enquiry and in pressing the case against economic liberalism. Not only did he ably support Fyler, Knatchbull, and Davenport, but he also led the attack on Vesey Fitzgerald's Silk Trade Bill of 1829 and repeatedly blocked Wilmot Horton's emigration proposals. In Parliament he fully justified the expectations of the Duke of Newcastle, who in 1829 had made him M.P. for the pocket borough of Newark, on the basis of his immensely popular speeches against the Catholic Relief Bill. Furthermore, outside of Parliament, he helped to articulate both parts of Tory radicalism, protectionism and the critique of political economy. His Ireland: Its Evils and their Remedies (1828) and The Law of Population (1830), together with his published speeches, were key documents for Tory radicals, as shown below.

The Ultras and the Tory radical journals received his labors rapturously. In August 1829, for example, Vyvyan offered him a post in the coalition government he was endeavoring to form. The Blackwood's circle
and the *Standard*, to select only two journals, praised him enthusiastically. As early as March Robinson mentioned him in a letter to Blackwood: "Mr. Sadler has made a brilliant start and I expect much from him. He is right in creed throughout, and as his patron the Duke of Newcastle is likewise, I hope he will continue so. If he speaks out with equal ability and boldness on free trade, etc., it is in the power of such a man to make a complete revolution in the House of Commons." In August Samuel O'Sullivan exulted that in Sadler the political economists had found an adversary "by whom their favourite measures were opposed, and their most familiar axioms disputed; and that not by scholastic sophistry, or unfounded assertion, or empty vehemence, or school-boy declamation, but by a reference to facts and to history, by a diligent and philosophical observation of human society. . . ."44

*Blackwood's* reviewed his books favorably, defended them against hostile critics, and persistently upheld his Parliamentary acts.45 Indeed, Blackwood wrote to Sadler in 1828 and in 1830 urging him to contribute to "Maga." "I need not repeat to you that it would gratify me much to receive at any time a communication from you for my Magazine," Blackwood emphasized in 1830. "It is a powerful engine, and ought to be supported by all true lovers of the good old cause. I cannot help thinking that you could with good effect occasionally avail yourself of it when any important matter occurs
to you about which you wish the public to be informed. A communication in your name in the magazine would have great weight. In 1828 Sadler thanked Blackwood for his offer but declined it as he was contractually bound to John Murray for his two books. He added that Blackwood's was "a work whose pages have so often delighted and instructed myself. . . . I conceive the system I have propounded lies at the foundation of that policy . . . which you have so often and so ably advocated: and will, I think confirm by actual calculations those general views, which you, in common with all others whose opinions are worth recording, had already pursued by the guidance of right feeling and true political philosophy." In 1830 and 1831 Sadler expressed to Blackwood his appreciation of the defence of his books undertaken by Johnstone and Wilson. Likewise, the Standard followed Sadler's career closely, reprinting his major speeches and refuting his critics. The Standard began to support Sadler very early, describing him in May 1829 as one "who never speaks or writes without conferring an obligation on his country." By June 1830 he could do nothing wrong: "The time has passed when we might without presumption pretend to introduce by our recommendation a speech from the eloquent gentleman in question."  

Alone of the Ultra Tories led by Vyvyan and Knatchbull, Sadler overcame the narrow preoccupation with committees of enquiry. Convinced that the government
of Wellington and Peel, and that of Grey and Althorpe, would neither enquire into nor cure the ills of the country, he conceived a positive program of his own to remedy them. The program was comprehensive, involving the North as well as the South, the operative as well as the laborer. Sadler proposed first to establish Irish Poor Laws, in order to prevent wholesale emigration of Irish laborers to England. In June 1830 and August 1831 he struggled to secure the enactment of this essential preliminary measure. In October 1831 he addressed the condition of the English laboring poor, espousing a national system of allotments to relieve them. And, in March 1832, he sponsored the measure for which he is famous, the Ten Hours Bill, intended to ameliorate the lot of operatives young and old by limiting their day's work. Sadler's program remained exemplary for Tory radicals; eight years after his death Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna reflected:

Until some large and efficient change takes place here, the general condition of the country must remain one of disorganiszation and peril. The perspicacious mind of Sadler at once discerned this; and he had no sooner laid before Parliament his demand for Poor-laws for Ireland, and his claim for protection for the poor factory-children, than he immediately followed these propositions by a third, for the amelioration of the condition of the agricultural poor.

All these three measures stood intimately connected, and each was commended to the Legislature on the same two-fold ground. Each might be claimed on the score of humanity; and each was based on a clear economical necessity.
All these measures, whose rationales are discussed more fully below, were defeated. In the general election of 1832 Sadler too was defeated, by Macaulay, an exponent of political economy and one of the ascendant middle class.53

On Sadler's defeat, Lord Ashley took up the Ten Hours Bill and became the Parliamentary representative of Tory radicalism. Of Lord Ashley's well-chronicled career as Sadler's successor, nothing here need be said.54 The life of Richard Oastler is also too well known to need discussion.55 Two connections with other Tory radicals did escape Cecil Driver and deserve mention. In September 1831, Oastler related later, Sadler wrote to him furnishing some information requested through Robert Perring. Sadler detailed his unsuccessful efforts to obtain Irish Poor Laws, mentioned his forthcoming plan for the laboring poor, and lamented the absence of an energetic collaborator: "My greatest loss is, that I have no energetic friend, like yourself, to prompt and encourage me in these endeavours."56 Sadler unknowingly revealed to Oastler the role and purpose towards which the latter was evolving. He revealed to Oastler the feasibility of Parliamentary action to redress social ills and the latter's impending role as leader of the Factory Reform Movement. The direct consequence was the fifth "Slavery in Yorkshire" letter, in which Oastler assumed leadership of the Movement and detailed its practical
The other personal connection occurred much later. In 1842, imprisoned in the Fleet, Oastler met and became an intimate friend of William Maginn. "Dr. Maginn's politics were in unison with my own -- they were all of the Saxon school," Oastler recollected in his obituary of him. "Such talents, united with such principles, I have rarely, if ever found." Their unanimity is significant. After years of independently elaborating Tory radicalism and promoting controversial popular movements, the two men discovered that their views were the same. Known to each other before 1842 only by reputation, they were bound together by a common ideology.

Tory radicalism bound together many lesser figures: Parson George Stephen Bull, Joseph Rayner Stephens, William Busfeild Ferrand, John Wood, William Walker, John Rand, Matthew Balme, and Squire Auty in particular. Three other Tory radicals should be mentioned here as well: Frances Trollope, Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna, and the author of *Simon Smike*. Thomas Adolphus Trollope offered in his autobiography the only glimpse of his mother's personal connections with other Tory radicals. Before commencing *Michael Armstrong*, Mrs. Trollope sought information and letters of introduction from Lord Ashley. Armed with his letters and his first *Quarterly Review* article on the factory system, she conducted a tour of the manufacturing districts. In its course she interviewed among others Parson
Bull, Wood, Stephens, and Oastler, who gave her access to his collection of documents. Thus informed of the factory system, she began her novel.

Mrs. Tonna's known involvement with the ideology is more extensive. In 1829 Southey reviewed with high praise her brother's posthumous history of Portugal. Tonna wrote to thank him, sending for good measure copies of her works. In reply, Southey promised to review them in the Quarterly when he next discussed an Irish topic. Although Southey never reviewed her works, she was so pleased by his notice of her brother that she reprinted it as an appendix to her autobiography. She was well known to Southey's chief disciple, Lord Ashley. Only one letter from her to Ashley survives: "I used to be so rejoiced when you got angry in the House about the factory children," she wrote in 1841. There are, however, several references to her in Ashley's unpublished diaries. In 1841, as he began to widen the scope of his activism, he wondered whether his old associates would continue to support him: "There are others -- why has Seeley who . . . aided me before, been so backward when I go further? Jowett answered to me long ago that Seeley disapproved -- is it possible that he can entertain fears lest a work he is publishing on the factory children should lose interest in the larger claims of this near class? Where too is Charlotte Elizabeth." The novel in question is Helen Fleetwood; and Ashley's fears were doubtless assuaged by the fully committed tracts.
which she and Seeley published in 1843 and 1844. Again in 1841 Ashley attended the first service of the Jewish Church at Bethnal Green, writing in his diary Tonna's remark that the "fullness of the Gentiles was come in." Furthermore, in 1846 Ashley urged Peel to grant her a state pension because terminal cancer prevented her from writing. He introduced her in the letter which forwarded her memorandum as a "distinguished authoress whom I have personally known for many years. Her writings, which have proved eminently useful to many thousands, have been published, at various times, as the works of 'Charlotte Elizabeth' her baptismal names."

In addition to Ashley and Southey, Tonna was long connected with Seeley. Seeley was an intimate friend of Sadler from the 'twenties until the latter's untimely death in 1835, and wrote his very eulogistic biography. Indeed, Sadler passed to Blackwood in 1830 a document prepared by Seeley on the statistics of his Law of Population. Seeley was equally intimate with Ashley. In 1841 he was one of the three people whom Ashley confidentially consulted before declining Peel's offer of office. Moreover, Seeley, as noted earlier, contributed to Fraser's and the Standard. He published all of Tonna's later books and employed her as editor of one of his journals, the Christian Lady's Magazine. Also, he wrote the sequel to her tract of 1843. Therefore, Mrs. Tonna had rich personal contacts with eminent Tory radicals; her contacts corroborated the ideology expressed
Finally, the author of *Simon Smike* displayed overtly his affiliation with Tory radicalism by habitually citing the pamphlets of Oastler and Stephens as his ultimate authorities. He eulogized Stephens in particular: "A man whose heart bleeds over the miseries of those who are doomed to a factory life, and whose language is as bold and uncompromising, as his feelings are generous and kind..." (SS 96). Unfortunately, his identity remains unknown. He, Mrs. Tonna, and Mrs. Trollope were part of the extensive personnel of Tory radicalism. In their novels they upheld this ideology, whose protectionism and critique of political economy had emerged decisively thirteen years before.

II

Whereas political economists desired the unhindered pursuit of self-interest, Tory radicals endeavored to protect all orders of society from undue competition, domestic as well as foreign. They shared with political economists the same fundamental purpose, that is, to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number, but upheld diametrically opposed means of achieving it. For Tory radicals, protectionism alone could foster the prosperity of all orders and economic interests because it ensured their harmonious interaction for the common good. They could not believe that Adam Smith’s ultimate
benevolence of self-interest was anything but a spurious theoretical construct. Hence, Johnstone hailed in 1829 the "true Tory principles," which "while they maintain the due order and proportion of each separate rank in the state, maintain also that protection and support are the right of all, so long as there are the means, within the state, of affording them." In fact, Toryism ought to be the protective system," Maginn maintained in 1834. "It ought to protect the agricultural labourer from the farmer, the factory-child from the mill-tyrant, the Spitalsfield weaver from the competition of the men of Lyons; it ought to enlarge circulation; lessen in every way the surplus labour which presses down the market; and never rest until general employment and fair wages were universal."

All Tory radicals shared the latter's particular concern for the laborer, the operative, and the weaver. Although committed to protecting all orders and interests, they recognized that dependence on one acutely vulnerable economic resource, physical labor, rendered the working class the weakest of them all. Therefore, it required especial protection. Sadler bluntly told the shipowners of Whitby that he sympathized far more with the distress of their employees than with their own, and cited Paley's belief that the "'care of the poor ought to be the principal object of all laws, for this plain reason, that the rich are able to care for themselves.'" Tory radicals sought
to strengthen the working class by guaranteeing their right to subsistence as enacted in the famous "forty-third of Elizabeth." Oastler explained the right in an electoral address of 1832: "he who works has a right to be first fed, and when he can no longer work, has a right to demand his food and clothing—without being removed from his place of residence, and without being subjected to part from his little furniture." When unable to find employment or when physically unable to work, the common man could rely on the state for support which would not strip him of home and chattels. This right to such support was his ultimate safeguard against destitution.

Under pressure from political economists, who denied the validity of extracontractual rights, and later from the New Poor Law, Tory radicals elaborately justified the right to subsistence. They articulated two congruent rationales, one constitutional, the other contractual. The former held that historically the Catholic Church in England had borne all responsibility for maintaining the unemployed or unfit poor. When Henry VIII expropriated its property, he promised the poor a better provision for their maintenance. The Elizabethan Poor Law, designed by Bacon, fulfilled his promise by entailing on the land maintenance of the poor, and by establishing in the constitution their right to it. The second rationale, perhaps based on Cobbett's "To Parson Malthus," held that the social contract guaranteed an inalienable right
to subsistence. Given the social contract, no man in acquiescing to the laws of society would renounce his natural freedom to protect and sustain himself. If society refused either to protect or to sustain him, then a state of nature existed in which he was absolutely free to fend for himself. The obligation and interest of society were to forestall the state of nature. In support of this rationale, Sadler and Oastler cited a host of authorities: Grotius, Puffendorf, Montesquieu, Locke, Blackstone, and Paley, among others.

Furthermore, Tory radicals boldly claimed that the right to subsistence held for the Irish as well as the English working class. According to both rationales, they were entitled to maintenance throughout the United Kingdom: neither the constitution nor the social contract recognized a geographical restriction: "We agree with every uncrazed man who bestows a thought upon the subject," avowed the Standard in 1829, "that poor laws are necessary, not only for Ireland, but for every nation under the sun. This is no new doctrine of ours; we have maintained it alone against Edinburgh and Quarterly reviewers, Malthusian pamphleteers, M'Cullough lecturers, and the whole breed of political economists." Following his book on Ireland, Sadler valiantly attempted in 1830 and 1831 to secure an Irish Poor Law, as noted above. On both occasions he argued that Parliament should compel the absentee landlords to honor their obligation to maintain the poor. "The time is come when property must
be taught that it has duties to perform as strictly and righteously due, as those it exacts from poverty," he argued. Tory radicals sought to implement their protective system consistently, extending its ultimate safeguard to the entire British working class.

Nevertheless, this safeguard could only function when events deprived one of employment. It guaranteed subsistence, not prosperity. To foster the prosperity of all orders and interests remained the constant purpose of Tory radicalism. From 1826 on, it developed a coherent protective system as the most effective means of achieving that purpose. The first principle of the protective system clearly embodied it: "National wealth and prosperity stem from the good profits or wages of the individual; therefore give these to the greatest number." Working from this guiding principle, David Robinson offered the finest exposition of the protective system in his four-part series of 1829-1830, "Political Economy." The exposition was normative. Robinson did not analyse the British economy as liberalized by Huskisson, but rather explored its operation under two conditions which were to be imposed: no excessive growth of population through immigration, and restriction of all foreign commodities which could compete with British ones. Robinson predicted that such an economy would be governed entirely by demand. Denying the tenet of political economy that production created demand, he explained that agriculture and manufacturing produced in order to supply the demand
of the working class, the prime source of demand. Without their consumption, the two dominant sectors of the economy could not produce. Hence, the laborer, operative, and weaver were the most important economic agents: they were the mainspring of the economy; their prosperity was its prosperity. "If wages rise, it gives such an impulse to consumption as raises prices," Robinson concluded, "if they fall, they diminish consumption, produce glut, and bring down prices." 81

Robinson began with the agricultural laborer, who constituted over half of the working class, and who spent almost all of the income on food and clothing. 82 When his wages were at the lowest point, at mere subsistence, he consumed only potatoes and oatmeal, and could not afford clothing at all. Consequently, the farmer could only sell these coarse foods, which gave him the lowest profits, and could employ very few laborers to grow them. In contrast, when the laborer's wages were high, he consumed more and better food: bread, meat, milk, beer. He could also buy clothing and other manufactured goods. In turn the farmer could grow more better foods, giving him the highest profits, and employ more laborers at high wages. The ability to sell highly profitable crops afforded him other advantages. He could extend his fields, cultivating poorer soils and draining wet areas, and rotate crops frequently, thereby ensuring higher yields and yet greater profits. Furthermore, with more land under cultivation, he could raise
more livestock on the waste, in turn using their manure to enhance the fertility of the land; the additional livestock were almost pure profit. Robinson estimated that a doubling of the laborer's wages would at least double the farmer's profits. High wages produced high profits; high demand, high production. Robinson detailed two major implications of such wages and profits. First, they had a natural limit. The farmer could not extend cultivation beyond his fallow and undrained lands; the land could produce only so much. Second neither farmer nor laborer would save substantially, but would both spend their income in consumption, the farmer more on manufactured goods than the laborer.

Robinson then considered the operative. Were his wages doubled, he would spend, like the laborer, most of his income on food, the remainder on manufactured goods. He would buy better goods, and more of them, thereby increasing the demand for his own labor. Unlike the farmer, the manufacturer would not double his profits. He could, however, easily extend them proportionally by raising his prices. Since wages comprised only a quarter of the price of a manufactured commodity, he need raise his prices only by twenty-five percent, plus two and a half percent for profit and another two and a half percent for middlemen. An increase in price of thirty percent would easily cover the doubling of wages. The manufacturer would gain far more than these calculations indicate, Robinson continued. The operative, laborer, and farmer
would buy at least twenty-five percent more goods at their higher prices, thereby increasing his yearly sales and profits by the same amount. Unlike the farmer, he did not face any limit to his production. In fact he enjoyed the unique advantage of increasing production vastly without increasing fixed costs; machinery would run faster for the same cost.

Furthermore, because the manufacturer did not increase consumption with increased profits, he quickly accumulated capital. This capital permitted reinvestment in faster machinery, which decreased labor costs and increased profits. In such perpetually increasing production and profits, Robinson recognized a major threat to the protective system: here was the open end of a system that should have been closed. He reasoned that a "high rate of profit must inevitably create an excess of capital, and this must create an excess of goods; such competition must follow as will bring down the rate, and probably for a time wholly destroy profits." The protective system could come to ruin by engendering, paradoxically, a fierce competition among manufacturers. To close this open end, Robinson suggested that manufacturers refrain from reinvesting without increasing employment as much as production. In that case consumption would rise with production; machinery "is only beneficial when it makes goods cheaper, without decreasing the quantity of employment and the amount of wages." Manufacturers must remain content with
moderate profits, which should prevent the emergence of self-destructive tendencies.

Therefore, if the wages of laborers and operatives were doubled, all orders and interest would benefit. Oastler summarized the effects of high wages and high demand even better than Robinson:

If the wages were higher, the labourer would be enabled to clothe himself, because his wages would be better; and those labourers are the persons who are after all the great consumers of agricultural and manufacturing produce, and not the capitalist, because a great capitalist, however wealthy he is, wears only one coat at once, at least, he certainly does seldom wear two coats at once; but 1,000 labourers, being enabled to buy a thousand coats, where they cannot now get one, would most certainly increase the trade. 86

All economic agents could accrue significant unseen benefits as well. Since taxes would merely increase marginally, all would pay a smaller proportion of income to the state. Also, since such imported commodities as cotton, wood, timber, and tea would remain constant in price, many expenses would be proportionally lower. High wages would enable all to benefit from the differential prices of Britain and her trading partners. 87 Furthermore, trade would fluctuate substantially only for short periods of time; the trade cycle would be largely prosperous, with limited depressions. For two or three years, Robinson suggested, prices and profits would be high generally; this would create considerable accumulation of capital among manufacturers, which, when reinvested,
would generate a surplus of commodities. A few months or a year of low prices and loss while the market was gorged would dissipate the accumulated capital, again raise prices, and restore prosperity. Through the protective system Robinson expected to eliminate the uncontrolled pressures of the export trade that caused the boom-and-bust cycles of the 'twenties and 'thirties. Of foreign trade he wrote: "in great empires like the British one, which depend principally on production, and on production for their own consumption, it ought on the same ground to be made strictly subservient to the general business carried on by the great body of the population of Britain." 

In the Tory radical protective system, currency played an important part. Without an extensive and growing supply of money in small notes, the many small transactions of the working class could not take place. Without such a currency, the working class could not effectively translate its labor into demand, which was the foundation of the entire system. An extensive money supply, furnished by banks whose assets were guaranteed by the state, would stimulate demand and therefore general prosperity. Above all, Tory radicals wanted to discourage the "tendency of capital to accumulate in large masses, instead of being generally diffused amongst the people." When accumulated capital was reinvested it caused excessive production and the single depressed period of the trade cycle. When simply accumulated, it constricted
the money supply, thereby curtailing demand. It acted as does a restriction of the money supply by a modern central bank, through a higher lending-rate and other means. Thus, an articulated and reflationary money supply was essential to the protective system.92

In sum, then, the protective system proved true to its name. As expounded by Robinson and others, it prevented external competition by allowing the import only of foreign goods which were not produced extensively in Britain. It also prevented harmful internal competition by harmonizing the activities of all economic agents. It established the agricultural interest as the greatest consumer of manufactured goods, and the manufacturing interest as the greatest consumer of agricultural produce. For the most vulnerable economic agents, the laborer and operative, it guaranteed subsistence when employment was unattainable; to them it gave ultimate economic importance as the prime source of demand, the motive force of the entire economy. An articulated and inflationary money supply permitted the working class easily to translate their labor into demand. Hence, the protective system established internal reciprocity, uniting employee and employer, farmer and manufacturer. Under the protective system, Robinson contended, "Profits and wages would be carried to the highest point throughout the population. This would raise employment for capital and labour, the extent of trade domestic and foreign, the accumulation of capital, and public wealth and
prosperity, to the highest point. This would reduce to
the lowest practicable point, taxes, duties, rates, and
the cost of foreign commodities."93

When expounding the protective system in 1829 and
the early 1830's. Tory radicals knew painfully that they
were on the defensive; clearly the political economists
had the advantage. To be sure, Tory radicals never
ceased to uphold the protective system. They repeatedly
affirmed its feasibility by referring to its operation
during the Napoleonic Wars. At that time, they declared,
it did promote the greatest happiness of the greatest
number. Indeed, while reiterating Robinson's point about
a strictly limited trade cycle, Sadler maintained that
Britain had then reached the apogee of prosperity:

Under that system of policy and in
spite of obstacles the most for-
midable, the nation increased its
wealth, promoted its prosperity,
consolidated its power, and extended
its dominion. Depressions there
certainly did occur in the country,
but these, which towards the last
were plainly traceable to the
introduction of parts of the absurd
policy now adopted, were, compara-
tively speaking, slight and temporary,
and, above all, partial: if one
interest suffered the rest were in a
condition to sustain it. The
vibrations of the national balance
soon subsided into the equipoise of
settled and general prosperity.94

Experience seemed to confirm the feasibility of the
protective system.
Nevertheless, the growing dominance of political economy forced Tory radicals to prefer refutation to affirmation. Confidence in the successful operation of protectionism inspired their first attack on the new "science." The abstract theories of political economy had no empirical basis, they contended, and the attempts of the Liberal Tories to implement them constituted an unprecedented and potentially disastrous experimentation. Blackwood's initiated this attack in the seminal preface of 1826. "Was it not in the fruits of that old system, that the ministry found the means by which they have been enabled to make their speculative changes, and to persuade Parliament to adopt their theoretical improvements? What proof, indeed, have we yet received, that these changes have done England any good?" The charge that political economy wrongly preferred theory to fact, experiment to experience, became commonplace among Tory radicals. The Standard, for example, professed in 1829 that the "jacobinical principle which sacrifices whole generations or classes of men to experimental systems, whether in government in commerce, is as false in policy as it is detestable in doctrine." It added that under protectionism "every man's interest was preserved in the only way in which rights can be so universally respected, viz. by the preservation of existing institutions. The result has been, the British empire, the wonder of the world."
Condemnation of theory and experiment only began the hostilities. As the doctrinaire measures passed by the Liberal Tories, and by their Whig successors, bore fruit, Tory radicals attacked in earnest, developing a forceful critique of political economy. Invariably Tory radicals focused on the pernicious consequences of such measures, contrasting their failure to the success of the protective system. The "results completely falsify all the principal doctrines of the Economists," Robinson concluded in 1830. Their "principles have been falsified by experience, and [their] prophecies have totally failed," Sadler declared in 1831. Free trade was the first doctrine of political economy to come under fire. Tory radicals attacked it from 1829 on, as the results of Huskisson's liberal measures became evident. In 1824 Huskisson persuaded Parliament to repeal the prohibition on imports of silk goods and to replace it with a duty of thirty per cent; in July 1826 this measure took effect. In 1829 Tory radicals assailed the guiding doctrine of free trade as well as Huskisson's measure for the silk industry.

In preface they argued that free trade could never function equitably for the silk industry. It unfairly placed the British manufacturer and weaver in competition with their French rivals, who enjoyed the great advantages of a native supply of raw silk and a daily wage of only ten pence. Unlike the French, the British possessed high taxes, prices, and habits of living.
Sadler noted that the British paid seventy percent more than the French for bread, and one hundred twenty percent more in taxes, but received only a thirty percent advantage from Huskisson's duty. He and other Tory radicals contended that the British entered into competition with the odds strongly against them: "To submit the particular manufacturer, under any consideration, to the free competition contemplated is to give, in effect, a positive premium to the foreign competitor: it is a direct bounty upon the product of the French loom."

When the prohibition ended and the duty came into operation in 1826, the British manufacturer of necessity reduced the prices of his goods to those of the French imports. The price of a pair of silk gloves, for example, fell from three shillings to two. Not only did his prices fall, but demand too: Seeley observed in 1832 that "his goods are rejected, because foreign goods are preferred by fashion." As demand and prices fell, profits virtually disappeared; indeed many manufacturers worked at a loss. To compensate for minimal profits, the manufacturer reduced wages by at least fifty percent and greatly increased production. Such an increase, together with vast French imports, glutted the domestic market and reduced prices still further. Robinson calculated that even in the glut, the French dominated the market. Judging from the amount of raw silk imported during the first three years of free trade, real consumption increased by 1,000,000 pounds; but, judging from
the amount imported during the last three years of prohibition, real consumption should have increased by 3,300,000 pounds; the difference between the actual and the expected went to the French.\textsuperscript{102} Robinson dismissed the claim of Vesey Fitzgerald, President of the Board of Trade, that British overproduction alone caused the glut; his figures showed that British production did not grow even as it would have if protected: "In a case like this, it is the height of absurdity to speak of overtrading."\textsuperscript{103}

Such glutted markets and such intense competition overwhelmed many manufacturers. Between 1826 and 1832, Maginn recorded, sixty-seven manufacturers failed and seventeen retired.\textsuperscript{104} As ever during economic distress, the working class suffered acutely. Tory radicals emphasized their plight as the most telling argument against free trade: many were made redundant, creating a universal glut of labor, and those still employed barely earned subsistence wages. "Hence labour has to be increased in its intensity and lengthened in its duration," Sadler explained in the second Parliamentary debate on the distress, "the infant has to be devoted at an earlier age; and the wife taken from her natural and proper sphere, that of domestic duty, and sent to work; and still all this mass of exertion is often inadequate to obtain for the family a scanty and insufficient subsistence."\textsuperscript{105} While impoverishing the worker and bankrupting the master, free trade in silk also inflated the poor rates, stimulated crime and immorality, and
jeopardized the currency supply. Free trade in only one heretofore protected commodity ravaged the domestic industry and injured society as a whole; according to Tory radicals, its prime beneficiary was the French silk industry.

Against this almost gratuitous exploitation of the working class, Tory radicals reasserted the advantages of the protective system. Prohibition of foreign silk was for them one effective device for guaranteeing remunerative employment to a large number of people. It acted as a very small luxury tax, "distributing the means of the wealthy amongst the lower and labouring classes of the community," according to Sadler.106 "These laws secured profitable employment to the poor," Edwards wrote, "and restrained the rich from seeking enjoyments to be derived from foreign sources, when these could have been supplied at home."107 Robinson furnished the best co-ordination of the protective system and the prohibition of silk goods.108 He reasoned that the native silk industry, relieved of foreign competition, stimulated national prosperity by buying agricultural and manufactured goods, while adding some little expense to the housekeeping of the wealthy. A constant source of demand, the silk industry directly and indirectly benefitted all parts of the economy. It expended at least four million pounds on agricultural produce, enabling farmers and laborers to consume that sum in manufactured goods. In turn, manufacturers could
employ another 50,000 hands, who would buy 400,000 pounds worth of agricultural produce, enabling farmers and laborers to consume 50,000 pounds worth of additional goods. Furthermore, the silk industry spent about two million pounds yearly on manufactured goods. Manufacturers then employed another 100,000 hands, the whole manufacturing sector spending half of its silk-income on agriculture, and half on itself. "In this case the Silk Trade causes an expenditure, amidst the other divisions, of twenty millions." Thus, one protected industry could create a vast demand for agricultural produce and manufactured goods by drawing on the wealthier class of society. Prohibition of foreign silks stimulated domestic demand, the cornerstone of the protective system, and thereby contributed to the prosperity of the greatest number.

Tory radicals pressed their attack on free trade by focusing on its actual and potential effects on other protected industries. In 1822, 1823, and 1825 Huskisson procured extensive revisions of the Navigation Act. He eliminated the requirement that goods be transported to Britain and her colonies in British vessels; every nation which signed a reciprocity treaty with Britain could freely ship goods to and from her and her colonies. From 1829 Tory radicals vehemently condemned this experiment in free trade for wrecking the domestic shipping industry. They adapted the arguments already used against free trade in silk for this new attack. They contended
that the burdens endured by British industry rendered competition with foreigners inherently unfair; Sadler observed to the shipowners and merchants of Whitby that their foreign competitors could build, man, and provision their vessels at half the British cost. The Leeds Intelligencer pursued the same line: "judging of the influence of Mr. Huskisson's system by its effects, it has actually given to the shipping of those foreign nations AN IMMENSE ADVANTAGE over THE SHIPPING OF THIS COUNTRY."

Tory radicals contended, again as they did for the silk industry, that competition with foreigners forced British prices to match theirs. Sadler noted that British shipowners were compelled to reduce their charges by half. On the effects of such reductions Tory radicals were unanimous: to compensate for the diminution of profit contingent on such charges, shipowners cut wages drastically and increased the activity of their ships. As Seeley emphasized in 1832, "Profits are so small that every compulsory reduction of price is of necessity thrown in a great measure on wages, and the loss to the labourer extends to the tradesmen who supply him." Tory radicals also maintained that business declined despite the fall in charges, and many redundancies ensued. They were able to offer telling figures. In 1829 Sadler documented the long and short term losses sustained by shipping under the regimen of free trade. From 1814 to 1828, British shipping diminished by 769
ships, 275,749 tons and 23,244 men; sixty percent fewer ships were built in 1828 than in 1826. Galt supplied similar figures in 1832. Less than half the tonnage was constructed in British shipyards in 1837 than in 1826; in 1830 there were 2,308 fewer vessels, 110,217 fewer tons, and 16,517 fewer men employed than in 1826. Learning from Robinson, Galt carefully exposed the economic ramifications of the collapse of the shipping industry. Its collapse meant a similar collapse among supportive trades, and a decrease in the demand for agricultural produce. The 16,517 unemployed sailors, together with the artisans made redundant, glutted the labor market and increased the poor rates. So severe was their impact on an already superabundant labor force, Galt believed, the rick burning of 1830 and 1831 was the consequence: "But precisely in the time that British tonnage has been decreasing, and that of the nations with which we have concluded reciprocity treaties increasing, it has so happened that the well-ordered realm of England has been shaken to its centre by nightly insurrection." The effects of free trade, while visible in the shipping and silk industries, extended to all vulnerable interests throughout the kingdom.

Galt's belief that Huskisson's experiments with free trade caused the distresses of the time in fact prevailed among Tory radicals. They steadfastly maintained that the prescriptions of political economy created not only the economic depression and social upheaval of
the early 'thirties, but also the graver troubles of the 'forties. "In many departments the distress has been directly produced by Free Trade," the Leeds Intelligencer professed in 1829, "and in all, by this system, the distress has been aggravated and increased. Away with its principles from the endurance of the nation!" 117 "We do not believe in free trade, or any of the other dogmas of the political economists," Maginn wrote in his survey of Fraser's first year, "and we have taken some pains . . . to prove that their desperate system has brought the financial and commercial interests of the country to the verge of destruction." 118

Sadler offered the best brief of the Tory radical case on the pernicious effects of free trade in his second speech on the silk industry in 1829, repeated in his major speeches at Newark and Whitby. 119 He demonstrated, with what statistical evidence then existed, that both the economy and the general state of the nation had suffered gravely since free trade came into operation. The number of bankruptcies of merchants increased during the first three years of free trade by an average of seven hundred fifty-four over the proceeding three years. The average number of paupers for the first three years increased by 556,867 over the proceeding three years. In 1829, there were thirty-five percent more criminal convictions than in 1823. The few economic indicators available to him supported the Tory radical case against free trade. Indeed, in the King's Speech of 1830, the
ministry could only produce an increase of traffic on canals to substantiate its claim of general prosperity, and Sadler, joined by Lord Stanhope, denied even that. By free trade, the "few may be, and, probably are served," Sadler concluded, "but the many are injured; profitable industry is crippled, and growing more and more languid . . . labour is becoming daily more redundant, and its remuneration is perpetually diminishing."120

For Tory radicals the supreme irony of free trade in silk was that it devastated a prosperous native industry in order to secure a negligible benefit to the wealthy consumer. Tory radicals estimated that a family would save about five pounds a year by buying French silks, granting that they would be more fashionable.121 But only the wealthy would accrue this saving because silk goods were a luxury that was wholly beyond the means of the working class. The working class, however, suffered greatly from the unemployment, overworking, and decrease in wages directly caused by free trade. The poor suffered for the minor benefit of the wealthy. Tory radicals bitterly attacked this ironic situation, construing free trade into a deliberate policy of exploitation. "If this system have any advantages," Johnstone wrote in 1829, "it is easy to show that they are advantages only to the capitalist, to the rich, purchased at the expense of the poor. The wretched, unhappy, starving artisan, is to suffer, in order that the rich may have silks somewhat cheaper. . . ."122 Edwards cynically asked
a year later: "Is that law wise, is that law humane, is that law friendly to the interests of the industrious poor, which would throw one part of the population out of employment, and produce a glut of labour, and a consequent diminution of the earnings of industry, to enable the rich consumer to purchase more articles of luxury from a foreigner?"¹²³

Political economists rebutted the Tory case by appealing to the theory of Say's law. As phrased by J.R. McCulloch in 1825, Say's law held that, as production created demand, neither an imbalance of trade, nor a domestic glut could ever exist; if either an imbalance or a glut ever appeared to exist, deficient consumption was the cause.¹²⁴ In a savage diatribe against Sadler and Robinson in 1830, Perronet Thompson deployed the law as his coup de grâce. "Nothing can be procured from abroad without being accompanied by the expenditure of the same amount in the end upon native workmen, as if the article had been created with any given amount of waste and expense at home."¹²⁵ Free trade could never injure any domestic industry because in the nature of things there was an ineluctable reciprocity of international trade.

Tory radicals perceived this law as one of the absurd, a factual theories whose acceptance had so ravaged the economy. They insisted constantly that in actuality inexorable reciprocity never had existed, never could exist. Sadler, for one, declared in Parliament that
"for any community, however rich, to take the labour of another community without returning their own, or without returning it to an equal value (a very possible, and, in many instances, an actual case, all that an economist has asserted to the contrary notwithstanding), tends to the impoverishment of any such community, and is a sacrifice of its own labour."126 Robinson, for another, pointed out that the United States, France, Russia, Spain and other countries deliberately raised their duties as British goods became cheaper, in order to exclude them: "They will take nothing from you save what their own interests require."127 In 1833 Maginn published corroboratory figures on the Anglo-French trade; since the introduction of free trade, the value of imports from France rose from 800,000 to 3,000,000 pounds sterling a year, while exports to France fell.128

While stressing the damage inflicted on British industry, Tory radicals noticed the threat to the currency raised by free trade. When Britain allowed imports while the exporting nations refused her goods, she could only pay for them with bullion. Payment in bullion constricted the domestic money supply, which was largely metallic, and stimulated depression. The Standard in particular emphasized the effects of bullion payments: "The gold and silver so sent out is indeed a clear unreturning deduction from the mass of wealth produced by the savings and industry of the British nation. But this is not the worst -- it is a contribution to the wealth
of rivals. The demonstrable facts of the balance of trade dealt, for Tory radicals, the final blow to Say's law.

Alone of Tory radicals, Robinson criticized the reasoning as well as the empirical base of Say's law. To expose it he proposed a simple test case: "how far would the sales of ten millions' worth of silks to England enable France to consume English goods?" In return for the silks, France required the food, clothing, and raw materials consumed in producing them, as well as the cash paid as rent, taxes, etc., and retained as savings. In return, according to political economists, Britain would supply France with ten million pounds worth of manufactured goods, to consume or resell as she chose. But France would accept only as many British manufactured goods as she normally consumed, or would desire to resell. Robinson estimated that she would accept at most one-fourth of the goods offered; the remainder must come in cash. This payment would enable France to discharge her domestic obligations and to buy extensively of other nations, but would contribute little to her ability or willingness to buy British goods. "I doubt," Robinson concluded, "whether this export of ten millions to, would add two millions to her imports from, England." Say's law did not rightly consider the logic of international trade; it was rather a crushing liability than a bulwark for the theory of free trade.

Thus, Tory radicals attacked the doctrine
of free trade for its faulty theoretical basis as well as for its pernicious effects. For them, Huskisson's implementation of the doctrine entailed the unilateral surrender of major British markets to foreign competitors who enjoyed lower taxes, costs, and wages. Forced to lower price to match these competitors, British silk manufacturers and shipowners had to struggle to retain any profits at all, and often failed. They drastically lowered wages and increased both the intensity and duration of labor. Consequently the working class suffered from overexertion and subsistence wages; to compensate for the fall in wages, women and children were forced to work. The injury inflicted by free trade was statistically verifiable: bankruptcies, pauperism, and criminal acquittals dramatically increased, while the currency supply diminished. Furthermore, the theoretical bulwark of free trade, Say's law, proved to be factually and logically untenable. To repair the damage wrought by Huskisson's adoption of free trade, Tory radicals offered a simple program: a plenary return to protectionism. At Newark in 1829 Sadler professed that "present sufferings are in a great measure chargeable upon the absurd and anti-national policy which has been adopted of late years, and that they are remediable by returning to a wiser, a kinder, and a more national cause: one by which the nation rose to its princely height and balmy state of prosperity, and from which it has regularly declined since an opposite policy has been
adopted. By prohibiting imported silk goods, returning to the old Navigation Acts, and continuing the corn laws, Tory radicals hoped to restore the prosperity which prevailed during the Napoleonic Wars.

IV

Tory radicals attacked the wages fund doctrine of political economy even more strongly than the doctrine of free trade. Virtually every part of the doctrine came under fire on the familiar ground of factual inaccuracy: the opposition of wages and profits; the Malthusian assumption of a geometric increase of population; the inability of the employer to affect the rate of wages; and even the free agency of the employee. Robinson began the attack in 1829 in the first number of "Political Economy." He denied the thesis of Ricardo and McCulloch that wages opposed profits, in amount or in proportion, and foresaw dire consequences for the working class from its acceptance: "By making high profits the sine qua non of national wealth, and low wages that of high profits, it in reality makes it the grand principle of civil government, to keep the mass of the human race in the lowest stages of indigence and suffering." Robinson proposed, as part of the protective system, that high wages were essential to high profits: "The truth is, the two shares flow from, and are dependant on, each other, they must increase and diminish
As noticed above, high wages meant high demand for agricultural produce and manufactured goods of the best quality, which gave farmers and manufacturers the highest profits. Only by encouraging high wages could any employer or ministry hope to maintain the demand essential to general prosperity.

Led by Sadler, Tory radicals also denied the validity of the Malthusian theory of population which underpinned the wages fund doctrine. The doctrine could hold only if population continually increased faster than the fund which supported it. If population did not in fact increase geometrically, then other, economic factors must determine the rate of wages. In his Law of Population Sadler produced elaborate statistical evidence that Malthus's theory was indeed wrong: "The multiplication of the species," Sadler contended in the Law and in Parliament, "... was under equal circumstances in the inverse ratio of the condensation of their numbers." His theory is accepted today by population biologists: as the density of population increases, its rate of reproduction diminishes. Other Tory radicals, Southey and the Blackwood's circle in particular, as seen above, promptly accepted Sadler's new theory and employed it in their struggle against political economy. Maginn too employed Sadler's theory and supporting evidence against political economy in the person of Thomas Chalmers: Sadler's work "at once put an end to the Malthusian notion of a geometric progression, and to Dr. Chalmers' position,
that a population doubling itself in fifteen years would continue to do so each following fifteen years."137 Tory radicals also staunchly defended Sadler against the counterattacks of Macaulay and others.

Once intellectually free of Malthus's theory, Tory radicals analyzed several economic factors determining the rate of wages. While steadfastly denying the presence of a superabundant population, they conceded that there was a surplus of labor, caused by several factors. Maginn, in 1833 and Seeley in the 'forties argued in particular that the "natural cupidity and selfishness of man, indeed, if left unchecked by the power of the law, will soon produce this very surplus."138 One factor contributing to it was Irish immigration. Because Irish absentee landowners, abetted by political economists, prevented the implementation of any sort of poor laws, Irish laborers flooded into the agricultural and manufacturing districts of England, especially during economic depressions. Accustomed to hard labor, low wages, and a commensurate standard of living, they easily underbid and supplanted many English laborers, who then constituted the surplus in question. The Standard observed that "much of the misery in Lancashire and London necessarily results from the influx of Irish paupers, who, monopolizing the whole market for simple labour, throw the whole body of the English peasantry into manufactories until they are crowded to repletion."139 Sadler thought that improvement of the lot of the English
working class was impossible before the operation of an Irish Poor Law. Indeed, he predicted that without it the "condition of the English peasant and artisan, already so much deteriorated, will be still further debased; and their condition will be speedily reduced to that of Irish labourers."140

Migration of English laborers also contributed to a surplus in the manufacturing districts. This factor emerged in 1835 when the Migration Scheme of the New Poor Law commenced.141 Tory radicals perceived the Scheme as a deliberate effort by the government, in collusion with such leading millowners as Henry Ashworth and R.H. Greg, to reduce the wages of the operatives by creating a surplus of labour. W.B. Ferrand actually cited Greg's letter to Chadwick, Secretary to the Poor Law Commission, as proof that the manufacturers "required that Poor Law Bill to bring in extra labourers from the southern counties to keep down the equalization of wages."142 Oastler too denounced the scheme as a conspiracy to make Southern laborers the "innocent instruments of ruining thousands of manufacturing labourers, by a reduction of their miserable wages, in consequence of the increased competition."143 Therefore, growth of population in Lancashire and Yorkshire obtained mainly from immigration of Southern laborers and the Irish; they glutted the labor market in the North, not the reproduction of native operatives.

Overproduction caused a surplus of labor as fully
as immigration, Tory radicals came to believe. In introducing this additional factor in the 'thirties, they shrewdly took advantage of its currency among their adversaries. As Huskisson and Vesey Fitzgerald, followed by Poulett Thomson among the Whigs, often relied on it to explain away economic fluctuations, political economists could scarcely contradict them. Robinson had prepared for later Tory radical thought on overproduction in his exposition of the protective system. Since manufacturers rather accumulated than consumed their profits, they could regularly reinvest them in new and faster machinery; it was also cheaper to operate because it invariably required fewer operatives in attendance. It increased production, while diminishing employment and demand; and a glut ensued during which profits dissipated, temporarily ending reinvestment. "Machinery which renders labour more productive," Robinson cautioned, "is not a good but a mighty evil, if it diminish employment."\footnote{144} Oastler and Bull concurred in 1836, advising operatives that "Factory Masters, generally, have not yet learned, that your wages cannot be lowered without eventually reducing their profits."\footnote{145}

Robinson's successors continued to elaborate the dangers of overproduction. Oastler and Bull, for example, advised that "long hours, and consequent overproduction, will assuredly, in the long run, lower both profits and wages; and that the Twelve-hour system is sure to produce
these effects, taking a few years together." To Tory radicals in the 'thirties, overproduction seemed an even graver danger than it had in the 'twenties, because of the much greater speed of machinery. Following the Radical M.P. John Fielden, Lord Ashley observed in 1836 that between 1819 and 1832, the speed of machinery in cotton mills had increased fivefold; a piecer in 1819 walked eight miles daily in tending mules, while he walked twenty miles in 1832. Lord Ashley reported in 1844, from meticulous measurements, that a piecer could walk as much as thirty-seven miles daily in tending some numbers of yarns. This dramatically faster machinery produced more goods than before, which cost much less. Greater quantity and lower cost meant that goods sold for less; the substantially increased competition among manufacturers forced prices down still lower. Paradoxically, such low prices benefitted neither the operative nor the manufacturer. The operative discovered that, as low wages came with the low price, he needed to work longer in order to earn his former income, and that, with the new machinery, he was compelled to work much harder for his lower wages. A much more laborious twelve to sixteen hour day supplanted the ten hour day of the past. The manufacturer similarly discovered that low prices entailed low profits; to earn as much as formerly he needed to operate his new machinery longer each day. As other manufacturers followed the same plan, the markets for their goods soon became glutted.
"We are, with all our might, overproducing, from which arises the necessity of underselling, not foreigners, but each other," Mallalieu commented in 1836.149

Faced with glutted markets, the manufacturer produced half-time as long as possible and eventually closed his mill, displacing all employees, until the markets reopened. When temporarily out of work, operatives became surplus labor and depended on parish or union relief for subsistence. Thus, a surplus of labor came about through the action of the manufacturer alone; he bore entire responsibility for it in a glut, and not the operative, through "improvident marriages" or other means. Tory radicals constantly emphasized his responsibility, in direct refutation of political economy. "But there is a real and widespread distress, and the mischief lies in the manufactories," Southey wrote in 1830, "they must sell at the lowest possible price; the necessity of a great sale at a rate of small profit makes low wages a consequence; when they have overstocked the market (which, during their season of prosperity, they use all efforts for doing), hands must be turned off; and every return of this cold fit is more violent than the former."150 The Preston Short Time Committee was even more explicit in a broadside of 1834:

But there are few honest and industrious men who can get a livelihood with 12 hours' labour, even without deducting time for meals. This being the case, an honest man is forced to work 2 or 3 hours daily over 12 hours, to make up his needful
weekly income, and thus, in most cases four men do the proper work of five or six. Two evils arise out of this: first, the market of merchandise is glutted with goods, and the market of labour with hands; and secondly, the price of labour is reduced in consequence of this double glut. Rates also increase to maintain the unemployed. Thus Manufacturer is placed in deadly competition with Manufacturer, and Operative with Operative, and thus it is that Excessive Labour produces Poverty.\[151\]

Rapid machinery, long hours, low wages, low profits, internecine competition, and massive gluts: these were the fruit of the manufacturer's unhindered pursuit of self-interest.

Furthermore, Tory radicals continued, the manufacturer could create an apparent surplus of labor even during normal production. Textile factories were designed to employ as many women and children as possible because they could perform many tasks as well as men and, more importantly, because they earned much less. In the 1830's, a child could earn at most four shillings a week and a woman ten, but a male spinner earned at least twenty-two. Hence adult males could find employment in the mills only in spinning or in very laborious tasks. New machinery often required still fewer male spinners and proportionally more female piecers and scavengers. Hence, the adult male operative found himself, through no fault of his own, either overworked or redundant and virtually unemployable. Of necessity the hapless operative survived on the wages of his wife and children,
supplemented by his own meager earnings from odd jobs. Oastler in particular condemned this "complete inversion of the law of nature, making little children into slaves, to work for their fathers and mothers, and leaving the fathers destitute in the streets, to mourn over their sorrows." Once again, the manufacturer alone contributed to the surplus of labor by increasing his profits at the expense of the jobs of male operatives. "It is far more easy for the masters to 'overstock the labour-market,' than for the workmen," Seeley concluded in the 'forties. The wages fund doctrine foundered on the true causes of superabundant labor: the manufacturers' pursuit of profit and the influx of laborers from Ireland and the Southern counties.

The plight of the redundant operative incited further analysis of the manufacturer's economic power, especially during the early and middle years of the Factory Reform Movement. To Tory radicals the power of the manufacturer over his employees seemed virtually absolute. He dictated hours, intensity, conditions, and remuneration of labor to the operative, who had no voice whatever in them. Indeed, the fierce competition for employment of any sort made the operative unwilling to challenge his master for any reason, even for outright fraud through unjust fines or manipulation of the mill clock. Were he to protest to a Factory Inspector, or to testify before either a Parliamentary Committee or a Royal Commission, his job was almost automatically forfeit. Were he to
join in a strike either against a reduction of wages, or for higher ones, the master, buttressed by his accumulated capital, the ability to borrow more, and governmental collusion, could easily outlast him, or recruit Irish and migrant replacements, or install new machinery which would make him redundant. Of course parochial officials would never relieve strikers, so that he had to capitulate when his exiguous resources failed. Moreover, to obtain relief when unemployed or ill, he was compelled to enroll his children in the factories; otherwise, the wages of factory-age children were deducted from it. In the end he could only accept the master's terms; his sole choice was of acceptance or starvation.

Nevertheless, even when deprived of economic freedom, he could choose to mitigate significantly the lot of his wife and children. He could refrain from sending them to work in the factories, except when he was unemployed or ill. When forced to rely on their wages, he could husband them by doing odd jobs and, above all, by eschewing alcohol and opium. He could also help his children by educating them in religion and in basic domestic skills. Tory radicals commended the many operatives who did so as "good parents." Oastler pitied the "good parent" who "loves his child" and "feels his curse to be -- he cannot find labour and must send his little child to work -- or he would starve. He will . . . hail with joy the rising hope that soon he may keep his child at home under the maternal eye, whilst he most
Illustration: George Cruikshank, circa 1833, vividly depicts the economic plight of the female and child operatives of the manufacturing districts. Courtesy of the Mansell Collection, London.
joyously enters your mills and willingly labours for its support from morn to evening."\textsuperscript{154}

Conversely, the operative could choose to exploit his children relentlessly. If deliberately unemployed or well-employed, he could force his children to work in the mills in order to supply him with food, drink, and the leisure in which to enjoy them. Valuing children solely for their hard-earned wages, he would neglect their health and morality, their religious and domestic education. Parson Bull indignantly condemned these Labans who "urged their children to mills, (who possessed the power of finding them employment at home, and of sending others to School), that they might hoard up the shillings which they could thus 'screw' out of them...," and those yet worse parents who "have driven their children to the factory, and whilst they themselves have done next to nothing to increase the family income, they have pinched their children of food and clothes, that they might consume their hard-earned wages in gluttony and drunkenness."\textsuperscript{155}

Deeply impressed by the plight of the redundant operative, whose only choice remained in his conduct to kith and kin, Tory radicals denounced free agency as an arbitrary fiction of political economy, lacking any basis in fact. They argued that the operative was a victim of economic necessity, utterly at the mercy of his employer. When proposing the first Ten Hours Bill, Sadler urgently pressed this argument in an attempt to
break the hold of political economy on M.Ps.: "the employer and the employed do not meet on equal terms in the market of labour; on the contrary, the latter, whatever be his age, and call him as free as you please, is often at the entire mercy of the former." Later in the speech he added that operatives with children were doubly constrained: "It is mockery to contend that these parents have a choice; that they can dictate to, or even parley with, the employer as to the number of hours their child shall be worked, or the treatment it shall be subject to in his mill; and it is an insult to the parental heart to say that they resign it voluntarily; no, 'Their poverty, and not their will consents.'" Lord Ashley also decried the fiction of free agency and upheld the truth of necessity when defending the Ten Hours Bill of 1844. He cited the Factory Inspectors' reports which "allowed that in theory these [operatives] were considered free agents, yet that in practice they were no such thing." To Lord Ashley the plight of the factory worker was nothing less than "white slavery." Although "white slavery" had existed since 1797 as a term for labor under atrocious conditions in factories, Tory radicals were the first to apply it to the economic necessity which governed operatives. Indeed, they transformed it into a catchphrase exclusively for economic necessity, from the emergence of the Factory Reform Movement. Ye are no more agents than black slaves are,
Oastler told factory children in his first "Slavery in Yorkshire" letter; "Ye are compelled to work as long as the necessity of your needy parents may require, or the cold-blooded avarice of your worse than barbarian masters may demand!"160 "We call it slavery, with deliberation," Maginn wrote in 1833, "because, the toil being excessive, destructive of the child's health and morals, and such as no parent ought to subject his child unto, the parents are yet compelled, by the threat of absolute starvation, to force their child to undertake it."161 With the catchphrase of "white slavery" and the concept of economic necessity, the Tory radical attack on the wages fund doctrine was complete. At every point they challenged the doctrine for factual inaccuracy; political economists embraced a theory which had little correspondence to economic reality: high wages produced high, not low profits; population decreased as it grew denser, instead of increasing geometrically until arrested by famine, disease, war, or the "preventive check"; and Irish immigration, Southern migration, overproduction, and employment of women and children would create a surplus of labor far more rapidly than normal reproduction ever could. In the end, the wages fund doctrine even presumed a free agency that did not exist. Because the employer had absolute control over his employees, he was the decisive economic agent. The economy was his domaine. This was the fundamental realization of Tory radicals, embodied in the adversary concept of economic
necessity.

Several measures were needed to curtail the master's absolute control and to restore truly free agency to the worker. The Ten Hours Bill was the foremost of these measures. By determining that children could work only half-time and young persons no more than ten hours daily, the Bill promised much relief to the operative. It would immediately end the overproduction and gluts which contributed largely to his unfree status. Once the manufacturer were unable to operate his high-speed machinery for twelve to sixteen hours a day, he could no longer produce more than the markets could bear at any one time; production would regularly supply demand, instead of exceeding it, creating a glut, and diminishing prices, wages, and profits. Manufacturer and operative would enjoy regular high profits and wages, uninterrupted by suspensions. Sadler emphasized the advantage of the Bill in his speech moving it:

If the effect of this bill were, in some measure to equalize the labour of these poor children, and thereby prevent these fluctuations which are so distressing to them in both its extremes, it would so far accomplish a most beneficial object. It might, I think, transfer a little of the fluctuation from the factory to the stock-room, with great advantages to the operatives, and consequently to the public at large.182

Furthermore, the Bill would increase the number of jobs for men. Oastler estimated that one-sixth more jobs for them would appear from the limitation of
women and children; they would return to the home while their husbands and fathers worked. Equally, increased production would create yet more jobs. When a manufacturer desired to increase production, which would be less often because profits would accumulate less rapidly, he could do so only by building another mill, thereby creating more jobs. He could no longer swell production by simply increasing the number of hours worked. Hence, with higher wages and more jobs, the operative would regain his freedom from the control of his employer: were the latter's terms unfavorable, the former would be able to seek, and find, employment elsewhere. In sum, Tory radicals foresaw universal advantages from the Bill; all economic agents would grow more prosperous and enjoy more leisure than ever before.

Two other measures were indispensable to diminish still further the surplus of labor. One of them was already mandated by both the constitutional and contractual rights of the poor to subsistence: an Irish Poor Law. Without such a guarantee of subsistence, Irish laborers would continue to flood into England in times of distress, supplanting the native worker and lowering his wages. As Sadler repeatedly argued: "the want of a Poor's-law in Ireland is a grievous injury to the industrious classes of England, who find their labour interfered with, and its value lessened, by that influx of Irish workmen of every description, who are driven to these shores by want and destitution. Such a law
would promptly eliminate the greatest constituent of the surplus, thereby raising wages and rendering the laborer more independent of his employer. The same effects would ensue from another measure: home colonization. The state or agriculturalists collectively should actively endeavor to extend the amount of land cultivated by purchasing waste lands and by creating new villages in undertilled areas. These lands would then be rented to redundant laborers, especially to redundant operatives in the congested manufacturing districts. Edwards wished "to withdraw this superabundant population from the factories, in which they are now, at least, partially unproductive, and settle them either as cottagers or colonists in some country district, where they may, by field-labour, replace the whole of the food required for their support." While reducing the labor surplus these colonies would simultaneously increase the demand for manufactured goods, to the benefit of all.

A final doctrine of political economy, profits, came under concerted attack with the free trade and wages fund doctrines. Tory radicals denied flatly that profits were the ultimate economic good which political economists held them to be; they found incredible the assertion that high profits, especially when earned by the manufacturer, contributed most to the general prosperity. In refutation they maintained that high profits always endangered the general prosperity. As Robinson set forth, high profits, when reinvested, inevitably led
to over-production, glut, and an indeterminate stoppage. When merely accumulated, profits constricted the money supply, raising prices and undercutting demand. Profits were universally beneficial when accrued at a moderate rate, allowing gradual reabsorption into the economy and currency. Another common attack on profits centered on their immediate effect on the worker. Oastler argued that manufacturers reaped exorbitant profits by unjustly reducing wages; conscious exploitation enriched one at the expense of many. He asked the Duke of Wellington: "Is this reasonable? Should not the poor labourers have a better share of such enormous profits? Is it not their just due? Can justice withhold it any longer?"\textsuperscript{166} A third attack abandoned argument in favor of moralistic denunciation. It judged profits to be the fruit of avarice, one of the seven deadly sins. Southey inaugurated the denunciation of profits as avarice, manufacturers as Mammonites. "There is a nation of warriors in Hindostan who call their deity All-Steel," he wrote in \textit{Sir Thomas More}. "Commercial nations, if they acknowledged the deity whom they serve, might call him All-Gold. If the sum of their sacrifices were compared, Mammon would be found a more merciless fiend than Moloch."\textsuperscript{167} To Lord Ashley he repeatedly affirmed: "I do not know where the love of gain appears in more undisguised deformity than in a cotton-mill. . . . I know not how a cotton-mill can be otherwise than an abomination to God and man."\textsuperscript{168} Thus, the ultimate
end of economic activity in political economy proved to Tory radicals immoral, unjust, or simply dangerous in excess.

The Ten Hours Bill would largely curb the excessive profits of the manufacturers, they thought. The Bill would strictly limit production, thereby lowering net profits; it would also lead to the employment of many more adult male operatives, thereby lowering the rate of profit. Hence, the wealth produced by manufacturing would be far more equitably distributed, and the master's avarice curtailed. Moreover, the economy would suffer much less often from gluts and restricted currency; there would be little impairment of the widely distributed demand. Nevertheless, the manufacturer still enjoyed unjustly high profits. Maginn sharply exposed the remaining inequity: taxation. While the operative and weaver paid very high taxes on such necessaries as coffee, tea, bread, candles, and coal, the manufacturer paid no taxes at all on his expensive machinery. "It is a revolting fiction to be told," Maginn wrote, "that the capitalist of fifty thousand pounds shall be less taxed, and less restrained in his operations, than the owner of a single loom, or the mechanic of a hundred pounds fortune, and fifty pounds borrowed capital, who employs one journeyman and two apprentices." To remedy this inequity he proposed a graduated income tax, which could easily raise twelve million pounds per annum. This tax would enable the repeal of the many taxes on basic
commodities which oppressed the working class. Oastler similarly criticized the manufacturers and other capitalists who "think they are a set of men to be benefitted more than anybody else, and neither are they taxed nor anything else."[^170] He advocated a general property tax as the best method of guaranteeing their contribution to the exchequer. Taxation of jennies and power looms would relieve the highly taxed working class and permit the handloom weavers again to work profitably. Thus, either a property tax or a graduated income tax was needed to complement the Ten Hours Bill in diminishing profits and establishing equitable burdens for all.
These curbs on profits were among the last major Tory radical proposals.

Hence, from the seminal Blackwood's preface of 1826 until the collapse of protectionism in the 1850's, Tory radicals articulated an incisive critique of political economy and a cogent rationale for the protective system. Widely disseminated through Blackwood's, Fraser's, the Standard, the Leeds Intelligencer, and the writings and speeches of individual Tory radicals, the ideology significantly informed the public mind. Indeed, it instigated and justified the Factory Reform Movement, the Anti-Poor Law Movement, and the popular attack on free trade. Tory radicalism played a prominent role in the ideological debates of the 1830's and 1840's, dwarfing the many Radical ideologies of unstamped and Chartist journals. It was also prominent
in several of the English novels of these decades which addressed important social problems, as shown in later chapters. An understanding of Tory radicalism is essential not only to the study of social reform movements, but also to the study of topical literature.
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Chapter Two
The Critical Demand for Realism in the 1830's

Early Victorian reviewers consistently demanded realism of the novel. They held that the novel should remain faithful to the inherited conception of art as a mirror which reflects life without distortion. One of the leading critics for the Athenaeum, William Pitt Scargill, succinctly stated in 1833 the universal belief of critics, and readers: "All that a novel has to depend upon is its truth of principle, its fidelity to nature, and the tact and talent with which that truth is told and that fidelity is preserved." While conceiving of the novel as an undistorted mirror, critics scarcely desired total realism; they were emphatically neither naturalists nor "photograpahic" realists. Rather, they placed two firm constraints on the realism of the novel. First, the novel must admit things rather as they were supposed to be than as they were, then or in the past. As the Spectator explained, "Fiction may be called the philosophy of fact: the events of life are reviewed, and a kind of average taken of them: those selected for fiction are the middle terms, and not the extreme and extraordinary circumstances, which require a strong body of evidence to establish them at all." The vraisemblable was not identical to the vrai; the mirror of art focused on the mean of life, excluding the extraordinary and the deviant.

121
While adhering to the vraisemblable, the novelist must, second, rigorously exclude the immoral in both topic and idea. In the boisterous early years of Fraser's, William Maginn and John Abraham Heraud contended with sober consistency that "Curiosity is not laudably employed where there is no good, healing, saving lesson to be learned."4 Reviewers in the latter years of the decade retained this conviction that the novelist must zealously attend to the morality of his characters' thoughts and milieux. First in the Edinburgh and again in the Encyclopedia Britannica, George Moir profusely thanked G.P.R. James for such zealous attention; for the "freedom from topics of doubtful morality; or, what is worse, the insinuation of opinions of which the morality is not doubtful—which is a distinguished and most honourable characteristic of all his fictions."5 Robert Chambers was equally emphatic in one of the three substantial histories of the British novel published in the 1830's. While praising John Banim's depiction of Irish life, Chambers nonetheless faulted Banim for exceeding the moral sphere of life: "the scenes which he selects for description are often so violent and horrible, that however true to nature, it were to be wished that they had been either softened or omitted."6 "True to nature" was the ubiquitous critical maxim; critics presumed that fiction would exclude both the immoral and the extreme, the watercloset and the pimpled heroine.7 Realism was a matter of convention, the mirror of art focusing on
what it should, not on what it could.

Reviews of historical novels exemplify most clearly the demand for realism in the 1830's. Critics conceived of the historical novel, as established by Scott, as "popular history divested of its dry and rugged features," and were acutely sensitive to distortions of the past. Scott himself set the example by warning that, if the "truth of history be violated, the eyes of the spectator are necessarily averted from a picture which excites in every well-regulated mind the hatred of incredulity." Critics habitually compared the standard history of a period or biography of a major figure to the novelist's account, rigorously exposing any inaccuracies. Edward Lytton Bulwer invited such close scrutiny by boldly claiming that in *Rienzi: The Last of the Roman Tribunes* he had "adhered, with a greater fidelity than is customary in Romance, to all the leading events of the public life of the Roman Tribune; and the Reader will perhaps find in these pages a more full and detailed account of the rise and fall of Rienzi than in any English work of which I am aware." Fortunately for the susceptible Bulwer, critics agreed. John Forster and Albany Fonblanque agreed ardently: "The truths of history are never in the course of the fiction in the slightest degree departed from. The minutest detail, so far as we have been able to judge, is never violated. . . . We accept the Fiction hereafter as the Truth." *Rienzi* fully satisfied the intractable demand for realism.
Few historical novels fared as well as Rienzi in satisfying it. Most of them trespassed against contemporary opinion through infidelity to the recorded life of a historical personage. J.A. Heraud condemned Allan Cunningham's *Paul Jones: A Romance* for wilful inconsistency with the established facts of the adventurer's life. After comparing Jones's biography to Cunningham's version of it, Heraud pronounced sentence: "We have intimated that the author had exaggerated the historical facts to extravagance - a necessary fault of the mode of construction he had adopted." Similarly, John Forster found Leigh Hunt's version of Nell Gwynn's life in *Sir Ralph Esher* at odds with her biography:

"We scarcely think, however, that the histories will bear Mr. Hunt out in the liberties he has taken with Nell Gwynne's early life; at least not in the colouring he has given it . . . . we must confess that the boarding-school breeding which Mr. Hunt has given her, produces an effect on the mind resembling a violation of the truth, and disturbs the preconceived and popular notions of her, to a degree amounting to the preposterous." Despite his avowed admiration for Hunt's radicalism, Forster could not qualify in the least his ingrained expectation of historical accuracy.

So frequent were such lapses from biographical truth, two leading critics of the 1830's offered the same guidance on the composition of historical novels. Both distinguished between two varieties of the historical novel, the biographical and the historical
proper. Heraud defined the former quite simply as a novel in which the main characters were historical personages. This variety entailed upon the novelist the necessity of complete biographical accuracy; therefore it hindered the writer's inventiveness and almost inevitably opened him to charges of inconsistency. The "writer will be inclined to ascribe incidents and relations to the historical hero inconsistent with all our previous associations, and destroy that degree of nascent belief which is indispensable to the enjoyment of fictitious composition," Heraud warned. In contrast, in the historical novel proper, the writer introduced historical personages and events primarily to authenticate his fictional characters, on whom the narrative centered. This variety of composition preserved him from inaccuracy, while giving ample scope to his creativity: "Opportunity is thus afforded to instruct as well as to amuse, and to make an effort of a higher kind than is necessary to the description of the other characters, in the careful elaboration of a vigorous sketch or full-length portrait of the Colossus who then 'bestrode our little world.'" In sum, he advised the novelist to focus on his fictional characters, thereby avoiding the pitfalls contingent on a historical personage. Cunningham ought to have written an historical, not a biographical novel, Heraud thought; he should have introduced one or two striking episodes from Jones's life, as realistic detail, and devoted his novel to the lives of other, fictional
Then he might have produced a work, as free from extravagance as it would have been full of grace," Heraud concluded.¹⁷

Thomas Henry Lister, a leading fashionable novelist and the prime novel-critic of the Edinburgh Review in the 1830's, also believed that the novelist should eschew biographical in favor of historical novels. The novelist should use historical fact sparingly, as a test, "like the spear of Ithuriel, to detect the falsehood and inconsistency" of any part of his narrative.¹⁸ Above all, Lister urged, he should abstain from concentrating on an historical person or event:

The fictitious person, who is not represented as having played a part in any well-known public event, is viewed with a comparatively indulgent eye; but if we are told that he has fought at Agincourt or at Waterloo (and the case is ever strongest where the event is most recent), we have a right to expect that he shall be delineated almost as by the hand of a biographer, and that every part of his conduct shall be probable and consistent. Yet there are many who write as if the reverse of this were true - as if there was a magic in historical names and circumstances which should cover all improbabilities and distortions, and be able alone to press conviction on the mind of the reader; as if we ought to receive with thankfulness the bushel of chaff, because a few grains of fact are to be found amongst it.¹⁹

Neither Lister nor Heraud desired the slightest weakening of the novel's verity; rather, because they insisted on realism, on historical accuracy, they
counselled the epigoni of Scott not to attempt what would inevitably lead to inaccuracy. Furthermore, both critics contended that the biographical novel was a corruption of the true historical novel as established by the "Wizard of the North." Scott did not fill "his pages with the names and incidents of Chronicles and Gazettes" claimed Lister, but rather personified the "feelings and habits of the times, collected from various scattered sources, and which what is commonly called history has too often neglected to convey." Heraud agreed that the novel was not historical "because it develops an historical event, or introduces characters whose names are enrolled in the annals of antiquity, but because it professes to delineate the distinctive peculiarities and costume of the time to which it is understood to relate." The purpose of the historical novel proper was to impart a true sense of the spirit of the past, not to focus narrowly on a specific personage or event. According to these critics, the biographical novel was not only impossible to compose realistically, but also selected the wrong elements of the past. It failed the test of realism.

To praise the novels which remained "true to nature," critics habitually invoked the traditional analogy of the novel to painting. The New Monthly Magazine explained that the "analogy is close between writing and drawing after nature. Any eye may see the prospect, but it is only for the master's hand to
throw it on paper. The most common subject allows of a
good picture, which pleases by its truth, and the ordinary
accidents of life, for the same reason, furnish scope
for good fiction." Only the best novelists, like
the best artists, could rightly depict the common life
about them. Captain Marryat himself, in his Metropolitan
Magazine, also believed that "Nothing is more easy than
to write a bad novel, or to paint a bad picture; nothing
more difficult than, in the attempt at either, to arrive
at anything like perfection." Right depiction was
equally different for the writer and artist. Neverthe­
less, painting was inherently the more realistic mode;
it was the "standard of estimated estimated perfection
to the ordeal of which all novels may be submitted, and
by which they must be criticized, as to their approach
to perfection." He went on to compare Scott's works
to the historical paintings of the "first masters," the
best romances to the paintings of Salvatore Rosa, the
best sea novels with those of Van der Velde, and so on.
Very high indeed was the pictorial standard of realism:
to it all novels should aspire; by it they must be judged.

The pervasiveness of the pictorial standard of
realism is cogently illustrated by the three histories
of the British novel published in the 1830's. In the
most extensive and influential of these histories,
printed serially in the Athenaeum in 1833, Allan
Cunningham repeatedly praised novelists for exacting
realism by comparing their works with paintings.
Cunningham thought that Fanny Burney "paints what she sees, and she sees it vividly." Maria Edgeworth's "brush seems ever full, and her canvas ever ready, and she dashes in the sad realities of life with a vigour and truth to which every heart responds. Nothing can surpass the intrepid fidelity of her delineations." He commended Mary Russell Mitford for an equal achievement: "No one has painted with such a true hand and in such natural colours, the joys and sorrows which crown the landscapes of humble life." His favorite novelists painted ordinary life in chiaroscuro, contrasting light with shade, joy with sorrow. Only their accuracy of color and delineation elevated them to the first rank of novelists.

The standard analogy of painting dominated the two subsequent histories of the British novel. Robert Chambers evoked it constantly in his ambitious History of the English Language and Literature of 1835. Like Cunningham, Chambers praised Fanny Burney for her "lively and just pictures of characters" and went on to notice later authors for the same cardinal virtue. Charlotte Smith excelled in the "lively and varied exhibition of natural character." Dr. John Moore displayed an impressive "force of moral painting." Elizabeth Hamilton is credited with originating the "lively and just pictures of Scottish humble life" which were so popular in the 'thirties. Sir Walter Scott, inevitably, earned Chambers's highest marks for pictorial fidelity.
Chambers declared that he was always struck by the "force, novelty, and fidelity of [Scott's] pictures." More successfully than any writer since Milton, Scott "touches those points which would first strike the eye of a beholder and thus invariably conveys a vivid and intelligent picture." George Moir likewise placed Scott in the "very highest position in literature" for his painterly devotion to realism. "His pictures combine in a singular way breadth and minuteness," Moir wrote for the Encyclopedia Britannica in 1839, "for while he painted the details with sharpness and firmness, no one better understood the art of arrangement in masses."

The pictorial analogy served Moir, Chambers, and Cunningham as a means of affirming the representational quality of the novel. Their incessantly repeated touchstones—fidelity, truth, naturalness, justness—all emphasize this quality. In striking contrast, they mentioned the artistic technique of the novel only in passing. Cunningham, for one, clearly enjoyed chiaroscuro, but verisimilitude remained paramount. The constant emphasis on verisimilitude betrayed a key limitation of contemporary criticism: the absence of any profound regard for the nonmimetic qualities of a novel, for language, structure, unity. Indeed, contemporary critics evaluated a novel precisely as they did a biography, book of travels, history, or dissertation on political economy. For them and for their readers, the novel was in effect a document,
receiving the same treatment as would any nonfictional commentary on current or past life.

Edward Lytton Bulwer, perhaps the finest practical critic of the 1830's, recognized the documentary status of fiction almost as soon as it emerged. In 1830 he wrote that "Readers now look into fiction for facts; as Voltaire, in his witty philosophy, looked among facts for fiction." With typical acuity Lister also recognized the novel's imposed status as a commentary on things as they are:

we have even received from works of fiction what it would once have been thought preposterous to expect - information. From some, we have gathered more respecting the manners of different tribes than books of travels have ever told us; and have obtained a clearer insight into the eventful interior of a soldier or a sailor's life, and the real nature of war and its concomitants, than from all the gazettes that were ever published, and many biographies to boot.

He is one with Bulwer's reader who searches in fiction for fact. For Lister, the status of the novel as commentary, as pure representation, greatly enhanced it; indeed, its capacity to impress information on the reader made it superior to the travels, gazettes, and biographies which aimed explicitly to inform. A writer in the "Metropolitan" elaborated on the new status of the novel:

Fiction and fact are so intimately blended in the occurrences in life,
assume each so completely the garb of the other, that we cannot point out a fiction that derives not its parentage from fact; scarcely a fact, beyond the multiplication and pence tables, that is not mixed up with, or wearing the disguise of, fiction. How many a fiction has been ruled to be fact, under names that are genuine in our courts of law; how many a fact has been regarded as fiction in that which has been looked upon as the invention of the novelist, in which every thing is true excepting the proper names! There is more moral, aye, and actual truth, in a well-written tale, than in ninety-nine cases and reports at nisi prius.

Fact and fiction blended as to become virtually indistinguishable. Among critics and readers, appreciation and even recognition of the nonmimetic qualities of the novel had reached ebb tide.

At the flood tide of realism, many reviewed novels as if they were simply documents which possessed the appreciated if superogatory attraction of amusement. The old formula of dulce et utile appeared to justify concerted neglect of everything but factuality, fidelity. Such neglect was particularly noticeable in reviews of works concerned with contemporary rather than historical subjects. Reviewers scarcely distinguished between a novel and a treatise on a contemporary subject; both received the same literal treatment. T. H. Lister helped very considerably to pioneer this relentlessly literal treatment of the novel. Noteworthy is his 1833 review of Lady Morgan's Dramatic Scenes from Real Life. In an
unpublished letter to Macvey Napier, editor of the Edinburgh Review, Lister disparaged Morgan's novel as anything but a useful document: "The fabric is but slight - & as a literary performance not much deserving of notice - But it is connected with - & rather clearly illustrates the condition of Ireland." He reiterated the same point in the review itself, openly admitting that he noticed the Dramatic Scenes solely "because one of its pieces exhibits an able and animated sketch of the state of Ireland." Lister summarized the piece, excerpted a few of the more salient passages, and then entered into a lengthy disquisition on the state of Ireland. Morgan's novel cogently presented the Irish problem and Lister used this evidence as the starting point for his political analysis. For him and the many Edinburgh readers, the novel served ably as a document of contemporary reality.

In the same year John Barrow similarly reviewed W. J. Neale's The Port Admiral for the rival Quarterly. Barrow treated The Port Admiral as if it were a Radical attack on the Admiralty, akin to other Radical attacks on municipal corporations, Church establishments, corn laws, and so on. Barrow amniadverted that Neale's aim was "but a too common one with the feeders of the novel press in the present day - namely, to degrade men in eminent situations, and to hold up all in office or command as plunderers of the public purse, and cold, selfish tyrants, destitute of any regard for those placed
under their authority or influence." In refutation, he stoutly defended the practice of impressment through six full pages. Perronet Thompson and Arthur Symonds of the Westminster received John Banim's Canvassing as precisely such a Radical attack. Reviewing it with the Speech of Lord John Russell At Honiton, they described the former as revealing the electoral corruption that the latter attempted to explain away. "Attend to Mr. Banim's description of the thing called an Election, the egg from which are to spring our boasted liberties," the two urged. On the basis of Banim's description, they launched into a strident defence of the secret ballot as the best method of preserving the voting people from aristocratic retribution. Thompson and Symonds used Canvassing as a document to support their position in a continuing controversy. The fact and not the fiction of it alone mattered.

Reviewers carried their preoccupation with the fact in fiction to extreme lengths, even construing the fashionable novels as documents. Although Fraser's and the Athenaeum had mercilessly stripped the allure bestowed by puffery from fashionable novels, reviewers in the early 1830's nevertheless considered them to be factual exposures of aristocratic frivolity, decadence, and rapacity. This consideration of them was very significant in the early years of the decade, when the struggle for Parliamentary reform was intense. In the context of that momentous struggle, these novels, considered as true
exposures, supplied Radical Reformers with powerful ammunition for their cause. James Mill and other leading proponents of Radical Reform had long argued that the franchise should be extended, and seats redistributed, if only to liberate Parliament from the grasp of a depraved aristocracy. In the fashionable novels Radical Reformers found timely additional evidence to support this cherished argument.

Reviewers judged and sentenced these hapless novels according to the politics of their journals. Of course Radical and Liberal journals exulted over the testimony of the fashionable novels and used it to damn the ruling class. In 1829 the Westminster warned that these novels were "supplying matter that more than one literary Mephistopheles is watching with a view to a future harvest of satire and derision, and that, too, concocted in a spirit, which may do an English nobility quite as little service, as similar follies and similar satires did a French noblesse not quite forty years ago." Later it gleefully commented on the effects of the novels, assuming that most of them were written by aristocrats:

They hardly seemed to be aware, that while indulging their preposterous appetite for fame, they were exposing their vices to the public gaze - vices that required only to be stripped of the aristocratic purple, to become objects of public scorn or execration. If they now cut a sorry figure, they do it on their own showing. The fault is not the public's. It saw their parliamentary harangues; it noted their occasional displays in the
courts of justice. But it required something to complete the picture; and they have added that something. They have stripped the veil from their social and domestic privacies; and the result has been to do more than their worst enemy could have accomplished, without the charitable co-operation of themselves.

The personal vices exposed in them succeeded in discrediting a class whose public acts and speeches paved the way. To the public, this fiction was more telling than fact.

Proudly dedicated to the teachings of Bentham, "our great master in political and moral science," Tait's Edinburgh Magazine predictably followed the Westminster in using the silver-fork school for subversive purposes. In a series of scathing articles on the school, and on Mrs. Gore in particular, the Radical Reformer, John Wade, pressed home the point that it had awakened the public "not only to the glaring weakness of the aristocratic school, but to the glaring defects and absurdities of that social system which draws such a line of demarcation betwixt the higher and the lower classes." In one article in the series Wade marvelled that fashionable novelists, supposedly aristocrats themselves, were so oblivious to the consequences of their works:

Woe to such narrow views of the use and purposes of fiction! Woe to the shortsightedness that cannot detect the importance of the self-portraits--the autobiographical libels, which the higher classes of Great Britain have been active, during the last ten years, in bestowing
upon themselves and their fraternity; that wants nous to discern how many copies of the Examiner, the Westminster, and Cobbett's Register to boot, would be wanting to make up the amount of scorn contained in one bitter page of these satires upon the nobility of the realm; that wants energy to applaud the infatuation with which the Priests of Baal have introduced us to the idols of the sanctuary, and made us acquainted with the events and issues of their gross impostures.52

Again, fiction seemed more effective than even the foremost Radical journals in exposing the aristocracy. The uses and purposes of fiction clearly superceded, in the reviewer's hands, those intended by the author.

Bulwer reiterated Wade's message during his editorship of the New Monthly. Of Mrs. Gore's characters he remarked: "The air of frivolity has blighted their stature; their colours are pale and languid--they have no generous ambition--the glory and vision have left them--they are little people! They are fine people!"53

From Lord Mulgrave's The Contrast he educed a fitting moral: "As much talent is frittered away amongst an indolent nobility as is crushed amongst an overlaboured peasantry. The world loses incalculably by both extremes."54 Bulwer summed up the effect of reviews of the kid glove school in his major expository work of the decade, England and the English:

Few writers ever produced so great an effect on the political spirit of their generation as some of these novelists, who without any other merit, unconsciously exposed the falsehood, the hypocrisy, the
arrogant and vulgar insolence of patrician life. Read by all classes, in every town, in every village, these works, as I have before stated, could not but engender a mingled indignation and disgust at the parade of frivolity, the ridiculous disdain of truth, nature and mankind, the self-consequence and absurdity, which, falsely or truly, these novels exhibited as a picture of aristocratic society. The Utilitarians railed against them, and they were effecting with unspeakable rapidity the very purposes the Utilitarians desired.55

Accepted as straightforward documents, these novels seemingly abetted the Radical and Utilitarian cause. Bulwer, like his compeers in the Westminster and Tait's, implied that once the poor many knew of the decadence of the rich few, as shown in these novels, they would act unstoppably to end it.

Conservative reviews reluctantly echoed Bulwer and the others in assessing the effect of the fashionable novels. Their echoes were rather apprehensive than corroborative. They bitterly regretted the exposures and deeply feared the consequences that their adversaries so eagerly anticipated. None of them dissented from the use of the novels as documents; the concept of the novel as representation was too deeply engrained for them to challenge that premise. One Conservative journal did differ from the others on the fribble school. In the major review of the school in Fraser's, Maginn and Heraud tartly dismissed it on moral grounds. "All principles in fashionable life, wherever a wholesome philosophy
might be established," they argued, "are either choked up from want of moisture, or have run to riot, or have become roots of deadly power, from their deadly source of existence." The school failed the basic moral test of realism; it selected for depiction an immoral reality, not the wholesome mean of life. For this reason, not for any political one, they candidly desired the extermination of the whole school.

In contrast to this succinct moral judgement, John Wilson discoursed at length on the school, in fear and trembling, in Blackwood's. He could scarcely believe that the fashionable novels were "criticized in innumerable journals, more especially in America, as furnishing data of undoubted authenticity whereon to form a grave estimate of the moral and social condition of our upper classes." He scorned them vehemently as meretricious echoes of the "false and fiendish libels of our Utilitarian doctrinaires," but grudgingly conceded nevertheless that:

perhaps the very darkest of them have failed in rendering complete justice to the moral and political profligacy of one circle of the British aristocracy. But the mischief and the misery is, that principles, feelings, and manners, the prevalence of which in that particular circle could never be denied, have been passed on the easy credence of ignorant foreigners and multitudes equally unobservant and unreflective at home, as common to the upper classes in this country as a body—whence, in great measure... that widespread prejudice against the
aristocracy, that real and rooted hostility to the established distinction of ranks among us.\textsuperscript{58}

Their vivid descriptions of the small immoral and profligate circle of fashionables directly produced the growing movement to supplant aristocracy with democracy.

The redoubtable editor of the Quarterly, John Gibson Lockhart, also feared the consequences of the fashionable novels: "They will be quoted as furnishing evidence that we deserved our fate – that an aristocracy so lost in voluptuousness, and middle ranks so debased by envy and small ambitions, called aloud for the besom of revolution."\textsuperscript{59} Against that dark prospect, he used the defence established by Wilson. The great majority of the aristocracy led exemplary lives; those of its members pictured in the novels belonged to a strictly circumscribed, unrepresentative "circle revolving around Almack's." In the same journal Sir Henry Taylor pronounced:

in no instance that we know of, has a book of this kind been published which was calculated, upon the whole, to convey a favourable impression of the classes of society described in it. The effect upon the public mind is, we are disposed to think, less slight and transitory than might, at first sight, be expected: and we are not without a suspicion that these fugacious volumes have permanently lowered the aristocracy in the estimation of the middle classes.\textsuperscript{60}

Like Lockhart and Wilson, he unwillingly conceded the verity of the novels with respect to a small circle,
and strongly deplored the etiolation of authority which would result from them.

At stake in these highly political reviews of the silver fork novels is the status of fiction in the first Victorian decade. These novels clearly did not deserve in the least the prominence that they enjoyed during the Reform controversy; truly, virtually all were as flimsy and fugacious as Taylor said. Moreover, there is no firm evidence, beyond the claims of the reviews, either that the novelists intended to overthrow the aristocracy or that their novels had such an effect. Indeed, one Radical reviewer in the Spectator, while gloating over the Quarterly's discomfiture, contended that the "obtuseness of moral feeling and disregard of moral of duties in the strictly private lives of the Aristocracy, had comparatively little to do with the recent overthrow of their unconstitutional influence." He instanced the Duke of Newcastle who, as an ardent Ultra Conservative, bitterly opposed Reform, but led an exemplary moral life. The majority of reviewers resembled Lady Marney, who, on learning of the Reform Bill, announced that a "revolution was inevitable, that all property would be instantly confiscated, the poor deluded king led to the block or sent over to Hanover at the best, and the whole of the nobility and principal gentry, and everyone who possessed anything, guillotined without remorse" (S2).

The silver fork novels became so notorious, instead of fading into the pages of literary history,
primarily because critics were obsessed with the concept of the novel as representation. They attended exclusively to the documentary, to the most insistently topical aspects of the fribbles, without regard to anything else. The misdemeanors, attitudes, and fashions of lords and ladies, excerpted at length in reviews, were paramount. That these aristocratic characters were absolutely one-dimensional, flat, mattered not at all. To be sure, critics resolutely ignored, by and large, the roundness of character, faithful attention to simple human nature, coherence of imagery, and structural unity. Had they honored these fundamental elements of fiction, they would have left the fribbles to the Mrs. Wititterlys and their well deserved inconsequence. After the crisis of 1832 critics did not cease to perceive the novel as a document. Rather, their inflexible demand for realism continued to entail on the novel a nonfictional status. In response to this unceasing demand, novelists began deliberately to write works that were more than fiction, that infringed on reality. The preoccupation of reviewers became that of novelists, for better or for worse.

John Galt's two Canadian novels of the early 1830's directly responded to this new demand. By design, they were much more than simple tales; they explicitly sought to infringe on reality by serving as guidebooks on Canadian colonization, while striving to amuse at the same time. Galt meticulously stressed his intentions in the novels and elsewhere; he did not wish his contemporaries to
neglect the nonfictional quality of his works, the steady responsiveness to reviewers' expectations. He asserted in the preface to *Laurie Todd* that his "description, which may be considered authentic, of the rise and progress of a successful American settlement, cannot but be useful to the emigrant who is driven to seek a home in the unknown wilderness of the woods." He reiterated in his *Literary Life* that no one could contradict his account of the settlement of Judiville: "though here and there a slip of jocularity may be detected, it was written with a sincere desire to hold up the mirror to real transactions." Likewise, he emphasized the preface to *Bogle Corbet* that it contains "instruction that may help to lighten the anxieties of those whom taste or fortune prompts to quit their native land, and to seek in the wilderness new objects of industry, enterprise, and care."

To justify the half-factual, half-fictional quality of the Canadian novels, Galt invoked the old formula of dulce et utile. He maintained that *Lawrie Todd*, "though written to amuse, was not altogether undertaken without a higher object." On *Bogle Corbet* he elaborated: "I have, in all my works, kept the instructive principle in view; probably by doing so, and restraining the scope of invention entirely to probabilities, I may have failed to give as much entertainment as works, more strictly amusing with the same incidents, might have furnished, but I always did my best, and I only desire it may be
remembered by my readers that, I had an object in view beyond what was apparent."[^14] Galt intentionally crafted these novels to be useful as guidebooks.[^67] Critics did not need to impose a documentary status on them: they furnished it themselves.

Both Lawrie Todd and Bogle Corbet, predictably, received enthusiastic reviews. Henry Southern in the Westminster commended the former for having a more practical intention than mere amusement. Galt "does not tell us that Lawrie Todd is to be considered the settler's Vade mecum or American Emigrant's guide; but we have no doubt that the fiction has been intended to be subservient to such a purpose."[^68] John Wilson also believed that it would have "very great success in the market, because of the valuable practical suggestions to persons emigrating to America."[^69] Wilson was correct. It went into two printings as a triple-decker, then was reissued as a single volume in Bentley's "Standard Novels" series. Correspondingly, of Bogle Corbet the venerable Gentleman's Magazine observed: "It steps out of the usual track of my Lord A-- and my Lady B--, to furnish useful knowledge about gentlemen, mercantile people, and emigration. . . . For settlers themselves in Canada it supplies the most useful suggestions."[^70] The New Monthly agreed that it offers "useful suggestions respecting the Colonial Administration for which we refer the reader to the book itself, where he will find profit mixed with a very large share of amusement."[^71] Like Galt himself, the
reviewers cited the old formula of *dulce et utile* in praising these novels. Their praise of them as amusing guidebooks plainly illustrates contemporary inattention to the nonrepresentational elements of fiction. For reviewer and writer, the novel occupied a middle status, half fiction, half reality, which rendered inconsequential other concerns. Nevertheless, neither reviewer nor writer fully recognized the radicalness of their emerging concept of the novel. They generally did not yet perceive how they had superceded older concepts which they still invoked, as if by rote. But this perception was soon to come.

From the early 1830's, critics retained their concept of the novel's documentary status, but did not long regard Galt's Canadian novels as its perfect embodiment. If the novel could encompass the ungainly subject of Canadian colonization, they reasoned, then it could as easily encompass more pressing contemporary subjects. Furthermore, if it could document contemporary subjects, then it could also advance political or ideological views of them, and exhort the reader to embrace them. Critics extended the scope of the novel, its topicality and its purposes. This extension of the scope and purpose of the novel appeared clearly in major reviews of the first half of the decade. In an important review of military and naval novels, Lister observed: "It has been discovered that the novel is a flexible and comprehensive form of composition, applicable to many purposes and capable
of combining much information with amusement."\textsuperscript{72} The novel informs while it amuses; here is the old formula of \textit{dulce et utile} as it had been construed for Lawrie Todd and Bogle Corbet. Lister advanced the nascent concept of the novel as half fact, half fiction while clinging to the old, imprecise terminology. Lister went on to stress both the scope and purposiveness of the novel: "There is scarcely any subject not either repulsive or of a very abstruse nature, which of necessity must be excluded from it."\textsuperscript{73} Equally, one can make a "novel the vehicle for philosophical or political discussion; employing the light fictitious garb to buoy up in the stream of public favour the heavy matter which would sink without it."\textsuperscript{74} Lister took the remarkable first step of acknowledging that the novel could document current issues and advance partisan views on them, exhorting the reader's acceptance.\textsuperscript{75}

In 1833 Harriet Martineau transformed acknowledgment into demand. Rejecting the historical romances of Scott and his eipigoni as irrelevant in the age of reform, Martineau claimed that the general public insisted on purposive and topical fiction: "The bulk of the reading public, whether or not on the scent of utility, cannot be interested without a larger share of philosophy, or a graver purpose in fiction, than formerly."\textsuperscript{76} She wondered why novelists did not address the most challenging and interesting topics of all, the political and social issues of the present:
We have had enough of ambitious intrigues; why not now take the magnificent subject, the birth of political principle, whose advent has been heralded so long? What can afford finer moral scenery than the transition state in which society now is? Where are nobler heroes to be found than those who sustain society in the struggle; and what catastrophe so grand as the downfall of bad institutions, and the issue of a process of renovation?"

She demanded that novelists include and reflect on issues relevant to the age of transition. Her shift from Lister's acknowledgment to this demand produced a crucial reorientation in the criticism of the novel. She and other critics regarded the novel as more than half fact, as a participation in reality. It should participate in things as they are by discussing contemporary issues, expounding definite views on them, and seeking the reader's agreement. Critics like Martineau considered the novel rather as a pamphlet than a document. It was reoriented from evidence to participation. Captain Marryat heartily endorsed this orientation in the criticism of the novel:

For, be it observed, whether a man write a political pamphlet or a novel, he has still the same opportunity of expressing his sentiments, of flattering the public by espousing their opinions; and as a writer of fiction, perhaps, his opinions carry greater weight than as a pamphleteer. In the first instance, you are prepared to expect a political partisan; in the latter; you read for amusement, and unconsciously receive the bias. For one who reads a political pamphlet (by-the-by, they are generally only read by those who are of the same way of
thinking as the author) there are hundreds who read through a work of fiction, so that the opinions of the latter are much more widely disseminated.78

Even more strongly than Martineau, he stressed the ability of the novel to disseminate political views. In this the novel easily surpassed the pamphlet in effectiveness by appealing to a wider audience. Others seized on the new orientation in order to urge writers to address specific issues and to promote their pet ideas and remedies. Writing a month before Marryat, G. R. Wythen Baxter wondered that no writer had "touched upon that most fertile of all subjects, either for pathetic lay, high-wrought description, or indignant denunciation--the New Poor Law."79 He expatiated at length on the potential effectiveness of fiction in supporting the Anti-Poor Law Movement:

how much sympathy for the oppressed might be awakened--how much indignation against the poors' oppressors might be excited--how much to point a moral and inculcate a useful, a warning lesson to the young and thoughtless of the lower ranks might be elicited! And then, what laurels might be obtained in a field, whose wide and extensive range has hitherto been uncultivated by the implements of prose or verse! And lastly, and better still, how much benevolence by the performance, might be achieved for humanity - how much to shame the official, and prevent the occurrence of such horrors as are hourly proceeding from such infamous edicts as the Bastardy,
Baxter treated the novel as another real-life element in the Movement; it would operate alongside pamphlets, broadsides, letters, speeches, and even demonstrations. For him the novel was a particularly vigorous participation in reality. From the viewpoint of Baxter and other critics the novel became much more than representation, more than even half fact, half fiction; the mirror vanished and life came to the fore.

Novelists promptly responded to this new orientation in criticism. They thoroughly exploited the novel's protean adaptability to diverse issues in order to promote political or ideological views. They skilfully employed it as a polemical instrument. Long before 1837, Captain Marryat employed his novels to forward his Liberal principles, as he did the Metropolitan Magazine while editor. Of course Liberal and Radical reviewers warmly greeted these principles as embodied in his naval novels. The Westminster praised Newton Foster highly for its effective attack on impressment:

A reformer of abuses now-a-days does not come into the field with the pen of controversy alone. He shows the abuse alive; he sets it before us in action; he dramatizes it; he does not merely convince our understandings, he arrests our sympathies and interests the passions. In this manner Captain Marryat, after the plan of Smollett, has done more against the practice of impressment, the white slave trade, by his description of the cruelty and injustice practiced
upon Newton Foster, than if he had written a bulky pamphlet on the subject.87

This reviewer anticipated Marryat's own statement on the novel that is cited above. Both reviewer and novelist stressed the novel's unrivalled ability to expose an abuse and to agitate for its reform. Fiction excelled in the work of the pamphlet; both forms of prose had the same nonfictional status.

George Robert Gleig also embraced the new orientation in his novel, The Chronicles of Waltham. He forthrightly avowed in the "Advertisement" that his purpose was to express his views on agrarian distress: the Chronicles "are to be regarded as nothing more than a vehicle, by means of which I have judged it expedient to describe, partly, scenes that have to a certain extent passed under my own observation; partly, my own opinions with reference to points on which all men will, and do, form judgments for themselves."82 Here is the new orientation with a vengeance: Gleig intended to recount actual events and to inform them with his Tory radical principles. Fiction was simply a vehicle for the communication of nonfictional events and principles, in the hope of persuading the reader to adopt them. In contrast, Galt desired merely to furnish the prospective colonist with accurate information.

Certainly reviewers recognized immediately the nature of Gleig's Chronicles. Charles Buller, M.P., in the London Review labelled it a "Political Novel,"
"illustrating the most approved Tory theories of our social system."\(^8\)\(^3\) While testily disagreeing with Gleig's ideology, he complained that his depiction of rural distress added nothing to what was known: "All these truths we have had before, in reviews and pamphlets, in essays and tales, in newspapers and in parliamentary reports, and finally, in the oral outpourings of legislative wisdom. No one now disputes them."\(^8\)\(^4\) Another noticed in the *Westminster Review* the commonness of Gleig's use of the novel, while condemning peremptorily his opinions: "In the present age, every man, woman, and child, who writes a novel or a notebook, a tale or a tome, spouts what is called philosophy by the yard."\(^8\)\(^5\) John Walter's *Times* approved of both Gleig's opinions and his means of expressing them: "Viewed merely as a vehicle for conveying salutary truths, which are not much heeded in a didactic form, this work is entitled to commendation."\(^8\)\(^6\)

A final review deserves mention. Allan Cunningham in the *Athenaeum* expressed his disapproval of a commentary on the state of the country in a novel, published by Richard Bentley, no less. Cunningham had telegraphed his disapproval of purposive and topical fiction before, in his "Biographical and Critical History." At the end of the history he declared: "I quit these regions with the less reluctance, since even among the fair scenes of fancy and fiction, the Demon of Utility has set up his spinning-jennies, his steam engines, and established
the drab-coloured manufacture."87 Reviewing Gleig's Waltham, he discountenanced, as the Athenaeum would continue to do for the next twenty years, the widely accepted use of the novel as a pamphlet, and speculated about its future: "If matters go on at this rate, we may take up a book bearing the seductive and picturesque title of 'Clarence', or 'Montalba', and find in it an instructive history of Spinning-Jennies and Billy-rollers!"88 This speculation proved to be uncannily accurate; the logical consequence of the novel's response to the new orientation was the factory novels of 1839, which bore such titles as Michael Armstrong, Simon Smike, and Helen Fleetwood.

Shortly before the first numbers of the factory novels appeared, Thomas Dolby published his novel of agrarian distress, Floreston: or, The New Lord of the Manor. Like Gleig, Dolby openly confessed that his novel aimed to expose such distress and to propose a remedy, urging its adoption everywhere. He contended as well that all novels in the future would resemble his in concerted purposiveness, because readers would no longer tolerate any other fiction. His words are very reminiscent of Martineau's:

All novelists and dramatists, therefore, are hereby forewarned and earnestly exhorted, to lose no time in beginning to widen the groundwork of their plots! For if Sympathy has made but little or no progress during these enquiries, Utility has begun to look
narrowly into the reason of things; and there are readers now-a-days that do not scruple to ask why we should wade through three volumes, post octavo, before we can be sure whether a man will turn out to be a prince or a bandit? Or what is the use of following an ill-natured man, with a Norman name, over the same extent of ground, upon the strength of the author's assurance that his teeth are perfectly regular, and that there is a kind of curl, up or down, or one way or other, in one or both of his lips . . . ?

The future of the novel lay in close examination of current issues and their solutions. As one would expect, critics noticed his earnest book sympathetically. The Spectator mentioned his purpose favorably:

Although the new Poor-law, the Corn law, the Game-laws, the Great Unpaid, the Clergy, and the Aristocracy in the characters of lords of the soil, are in turn made the subject of satire, or connected with the story in Floreston, the real purpose of the author is to denounce the wrongs of the poor, to excite a sympathy in their favour, and to propound what he thinks the best mode of carrying his philanthropy into effect.

To expose, to excite, and to propound was truly the technique of Floreston, which the factory novels also adopted fully. Other critics hailed Floreston as one of those works "which, while they dare to speak out honestly and zealously, are at the same time full of the milk of human kindness, and point out that better order of things by which all classes may become happier than they are at present." Dolby constructed his
novel in accordance with the critical status of the novel as pamphlet, as a participation in reality, and critics received it favorably in return. Demand produced novels which elicited predictable encomia.

Nevertheless, critics did detect one significant weakness in Floreston: its isolation. It exposed, exhorted, and propounded in isolation from any established ideological or political position on rural distress. The New Monthly and the Spectator both described Dolby as an "amiable and benevolent theorist" whose plans would never prevail. They lacked the indispensable support of an established group, which alone could generate the Parliamentary and extra-Parliamentary support needed to secure their implementation. In contrast, Gleig's Chronicles fell entirely within the pale of Tory radicalism, and so benefited from its support.

Critics persistently commended Charles Dickens from Oliver Twist on for accepting the new status of the novel. While amusing better than any other writer of the time, Dickens vividly portrayed actual injustices and aroused in his readers an indignation that militated for reform. In portraying workhouse and cheap school he not only revealed glaring abuses, but also strenuously urged their reform, as his contemporaries saw at once. In 1837 Charles Buller observed the "definite purpose" of Oliver Twist: "it seems to be his object to detail the miseries of the unprotected poor, in order to excite a deep sympathy with their lot. The purpose is most
Creditable to the author." He appears to propose to himself in all his works some definite abuse to be assailed," Richard Ford noted later. Ford even claimed that Dickens's exposure of Dotheboys Hall had effected some genuine reform: "we rejoice to hear that the exposure has already put down many infant bastilles."

T.H. Lister's review of Dickens's early novels deserves particular attention because he, as much as anyone, helped to establish the new orientation in criticism which led to purposive novels. At first Lister assumed the older critical stance, singling out Dickens as a faithful realist, as the "truest and most spirited delineator of English life," but he soon turned to the purpose of his novels:

The tendency of his writings is to make us practically benevolent—to excite our sympathy in behalf of the aggrieved and suffering in all classes; and especially in those who are most removed from observation. He especially directs our attention to the helpless victims of untoward circumstances, or a vicious system—to the imprisoned debtor—the orphan pauper—the parish apprentice—the juvenile criminal—and to the tyrant, which, under the combination of parental neglect, with the mercenary brutality of a pedagogue, may be exercised with impunity in schools. His humanity is plain, practical, and manly.

Dickens excelled by exposing significant social ills and by exciting the reader to act against them. Dickens was a practical reformer, using his novels to intervene in life, to promote specific actions. He provided exactly
what Lister demanded eight years before: novels that documented current issues and proposed remedies for them. Likewise, the Literary Gazette, in the last week of the decade, upheld the scope and purpose of Dickens's fiction as exemplary:

There is but one way to produce an effect on the public in works of this kind: it is by devoting the most minute examination to the system which is to be exposed to objection and obloquy, in order to amend it; and, as another requisite, possessing the talents to exhibit its wrongs and errors in the most powerful light. Dickens's Parish Workhouse and Yorkshire School are splendid examples of this class; their details came home to the understanding and the heart, because they were founded on actual observation--facts, truths, pointed with all the force of the most acute perception of individualities and generalities, and realized by traits of such accurate, and touches of such exquisite feeling, that none ever doubted the existence and the sufferings of a persecuted Oliver Twist or a miserable Smike.

Thus, critics signalized those aspects of Dickens's works which accorded with their new orientation. For them his novels held the ideal, participatory status of fiction. They were more than half reality.

It is paradoxical that the works of Dickens which exemplified the ideal of contemporary criticism also betrayed its fundamental weakness. While focusing on the reformatory purpose of Dickens's novels, all of the reviewers quoted above also remarked on their humor. "The qualities
for which everyone reads and admires him are his humour and wit," Buller testified. "We are amused by the comicality," Ford agreed. Lister also noted his "keen sense of the ludicrous-exuberant humour." They quite regarded the humor as secondary to the purpose; the workhouse and the cheap school were paramount for them, not Sam Weller or Mrs. Nickleby, although they helped to pass the time. The old maxim of dulce et utile still lingered in their minds, although they now construed utile as to participate, not to inform, as they had done earlier in the decade. Reviewers did not perceive that the success of Dickens's novels stemmed from his union of purpose with all else that fiction affords. Because social purpose was fully integrated with his novels, they struck the early Victorian reader with unusual force. The great weakness of contemporary criticism was that it amalgamated almost cursorily everything but purpose into "humor and wit," which seemed rather helpful to the purpose that was for them the very center and justification of the novel. Critics could not accept that the purpose of fiction must be integrally merged with the "secondary" aspects if it were to prevail.

This crucial weakness of early Victorian criticism became most evident when a novel served admirably as a pamphlet but failed altogether to amuse. A dolefully dull but strongly purposive and topical novel would have threatened contemporary criticism by forcing some consideration of character, style, imagery, and structure.
Critics would have confronted the fact that fiction does not live by purpose alone. This confrontation almost developed around Gleig's *Chronicles of Waltham*. One critic found the work "amusing" and another maintained that Gleig had written well and pleasantly, but several were dissatisfied. Their complaints were blunt: "the style is as abominable as the matter, and the fiction as faulty as the reasoning"; it is "constructed with little artist-like skill." Whereas the *Times* endorsed Gleig's ideology without hesitation, it reluctantly judged the *Chronicles* "an indifferent production."

To be sure, it added the just qualification: "It belongs to a class of productions the growth, in a great measure, of very recent times, respecting which the rules of criticism are not yet settled." Had the *Chronicles* failed disastrously, critics would have been compelled to acknowledge that their new orientation succeeded best with such excellent, unified novels as Dickens's. Participation in reality succeeded with the reader and remained a viable critical precept only when fused with all other elements of the novel. This acknowledgement did not force itself on critics until long after their demands had engendered the topical novels of the 1830's and 1840's.

Despite Dickens's immensely popular combination of humor and purpose, one critic in *Fraser's* faulted him for not going further. Although acknowledging that the "very choice of his later subjects proves his desire to
do good," this lady-critic regretted that he "should turn his vast opportunities to so slender an account."

His fault was one of omission. He should not have neglected perhaps the greatest abuse of the time, which could have been easily remedied by Parliament, namely, the "working little boys and girls to death in the factories." He should have written a factory novel. Dickens did consider striking a blow for Lord Ashley inNickelby, but did not venture into the factories until 1854 inHard Times. This critic's insistence that Dickens participate even more vigorously and in a leading controversy lucidly indicates the constant pressure exerted on novelists. Reviewers demanded participation in the last years of the decade even more ardently than they had demanded information in its early years. The novelist had to respond to this pressure or risk poor reviews and few readers. In so intense a climate the novelist was inclined to produce works that were wholly topical and purposive. He could focus almost exclusively on a current issue and expect critical approbation. The urgent temptation was to slight the tradition and craft of the novel in favor of a present issue or cause. Dickens was extremely rare in his ability to uphold tradition and craft while addressing the problems of the time.

Appearing immediately afterNicholas Nickleby, the factory novels of 1839 accorded completely with the stringent new demands of contemporary criticism. The
lady-critic in Fraser's required novels about factory labor that were even more participatory than Dickens's, and such were forthcoming. The works that emerged in response to the extreme pressure that she and others exerted were exemplary as pamphlets but suspect in matter of character, structure, imagery, and language. These failings are partly the subject of chapter four. However obvious to the latter-day critic, they went nearly unnoticed in 1839. Indeed, those who reviewed the factory novels on their appearance in 1839 earnestly perpetuated the new orientation initiated by Lister and Martineau after the passage of the Reform Bill. This critical orientation had precipitated the factory novels, and by it they were judged.

Representative is Sir Charles Morgan's review of Michael Armstrong, the longest review of a novel printed by the Athenaeum in 1839. In the early Victorian period the Athenaeum was a prominent advocate of political economy. Led by William Cooke Taylor, its contributors avidly popularized the tenets of political economy and upheld the virtues of the ascendant middle class. Severely did they deal with any writer who disputed their convictions. Firmly rooted in this milieu, Sir Charles Morgan critiqued Michael Armstrong as if it were an exposition of Tory radicalism, pamphlet rather than novel. Ignoring the fictive qualities of Mrs. Trollope's work, except for the odd ill-tempered sneer at her characterization, Sir Charles identified and assailed the Tory
radical principles embodied in it. He rejected peremptorily her moral condemnation of manufacturers' profits as greedy exploitation of operatives. It was absurd, he claimed, to pretend that "avarice and cruelty are more strikingly predictable of mill-owners than of any other class of employers." He attributed the evils of the manufacturing system rather to the uncontrollable exigencies of the "progress of commerce" than to the malice or neglect of masters. This attribution of factory evils to economic circumstances and economic laws that constrained masters as well as men allowed Morgan to undermine the Tory radical concept of economic necessity. He observed that masters lived in perpetual fear of strikes and machine-breaking by their misguided men; the masters, to be sure, were blameless since their self-interest demanded adequate remuneration of operatives. Besides, a millowner could "get more work from a healthy, contented operative, than from him who is half-starved and sulky."

Furthermore, the master was not responsible for the rate of wages. The wages fund doctrine of political economy assigned full responsibility for wages to the employed, who alone could control the key factor, population. "Need we, in the present day," Sir Charles asked, rhetorically, "insist on so elementary a fact, as that the value of labour in the market, and the variations of profits, and of wages, are governed by their own laws, and they have nothing to do with benevolence or
exaction." He went on to adduce the unwilling enrollment of children in factories as decisive proof of an "over-ruling cause, beyond the mere volitions of the manufacturer." Sir Charles then introduced two other economic forces which bore on the factory system. Foreign competition and the frequency of commercial crises severely limited the profits and capital of the manufacturer, leaving him with very little freedom of action. His only sure course, in common with the operative, was "to keep the mill going, and preserve the establishment till the cloud blows over." Foreign and domestic forces combined to prevent the master from raising profits as well as wages, lest he price his goods out of the market. In short, Michael Armstrong carelessly neglected the economic situation and its causes, as construed by political economy.

Throughout this lengthy review Morgan criticized Michael Armstrong as if it were a reasoned treatise expounding Tory radical beliefs. He duplicated the savagery and injustice of Macaulay's critique of Sadler's Law of Population, although he had no figures to fudge as Macaulay had. Doctrine matched doctrine, one for one, with Michael Armstrong assuming the status of a pamphlet. Unlike many of his contemporaries, however, Morgan pursued the new critical orientation to the utmost. For him, Michael Armstrong was as much provocation as pamphlet. In his view it sought to provoke the operatives of Northern England to armed insurrection, thereby entering
the physical realm of action and decision. Morgan exceeded his set economic brief to warn of the ominous potential consequences of so graphic a work as *Michael Armstrong*. Assuming that others would read the novel as literally as he had, Morgan grimly predicted that it would incite the working class to overthrow their supposed oppressors. Mrs. Trollope's factory novel was in truth a fearful revolutionary instrument. Sir Charles implored her to remember that the most probable immediate effect of her pennings and her pencillings will be the burning of factories, with sacred months, and the plunder of property of all kinds: while the remote effects of her ill-conceived political economy, would be the driving of manufacture out of the kingdom, and consequently the misery of four millions of people, with that of all the victims of their agonizing re-action - in a word, civil war, bankruptcy, and national destruction.313

His apprehensions about this topical novel were shared by a reviewer in the *Bolton Chronicle*, which was partly owned by the Liberal manufacturers, Edmund and Henry Ashworth. This anonymous critic denounced *Michael Armstrong* as a "mischievous attempt to excite the worst and bitterest feelings" against manufacturers.112 He examined the implications of this attempt; as the novel was a blatant incitement to sedition he thought that Trollope deserved "as richly to have eighteen months in Chester gaol as any that are now there for using violent language against the 'monster spinning
He detected no significant difference between Michael Armstrong and the speeches of Joseph Rayner Stephens. Trollope and Stephens were malefactors of the same kind and degree.

He and Morgan accepted without question the new participatory status of the novel, as seen in their straightforward criticism of Mrs. Trollope's economic principles; but they vehemently disapproved of her misuse of it to inflame the masses. Agitation for reform of specific evils and advocacy of Tory radical principles were valid uses of the novel; provocation, or what seemed to be provocation, was utterly reprehensible. The two reviewers set an absolute limit on the new status of the novel, a limit which they thought Trollope exceeded. Writing at the very end of the 1830's the two Liberal reviewers resemble the Conservatives of 1832 who feared the effects of the fashionable novels, thinking that they documented the misdemeanors of the aristocracy at a dangerous time. The two translated, in effect, the fears arising from the earlier orientation in criticism into the fears of the later one. Significantly, there is no more evidence for 1839-40 than for 1832 that the novel would or in fact did lend to any disorder.

Thus, critics demanded that the novel remain "true to life" throughout the decade. In 1839 as in 1830 the demand was inflexible. The meaning of the demand, however, changed drastically. In 1830 critics were generally content with a moral and normal reality. They approved especially of historical novels which faithfully evoked
the spirit of a past age, and simultaneously disparaged those which succumbed to the pitfalls of centering on a historical character. Painting seemed the most veracious of arts and therefore the novel should aspire to pictorial fidelity. The three historians of the novel were typical in distinguishing novelists by comparing them with painters. This wholly traditional climate of criticism perceptibly gave way to a newer climate. Critics began to treat the novel as if it were a document, deserving the same reception as nonfictional prose. To them the novel seemed half fiction, half reality. In turn such novelists as Galt began to write novels that demonstrably possessed this documentary status; his Canadian novels served as guidebooks for colonists. Also, William Mudford introduced the three volumes of his political novel of 1830, The Premier, with the confident assertion: "They cannot share the fate of works of fiction, by being condemned as improbable. Fiction they undoubtedly contain; but in so small a proportion, that they who may be able to recognize where the truth begins, will hardly detect where it ends." Critics still insisted, however, on a closer interconnection of fact and fiction. They sought in the novel a more immediate scope and purpose. It was to reveal contemporary problems and issues, to propose solutions, and then to admonish the reader to cooperate. It became rather a pamphlet than a simple document; it was to participate in life as did any tract for the times. Under relenting pressure to conform to
this new orientation, writers produced novels which were intimately concerned with agrarian distress, workhouses, and cheap schools. The status of the novel as participation created a potential conflict with its sorely neglected nonrepresentational elements. This conflict remained potential so long as wit and humor attracted the reader; a thoroughly dismal novel would have brought the conflict to the fore. Critical demands culminated in Fraser's call for a factory novel, which was answered in 1839. The three factory novels of that year were the telos of the maxim "true to life." The Liberal criticism of the factory novels confirmed their participatory status and, in condemning them as seditious provocations, ironically repeated the fears of Conservative reviewers in 1832.
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Chapter Three

The Novel and the Pressure to Conform:

The Case of The Member

Reflecting in 1834 on his main literary writings, John Galt identified his cardinal "rule of art" as "to bring impressions on the memory harmoniously together." Galt explained that he combined as naturally as possible only those things actually perceived by the senses and inscribed on the memory. He added that this rule did not confine him to unadorned recollection of the events and people of his own life, as some had wrongly alleged. On the contrary, he imaginatively transformed remembered experience according to the "universal harmony in nature" and his immediate artistic purpose. His works presented, therefore, common and enduring, not solitary and fugacious, human experience: "the mere mirroring in the mind is not their sole merit."

Galt indicated in the course of the Literary Life how his novels conformed to his cardinal rule. He consistently reported the actual models for his principal characters; he modelled Mr. Balwhidder on a minister of Saltcoats, Provost Pawkie on Bailie Fullerton of Irvine, Sir Andrew Wylie on a worthy strait-laced baronet, Lord Sandiford on the Earl of Blessington, and so on. He wryly illustrated the verisimilitude achieved by his rule in an anecdote about Blessington, who commended him
on Sandiford, unwittingly confessing that "in the same circumstances, he would have acted similarly." In every instance Galt carefully noted the often striking differences of class, temperament, and politics between his characters and their originals, stressing his transformation of them. Unlike Peacock and Disraeli, he did not write romans à clef. Galt adhered as strictly to rule in his novels of the 1830's as he did in those of the 1820's. The two Canadian novels of the early 1830's exemplify his adherence. He admitted in Fraser's Magazine as well as in the Literary Life that the original of Lawrie Todd was Grant Thorburn of New York; indeed, the "first part of that work contains nearly his own autobiography." Equally, in Bogle Corbet Galt relied on "familiar models for all the principal characters." He testified as well that the characters of both novels were rather common than individual, directly serving his didactic purpose. Galt believed, quite rightly, that rule and practice were identical in his novels.

But Galt could not adhere to his prescriptive rule in isolation from the literary pressures of the time. He was, like Scott, too needy and too canny. Although he was too early to be subject to the magnates of circulating libraries like Mudie, he did not escape the desires of either publishers or reviewers. Despite keen artistic misgivings, he acceded to William Blackwood's dictates during the composition of Sir Andrew Wylie and The Last of the Lairds. While complaining that "booksellers
step from their line when they give orders, like to an upholsterer for a piece of furniture," he acted promptly on Henry Colburn's suggestion that he write a second Canadian novel.9 Moreover, as seen in chapter two, Galt studiously arranged the two Canadian novels to comply with the waxing critical demand for works that were more than fiction, that infringed on reality. In the preface to Lawrie Todd he disclosed that he had based the settlement of Judiville on his wide experience in founding the settlements of Guelph and Galt in Upper Canada. Indeed, so accurate was his account of Judiville, it could not but be "useful to the emigrant who is driven to seek a home in the unknown wilderness of the woods."10 He stated as well that Bogle Corbet was a veritable guidebook, an "attempt to embody facts and observations made on actual occurrences."11 Ever pragmatic and impecunious, Galt remained flexible, adapting practice and rule to the exigencies of the moment.

Despite such literary pressures Galt managed to adhere to rule in his short "political" novel of 1832, The Member.12 For the first time since The Omen in 1826, he had a relatively free hand in a novel. He had by 1832 written himself out of debt and therefore out of servitude as "upholsterer" for Colburn; with James Fraser eager to print anything old or new, short or long from his pen, he had no need to return to Blackwood's closely guarded fold; and, with so much conventional prosing in
the Colburn and Bentley mold just behind him, he could freely resume his major mode of the 1820's, fictional autobiography. Steadily following his cardinal rule, Galt turned to an unexploited region of remembered experience, his long career in political affairs. His career began suddenly in 1819 when he undertook, successfully, to superintend a private enabling bill for the Union Canal Company. Thereafter he served for many years as a Parliamentary agent for various Scottish and Canadian concerns, becoming expert in the operations of government. As Ian Gordon, his ablest biographer, observes, he "had seen from the inside the workings of the old unreformed House, knew the system of balances of pressures and patronage, of private and public interest, on which the practical manipulation of government was based. He knew at first hand how the ordinary member of parliament had to think and act if he were to survive and succeed" (Mem viii-ix). Although Galt had briefly tapped this knowledge in earlier novels, most recently in Bogle Corbet, he drew heavily on it in creating Archibald Jobbry, his comic maneuverings in the House, and the three Frailtown elections. In addition, as Gordon shows conclusively, Galt modelled Frailtown, as he did Judiville, on an actual locale and constituency, in this case, Higham Ferrars, Northamptonshire (Mem xi-x).

In The Member Galt exploited as well a region of remembered experience other than the political, which
Illustration: Both before and after the Great Reform Act, canvassing was anything but genteel or pure. Punch, 1 (17 July 1841), 7, shows some of the postures Archibald Jobbry may have assumed in winning the two contested Frailtown elections.
latter-day critics have not noticed. He drew as heavily on his long commitment to Tory radicalism as he did on his political expertise. This commitment began in 1822, even as the ideology took shape, with his articles in *Blackwood's* on the retrenchment and agricultural distress which followed the Napoleonic wars; before writing, he discussed his thoughts on these topics with the brilliant Tory radical, David Robinson. Galt wrote occasionally on social and economic topics in *Blackwood's*, contributing to the important preface of 1826, and frequently in *Fraser's* upon its commencement in 1830. He brought this ideological experience into play in *The Member*. He dedicated a third of it, roughly, to a series of brief commentaries on highly controversial current issues: the currency, the Catholic emancipation, free trade, the corn laws, agrarian distress, the inaction of Parliament, and the call for reform of it. He endowed Archibald Jobbry with familiar doctrines of Tory radicalism and employed him as a spokesman for it in this series of meditations. Jobbry is no objective commentator on the contemporary scene, despite the assertion of several modern critics. Furthermore, Galt based Archibald Jobbry and his evolution from self-interest to selfless responsibility on Tory radicalism. Ideology is central to *The Member*, informing character as well as direct statement, as shown in detail below. Galt brought ideology into this novel by adhering to his entrenched practice of
using "impressions on the memory." There was no conflict between artistic rule and ideology; Galt united them to impart a concrete verismilitude to his fiction.

In The Member Galt heeded one literary pressure in addition to his self-imposed rule: the swelling critical demand for participation in reality. Along with a very few writers in the 1830's he detected the demand for participation almost as soon as it emerged, and sought to comply with it in his next work. He did so by endowing Archibald Jobbry with the role of spokesman for Tory radicalism. Jobbry's meditations on current issues satisfied the new critical demand for participation. Reviewers readily perceived Jobbry's ideological role and construed it as the desired participation. The Fraser's reviewer, for one, who shared Galt's Tory radicalism, examined Jobbry's opinions at length and heartily endorsed them: "The currency, the corn-laws, agricultural distress and disturbances, foreign affairs and domestic policy, and the theories of utilitarians and economists, are successively canvassed, and many a hint is thrown out which may well form germs for ample volumes."16 Likewise the reviewer for the independent New Monthly Magazine thought that "several useful hints are thrown out on some important subjects; --for instance-'private bills' and 'poor rates;' emigration and public works are recom-mended, en passant; and ... the remarks on economy and finance ... are generally ingenious, and in many cases,
just." The reviewers' notice and commendation of Jobbry's opinions show how well Galt complied with the new demand. Indeed, the Fraser's reviewer declared on the basis of The Member that the "well-wrought tale often wins its convincing way where the severe proposition would fail of beneficial effect." His declaration indicates the extent of Galt's achievement in The Member: he complied with a drastic and still-emerging critical precept and introduced ideology into the early Victorian novel while following effortlessly his own cardinal "rule of art."

I

The immediate inspiration as well as the ideological commitment of The Member came from Fraser's and Blackwood's in 1830-31. From the former came the idea of a fictional political memoir supposedly by a living personage, which coincided with Galt's major mode of the 1820's, fictional autobiography. In December 1830, William Maginn printed a short "rumination" written from the vantage of his old Blackwood's persona, Sir Morgan O'Doherty. He ruminated at length on his astonishment at the recent resignation of William Holmes, M.P. for Haslemere and Tory whip who had clung tenaciously to office through the tenure of four prime ministers. "You who had clung firm under Lord Liverpool, under George Canning, under Goosy Goderich, under King Arthur," he marveled, "you now, at
this time of your life to resign! The world is coming
to an end!"¹⁹ Maginn printed in March 1831 a short
satiric reminiscence under the pseudonym of Holmes; he
revolved on his long years of service to the four premiers,
derided several of their more conspicuous adversaries,
and ended with an inebriated wail of regret for lost
place and power. Typical is his denunciation of Whig
retrenchment:

Can the country go on--I leave
it to a reasonable man--unless there
is a real management of affairs?
Cut down! Cut down! Cut down! that's
the low cry of them who know nothing.
Don't pension my lady this, and Mrs.
that, and Mother together,' or 'oh!--
there's a lot too much money given to
privy counsellors and members of
Parliament, and other deserving charac-
ters.' What mean talk, what dirty
talk, what a filthy, shabby, beastly,
good-for-nothing, villainous, and
truly base set of characters they are
who say that---²⁰

The Member is also a fictional memoir ostensibly by a
former Tory M.P., whose rotten borough vanished, like
Holmes's, under "Schedule A" of the Reform Bill. Jobbry
shared Holmes's contempt for Whigs, "greedy as corbies
and chattering like pyets" (119), and his lamentation of
retrenchment, which left destitute the poor widows of
placeholders (81).

That Galt conceived The Member, appropriately pub-
lished by James Fraser, as a contribution to the series
of fictional memoirs, was made clear by his friend John
Gibson Lockhart. Lockhart himself wrote the humorous
preface to the novel, dedicating it, as Jobbry, to Holmes. "It was chiefly under your kind superintendence that I had the satisfaction of exerting myself as an independent member," Jobbry writes with obvious irony (1). Lockhart emphasized in the preface the novel's relation to the Fraser's series; he rehearsed the major themes of the series (especially the end of jobbery guaranteed by retrenchment) in a passage which gloomily prophesied the consequence of the Reform Bill:

---A church in tatters; a peerage humbled and degraded--no doubt, soon to be entirely got rid of; that poor, deluded man, the well-meaning William IV, probably packed off to Hanover; the three per cents down to two, at the very best of it; a graduated property tax sapping the vitals of order in all quarters; and, no question, parliamentary grants and pensions of every description no longer held sacred! (2)

Maginn recognized, of course, Lockhart's and Galt's allusions to his series of memoirs, and replied in kind. He printed in April 1832 a letter from Holmes to Jobbry, which thanked him for the dedication and renewed the theme of jobbery:

Like as are the Whigs to magpies chatter, they are far liker them in thieving. Dear Mr. Jobbry, if you were in house now, your mouth would water to turn Whig. Between you and me, though I hate the blackguards, and sure I have reason, I must do them the justice to say, that they have done some as pretty strokes of work since they came in as ever was seen. (2)

In May Maginn included yet another fictional memoir,
supposedly by the Whig whip, Lord Duncannon. Duncannon assured Jobbry that the Whigs would continue jobbery with even greater gusto than the Tories; retrenchment was a sham cry, perpetuated righteously in opposition, then unceremoniously dropped in office. To support his claim he boasted that "Jobbing is indeed a word peculiarly of Whig invention" and, in a striking anticipation of Disraeli, traced the fortunes of the great Whig families (Bedford, Fitzwilliam, Cavendish, Holland, in particular) to generations of earnest jobbing. Thus, The Member was part and parcel of Fraserian satire: inspired by Maginn's fictional memoirs, collaborating with them in preface and text, and gaily recuperated by Maginn afterwards. Given these intimate interconnections, their expression of a common ideology seems almost inevitable.

From Blackwood's came the inspiration of Archibald Jobbry, M.P. In the leading article for August 1830, David Robinson mercilessly dissected the forthcoming general election, exposing the inevitable types of candidates, canvassings, elections, and electors. Robinson identified ten types of candidates, who, he predicted bitterly, would constitute a Parliament notorious for "its ignorance and incapacity, its corruption and profligacy, its destitution of sympathy with public feeling, and its abandoned scorn of the public voice." Archibald Jobbry is a recognizable specimen of the ninth type of candidate:
A sober long-headed person now exhibits himself; he is a city haberdasher, or a stock-jobber, or a merchant. Is he an orator? No; he cannot make a speech. Does he understand public affairs? No. Does he wish wish to serve his country? No. Is he an instrument of party? No he is wholly unknown to it. Why, then, does he desire a seat? He is an expert calculator, and he has discovered that, by vesting a certain sum in one, he can make it yield him enormous pecuniary profits; he proceeds on no vague suppositions; he has the whole matter traced on a balance-sheet, in proper counting-house form, and the mighty gain shines in arithmetical proof. By standing aloof from party, observing severe impartiality concerning creed to all customers, and carrying his vote to the best market on all trying questions, he sees that he can obtain lucrative contracts, agencies, etc. for himself and his connections.

Jobbry too is a pawky old carle who knows well that "no business of this world is without its craft, more especially undertakings of a political nature" (4). He confesses freely that he is no speechifier (19, 36-37), a trait noted by Maginn. Like Robinson's M.P. again, he is an expert calculator. Galt emphasized this practical shrewdness repeatedly in the opening pages of The Member. Jobbry purchases an estate in Scotland despite stiff competition, because rural property had "risen in value" (2). When needy relatives importune him for his patronage, he becomes involved in various public concerns which offer an occasional clerkship. He calculates that a seat in Parliament will afford more positions for them.

Following Robinson's script further, he determines
once seated to sell his vote for the best price he can wangle: "I was convinced, that unless I put a good price on my commodity, there would be no disposition to deal fairly by me" (19). His strict independence of party abets this determination; he can deal ambivalently with either party, seeking exclusively the highest price for his vote. Galt characterized Jobbry exactly as Robinson did his "sober long-headed person." It is important to recognize, moreover, that Jobbry remains a credible character throughout The Member. His narrow resemblance to Robinson's long-headed person does not diminish him anymore than Robinson Crusoe and Lords Monmouth and Steyne are diminished by resemblance to Alexander Selkirk and the Marquess of Hertford, respectively. Galt's fiction, like Defoe's, Disraeli's, and Thackeray's, gains in verisimilitude by such resemblance, while retaining a vitality, a novelty that belongs entirely to its maker.

One detail confirms Galt's inspiration by Robinson's "A General Election." Robinson described one inherently comic election tactic which would be directed against an unpopular candidate: "the multitude sallies forth to encounter him, breaks his carriage to pieces, or throws it into some river, and he narrowly escapes with his life."27 Galt included this tactic with embellishments in The Member. As Jobbry has contrived to render Mr. Gales unpopular with the multitude of Frailtown, his partisans seize the opportunity to don Gale's cockades,
waylay his carriage, and draw "him into a pool in the river, where, wishing him good day, they left him sitting in his horseless carriage, cooling his heels, till his servants could get him out" (74). Galt obtained this brief episode as well as the outline for the character of Jobbry from "A General Election," relying once more on the journal which had sustained his early career and formed his social and economic thought.

II

To be sure, Galt accepted completely Robinson's negative judgment of self-interested M.P.s like Jobbry. He and the Blackwood's circle, closely followed by Fraser's under Maginn, steadily condemned M.P.s who "take all the trouble they are capable of taking about their own immediate interests, which limited sphere is all that their public virtue or their capacity is able to comprehend." Unlike Holmes and Duncannon, Tory radicals openly condemned jobbery as corruption and sought to eliminate it from public life. Indeed, in encouraging the formation of a Parliamentary Opposition to the Liberal Tories in the late 1820's, they often mentioned their desire to extirpate jobbery. "To crush this system of corrupt influence--this buying and selling of the State for personal profit---" Robinson advised in 1829, "the system of corrupt appointments must be crushed." He stated plainly the Tory radical value of altruistic
government; eschewing personal gain, the Opposition "must be governed solely by the interests of the coun-
try." Tory radicals sought to persuade M.P.s to abandon the pursuit of personal gain and to adopt a program of disinterested service; failing such individual reform, they wanted an indignant electorate to return M.P.s dedicated to the national interest. They applauded in particular Michael Thomas Sadler's entry into the House of Commons, in one of the Duke of Newcastle's seats, and hoped that his success would encourage other borough proprietors to follow Newcastle's example in sponsoring "men of probity and talent, and virtuous enthusiasm."

Although Jobbry appears at the outset as a paragon of the self-interested M.P., he does not long retain his relish for it. This unexpected change is crucial for the novel. The burden of The Member is Jobbry's moral evolution or Bildung from self-interest to the disinterested performance of duty. Jobbry evolves precisely as Tory radicals desired his actual counterparts in Parliament to evolve; here ideology governs character and character development. Galt created Jobbry, in part, as a moral exemplum in the service of Tory radicalism. Early in his memoir, as shown above, Jobbry shrewdly pursues his financial advantage, purchasing an estate, becoming involved in public concerns, and prospecting for a seat. He professes on several occasions that his advantage is his constant aim: "My object in
going into Parliament was to help my kith and kin by a judicious assistance to Government" (31, 56, 64). Nevertheless, he simultaneously alleges that "public spirit" is a primary motive, explaining that "it is a thing expected of every man, when he retires from business, that he will do his endeavour to serve his country, and make himself a name in the community" (4). He soberly informs Mr. Curry of his newfound spirit, much to that nabob's astonishment. Absolving Jobbry of deliberate hypocrisy, it is evident that he deceives himself as to his "public spirit." Despite his assertions, he does nothing altruistically in the public interest; acting for himself, to relieve himself of burdensome family obligations, he believes with perfect self-deception that he acts otherwise.

His first actions in Parliament abundantly reveal his self-deception as he continues unconsciously to act for himself while claiming the contrary. His initial dispensation of patronage, a stamp distributorship for James Gled, is an excellent example. He approaches the lordling responsible for the post with a virtuous disavowal of involvement: "I'm a man that wants nothing: only it would be a sort of satisfaction to oblige this very meritorious man, Mr. Gled" (21). His disavowal notwithstanding, he redistributes Gled's emoluments in a manner very much to his benefit; he is relieved of his son's expenses and his charity fund gives him "great role and power" among public charities (22). Jobbry's disavowel
and his own belief contradict the actual results of his redistribution.

His self-deception is so strong that he does not recognize it even when Mr. Spicer mirrors his actions. As Mayor of Frailtown, Spicer overtly solicits Jobbry's support for the extension of a canal, and hopes to procure covertly a stamp distributorship for his son-in-law. His approach is strikingly close to Jobbry's of the lordling, which has just transpired. Like Jobbry, Spicer protests that he desires nothing for himself ("I'm a man that wants nothing," said Jobbry), but merely a distributorship for "a most deserving young man" ("This very meritorious man, Mr. Gled") (24). These verbal resemblances highlight the mirroring of action: both Jobbry and Spicer intend to help themselves as much as possible while pretending to altruistic motives. The difference between them is that the one is oblivious of his true motive, the other quite knowing. But Jobbry thinks that he, not Spicer, is the knowing one: "I could not help laughing in my sleeve to hear that the honest man believed, in seeking to help a friend, I did not see he was really helping himself" (24). Jobbry is amused by Spicer's "self-delusion" that he did not see Spicer's pursuit of self-interest; but Jobbry does not see himself that Spicer's pursuit of that end while disavowing it is a mirror of his own action. It is the reader who is amused by Jobbry's self-deception. In Victorian fiction, the appearance of a mirror or double usually
impels the protagonist to recognize his own flaws and misdeeds, this recognition bringing in its course moral reformation. The contrary happens in *The Member*. Spicer serves to reveal broadly to the reader Jobbry's self-deception, not to effect recognition and reform.

Recognition comes later, in Jobbry's important conference with Sir John Bulky. Sir John is an exemplary M.P. for six successive Parliaments and "a good neighbour, a very equitable magistrate, and in all respects a most worthy country gentleman, upholding the laws and power of Government around him with courageous resolution in the worst of times" (32). Sir John represents the Tory Radical ideal, which subliminally attracts Jobbry, who is still unaware of how badly he suits it. When Jobbry offers to exchange his seat for the one Sir John intends to vacate, the baronet declines with a blunt reference to his pursuit of self-interest: "you have not yet got right notions of what belongs to the public; you take too close and personal an interest for your own sake in your borough." He criticizes the member for Frailtown for failing to comport himself with the selfless public spirit upheld by Tory radicals. Jobbry's reaction to this criticism is very important because it initiates the evolution of his character: "what he said made a deep impression, and I was really displeased at his opinion of me, which led me to adopt the resolutions and line of conduct which will be described in the next chapter" (35). Sir John's criticism deeply displeases
Jobbry and, perhaps unconsciously, to please him he changes his attitudes and actions. As ever so obvious a mirror as Spicer is lost on Jobbry, an authoritative, admired figure like Bulky is requisite to instigate his reform. In this episode, nevertheless, Jobbry does not clearly recognize either his ingrained selfishness or his self-deception. There is no recognition that he has erred, no mea culpa. In the course of the novel he does evolve beyond the errors criticized, but consciousness of them, true self-consciousness, eludes him. Hence he asserts later that his actions remained as "pure and independent" at the end of his career as at the outset, although they are in fact far less interested at the end.33

Towards the disinterested performance of duty represented by Sir John, Jobbry begins to evolve, but not in the next chapter. After the six chapters of the first Frailtown election his evolution begins in earnest. He wanders from the straight path of personal advantage by soliciting a place for Tom Brag, even though he must press a recalcitrant lordling and risk antagonizing influential Lord Dilldam. "But, though this affair was not without the solace of a satisfaction," he reflects, "it was rather an inroad on my system" (56). He reveals his discontent with this uncharacteristic action, speculating that it would have been more congenial to secure the post for his nephew. Despite doubts and discontent, Jobbry cleaves to the unselfish conduct which he has
just initiated. He becomes an exemplary member in his
prosecution of private grievances and bills, "in salutary
accordance with what Government naturally expects of
members of the private and domestic kind" (95). He
limits himself to cases of singular hardship and great
distress among widows and orphans, with no hint of the
help to kith and kin which was his object in entering
Parliament. He assists and advises Mr. Selby in his
fruitless struggle to obtain fulfillment of the govern­
ment's promises, and also intervenes, at his own expense,
to rescue the Selby children and to reunite them with
their long-lost uncle. He eventually loses his once
ardent relish for gaining and distributing patronage
(81), and votes for the Catholic Relief Bill, although
he never ceases to lament compliance with "public duty,
rather than private judgment" (99). Public duty becomes
paramount for Jobbry; selfless responsibility supplants
self-interest. He evolves into an exemplary M.P., an
instance of the Tory radical ideal, like Sir John Bulky.
"If I am becoming an older man," he remarks, "surely it
is also pleasing Heaven to make me a better" (90).

One index of Jobbry's steady evolution is the change
in his concept of disease. Disease was of course one of
the pervasive images and realities of the time.
Stimulated by the cholera epidemics of 1832 and 1848,
contemporaries habitually described social and political
troubles as a disease of the body politic. For example,
one writer expounded in a pamphlet of 1829: "As the
humours in the human body gain strength unperceived, till nature, in her efforts for relief, throws them off in a fit of gout, so the abuses which lurk in the body politic are daily becoming more virulent, till society, in its struggle for improvement, brings them to the surface in the shape of popular discontents. For Jobbry, the image of disease is at first a source of humor, but becomes, as he grows more responsible, a serious analogy to the evils which afflict the nation. Before he sets out for London to purchase a seat, he describes his country manor as "in the cholera morbus of reparation" (4); cholera meant nothing more to him than a convenient vehicle of comic description. Disease begins to import more to Jobbry during his conference with Sir John Bulky. Distilling the experience of six Parliaments, Sir John informs him that "every season has its own peculiar malady both moral and physical," and the following season a new one. To emphasize the severity of the current malady, he quickly adds that the "disease of every year is not attended with such a high delirium as we have seen of late" (33). His emphasis on this analogy carries more than his own considerable authority. In fact he paraphrases a well-known passage in Southey's _Sir Thomas More_: "Society has its critical periods, and its climacterics; no change, no development can take place at such seasons without inducing some peculiar and accompanying danger; and at all seasons it is liable to its influenzas and its plagues." Using precisely the
same terms, Southey and Sir John conceive of society as a delicate, changing body continually subject to disease; the severe current one threatens to become critical, unless treated wisely. Jobbry's counsellor and ideal, thus, doubly impresses on him the verity and weight of the analogy of disease; the analogy is intimately bound up in the episode that initiates his evolution.

Thereafter he never mentions the analogy without condign sobriety. He considers the many revolts and revolutions subsequent to the French Revolution as "out-breakings of a deep and widespread disease," as "discontented eruptions" (98). In the same passage, significantly, Jobbry refers implicitly to his conversation with Bulky and its basis in Southey. As disease accompanies any change during the critical periods of society, he reasons, so revolts and revolutions accompany the changes of the current season and show "that the rightful season for changes in the old establishments of the governments of Europe had not come to pass" (98). Were the season right for change there would be neither revolt nor revolution but peaceful innovation and adjustment; here Jobbry logically extrapolates from the idea impressed on him by Sir John. Furthermore, for Jobbry the growth of radicalism is a "malady," an "infection," which even the inhabitants of Frailtown have not escaped (106). He also confides to Mr. Blount that a "disease, a moral cholera" spreads throughout the country. In his confidence appears the full measure of his moral evolution.
From glibly jesting about the "cholera morbus" of house repair, he comes to reserve the image as appropriate to represent only the deeply troubled state of the country. The ultimately dutiful M.P. preserves an appropriate weight in his concept of disease, resembling Sir John in speech as well as in deed.

III

When Jobbry achieves the commitment to public duty which marks the ultimate state of his moral evolution, he commences a series of meditations on the worsening condition of England. His meditations are especially noteworthy because they cogently recapitulate the doctrines and arguments of Tory radicalism before its engagement in the great social movements of the 1830's and 1840's. Galt carefully reformed Jobbry into an exemplary M.P. before he entrusted to him the tenets of Tory radicalism; Jobbry becomes a spokesman for the ideology, and for Galt, only when worthy of the role. Galt clearly did not wish irony to undermine Jobbry's meditations. Anticipating them is Jobbry's seminal conference with Sir John. In the course of it the two agree on the impolicy of financial retrenchment by government during economic depression. Jobbry contends that government "cannot reduce the establishments without making so many people poorer and obliging them to reduce their
establishments, thereby spreading distress and privation wider. It is not a time to reduce public appointments when there is national distress; the proper season is when all is green and flourishing" (33). Sir John heartily concurs in reprehending the "distemper of making savings to the general state at the expense of casting individuals into poverty" (34). Their belief in the impolicy of retrenchment was commonplace among Tory radicals and their Ultra Tory supporters. Indeed, as early as 1817 Southey had sharply criticized the cry of retrenchment raised by such Radical M.P.s as William Smith:

Never indeed was there a more senseless cry than that which is at this time raised for retrenchment in the public expenditure as a means of alleviating the present distress. That distress arises from a great and sudden diminution of employment, occasioned by many coinciding causes, the chief of which is that the war-expenditure of from forty to fifty millions yearly has ceased. Men are out of employ: the evil is that too little is spent, and as a remedy we are exhorted to spend less! Everywhere there are mouths crying out for food because the hands want work; and at this time, and for this reason, the state-quack requires further reduction! Because so many hands are unemployed, he calls upon government to throw more upon the public by reducing its establishments and suspending its works!38

Southey's very words as well as his criticism echo in those of Jobbry and Bulky; again Galt turned to the founding father of Tory radicalism in this important conversation. The Blackwood's circle soon followed
Southey in denouncing retrenchment as a policy certain to increase the already acute post-Napoleonic distress. Henry Lascelles, Earl of Harewood, repeated Southey's criticism of retrenchment in 1821. Galt himself observed in 1822 that massive redundancies of civil servants would reduce the income of their local shop­keepers and tradesmen, affecting in turn farmers and manufacturers; such redundancies would also swell the poor rates, while contributing negligible savings to the Treasury. He contended that retrenchment would redouble the pernicious effects of the demobilization of soldiers after the Napoleonic Wars, the true source of the present distress. The Blackwood's circle and Southey, thus, established the position adopted by Jobbry and Bulky; their conversation is an unmistakable foretaste of Jobbry's meditations, which constitute the last third of The Member.

His first meditation concerns the "Money Question," the controversy about the merits of paper and metallic currency which became prominent with the enactment of Robert Peel's Cash Payments Bill in 1819. Jobbry thinks that there is no intrinsic difference between paper and metallic money, providing that the banks which issue the former furnish some sure guarantee of it. Given the "craft and fraudulency" of some banks which issue money without adequate supportive assets, he resolves that the government should "never have parted with the privilege of coining" and should itself provide a stable
currency (89). Futhermore, Jobbry charges the Bank of England with capricious regulation of the money supply, creating periodic scarcities of money; the Bank acted capriciously because it never considered thoroughly the impact of the contraction and expansion of its issues. Jobbry agrees later with Mr. Blount that this capricious regulation was a principal cause of the agrarian distress of 1830-1831: "our evils arise from our contracted circulation" (109). All of Jobbry's notions on currency were familiar to Tory radicals. Galt himself advanced the first part of them in an essay of the early 1830's printed in his *Literary Life*. He contended in "Money. The Bullion Question" that paper and metallic money were alike representative; however, paper money should be preferred because it would bring into circulation far more of the vast masses of property in the country.40 Many of the early Tory radicals anticipated the second part of Jobbry's notions, also identifying a contracted money supply as the prime cause of agrarian distress. In December 1829 William Johnstone described the aftermath of the Cash Payments Bill: "The currency was contracted very materially, all branches of trade immediately became distressed."41 In addition he proposed that Parliament establish a sound currency by requiring guaranteed pledges for all paper notes. Likewise Edward Edwards denounced in February 1830 the "suppresion of the one-pound note" as an "unjust and injurious contraction of the circulating medium." Edwards too maintained that coining was "properly
the function of Government; and it never should be delegated to any party, of whose integrity and responsibility Government is not assured." Maginn seconded the Blackwood's circle in the major Fraser's article on agrarian distress. He attacked the "change effected in the currency by Peel's Bill" as the exclusive cause of agrarian distress. It worked so perniciously in two opposite ways: first by preventing the farmer from undertaking needed improvements and employing sufficient laborers; and second by throwing capital into the hands of moneylenders and stockbrokers, who did nothing to employ the pauperized laborers of the home counties. The deflationary policy of Peel's Bill increased the value of money so much that farmers who contracted debts during the Napoleonic Wars could scarcely repay the increasingly wealthy moneylenders. Maginn, Edwards, Johnstone, Galt, and others articulated the reflationary, distributive line taken up by Jobbry. His thoughts on the "Money Question" bring into fiction the Tory radical view.

Other meditations deal with the equally disputed question of free trade. Jobbry mentions in one the "dreadful shock" many Tory M.P.s received from the Liberal Tory assault on legislation protecting commerce and shipping (100). Declaring that this assault damaged Tory unity even more than Catholic Emancipation, he bewailed its theoretical motivation:

"Theoretical principle was more consulted than practice,
and the result was, at least to many of us, doubtful" (101). He introduces here a constantly reiterated Tory radical objection to free trade, namely, that the doctrine preferred economic theory to centuries of economic practice. With overt deference to Edmund Burke, Tory radicals plumped solidly for practice, experience, fact. Galt set an example as early as 1822 in his contributions to Blackwood's, which noted the "error of applying an abstract principle to practical matters." In 1829 he presented his ideas on home-colonization, which were "not the result of theoretical speculation, but of PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE." In Fraser's in 1832 he complained as well that the "theories of political economists have been substituted for the expediences of managing mankind." Precisely like Galt, leading Tory radicals rejected in both journals the inexplicable preference of theory to fact among political economists and their adherents in Parliament, as shown in chapter one. Robinson and Maginn in particular savagely mocked the supposed maxim of the economists: "You must not look at facts, or regard demonstrations--fruits and effects you must not notice--petitions and remonstrances you must sternly disdain." Thus Jobbry's lamentation over the prevalence of theory echoes a dominant note among Tory radicals.

In the following meditation Jobbry continues to address the question of free trade, particularly as related to the corn laws. He reasons that all economic interests are entitled to equal protection by government;
the "produce of the soil was as justly entitled to protec-
tion as the produce of the loom, or any other manufacture" (102). Hence, it seems "very unfair and unjust" that the manufacturing interest should clamor for free trade in corn while coveting entire prohibition of foreign textile manufactures. Furthermore, were the covetousness of the manufacturing interest gratified, economic ruin would inevitably ensue. That interest would be obliged to exchange gold, not textile products, for cheaper foreign corn. The consequent drain on the money supply would severely deplete the capital available for manufacturing, thereby rendering the interest far worse off than under the status quo. "Would not the money thus sent be taken from the capital of the kingdom," Jobbry postulates, "and would not that capital so diminished lessen the means of employing the operatives, and thus bring to them an evil as great as the difference of price between what they pay for corn brought in under regulations, and what they would pay were the trade free in that article" (103).

Jobbry's meditation on the corn laws effectively combines the different arguments of Fraser's and Blackwood's, both of which stoutly defended the Corn Law of 1815, as indicated in chapter one. In November 1830, Maginn compared the protection afforded to the agricultural and manufacturing interests. Under the sliding scale of 1828, he observed, imported corn paid a duty of two shillings to eight shillings per quarter
whereas manufactured goods suffered duties ranging from twenty-five to fifty per cent of their value. After noting that the agriculturalists never complained of the vastly superior protection enjoyed by manufacturers, Maginn argued that repeal of the corn laws must in justice be accompanied by repeal of all protection of the other interests: "If the corn grower is to be exposed to the competition of the foreigner, the manufacturer must be equally exposed." Maginn's argument is Jobbry's: all interests should be equally protected or equally unprotected. Maginn prophesied as well universal ruin from unilateral repeal of the corn laws but, unlike Jobbry, he did not specify depletion of the money supply. Not until August 1833 did Maginn introduce the threat to the money supply: "we should see our circulating medium daily contracting, from the constant drafts upon it, for coin transmitted to the continent in payment for grain." Jobbry's concern with the money supply came instead from Blackwood's. That it should is logical, because the Blackwood's circle was profoundly disturbed by the transfer from paper to metallic currency effected by Peel's Cash Payments Bill, as shown above. David Robinson, the contributor who was most involved in monetary policy, carefully evaluated the monetary implications of repeal of the corn laws. In the third of his major series of articles on political economy, printed a month after Galt's "Thoughts on the Times," he contended
that [Great Britain] can buy of other nations without paying them with goods — that she can buy more of France, Germany, Russia, or any other foreign part, than she does, to the amount of many millions annually, without increasing her export of goods — that if she so buy, the amount of her purchases can go into the general balance of trade against her, and the balance can be from time to time adjusted by bills, or an export of gold — and that, if an adverse balance compel her to buy gold, this reduces, instead of increasing, her export of goods.

Hence, repeal could only produce a severe deficit in the balance of trade and a depletion of the crucial gold supply; continued drain on that supply would result in reduced exports — a vicious circle ending in national bankruptcy. From such contentions and from those in Fraser's Galt derived the meditations on free trade in The Member. He straightforwardly expressed through Archibald Jobbry the Tory radical position on one of the most controversial questions of the early Victorian period.

In meditating on such questions Jobbry frequently complains of the inactivity of the Parliament led by the Wellington-Peel administration of 1828-30. "My third parliament was more remarkable for talk than trade," he records. "A great many motions were vehemently discussed, not one of which was of the slightest benefit to the nation" (87). He contemptuously labels it the "do-little Parliament," repeating the label for emphasis (96, 99, 100). Although today one marvels that the Parliament
which introduced the sliding-scale on corn, repealed the Test Acts, and passed the Catholic Relief Bill could be labelled "do-nothing," Jobbry's complaint ran deep in the late 1820's. Tory radicals and Ultra Tories were strongly aggrieved by a decade of Liberal Toryism that climaxed in the refusal of the Wellington-Peel administration to mitigate or even to inquire into the effects of economic liberalism. They believed firmly that the repeal of the duties on silk, modification of the Navigation Acts, and adoption of the sliding-scale on corn—acts mandated by political economy—had devastating repercussions on the economic interests involved and on the working class; they demanded meticulous Parliamentary inquiries into these repercussions and then legislation to alleviate them. Richard Fyler, Sir Richard Vyvyan, Michael Thomas Sadler, Sir Edward Knatchbull, and Edward Davenport in the Commons, seconded by Lord Stanhope in the Lords, urged Parliament to undertake such inquiries, but were consistently defeated by the administration.\(^{52}\) Infuriated by this self-serving inaction, Tory radicals savagely denounced the administration and its tame Parliament. Robinson claimed in his valedictory article:

> For several years, not a single petition from the people has been able to gain the attention of the Legislature, and in general it has covered the petitioners with slander and insult. Immense masses of them have, in detail, implored it to enquire and receive proofs, in order that it might spare their possessions, or remedy their sufferings; but they have
implored in vain. When the country at large was in unparalleled distress, it refused investigation, and declared nothing could be granted as relief beyond a remission of taxes.  

Maginn voiced the same outrage in one of the first issues of Fraser's: "The existence of public distress to a dreadful degree was acknowledged in the first speech from the throne in November, 1826; it has increased under the exertions of Parliament to a treble degree. In short, the House did nothing but job." (Maginn's collocation of themes, inaction and jobbery, is very apropos of The Member.) By early 1831 Tory radicals had articulated an incisive attack on the inaction of Parliament that would lead to their telling support for its reform. Jobbry's complaints of a "dolittle Parliament" which neglected all measures beneficial to the nation, repeat the fierce condemnations of Tory radicals within and outside of Parliament; he contributes directly to an on-going controversy.

IV

Contemporary reviewers perceived Jobbry's meditations on such controversies as direct intervention in reality. To them The Member seemed to progress beyond the documentary status of the Canadian novels and embrace the new status of the novel as an exemplary pamphlet. The Member displaced the mirror of art, joining in reality itself as artifact,
not artifice, as the reviewers in Fraser's and the New Monthly asserted. Their perception of it is certainly plausible. By endowing Jobbry with the foremost doctrines of early Tory radicalism, Galt undoubtedly responded to the new critical demand, as shown above. The adroit timing of the novel for the crucial year 1832 amply underscored its participatory status. To be sure, Galt's "rule of art" made his responsiveness easy. He could draw on his commitment to Tory radicalism and his many writings in its service, while addressing current issues and disputes. Personal artistic precept and compliance with critical demands could go hand-in-hand.

Nevertheless, The Member remains fiction, not fact. Despite the myopic claims of contemporaries, its overt Tory radicalism never reduces it to the prosaic argumentativeness of an early Victorian pamphlet and never makes Jobbry implausible. The technical reasons for this success are twofold. First, Galt did not intrude at any point into Jobbry's autobiographical narrative in his own voice or the hastily assumed disguise of an implied or textual author. He thereby avoided the grave errors that would help to sink the factory novels of 1839: arbitrary testimonials to the verity of the fiction, and personal reflections on an issue or doctrine. Unlike the factory novelists, Galt left his character to speak for himself. In addition Galt upheld Jobbry's integrity by restricting him to what he could plausibly have known. Writers of first person narratives are commonly tempted
to burden the I-narrator with information, wisdom, or
diction alien to him, but Galt never succumbed to this
temptation. Jobbry is always in character, even in his
lengthy series of meditations. Galt tailored them so
that they do not seem extraneous in the least. They
appear in the last third of the novel, well after Jobbry
has enlisted the reader's bemused sympathy. They serve
to distance the mature, selfless Jobbry from his interested
pursuit of the Frailtown seat during the three elections.
They also reveal his thoughts on the condition of England,
which were unformed during his earlier preoccupation
with patronage. His meditations show the full commitment
of a once jobbing Jobbry. Galt's skill in naturalizing
these meditations should not be neglected. Few writers
in the 1830's were as adept in fusing social commentary
with plausible characterization. Harriet Martineau
failed badly in attempting this fusion; her Illustrations
of Political Economy abound with peasants and operatives
who discourse with impossible erudition, while disrupting
the progress of the tales. Many novelists resembled
Edward Howard in Rattlin the Reefer; Howard interrupted
the novel at one point in order to harangue the reader
for pages on the evils of aristocratic education.55
Such flawed efforts as these illuminate the excellence
of Galt's skill in naturalizing Jobbry's meditations.

Furthermore, Galt preserved Jobbry's integrity by
avoiding the romance narrative pattern and the distort-
tions inherent in it. He had learned of the dangers of
romance quite painfully in his early career. Blackwood had strongly pressured him to abandon his original design for Sir Andrew Wylie and to write instead an orthodox romance. The resulting novel never pleased Galt, who dismissed it in the Literary life: "The incidents are by far too romantic and uncommon to my own taste, and are only redeemed from their extravagance by the natural portraiture of the characters." Given a free hand by James Fraser, Galt avoided romance and its extreme characters representative of absolute good and evil; The Member has no Oliver Twist or Fagin, no Ralph Rattlin or Joshua Daunton. It does have Archibald Jobbry, who is as plausible as any character in the fiction of the 1830's. If he is not as striking as Samuel Weller, he is at least more credible than Nicholas Nickleby, Mr. Crotchet, Eugene Aram, or Contarini Fleming. Although a product of Galt's commitment to Tory radicalism, Jobbry is a living character. It is useful to compare him to Robinson Crusoe, who was no less rigorously determined by Defoe's religious ideology. Jobbry's moral evolution from narrow pursuit of self-interest to selfless performance of duty is as compelling as Crusoe's model conversion to Christianity. Jobbry's evolution seems an integral part of his character, not an imposed ideological pattern.

Appropriately, critics Victorian and modern have praised Galt's creation of Jobbry. "Mr. Galt is excelled certainly in some of the more shining qualities of a narrative," allowed Allan Cunningham, "but, who has
surpassed him in communicating to an ideal story, the attractions of real and positive truth? Edward Howard concurred: "He puts himself into the exact place of the individual character he describes, and makes him say and do precisely what a man should say and do in his circumstances—an excellence in such kind of writing which very few are able to reach in so eminent a degree." To convey the excellence of Jobbry these two critics approach Keats's concept of the artist who loses his identity by informing a character through the exercise of the negative capability. Among latter-day critics, Ian Jack and Ian Gordon praise Galt's characterization of Jobbry. In him Galt excelled in harmonizing ideology with the permanent artistic imperative of faithfully representing human experience and psychology. This excellence is symptomatic of The Member; in it Galt succeeds in balancing a controversial ideology, extreme critical demands, his own cardinal rule, and the permanent artistic imperative. The result is a living novel, the first ideological novel of the Victorian age.
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Chapter Four

The Factory Novels of 1839

1839 marked a unique event in the history of the English novel: the appearance of the first three factory novels. Although topical novels had proliferated in the 1830's, never before had the English novel concerned itself extensively with factory labor and life. Then three factory novels appeared within a few months of each other in 1839. They were all serial, published in monthly or weekly parts, in imitation of Dickens's immensely popular Oliver Twist and Nicholas Nickleby. Frances Milton Trollope's Michael Armstrong began in the first week of March and continued in eleven monthly parts, republished in a single volume in 1840. The anonymous Simon Smike began by 23 March and concluded in August, when the weekly parts were collected with an introduction and title-page. Although partly written in 1838, Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna's Helen Fleetwood commenced in September, one installment included in each month's Christian Lady's Magazine; it was republished in a single volume in 1841. By date of first publication, the factory novels belong to 1839; one cannot correctly date them by their years of republication.

Paradoxically, the factory novels appeared at one of the least propitious moments in the decade for the factory Reform Movement. In a year deeply preoccupied with
Chartism, little occurred of any importance to Factory Reform. On 14 February, Fox Maule, Undersecretary of State, introduced a bill, revised from one dropped the preceding year, to improve the operation of the 1833 Factory Act; he dallied with the bill, bringing it into Committee on 1 July but suddenly abandoning it on 27 July. These proceedings excited little interest in Parliament and virtually none among the Short Time Committees of the North. Indeed, the factory novels themselves clearly reflect the lack of contemporary agitation. Mrs. Trollope avoided altogether references to 1839 by ending the major action of her novel in 1832 with the great York Castle meeting. The anonymous author of Simon Smike briefly mentioned Lord Ashley's part in the meager debate of 1 July on Fox Maule's bill, but could muster no other coeval action (SS 155-56). Mrs. Tonna similarly referred to a minor episode of 1840, in which Ashley opposed John Fielden's abortive effort to investigate the activities of the Factory Inspectors and Superintendants (HF 335-38).

If unpropitious in terms of the Factory Reform Movement, the three novels appeared at probably the best moment of the decade in terms of literary pressures. As early as 1832 reviewers had begun to emphasize the ideological potential of the novel. T.H. Lister and Harriet Martineau in particular thought of the novel as an appropriate "vehicle for philosophical or political discussion; employing the light fictitious garb to buoy up in the stream of favour the heavy matter which would sink without
it." Chapter two traces the critical revaluation of the novel into a sort of supremely able pamphlet. No longer a simple mirror which reflected things as they are, the novel was actively to participate in life itself. John Galt was among the first to detect this new critical demand, and he conformed to it, and to his own "rule of art," by giving to Archibald Jobbry a series of orthodox Tory radical meditations on leading contemporary issues. The Member was thus the first ideological novel of the early Victorian period. After 1832 critical demands for participation in reality intensified. They reached something of a crescendo in 1837-38 when several influential figures ardently re-emphasized the demand for participation. Captain Marryat, at the apogee of his popularity, insisted that the novel could do the work of a pamphlet far better than any pamphlet. In a compendium to which Mrs. Trollope, Disraeli, and all the Tory radical leaders subscribed, G.R. Wythen Baxter expatiated on the possible effectiveness of the novel in attacking the New Poor Law. In 1838 a reviewer in Fraser's reproached Dickens for his failure to challenge the most vulnerable public evil of them all, "the working little boys and girls to death in the factories." Such repeated urgings as these constituted in the aggregate a very formidable literary pressure. Given the competitiveness of the literary marketplace, this pressure for hyper-topical fiction could not but prevail over novelists who kept up with current trends. Charles Dickens, for one, did not delay in
yielding to this pressure or in capitalizing on the
general hostility to the New Poor Law. The reward for his
astuteness, and for his native genius, was the terrific
success of *Oliver Twist*. As one indication of how fully
*Oliver Twist* qualified as a participation in reality, the
*Leeds Intelligencer* featured an excerpt from the workhouse
episode as a telling demonstration of the inhumanity of the
New Poor Law. The factory novelists were as keenly aware
as Dickens of the literary pressure for topicality and the
social pressures for activism. Mrs. Trollope paused in her
travel book of 1838, *Vienna and the Austrians*, to remark on
the immense poverty and suffering which ensued from British
manufacturing. In contrast, nowhere in Austria could there
be found the "thousands of pale attenuated children, whose
young muscles have been strained to convert cotton into
gold." In 1838 Mrs. Tonna contributed to her magazine a
lengthy article, "English Slavery," which set forth the
case for factory reform and briefly chronicled the history
of the Factory Reform Movement. At the same time the
unknown author of *Simon Smike* was evidently perusing the
pamphlets of Richard Oastler, Joseph Rayner Stephens, and
John Fielden. Fully aware of contemporary events, the
factory novelists yielded to the dominant literary pressure
of the late 1830's, which promised them favorable reviews,
a receptive audience, and financial success. If the hiatus
in the Factory Reform Movement was inauspicious, the literary
climate could not have been more promising.

The three novelists responded to this climate partly
by dwelling on the raw facts of factory labor and life, but primarily by reiterating the doctrines and norms of Tory radicalism, as had John Galt in *The Member*. This Chapter explores the use of character and the implied author in expressing Tory radicalism. To articulate the doctrines of Tory radicalism, the implied authors frequently intervened; their interventions eroded the objective framework of the novels, thereby endangering their fictionality. The danger was that the urgent statement of ideology would eclipse both the realism and the structural integrity of the novels; here is the familiar tension between purpose, reality, and literary tradition that debilitated many early Victorian topical novels. Ironically, the danger was a side-effect of the critical pressure for participation in reality. The present chapter also examines a more subtle and effective response to that insistent pressure. Each of the novels developed a subplot in which a rural innocent is awakened from total ignorance of factory life and labor into a militant activism in the cause of factory reform. Like Galt with Jobbry, the novelists focused on the inner transformation of the character. Furthermore, this transformation recapitulates the secular conversion to activism actually lived by at least two eminent Tory radicals. The lived experience of committed Tory radicals provided the template for the subplots of the factory novels. Here one can see the effectiveness of fiction with no immediate tension between ideology and reality.

Before examining in detail these subplots and their
template, it is necessary to define the "secular conversion" involved. The Victorian period was of course replete with conversions of differing patterns and directions. One of the best known today is the literary pattern of conversion identified by Jerome Buckley in his classic study, *The Victorian Temper*. It consisted, in short, of spiritual growth from "unshadowed hope through the denial of life itself towards the final conquest of doubt and despair" and self-consciousness. However, it is important to recognize that conversions were not necessarily religious. In an important article, "Loss and Gain? The Theme of Conversion in Late Victorian Fiction," R.M. Scheider distinguished between two kinds of Victorian conversions. Referring to the Oxford English Dictionary, he specified a general religious conversion, the "turning of sinners to God," and a sectarian conversion, the "bringing of anyone over to a specified religious faith, profession, or party...." Scheider does not notice that the Oxford English Dictionary adds a non-religious or secular variant of this second kind of conversion: the "act of converting or fact of being converted, to some opinion, belief, party, etc." It is this secular conversion that figures in the subplots of the factory novels. Like the sectarian conversion anatomized by Scheider, this secular conversion has a definite pattern; it consists of awakening, arousal, and direction. Already a devout Christian, one is awakened to the moral and physical evils of factory labor by a traumatic personal experience, then aroused to demand publically their removal,
and finally directed to the Ten Hours Bill as the only effective remedy. By incorporating this pattern in their subplots, the novelists not only recorded the actual experience of leading Tory radicals, but also attempted to enlist the sympathies and services of the reader in the cause of factory reform. They sought to convert the reader by meticulously portraying the model conversion of a rural innocent. Conversion to activism is thus both the subject and the intent of the factory novels. Without ceasing to be fiction, their subplots function as rhetorical instruments of Tory radicalism and the Factory Reform Movement.

I

As every schoolboy knows, on the night of 28 September 1830, John Wood revealed to the unsuspecting Richard Oastler the conditions of child labor prevalent in the worsted mills of Bradford. Wood's revelations were crucial for Oastler and for the as yet unformed Factory Reform Movement. Possessed of an acute Evangelical conscience, Oastler reacted profoundly to them and to his friend's conscience-stricken plea that he strive "to expose this horrible system of slavery." No further prompting was needed; he vowed that he would so strive, reflecting proudly in 1841 that he had kept that "solemn, costly vow." As the two men agreed, he wrote the next day to the editors of the Leeds Mercury. In the first of the "Slavery in Yorkshire" letters, he presented the same revelations and exhortation that had so
He boldly repeated Wood's comparison of child labor and slavery: "Thousands of our fellow-creatures and fellow-subjects, both male and female, the miserable inhabitants of a Yorkshire town . . . are this very moment existing in a state of slavery, more horrid than are the victims of that hellish system 'colonial slavery!'" The physical punishment by overseers, thirteen-hour days, extreme fatigue, and early mortality endured by operatives fully justified the comparison. Having exposed these conditions, he exhorted the four Yorkshire M.P.s to destroy this infant slavery as well as colonial slavery, suggesting for the purpose an extension of the Factory Act of 1819 to worsted mills. "If I have succeeded in calling the attention of your readers to the horrid and abominable system on which the worsted mills in and near Bradford is conducted," he concluded, "I have done some good." Oastler could conclude his letter so confidently because he believed that the community shared his acute conscience. Judging from the ardent response of Yorkshire to black slavery, he expected immediate cooperation in reforming that in the mills. Of course, he conceded in the second letter, he expected to "rouse the indignation of certain individuals who were quietly pocketing the profits of the children's excessive labour," but other opposition was inconceivable. "I felt quite sure," he recalled in 1840, "that every factory master, who was a Christian, would, at once renounce the hateful practices of the system, and would by his example pave the way for an immediate,
general, and universal reform in factory labour."24

Opposition to the call for reform soon proved all-too-conceivable to Simeon Townend and two anonymous correspondents in the Mercury. Replying in the second "Slavery in Yorkshire" letter, Oastler reproached them with adopting the arguments of slaveowners; those in the West Indies similarly declared their slaves to be the "best clothed, best fed, the most cheerful and contended peasantry in the world!"25 Oastler stuck firmly to his original position, sanguinely relying on the public conscience to act rightly: "the system is horrid, and the individual sufferings consequent on such a system will match, nay shame the horrors of Colonial Slavery. Grant me but this fact, and you supply me with the fulcrum, on which to place the lever of liberty, by which I can overthrow a world of tyranny and oppression."26 While declining to inflame public opinion by specifying individual suffering, he added that conditions were often worse than he had stated: children suffered severe beatings for the slightest neglect, worked compulsory overtime to compensate for stoppages of machinery, and breathed unwholesome air. Still confident in the moral power of his general revelations, he discounted the Mercury's advice of petitioning Parliament to shorten the working day. While accepting the need for such legislation he preferred "to engage the public attention, by a free discussion through the medium of the press."27 In the country that returned Wilberforce to Parliament, awakening of the public conscience would suffice.
Oastler enthusiastically applauded the Talbot Inn meeting of Bradford manufacturers in his third letter. He perceived it as the inevitable reaction of the public conscience to his disclosures, and he even expected similarly prompt and direct action from Parliament. "Surely it cannot be difficult," he wrote, "to persuade Parliament it is incumbent on them to remove an evil, which like a canker-worm, feeds on the vitals of the country, destroying, as it most assuredly does, the commercial, political, physical, and moral strength of the nation." Believing in the simple moral and religious goodness of factory reform, he bitterly condemned the "pretended and popular religion of the day" for condoning the unchanged operation of the factory system; it was "no other than vile 'hypocrisy,' let it be called by what name it may." Particularly important in this letter are his remarks to Simeon Townend, who abandoned his defence of the system after Oastler's rebuttal. He counselled Townend to confirm his verbal agreement with him by striving to amend the system, "otherwise he will leave room for his enemies to suspect the genuine-ness of his conversion." For Oastler, Townend's movement from defense to reform of child labor was a secular conversion: it was a personal movement to conform to moral and religious imperatives that supplemented a prior religious conversion. Hence, his own awakening to the actual conditions of the factories by Wood, followed by exhortation to others and proposal of corrective legislation, also comprised a secular conversion. Himself a convert, his
duty was to convert others. In this Oastler revealed the
guiding analogy of his activism.

Publication of the "Resolutions of the Master Worsted
Spinners of Halifax" (5 March 1831), the first working
brief of political economy in the factory controversy,
provoked the fourth letter. Presented with what he had
deemed inconceivable, with determined opposition to factory
reform, Oastler registered his profound disillusionment.
"I had hoped," he wrote sadly, "after the long controversy
which has already taken place on this subject, it would
have been unnecessary that I should have troubled you with
any more remarks." But disillusionment could not be
allowed to weaken his activism. Oastler turned to the
attack with even greater determination. Dismissing the
economic rationale of the masters, Oastler explained their
opposition as "avarice and self-interest": "Is it possible
that avarice and self-interest can have such a bewildering
effect on the mind of man!" To defeat them, as they were
immune to his appeals to conscience, he looked to Sir John
Cam Hobhouse's recent Factory Bill, urging his supporters
to send numerous petitions to Parliament. No longer did he
expect an aroused public conscience to suffice; now the
good-hearted majority must support Parliament in correcting
the evils perpetrated by an oppressive, unrepentant minority.
A month later, before the impending elections, he extended
his efforts to promote Hobhouse's Bill. He encouraged
reformers not only to petition Parliament, but also to
canvass the candidates on the Bill. By electing
candidates favorable to it, they could eliminate the danger of its defeat by interested parties: "NOW YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO USE YOUR INFLUENCE." With this encouragement of petitions and canvassing, Oastler reached the apex of his personal activism; by himself, with no ancillary organization or program, he could do no more.

Defeat of the key provisions of Hobhouse's Bill precipitated the fifth letter, in which Oastler surpassed his personal activism by becoming leader of the Factory Reform Movement. Two events made possible his leadership: first, the well-known formation of the Fixby Compact with the Huddersfield Short Time Committee, and, second, the first letter from Michael Thomas Sadler, in which he disclosed that a Factory Bill was one part of his threefold program for healing the condition of England. Thus, in the space of three months, Oastler gained a committed popular following and a coadjutor in Parliament who had anticipated him in acting to implement his Tory radical creed. In this letter Oastler accordingly detailed his program for factory reform; the letter is exceedingly important to the understanding of the Factory Reform Movement and, as well, of the factory novels of 1839. Oastler translated his personal conversion to activism into the practical program of the new Factory Reform Movement. His personal conversion by and to exposure, exhortation, and proposal was writ large for the Movement as publications, meetings, and petitions and canvassing. Converted to the need for a Factory Act, he sought to create an
organization capable of wresting it from Parliament. He urged reformers to establish at once Short Time Committees in every manufacturing town and village, "to collect information and publish facts, (you will see a few at the foot of this letter) unfolding the horrors of this system."\textsuperscript{36} As the public was profoundly ignorant of these horrors, he added, this preliminary exposure was essential and urgent. To underscore the urgency of this work of exposure, he fired at the reader a quiver of imperatives: "Tell," "Show," "Tell," "Count." "Bring facts before the public, and show the hideous monster in his native glare," he enthusiastically summarized.\textsuperscript{37}

His sense of which information and facts were relevant as well as his stress on exposing them deserves notice. He wanted the Short Time Committees to collect information about punishment, fines, long hours, fatigue, ill-health, immorality, and filial disaffection, and about the harmful effects on society, not solely on operatives, of the factory system: impoverishment of handloom weavers and their families; increase of poor rates; and decreased custom for the shopkeeper, butcher, farmer, and artisan. He also wanted the committees to publish facts, by which he meant particular, verifiable examples of factory conditions and their social effects. In a speech delivered two months after the fifth letter, he called again for particular examples: "Take a little child, for it is in units we must deal; the whole mass of factory woes would cloud your understandings and make you like myself, as I have by my
opponents been described -- 'mad.'"38 In this call for particulars, unknowingly he closely echoed Coleridge's pamphlets, written in support of Sir Robert Peel's Factory Bill of 1818. "Generalities are apt to deceive us," Coleridge wrote. "Individualize the sufferings which it is the object of this Bill to remedy: follow up the detail in some one case with a human sympathy: and the deception vanishes."39 Oastler included several of these facts or examples in a large footnote. With the preface, "I cannot refrain from mentioning a few facts," he gave the first exemplum:

At one of these mills, -- -- --, a boy about ten or eleven years of age, has worked for five months from SIX o'clock in the morning to TEN o'clock at night at night - say FOURTEEN hours work per day, allowing TWO hours for meals. This boy has very frequently been sick and ill, when he has kept to his labour; nine days ago, however, he was obliged to be laid up, and has not yet returned to his work. About FORTY boys have worked along with him. Now the master of this mill is a strenuous petitioner against 'Negro Slavery;' and at the same time a practiser of, and petitioner for 'Yorkshire Slavery.' If he be what he professes, he is also 'a very good Christian.' Let him name forty boys in the West Indies as cruelly treated as these boys of his are, or if he fail, let him blush, repent, and be just.40

Oastler and Coleridge independently arrived at an effective method of interesting the public and pricking its conscience. The tactic of disseminating both information and facts, the general and the specific, the quantitative and the concrete, pressed home the case for reform,
appealing to reason and emotion alike. Furthermore, the tactic neatly conformed to the ingrained Tory radical bias toward fact and against theory.

After underscoring the urgency of exposure, Oastler detailed the second part of the program for factory reform. "In due time call public meetings, and there plead the cause of the poor infant sufferers," he continued, "and expose the horrors of the factory system...." He proposed that these mass meetings should follow the thorough exposure of the system in all available media. The meetings were verbally to transmit the information and facts already in print, and, more importantly, to plead with the committed, ignorant, and indifferent to act in concert with the reform campaign.

Since he himself had been deeply susceptible to Wood's pleading, Oastler strongly encouraged exhortation that could similarly influence others. As the frequent exhortations of his "Slavery in Yorkshire" letters showed, he firmly believed in the persuasive power of this tactic. Once these meetings had aroused the public, Short Time Committees and individual reformers should "prepare petitions to Parliament, praying it to interfere in the sacred cause of suffering humanity--and, on every election for members of Parliament, use your influence throughout the empire, to prevent any man being returned, who will not distinctly and unequivocally pledge himself to support a 'Ten hours a day and a time book bill.'" Proposal of the Ten Hours Bill in petitions and on the hustings.
formed the last part of Oastler's program for reform. Having awakened and aroused the public by writings and meetings, Tory radicals and other reformers should bring pressure on Parliament and prospective M.P.s to enact the Bill. Only by such legislation could they overcome decisively the opposition of hypocritical, avaricious, demonically-inspired manufacturers and political economists. Only a Ten Hours Act could enforce the mandate of the keen, Christian public conscience. Throughout his long activism, Oastler remained convinced of the goodness of this shared conscience. As he asserted in the fifth letter immediately after outlining his program, "It is impossible that a system so cruel, so injurious, so unjust, so unchristian can stand in a Christian country, when once the eyes of the public are open to its horrors."43

Thus Oastler translated his personal conversion to activism into the program of the emerging Factory Reform Movement. Publication of information and facts, mass meetings, and petitioning and canvassing for the Ten Hours Bill originated in Oastler's commitment to exposure, exhortation, and proposal. Wood's revelations and heartfelt plea, and the opposition of the Halifax masters converted Oastler and determined the shape of a movement that would live for the next twenty-five years. The program outlined in the fifth letter proved to be not merely a sincere hope, but a powerful reality or Carlylean "fact." The desired publications began almost at once:
broadsides, placards, pamphlets, tracts, and even small newspapers poured forth; in January 1832 John Doherty launched The Poor Man's Advocate, followed in September by G.S. Bull's British Labourer's Protector and Factory Child's Friend. The mass meetings appeared as speedily: the first series commenced with the Huddersfield meeting on Boxing Day 1831 and culminated in the great York Castle rally of 23 April 1832. After the failure of Hobhouse's Bill, Sadler became the sponsor of the Ten Hours Bill and presented the many petitions supporting it; canvassing for the Bill took place continuously during the elections of December 1832, in which Sadler lost his seat. The Factory Reform Movement actually developed according to Oastler's early program.

Furthermore, his lived pattern of conversion by exposure, exhortation, and proposal persisted as a touchstone for Tory radicals. Habitually they devised their printed propaganda so as to induce in the reader a conversion similar to Oastler's. Illustrative of this habit is a broadside issued in 1832 after the publication of the Report of the Sadler Committee [see following page]. The broadside features a summary table of the medical testimony contained in the Report, which upheld a ten hour day as the longest compatible with operatives' health. The aim of the table is to awaken the reader to the need, if only on medical grounds, for a ten hour day and, by implication, to the evils of the present longer days. Here is the exposure of information experienced
TABLE

OF

Medical Opinion & Testimony

Before the Select Committee on the Ten Hour Bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Profession, &amp;c.</th>
<th>Principal Residence</th>
<th>No. of the Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sir Anthony Carline, F.B.S.</td>
<td>Principal Surgeon of Westminster Hospital 40 Years.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sir William Blizzard, F.B.S.</td>
<td>Surgeons to the London Hospital 50 Years.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sir Charles Bell, E.M.D. F.B.S.</td>
<td>Surgeons to Bethlem Hospital.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sir George L. Tuffill, F.B.S.</td>
<td>Surgeons to Westminster Hospital 20 Years.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Joseph H. Glyn, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeons to St. Thomas's Hospital—President K.C.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. James Blundell, E.S. M.D.</td>
<td>Physician to Guy's Hospital, Lecturer, &amp;c.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thomas Hoggden, E.S. M.D.</td>
<td>Physician to the London Dispensary.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John Morgan, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon to Guy's Hospital.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Benjamin Brooke, E.S. F.B.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon of St. George's Hospital.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. William Lutener, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon of the Infirmary.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Samuel Smith, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon to the Dispensary.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. William Nutter, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon to the Infirmary.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. J. Turner Thackeray, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon,</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. J. Maitly, E.S.</td>
<td>Late a Physician of Manchester Infirmary.</td>
<td>Manchester.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. P. M. Bogot, E.S. F.B.S.</td>
<td>Physician to St. Thomas's Hospital.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. C. A. Key, E.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon, and Vice-President of the Royal College</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Thomas Young, E.S. M.D.</td>
<td>Physician.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Benjamin Travays, F.B.S.</td>
<td>Surgeon of St. Thomas's Hospital.</td>
<td>Bolton.</td>
<td>11542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRISTIANS AND ENGLISHMEN !!!**

Read, and be convinced, that a Ten Hour Bill must pass. Remember, besides the above Testimony, admitting of Ten Hours, as the smallest Limitation which can be sanctioned, there is the written Testimony of Nineteen Medical Men in Scotland, of the highest Class, and of Thirteen Clergymen, besides that of many Physicians, Surgeons, Ministers of the Gospel, and humane Factory Masters, who have raised their Voice in favour of the Bill at Public Meetings. There is also the Evidence given before the Committees of Two Clergymen, Two Gentlemen, Forty-one Yorkshire Operatives, Seven from Lancashire, Seven from Scotland, and Five others, including Three Females, in all ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEEN WITNESSES, against the present Factory System.

**MEN OF GREAT BRITAIN !!!**

Here is the Four-fold Voice of Science, Humanity, Christianity, and bitter Experience, in Favour of a Ten Hour Bill. Will you suffer it to be drowned by the clamorous Noise of Avraeis and Selfishness? And will you suffer those who wish to represent you in Parliament, to put the Question of a Ten Hour Bill? First, ask them, whether Christianity and Humanity demand it; and then ask them, whether they will support it, or whether they will allow the Influence of Wealth to triumph over the highest Sanctions which God or his Creatures can give. After such Testimony as the above, (just to mention that which bears on the daily working of the System—without producing aggravated and extreme Cases,) surely henceforth Opposition must be utterly inexpressible. Christians! Fathers! Mothers! will you support the Ten Hour Bill, or renounce your Religion and your Names!!

II. Wardman, Printer, G. Chapel-lane, Bradford.
and urged by Oastler. "Here is the fourfold Voice of
Science, Humanity, Christianity, and bitter Experience,
in favour of a Ten Hour Bill," it asserts. Exhortation
and proposal, to arouse and direct the reader, follow
together: "Christians! Fathers! Mothers! will you
support the Ten Hours Bill or renounce your Religion and
your Names!!!" In the name of religion and morality it
exhorts the reader to canvass his M.P. in favor of the
Ten Hours Bill. Every word in the broadside acts to draw
the reader into the prototypical pattern of conversion
established by Oastler. That it probably succeeded rather
in reassuring the committed than in converting the
ignorant or indifferent, does not alter its fundamental
aim and construction.

At least one contemporary of Oastler's underwent a
very similar conversion to activism. She was Charlotte
Elizabeth Tonna. In her two articles in the 1830's on
the factory question Tonna unwittingly chronicled her
conversion. The first article, "Politics," is a dialogue
between a young woman and her uncle, modelled on Tonna
and her publisher, Robert Benton Seeley. The uncle
disclosed the factory evils usually disclosed by reformers:
long hours, close confinement, heat, dust, noise, nauseous
effluvia, punishment, and injuries. To this information
he added three facts or exempla culled from Leeds
newspapers; one of them is truly horrific:

On Thursday week, a youth named Thomas
Rhodes fifteen years of age, was employed
as a feeder of woollen engines at Mr. S----'s factory, Rochdale, one of the straps belonging to the engine came off; and while he was attempting to put it on the drum, the strap gathered round his ankle and carried him up. He screamed out, and two men went to his assistance, but without effect; the poor boy was taken round the drum, and as there were only about ten inches between the top of the drum and the ceiling, his head and his legs were torn from his body, and his intestines were scattered about the room.46

Moved by her uncle's general disclosures and appalled by such "dreadful particulars," the young woman awoke to the evils of the system and endorsed the Ten Hours Bill, asking what she could do to promote it. The answer was short and simple: she could inform herself fully of the true circumstances of the system and then exhort M.P.s to reach a "mutual good understanding" with master manufacturers.47 Significantly, the woman was neither directed to propose Sadler's Bill to M.P.s, nor to support any popular movement. Indeed, uncle expressly forbade agitation, which was the province of those "who are rousing the water-floods to a fierce though fruitless onset, against Him who sitteth above them."48 That the uncle should forbid proposal and agitation is strikingly inconsistent because he himself approved of Sadler's Bill and strongly criticized the Factory Act of 1833 for removing its severe penalties and its requirements of fencing. This inconsistency is all the more striking because Tonna drew these criticisms from an article in Fraser's, published four months earlier, which stoutly
upheld both proposal and agitation. The inconsistency does, however, illuminate the progress of Tonna's own conversion to activism. Alive to the baleful effects of factory labor and to the need for legislative remedy, she still relied on public discussion to stimulate the consciences of M.P.s and manufacturers: "Interest when awakened will led to enquiry; and, under the divine blessing, we shall see it followed by results that may bring health and comfort to thousands." Tonna closely resembled Oastler, before the Halifax "Resolutions" and the fourth letter, in her naive confidence in the power of exposure and exhortation to work on the conscience. Instinctively, her confidence determines the impact of the uncle's disclosures on the niece: awakened by them at once, she unhesitatingly endorsed the Ten Hours Bill, thus conforming to the established Tory radical pattern of conversion.

Tonna's conversion to activism did not stop short, but developed to maturity, as her second article on the factory controversy, published four years later, showed. In "English Slavery" she drew on a variety of sources to establish a truly compelling case for legislation to protect the "myriads of little English victims who are now suffering the horrors of a lingering, torturing death, in those frightful contrivances for extracting the last farthing that avarice can extort, from the bones and sinews, and life and spirit of multitudes of infant children,--our cotton mills and factories of various
descriptions.¹⁵² Despite her elaborate exposure of factory evils, she concentrated on the history of and obstacles to factory reform. Echoing Lord Ashley's almost simultaneous proposals in Parliament, she demanded amendment of the Factory Act of 1833 so that it would protect all children, establish a ten hour day, and affix adequate penalties for violations.⁵³ In effect she demanded an effective Ten Hours Act. The contrast with her earlier article is strong. No longer did she avoid proposing and agitating for the needed legislation; no longer did she rely on the action of awakened conscience. Rather, clearly perceiving the opposition of avaricious masters, she plumped solidly for the Ten Hours Bill. Her conversion was complete. She resembled Oastler in the fourth and later letters, maturely fighting the good fight of reform. So did she still in her later writings, especially her long tract of 1843, The Perils of the Nation.⁵⁴ Her writings fully conform the conversion to activism established by Richard Oastler, and steadfastly ignored by latter-day scholars.

III

Of the three factory novelists of 1839, only Tonna demonstrably underwent a secular conversion to activism according to the Tory radical pattern. How Frances Trollope and the anonymous author of Simon Smike came to
espouse factory reform is not revealed by available material and may never be known. Nevertheless, all of the novelists incorporated in the their works the distinctive Tory radical pattern of conversion. That Tonna and Trollope should incorporate it belongs undoubtedly to their common ideology, since much of Helen Fleetwood was written before Michael Armstrong appeared; that Simon Smike should also incorporate it does not necessarily belong to Tory radicalism, since its author undisguisedly imitated Michael Armstrong, as the authors of Pickwick Abroad, Oliver Twiss, and Nicholas Nickleberry imitated Dickens's works. The conversion common to the novels figures prominently in each in a self-contained or intercalated subplot. This subplot introduced an attractive if naive character from a wholly agrarian situation into the factory districts, then traced his conversion from awakening and arousal to activism. Innocent at the outset, this central character evolves into a committed opponent of the system. In meticulously tracing the conversions of Richard Green, Mary Brotherton, and Alice Everingham, the novelists had a twofold purpose: they aimed not only to furnish the reader with a model of conversion, but also to subject him to the exposure, exhortation, and proposal known to be successful in conversions to factory reform. The factory novels function in part as does the broadside discussed above.55
On arriving in M., or Manchester, Richard Green knows as little of things industrial as could be expected of a Suffolk peasant; indeed, "Nothing resembling the reality had ever crossed his imagination" (HF 249). By the end of this first day there, however, he is keenly aware of the evils of the factory system and the flaws of the 1833 Factory Act; he is awakened almost at once. By attending the magistrates' sessions and hearing Joe South's commentary just after his arrival, Richard comes to know the key weaknesses of the Factory Act. One case concerning a false age certificate arose because a magistrate and a physician had neglected their duties under the Act (259-63). Another case concerning employment of children without required school certificates and overworking of children ends, without defence, in a fine of five shillings. "Five shillings for seven children worked to the edge of the grave—for this is merely one instance picked out from a year's overwork," South comments (265-66). He informs Richard that one of the magistrates is the defendant's father-in-law and a second is the proprietor of a firm which trades with him. Under Hobhouse's 1831 Act, South adds, the defendant could not have had a connection on the bench and could not have been fined less than twenty pounds for each offence. In a third case, Mary Green's complaint against John Roy, browbeating, intimidation, slander, and perjury prevented any just decision. "The inspector is getting too sharp, and he must be checked, by shewing him how little good his interference can do,"
South commented later (279). The sessions presented to Richard a nightmarish spectacle; the court delivered injustice always, justice never, to the oppressed; the Factory Act licensed abuse of its provisions without regulating the factories at all. This sudden, unexpected, exposure overwhelmed Richard.

That night, in the course of a long conversation, South revealed to Richard the moral and physical evils of the factory system which he only glimpsed in court. Hot, close confinement, long hours, fatigue, dusty, fetid air, and immorality were the normal conditions of factory labor. Could not Richard see how these conditions led to intemperance and atheism? asks South. Could not he see that had he not lived rather in Manchester than in Suffolk, he would have been no different from the common operative? South's exposure overwhelms Richard as had the court earlier: "Oh, say no more!" he exclaims, burying his face in his hands. But South continues, hunting down the party truly responsible for the factory system. He finds it to be Parliament, which contemptuously disregarded operatives: "A boroughmongering Parliament passed Old Sir Robert Peel's bill, which is the only real boon ever bestowed on the poor factory labourers; and a reformed Parliament, a reforming government undid all the best clauses in that bill" (300). Richard agrees. Thus, at the end of his first day in Manchester, Richard knows of the moral and physical evils attendant on factory labor, and of the faulty legislation which permits them to exist.
He knows too that Parliament bears responsibility and that from Parliament redress must emanate. His awakening, the first part of conversion, is thorough.

Richard completes his conversion by the end of the third day. At the meeting of the Manchester Short Time Committee, he heeds Hudson's exhortation "to rouse the feelings of our fellow-countrymen on behalf of the poor children employed in these mills" (342). He heeds also his subsequent proposal that electors "make it a point with the candidate they vote for, that he should support our cause in Parliament" (342). Hudson repeats Oastler's own proposal to canvass prospective M.P.s in favor of the Ten Hours Bill. Ripened by the traumatic revelations of his first day, Richard is easily aroused and directed by Hudson; effortlessly the reformer converts the young peasant to the cause. Indeed, Richard immediately advances a plan for bringing more pressure on Parliament for the Ten Hours Bill. He suggests that the gentry should use their influence on shopkeepers and tradesmen to induce them to vote for candidates who support the Bill (242-43). Richard's activism emerges from the very moment of his conversion to the cause.

The rest of the meeting reinforces Richard's conversion and confirms its Tory radical basis. Hudson advises his new friend of an effective method of persuading the gentry to use their influence. The method is to convert them according to the threefold Tory radical pattern that Richard has just
undergone. Reformers should "have some public information given about it, such as will be read, and may stir up the hearts of God's servants to succour us" (343). After this arousal and hortation, they should propose that the gentry "bring an influence to bear on the House of Commons; and that has the power of righting all that is wrong and oppressive among their poor country people" (343-44). Such reinforcement of what the reader just encountered in Richard Green risks seeming redundant; but Tonna clearly wants to drive home to the reader the pattern of conversion. She goes even further by reiterating it, lest one overlook it. The chairman interrupts Hudson in order to recount his experience of the pattern in an anti-slavery meeting. Its organizers "read descriptions, commented on the miserable state, both bodily and spiritual, of those children, proposed resolutions, established a society, and made a collection for the express purpose of spreading those facts, and extending that appeal throughout the land" (344). The meeting achieved what Hudson and Green desired to achieve with the gentry, and it fulfills the purpose of the mass meetings which Oastler programmed to follow the publications of Short Time Committees. By this account of an anti-slavery meeting Tonna indicated the next stage of action by the Manchester Short Time Committee itself. Richard responds as expected to South's revelations, thus, and to Hudson's appeal and proposal; his conversion to activism is identical to Oastler's and Tonna's.
Furthermore, the subplot points from individuals to mass conversion, as the chairman discovers the next stage of action, namely, mass meetings. This subplot of conversion vigorously incorporates the lived Tory radical pattern: the novel is faithful to contemporary experience.

Educated in London and then isolated by the tacit constraints of polite society, Mary Brotherton knew nothing of the industrial scene. Like many women, and men, of the upper and middle classes, she "grew up in total ignorance of the moans and the misery that lurked beneath the unsightly edifices, which she just knew were called the factories..." (MA 93). She possesses the quick English conscience cherished by Tory radicals, which reacts rightly to previously unsuspected wrongs, and desires some purpose to fulfill her empty life. Both conscience and desire come into play when she abruptly seizes on Lady Clarissa's passing remark about factory life: "But why should you call it a sad way of life, Lady Clarissa?" (94). Suddenly beset by burning impatience to learn the actual state of factory labor, particularly why it should differ greatly from agricultural labor, Brotherton sets about questioning an increasingly knowledgeable series of informants. By means of Brotherton's implausible curiosity, Trollope introduces the key subplot of conversion, which alternates with the much less interesting plot, the life and adventures of Michael Armstrong. Unlike the subplot of Helen Fleetwood, which
complements its controlling plot, this one easily eclipses the altogether conventional romance plot of Michael Armstrong.

Somehow suspecting that she may be wrong to be so ignorant, Brotherton first questions her companion about operatives: "Why do not we know something about our poor people, as the people with landed estates do about theirs?" (95). Mrs. Tremlett replies that their differing knowledge is due to the differing moral worth of agricultural and industrial workers; from personal experience she knows that the former are good and virtuous, while from hearsay she gathers that the latter are vicious, intemperate, dirty, and unthrifty (96). Her reply scarcely satisfied Brotherton, who speculates that "there must be something deeply, radically wrong in a system that leads to such results" (98). Already she begins to awaken to the evils of the factory system, even though she but barely glimpses them. She next questions Martha Dowling about the opposed attitudes to laborers and operatives. Admitting her own ignorance, Martha can only repeat derogatory hearsay; she has heard all her life that operatives were good-for-nothing, disaffected, profligate, lazy, and, worst of all, very immoral. Reacting sharply to such dubious information, Brotherton concludes:

If this be so, Miss Martha Dowling, if thousands of human beings in a Christian country are stigmatized as wicked, because their destiny placed them in a particular employment, that employment ought to be swept for ever and ever
from the land, though the wealth that flowed from it outweighed the treasures of Mexico (108).

This sudden conclusion whets her desire for information and brings her to the verge of awakening. Her personal encounter with the Drake family in their squalid tenement provokes her awakening. Their degraded state and the death of the mother, vividly illustrated by August Hervieu, impress on her the unrelieved misery endured by operatives. Her ignorance "was now passing away from her intellect forever"; "this, worse than fool's paradise, was thus closed upon her for ever" (150). Following Oastler closely, Trollope compares here the first part of this secular to religious conversion. Brotherton "thanked God upon her bended knees" for opening her eyes; "never did sainted nun breathe purer or more earnest vows of self-devotion to heaven, than did this ardent-spirited girl" (150). Furthermore, like Richard Green, she is prepared and eager for activism for the time of awakening; it is so deeply-felt that exhortation is superfluous and direction alone required. She vows to devote herself "to the examination, and, if possible, to the relief of the misery she had at length learned to know existed around her" (150). Despite this encounter and her awakening, Brotherton only knows that deep misery exists among operatives; she does not know enough decisively to connect it to the factory system (151).

Accordingly the questions continue. In pursuit of an
Illustration: Auguste Hervieu dramatizes the dismal condition of the industrial operative, inexorably caught in the web of economic necessity (MA 136).
authoritative informant, Brotherton questions, third, Sophy Drake. Sophy tells of inadequate wages, poor and insufficient food, intemperance, illiteracy, fatigue, and unwittingly shows her abject ignorance of domestic skills. Nevertheless she fails to convince the heiress that factory labor brought these evils with it. Indeed, Brotherton decides not only that "it was not from her that any general information could be obtained," but also that such evils depended on the drunkenness of the father (155). As misery was the inevitable visitation on intemperance, she could never hope to do the Drakes any essential service (156). She questions, fifth, Mrs. Sykes, who speaks cryptically of the economic necessity which constrains operatives. Detecting that Mrs. Sykes is as intemperate as emaciated, Brotherton decides again that her informant is unreliable (164-65). At last she questions Parson Bell of Fairley, who informs her accurately and at length of operatives and the factory system. Bell expounds the central Tory radical doctrines, a digest in fact of G.S. Bull's Evils of the Factory System, the main pamphlet of his actual prototype, whom Mrs. Trollope met in her "home tour" of the manufacturing districts. His long exposition is especially important because it enables Brotherton to complete her conversion to activism. As he ends he stresses the need to reveal the evils of the system and to exhort others to cure them: "Loud and long must be the cry that shall awaken the indifferent and rouse the indolent to action" (206). Through these two stages of conversion Brotherton has already passed; she is fully awakened and aroused. In his next statement Bull
proposes the Ten Hours Bill as the sufficient remedy for the evils of the system. "All that we ask for," he explains, "all that the poor creatures themselves ask for, is that by Act of Parliament it should be rendered illegal for men, women and children to be kept to the wearying unhealthy labor of the mills for more than ten hours out of every day, leaving their daily wages at the same rate as now" (206). With this simple proposal he completes Brotherton's conversion; her zeal is now directed into the right channel; informed, aroused, and now directed, she can devote her talents and fortune to agitating for the Ten Hours Bill. Bell finally details the five major benefits the Bill would bestow on operatives and reaffirms the absolute need for such legislation by Parliament: "But the oppression under which they groan is too overwhelming to be removed, or even lightened, by any agency less powerful than that of the law" (207-8).

Unaccountably, however, Bell immediately undermines both his proposal and Brotherton's conversion. He announces that "all, or nearly all, that private individuals can do, in the way of petition and remonstrance, has already been tried," and counsels her that she can do nothing to promote the cause: "I cannot in conscience tell you that it is in your power effectually to assist them" (207, 208). Hence, having just completed her conversion and keenly desiring to devote herself to activism, Brotherton learns that she can do nothing. She could indulge in individual acts of personal charity, as small comfort, but the real work of factory reform
remains beyond the power of individuals. By so suddenly and so unreasonably undermining both reform and conversion, Trollope destroys much of the force of Michael Armstrong; she implies that the Tory radicalism which governs it cannot secure any effective reform of the factory system; the Ten Hours Bill cannot come to pass. In contrast, Tonna has Hudson in Helen Fleetwood assist a mere peasant in finding ways to promote the Bill. Indeed, the chairman proposed public meetings, the second part of Oastler's program, so that individuals could bring pressure on Parliament through collective action. Helen Fleetwood suggests possibilities of still more action where Michael Armstrong hastily retreats.

Furthermore, Trollope's sudden retreat jars strongly against the realism of her accounts of factory life. Bell counsels donothingism, according to the time-scheme of the novel, in 1824, long before the Ten Hours Bill was proposed, long before reformers mounted petition and remonstrance on a national scale. Petition and remonstrance were certainly not exhausted even in 1840, when Michael Armstrong was completed. And Parson Bull, transparently the model of Bell, never counselled retreat in his published speeches and writings. The utter implausibility of Bell's counsel appears in his parting statements to Brotherton. He points to the exemplary mill of John Wood and William Walker, who had voluntarily implemented the provisions of the Bill. There, he testifies, the "voice of misery is never heard, for there the love of gold is chained and held captive by religion and
humanity" (230) The mill confirms his earlier suggestion that the manufacturing system "might, in all its agencies, be made the friend of man" (205). It is a blatant contradiction to assert that individuals can do nothing, and then to commend two manufacturers who had humanized their mill, purging it of the evils of the system. At the very least, Brotherton could construct and manage similarly humane mills; thereby she could employ her fortune in implementing model factory conditions. Another equally glaring contradiction emerges later in the novel. On returning to Westmorland after a brief visit to Ashleigh, Michael Armstrong reads a mass of handbills advertising the great York Castle rally of 1832, signs a petition for the Ten Hours Bill, and attends the rally itself. He "felt convinced that duty as well as inclination would lead him to do all that a loyal subject and peaceable citizen could, in aid of the suffering class from whose ranks he had so miraculously escaped" (313). Trollope plainly shows that the individual could effectively work for factory reform and that petition and remonstrance were anything but exhausted. She directly contradicts the summary judgment given by Parson Bell and belies her carefully contrived retreat from activism. This is scarcely a satisfactory ending for the subplot of Michael Armstrong.

One explanation of the retreat from activism emerges from the historical context of Michael Armstrong. In 1839 little occurred of significance to the Factory Reform Movement because some of its leaders, in parti-
cular Joseph Rayner Stephens, and many of its supporters were actively engaged in Chartism. 1839 marked the first and most disturbing wave of "physical force" uprisings, the most notable occurring in Monmouthshire and Birmingham. To some, Michael Armstrong seemed to justify and abet the "physical force" Chartists.

Breaking the standard policy of the Athenaeum, Sir Charles Morgan reviewed the novel after the appearance of only six of its twelve monthly parts. Morgan vehemently denounced it for

scattering firebrands among the people, for wantonly decrying and discrediting a class of persons whose operations are intimately bound up with the very existence of the nation, and for adding to that already mounting sum of discontent, which, under the name of Chartism, is a matter of such grave and fearful interest to every enlightened lover of our country.

As seen in chapter two, Morgan's review was a triumph of the demand for participation in reality, providing that the participation was of an acceptable kind. For this and other Liberal reviewers, Michael Armstrong was emphatically not acceptable.

Keenly aware of such reviews and of contemporary events, Mrs. Trollope reacted promptly by altering her composition. In the preface to the 1840 single volume edition of Michael Armstrong she underscored these alterations. She revealed that her original intention had been to write a sequel in which Armstrong would have become a working class leader of "perfectly constitutional" social reform movements. However, the Chartist
activities of many factory reformers, and no doubt reviews like Sir Charles Morgan's, impelled her to abandon this scheme. Referring to the uprising of 1839, she declared:

> When those in whose behalf she hoped to move the sympathy of their country are found busy in scenes of outrage and lawless violence, and uniting themselves with individuals whose doctrines are subversive of every species of social order, the author feels that it would be alike acting in violation of her own principles, and doing injury to the cause she wishes to serve, were she to persist in an attempt to hold up as objects of public sympathy, men who have stained their righteous cause with deeds of violence and blood (iv).

Throughout this declaration, as throughout Morgan's review, one can perceive the fear of working class insurrection which obsessed the British ruling classes for the first decade of Victoria's reign. This fear, combined with a canny deference to critical demands, led Mrs. Trollope not only to abandon the proposed sequel but also to keep Mary Brotherton from any involvement in the mass campaigns of the Factory Reform Movement. Fear nullified the activism in which Brotherton's conversion should have ended.

Fear undoubtedly motivated this retreat from activism, but the actions of the hero, which constitute the plot, strongly magnify it. One of the striking features of *Michael Armstrong* is that its ideological burden is concentrated in its subplot rather than in its plot. The plot does not offset in the least the unsatisfactory ending of the subplot, which is therefore doubly glaring.
Mary Brotherton diligently seeks information about factory labor and life, undergoes the expected conversion, and unflaggingly searches for Armstrong, uncovering many evils of the factory system in her course; she also elicits from Parson Bell the novel's most authoritative statements of Tory radicalism. In sharp contrast to Mary Brotherton, Michael Armstrong remains at the periphery of the novel's Tory radicalism. One glimpses him in Brookford Mill and again in Deep Valley Mill (75-83, 181-219, 278-86), but nowhere else is he part of the industrial scene. The rest of his life and adventures scarcely pertain either to Tory radicalism or factory reform; indeed, they are almost entirely passed in Westmorland and Germany. His life and adventures are peripheral to the novel's ideology and topical concerns because they are romance, the conative, non-mimetic framework of so much realistic Victorian fiction. True to the romance narrative pattern, Armstrong begins as a poor, illiterate child and ends as a wealthy, educated gentlemen. Within so ostentatiously realistic a novel as Michael Armstrong, the romance pattern becomes an assertion of pure imagination and desire against the constraints of things as they are. This is Mrs. Trollope's personal, perhaps involuntary, assertion of her creative energies against the literary and social pressures which bind them through most of the novel. Here again is the paradox noted by George Levine: in the most realistic nineteenth century novels one finds the most conspicuous manifestations of romance, wish, and
When Hyacinth Thorneycroft decides to marry Alice Everingham, the subplot of Simon Smike begins. A scion of the landed gentry of Lancashire, she is predictably ignorant of things industrial. Like Mary Brotherton, upon whom she is undisguisedly modelled, Alice is one of the angels who constitute the moral centers of Victorian novels; she is "beautiful — a mild, placid beauty: grace was in all her movements, and kindness shone in every glance" (SS 95). Abruptly possessed, like Brotherton before her, of an insatiable curiosity about factory labor, she wheedles from Thorneycroft a visit to his factory, which proceeds as far as the counting house. She succeeds in observing only the offensiveness of the air: "Oh what a place. How dirty it is — and dear me how offensive the air is; I can hardly breathe" (101). Afterwards she resolves, in order to satisfy her tender conscience, to ascertain whether her suitor "was or was not a vexer of the poor — or hard-hearted to the widow and orphan" before consenting to marry (103). She insists on a second visit to the factory, a full inspection that exposes its evils in all their ugliness. At the start of the important visit, the author ties her investigations to the Tory radical pattern of conversion:

If every British maiden or mother could only behold the horrors which Alice saw — and hear the tales of woe which were poured into her ears by those who were the victims of the cruelty which they pictured -- the doom of the factory system would long ere this have been
overturned amidst the curses and exorcisions of the world (107-8).

Exposure of the evils should lead to their extirpation, the author sanguinely declares. This is the early position of Oastler and Tonna, which naively assumes that awakening alone will suffice for reform; exhortation and proposal remain implicit.

On entering the mill proper, Alice exclaims, "What a horrible place! How can poor creatures live in the midst of all this noise, heat and filth" (109). Her awakening to these evils is almost comically spontaneous. While Thorneycroft stands helplessly by, she questions several of the infant operatives and learns of the injuries, fatigue, deformities, illiteracy, punishment, and immorality prevalent among them. While she questions them, the author intrudes with several excerpts from the Factory Commission Report of 1833, prefacing them with the brief exhortation, "Learn it! -- bear it in your minds -- write it on your hearts -- let it influence your actions as it must appal your sensibilities: -- and SAY, shall so fiendish a system be continued?" (110; cf. 55n). He reveals and exhorts, appealing to reason and emotion, but fails to press on to proposal; he once again depends on the reader to act in some unspecified way to ameliorate the factory system. He realizes only the first two elements of the pattern of conversion, as if ignorant of the third. Significantly, Tonna cited the same section of the Report in her second article,
"English Slavery," and prefaced them similarly: "We entreat our readers to do violence to their feelings, and to force themselves to read attentively, and to reflect upon, the following statements." Both she and the anonymous author strongly emphasized disclosure and appeal, but she could not rest content with them. She carefully included, as in Helen Fleetwood, proposal of the Ten Hours Bill. She recognized, unlike the author of Simon Smike, the need to direct as well as to awaken and arouse the reader, and the character undergoing conversion.

Full inspection of Thorneycroft's mill profoundly disturbs Alice: "repugnance," "disgust," and "shock" are her emotions (109). Appositely she dissolves in tears, but comes to no resolution; she has awakened to the evils of the system without progressing to activism (118). She creates the opportunity for a third investigation, this one by questioning Sally Smike. She learns that Sally "was the victim of FORCIBLE AND SAVAGE VIOLATION" (125) by Thorneycroft, and immediately ceases to investigate, breaking her engagement to the millowner (124-28). "I have declared my mind," she tells her father, "this hand shall never be given to one who has not my heart; and, papa, I will tell you now that Mr. Thorneycroft is hateful in my sight" (128). Sheriff Everingham and Alice return home, rescuing Sally Smike; their exit ends the subplot. Compared even with Michael Armstrong, Simon Smike proves woefully inconclusive. It fails to
complete the conversion of Alice, never touching on proposal, agitation, or the Ten Hours Bill. The author composes this novel as if simple exposure would suffice to reform the factory system; the need to bring pressure on Parliament for the Bill is altogether beyond his ken. Indeed, the only solace he offers operatives is the feeble one of the rescue by a benevolent lady. In sum, Simon Smike fails to include the key element of conversion to activism; it removes the urgent, powerful drive for the Bill from its version of Tory radicalism.

Thus, the line is unbroken from Oastler's first "Slavery in Yorkshire" letter to the last and least factory novel of 1839. Unexpectedly awakened to the actualities of infant labor and aroused to expose them in public, Oastler came slowly to activism. Faced with growing opposition to his pious calls for reform, he gradually perceived the need for both strict legislation and popular pressure for Parliament to enact it. His conversion to activism was wholly unselfconscious. His lived pattern of conversion he then translated into the practical program for factory reform which Tory radicals adopted. Publications, meetings, and petitions and canvassing were simply mass forms of exposure, exhortation, and proposal: they intended to awaken, arouse, and direct. The countless open letters and broadsides issued by Short Time Committees worked in the same way, striving to lead the reader into the set pattern of
conversion. So strived the factory novels of 1839, with their more or less conclusive subplots. Already converted to the cause of factory reform, Mrs. Tonna incorporated the pattern without deviation. Fearful of aiding Chartism and sensitive to hostile reviews, Mrs. Trollope awkwardly retreated from the activism to which she led Mary Brotherton, thereby weakening her novel. The anonymous author of Simon Smike, unable to grasp the essential element of proposal, left the subplot glaringly unresolved. However conclusive the subplots in terms of Tory radicalism, it is important to recognize that all of the novelists were able to develop them without injuring the reader's native sense of what is real. Mary Brotherton, Richard Green, and Alice Everingham may seem at times too eager to learn about factory labor and life, and rather unreflective about the course of their development, but their conversions never become improbably or obviously imposed. Like John Galt in The Member, the factory novelists were able to reconcile their ideological commitment with the perpetual artistic imperative of faithfully representing human experience and fact. In these subplots, at least, there is no perceptible tension between ideology and experience. Like Galt as well, the factory novelists prospered in response to extreme and unremitting demands for participation in reality. Out of a welter of intemperate literary and social pressures, they were able to write credible ideological fiction. In light of contemporary and latter-
day efforts to do the same, their labors constitute no inconsiderable achievement.

III

The factory novels of 1839 can claim the distinction of successfully reconciling in their subplots two conflicting pressures: the urgent social and critical demands for outright participation in reality and the received artistic imperative to portray faithfully things as they are. Here at least the factory novels achieve the optimum balance of ideology and realism that is expounded for topical fiction in the Introduction. This achievement is all the more notable because few of these novels avoided the obvious pitfall of disseminating ideology to the exclusion of all other considerations. George Robert Gleig's novel, The Chronicles of Waltham, is an exemplary instance. Gleig sedulously developed the Tory radical diagnosis of the agrarian condition of England and prescribed the standard cure for it, without concerning himself unduly with credible characters or structural unity. Even like-minded reviewers objected. The critic for the Times commended both diagnosis and prescription, but disparaged the verisimilitude of the Chronicles. Its characters were particularly lacking:

There is scarcely any attempt at individuality of character. From the farming men up to my Lord, all speak nearly the same language, and their thoughts seem the fruit of one mind.
Giles Solley, indeed, at the vestry (vol. II., p. 211,) delivers a speech, in which the topics imply a knowledge of European history which is utterly incongruous with his opportunities. Even a continuity of character is not preserved.¹¹

These failures are those of Harriet Martineau's Illustrations of Political Economy, which are crowded with erudite peasants capable of Socratic logic and Spartan self-discipline. The Illustrations are overtly didactic, however, and do not pretend, as do the Chronicles, to be literary fiction. Their failures are inherent in the genre of didactic fiction and therefore excusable.

Unfortunately, the factory novels do not sustain throughout the achievement of the subplots. Indeed, the novels succumb in varying degrees to the same pitfall as Gleig's Chronicles: too responsive to the social and literary demands on them, they become more purely ideological than the novel can properly allow. In particular, they err consistently in regard to the implied author. In early Victorian realistic fiction the implied author plays an important part; he provides the reader with the only objective, fully reliable information available to him. Thus the reader can accept as fact the information that Ashleigh is one of the busiest towns in towns in Lancashire, that Helen Fleetwood is an orphan, adopted by the Greens, that Simon Smike is legally apprenticed to Hyacinth Thorneycroft, and so on. Were the implied author to falsify such basic information,
there would be little point to reading on. Whereas the narrators of the factory novels do not mislead on such basic matters, they do abandon all objectivity with regard to factory labor and life. When presenting industrial relations and conditions they express exclusively the attitudes of Tory radicalism. They occupy an ambiguous position, thus, as purveyors of objective information and evangelists for Tory radicalism and factory reform. Their ambiguous position leaves the reader ultimately uncertain as to what is fact and what doctrine.

Although the three novelists focus on several Tory radical doctrines, that of economic necessity is foremost; it generates the most emphatic pronouncements of the implied authors in each factory novel. The doctrine of economic necessity arose in opposition to the wages fund theory of political economy, as shown in chapter one. Whereas the wages fund theory held that the operative effectively determined his own wages as a free agent, the Tory radical doctrine insisted that he was anything but free. The operative was wholly constrained by the economic power of the manufacturer. The manufacturer dictated hours, intensity, conditions, and remuneration of labor to the operative, who had no voice whatever in them. All avenues of appeal were closed to the operative. Were he to protest to a Factory Inspector, Parliamentary Committee, or Royal Commission, his job was automatically forfeit. Were he to join a trades union and strike, the
master's economic resources were sure to prevail. Moreover, the rudimentary relief agencies of the time were of no help in any conflict with the manufacturer. No relief was afforded to strikers, and in times of illness or unemployment the operative was obliged to enroll his children in the mills, lest their potential earnings be deducted from his relief payments. In the end he could only accept the master's terms or starve. As Mrs. Tonna concluded in 1838 and again in 1843, "Nothing remains for him, but to crave the liberty of making merchandise of such bodily strength, or skill, as he may possess; and it is not his to dictate terms ... he who has nothing, must procure, at any price of personal suffering, the morsel without which he cannot survive until the morrow." 63

Mrs. Tonna and Mrs. Trollope clearly reiterate the doctrine of economic necessity in their novels through the convenient vehicle of the implied author. In choosing this vehicle the two novelists gain the advantage of clarity, but incur all of the disadvantages noted above. In Helen Fleetwood, as Hudson and Richard Green tour the model factory located outside of M., Mrs. Tonna intrudes with a disquisition on the doctrine of economic necessity. She meticulously rehearses the situation of the prime economic agents, parent, child, and master. She ridicules the political economists' notion that adult operatives were free agents: "They, of course, were under no compulsion, save that of poverty;
and had they rather chosen to starve, they had liberty so
to do" (370). There was no pretense, however, that
children were free agents. Children were forced to work
as pieceners and scavengers by their needy parents, "their
time, their health, their lives regarded as a bare matter
of merchandise between two parties," the parent and the
master (370). The one needed all that the child could
earn, for survival's sake; the other intended to wring
from him all that he could produce; each was "jealous
lest he should have failed to extract full profit from
the withering form of his human machine" (371). Both
denied responsibility for the child, Tonna continues.
The parent, who had no real choice in the matter, placed
full responsibility on the master, who as an educated
family man would doubtless act rightly; after all, he
could not interfere in the operation of the mill (371).
The master temporized that he must operate his costly
mill at maximum capacity; after all, he could not judge
what another's child could do; if the child voluntarily
sent to him suffered from its toil, then its parent was
at fault (371-72). Not content with this lengthy
disquisition alone, Tonna presses home true responsibility.
Directly addressing the master, she seizes on his claim
that the child was voluntarily sent to him:

Voluntarily! -- No, it is not a volun-
tary act. You will know that the
cravings of nature must be satisfied;
and though your poverty-stricken
brother asks no more than the dry
morsel from which your pampered dog
would turn away, still without that
morsel he cannot exist. You enter tacitly, at least, into a confederacy with your wealthy compeers, and leave him no option between actual starvation and a compact whereby he obtains a scanty meal, and shelter from the inclement sky, at the price of his own or his children's life-blood (HF 372).

Responsibility was his because he dominated the marketplace and effectively controlled the other agents in it.

Tonna's concluding communication is clear and emphatic.

Mrs. Trollope similarly intervenes in Michael Armstrong in order to emphasize the doctrine of economic necessity. As the hero ponders over the fortunate release of Fanny Fletcher the author suddenly holds forth:

In no other situation do labouring men, women, and children, feel and know that unless they submit in all things to the behests of their employer, they must die -- and that too by a process ten thousand times slower than either the hangman's cord, or the headsman's axe -- they must die the death of famine. If their lingering hours of labour be prolonged beyond the stipulated time for which they are paid, they cannot turn and say, 'I will not, for it is not in the bond,' for the ready answer is, 'Go. We employ none who make conditions with us.' And where are they to go? To the parish officers? As ready an answer meets them there: 'Go. We relieve none who can get work, and refuse it.' If they are fined, however unjustly, however arbitrarily, if the iniquitous truck system be resorted to for payment of wages, instead of money, if their
women be insulted, or their children crippled, and remonstrance follows, the same deathdooming reply awaits them: 'Go. We employ no grumblers here' (MA 282).

Her summary of the constraints on the operative is excellent. Whereas Mrs. Tonna deftly exposes the bad faith practiced by master and parent, she rigorously identifies the avenues closed to the poor operative. Both novelists passionately restated the doctrine of economic necessity and the reader can easily appreciate arguments that are so lucidly and forcefully put. Were these disquisitions included in public speeches or pamphlets, they would have undoubtedly impressed many. Included in early Victorian novels, however, they appear as dry preachments without justification in their immediate context. They are statements of propaganda which reduce the effectiveness of the novels by making them unduly like the many pamphlets on the Factory Question issued by Tory radicals. This pamphleteering coincides exactly with contemporary critical demands, as it was intended to do, but deprives the factory novels of the openness to experience expected of them.

Such outspoken pamphleteering abruptly interrupts the narrative action of the novels, further injuring them. Mrs. Tonna leaves Hudson and Richard Green hanging fire in the the mill outside M. and does not allow the emotional impact of their visit to register on Green; her essay forestalls it. Likewise, Michael Armstrong's simultaneous grief and joy over Fletcher's release is
introduced, suspended, and then reintroduced so that Mrs. Trollope can hold forth. These interruptions would not enhance any novel. Furthermore, by intruding with these preachments, the novelists badly erode the objectivity of the implied authors. If such overtly partisan doctrines are iterated as uncontestable truth, then what can the reader accept as truly non-partisan? The distinction between fact and opinion vanishes. The novelists unwittingly render their narrators unreliable and thereby diminish the realistic impression of their works. Ideological commitment betrayed Mrs. Tonna and Mrs. Trollope into statements that, although earnest and impassioned, severely weaken their novels.

It is instructive that the novelists need never have intruded these damaging statements into their novels. In the course of the subplots of inquiry they furnished their works with a variety of characters who could speak authoritatively about factory life and labor. In fact several characters in each novel do mention the economic constraints on the operative. Tom South, for one, takes Richard Green in hand, as he did Widow Green earlier, and reliably informs him about economic necessity. South freely confesses that he has no choice but to enroll his children in the mills, however bitterly he regrets it. "With my bedridden old mother, and wife in a galloping consumption, and myself hardly up to the little work I can get, and not a hand's turn at any business for them, I can't take them out of employ," he says. "What can I
do?" (HF 87). Similarly, Parson Bell instructs Mary Brotherton with the authority that her prior informants lack. Touching briefly on the theme of economic necessity, he declares that child operatives "have no power of choice, for if they, or their parents for them, refuse, they are instantly turned off to literal starvation -- no parish assistance being allowed to those who resist the regulations of the manufacturers" (MA 206). Parson Bell and Tom South can expound the doctrine of economic necessity with perfect appropriateness and credibility. Instead of these brief remarks, they could easily have been given the gist of the implied narrators' statements. An activist priest in the factory districts and a militant former operative could express the doctrine vividly and plausibly, without incurring any of the liabilities of the implied author. Mrs. Tonna and Mrs. Trollope should have relied more on their characters and less on their own ideological rectitude. In the end their ideological commitment undermined their art.
Notes


2 On the genesis of Michael Armstrong see Thomas Adolphus Trollope, What I Remember (London: Bentley, 1887), 2, 7-13, and F.E. Trollope, Francis Trollope: Her Life and Literary Work from George III to Victoria (1895; rpt. New York: AMS, 1975), 1, 300. Subsequent biographies of Mrs. Trollope derive from these accounts.

3 See the advertisement for the first installment, Northern Star (23 March 1839), p. 3.


6 This debate appears in Hansard, 3S, 48 (1839), cols. 1078-86.

7 This episode appears in Hansard, 3S, 55 (1840), cols. 786-809.

8 "Tales of Military and Naval Life," ER, 52 (1832), 119-20.

9 "Loose Thoughts," FM, 18 (1838), 500.

11 Vienna and the Austrians (London: Bentley, 1838), 2, 279.


13 He quotes them abundantly in the footnotes, e.g. p. 55.

14 The authoritative discussion of the implied author is, of course, Wayne Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago: Chicago U.P., 1961), pp. 67-81. Booth defines the implied author in a well known passage: the novelist "creates not simply an ideal, impersonal 'man in general' but an implied version of himself that is different from the implied authors we meet in other men's works. . . . However impersonal he may try to be, his reader will inevitably construct a picture of the official scribe will never be neutral toward all values," pp. 70-71. See also Susan Suleiman's "Ideological Dissent from Works of Fiction: Toward a Rhetoric of the Roman à These," Neophilologious, 60 (1976), 162-77, to which I am indebted.


16 Buckley, p. 87.

17 "Loss and Gain? The Theme of Conversion in Late Victorian Fiction," VS, 9 (1965), 29-44.
18 Ibid., pp. 32-33.


20 "Yorkshire Slavery (No. 1)," LM (16 Oct. 1830), p. 4; rpt. in Driver, pp. 42-44.

21 Ibid., pp. 42-43.

22 Ibid., p. 44.


25 "Slavery . . . (No. 2)," p. 4.

26 Ibid., p. 4.

27 Ibid., p. 4.


29 Ibid., p. 4.

30 Ibid., p. 4.

31 Driver reprints this document, pp. 547-50.

32 "Slavery in Yorkshire (No. 4)," LI (24 March 1831), p. 4.

33 Ibid., p. 4.

34 "TO THE WORKING CLASSES OF THE WEST RIDING OF THE


36 "Slavery in Yorkshire (No. 5)," LI (20 Oct. 1831), p. 4.

37 Ibid., p. 4.

38 "Public Meeting at Huddersfield in support of Mr. Sadler's Factory Bill," LI (29 Dec. 1831), p. 3.


40 "Slavery . . . (No. 5)," p. 4.

41 Ibid., p. 4.

42 Ibid., p. 4.

43 Ibid., p. 4.


45 "Politics," Christian Lady's Magazine, 1 (1834), 154-60. "Politics" was Tonna's continuing editorial article, equivalent to her article, "The Watchman," in the Protestant Magazine, 1841-1843. See her husband's "Concluding Remarks" in her Personal Recollections (London:
278

Seeley and Burnside, 1847), pp. 392-393.

46 Ibid., p. 157.
47 Ibid., p. 159.
48 Ibid., p. 160.
49 William Maginn, "Specimens of the Art of Governing 'by Commission,'" FM, 8 (1833), 477-78. Significantly, Seeley frequently cited this article in his own works, as in Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Michael Thomas Sadler (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1842), pp. 418-24, and Remedies suggested for some of the evils which constitute "The Perils of the Nation" (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1844), pp. 232-35.

52 Ibid., p. 47.
53 Ibid., p. 59.


56 The Evils of the Factory System (Bradford: T. Inkersley, 1832). On her meeting with Bull see T.A. Trollope, I, 11.


62 For a similar analysis of the roman à these see Suleiman, esp. pp. 168-69.

Chapter Five

Disraeli and the Condition of England:

The Tory Radicalism of Sybil

In his retrospective "General Preface" of 1870, Disraeli reaffirmed the internal suggestions of his trilogy of the 1840's: Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred formed a comprehensive manifesto of the Young England Party. Each novel was dedicated, he explained, to one of three principal topics: "The derivation and character of political parties; the condition of the people which had been the consequence of them; the duties of the Church as a main remedial agency in our present state."  

Few novelists have been as successful as Disraeli in influencing subsequent interpretation of their work. Indeed, it is the consensus of latter-day critics that the "great trilogy of the 1840's is, in effect, an exposition of the more serious and coherent ideas of Young England."  

Perhaps the most significant refinement of this interpretation, begun by Froude and newly reaffirmed by Lord Blake and Richard Levine, holds that Young England was the political expression of the Oxford Movement.  

Disraeli's trilogy advanced medieval political ideals as the Oxford Movement upheld their religious correlates, from neo-Gothic architecture to Anglican holy orders.  

One distinguished historian, Donald Southgate, has challenged the consensus on the Young England trilogy with
respect to Sybil, which I believe to be the best of Disraeli's novels. In a recent study of the Conservative party from Disraeli to Law, Southgate argues that "Sybil seems to owe more than is usually granted to [William Busfeild] Ferrand and to the writings of Richard Oastler (imprisoned for debt in the Fleet from 1841 to 1844) who stood at the heart of a Northern movement against the 'thraldom of capitalism' and the oppression and laches of government." Southgate boldly locates Sybil in the context of the leading anti-capitalist ideology of the early Victorian period, relegating Young England to a distinct second place. He infers that Disraeli consciously drew on Tory radicalism in this novel while downplaying the already moribund schemes of Young England.

Although undeveloped, Southgate's argument is perceptive and, I believe, valid. For the present study, it has the immediate effect of placing Sybil in the line of Tory radical novels which began with The Member in 1832. This context illuminates the ideologically determined elements of Disraeli's novel, in particular, character, action, setting, and thematic organization. This context also provides a corrective to the received idea that Sybil was the first unquestioned "social-problem" novel and should be seen in light of later novels, from Mary Barton to Felix Holt. Unlike other Tory radical novels, however, Sybil does not possess a pure commitment to its ideology. It bears the trappings of Young England as its concluding pages amply demonstrate: "From the state of
parties it would now draw public thought to the state of the People whom those parties for two centuries have governed" (S 430). Indeed, the novel is instructive precisely because it is the product of two different and not fully congruent ideologies. As I shall show, Sybil is divided between a compelling Tory radical analysis of the condition of England and an implausible Young England remedy which is bound up in the romance narrative pattern; diagnosis and cure come from different schools of social thought and inform different structural components. Disraeli openly incorporated in Sybil three well-established Tory radical principles: that acceptance of the prescriptions of political economy ruined the condition of the country; that abdication of the governors of Britain permitted and abetted the depredations of political economy; and that the unnatural schism of society into rich and poor came about by a combination of the two preceding factors. Here is the true strength of the novel. Disraeli advanced as openly the Young England panacea for the ills of the nation, namely, a rejuvenated aristocracy which would take its rightful place as the leadership of the people. Here is the weakest part of Sybil, a thorough anticlimax.

Southgate does not establish the connections between Disraeli and Tory radicalism, but they certainly exist. Many of these connections are peripheral: Disraeli was an ally of the elder John Walter, M.P. and editor of the
Times, who enjoyed the support of Richard Oastler and in turn supported him; and Thomas Duncombe obtained for Disraeli the "whole of the correspondence of Feargus O'Connor when conductor of the 'Northern Star,'" which contained many letters from such leading Tory radicals as Oastler and Joseph Rayner Stephens. Some of these connections are direct: in 1839 and 1840 Disraeli defended Oastler by name in the House of Commons against the accusations of such prominent Whigs as Lord John Russell, Home Secretary, and Sir Charles Grey, Judge Advocate-General; also, Disraeli was a close friend and colleague of the pugnacious Tory radical, William Busfeild Ferrand, from whose Harden Grange estate he obtained some of the topographical features of Sybil. Undoubtedly, Disraeli knew Tory radicalism thoroughly long before he undertook the second part of the trilogy.

One aspect in particular of Disraeli's public life confirms this knowledge: his consistent opposition to the New Poor Law of 1834. As early as 1835 in the Vindication of the English Constitution, he had denounced the Whigs for passing the Law and declared his belief that the "soil on which [the Englishman] labours must supply him with an honest and decorous maintenance." On the hustings in 1837 he boasted that he was the first county magistrate to oppose the Law. In Parliament he repeatedly voted and spoke with a tiny group of Radicals, Ultra Tories, and Tory radicals in opposing successive renewals of the Law. He explained in detail the reasons
for his opposition in the debate on the Chartist National Petition in 1839 and again in 1841. These explanations are noteworthy because they show his near proximity to the constant Tory radical statements on the New Poor Law. Indeed, Disraeli was uncannily reminiscent of Oastler, the foremost leader of the Anti-Poor Law Movement. In the speech of 1839, praised by Mark Hovell as the "most interesting contribution to the debate," he contended that the Law invaded the civil rights of the working class by denying their constitutional right to subsistence. This was of course a familiar contention of Tory radicals, one that Oastler expressed as soon as the Law passed. "The Constitution for which our fathers died is now destroyed!" he wrote in 1834, "Whigs-Tories-and Radicals have now joined their forces in Parliament, to upset the rights of the Poor, -to remove them from the protection of the Law, -to deprive them of any right to the soil of England!"

The Law not only invaded the civil rights of the poor, Disraeli continued, it instituted as well the French system of centralized government, which was inherently unsuited to the English character. He reproached the Tories specifically for consenting to the Law because their consent betrayed the traditional "principle of opposing everything like central government, and favouring in every possible degree the distribution of power." In a major series of letters published in the Northern Star in 1838, Oastler likewise condemned the Reformed
Parliament for its intention "to destroy all their local attachments to the magistrate and local officers of their districts... and to cover the country with an unconstitutional police:—thus establishing the hateful system of French centralization by French espionage!!"\(^{17}\)

Furthermore, Disraeli attributed the Law to the ascendant political power of the newly enfranchised ten pound freeholders. They possessed great privileges, but no corresponding duties. Consequently they demanded the New Poor Law since it operated "without any appeal to their pocket, without any cost of their time."\(^{18}\) Oastler sounded the same note in his 1838 letters to the Northern Star. He bitterly denounced the Reform Act for enabling the passage of the Law, highlighting the inhumane regime of the new workhouses it instituted: "The expectations that had been raised in the minds of the people, under the name of 'Reform,' have ended in disappointment. That minority which promised them peace—has sent them the sword! Instead of bread, it has given them separation, starvation, and imprisonment!"\(^{19}\) Oastler and Disraeli, thus, expressed virtually identical views of the New Poor Law; in Oastler's Tory radicalism one finds Disraeli's working brief. "Those were not merely Oastler's arguments: they were some of his very phrases," Cecil Driver concludes in his magisterial biography of Oastler.\(^{20}\) For nearly eleven years before the publication of Sybil, Disraeli had not merely known and known of leading Tory radicals, but had also enunciated their views of one of the most
contentious measures of the period.

As a prologue to the main action of *Sybil*, Disraeli outlined in the lengthy third chapter the history of England from the reign of Henry VIII to the premiership of Wellington. He attributed the dismal state of the country in 1830 to the usurpations of the Whig oligarchy and to the "system of Dutch finance" instituted by William III. This attribution was part and parcel of the Young England theory of history—that idealized mélange of Clarendon's *History*, Bolingbroke's *Patriot King*, Kenelm Digby's *Broadstone of Honour*, Scott's historical novels, and the *Tracts for the Times*. However, the Whig oligarchy and the national debt seem ludicrously inadequate to explain the woes of 1830, "a mortgaged aristocracy, a gambling foreign commerce, a home trade founded on a morbid competition, and a degraded people" (21), and they bear peripherally at best on the industrial and agrarian troubles disclosed in the novel. Indeed, one contemporary reviewer detected the inadequacy of these two causes but graciously forgave the "absurd theories" of Young England, "the abuse of the Reformation and the Revolution--of the great Whig families--of the Stadtholer of Holland, and of Dutch finance."22

As if aware of this inadequacy, Disraeli returned to his history in chapter five, identifying the cause of the
condition of England from the Reform Act on: "To acquire, to accumulate, to plunder each other by virtue of philosophic phrases, to propose a Utopia to consist only of WEALTH and TOIL, this has been the breathless business of enfranchised England for the last twelve years, until we are startled from our voracious strife by the wail of intolerable serfage" (31). Here Disraeli introduced a far more plausible cause, namely, the unrestricted pursuit of wealth, of self-interest, sponsored by the newly dominant "philosophy" of political economy. It is most significant that here the jejeune historical theories of Young England have no part. Rather, for the sufficient cause of the condition of England, Disraeli turned to perhaps the foremost theme of Tory radicalism, the critique of political economy. From 1826 on Tory radicals had sharply denounced the policy prescriptions of political economy as the prime cause of the nation's evils, as shown in chapter one. Indeed, in 1844, as Sybil was in process, Robert Benton Seeley had declared that "it is by adopting this system of Adam Smith and Malthus, that we have got the country into its present frightful condition; and it is only by an entire and complete reversal, that we shall ever succeed in recovering it." Setting aside the dicta of Young England at the very outset of Sybil, Disraeli adopted the Tory radical analysis of the condition of England.

To develop and support the laconic statement of chapter five, Disraeli included a concrete illustration
of the pernicious effects of political economy on the condition of England. He carefully portrayed Lord Marney as an outspoken proponent of political economy, then exposed the consequences of his precepts for the laborers of the Marney estate. Disraeli forthrightly characterized Marney as having "no inconsiderable acquaintance with the doctrines of the economists" and as, appropriately, a disciple of Helvétius, the philosopher of self-interest (47). Marney embraces wholeheartedly the doctrines of two economists in particular, Malthus and Ricardo. Following Malthus's theory that population, if unchecked, will continually press against and ultimately exhaust the means of subsistence, Marney considers surplus population to be the premier evil of the time; he declares absolutely that "it is all an affair of population" (12). Hence he pursues all feasible efforts to diminish the population of the working class. Since Malthus attacked Arthur Young's allotment plan as an "encouragement to marriage and a bounty on children," 25 Marney too is "tremendously fierce against allotments" and opposes even the attenuated substitute for them, potato grounds (47, 111). As Malthus criticized the "facility of obtaining a cabin" as another incentive to population growth, 26 so Marney acts vigorously against cottages. "I will take care that the population of my parishes is not increased," he informs St. Lys. "I build no cottages, and destroy all I can; and I am not afraid or ashamed to say so" (112). He even regards employment as a stimulus to population, in a tirade
that is an unwitting *reductio ad absurdum* of the political economy he espouses: "The people do not want employment, it is the greatest mistake in the world: all this employment is a stimulus to population" (127). While hostile to all that encourages population growth, Marney endorses two measures intended to reduce it: emigration and the New Poor Law. "Nothing can put this country right but emigration on a great scale," he asserts confidently, reiterating one of the leading panaceas of his "philosophy" (112). Until the government should implement a program of mass emigration, Marney strictly enforces the New Poor Law. Overtly Malthusian in character, the New Poor Law was designed by Nassau Senior and Edwin Chadwick to discourage "improvident marriages" and the increase of population.\(^{27}\) Finding in it confirmation of his dearest precepts and authority to act on them, Marney "eulogized the New Poor Law, which he declared would be the salvation of the country" and gauged its success by the reduction of rates (47-49, 110). Hence, Marney's political economy consistently worked against population growth, deriding measures which supposedly would stimulate it and supporting those which could diminish it.\(^{28}\)

Having elicited Marney's economic creed, Disraeli portrayed its effects on the laborers of his estate. The technique that sets up the portrayal is very effective: the first chapter of book two places the doctrinaire aristocrat at Marney Abbey and reveals his creed; the
brief second chapter relates Egremont's droll conversation with Sir Vavasour; in sharp contrast, the third chapter depicts the wretched state of the working class, produced entirely by the policies of Marney and his fellow landowners. Disraeli turned abruptly from cause to effect, vividly connecting them for the reader. The effect is lurid: congested lanes of ruinous huts, built of rubble and unhewn stone, surrounded by heaps of decomposing muck, infected with disease, and a hungry, degraded people. Because landowners had systematically destroyed cottages for over fifty years, even these squalid huts were overcrowded. Because the working class contrived to multiply even without the stimuli of cottages and allotments, "there were few districts in the kingdom where the rate of wages was more depressed" (55). The laborers reacted to their abject conditions in two significant ways: by poaching, exemplified by the luckless Thomas Hind, and by incendiarism, manifested in the burning of the ricks of Abbey Farm (201, 57). Disraeli emphasized that incendiarism was the direct, inarticulate response of the poor to their desperate plight. "Do you know, sir," Bingley confides to Egremont, "there were two or three score of them here, and except my own farm servants, not one of them would lend a helping hand to put out the flames" (57). Marney's angry insistence that wages had nothing to do with the fires simply betrays his guilty consciousness that they in fact had very much to do with them. Intended to discourage surplus population,
and to lower the rates, the prescriptions of the economists, so zealously implemented by Marney, led not only to the immiseration and increase of the population, but to poaching and incendiarism as well. Political economy brought about the reverse of what it desired and expected.

In refuting the prescriptions of Marney's creed by revealing their injurious practical effects, Disraeli adhered, perhaps consciously, to an inveterate Tory radical tactic. Tory radicals had habitually criticized the doctrines of political economy by focusing on their effects when put into practice. As David Robinson concluded in 1830, the "results completely falsify all the principal doctrines of the Economists." While adopting this familiar tactic in Sybil, Disraeli also reiterated the longstanding Tory radical explanation of agrarian distress, one aspect of the condition of England. Precisely like Disraeli, Tory radicals attributed the horrific circumstances of the agrarian laborer to the destruction of cottages and allotments mandated by political economy, which promoted large farms as a means of reducing population and increasing profits. As early as 1822 John Galt had articulated this explanation. Writing in Blackwood's, he contended that the "system of great farms is a Malthusian system; its tendency is to increase the means of subsistence, and to diminish population." Among the effects of the large farm system were the destruction of cottages and hamlets, the enclosure of allotments, and the inevitable dispossessio
of laborers into overcrowded villages and market towns. Like Disraeli twenty-two years later, Galt unhesitatingly blamed the landed aristocracy for instituting the large farm system and thereby creating agrarian distress: the "outcry should be directed against the Country Gentlemen, who had depopulated their estates, to make room for the great-farm system. They, and they only, are the class who have lessened the employment of the poor."\(^{31}\)

Galt's initial explanation of agrarian misery became commonplace among Tory radicals over the following twenty-two years. The Reverend Edward Edwards restated it at length in several influential articles of 1829-30. Edwards deplored the general extinction of allotments, small farms, and their attached cottages that had begun in the early eighteenth century, and angrily defined the cause of it in the very terms employed by Galt eight years before, and Disraeli fifteen years later:

The gross and pernicious absurdities of the Malthusian School, have inspired the landowners of the country with so much horror of cottages, that the want of that species of accommodation for the labouring poor begins to operate as an intolerable evil in many parts of the country. . . it seems to operate admirably in destroying the comforts, degrading the character, and deteriorating the morals of the poor: but it appears somewhat doubtful whether it will have any effect in preventing improvident marriages and checking the increase of population.\(^{32}\)

As in Sybil, political economy paradoxically succeeded in degrading and impoverishing the working class while failing to achieve its aim of reducing their numbers.
Edwards rehearsed, much more fully than Galt, the harmful consequences of the large farm system: the destruction of the moral character of the poor, of honesty, sobriety, contentment, and a dramatic increase in the poor rates. More importantly, Edwards, on the eve of the Swing riots of 1830-31, warned that poaching and incendiarism would also ensue from the Malthusian policies implemented by the landowners. The pattern of cause and effect detailed in Sybil was then complete.

Michael Thomas Sadler canonized this pattern in his major speech of 1831 on the laboring poor, which introduced the second part of his threefold plan for healing the ills of the nation. Sadler denounced the large farm system of the "ignorant and selfish system of spurious political economy" and provided a thorough, if familiar, list of its results: destruction of cottages, subsequent overcrowding and demoralization, increased crime, exorbitant rents, and subsistence wages. He was much more graphic than either Edwards or Galt in describing its impact on the working class:

The lonely and naked hut into which they are now thrust, for which is exacted an exorbitant rent, is destitute, both without and within, of all that formerly distinguished their humble abodes, is often unfit to stable even quadrupeds, and frequently so crowded by different families, as to set not comfort merely, but decency at defiance, and render morality itself an impossible virtue. Thither, then, the unhappy parent, when employed, carries his wages, which, with the exception of a few short weeks in the year, are utterly inadequate to supply the necessities of a craving family. . . . Not only are the falsest accusations
levelled at him, but even the feelings common to nature are imputed to him as an offence; his marriage was a crime; his children are so many living nuisances, he himself is pronounced a redundancy; and after having been despoiled of every advantage he once possessed, he is kindly recommended as his best, and indeed only course to transport himself for life, for the good of his oppressors, and to die unpitied and unknown in some distant wilderness.34

This passage anticipates the Marney episode of Sybil with uncanny accuracy. The features of rural poverty are virtually identical, from the squalid, unsanitary huts to low wages to overcrowding and demoralization. Although Disraeli obtained the details of the Marney estate from Edwin Chadwick's famous Report of the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population,35 he presents them in the Tory radical pattern determined by Sadler's speech. Also identical to Sybil is the Malthusian judgment of the poor laborer and his family. But Sadler's speech is also notable for its stern warning, reinforced by the still fresh memory of the Swing riots, that the laborer would react like Samson to his miserable circumstances, with the "spirit of vengeance and of strength," overthrowing the entire social structure. In the aftermath of Captain Swing, Sadler reminded the House of Commons of his message on Ireland: as the "clearings" of the Irish peasantry had engendered revolt after revolt, so the continuation of the large farm system would lead to more agrarian uprisings in England itself.36

The agrarian distress of 1843-45 impelled later Tory radicals to reiterate the pattern which was permanently
Illustration: Punch, 7 (29 June 1844), 17, captures the misery of the agricultural laborer, which would drive him to poaching and incendiaryism. The Tory radical view of rural distress is neatly embodied here.
set in 1831. In her once famous tract of 1843, *The Perils of the Nation*, Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna consciously followed in Sadler's footsteps. She carefully surveyed the unceasing toil, poor food, ragged clothing, and ruinous huts suffered by the laboring class, then observed that they were thereby driven to "indulge in poaching, smuggling, and often, in their blind revenge, in rick-burning." "Such is the state, and such are the prospects to which the modern system of political economy would consign the great body of our agricultural poor," she concluded.37 Adoption of political economy by the gentry and landed aristocracy, destruction of cottages, enclosure of allotments and small farms, then degradation and impoverishment of the working class, culminating in poaching and incendiaryism: the pattern of cause and effect is clear.38

The pattern is equally clear in *Sybil*. Acutely sensitive to the "Condition of the People" at precisely the time Mrs. Tonna wrote, Disraeli may well have encountered the Tory radical analysis of agrarian distress through her tract or kindred published sources. But one need not merely conjecture that Disraeli knew what was in the wind and relied on it to supplement the feeble theories of Young England in the novel. Rather, Disraeli's extensive knowledge of Tory radical agrarian thought is indisputable. His outspoken friend and colleague, William Busfeild Ferrand, introduced in 1843 a bill for providing the poor with allotments from existing waste lands. Ferrand
discussed the overcrowding, immorality, and disease engendered by the scarcity of sound cottages and allotments, then, quoting from Sadler's speech of 1831, outlined a program which would end the scarcity. Here was the Tory radical analysis coupled to a specific remedial measure, which Lord John Manners immediately supported. Postponed several times, Ferrand's bill eventually lapsed, whereupon Lord Ashley proposed another with the same aims. Furthermore, Disraeli and Manners joined Ferrand in October 1844, when Sybil was in progress, to celebrate the success of an allotment program conducted at Bingley by Mrs. Walker Ferrand. Speaking at the public dinner, Manners stressed the value of allotments to the laborer while declaring that "contentment must spring from hope, and no one could pretend to say that there was any hope under the large farm system, that the peasant could rise out of the condition in which he had been placed." Disraeli likewise expatiated on the benefits of allotments while assuring his audience that "no dry dogmas of political economy however quoted, will stop us in our course, supported by the sympathy of millions, and working for the benefit of a nation." Under Ferrand's tutelage, Disraeli and Manners expounded the agrarian program and views of Tory radicalism, for all the world to see. Indeed, the two Young Englanders did in person what Disraeli did in Sybil: they neglected their own sophomoric lessons to acquire, if only temporarily, the established views of the leading anticapitalist
Perhaps the most telling evidence for Disraeli's use of Tory radicalism in the Marney episode lies in George Robert Gleig's cheap novel of 1845, Things Old and New. Being a Sequel to "The Chronicles of Waltham ". Like Disraeli and so many other topical novelists of the decade, Gleig announced that his purpose was to express "certain opinions on subjects of grave interest," fiction being the most effective vehicle for them. But Gleig, unlike most topical novelists, chose to address the recently revived issue of agrarian distress. He traced closely the decline of a small Kentish village, Waltham, from prosperity to embittered poverty. Waltham's prosperity ensued from an allotment system established in the wake of the fires of 1830, as related in The Chronicles of Waltham. With the allotment system, the landowners and farmers of Waltham maintained their rentals, secured a contented, fully employed workforce, and reduced the poor rates by two thirds (2). The appearance of a new landowner, Samuel Smith, marked the decline of Waltham. A wealthy stockbroker and M.P. for Tinborough (and cross between Ricardo and James Smith of Deanston), Smith, like Lord Marney, is a close student of political economy (74). Like Lord Marney as well, Smith considers the allotment system in particular as "a positive abomination" (47). He fiercely opposes it on doctrinaire grounds: it interferes with the free operation of the labor market and would inevitably bring repetition of the disastrous
Irish system of underletting. Determined to put an end to it, Smith convenes a meeting of Waltham farmers and leads it to a resolution that all allotments should be enclosed. Precisely as in Sybil, widespread enclosure of allotments leads directly to poaching and incendiarism. Heretofore honest and peaceful laborers become ferocious poachers, emptying Smith's preserves and ambushing his gamekeepers. On a single night an incendiary fires the ricks of the four largest farms in the parish. As in Sybil again, the laborers present sullenly refuse to assist those fighting the fires. At Smith's farm a few laborers "worked at the engines or carried water; but the large majority stood by with their hands in their pockets, till, one after another, the whole of the stacks were ignited, and the triumph of the destroyer was complete" (185). In sum, Things Old and New and Sybil share without exception the main elements of the Tory radical pattern: a landowner committed to political economy, enclosure of allotments, immiseration of the working class, poaching and incendiarism. Both novels reiterate the central theme of Tory radicalism: the prescriptions of political economy inevitably devastate the working class.

The shared elements of Things Old and New and Sybil are all the more significant because their authors were each ignorant of the other's work. Gleig finished Things Old and New in February 1845 and it was published in April; hence it was much too recent to have influenced Sybil before its completion, in desperate haste, on May
Day. Nor is there any evidence that Disraeli knew Gleig personally, perhaps having access to his novel in composition. The only plausible explanation of the common elements of the two novels is that they stemmed from a single ideology, Tory radicalism. Furthermore, in reviewing *Sybil* for *Fraser's*, Gleig took the opportunity to emphasize one of these common elements. He praised Lord Marney as the "best drawn" character in the novel, noting that his "determination not to admit that the fire at Marney Abbey and its origin in low wages and a discontented peasantry is too near the truth to be disputed." While tartly criticizing Egremont and Sybil, Gleig predictably favored Marney because he and Samuel Smith were instances of the same Tory radical type, the landowner committed to political economy.

II

In the Marney episode Disraeli discovered an ideological means of organizing the rest of *Sybil*. Tory radicals had meticulously diagnosed every evil of the condition of England as a result of one or more specific policies of political economy. As the large farm system had devastated rural England, so other policies had caused the grave condition of industrial England: the wages fund theory condemned the operatives of the textile mills to ever longer toil and lower wages; the doctrine that machinery was an unmitigated good impoverished the handloom
weavers, and so on. Tory radicalism also provided character types who could function as does Lord Marney: the rapacious millowner, the "slaughterhouse" merchant, and others. However, the option offered by the critique of political economy did not allow Disraeli to write at his best; he excelled with such upper class characters as Marney, Monmouth, and Rigby, and very seldom with characters from other classes. The farther Disraeli moved from fashionable life, which he knew intimately, and the nearer he approached the daily life of the working class, known at second hand, the worse he wrote. Indeed, Devils--dust and Warner are the only working class characters in Sybil who truly live for the reader, as critics Victorian as well as modern generally agree.

In order to deploy his strongest skills as a novelist, Disraeli obviously had to focus on the upper class. In order to fulfill the avowed purpose of Sybil, he also could not neglect the remaining "Condition of the People." The conflict between these two requirements had been latent in Sybil from the outset, but the historical chapters and the Marney episode had not precipitated it; subsequent chapters threatened to do so, if they conformed to the critique of political economy. Disraeli reconciled the two requirements, successfully, by abandoning the Tory radical critique for a theme more familiar to him: the abdication of the governors. He organized subsequent chapters by accounting for the plight of the industrial working class as a direct product of the
irresponsibility of the ruling class. He repeatedly condemned the aristocracy and Parliament for failing to perform the duties contingent on their enormous privileges. His condemnation of them is devastating, surely the most outstanding part of the novel. Indeed, it is easily the most effective attack on them in the early Victorian novel, surpassing the fashionable novels which frightened Conservative reviewers in 1832 as well as the Radical novels of Marryat, Trelawny, and W. J. Neale. Not since the heyday of Godwin, Bage, and Holcroft had the English novel known such an attack on the ruling class.

Nevertheless Disraeli did not abandon the critique of political economy without preparing for the emergence of the new theme. For example, he characterized Lord Marney as an irresponsible aristocrat as well as a landowner committed to political economy. Marney's ruling passion is an indomitable selfishness, which makes him inconsiderate even to his wife and heartless to his laborers. He beligerently opposes any attempt to benefit them; he keeps wages low, disapproves of beer money, forbids infant schools, severely enforces the game laws, hates leases, discourages Vicar Slimsey from performing his pastoral duties, and usurps the tithes belonging to his living (47-48, 56, 201). Equally, he implements the measures prescribed by political economy which serve his personal interests while openly rejecting those, like repeal of the corn laws, which do not. The New Poor Law is a case in point. Marney strictly enforces it,
ostensibly, as one of several measures designed to discourage population growth; however, he mentions only those aspects of the Law which reduce the cost of its operation, namely the workhouse test, denial of out-door relief, dietaries, and the bastardy clause (48-49, 110). He betrays his true concern when he confides to Lord de Mowbray, "We continue reducing the rates, and as long as we do that the country must improve" (110). Reduction of the poor rate alone concerns this aristocratic landowner, not the greatest happiness of the greatest number. While Disraeli's notice of Marney and the New Poor Law helps to introduce the theme of aristocratic irresponsibility, it also reveals yet another dimension of the Tory radical influence on Sybil. In resisting the Law, during the Anti-Poor Law Movement and afterwards, Tory radicals argued, in part, that it was an attempt by the landed aristocracy to reduce their rate-payments, their entailed obligations to the poor. Richard Oastler, for one, grimly pronounced that "it was to enable the land-owners to pilfer the rates (the poor man's share of England's soil) that that law of robbery was passed."49 In portraying the full extent of Marney's irresponsibility, Disraeli instinctively turned to Tory radicalism. The theme intended to organize and to explain the industrial condition of England had, as well as the analysis of agrarian distress, a Tory radical underpinning.

Throughout Sybil Disraeli struck hard at the irresponsible aristocracy. Although Marney is the worst
aristocrat in the novel, none even faintly resemble what a true aristocrat should be. In addition to present delinquency, Disraeli frequently used the sham pedigrees and disreputable forebears of the aristocracy to expose their true character; the past as well as the present was a weapon in his hands. Both members of the Egremont family were targets. Egremont is born to the view that Church and State existed to finance the dissipation of his class. "A schoolboy's ideas of the Church then were fat livings, and of the State rotten boroughs. To do nothing and get something formed a boy's ideal of a manly career" (29). The motto and plan of Egremont, like the "pseudo-aristocracy" of which he is a member, is *carpe diem*. He escapes from the vapid routine of his class only through his unsuccessful passion for Isabella and his foreign tour, followed by his edifying acquaintance with Gerard and Sybil. Introduced with Marney in book two, Sir Vavasour Firebrace is obsessed with the petty trappings and perquisites of the baronets, until he becomes Lord Bardolf by the dishonest machinations of Hatton. The son of an unscrupulous waiter, Lord de Mowbray presides blindly over the industrial nightmare of Mowbray and longs for the days when his grandson shall become Baron Valence and when he shall receive the garter, courtesy of Tadpole and Taper. Descended from a French actress and supported by by pension, tax, and tithe, the Duke of Fitz-Acquitaine is similarly devoid of ability and ambitious of gratuitous distinction. The lesser aristocratic fry suffer debunking as well. Lord Loraine
wastes his life by languidly "crossing from Brook's to Boodle's, and from Boodle's to Brook's, testing the comparative intelligence of these two celebrated bodies" (287). Disraeli reserves perhaps his sharpest criticism for the politicking great Ladies, St. Julians and Firebrace, whom Egremont tartly rebukes for offering insolent notice "as an inducement to infamous tergiversation" (219).

Parliament fares as badly as the aristocracy in Sybil. Disraeli spared none who lived the "life of saloons, full of affectation, perverted ideas, and factitious passions" (36). He criticized Parliament fundamentally for its narrow preoccupation with the scheming of parties and for its consequent neglect of the problems that beset the nation. Factional competition superceded government of the people. The prime illustration of this debilitating preoccupation of M.P.s is the contrast between their responses to the debate on the constitution of Jamaica and that on the Chartist National Petition. The first brought every member to the House, lasted for days, engaged all leading public men, threatened the survival of the government, forced reorganization of the cabinet, and even involved the Queen. The second debate was but a feeble shadow of the first; it entailed no party struggle and hence did not interest Parliament. The treatment of Gerard and Morley in canvassing for the Petition reinforces the neglect of major problems; Milford, Thorough Base, Kremlin, Wriggle, Bombastes Rip, Floatwell, and Kite deal with the delegates
as shabbily as Parliament dealt with the petition. The triumph of the "physical force" Chartists is the direct result of such mean treatment, Disraeli inferred.

Tadpole and Taper, as the Tory whips, epitomize the ruling passion of the two Houses. The means of government are everything to them, the duties nothing. Tadpole's advice to Taper is exemplary: "Whisper nothings that sound like something. But be discreet; do not let there be more than half a hundred fellows who believe they are going to be under-secretaries of State. And be cautious about titles. If they push you, give a wink, and press your finger to your lips" (266). Disraeli reserved his hardest jab for Peel. Like his whips, he aims only to keep in office, construing his policies in opposite ways to deceive different interests. "What we have to do with individuals, Peel has to do with a nation," Tadpole confesses to Taper (266).

A Parliament stolidly apathetic to the lot of the people and a sham aristocracy infest the world of Sybil—they have effectively abdicated from government, while clutching tightly its emoluments. Disraeli vividly depicted the results of their abdication in the working class episodes of the novel. In Mowbray, Shuffle and Screw, Truck and Trett, Wiggins and Webster oppress their operatives with unjust and exorbitant fines, deductions for rent, and mandatory cleaning of machinery during mealtimes. These manufacturers also recruit agricultural laborers for their factories, through the Migration
Scheme of the Poor Law Commission, in the hope of lowering wages. By liberal application of Godfrey's Cordial, "Infanticide is practised as extensively and as legally in England, as it is on the banks of the Ganges" (99). And handloom weavers, represented by Warner, decline slowly to the utter destitution consequent on technological obsolescence, despite remonstration after remonstration to Parliament. In the mining district, as the landlords and lessees remain aloof from the miners, the unsupervised butties, like Diggs and son, conduct an illegal truck system to enrich themselves and deprive the men of economic resources; paid in truck, they can neither save nor support a trade union. The butties also maintain without check the grotesquely inhumane conditions of the mines and deliberately cheat the miners by undermeasuring stints. Finally, in Wodgate the consequences of abdication appear most limpidly. Disraeli emphasized that government does not extend to Wodgate; there is neither landowner nor priest (164, 166); "There is no municipality, no magistrate; there are no local acts, no vestries, no schools of any kind" (165); "There were no public buildings of any sort; no churches, chapels, town-hall, institute, theatre" (167). Utterly destitute of secular and religious authority, Wodgate evolved its own parodic authority, the many master workmen who were brutal and ruthless tyrants to their apprentices. Among the master workman Bishop Hatton is chief; he is the nominal governor and bishop, a comically
macabre parody of the aristocracy that should govern not only Wodgate, but England as well.

As indicated by Marney's telling encomium of the New Poor Law, the theme of the abdication of the aristocracy derives as well from Tory radicalism, if from one of its greyer, less certain regions. Tory radicals came slowly and reluctantly to recognize that the aristocracy, by choice, did not discharge the duties that were clearly theirs.50 Primarily dedicated to the welfare of the working class, agrarian and industrial, Tory radicals retained an idealized image of the "higher orders" of society as partakers of this dedication. Harold Perkin has identified Tory radicals as the early Victorian group which was foremost in upholding the aristocratic ideal against the new entrepreneurial ideal of the middle classes.51 To be sure, contemporary events and alignments initially confirmed their idealized image as much as they debunked it later. In the late 1820's, Ultra Tory aristocrats, almost to a man, joined Tory radicals in opposing Huskisson's liberal measures. Sadler and the Blackwood's group worked closely with such lords as Newcastle, especially, Richmond, Cumberland, Eldon, Stanhope, and Kenyon, and with Sir Richard Vyvyan and Sir Edward Knatchbull, among others. As the mass movements of the 1830's developed under Tory radical auspices, aristocratic support continued. After Sadler's defeat in 1832, Lord Ashley assumed leadership of the Ten Hours Movement, and H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex, no less,
sponsored the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of Factory Children.

1834 marked the turning point for the naive Tory radical ideal. The passage of the New Poor Law decisively convinced Tory radicals that the aristocracy was as intent on the pursuit of self-interest as the middle class. Duty meant nothing when profit was at stake; Tory radicals perceived that the English nobility was no different than the Irish absentee whom they had long disparaged as "culpably negligent of their duties."52 Richard Oastler's reaction to the New Poor Law was symptomatic. As soon as it was published as a bill, he journeyed to London to canvass sundry nobles against it. He discovered to his mortification that even the Duke of Wellington, the premier aristocrat of the time, had promised to support "such an unjust and revolutionary measure."53 The bill's effortless passage through Parliament convinced him that narrow self-interest guided the aristocracy; they had sacrificed the constitutional rights of the poor in order to reduce the rates. The final blow came in 1838 when Squire Thornhill betrayed him at the urging of Poor Law Commissioner Frankland Lewis. Thereafter Oastler's condemnation of the "higher orders" was unsparing. In his mammoth series of letters to the Northern Star in 1838, "To the People of England," Oastler commenced the attack which would persist through the 1840's in his Fleet Papers and pamphlets. He charged that the aristocracy "have forgotten that they descended
from the 'the Old English Barons' and 'the Old English Gentlemen.' Their *Homes* are no longer the Castles and Halls of their sires. Their neighbours are not now their tenants, or, as it were, a part of themselves. They live in LONDON, or in PARIS, or in ROME, and, by pursuing a course of life, which their forefathers would have blushed to lead, they lost the spirit of patriotism which associated their sires with the tenantry, and attached them to the soil of their native land. They have become effeminate, voluptuous, and altogether un-English." It is not surprising that Oastler's specific language reminds one of *Sybil*; Disraeli had access to the correspondence file of the *Northern Star* and defended Oastler in Parliament at a time when such charges resounded in his writings.

It is instructive that neither Oastler nor Disraeli echoed the Radical demand for the elimination of the aristocracy. Rather, both men hoped for the renewal and reform of the aristocracy while sternly condemning their irresponsibility. "Why so earnestly plead with you for yourselves?" Oastler asked. "Because... I recognize in the 'order' of the aristocracy (I wish I could say in the present race) that bulwark against despotism on either hand, from the crown or from the oppressors of the people,
which I have ever believed to be are proof of the beauty and strength of the English Constitution."\(^{55}\) He and Disraeli looked to a new generation of aristocrats who would conscientiously perform their duties, thereby healing the condition of England. In contrast, Radicals saw no hope for a superannuated, obscurantist order. John Stuart Mill, for one, argued the case for elimination in his famous series of Examiner articles, *The Spirit of the Age*, which were directed at Southey and David Robinson. Mill contended that the aristocracy had long since lost the virtue and intelligence which enabled and justified their government of the country; lazy enjoyment had totally enervated them. The aristocracy "have gradually contrived, in a manner, to exclude from their minds the very idea of their living and breathing fellow-citizens as the subjects of moral obligation in their capacity of rulers."\(^{56}\) With a vengeance he slated their disdain of entailed duties and zealous preservation of power. With a vengeance, too, he called for their prompt removal from government and from wealth. Without complete extirpation of the aristocracy, the most virtuous and best-instructed of the nation could not assume their needful role as governors.\(^{57}\) The line of demarcation between Radicals like Mill and Tory radicals like Oastler was unmistakable; it was that between abolition and reform.
While reluctant and slow to criticize the aristocracy, Tory radicals never hesitated to rebuke Parliament, which seemed chronically indifferent to the distress of the people and preoccupied with party politics. Their sharply critical attitude toward Parliament, the Commons in particular, had evolved during the severe depression of 1829-30. They interpreted the depression as the inevitable result of the liberal economic policies instituted during the 1820's; it vindicated the critique of political economy. But Parliament's willingness to introduce experimental measures into an ancient, complex, and integrated economy was eclipsed, in their view, by its stubborn refusal to investigate the causes of the depression. Exasperatingly, every effort by Tory radicals and Ultra Tories to secure Parliamentary inquiry failed, while Parliament occupied itself with a succession of relatively trivial matters. David Robinson fulminated in Blackwood's:

On such petty matters as free beer-shops, change in the sugar-duties, and the abolition of trifling sinecures, public men may venture into disunion and battle, Ministers may be overthrown, and the government may be broken up; but these men must harmoniously shun the infamy of preventing the creation of loss and want, giving food to the starving, extricating vast bodies from bankruptcy, and relieving the whole empire from wretchedness.58

Robinson anticipated here precisely Disraeli's point in
comparing the Jamaica and Chartist debates: factional bickering is Parliament's true interest, not the welfare of the nation. It is illuminating, too, that Disraeli was not the first novelist to focus on this idea. John Galt had preceded him by thirteen years in fictionalizing the abdication of Parliament. In *The Member* Archibald Jobbry, recollecting the years 1829-30, disparages Parliament as "do little," busied with "do little disputation," while the country cried out for redress of its troubles (Mem 96, 99). Galt established the fictional tradition which Disraeli renewed in *Sybil*.

In the years which separated *The Member* from *Sybil*, Tory radicals repeatedly encountered the indifference of Parliament to measures proposed for the benefit of the working class. John Cam Hobhouse's Short Time Bill of 1831 was emasculated; Sadler's Ten Hours Bill of 1832 and Lord Ashley's of 1833, 1838, 1839, 1841, 1843, 1844, and 1846, failed; the New Poor Law was easily passed in 1834 and amendments to it steadily defeated, and so on. Tory radicals, and others of course, grew increasingly frustrated with a Parliament unwilling to do its duty by the people. "My Lord, I have no hopes of success," Oastler complained to Ashley in 1835. "I see the Government, whether Tory or Whig, are blind--blind as bats--stone blind. What care the PEOPLE of England about the Dissenters? or the Corporations? or O'Connell? NOT ONE RUSH. They want bread, and the Whigs and Tories and Radicals join together in robbing the pauper!! Oh, shame--shame. And to refuse
to protect Labour!!"\(^{59}\) This frustration with Parliament and all of its contentious parties entered into another Tory radical novel, *Helen Fleetwood*, before reaching *Sybil*. On attending a session of the Manchester Short Time Committee, Richard Green learns that the prime obstacle to Lord Ashley's Bill was not manufacturers' opposition, but the apathy which evervated M.P.s. When the factory question was raised in the Commons, Mrs. Tonna reported,

> The worst part of the case was, the very great indifference shewn by the House, many went out as soon as the subject was started; some folded their arms and fell asleep; others kept up conversations, often rising loud enough to drown the voices of the speakers; while pamphlets and newspapers were being handed about, and consultations held on all sorts of subjects (HF 335).

In reiterating a major theme over many years, Tory radicals habitually formulated a type which helped to express it; Marney, for example, was an instance of the type of the landowner committed to political economy. The indolent M.P. was yet another Tory radical type. Tonna's publisher, Robert Benton Seeley, lucidly minted this type in 1844:

> "A landed proprietor, passing his time between the club-house, the House of Commons, and the drawing-rooms of Belgrave Square, may easily be induced to hope and believe that these alarms of 'peril' are groundless or at least greatly exaggerated."\(^{60}\) Here is the very pattern of Lord Loraine; once again, Disraeli found character as well as theme for *Sybil* within Tory radicalism. His sharp criticism
of a Parliament unconcerned with the weal and woe of the people was that voiced by Tory radicals for two decades before Sybil.

III

In Sybil the abdication of Parliament and of the aristocracy, and the prescriptions of political economy combine to produce the condition of England. Marney, Mowbray, the mining district, and Wodgate are the rotten fruit of England's governors and economic liberalism. Disraeli encapsulated the two causes and their effects in his famous image of the "two nations," given by Stephen Morley:

Two nations: between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws. . . . THE RICH AND THE POOR (67).

"Atween the poor man and the gentleman there never was no connection, and that's the wital mischief of this country," repeated Master Nixon, Gerard, and Sybil (147, 63, 296). Because Disraeli gives this encapsulating image through the working class Radicals of the novel, Patrick Brantlinger concludes that he does not himself accept it; on the contrary, "Disraeli treats the 'two nations' theme as a paradox he hopes will startle his readers into some awareness of the problems of the poor, but he
also treats it as a dangerous illusion and a cliché of radicals like Morley. Brantlinger's conclusion is egregiously inaccurate, principally because it fails to recognize the ideological influence on Disraeli and his novel. Long before Disraeli entered Parliament and long before Young England came to be, Tory radicals, with their acute sensitivity to the welfare of the working class, perceived and articulated the idea of the "two nations." As Disraeli turned to Tory radicalism for his incisive analysis of the state of the nation, so he drew on it for his summarizing idea, which he gave a typically Disraelian cast in his memorable image. Instances of the idea abound among Tory radicals. "We are fast verging to a state in which only two classes will be found - the very rich and the very poor: the Task-Master, and the mere hewers of wood and water," observed the editor of the Leeds Intelligencer in his annual statement of 1829. "Our whole system of legislation, seems latterly to have been intended to protect individuals in the acquirement of immense sums of money, to pauperize the labourer, and to ruin the landlord - tending to create two classes - the very rich and the very poor," Oastler wrote in 1832 in a published letter to the Duke of Wellington. Lord Ashley strongly advanced the theme in his two Quarterly articles on the factory question. In the first he feared the "total annihilation of all friendliness and confidence between employer and employed," and was even more explicit in the second: "the rich and poor are antagonist parties,
each watching the opportunity to gain an advantage over the other. As a final instance, W.B. Ferrand contended at one of the many meeting to raise funds for Oastler's release from debtor's prison:

We are now divided, as nearly as possible, into two classes - the very rich and the very poor. Search history, and you will learn that no country can long exist in which society is broken into such widely distant divisions. We must have the intermediate links, amalgamating into each other, descending with a regular and even gradation, in order that the monarch on the throne and the peasant in the cottage may alike enjoy the privileges and blessing of our free and glorious constitution.

As these passages reveal, Disraeli's notice of the ominous gulf between rich and poor was intimately part of Tory radicalism. The most famous single element of Sybil derived from the ideology of his predecessors.

IV

Thus, Disraeli steadily relied on Tory radicalism for his analysis of the condition of England, the strongest part of Sybil. The agrarian distress of Marney stemmed from the enclosure of allotments and destruction of cottages prescribed by political economy and effected by irresponsible landowners. The woes of Mowbray, the mining district, and Woodgate belonged to the abdication of the aristocracy and Parliament. Together the depredations of political economy and the abdication of the governors produced the unnatural division of England into two
nations, the rich and the poor. Disraeli and the Tory radicals expressed this analysis with one voice. Indeed, at several points Sybil echoes passages in the Tory radical novels which preceded it: The Member, Helen Fleetwood, and Things Old and New. The Tory radical presence in Sybil confirms the view, represented by David Roberts, that Disraeli achieved a "true understanding of the grievances of industrial workers" and undermines the contrary view, held by Paul Smith and others, that he did not attempt a "fundamental analysis of the social problem."

This reliance on Tory radicalism presented Disraeli with a clear option for resolving Sybil. He could have transformed Egremont in the course of the novel into a dedicated Tory radical M.P. At novel's end Egremont could have undertaken the expected, if arduous task of promoting the standard Tory radical remedies for the perils of the nation: the Ten Hours Bill to relieve the operatives of Mowbray; taxation of industrial machinery to restore handloom weavers like Warner to prosperity; an allotment system, with a provision for building cottages, for the laborers of Marney, and so on. Each part of the analysis of the condition of England would have corresponded to a pragmatic measure of reform. The evolution of Archibald Jobbry in The Member demonstrates the possibility of a similar evolution on Egremont's part. Moreover, in the aftermath of the Plug Plot riots which close the novel, Egremont could have acted as Tory radical
M.P.s were constrained to act: by building pressure from without through popular movements and then by cooperating with any willing M.P., irregardless of party affiliation. The pitifully few Tory radical M.P.s--Sadler, Ashley, Ferrand--were always obliged to act with whatever Whigs, Radicals, or Tories they could muster. The option would have furnished Sybil with a vigorous resolution, one in keeping with its internal analysis as well as with the social and political realities of the 1840's.

Obviously Disraeli did not choose this option. Rather, he reverted to Young Englandism for the resolution of Sybil. He wisely ignored Lord John Manners's pet pleas for national holy days, public baths, games, walks, playgrounds, Anglican holy orders, and repeal of the law of mortmain; he seized instead on the Young England panacea of a revivified aristocracy, the "new generation" introduced in Coningsby. Neither the irresponsible aristocracy, nor Parliament, nor the Chartist delegates ("a plebian senate of wild ambitions and sinister and selfish ends," 295, 238, 255) could deal effectively with the condition of England. The "new generation," represented by Egremont, would alone suffice. "The new generation of the aristocracy of England are not tyrants, not oppressors, Sybil, as you persist in believing," Egremont argues. "Enough that their sympathies are awakened; time and thought will bring the rest. They are the natural leaders of the people, Sybil; believe me they are the only ones" (282). Egremont proves his argument.
Illustration: The absurdity of Young Englandism, without the solid basis of Tory radicalism found in Sybil, was too good a target for Punch to miss; from Punch, 8 (7 June 1845), 252.
by marrying Sybil at novel's end and thereby uniting symbolically the two nations in their various ramifications: the rich and the poor, the Norman nobility and the Saxon peasantry, the Anglican and the Catholic.

This triumphant Young England resolution is largely a product of the romance narrative pattern on which Disraeli constructed Sybil. Disraeli's adoption of romance was almost inevitable: it had repeatedly figured in his fashionable novels of the 1830's and would reappear in his later novels. John Holloway observes, "Every one of Disraeli's novels is centered upon a young man's growing to maturity, forming his views on the world, and finding his right place in it (Sybil is different only in that this happens to both the hero and the heroine)." More importantly, a novelist of the time who sought dense factuality in his work usually provoked a reaction from his imaginative energies which perversely centered on romance—a defiant assertion of human pattern against reality. This was the paradoxical situation which affected contemporary topical novels: the more realistic their subject, the more conventional their narrative action. Sybil is a lucid instance: Disraeli's concern with the "Condition of the People," seen through Tory radical spectacles, entailed on Sybil the stubbornly non-mimetic romance pattern.

The results are debilitating for Sybil. The romance pattern deals primarily with Egremont and Sybil as hero
and heroine, demoting the working class episodes to the subplot. It is striking that Egremont scarcely involves himself with the condition of the working class. It impinges on him during his brief visit to Bingley's farm and in his excursion with Aubrey St. Lys to Warner's. Indeed, Egremont contributes nothing to the Tory radical analysis which governs the topical episodes of the novel. They belong to Stephen Morley and the narrator, the implied author. It is Morley who penetrates, with Gerard, the depths of Mowbray and who travels alone through the mining district and Wodgate. It is the narrator who analyzes the causes of agrarian and industrial distress; it is he who provides the cinematic glimpses of the indifferent Parliament and an irresponsible aristocracy. Moreover, these cinematic flashes act with the abrupt shifts of focus in Sybil to disrupt the attenuated romance pattern; they direct the reader's attention to condition and causes, away from hero and heroine. Hence, it is evident that Sybil is divided between a narrative pattern that ultimately vindicates Young Englandism and an internal content that is richly Tory radical. The opposing directions of these key elements make Sybil less than satisfactory; Disraeli did not create a unified whole, as readers Victorian and modern have remarked.

The unsatisfactory juxtaposition of romance and Tory radicalism throughout Sybil severely weakens its resolution. Disraeli could not resist one of the oldest conventions of romance: the discovery that the protagonist
is not a pauper, but rather a noble and heir to a great estate and fortune. At the climax of the Plug Plot riots, he transformed both protagonists accordingly: Marney's death makes Egremont the new Earl of Marney; Gerard's unfortunate death and the recovery of his papers make Sybil the rightful Countess of of Mowbray, worth 40,000 per annum. True to convention, they wed and depart for a year's tour of the continent. This convention destroys, however, the symbolic union which Disraeli plainly intended. There is no appropriate union of rich and poor; rather, rich aristocrat weds rich aristocrat. The Spectator tartly remarked: "With power to combine every probable opportunity and incident of social life in the form of fiction, philosophical Young England can only imagine two modes of amalgamating the Two Nations--killing off the poor, or making them rich." From romance came the symbolic union desired by Young England; from romance too came its effective negation.

It is noteworthy also that the marriage of the two aristocrats did not signal any visible commitment to the welfare of the working class. After a major, quasi-revolutionary insurrection in their home county, Egremont and Sybil quite happily adopt the old aristocratic custom of a continental tour. While neglecting the extreme discontent of the Northern working class, they consort in Naples with Lord Valentine, who emphatically rejected the claims of Gerard and Morley. The two show no inclination to honor the duties expected of them. Young Englandism
bears no tangible fruit. This is sharply ironic in light of Disraeli's criticism of the aristocracy; indeed, it betrays the fundamental weakness of the ending. Such men as Egremont and Young England did very little in fact to ameliorate the lot of the working class in the early Victorian period, as David Roberts has shown. The prime movers of needed social reform were a diverse and changing group of Tory radicals, Tories, Whigs, and Radicals—commoners and aristocrats; to them belongs credit for the Mines and Collieries Act of 1843, the Factory Act of 1847, and the Public Health Act of 1848. Disraeli badly misjudged both the actors and the actions needed in the 1840's. By following the logic of romance and the panacea of Young England he reached a demonstrably false conclusion. The weak ending does not nullify, however, the abiding strength of Sybil: its Tory radical analysis of the condition of England.

V

Tory radicalism pervaded the early Victorian period and informed several notable topical novels—The Member, Michael Armstrong, Simon Smike, Helen Fleetwood, and Sybil—as this study has shown. Tory radicalism shaped decisively several key elements of these novels, in particular, character, structure, language, and theme. Of all
these elements, character bore the greatest burden of ideology. Tory radicalism furnished a number of stock character types, overtly "flat" characters, who illustrated prominent doctrines and who connected the novels visibly and emphatically with Tory radical propaganda, verbal as well as written. The type of the irresponsible M.P. underlay Archibald Jobbry, at least at the outset of The Member, and also Lord Loraine, as seen above. The landowner committed to political economy was the model for Lord Marney and for Samuel Smith in G.R. Gleig's Things Old and New. These ideological types joined an enormous host of stock characters in early Victorian fiction, which ranged from the Byronic hero to the Jewish moneylender, to the engaging if loquacious sidekick. Early Victorian fiction was in fact an ideal milieu for the ideological type, which received a much harsher reception later in the century when demands for psychological realism were ascendant.

More importantly, Tory radicalism imparted to the novel conspicuous patterns of character change. The steady evolution of Archibald Jobbry from the pursuit of his self-interest to selfless performance of public duty and sober reflection on the condition of England, was mandated by Tory radicals like David Robinson from the early 1820's on. Furthermore, Richard Oastler and Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna underwent a secular conversion to activism in the cause of Factory Reform, the pattern
of which clearly reappeared in the factory novels of 1839. With surprising consistency the three novelists incorporated it in their subplots, using a young, innocent, rural character as its focus. While these novels are seriously flawed, as chapter four indicates, the subplots succeed in reconciling ideology and the artist's abiding commitment honestly to portray human experience. In this the otherwise imperfect factory novels excel.

However significant the presence of Tory radicalism in the early Victorian novel, in character and other elements, it was scarcely alone. To be sure, as the Introduction recounts, ideology pervaded the early Victorian period. Tory radicalism competed with a multitude of social and political ideologies for the allegiance of Britons. Of these, political economy and a myriad of Radical ideologies were the principal rivals of Tory radicalism. And they too left their mark on the Victorian novel. Many critics have examined the influence of political economy on the novels and tracts of Harriet Martineau and lesser figures also intent on indoctrinating the common reader. The Chartist novels of the 1840's and 1850's have undergone equally rigorous scrutiny. But very few studies of the literary expression of Radicalism exist. Indeed, this is a major hiatus in modern criticism of the Victorian novel. The Radical naval novels of Marryat, Trelawny, Howard, and W.J. Neale provide an obvious point of departure for the critic. Part of the reaction to their novels, and the literary climate which created them, has
been discussed here. The path is now open for further work. In exploring the relationship of Tory radicalism and the early Victorian novel, the present work has consciously been but a case study in an encompassing topic. The ideological determination of character, structure, theme, and language by Tory radicalism is doubtless typical of Radicalism and other ideologies, modern as well as Victorian. The present study hopes that it has prepared for and will provoke further investigation into the relationship of ideology and the novel.
Notes


5For a differing view of Disraeli's ideological commitment see esp. H.W.J. Edwards, introd., The Radical...


7 "General Preface," p. xiii.


16 Cols. 247, 249.

18 Col. 248.
21 Whibley, 1, 131-34, and Blake, p. 168.
23 Monypenny, 2, 78, advances the same interpretation of this passage.
24 Remedies suggested, for some of the evils which constitute the "Perils of the Nation" (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1844), p. 236.
26 Ibid., 2, 383.

29"Political Economy. No. 4," BEM, 27 (1830), 40.

30"Hints to the Country Gentlemen, In a Letter to C. North, Esq.," BEM, 12 (1822), 490.

31Ibid., p. 490. This account of agrarian distress supplements, not supplants, the monetarist one discussed in chapter three.


33Hansard, 35, 8 (11 Oct. 1831), cols. 501, 517-22. Seeley remarked in 1842 that this speech "contains facts and arguments which are as much needed Now, as they were at the moment of delivery," in Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Michael Thomas Sadler (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1842), p. 291.

34Cols. 501-2. McCulloch inadvertently testified to the cogency of Sadler's arguments, protesting in "Causes and Cures," p. 45, that "if the distresses that
afflict the southern counties can neither be ascribed to the return to specie payments, nor to the pressure of taxation, still less can they be ascribed -- as Mr. Sadler and others of that school would have us to believe -- to the ascendancy of the doctrines as to free trade."


38Eric Hobsbaum and George Rudé confirm that poaching and incendiarism were the foremost manifestations of chronic agrarian discontent at this time, in Captain Swing (1968; rpt. New York: Norton, 1975), pp. 79-83.

Manners served with Ferrand on the Select Committee on Allotments (1843).

For contemporary comment see Labourer's Friend Magazine, No. 150 (1843), pp. 128-32, and No. 151 (1843), pp. 139-43. None of Ashley's biographers seem to notice this measure, despite its relevance to his controversial Sturminster speech of November 1843.


Ibid., p. 7.


"Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, M.P.," FM, 31 (1845), 731.

"Advertisement," Sybil; or the Two Nations (London: Colburn, 1845), 1, vii-viii. This does not appear in the World Classics ed.

FP 2 (23 April 1842), 132.


52 Sadler, Hansard, 2S, 26 (1830), col. 131. See also his Ireland, pp. 67-78.

53 FP, 2 (9 July 1842), 222. Driver discusses this episode, pp. 284-86.


57 Perkin examines such Radical calls for the elimination of the aristocracy, pp. 227-30.

58 "A General Election," BEM, 28 (1830), 291; see too William Johnstone, "Our Domestic Policy. No. 3," BEM, 27 (1830), 93.


60 Remedies, p. 385. In FP, 2 (11 June 1842), 189, Oastler similarly sneered at the "butterfly legislators, who sport their hours away alternately at balls, clubs, gaming-houses, and then at 'the House.'"

62 "To the Public," LI (5 Nov. 1829), p. 2.


64 "The Factory System," QR, 57 (1836), 443, and "Infant Labour," QR, 67 (1840), 180. Of the second article, Ashley complained in a passage not printed in Hodder: "The love of many waneth cold; not a newspaper will re-echo the appeal; and I have menaced like a dismal bird of the night, frightening many and fascinating none," Shaftesbury's Diary, 1838-1843, SHA/PD (2), Broadlands MSS., National Register or Archives, Quality House, London.


Recall the "Introduction."


"Sybil, or The Two Nations," Spectator, 18 (1845), 472.
The Memorial of Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna

Humbly showeth

That your Memorialist has for the last twenty-five years wholly devoted herself to literary employments, the subject of her writings being chiefly educational, and their purport, as far as her power went, to impart moral and religious instruction; her earlier works were written principally for Ireland.

That in 1828 your Memorialist lost her only brother, Captain Browne, who was unhappily drowned while doing duty with his regiment, the 7th, at Mullingar. A brief memoir of his long and honourable military services, from the pen of Dr. Southey will be found in the Quarterly Review for July 1829 in a notice of his book on the state of Portugal.

That your Memorialist's writings, on which she was wholly dependent for her own support, having then obtained a ready circulation, she immediately adopted her brother's eldest son, then five years of age, and subsequently the youngest; she has wholly maintained, educated and placed them both in the way of an honourable independence besides placing their sister at school, and providing the needful comforts for the declining years of her blind and very aged mother, by means of her pen; and this constant demand obliging her to sell her copyrights
for ready money, the fact of some of her larger works having passed through seven or eight editions has brought no additional gain to her, neither has she ever hoarded for her own use a single shilling of the money thus earned.

That in the summer of 1844, when her eldest nephew came of age and became independent of her, cancer which had been for some months forming under the left arm, developed itself so as to render writing a very difficult task; it has now spread on the heart and shoulder, by its painful effects almost totally disabling her; and thus the source of her little income is well nigh dried up, while her mother's increasing infirmities call for augmented help.

That your Memorialist feeling conscious that she has devoted such talents as God has been pleased to entrust her with, to the cause of truth and good order, and has expended her earnings in bringing up two most loyal, faithful, and valuable subjects for Her Majesty; and seeing also that by a mysterious dispensation of Providence, a course of industry that promised many years' continuance has been unexpectedly cut short; would most respectfully submit to your benevolent consideration whether she may not be deemed eligible to share in the pecuniary advantages, considerately provided by Government for those who having
honestly worked while they could in the field of useful literature, are still most willing, though unhappily unable, to continue their labours.

March 27, 1846
1Peel Papers, Add. MSS 40,483, BL.
2Sir Robert Peel refused, explaining that the Civil
List Pension was fully expended for 1846, "To Lord Ashley,
29 Mar. 1846, Add. MSS 40,483, f. 180, BL.
Bibliography

This bibliography includes: I Manuscript Collections and Archives; II Official Printed Sources; III Primary Sources; IV Contemporary Periodicals; and V Secondary Sources.

I
Manuscript Collections and Archives

Bradford City Library:
Matthew Balme Collection, Deed Box 27.

British Library:
Macvey Napier Papers, Add. MSS 34,616, f. 136.
Peel Papers, Add. MSS 40,483, 40,505.
Place Collection.

Goldsmiths' Library of Economic Literature, University of London Library:
Richard Oastler Collection, "White Slavery" Broadsides.

Hertfordshire Public Record Office, Hertford:
Lytton Papers, D/EK/C 1-21.

Manchester Central Library:
Local History Collection, Broadsides.

National Library of Scotland:
Blackwood Papers, MSS 4023, 4024, 4026, 4027, 4028, 4031, 4037; ACC 5643.
National Register of Archives, London:
    Broadlands MSS, Shaftesbury Diaries, SHA/PD/2.
New Statesman, London:
    File copy of Athenaeum.
Royal Literary Fund, London:
    John Wade Applications, No. 1386.

II

Official Printed Sources

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 2nd, 3rd Series (1820-1829, 1830-1854).

Parliamentary Papers.

Select Committee on Hand-Loom Weavers' Petitions (1834), 10.

III

Primary Sources


Bull, George Stringer. The Evils of the Factory System.
Bradford: T. Inkersley, 1832.


___________. "Lady Blessington's Novels." ER, 67 (1833), 349-57.

___________. "Modern Novelists and Recent Novels." NMM, 38 (1833), 135-42.


___________. Paul Clifford. 3 vols. London: Colburn and Bentley, 1830.


"Captain Marryat the Sea Novelist." NMM, 48 (1836), 228-32.


"Chronicles of Waltham." WR, 24 (1836), 124-35.


____________. "Infant Labour." QR, 67 (1840), 171-81


[Cunningham, Allan?] "The Member: An Autobiography."


"Devereux." WR, 11 (1829), 490-94.


Sybil; or, The Two Nations. 3 vols.  
London: Colburn, 1845.

Sybil: or the Two Nations.  

Whigs and Whiggism: Political Writings  

A Tale of Humanity, Comprising the History of a Rural Revolution from Vice and Misery to Virtue and Happiness. London: Joseph Rickerby, 1839.


"Condition of the English Peasantry." QR, 41 (1829), 240-84.

"The Influence of Free Trade upon the Condition of the Labouring Classes." BEM, 27 (1830), 553-68.


The Factory Lad; or, The Life of Simon Smike; Exemplifying the Horrors of White Slavery. London: Thomas White, 1839.

"Floreston; or, The New Lord of the Manor." Eclectic Review, 6 (1839), 456.

"Floreston; or, The New Lord of the Manor." NMM, 57
"Floreston; or, The New Lord of the Manor." Spectator, No. 571 (8 June 1839), p. 539.


___________. "Rienzi, the Last of the Tribunes."


___________. Bogle Corbet; or, The Emigrants. 2 vols. London: Colburn and Bentley, 1831.

___________. "The Free Trade Question. Letter 1."

FM, 6 (1832), 593-98.

___________. "The Free Trade Question. Letter 2."

FM, 7 (1833), 106-11.


___________. Lawrie Todd; or, The Settlers in the Woods. Standord Novels. 1830; rpt. London: Bentley, 1849.


___________. "On the Agricultural Distresses." BEM,
Sir Andrew Wylie; or, of that Ilk. 1822; rpt. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1841.


"Thoughts on the Times." BEM, 26 (1829), 640-43


"Coningsby; or, The New Generation." FM, 30 (1844), 71-84.


"Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, M.P." FM, 31 (1845), 727-37.


Heraud, John Abraham. "Historical Romance: Sir Walter Scott and His Imitators. No. 1." FM,
5 (1832), 6-19.

___________. "Historical Romance: Sir Walter Scott and His Imitators. No. 2." FM, 5 (1832), 207-17.

[Howard, Edward?] "The Member: An Autobiography."

MM, 3 (1832), 75.


___________. "Our Domestic Policy. No. 1." BEM, 26 (1829), 768-74.

___________. "Our Domestic Policy. No. 2." BEM, 26 (1829), 768-74.

___________. "Our Domestic Policy. No. 3." BEM, 27 (1830), 90-96.


Lister, Thomas Henry. "Dickens's Tales." ER, 68 (1838), 75-77.

___________. "Lady Morgan's Dramatic Scenes." ER, 58 (1833), 88-113.

___________. "Tales of Military and Naval life." ER 52 (1832), 119-38.

___________. "The Waverly Novels." ER, 55 (1832),
Lockhart, John Gibson "Recollections of a Chaperon." OR, 49 (1833).

"Loose Thoughts." FM, 18 (1838), 500.


____________. "The Dead Parliament." FM, 2 (1830),

____________. "Epistles to the Literati. No. 3.


____________. "Epistles to the Literati. No. 4.


____________. "Gallery of Literary Characters:

Grant Thornburn, the original 'Lawrie Todd.'" FM, 8 (1833), 233.

____________. "John Black's 'Lord Plunkett and John Galt's Archibald Jobbry.'" FM, 5 (1832), 238-43.

____________. "Lady Morgan's Dramatic Scenes." FM, 8 (1833), 613-21.


____________. "On National Economy. No. 1." FM, 6 (1832), 113-118.

____________. "On National Economy. No. 2." FM, 6
(1832), 239-48.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 3." FM,
6 (1832), 403-13.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 4." FM,
7 (1833), 282-91.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 5." FM,
7 (1833), 377-92.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 7." FM,
8 (1833), 103-12.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 8." FM,
8 (1833), 222-31.

___________. "On National Economy. No. 9." FM,
8 (1833), 604-13.

___________. "On our National Prospects and Political History." FM, 3 (1831), 252-53.

___________. "Rumbling Murmurs of an Old Tory over the Fate of his quondam Friends." FM, 3 (1831), 648-54.

___________. "Specimens of the Art of Governing 'By Commission.'" FM, 8 (1833), 470-78.


"Mrs. Gore's Fair of May Fair." *WR, 17* (1832), 468-78.


----------. "The Silent Member. No. 3." *BEM,* 27 (1830), 849-61.


----------. *The Right of the Poor to Liberty and Life.* London: Roake and Varty, 1838.


"Parliamentary Notices of the Allotment System."
Labourer's Friend Magazine, No. 146 (1843), 70-79.


"Rienzi." Monthly Repository, 10 (1836), 46.


"A General Election." BEM, 28 (1830), 289-309.

"Letter to Christopher North, Esquire, on the Spirit of the Age." BEM, 28 (1830), 900-20.


"Political Economy. No. 1." BEM, 26 (1829), 510-23.


Seeley, Robert Benton. Remedies suggested for some of the evils which constitute "The Perils of the Nation". London: Seeley and Burnside, 1844.

Southern, Henry. "Galt's Lawrie Todd." WR, 13 (1830), 405-16.


___________. "Lady Morgan's Princess." *WR*, 22 (1835), 281-304.


___________. Helen Fleetwood. London: Seeley and Burnside, 1841.

___________. The Perils of the Nation: An Appeal to the Legislature, the Clergy, and the Higher and Middle Classes. 2nd ed. London: Seeley and Burnside, 1843.


___________. "Politics." *Christian Lady's Magazine*, 1 (1834), 154-60.


Vienna and the Austrians. 2 vols.  
London: Bentley, 1838.


[______________]. "Lady Morgan's Princess." Tait's,  
NS 2 (1835), 85-114.

[______________]. "The Talent of the Aristocracy and  
the Aristocracy of Talent." Tait's, NS 2 (1835),  
515-18.

Wilson, John. "Balance of Food and Numbers of Animated  

[______________]. "The Factory System." BEM, 33 (1833),  
419-5.

[______________]. "Noctes Ambrosianae. No. 58." BEM,  
30 (1831), 531-38.

[______________]. "Mr. Sadler and the Edinburgh Reviewer:  
A Prolusion in Three Chapters." BEM, 29 (1831),  
392-429.

[______________], et al. "Preface." BEM, 19 (1826),  
i-xxxiii.

Wing, Charles, comp. Evils of the Factory System,  
Demonstrated by Parliamentary Evidence. 1837; rpt.  
Contemporary Periodicals

Athenauem
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine
Bolton Free Press
British Quarterly Review
Chambers' Edinburgh Journal
Christian Lady's Magazine
Dublin University Magazine
Eclectic Review
Edinburgh Review
Examiner
Fleet Papers
Fraser's Magazine
Gentlemen's Magazine
Labourer's Friend Magazine
Leeds Intelligencer
Leeds Mercury
Literary Gazette
London Review
Manchester Courier
Metropolitan Magazine
Monthly Repository
New Monthly Magazine
New York Mirror
Northern Star
Penny Magazine
Poor Man's Guardian
Quarterly Review
Spectator
Standard
Statesman
Tait's Edinburgh Magazine
Tatler
Times
Westminster Review
SECONDARY SOURCES


Publications of the Thoresby Society, 50 (1955),
i-1.

_____ and Mildred Gibb. The Yorkshire Post:
Two Centuries. Bradford: Yorkshire Conservative
Newspaper Co., 1954.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. The Social
Construction of Reality. 1966; rpt. New York:
Anchor, 1967.


Best, Geoffrey, Shaftesbury. 1964; rpt. London: NEL,
1975.

Bewley, Marius. "Towards Reading Disraeli." Prose, 4
(1972), 5-23.

Blake, Robert. The Conservative Party from Peel to

_____. Disraeli. London: Eyre and Spottis-
woode, 1966.

_____. "Disraeli's Political Novels." HT,
16 (1966), 459-66.

Booth, Wayne. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago:

Bradfield, B.T. "Sir Richard Vyvyan and the Country
Gentlemen, 1830-34." EHR, 83 (1968), 729-43.

_____. "Sir Richard Vyvyan and the Fall of
Wellington's Government." University of Birmingham
Historical Journal, 11 (1967-68), 141-56.


Cobban, Alfred. *Edmund Burke and the Revolt against the*


Fido, Martin. "'From His Own Observation': Sources of Working Class Passages in Disraeli's 'Sybil.'" MLR, 72 (1977), 268-84.

__________. "The Treatment of Rural Distress in


Moore, D.C. "The Other Face of Reform." VS, 5 (1961), 7-34.


___________. "'Sooty Manchester' and the Social-Reform Novel 1845-1855: an Examination of Sybil, Mary Barton, North and South and Hard Times." British Journal of Industrial Medicine, 18 (1961), 85-92.


Scheider, R.S. "Loss and Gain? The Theme of Conversion in Late Victorian Fiction." VS, 9 (1965), 29-44.


Suleiman, Susan. "Ideological Dissent from Works of Fiction: Toward a Rhetoric of the Roman à These." Neophilologicus, 60 (1976), 162-77.


Swinnerton, Frank. "Disraeli as a Novelist." VT, NS 17 (1928), 283-300.


"Some Aspects of Working-class Conservativism in the Nineteenth Century." In 


M.D. Youngblood, *Ideology and the Early Victorian Novel*

CORRIGENDA

22 *(et passim)* 'the first early Victorian ideological novel' — better to find some other formula (nineteenth-century? post-Romantic?), as in fact pre-Victorian (*e.g.* p. 226)

30 [undermines [in turn]
Frye quotation has no final "

31 While Whilst

43 critiqued criticised

49 Robinson's

58 [displayed [overtly]

63 more / better foods and?

71 In preface ?

90 marked e

98 Sadler quotation has no final "

105 n.2 Bernhardt-Kabisch /

121 photographic

132 appeared

133 animadverted animadverted

141 announced n

164 provocation o

165 William l

168 n.1 Magazine

183 for for

188 villainous incl.

193 condemned d

208 the money thus spent

209 prophesied as well also prophesied

221 n.39 On's

228 Chapter c

243 le'd a

259 conative?

century

265 for r

269 pieceners?
para 2 pamphlet e ring e

Mr./ s

because

decline l

immiseration?

portraying

none . . resemble/ s

by by

underline Mrs. Gaskell (Pollard title)