



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *State Formation and Moral Regulation in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Sociological Investigations.*

Corrigan, Philip

#### How to cite:

---

Corrigan, Philip (1977) *State Formation and Moral Regulation in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Sociological Investigations.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1863/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

STATE FORMATION AND MORAL REGULATION  
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN:  
SOCIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PHILIP CORRIGAN  
B.A. (Dunelm), F.L.A.

JANUARY 1977

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM  
Durham City

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

PHILIP CORRIGAN

Ph.D. thesis

STATE FORMATION AND MORAL REGULATION IN  
NINETEENTH CENTURY BRITAIN: SOCIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

ABSTRACT

This thesis shows the implications of certain historical and theoretical writings for any conception of the State.

Alternative kinds of debate about the nature of the State are surveyed. The logic of various debates amongst British historians since 1945, concerning 'the revolution in government', the New Poor Law, and the 1854-1870 Civil Service Reforms, is elucidated. In order to examine the validity of the assumptions employed, a summary of the moral premises of political economy, especially Benthamite Utilitarianism, is provided. Appendix III explicates the contrasting Idealist theory of the State in the work of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. The alternative approaches provided by the sociological theorists Marx, Weber, and Spencer, are examined, stressing their emphasis upon the links between State apparatuses and the class-structure of a capitalist social formation.

The core of the thesis is a presentation of the work of four major State Servants, whose biographies are presented in Appendix I. Appendix II provides statistical data relevant to the growth in the numbers employed by, and the cost of, the State in Britain since the 1790s. The individuals examined are: Leonard Horner, Sir James P. Kay-Shuttleworth, H.S. Tremenheere, and Sir Edwin Chadwick. The close administrative and practical links between these four are demonstrated, their common 'sociological' and moral assumptions exemplified, and the relevance of Durkheim's attention to the moral core of the State stressed. These presentations show the necessity of relating bodies of theory and practical policy that are often separated. Moral regulation is internally related to State formation. Moral perspectives are intrinsic to economic and social policy. This contrasts with the characterisation which sees morals as epiphenomenal to 'more basic' policies. And, more generally, it shows the limits of any functionalist framework.

Finally, the relevance of these arguments to the debate amongst historians concerning the aetiology of the Liberal Reforms of 1906, which normally grants 'causal power' to T.H. Green, is established. The link between Radicalism and Fabianism, in terms of their similar views of the State, is emphasised.

---

# C O N T E N T S

Preface

i - xix

## Chapters

1	On the 'Revolution in Government' :debates amongst historians since 1945	1-62
1.1	Introduction	4
1.2	Political economy, Benthamism and moral order	6
1.3	The logic of the Great Debate	22
1.4	The Poor Law as a model	42
1.5	Roots and Results of the 1854/1870 Reforms	48
1.6	Conclusion	58
2	An alternative strategy: Marx, Weber and the origins of the modern, democratic Nation-State	63-108
2.1	Introduction	66
2.2	Marx (and Weber) on the 'peculiarities of the English'	82
2.3	On Herbert Spencer	97
2.4	Conclusion	104
3	State formation: ' a national system of Improvement'	109-279
3.1	Introduction	109
3.2	The context of State action	122
3.3	Whig-Liberalism and the sociology of intervention	147
3.4	State Servants and State formation Leonard Horner, Factory Inspector J.P.Kay, Educationist H.S. Tremenheere, Commissioner E. Chadwick	160
4	The sociology of moral order	280-378
4.1	Introduction	283
4.2	War, Nationalism and the State	303
4.3	Internal Law and Order	309
4.4	Class and Public Opinion	321
4.5	On Spiritual Production	359
4.6	Conclusion	373

5	On "Institutions considered as ethical ideas"	379-431
5.1	Introduction	381
5.2	The Paradox of T.H. Green	393
5.3	Ethical Socialism, New Liberalism and the crises of political economy	408
5.4	Fabianism and Benthamism	424
5.5	Conclusion	429

Afterword	432-441
-----------	---------

S U P P L E M E N T A R Y    M A T E R I A L S

Notes	N/1 - 22
-------	----------

Appendices	App/1 - 120
------------	-------------

I:Biographies	1
II:Statistics	55
III: Coleridge and the 'Revolution in Government'	70

Bibliographies	B/1 - 128
----------------	-----------

A: Unpublished materials	1
A.1 Private Papers	2
A.2 Public Record Office materials	3
A.3 Theses	4
B: Published materials	
B.1 Parliamentary Papers	6
B.2 Others	
(a) By the four State Servants	13
(b) All other materials	21

\*\*\*\*\*

... the subject of my next lecture... I shall trace the state of mind in the Civil Wars under Charles the First and from thence the progress of materialism and infidelity on to the time immediately before the French Revolution. And I beg to conclude with one remark, namely, that the influences of philosophy must not be sought for either in the lives of philosophers themselves or in the immediate effect of their writings upon the students of speculative knowledge. No! we must look for it everywhere, only not in their own shape, for it becomes active by being diluted. It combines itself as a color, as it were, lying on the public mind, as a sort of preparation for receiving thought in a particular way, and excluding particular views, and in this way its effect has been great indeed, great in past times for good, but great, likewise, in recent times for evil.

S.T. Coleridge, at the end of his ninth Philosophical Lecture, Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, March 8th, 1819.

In the succession of the economic categories, as in any other historical, social science, it must not be forgotten that their subject- here, modern bourgeois society- is always what is given, in the head as well as in reality, and that these categories therefore express the forms of being, the characteristics of existence, and often only individual sides of this specific society, this subject, and that ... this society by no means begins only at the point where one can speak of it as such; this holds for science as well.

... In all forms of society there is one specific kind of production which predominates over the rest, whose relations thus assign rank and influence to the others. It is a general illumination which bathes all other colours and modifies their particularity. It is a particular ether which determines the specific gravity of every being which has materialized within it... Capital is the all-dominating economic power of bourgeois society.

K. Marx, in his 'Introduction' to the Grundrisse, August-September, 1857.

...capital is not a thing, but rather a definite social production relation, belonging to a definite historical formation of society, which is manifested in a thing and lends this thing a specific social character.

K. Marx, Capital, III, Part VI, Chapter XLVIII, Section 1.

...capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons, established by the instrumentality of things.

K. Marx, Capital, I, Part VIII, Chapter XXXIII.

\*\*\*\*\*

PREFACE

Two theses are announced here, but I am only able to defend one of them. An examination of various key episodes, and a detailed study of the views of the major participants, show that we can only understand both the construction of different State apparatuses and the inception of different State policies in terms of a class analysis. It is normal to separate 'Reform' from 'Repression', or the 'Managerial' from the 'Police' State, in trying to establish a relevant typology. Such a project is fundamentally misguided as a strategy, however useful it may be in comprehending this or that particular series of events. For all areas of State provision involve - whether the consequence was intended or not - the suppression, repression, or, at the least, marginalization, of a pre-existing form of social organization. That is to say State agencies make obsolete (or render illegal) some forms of voluntary organization however much evidence can be produced, all of it valid, which shows State aid fostering and enlarging some areas of private provision. The areas (enlarged/suppressed) are therefore important as a discriminating device; but equally so, I am arguing, is the matter of class, or, more broadly class-style. The areas that are



encouraged - are derived from a prior sociology\* which informed the State Servants and Statesmen of the period under review. It was this sociology which declared some activities by some classes at certain times to be dangerous or threatening. It is against these organizations by those classes that the State intervenes. To defend that thesis would entail my completing the work begun by E.P. Thompson and others to demonstrate, across the whole range of the social structure of 19th century Britain, how there were alternatives to the State; to show, in brief that the State rarely (if at all) intervenes into a vacuum. Entailed in that undefended thesis is an important point which is partly present in both specific studies (notably those of R.K. Webb on what I call 'social literacy') and in such general histories as Perkin (1969). What was at issue, in the first half of the nineteenth century in Britain, was not a matter of the possession of an otherwise unproblematic 'object' or 'facility', but a series of definitions stemming from quite different historical experiences and aspirations. At root these reflect a different idea of what social life is about and what it might become, which I would summarise

---

\* By 'a sociology' I mean a social theory (defined by Quinton, (1973:872) as 'a system of political principles based on moral foundations [with] rational unity and coherence) and direct 'policy' implications involving both suggested methods of investigation and notions of change. Theory and practice are almost inseparable. As to my use of the term 'moral', I follow the use of the early 19th century which equated 'moral' and 'social' (Cf. Durkheim's sociology) as is clear in a work such as Adam Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759); or Marx' comment on the Comtists 'They do not know that every social form of property has 'morals' of its own ...'; or in the discussion of 'amelioration' by Abrams (1968:31f.). Cf. Corrigan, 1975b, and references there, plus Ch.IV below.

by the terms moral economy, political economy and social economy. These are not watertight compartments, and it would be childish to try to establish lines of exact equivalence with particular classes. The terms simply point to different sociological resources which were brought to bear on questions about the nature of State power. Because the State institutions and policies of this time are a consequence of the struggle over such social definitions, we must be aware that every policy and each institution represents a suppression of alternatives. These hidden alternatives have to be recovered (and the activity is closer to archaeology than conventional modern history) before we can make sense of the origins of the institutions which now surround us. The problem is further complicated by the fact that our very conceptual apparatus is also a product of such struggles, our ways of naming and arguing over State policies itself narrows down the choices and denies a particular kind of social possibility. By returning to the early years of the nineteenth century we can find some options still open, we can find hesitations and ambiguities in the public and private lives of State Servants. We can, in sum, see the construction just described taking place.

But matters did not remain open for long, the institutions and policies described in this thesis exercised as much a conceptual as any other kind of limitation. This means that we must avoid the errors of various historians: words do not remain the same throughout the century. To talk of co-operation in the 1820s is to describe an endeavour - above all a 'social hope' to use a concept from William Morris - which is altogether absent from the co-operation which is so triumphant in the 1860s and 1870s. This is why it is genuinely possible for Sir William Harcourt to declare in the mid-eighties that

'We are all Socialists now'; which, of course, does not deny the continuity in the alternative traditions which provides a constant thread to British political history from the 1790s to the 1970s. But it does explain why that tradition is deeply concealed by the more obvious phenomena of reformism and apathy which are frequently seen as depicting working-class consciousness in Britain now.

The other thesis, which I do seek to defend here, concerns the relation between the key terms of my title: 'State formation' and 'Moral regulation'. Whether one reads Marx or Durkheim, both indicate a particular kind of 'equivalence' between these terms, whilst both also emphasise that the latter is the more comprehensive. For different reasons they have both been misinterpreted on this matter: Marxism has been applied largely in those versions which record the metaphor of base and superstructure as an invariant 'social law'; Durkheim's work has been depoliticized, his notion of 'the State' has been elided with 'Society' in general.

The general denial of the possibility of a 'classical sociology' in the Britain of the 1820s (and therefore the ignoring of the rich sociological elements in political economy and Benthamism) has led to a serious mishandling of the evidence which bears on the problems indicated by my title. On the one hand, the particular 'power' of individual capitalists over their 'own' workers has been inflated in two specific directions: first, it has been too easily extended beyond the hours and places of work, and, secondly, within work it has not been recognised as a problem of enforcement. On the other hand, the various and extensive moral regulatory devices (whether Public or Private) have been given a secondary, or supplementary -

'We are all Socialists now'; which, of course, does not deny the continuity in the alternative traditions which provides a constant thread to British political history from the 1790s to the 1970s. But it does explain why that tradition is deeply concealed by the more obvious phenomena of reformism and apathy which are frequently seen as depicting working-class consciousness in Britain now.

The other thesis, which I do seek to defend here, concerns the relation between the key terms of my title: 'State formation' and 'Moral regulation'. Whether one reads Marx or Durkheim, both indicate a particular kind of 'equivalence' between these terms, whilst both also emphasise that the latter is the more comprehensive. For different reasons they have both been misinterpreted on this matter: Marxism has been applied largely in those versions which record the metaphor of base and superstructure as an invariant 'social law'; Durkheim's work has been depoliticized, his notion of 'the State' has been elided with 'Society' in general.

The general denial of the possibility of a 'classical sociology' in the Britain of the 1820s (and therefore the ignoring of the rich sociological elements in political economy and Benthamism) has led to a serious mishandling of the evidence which bears on the problems indicated by my title. On the one hand, the particular 'power' of individual capitalists over their 'own' workers has been inflated in two specific directions: first, it has been too easily extended beyond the hours and places of work, and, secondly, within work it has not been recognised as a problem of enforcement. On the other hand, the various and extensive moral regulatory devices (whether Public or Private) have been given a secondary, or supplementary -

at the very best, a complementary - role to the power of the capitalist in the farm, factory or office.

We are talking about how a ruling class rules and how ruled classes are ruled. Approaches such as the above deny the seriousness of this kind of question. Worse, many can only understand State provision (of a clearly noncoercive character) in terms of the crudest functionalism; thereby revealing their dependence upon a theory of productive forces to explain historical events, since the 'requisites' they evoke are traceable to particular features of their image of machine production. Instead, it is necessary to give a dynamic, anticipatory, role to moral relations and political forms which institutionalize particular ethical perspectives. The contemporary literature leaves no doubt, as I clarify in my two central chapters below, that major State Servants, and others, were concerned to establish the equivalent of what they understood as the moral police of the eighteenth century. They recognised, fitfully, that the political economy which now governed relations between people had attenuated if not totally destroyed the former moral relations and, importantly, that there was no automatic generation of links between employer and employed as they believed, however wrongly, there had been between Master and Servant. They were also aware that the new conglomerations of working people were - whether spontaneously or because agitators were amongst them - organising around new ideas and establishing a new kind of politics. In this they were, of course, correct.

Therefore, the early nineteenth century, as the empirical evidence shows clearly, is marked by both 'laissez faire' (and

pragmatic responses to sudden 'problems') and 'State intervention' (and a guiding philosophy, part Benthamism and part residual paternalism). This followed from features already presented: no credo or set of policies was stronger than the need to prevent Revolution - and State provision was one such method of prevention. Secondly, whilst political economy might establish very clear 'laws' regarding the right of Capitalists to conduct their business without interference, it could not easily establish any coherent policy with regard to the supporting institutions which would sustain the right sorts of markets wherein bargains could take place. In order to ensure the production and reproduction of the relations which sustained such markets it was necessary to regulate morals and habits - suppressing some moral perspectives (and the organizations which had been constructed to sustain them) and encouraging others. When it came to the matter of which agency should conduct such regulation, we find a variety of possibilities. Throughout the century - and any reader of the newspapers will know that this ideology is not absent in the 1970s - there was the frequent hope that individual employers (or groups of the latter) would establish such good relations with their employees that the old fully-fledged moral community would be restored. But, again, matters were often far too urgent to be left to such hopes, and coercive or permissive legislation made some initial provision which, it was hoped, would encourage widespread emulation.

It is through procedures like this that we must locate the origins of many contemporary institutions. We shall not find anyone who is a pure Benthamite, just as we find the much quoted 'law' of laissez-faire (in J.S. Mill's mid-century formula) immediately followed by

several pages of political justification for excluding educational provision by the State; a 'loophole' which Chadwick had been employing, of course, since the early 1830s. It is only when we remind ourselves that we are examining debates within a wider consensus - which concerns how a ruling class is to continue to rule - that we can see how much the existing historiographical debates leave out.

I have seen my task from the start as one of elucidation; and insist on the force of my concluding subtitle. These are varied investigations which cumulatively will, I hope, prevent certain kinds of false questions, about the State, being asked. This work over the past few years has been inspired, by the work of E.P. Thompson, whose major study I see my own work as complementing. It is sensible therefore to employ his words to register the different kinds of 'wrong questioning' which we both seek to prevent. Above all, if I understand him, neither of us believes that it is a matter of gathering in 'more' facts. It is rather a question of clarifying the relations between the facts (and between us and the facts) and uncovering the methodologies which make some facts salient and render others suspect. I have always believed that Durkheim was right to stress the thing-like nature of social facts, but wrong in his commitment to one-dimensional interpretation. Facts are far from simple; being differently experienced, they are subject to multiple constitution through differing historical experiences, as I tried to indicate above. In 1963 E.P. Thompson wrote

This is a group of studies, on related themes, rather than a consecutive narrative. In selecting these themes I have been conscious at times, of writing against the weight of prevailing

orthodoxies. There is the Fabian orthodoxy, in which the great majority of working people are seen as passive victims of laissez faire, with the exception of a handful of far-sighted organizers (notably, Francis Place). There is the orthodoxy of the empirical economic historians, in which working people are seen as a labour force, as migrants, or as the data for statistical series. There is the "Pilgrim's Progress" orthodoxy, in which the period is ransacked for forerunners - pioneers of the Welfare State, progenitors of a Socialist Commonwealth, or (more recently) early exemplars of rational industrial relations. Each of these orthodoxies has a certain validity. All have added to our knowledge. My quarrel with the first and second is that they tend to obscure the agency of working people, the degree to which they contributed by conscious efforts, to the making of history. My quarrel with the third is that it reads history in the light of subsequent preoccupations, and not as in fact it occurred.

(Thompson, 1963: 12-13)

My reason for studying Civil (or State, as I call them) Servants is two-fold. Many years ago I first read R.K. Webb's account of H.S. Tremenheere, later I read the latter's own reports on Mining Districts and was struck by the powerful sociological resources being used. The second reason relates to another major influence on my work, the two short but significant articles by O.R. McGregor, in the second of which he says

I have concentrated attention on the role of civil servants in the measurement of the social running costs of early



industrialism and in the initiation of policy because the hagiographical approach to the history of social policy coupled with the failure to recognize that laissez faire, though an attitude of mind, was never a system, has obscured their collective and decisive importance. Their achievement was a structure through which exhortation could work towards compulsorily imposed standards of social behaviour and the construction of an integrated system of local government in place of indirect rule and ad hoc expedients.

(McGregor, 1957: 152, his emphasis).

Relatedly, I have gained much from Finer's brilliant study of Chadwick which has led me to puzzle over how historians can employ his work as a resource whilst negating the structure of his argument.

. . . . .

My methods are simply stated. I have sought to avoid two kinds of false generalisation: the search for essences, which both Marx and Wittgenstein have warned against (and in almost identical terms) as a form of speculative metaphysics. Secondly, 'forcible' or 'violent abstraction' which Marx charges as the main vice of the political economists of his time and which has been clarified for us by Derek Sayer. Although my work is mainly elucidatory, and thus analytical, I have been trying to demonstrate to sociologists the relevance of historical investigations. It is customary for sociologists to use historical evidence in a subordinate, exemplifying capacity; I have tried to reverse this by employing, usually without labouring the point, the approaches and tools of sociology in order to clarify a range of historical problems. But I am not simply saying something about the past. Reviewing a study of comparative grammar in the 1850s

a radical Journal declared

Whoever would appreciate a system of philosophy, should engage it to write a history.

(Westminster Review, n.s., vol.6, 1854: 557)

which is what I have tried to do with certain sociological and Marxist perspectives. But there is more to it than that, first as Jameson argues:

All

philosophical thinking, if pursued far enough, turns into historical thinking, and the understanding of abstract thought ultimately resolves itself back into an awareness of the content of that thought, which is to say, of the basic historical situation in which it took place.

(Jameson, 1971: 345; Cf. Clarke, 1927 and Fleishcher, 1969)

Secondly,

history and sociology ... are not separate or even intelligently separable activities ... the differences between them are largely fortuitous or ad hoc, matters of style or emphasis or techniques which cannot be held to constitute the frontiers of distinct sciences.

(Abrams, 1972a: 118)

Or, as John Clarke phrased it in his National Council of Labour Colleges' pamphlet, 'History is not an exact science, it is only part of the science of sociology' (1927: 23). But their practice as separate disciplines has meant an effective denial of history by much sociological theorizing, where

the identification of structural types, the formal differentiation of past and present, is effected with such élan and

internal cogency that it ends up by apparently making unnecessary any further study of the intervening structuring through which the past presumably became the present. Yet, of course, it is only such work that will tell us whether our structural concepts make sense, let alone whether they explain anything.

(Abrams, 1972b: 32)

Philip Abrams has oriented his last point to indicate the precise kind of work which I have attempted here:

... some writers assert the existence of a ruling class in Britain, others insist that while there is an upper class it does not rule or alternatively that although there is rule it is not by a class. The point is that we shall never produce satisfactory answers to questions like "is there a ruling class in Britain?" while we insist on offering answers couched firmly and exclusively in the present tense. Analyses of the structure of power must be historical; they have to deal in processes of appropriation, defence, loss, accommodation, aggrandisement, in other words in the mechanics of structuring through time ...

(Abrams, 1972c: 10)

This thesis relates a number of contemporary sociological puzzles, or even challenges to ruling paradigms within sociology (and possibly history also), to the historical evidence which these debates centre upon. An elucidation of those debates shows a shared agreement which has acted to diminish the impact of significant questions. In an exactly contrary sense, as I have indicated already,

the existence of the debates, as disagreements, is important to our contemporary theories of politics, the State, reformism, and so on. There is then a series of tensions involved here, a moving from sociology to history, and within history from the logic of debates to the nature of evidence, and back again. The tensions have resulted in a barely suppressed sensation of a number of dams about to burst as I have sought to hold off certain demanding questions in order to clarify what I saw as a key point. I am afraid that this has made the bibliographical apparatus even more lumbering than normal.

A word about the structure of what follows is necessary since that structure involves a request for extra effort on the part of those who want to make use of this thesis. The investigations operate at a number of levels. Within each chapter, or section of a chapter, I have tried to obtain some coherence from the work being studied or presented, with the intentions and through the methods indicated above. The thesis also says much 'as a whole' without saying it explicitly, for to do this would have fallen into some of those orthodoxies which Thompson is rightly cautious about. These central statements concern the empirical facets of the following formulation:

The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling class, therefore, the ideas of its dominance.

(Marx, 1845: 61; Cf. Ibid., Part One)

The materials studied support the contention common to Marx and Durkheim (it is not absent from the comprehension of Weber either)

that the State is both an expression of the Social Division of Labour and a necessary regulatory agency sustaining that division. Far from it being the case that changes in productive forces eventuate, at a later moment, in transformed political forms and cultural perspectives; it is now - far more widely than when I began this thesis - recognised that:

In the combination productive forces/production relations, the latter play the dominant role by imposing the conditions under which the productive forces are reproduced. Conversely, the development of the productive forces never directly determines the transformation of the production relations; this transformation is always the focus of intervention by the contending classes - that is, of class struggle.

(Bettelheim, 1973: 91-92)

Charles Bettelheim intended this as part of his long clarification of socialist construction; but he had earlier\* applied a similar formulation to capitalism:

capitalist relations of production took shape before machine industry; the latter develops under the domination of capitalist relations of production ...

(Bettelheim, 1970: 87)

---

\* I am not, of course, arguing about 'first discovery' here - if I were the laurels would go clearly to Marx (1867: Ch.31). It is worth remarking, however, that both Alasdair MacIntyre and E.P. Thompson (as he reminds us in his 1965; 1974 texts) in the mid 1950s New Reasoner - and, rather differently, Raymond Williams at the same time - established profound and damaging criticisms of the 'theory of productive forces' and the whole 'base/superstructure' metaphor, when read as a 'social law'.

Perry Anderson has argued similarly, that

contrary to widely received beliefs among Marxists - the characteristic 'figure' of a crisis in a mode of production is not one in which vigorous (economic) forces of production burst triumphantly through retrograde (social) relations of production, and promptly establish a higher productivity and society on their ruins. On the contrary, the forces of production typically tend to stall and recede within the existent relations of production; these then must themselves first be radically changed and reordered before new forces of production can be created and combined for a globally new mode of production.

(P. Anderson, 1974a: 204; But Cf. his own depiction of Tsarism 1974b: Part II: Ch.6)

My thesis is also classical in offering the first four chapters as analogies of Thesis, Antithesis, and Resolution; with the final chapter being properly read as an Epilogue. The latter is necessary because three great debates about 'social policy' (implicitly, in each case, discussing the nature of State power) have been kept almost totally separate from one another. This has taken place to such an extent that the fact that quite different kinds of argument are being employed seems to have generally escaped theoretical attention, although Goldthorpe's 1962 paper could have initiated a wider debate. The debate about the early nineteenth century Reforms, that concerning the Liberal Reforms, and that involving the origins of the Welfare State, need surely to be related if we are to make any sense of the enduring social relations which all three 'moments' expose. My last chapter, however briefly, enters a plea for just such a project. The long note I append to my third chapter entails the admission that

I have been unable to effect a proper comparative trans-national study.

\* \* \* \* \*

Finally, before my formal acknowledgements for material and mental assistance over the past years, I feel the need to deal with a particular kind of 'accusation' which may follow from what follows. I am a 'child' of the Welfare State and similar institutions created by Social-Democracy in the years of, and immediately after, the World War of 1939-1945. The Labour Party, in its national and local council forms, has been responsible, in large measure, for my health, my housing, my education and, during my career as a librarian and lecturer, my employment. The extent of Social-Democracy's influence on the social fabric is now becoming clearer as the effect of structural changes, in State form as much as in any other relations, of the mid-1960s is felt in massive, and probably permanent, destruction of what are, in any estimation, 'social' (as opposed to private) assets. I am not therefore arguing that Social-Democracy, and the modern democratic Nation-State which fosters it, make no difference to social structure. I am not, that is to say, in short, in the business of Blame. On the contrary I am trying to show the extensive ethical values (rather than calculating amorality) involved in the construction of State institutions. But, to repeat two sociological axioms whose cutting edge has been somewhat blunted, just as when people believe 'the situation' to be so, their actions follow from such a belief, so such actions have unintended consequences. Having said that, it is also fair to stress how frequently the situation was exactly as major ruling class figures believed it to be, and how often the consequences were fully intended.

Although no part of this work results directly from collaborative work, it, like any human artefact, is a collective production. It has been long in the making, and thus predates certain material means without which it could not have been completed: the grant of an S.S.R.C. Senior Research Fellowship from 30th September 1973 and the provision, by the University of Durham, of working space and library facilities.

There are many influences and much aid which has to be gratefully acknowledged. I have indicated my debts to printed, and for access to unpublished, materials throughout my notes in the text that follows. I list here the names of those from whose conversation and assistance I have gained much generally or at particular moments of stress or anxiety. Three prefatory points need to be made. During these three or more years I have also been involved in a collaboration with Derek Sayer and Harvie Ramsay concerning work which is partly forthcoming as our book Socialist Construction and Marxist Theory (Macmillan, 1977); through this work, through literally thousands of conversational or textual exchanges, I have learned that co-operative work is possible and that only such work makes very large advances - Great Leaps Forward - probable. Secondly, and relatedly, I am grateful to all the members of the Political Economy Group, Durham, which was founded by Gavin Williams in 1973 and has met fortnightly in term-time ever since. Thirdly, it is right that the first name recorded here is that of my supervisor, several of whose writings have set a standard for my own work.

Thanks to:

P. Abrams; R.K. Brown; Paul Corrigan; J. Ditton; S. Frith;  
V. Gillespie; B. Graham; C. Jones; T. Novak; N. Pearson;



H. Ramsay; G. Sutherland; D. Sayer; M. Syer; R.K. Webb;  
G. Williams. For the physical thesis: H.E. Coppen and the  
staff of the Reprographic Unit.

As a Librarian I want to emphasise that this thesis, like most  
academic work - and much other work besides - would simply not be  
possible without the active help of librarians all over the world.  
I want to express particular thanks to colleagues in the Interloan  
and Photocopying Sections of the University Library at Durham without  
whose assistance I could not have completed my work.

Department of Sociology,  
Durham University,  
Durham City.

Philip Corrigan  
December 1976

A Note on Notes

I have used \* to indicate a footnote occurring on the same page.

Superior numerals, as <sup>1</sup>, refer to the Notes sequence at the end of the Thesis. I have tried to keep references within footnotes, using the Notes for extended bibliographical or biographical data.

In order to save space I have adopted a citation method which provides, in the text and footnotes, the author and date, plus pagination, for texts. The full details can be found only in the Bibliographies at the very end of the Thesis; where I explain their arrangement. Thus, citations such as E. Thompson (1963: 8); P.P. 1850 [1248] XXIII; Richards Ph.D. thesis; or P.R.O. LAB/15.I, refer to different kinds of material: a printed book; a Parliamentary Publication; an unpublished doctoral thesis and a volume in the Public Record Office - all of which are fully identified in the Bibliographies.

With a thesis of this character - surveying a wide range of primary and secondary literature - I am afraid that very many separate items have to be examined and cited; this makes the text and especially the footnotes occasionally very difficult to read. For this I apologise.

Chapter One: On the 'Revolution in Government' : debates amongst  
Historians since 1945.

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Political economy, Benthamism and moral order\*
- 1.3 The logic of the Great Debate
- 1.4 The Poor Law as a model
- 1.5 The roots and results of the 1854/1870 reforms
- 1.6 Conclusion

---

\* This discussion is supplemented by the third Appendix below which summarizes the Political philosophy of S.T. Coleridge as an example of alternative perspectives on State Intervention and 'moral order.'

## CHAPTER ONE

The Nature of the Beast

Each individual takes up the Phenomenon according to his point of vision ... gives, consciously, some poor crotchety picture of several things; unconsciously some picture of himself at least. And the Phenomenon, for its part, subsists there, all the while, unaltered; waiting to be pictured as often as you like, its entire meaning not to be compressed into any picture drawn by man.

Thomas Carlyle 'Parliamentary History'

(qu Ben-Israel, 1968:119 fn 21; Cf. Coleridge, 1819 passim)

---

Historians of nineteenth-century government growth are still in the position of the three blind men handling various parts of the elephant, and speculating from limited data and much conjecture as to the exact nature of the beast.

R.A. Lewis, Reviewing Sutherland, 1972 (1974: 116)

---

When government interferes, it directs its efforts more to make people obedient and docile, than wise and happy ... Men had better be without education, than be educated by their rulers ...

Thomas Hodgskin Mechanics Magazine 11 October 1823

---

Q. Are the working classes better satisfied with the institutions of the country since the change [1832 Reform] has taken place?

A. I do not think they are. They viewed the Reform Bill as a measure calculated to join the middle and upper classes to Government, and leave them in the hands of Government as a sort of machine to work according to the pleasure of Government.

Select Committee on Handloom Weavers (1835)

(qu E. Thompson, 1963:915)

## Introduction

One preliminary sociological comment worth making about the several historical debates, relevant to any investigation of nineteenth century Britain, is that they are separate. This has kept apart bodies of material and argument which a sociological understanding would require us to comprehend as facets of one totality. Historians study institutions, episodes, individuals, movements and so on; they occasionally offer a more general survey of an 'age' or 'period'; and they also discuss the validity of varieties of evidence and perspective. English historians are very silent on what a sociologist would call their methodology: the general theories which inform their whole historiographical practice. It is therefore only in the debates that one can gain access to their taken-for-granted assumptions, their frameworks and paradigms, which make the 'normal' history possible. (Cf. G.S. Jones, 1967; Halstead, 1973; Donnelly, 1976)

Since 1945 there have been about half a dozen major debates<sup>\*</sup> relevant to my theme: about the 'Standard of Living'; about the nature of Class(es); about Systems and Originators of Ideas; about Voting, whether Franchise Reform or within Parliament; and, finally, about the 'Revolution in Government' or, as it was earlier formulated, whether there ever was an era of laissez faire. Each debate, of course, contains sub-debates; just as each has varied in intensity and involvement over the years.

---

\* I append, in endnote One to this chapter, a full listing of the relevant literature, with some brief annotation.

Having alleged the relevance of this mass of material, I cannot even summarise the main strands of the different arguments in the space of a single thesis, let alone an introductory first chapter.\* Study of the generality informs my investigations (in the same way that I do not cite the many relevant sociological debates which I have similarly used).

Instead I have chosen to concentrate on illuminating what I see as grossly under-estimated features of the evidence\*\* used in what are consequently impoverished debates. I begin, naturally, with the system of Ideas which is held to provide the 'spirit' of the new State institutions (or, as the anti-Benthamites call it: 'the Revolution in Government'): Bentham's version of political economy. I seek to show here the sociology entailed in Benthamism. I seek to elucidate the 'logic' of the major Debate between those who see the influence of Benthamism everywhere and those who see instead a 'pragmatic' response to 'social' problems. This also entails some attempt to adjudicate between complicated claims as to whether 'laissez faire' or 'State intervention' is an apt phrase for the 1830s onwards. I close the chapter by considering two representative subDebates: on the Poor Law; and on the aetiology and consequences of the Trevelyan-Northcote investigations and reforms which led to their famous 1854 report and the subsequent 1870 Order in Council.

These are, and I think this repetition necessary, sociological investigations. I have not provided the conventional substance of

---

\* A first (incomplete) draft summarising merely the major debates occupied 168 pages of text and 53 pages of notes.

\*\* For a discussion of evidence, in relation to 'Blue Books', see R. Johnson, 1973.



an historical thesis anywhere (with the possible exception of my third Chapter and some appendices): but this has not prevented me from sometimes using 'evidence' against some of the conclusions advanced.

\* \* \* \* \*

Political economy, Benthamism and moral order

In 1776 Adam Smith published The Wealth of Nations, and Jeremy Bentham the Fragment on Government. I shall have more to say of the latter below; as to the former - and the science of political economy/classical economics which it helped to found - I wish only to make a few, general points. Recent commentators on Smith have regained the insights which were central to Marx' appreciation of political economy; this focus is crystallised in Marx' discussion of the division of labour in which he praises G. Garnier the French translator of Smith for 'rightly' using the word Society 'for capital, landed property and their State' (1867:363). That is to say: political economy depends upon a comprehensive sociology and theory of human nature to found its organizing concepts.

This is hardly surprising if one places Smith in the context of his time and place: the Scottish Enlightenment\*. As Forbes\*\* has

---

\* I briefly discuss this in Chapter Three and my first Appendix. Cf. MacRae, 1958, 1963; Swingewood, 1970a and the work of Lehmann, 1930-1971.

\*\* This is an essay in the important collection, Skinner (1975) which may be consulted for the range of work done on Smith in the last 200 years; the collection contains an enlarged version of the essay by Rosenberg that I shall use in the version I first encountered (1960).

shown, the Wealth of Nations is permeated with comparative sociology: historical (particularly in relation to key Whig questions) and trans-national. Smith seeks to show the relationship, within a wider Improvement or Civilization, of commerce and liberty; he gave causal primacy, as is well known, to the progress of commerce and manufacturing. It is commonly argued that this belief, that social amelioration follows from the fullest flowering of capitalist expansion, is bound up entirely with Smith's commitment to a theory of self-interested Individualism, on the one hand, and a somewhat mystical notion of the self-regulating market (with its 'hidden hand'), on the other. But Smith's argument involves an intervening variable which makes it possible for commerce to progress in such a manner that a certain kind of liberty (freedom to trade, above all) is accomplished. In 1960 Rosenberg clarified this intervening variable by showing how Smith's account entailed a set of institutional provisions. Aside from his stress on the need for a standing army, and his very Benthamite discussion of the 'natural' aristocracy (of talent and power) which is involved in the best government, Rosenberg shows that Smith's conception of human nature, taken with his understanding of British history, leads him to detail 'an optimal institutional structure' so that 'the price mechanism' is enabled to allocate 'resources in a free market economy'. Relatedly - and it is a crucial matter - Smith allowed State action with regard to initial or elementary education and did not specifically negate (according to Hollander, 1968) the provision of vocational or trade education.\*

---

\* There is no space to extend these comments through a consideration of Ricardo's 1817 text or later works (Cf. Dobb, 1973; Hartwell, 1970). It is sufficient, perhaps, to point to (i) Ricardo's attenuated discussion of the 'necessities' for capitalism; (ii) his 1820 definition of political economy as 'an inquiry into the laws which determine the division of the produce of industry among the classes ...'.

Before I consider Bentham's project and influence,<sup>\*</sup> it is vital to discuss briefly the issue of agency. A body of ideas may be said to be influential in two rather contradictory ways: they may originate with one individual and then be spread (broadcast) and applied (in institutional forms) and thus generalized in practice. Equally, however, they may be taken as a representative report upon, or description of, prevailing generalized ideas and practices. The second is no less striking or original than the former but would require us to draw rather different conclusions. In the case of political economy and Benthamism, as W. Thomas has remarked (1974) little attention has been paid to the 'parliamentary wing' and that kind of influence. Two matters will be stressed briefly here, since the problem of agency rightly permeates the whole of this thesis. First, we should say something of the sociology of the 1832 Reform and the postReform Commons. Penetrating beyond the Whig political sociology of Sir George Young in 1867, according to Halevy 'the first Reformed Parliament, returned by a middle-class electorate, was like its predecessors a Parliament the overwhelming majority of whose members were country gentlemen and members of the aristocracy' (1923b: 63)<sup>\*\*</sup>. D.C. Moore and others have argued that the intention of the 1832 Reform was to sustain particular bases of power, rather than alter the nature of power itself. This accords with assessments, at the time<sup>\*\*\*</sup>, of

---

\* Appendix III gives a complementary analysis of Coleridge's Political philosophy.

\*\* Aydelotte (1962) supports this conclusion. Cf. Beer (1957:623) who finds 'fully three-quarters' of the 5,034 M.P.s from 1734 to 1832 to have had their principal economic interest in Land'.

\*\*\* Apart from the example quoted, Cf. E. Thompson, 1963: 899f especially the analyses of Bronterre O'Brien, Ibid., p.903. On O'Brien, see Hollis, 1970.

how the Act operated:

The promoters of the Reform Bill projected it, not with a view to subvert, or even remodel our aristocratic institutions, but to consolidate them by a reinforcement of sub-aristocracy from the middle classes ...

(Poor Man's Guardian 25 October 1832; qu E. Thompson, 1963: 893)

Secondly, many major measures of Reform depended centrally upon Whigs for their execution as sustained State policy, and frequently needed Evangelical spokesman to initiate inquiry or legislation.\* D. Beales has recently drawn attention to the importance of the Whigs, in a review essay which includes several of my key texts, where he draws attention to the importance of Whig initiative in relation to Treasury grants-in-aid for education as I discuss in Chapter III below. He suggests that the Whigs 'may hold the key to the problem of the interaction between government and administration on the one hand, and pressure groups and popular agitation on the other' (1974: 881). I would endorse this and suggest that the Whigs (or, better, Whig-Liberals) developed what I call a 'sociology of intervention' which drew upon differing resources (including Benthamism) and which involved a Whig-Liberal community far wider than particular parliamentary groupings. Thomas' 1974 essay on the Philosophic Radicals shows,

---

\* On this Cf. Halevy, 1923b:114f and Bradley, 1976 for the Evangelical connection; on a more general Tory-Radical alliance Cf. Halevy, 1923b:109; Aydelotte (1962:159;1972:329) considers whether this will explain voting patterns in the Commons over Reform issues, but rejects it. Of course, the best known Tory-'radical' alliances took place in such extra-Parliamentary action as Anti-Poor Law or Ten Hours Movements - here the radicalism was much more authentically working class than in Parliament. A useful discussion of working class pressure and the Commons is contained in Richards Ph.D. thesis.

first that this term comprehends a variety of doctrines (within which Bentham's ideas are not necessary crucial), and, secondly, that even those who accepted the label of 'philosophical radical' in the Commons rarely acted as a 'party' but as traditional 'Independent' Members. Thomas (1974: 53 n4), and Burn (1963: 140) before him, express a justifiable weariness with the game of 'cherchez Bentham'. In Cullen's words "It might be remarked that it is time that historians stopped calling any middle class intellectual with a coherent social ideology a Benthamite" (1975: 181 n56). Himmelfarb (1969: 199f) has discussed the treacherous problems of 'influence'; whilst Alan Ryan has posed the wider difficulties of any history of ideas (1974: 2f). In an earlier paper, Ryan divides the problem into two parts: the 'factual matter' ('which awaits resolution by empirical investigation') of how regulation came to grow (1969: 36); and, secondly, a general criticism of uni-causal explanations:

I am inclined to think that there was no such thing as the utilitarian view of administrative reform ... any more, I suspect, than there was such a thing as the non-conformist view or the evangelical view. Rather, what was involved in accepting a utilitarian view of social and political life was the acceptance of a theoretical framework within which certain ways of describing and explaining social and political matters got to the heart of them ...

(Ryan, 1969: 37)\*

This is clearly correct. Ryan acknowledges a debt to Kuhnian ideas

---

\* Himmelfarb (1969:204f) shows Benthamite ideas generally shared by 'A good part of the establishment.'

of paradigm; but he ignores some sociological determinants which are politically significant. The acceptability or not of certain ways of posing questions (or what is unchangeable, or 'a law') varies according to class situation in two rather different ways: first, simply at the level of what appears, from experience, to be the case; secondly, in terms of whether or not one, or one's friends, have the political power to transform ideas into policies. If we leave this out - the matter of agency again<sup>\*\*</sup> - the history of ideas is a vacuous study, conditioned only by basic rules of logic and standard tests of accuracy.

From what I have read, I find the estimation of J.S. Mill (1838) and Halevy (1934) to be more correct than that of Finer (1952a, 1959) or Brebner (1948) - if - and it is an important qualification - the latter mean by Benthamism a system of ideas more rooted in the philosophy of Bentham, than in other complementary or more general systems of philosophy. Mill (1838) and Halevy (1934) focus upon what Mill calls the 'Benthamic theory of government' (p.83): this, based upon Bentham's conception of human beings, follows from

Bentham's idea of the world is that of a collection of persons pursuing each his separate interest or pleasure, and the prevention of whom from jostling one another more than is unavoidable, may be attempted by hopes and fears derived from three sources - the law, religion, and public opinion.

(Mill, 1838: 70; Mill omits the fourth - physical. Cf. Bentham, 1823: Ch.3)

---

\* The most sustained discussion of agency is that of Finer's 1959 paper (although parts of Parris' work brings this out, as does Roberts, from contrary positions) as supplemented by Henriques, 1974. But both ignore the significance of Whiggism which I try to substantiate in Chapters 3-4 and Appendix I below.

These three sources have three sanctions: the law, the after-life and 'the favour and disfavour of our fellow creatures'. Mill condemns Bentham for ignoring the most important part of morality: 'self-education', which is more important than 'the regulation of ... outward actions' (p.70,71). Bentham, according to Mill, enables 'a society ...to prescribe the rules by which it may protect its material interests' (p.72); 'a philosophy like Bentham's can ... teach the means of organizing and regulating the merely business part of the social arrangements' (p.73). Thinking this rather negative, Mill praises Bentham's reform of the law; Bentham himself declared

Law alone has accomplished what all the natural feelings were not able to do; Law alone has been able to create a fixed and durable possession which deserves the name of Property

(qu Halevy, 1934: 503; Cf. James, 1973 passim)

Halevy stresses (1934: 364f; 426f) the anti-Socialistic views of Bentham, the political economists and Malthus, who argued that

an equal division of goods would result in universal poverty. Thus, in the interest of all, the State should protect the property of the rich against the poor ...

They all saw the only remedy for poverty to be limitation in population

All must therefore receive the rudiments of instruction, and must learn the elements of social science: hence the political economy of the Utilitarians demanded the intervention of the State as universal educator.

(Halevy, 1934: 490; Cf. Halevy, 1923b: 98f).

Empirical - particularly biographical - history is important here.\* I want to try to establish the general framework of Bentham's 'system' before the moment of reciprocal influence - by political economy, by Mill, by Place - from which the general 'movement' of Radicalism/Utilitarianism partly developed. One of the most valuable modern assessments of Bentham's work is that of the editor of his 1776 and 1823 texts (and I have followed Harrison's version of these) who argues that Benthamism's 'achievements' include 'two fundamental alterations in the methods of government - the establishment of legislation as the primary means of reform, and of central control and inspection as means for the direction of administration' (1948:xi; Cf. Finer, 1959; Henriques, 1974). But he argues that Bentham 'was concerned with practical reform and with clarifying thought about social phenomena - so was T.H. Green, and so, indeed, was Karl Marx' (1948: xii). Harrison offers a general stress upon Bentham's project of elucidating 'government as a sociological fact' which is congruent with a study of the early texts, and, as I remarked, the estimation of Mill and Halevy.

Graham Wallas ably recognised the real power and significance of Bentham in his 1925 lecture 'Bentham as a political inventor'. Bentham considered his 1776 fragment (with typical modesty):

the very first publication by which men at large were invited to break loose from the trammels of authority and ancestor-worship on the field of law.

(qu Harrison, 1948: xxxvi, n.3)

---

\* In end Note 2 I give a brief biography of Bentham, indicating his contacts with the Radicals after 1810 or so. Halevy is thorough on this but can be supplemented by Harrison, 1948; Everett, 1966; W. Thomas, 1969, 1974.



However much Bentham's ideas were shared (or even written) by others in 1776, his commentary on Blackstone offers a fundamentally liberating view of the relation between human sociation and Law. He shows that institutions cannot be justified by their 'age'; he also shows - with an edge which Radicalism never lost - how false are all arguments from 'divine law' or, most importantly, 'laws of nature'.\* He offers a secular definition of a 'political society'<sup>\*\*</sup>:

When a number of persons (whom we may style subjects) are supposed to be in the habit of paying obedience to a person, or assemblage of persons, of a known and certain description (whom we may call governor or governors) such persons altogether (subjects and governors) are said to be in a state of political SOCIETY.

(Bentham, 1776: 38; his emphasis and typography; Cf. Burns, 1973).

Bentham saw his work as analogous to that of natural science:

Correspondent to discovery and improvement in the natural world, is reformation in the moral ... if there be room for making, and if there be use in publishing, discoveries in the natural world, surely there is not much less room for making, nor much less use us proposing, reformation in the moral ...

(Bentham, 1776:3; for his debt to Hume and Smith Cf. Harrison, 1948:xlvi; his greatest debt was probably to Helvétius)

Through a merciless anatomization of Blackstone, and other received

\* Cf. Bentham's 1824 Book of Fallacies (qu Everett, 1966:166-194). This cutting edge is well displayed in J.S. Mill's early work; I return to it briefly at the start of Chapter Three below.

\*\* John Austin added to this definition the importance of freedom from external commands; in this form it may be seen in the work of T.H. Green (1881: Paras 75f); Weber (1918a:78); Durkheim (eg. qu. 1972: Sect.9); Barker, 1930:3; Laski, 1935: Ch.1. My second Chapter stresses what is 'left out'.

wisdom, Bentham seeks to show that principles of Law can be constructed which owe nothing to any 'external' philosophizing other than the 'principle of UTILITY ...' (p.56): 'it is the greatest happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and wrong ...' (p.3)

In 1780 Bentham's Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation was set up in type, but the first edition appeared only in 1789 (unlike the 1776 Fragment, this featured Bentham's name); and a second edition appeared in 1823. This work deserves to be considered a work of sociological theory, since Bentham's discussion of his key concepts 'pleasure, pain, motive, and disposition' (like his brief note on 'mental pathology') invite direct comparison with similar sociological endeavours. Bentham seeks to interpret 'the words ought, and right and wrong' in terms of the principle of utility as a kind of social law, which has effect because of the fact that 'Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure' (1823: 125). I argue for Bentham's sociology, even whilst I accept that he relies, finally, upon a (social) psychology\* in (i) relating 'pain' and 'pleasure' and (ii) relating one 'governor' to one 'individual'. A very thorough critique of utility is advanced by Milne (1973) who, following T.H. Green, roots morality in the community (which Bentham thought a 'fiction' 1823:126) and co-operation (which Bentham's commitment to political economy would not admit). My depiction of Bentham as sociological follows from (a) his assumptions of 'ordinary commercial motives' (p.249) or 'the business of government' (p.189) and (b), as Halevy shows, Bentham's division of society 'into classes, the one governing and the other governed' (1934: 405).

---

\* This seems also to have been the view of J.S. Mill (Thomas, 1971a: 355).

Buried within the principle of utility, as a social bond, is a fundamental contradiction. Suddenly, for no clear theoretical reasons, governors and governing classes are introduced into a theory which rests upon the axiom that 'the law produces social union by artifices' (Halevy, 1934: 411). Halevy recognises the wider tension within Radicalism (understood as blending political economy with Bentham's jurisprudence): as fast as Bentham attacked 'natural law' or legal 'fictions' so political economy assembled its own natural laws and the fictions of market equality, total information, and so on; which Marx was to expose and criticise so thoroughly. Indeed, as Halevy shows clearly, Bentham's theory of State rests upon a fiction

the Radical State as defined by Bentham's Utilitarianism is a State which confers sovereignty on the people; after which the people finds itself constrained to delegate a certain number of political functions to a minority of individuals, elected either directly or indirectly ...

(Halevy, 1934: 409; again Cf. Durkheim, 1972: Sect.9)

Halevy (Ibid., 414f) and Coates (1950) stress that this contradiction is only apparent if we search for a logically coherent system; they argue, in Coates' words, that it was the intention of Bentham's Utilitarianism to achieve reforms which

would sweep away obstacles to the spontaneous activities of the middle class in whose virtues he believed; they would release energies in the economic sphere where the identity of interests was conceived to be natural.

(Coates, 1950: 360)

This would certainly clarify the deeper meaning of 'greatest

good' \* in terms of a commitment to found that definition upon the expansion of capitalism as the only sure (lawful) way of generating The Good Society. Hume (1967) identifies some features of Bentham's Code which would assist this 'sweeping away': the centrality of law-making, the identification of 'subject matters ... needing reform or being susceptible of improvement' (qu 1967: 366) and the 'inspective function'. Hume's conclusion, however, that there was no presence within the Code of the ideas of 'laissez faire or the ... self-regulating economy' (1967: 373) needs qualification. That may be true of that text, but the strategy of Bentham's aspirations point to the moral equivalent of the market, 'producing' utility and ensuring self-regulation of political society. This would seem to be implicit in Rosenblum (1973) who suggests that Bentham sought to provide a rationale for legislation through 'socializing' Locke's uneasiness ('The Chief, if not the only spur to human industry and action' qu Rosenblum, 1973: 179) and Hobbes' fear (Cf. Thomas, 1971b: 744f).

But Bentham did not only produce texts, he 'enthused' a group which includes James and J.S. Mill \*\* and Francis Place \*\*\*. In 1948

---

\* There is evidence (Bentham, 1973 Appx A) that Bentham wished to take away any mathematical - and possibly democratic - meaning from this term by the 1820s. But, Cf. Bentham, 1820, passim. From Halevy's gloss (1934:427) the Radicals would agree with Maudling: 'One citizen, one vote, combines political fairness and equality; but one citizen, one income, would be as unjust to the talented, enterprising or hard working as it would be over fair to the lazy' (Maudling, 1974 Cf. Mannheim, 1936: 249f; Marshall, 1972: 29f)

\*\* On James Mill (1773-1836): Halevy, 1934; Thomas, 1969; Ryan, 1974 and Mazlish, 1975. On J.S. Mill (1806-1873): Thomas (1971a) and Ryan (1974: Chs 1 and 2) situate critically the famous Autobiography.

\*\*\* On Francis Place (1771-1854): Thomas, 1962; E. Thompson, 1963; B. Harrison, 1968; Rowe, 1973a; for some of Place's texts see his 1970; his Autobiography (1972) is important, especially p.250 n.2

Brebner argued that James Mill ('with at least the assent of Bentham') 'performed the astounding feat of seeming to reconcile his friend's principle of the artificial identification of individual interests with Smith's principle of their natural identification and with Malthus' population principle' (1948: 63)\*. For Leavis (1950:33; 1948) it was 'James Mill who ... made Benthamism a political force ...'. From 1808 James Mill - with, later, David Ricardo, Francis Place, and, acting as Bentham's Secretary for a time, J.S. Mill - discussed with Bentham the ideas of the Scottish Moralists and those of political economy. Centrally, this confluence of ideas must be related to their shared historical experiences - above all, of the Wars against Napoleon (Mazlish, 1975: 98 Cf. Halevy, 1912). Mill's Elements of Political Economy (1821) - in which Ricardo, J.S. Mill and Bentham may have played a part- was designed as a 'school book', unlike Bentham's Manual (1811); or those Principles of Ricardo (1817) and J.S. Mill (1848). But such 'school books' are often revealing; Mill's 1821 text begins: 'Political economy is to the State, what domestic economy is to the family'.\*\*

But I wish mainly to consider Mill's political theory, as explicated by two articles in 1969: Thomas' study of the Essay on

---

\* Brebner goes on to suggest a split into the two kinds of Radicalism/ political economy/Benthamism; identified as 'anarchist' and 'collectivist' by Finer (1952a: Ch.1).

\*\* Mill's Elements also stress (i) 'the metaphysical equilibrium of sellers and buyers'; (ii) that the State could own all the land without altering the basic laws of capitalism. It was because of this forthrightness that Marx paid much attention to it; for his commentary see the newly published 1844a; and the well-known 1844b:319f; 1859b: 179f. Marx also makes use of Mill's Commerce defended (1808) which first drew Ricardo and Mill together (Mazlish, 1975:111).

Government and D.C. Moore's discussion of morality. Halevy (1934) and Thomas (1969: 257) suggest a similarity between Ricardo's laws of political economy and Mill's attempt in the Essay, and later Westminster Review articles, to establish similar laws of government. Thomas and Halevy also agree that Mill's earlier History of British India (1817) was not so much an empirical work, as an essay to show 'the principles and laws of the social order' (qu Thomas, 1969: 258) which gave 'a clear comprehension of the practical play of the machinery of government' (qu Halevy, 1934: 271). Thomas argues, further, that - contrary to many interpretations - Mill's Essay 'embraces ... an argument for universal and an argument for a more restricted suffrage' (Thomas, 1969: 254; Cf. Halevy, 1934: 419). Thomas also shows that Macaulay's criticism of the Essay partly exposed the contradictions within the Radical Benthamite project which I mentioned above (1969; Cf. 1971a: 351). Thomas and D.C. Moore (1969: 12) agree that Mill is operating with a particular sociology which stresses that the use of the ballot (Thomas, 1969: 280f), and 'the grand discovery of modern times, the system of representation' (qu Thomas, 1969: 252), will allow 'democracy', whilst reproducing existing bases of power. Mill once defined universal suffrage as

collecting the public opinion in the most perfect possible manner ... upon one particular point, not abstract, not complicated - Who are the fittest men to administer the affairs of government?

(qu Thomas, 1969: 273)\*

His son - the well known Radical, J.S. Mill, in his 1831 Essay

---

\* As 'habits' are so central to Bentham's sociology, we should note that Mill desires the ballot because of 'diseased habits' (qu Thomas, 1969: 280; Cf. Halevy, 1934: 405).

The Spirit of the Age, speaks of a natural state of society being attained (regained?) when

those whose opinions the people follow, whose feelings they imbibe, and who practically and by common consent, perform, no matter under what original title, the office of thinking for the people, are persons better qualified than any others ...

(qu Moore, 1969: 15)\*

Property is the key to all this - the protection of property. Both D.C. Moore and W. Thomas quote the same passage from Mill's Essay with the same emphasis added\*\*

if the whole mass of the people who have some property would make a good choice, it will hardly be pretended that, added to them, the comparatively small number of those who have none, and whose minds are naturally and almost necessarily governed by the minds of those who have, would be able to make the choice a bad one.

(qu Thomas, 1969: 253; Moore, 1969: 10)

As Thomas shows, Mill's responses to the criticism that the representation of Interests was better than actual or virtual representation, as well as his discussion of the Ballot, reinforce the interpretation given. Representation and the Ballot would make

\* D.C. Moore also quotes (1969: 29) J.S. Mill's 1854 argument against the ballot and a wider suffrage. Thomas (1971a) stresses that by the 1830s J.S. Mill was pledged to an 'Aristocracy of intellect' - a point relevant to Wolfe's 1975 thesis on Fabianism which I discuss in Ch. 5 below.

\*\* D.C. Moore alone (1969: 10) reports that Halevy (1934: 423) quotes this passage, but with the emphasised portion omitted. There is no space here to discuss Halevy's own politics, R.K. Webb gives one sketch at the start of Halevy, 1965; Semmel another as preface to Halevy 1906. A comparison of Halevy and Durkheim would be very instructive.

'every rich man' take 'pains' with 'his poorer neighbours' (qu Thomas, 1969: 261) and correct ideas would be widely diffused (Ibid). After all: 'The Man who proceeds to the scene of an election with that reverence in his heart, which the moral influence of property implies, will not be deserted of that moral impulse, when he places his vote in secrecy' (qu Thomas, 1969: 281).\*

D.C. Moore's argument (as with his other work which I shall consider in Chapter Four) supports the recent reinterpretation of Whiggism which I have mentioned\*\*. He argues that 'the men who initiated the reform process were concerned to perpetuate' certain 'vertical' relationships; represented by 'communities - estates, mills, factories', where 'leadership was generally the function of high social status' (Moore, 1969: 43). What readers of Mill, and others, have conflated, argues Moore, are two distinct 'proofs' for two different conclusions: (1) why any government is needed, where Mill and others use notions of individualistic, if enlightened, self-interest; and (2) how (why) people select those fit to govern them, where Mill and others discuss the social and moral influence of Property. Mill, for Moore, by 'means of the ballot ... sought to "moralize" the effective influences within the society' (Moore, 1969:12).

I think that many of the ambiguities - which neither Finer's 1959 'Manifesto' nor Henriques' 1974 agnosticism resolve - enabling (as Himmelfarb, 1969, shows) Benthamism to be the cause of a wide range of completely contradictory State policies, flow from some of the

---

\* Thomas 1969 led to a brief debate: W. Carr, 1971; Thomas, 1971b; Carr, 1972; none of which cite D.C. Moore's work at all.

\*\* Thomas (1971a: 351) claims that James Mill become 'more and more whig' after the Essay (1820); associating with Brougham and the SDUK.



contradictions I have indicated above. Bentham and James Mill draw upon different kinds of conceptual vocabularies\* and different notions of community. They are both eighteenth century philosophers of Society, discussing relatively fixed communities, and they are political economists trying to make sense of the curiously location-less 'communities' established/dissolved by the Capitalist relations of production. As Thomas has argued in several of his articles - these contradictions are there in the texts; I would go further, they are there in the social formation.

#### The Logic of the Great Debate

Historians, from some recent reviews, seem to be tiring of the debate as to whether nineteenth century Britain can be called a laissez faire or State interventionist social formation (and, if either, who was responsible). All the signs of weariness are there: the demand for more and more 'facts' (Burn, 1963:141; Lewis, 1971: 122; O. Anderson, 1974b: 680); the ambiguity and uncertainty 'built into' comments, as in the case of Kitson Clark (Compare 1962: 95f and 1967: Ch.8), David Roberts, or, perhaps inevitably, Taylor's summary volume (1972). There is also a retreat from what little theoretical apparatus has been brought to bear. McCord and Kitson Clark seem to be arguing that historians should invert their normal concerns - which, I take it, have something to do with showing the degree to which human beings exercise some control of things (or those concatenations of things and people we call 'events') - and stress only 'difficulties' and 'limitations' (to use McCord's favourite concepts). For one

---

\* The absence of certain key concepts - notably 'class' - is very marked. Cf. Bestor, 1948; Briggs, 1960.

'muddling through' (McCord, 1967a: 389 Cf. 1974), and for the other 'hugger mugger' (Clark, 1959: 29) are, apparently, the organizing themes that we may use to depict State formation and policy. I hope to do better than that.

Ignoring earlier accounts - which still retain much value - such as Halevy's concept of 'administrative centralisation' (1923b: Part 1 Ch.2) or Mantoux's survey (1928: Part 3 Ch.4; other earlier accounts are discussed in Taylor, 1972 and Harvie, 1974a) - I shall begin with 1945, the year from which other commentators have considered the debate to have started (McGregor, 1951, 1957; Goldthorpe, 1962). Lipson, Polanyi and E.H. Carr - despite their other disagreements - all agree that laissez faire<sup>\*</sup> was replaced, between 1800 and 1945, by some other categorisation. For Carr (1951: Ch.3) the shift is 'from economic whip to Welfare State'; for Polanyi (1945) from the 'self-regulating market' to the 'self protection of society'; and, for Lipson (1946) 'the conception of a "national minimum"<sup>\*\*</sup> replaced that of laissez faire as 'a recognized postulate of social morality' (1946: 168). Carr<sup>\*\*\*</sup> is emphatic that the nineteenth century State 'did not intervene economically ... and still less politically. It

---

\* I shall not attempt to define the key terms which are themselves part of the dispute. Cf. Taylor, 1972: Ch.1.

\*\* On 'national minimum' Cf. Briggs, 1961: 276f. Lipson differs from almost all other commentators in dating (1946: 165) laissez faire in the eighteenth century, and stressing laissez passer as the commercial policy of the nineteenth century.

\*\*\* Carr sees the 'humanitarian movement' leading to 'extensive factory legislation' in the 1840s; and sees H. Spencer as fighting a rearguard action by the 1880s (p.22). But later (p.45) he sees laissez faire intact until the end of the nineteenth century. Carr's work relates to the wider debate on 'social policy' and the roots of the Welfare State (Beales, 1945; Briggs, 1961; Goldthorpe, 1962) I discuss in Chapter Five.

held the ring to prevent foul play and protect the rights of property against malefactors. Its functions were police functions' (1951:21). Polanyi and Carr use similar periodization, and share similar foci of significance (Townsend's 1785 Dissertation, the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, and Herbert Spencer); but, Polanyi offers a very subtle account. Although he insists (147-152) that there was no coherent 'counter move' against economic exploitation - arguing for a 'spontaneous reaction' of a semi-Newtonian kind (for every social change there is an exact counter change ...) - Polanyi sees that economic liberalism ('a labour market, the gold standard, and free trade' p.137) was enforced by the State \* :

There was nothing natural about laissez-faire ... [it was] itself enforced by the State ...

To the typical utilitarian, economic liberalism was a social project which should put into effect the greatest happiness of the greatest number; laissez-faire was not a method of achieving a thing, it was the thing to be achieved. True, legislation could do nothing directly, except by repealing harmful restrictions. But that did not mean that government could do nothing, especially indirectly.

(Polanyi, 1945: 141)

Probably the most important contribution to this whole debate is Brebner's 1948 paper which opens by suggesting that laissez faire was a particular kind of 'myth': 'a slogan or war cry employed by

---

\* Polanyi's "paradox": 'While laissez-faire economy was the product of deliberate State action, subsequent restrictions on laissez-faire started in a spontaneous way. Laissez faire was planned; planning was not' (1945: 143).

newer forms of enterprise in their politico-economical war against the landed oligarchy'\*. Brebner argues

In the historical view, neither laissez faire nor state intervention was the engine of change in nineteenth century Britain. Instead, both were constant accompaniments of the basic force - industrialization. Politics\*\* was as usual the agency resorted to for the adaptation of society to profound, pervasive alterations, and the central state gradually became vital in the lives of more and more men.

(1948: 69)

Brebner is almost unique in relating State formation to intra- and inter-class struggle:

It is difficult to summarize justly the interplay of laissez faire and state intervention in Great Britain during the nineteenth century. Much of the difficulty stems from the fact that it was interplay in terms of political power and therefore involved two other forces, the landed interest and the masses, evoking the most curious and impermanent alignments of the four figures in the political dance.

(1948: 64)

---

\* E.P. Thompson (1965: 318-319) and D.C. Moore (1965) would argue that this weapon was used also by capitalist farmers against the gentry.

\*\* Brebner recognises that he is discussing 'exercises in political power ... instrumentalities of several kinds of interest. These interests strove to be the State, to use the State ...' (1948: 65). Gramsci's formulations are very similar, for him the State was 'the instrument for conforming civil society to the economic structure'. He stresses 'it is necessary for the State to "be willing" to do this; for the representatives of the change that has taken place in the economic structure to be in control of the State' (1948: 266f qu. Prison Notebooks 1971 ed, 208f). Weber provides a parallel argument of great subtlety (1918a: 82; 1922: Part 4).

He also severely questions Dicey's methods and judgements.

With the work of MacDonagh the terms of the debate shift so considerably that it is necessary to present his work in some detail, and show how that of Roberts, Lambert and others supports MacDonagh; before presenting the criticisms, principally of Parris and Hart, but including the ultraBenthamites such as Finer. This is difficult enough but entails quite large omissions. First, I shall accept the frameworks employed in the debate (my critique of them is this thesis, particularly the second to fourth chapters). Second, I shall ignore both the specific studies<sup>\*</sup> which inform the debate and several 'side' debates which are drawn upon: studies of policy<sup>\*\*</sup> in the usually accepted sense; franchise Reform<sup>\*\*\*</sup> and 'pressure

---

\* On the 1830s: Halevy, 1923b; Finlayson, 1969; Llewellyn, 1972; and the surveys of Roberts, 1960; Parris, 1969; Lubenow, 1971 and in Sutherland, 1972. The Board of Trade has been studied by Prouty, 1957 and Brown, 1958 (on 'free trade' Cf. McCord, 1970, Taylor, 1972; on colonial policy and emigration: Shaw, 1970, Semmel, 1970; Johnson, 1913; MacDonagh, 1953, 1955, 1961 and Johnston, 1972). On Railways - Parris, 1965; Lubenow, 1971:Ch.4 and Bagwell, 1974:170f all show how new 'technology' varies dogma. We surely need to retreat from single labels when we learn that the politician who introduced a Bill for the public ownership of railways in 1844 was W.E. Gladstone. Much recent work has been written with an eye on the debate, e.g. Pellew, 1974, on the Explosives Act.

\*\* The best recent work is Lubenow, 1971 and Richards Ph.D. thesis. A good survey of the 'policy' within political economy is given by Taylor, 1972: Chs.3 and 4, but see also Blaug, 1958; Winch, 1971 and, on the spread of ideas, Checkland, 1949 and Webb, 1955b and the start of my Chapter Three below on 'the popularisers'.

\*\*\* Most important here is D.C. Moore's work (and Brundage, 1972, 1974) but see Herrick, 1948; Beer, 1957; Fraser, 1970; Wright, 1970; Wilson, 1974. On 1832 itself see Brock, 1973; for texts: Maehl, 1967; for pictures: Cromwell, 1973; for sociology: E.P. Thompson, 1963.

from without'\*. I shall also, more seriously, not present an analysis of A.V. Dicey's Law and Public Opinion ... (1st ed 1905; 2nd ed., 1914)\*\* which I consider has been mentioned as an occasion for debate rather than used in the analysis (Cf. Taylor, 1972; Harvie, 1974a).

Two particular 'side' debates are, however, worth more than a bibliographical aside. The first concerns the depiction of State activity in terms of a local/central contradiction. This may refer to the 'fact' that, in former times, local communities ruled themselves and needed no State (Taylor's lament of 1857:473f. seems to present this view). It may refer to 'real' government taking place in the localities and thus only an investigation there can reveal 'the truth'. Or, finally, it may indicate that the novelty of State formation is precisely to be found in how that contradiction is 'handled'; how local and central kinds and bases of power are co-ordinated or not.\*\*\* Gutchen (1961) and Midwinter (1966, 1967, 1968a, b, c, 1969)\*\*\*\* both contribute to this last approach which

---

\* Cf. McGregor, 1951; 1957; Abrams, 1968, Hollis, 1974. On the societies promoting statistics and education see my third chapter and first appendix below. I briefly discuss the Administrative Reform Association later in this chapter.

\*\* The best discussion of A.V. Dicey (1835-1922) is Parris (1960, 1969). Dicey's contribution to Essays in Reform (1867) helps to locate him as an Old Liberal (Cf. Roach, 1957). I also do not discuss Robbins Theory of economic policy (1952) which is similarly mentioned. Texts like the latter may be important in indicating why such a debate began since I am sure that Robbins' experience in the Economic Section of the Cabinet Secretariat was important (Cf. Harvie, 1974a).

\*\*\* Poor Law Studies are relevant here: Fraser, 1976a. Local struggles over social policy can be seen in Fraser, 1971, 1972; Hennock, 1972; Sheppard, 1971 and Rogers, 1971. Two important discussions concern finance (Hennock, 1963) and class (Foster, 1966, 1974).

\*\*\*\* I discuss Lambert's study of the Local Government Act Office later in this chapter.

is still, after all, an 'open' question in 1976. Gutchen denies the value of 'centralization' as explaining changes in local authorities; he sees the 'key' in 'the struggle by the government to create and impose national, uniform, standards ...' (1961: 86). The methods of achieving such standards were legal (model clauses for Acts, General rather than Local acts, but also leaving much legislation as permissive and adoptive); and administrative (under the 1846 Preliminary Inquiries Act a 'surveying officer' could inspect a locality; under the 1866 Sanitary Act, central inspectors could respond to any complaints against any local board or authority). These methods look familiar to any student of the debate; figures as varied as Kay, Chadwick or Tremenheere \* saw part of their work of 'national improvement' to involve an attack on 'Vestry power'. There is almost perfect disagreement between Gutchen (1961:95) and Midwinter (1966:133; 1968a: 156) on the subject of Benthamite influence - the former denying, the latter affirming. But one presumes Midwinter to be modifying his argument when he stresses how the debate leaves local government in an 'anomalous' position (1966:131; 1968a:155) - he finds continuity of key personnel (1966: 131 Cf. Brundage, 1972, 1974) and finds, for Lancashire and for the police, public health, and the poor law, 'a draw in the match between individualism and State action' (1968a:161), 'traditional techniques and boundaries' persist.

The second 'side' debate concerns the studies of voting patterns by Aydelotte (1962; 1963; 1965; 1967a, b; 1972). These produce contradictory results. His exhaustive analysis (114 divisions, between 1841 to 1847, involving 93,000 items of data) results in largely negative conclusions regarding certain accepted theses (1963: 158-161) but he does point to (i) the cohesiveness of Party - although

---

\* Readers are advised to peruse my first Appendix - on Horner, Kay, Tremenheere, and Chadwick - before reading Chapter Three.

with important exceptions (e.g. factory legislation 1965: 110 but Cf. his 1972 discussion); (ii) the coherence of Party divisions and reformations - particularly so in the case of 'protectionists' and the Ten Hours question (1967); and (iii) that a central issue was indeed a matter of class, but 'between the old and new forms of wealth ... the divergent interests of the rich' (1963: 146, 157). He lends some support to Brebner in suggesting that the alliances and patterns may 'revolve around an illusion' insofar as we may not be able to construct a rationale of patterns of voting on the basis of any analysis which over-emphasises the intellectual as against the emotional. A number of accounts support Aydelotte in their stress on how easily some items - 'objectively', say, State interventionist - passed through Parliament under two kinds of special condition; either, in times of 'national emergency' (particularly epidemics or wars - against external or internal enemies), or, if the items were not named as novel, but seen to be administrative and technical. Often, of course, both were present - when there was much talk of 'temporary expedients'. Aydelotte, finally, is valuable for his stress on the reality of a 'class interpretation' - this is 'not a theory imposed by historians ... Class arguments frequently occurred in the debates in Parliament, and were used on both sides of the house' (1963: 147)\*.

---

Since the early 1950s Oliver MacDonagh has published a number of papers and a book on 'emigration and the State'\*\* from which he

---

\* It is one of my basic arguments that such class perspectives are the a priori framework of nearly all other debates; this social theory being what Foucault calls the 'episteme' supporting other disagreements.

\*\* He has also investigated other matters (1958b; 1962b; 1967).



has drawn out a general thesis concerning a specific kind of 'Revolution in Government' as his famous paper (1958a) declares. To summarise this corpus of work is not easy, I shall have to concentrate on the bare logical features, and not provide the rather significant empirical data (in his own accounts and from other work on the same areas) which would lead to a modification of his 'model'. The latter relies upon two key explanatory concepts: 'humanitarianism' as a general ethos, plus 'specialist officers'; the two, related by 'internal dynamism', explaining much government growth, although more force is given to humanitarianism (e.g. 1961: 330). MacDonagh has given various formulations of his 'model' and they need to be carefully compared (1953: 172f; 1955: 134f; 1958a: 57f; 1958b: 44f; 1961: 15f and 348f; 1967: 85f). Probably the most valuable part of MacDonagh's work resides in his call for 'really close and consecutive analysis' of 'what was actually taking place within executive government itself' (1958b: 32; 1958a: 54) which is not a call for facts simpliciter, since all his papers provide both a critique of previous methods, and suggest new approaches.

His model, covering a 'dialectic of nineteenth century reform' with 'cycles' and a 'chain reaction of regulation' (1955: 153) explains a 'legislative-cum-administrative process' which is 'set in motion' by a 'concatenation of circumstances' (1958a: 58f). It has five stages: (i) 'the exposure of a social evil' occasions both a demand for 'prohibitory enactments' and, in turn, opposition to such prohibitions<sup>\*</sup> aided by 'the various forces of inertia'; some kind of legislative enactment establishes a 'precedent'. (ii) Further exposure and demands,

---

\* He includes Benthamism as an obstacle to government growth; for a general account of resistance see 1958a: 62.

stressing that existing legislation is inadequate, result in 'summary processes at law' with, crucially, special officers (MacDonagh, 1955, 1958b, 1961: Chs. 5 and 6 detail such officers), who improve the quality and quantity of data about the 'social evil'. (iii) Further demands involve the consolidation of legislation and the centralization of remedial agencies, and are supported by the officers. (iv) The original definition of the 'problem' is seen to be too narrow; there is the 'gradual crystallization of an expertise ...' (1958a: 60). (v) This 'new and more or less conscious Fabianism<sup>\*</sup> worked itself into modes of government' via executive officers with discretionary powers, creating a 'dynamic role for government within society, a new sort of state was being born' (1958a: 61). The model is (a) restricted to 'the half century 1825 to 1875' and (b) does not 'correspond in detail with any specific departmental growth'.

MacDonagh frequently sees his own work as replacing Dicey whom he regards as being the only serious theorist of 'the governmental revolution' (1958a: 56). He criticises Dicey, and those who follow him, for inflating the significance of both the Northcote-Trevelyan 'type of reform' and Benthamism: 'it is sometimes assumed that these two between them virtually created the modern form of government' (1958a: 63). He considers the contribution of Benthamism to have been 'antagonistic to the main line of growth' of government (1958a:67), if it had any influence at all; since the 'great body of such changes were natural answers to concrete day-to-day problems, pressed eventually to the surface by the sheer exigencies of the case' (1958a: 65). But, as I quoted MacDonagh's own words immediately above, he sees the end result as 'more or less conscious Fabianism'!

---

\* Curiously both MacDonagh and Finer see Fabianism as the outcome of their different explanations.

Apart from empirical contradictions to MacDonagh's work - Johnston (1972), for example, shows the State had an emigration policy (it was called 'shovelling out paupers') many years before the 'social evil' registers on MacDonagh's model - and the significant variations in theoretical argument employed by MacDonagh himself in other contexts (e.g. 1962a, b) - there are some acute tensions within the corpus of work being studied here which his critics do not sufficiently bring to light. After presenting his 'model', MacDonagh not only limits it by time and stresses it is a 'model', but adds

To guard further against exorbitance, it may be useful to try to say why this momentum was but relatively effective in its operation.

(1958a: 61)

Which is a warning to the careful reader that this 'model' may describe little which took place empirically at all. This turns out to be confirmed when a careful examination of MacDonagh's own empirical work is made\* - many pages of careful 'theoretical' argument are followed by sentences which indicate that the reforms never became law, or if they were made into law, were ineffective, or some other severe empirical qualification. In turn, this leads MacDonagh to quite mystical turns of phrase:

Although diverted, confined and unrecognised at many points - indeed because its nature, extent and tendency towards self-multiplication were unrecognised - the process had spread like contagion out of sight.

(1958a: 63)

---

\* A good example is the 1847 'crisis' and actual fate of the remedial proposals (1953:173; 1955:151f;1961:196f) or the 1849 legislation (1953:176; 1961:219) or, crucially, the continuity of the suffering - 1953:179; 1961:227f. MacDonagh relies upon Walpole, 1931 - but he does not follow classical works like Johnson, 1913, or new data about the migrants.

R.J. Lambert's studies (his 1963 book is based on his 1959 Ph.D. on Public Health, 1858-1871) are explicitly oriented to support MacDonagh's model. In his study of vaccination (1962a) he seeks to correct two false views: the first suggests 'stagnation or retraction of state health action in the years after Chadwick's fall in 1854', Lambert can show 'one branch which grew incessantly in terms of power, effectiveness, intrusiveness and organization in the immediately subsequent years, 1855-71' (1962a: 14). Secondly, Lambert argues that 'vaccination certainly exhibits those "spontaneous developments in administration" which Dr. MacDonagh has recently brought to our attention ...' (1962a: 17, his reference is to MacDonagh, 1958a). In his study of the Local Government Act Office (the counterpart of the Medical Office of the Privy Council after the deconstruction of the General Board of Health in 1854), Lambert sees its growth as 'a prime instance of that force which occasioned so much state expansion - the self-sustaining and self-generating impulse of administration itself ... Administrative expediency proved a dynamic and self-educative impulse in the L.G.A.O. as much as in the Medical Department of the Privy Council and elsewhere in central government' (1962a: 150, reference is made to MacDonagh, 1961)\*.

If MacDonagh, and rather less so Lambert, argue for an administrative impulse toward State formation, it is not at all clear what David Roberts sees as the 'springs of action' in this instance. He is clearly against ideational explanations as his 1957 examination of Tory ideals, or his 1959 consideration of Bentham's influence, make clear. The first concludes that 'recent historians and new

---

\* Apart from empirical challenges to Lambert's work - Gutchen, 1961, differs, for example - note how he makes a general case from the rather special years between -1854 and 1871.

conservatives alike have romanticised nineteenth century conservatism. It was not as benevolent, as generous, nor as heroic as they imagine' (1957: 337)\*. His examination of Bentham's influence argues that: the Code was predominantly laissez faire (Cf. Hume, 1967 for explicit rejection of this view); those ideas of Bentham's which were influential (e.g. inspection) were both commonplace, favoured by larger manufacturers, and not new anyway; and where Bentham was indirectly influential (e.g. in the post 1834 Poor Law) more credit should be given to Chadwick's own inventiveness. Roberts concludes:

Had Bentham never written his epochal works, Victorian reformers would probably have contrived their poor laws, factory acts, and educational schemes, all fitted out with central inspectors (1959: 209).

Roberts ends his 1959 paper (p.209-210) with reference to MacDonagh's "brilliant study" (i.e. 1958a) but his 1960 book appears to embrace an explanation which is somewhat anti-MacDonagh. Roberts concludes his book (1960: 326) by stressing that what he has studied 'allows for no neat concluding judgement ...'. The structure of explanation of his book supports this. He begins by evoking 'the temper of the times' (p.11); 'forces and events' (p.71); and the 'spirit of the age' (p.89; one of 'solicitude' p.88) as explanations for how the postReform Parliament - acting without intention - was able to establish two key principles: 'that government might interfere in economic affairs in order to protect the individual and that Whitehall might supervise local government in order to ensure administrative efficiency' (p.36). Narrowly, he speaks of 'serious social abuses' forcing 'the English to establish effective central departments

---

\* His examination is not particularly thorough - for Ashley Cf. Breedy, 1926; Finlayson, 1974 and Bradley, 1976.

...' (p.316). He qualifies this hint of agency by noting that: (a) it was 'the ruling classes' who 'decided' (p.104); (b) the new inspectorate marked 'a new force for social reform' (p.52); and (c) they needed 'the powerful support of that humanitarian and reforming zeal in public and Parliament' (p.72). Finding this combination of 'social abuses' and vague 'humanitarianism' 'somewhat impersonal and Marxian' (p.317) Roberts searches for a 'creative minority' whom he identifies as the Evangelicals and Utilitarians (p.84; 88-89; 99):

The most rational in their demands that an efficient central government promote administrative reforms were the Utilitarians, while the most passionate in calling on the Government to redress social evils were the Evangelicals.

(1960: 318)

That is to say, in the end, that which was denied, reappears!\*

Recently Crouch (1967; Cf. very similar conclusions in Taylor, 1972: 63-64) has argued that, for the period 1825-1875 'laissez-faire was more reality than myth' (1967: 215). But, importantly, he does this through showing (as did Rosenberg, in his 1960 paper which I discussed above) that the 'institution of a refined laissez-faire regime demands positive state action in the class of well-defined situations outlined' (1967: 215): Law; anti-Monopoly; Education; Stable Money; and Protection of the 'Indigent'. He shows that Brebner's instances of collectivism actually fit this model of laissez faire.\*\*

---

\* In one place Roberts goes so far as to suggest that the causal group may have been 'the Benthamites' (1960: 100).

\*\* This 'refined' model seems to me to be social-Democratic. Contrast the ideology drawn from the Economist by Gordon (1955) who notes an editorial (5 August 1854) urging that Chadwick be sent to Russia 'where he would be warmly welcomed' (1955: 484). H. Spencer was assistant editor of the Economist from 1848-1853 (Peel, 1971: 77f).

Finer (1952a; 1959) has been concerned to publicize most thoroughly the impact of Bentham's ideas upon early nineteenth century State apparatuses. In his earlier work he emphasises the roots of twentieth century concerns with social product in the perspectives of Bentham's disciple, Chadwick; Kitson Clark also discusses the need (1962: 96) for such 'conscious direction' if 'development' is to be effective. In the later work Finer tries to specify the means used in the extensive list of Bentham-influenced reforms (see Finer, 1959: 32). He suggests three methods: irradiation; suscitation; permeation (1959: 13f). The first concerns the creation of disciples and 'Second-Degree Benthamites'; the second relates to the arranging of public inquiries and press (on this note how both Chadwick and Trevelyan made use of the press; Clark, 1959; Hughes, 1942-1949; Preston-Thomas, 1909, shows this to be a general phenomenon); and, the third involves the securing of 'official employment for oneself'. Even the casual reader of other historiographical debates will be struck by the similarities here with those other bourgeois Radicals - the Fabians.\* As with the latter, I think Finer is prone to elide Benthamism with other general doctrines (i.e. political economy) and Benthamite with other, rather different, tendencies, notably the Whigs; his claim that the Edinburgh Review was Benthamite is a good example of both exaggerations.

The major critic of MacDonagh is Henry Parris (1960; 1969:Ch.9) who begins by showing how we need to understand Dicey's classic (and Dicey's perception of Bentham) through a political understanding of

---

\* I return to this in Chapter Five below; the most emphatic linking of Benthamism and Fabianism is given by R.A. Lewis (qu Parris, 1960:36) but Cf. Coates, 1950; Mack, 1955; Hume, 1967; Beer, 1969:Epilogue; and of course, the Webbs' total output.

Dicey 'as a whiggish exponent of the true Liberal faith' (p.18). Parris also shows how Dicey's periodization reflects this, and is contradicted by the examples Dicey himself discusses which, for example, remove the start of 'Collectivism' from the 1865 of Dicey's table to the 1833 of the Factory Regulation Act, that is almost at the start of the 'Period of Benthamism or Individualism' (1825-1870). He considers MacDonagh's model and finds it justified for control of emigration traffic (p.31, 33) but not for 'ten other branches of administration' (1960: 33; Cf. his 1969: Ch.8). Parris argues (as with Hume, 1967 and, of course, Finer, 1952a; 1959) that 'the nineteenth century revolution in government ... cannot be understood without allotting a major part to the operation of that doctrine' (p.37) i.e. Benthamism. Parris supplies a counter 'model': (a) a closer 'connexion between law and opinion'; (b) periodization should make a dividing line about 1830; (c) in the second period, 'the dominant current of opinion was Utilitarianism'; (d) 'the principle of utility ... led to considerable extensions both of laissez faire and of State intervention simultaneously'; and (e) once special officers were appointed, 'they themselves played a leading role in legislation, including the development of their own powers' (1960: 35).

Jennifer Hart's 1965 paper groups MacDonagh, Roberts, Lambert and W.L. Burn as proponents of 'a' (sometimes 'the') 'Tory interpretation of history' which belittles 'the role of men and ideas ... they consider that opinion ... was generally humanitarian ... that many changes were not premeditated or in some sense planned, but were the result of "the historical process" or of "blind forces":

The implication is that social progress will in the future as in the past, take place without human effort; all will turn out for the best if we just drift in an Oakeshottian boat. (1965: 39)



She agrees with Parris that MacDonagh 'generalizes unwarrantably' from the emigrant regulation area (where, Parris and Hart seem to agree, his 'thesis is clearly correct'). She considers that Mac Donagh's conception of 'influence' is so extreme as to make any major thinker uninfluential; moreover she stresses that the Benthamites engaged in empirical research (1965: 47). Like Parris she argues that the application of the principle of utility 'led to considerable extensions of both laissez faire and of state intervention' (1965:47); and she shows, following Robbins' work, that political economy allowed a substantial amount of State activity. The 'Tory' notion that 'intolerability' causes social policy changes is untenable because of the varying definitions possible of what is or is not tolerable; she considers humanitarianism wrongly construed: 'Thus Tremeneere considered he was a humanitarian, but in fact he was really a moralist' \* (1965: 53) \*\*. Eric Midwinter stresses how 'the Benthamite solution' was accepted time and again from the 'countless formulae' advanced for dealing with social problems (1966: 130, 133; 1968a: 156).

'The Preventive ideal was the basis of action ... The ring was, artificially, to be cleared of the obstacles of a shackled labour mart, an economically crippling health problem, and the inroads of crime into the national produce.

(Midwinter, 1966: 130)

---

\* Hart fatally (again on p.61) fails to understand the meaning of morality in nineteenth century political theory. Cf. Abrams, 1968:31.

\*\* As Beales (1974: 878) notes, Hart (1969) gives greater causal power to 'administration' alone.

There have been, finally, a number of contributions which do not so much participate in as comment upon the foregoing debate\* . Cromwell (1966) offers a review of some of the texts I have summarised above and stresses the significance of the more general realm of politics; here she notes that the 1850-1870 period is one of both 'administrative quiescence' (but Cf. Willson, 1955) and 'party fragmentation' (p.254). 'Whether or not or however much Bentham's views affected administrative change, that change occurred within and around a particular political structure which had to sanction it' (1966: 255 Cf. her own study with Steiner of the Foreign Office). The two most sustained treatments of the debate are those occasioned by Gillian Sutherland's 'Colloquium' of 1969 (Sutherland, 1969a, 1970, 1972), and the monograph by Lubenow (1971). Sutherland (1970) - drawing from the papers in the 1972 book which she edited - offers some tentative generalizations 'about developments from the 1840's onwards' (1970: 409f). First, political patronage continues for much longer than was previously thought the case; secondly, there was the need for reforming civil servants to have support from their political chiefs - 'political considerations remained - and remain - of great importance'; and, thirdly, there is the general influence of ideas about public expenditure, local fiscal self-sufficiency and, rather differently, Treasury control/parsimony, which cuts across other tendencies.

Lubenow\*\* concludes his studies, which placed these questions

---

\* One of the best of these is Perkin (1969: 267f) although he considers it possible to be 'simply professional' sans politics, sans class ... For further specific studies see the references given in Sutherland, 1970: 409 fn5 which does not repeat those of Cromwell, 1966.

\*\* Some important qualifications of Lubenow can be found in P.G. Richards Ph.D. thesis.

much more in the general political contexts demanded by Cromwell, Sutherland and others, by stressing the 'traditional political forms' of what was taking place. Even where he admits to the novelty of the central departments, Lubenow stresses how power continued to be diffused. He sees the reforms he describes as formed partly through the opposition of 'the historical perspective' (a sustained opposition to centralization) and 'the incremental approach' ('cautious modifications in existing institutional arrangements' p.185); and stresses an overall gradualism (p.187). He nevertheless depicts two novel features: (1) 'Landed magnates ... came to share political power and social authority ...'; and (2) 'governmental alterations in the early Victorian period were precedents for central inspection and delegated authority ...' (p.188):

Taken together, the nineteenth-century revolution in government is a comforting paradigm of the way peaceful institutional change can occur in traditional political and social structures troubled and torn by massive economic and social dislocation.

(Lubenow, 1971: 188)

McCord (1974: 187) has also noted how the years 1815-1870: offer to the historian the engrossing spectacle of a decentralized rural society facing enormous and unprecedented pressures of economic and social change coupled with accelerating population growth - and facing those difficulties with a notably small record of internal conflict and bloodshed.\*

---

\* Professor McCord's methodological injunctions (1967a; 1972a) against taking any 'egalitarian or democratic spirit' to our historical investigations do not prevent him declaring of Peterloo: 'as massacres go it is not a very impressive example' (1967b: 93 fn4) [Contd. on p.41]

His conclusions deny 'any widespread and continuous pressure' for increased government expenditure and expanded agencies of State administration. 'Where expansion took place, and expenditure increased, it was more often the product of small groups of devoted reformers, usually within the ranks of the ruling minorities and not infrequently within government itself, working with the inexorable facts themselves, than the result of any continuous or widespread demand ...' (1974: 191-192).

Henriques' paper in the same festschrift gives great weight to 'the exigencies of the situation' and concludes:

the development of consitutional machinery, like the technical achievements of the Industrial Revolution, was the work of many hands. Attempts to ascribe responsibility may never produce an unchallengable verdict, bringing as they do the historian face to face with the complexities of settling historical truth

(1974: 186; against this agnosticism Cf. her, 1968; 1971)

Taylor's summary volume attempts to divide the problem into different spheres of social experience (and departments of history): he finds the concept of an 'age of laissez faire' less applicable to social and political issues, but considers it very applicable in the economic

thereby agreeing with the Duke of Wellington who deemed it 'a Little murder' (Longford, 1971). E. Thompson's criticism of McCord's 1967b (1968: 938 fn4) is far too mild. Empirically, anyway, both poster evidence (e.g. that of the "Political Protestants of North and South Shields, 2 October 1819" - North Tyneside Local History Centre Archives) and the history of participants (Northern Tribune, 1, 1854) show the limitations of McCord's approach.

sphere (1972: 64). Of this conclusion, Stefan Collini has remarked: 'Such a perspective is sanity itself when contrasted with the prevailing tendency to find the "origins of the welfare state" in the slightest twitch of the arm of Victorian government' (1974).

Before I comment on this Debate it is necessary to examine two related discussions.

---

The Poor Law as a model

There is almost as much literature relating to particular issues concerning the post 1834 Poor Law as there is for several other major Debates put together\*. All I can hope to do here is indicate what I regard as curiously neglected or understressed features of the whole structuring of the new Poor Law - as policy, as a set of institutions, and as a 'lens' by means of which larger issues are made clearer.

Aside from a general neglect of social structural features, studies of the post 1834 Poor Law have ignored its moral relations. By its obvious and intended close relationship with the labour market and wages systems, the Poor Law operated to classify (i.e. 'mark') different poor people in different ways. It was in improvement on actually branding or mutilating them which had been a previous norm of social policy. Polanyi's judgement, which I quoted above, is amply supported by the moral intentions of the Poor Law. Chadwick

---

\* See endnote 3 for a listing of much of this material.

and Nassau Senior (Levy, 1943; Finer, 1952a) - the authors of the 1834 Report - saw their recommendations as the means to help men and women to become better, by removing evil. They close their Report thus:

We are perfectly aware that for the general diffusion of right principles and habits we are to look, not so much to any economic arrangements and regulations as to the influence of a moral and religious education ...

[What we propose will] remove the obstacles which now impede the progress of instruction, and intercept its results; and will afford a freer scope to the operation of every instrument which may be employed, for elevating the intellectual and moral condition of the poorer classes. We believe that if the funds now destined to the purposes of education, many of which are applied in a manner unsuited to the present wants of society, were wisely and economically employed, they would be sufficient to give all the assistance which can be prudently afforded by the state.

(Report (Penguin edition, ed. Checklands) : 496-497)

The full extent of the moral objectives are also clear in a letter from Francis Place to William Lovett, urging the latter to read the 1837 Report of the Poor Law Commission (BM Add. Mss 35151 ff21f; qu Place, 1970: 177f).

It was to this end that workhouses were designed to be 'objects of terror' wherein the less eligible were to be regimented and

disciplined (the young being 'saved'; the old being 'punished')<sup>\*</sup>. This is how power is expressed in a social formation: these Houses were part of the social architecture of menace, along with Churches and Chapels, the Big House and, after the 1870s, the Board Schools. This 'architectural' facet of how one's classification of things and people is constituted is almost totally lacking from social history and sociology<sup>\*\*</sup>. It is all this - terror, less eligibility, discipline, allowance system, The House - which constitute Professor McCord's '"scientific" device for improving the position and character of British workers.' (1972a: 95. Cf. 1969b).

Of course, the Poor Law was concerned with other matters - I discuss the labour market and politics immediately below. It wished to remoralize the 'indigent and disorderly' to labour (Report, p.338) and to spread better diets and the 'sanitary idea'

---

\* One of the reasons why the 1832 Commissioners rejected a 'national system' was that this might decrease the Terror (Report, p.277; on 'strict discipline' Cf. Ibid., p.338). One of Chadwick's correspondents (the Rev. H.H. Milman) suggested to him in 1832 that the Workhouses 'should be as repulsive as is consistent with humanity' (Ansthruther, 1973, epigram). See, for the educational policy of the Poor Law: Halevy, 1923b: 105f; Duke, 1976 and Chapter Three below. 'Less eligibility' was (Finer, 1952a:74f) drawn directly from Bentham's Panopticon scheme for prisoners - i.e. it was a punishment. The allowance system was little better of course (Rose, 1966a). The classifying system worked - we have one documented suicide (D. Tompkins' letter Radio Times 6 August 1975; Cf. Ibid. for the debate between M. Rose and N. Longmate over the latter's Pauper Palace, broadcast BBC Radio 4 17 July 1975).

\*\* Banks were once built to look like Temples for the same reason. For sketches of a possible 'social architecture' see Pevsner, 1976; on workhouses, Wildman, 1974. Many General Workhouses became General Hospitals in 1948 hence the rationality of many older people who refused to enter them since they knew you only ever 'came out dead'.

(Beales, 1948: 318; Flinn, 1976). But, the former, as Chadwick's speeches of the 1860s show, was concerned about production capacities and the availability of a fit army; and the latter, as I try to show in my third Chapter, 'contained' a 'sanitary economics'. In sum, as E.P. Hennock states: 'it was in the national interest to prevent the erosion of human capacities that follow from extreme poverty' (1968, last sentence)\*.

The moral dimension has so escaped historical attention that a recent survey (by the Checklands in introducing the Penguin edition of the 1834 Report) can suggest that the 'prevailing view in the England of the 1830s ... [was] basically individualistic and moralistic' (p.11). Although they mention the influence of some 'environmentalism', the meaning they give to 'moral relations' is antithetical to my own - they go so far as to deny (p.21, 28) the possibility of 'a sociology' in the 1830s, claiming that until environmentalism became the 'dominant thought-idiom' (p.11, 21) there could be no sociology. The Poor Law was an institutional display - a materialization - of a moral classification of things and people; it entailed a particular kind of empirical work ('the statistical idea') and marked the inception of two social policy strategies ('the educational idea' and 'the sanitary idea'); and it drew upon a range of other sciences and disciplines - is that not a sociology?

Beales suggests, from a study of Chadwick and Senior, that what the 1834 Report's authors sought 'beside economy, was a system of social police which would open up the labour market and render the labour factor

---

\* This comment relates also to the 1880s onwards, Cf. Hennock, 1976 and studies of the politicians' reading of Booth or Rowntree Cf. Abrams, 1968 and my Ch. 5.



of production mobile and docile, that is, disciplined and as nearly rational and predictable as may be' (Beales, 1948: 315)\*. This is one of the clear strands shown in recent debates whether about the origins of 1834, its mode of operation (especially the paper by Digby, 1975\*\*), or whether it was 'cruel' (Roberts, 1963; Henriques, 1968). The Poor Law institutions were 'finely tuned' in their support of a 'free' labour market, they were sensitive not only to sectoral and regional variations (Hunt's work, 1972, 1973, makes it possible to relate variations on policy to wage level changes); but also to fluctuations in trade. In conditions of labour scarcity the workhouse test could be rigidly and mercilessly applied; in conditions of a surfeit of labour a supplement to income plus programmes of public works were provided. Much against the designs of Chadwick (as Finer, 1952a has shown) the patchy implementation of uniform standards\*\*\* considerably weakened the cost/benefit equations of the authors of 1834. Variations also existed because of the triple structure: the Commissioners/Board at the Centre, the Assistant Commissioners (later Inspectors), and the Guardians and staff in the Unions.\*\*\*\*

---

\* See the agreement between E.P. Thompson, 1963: 295f; B.Inglis, 1971: 372f; and A.W. Coats, 1972:165; the first two relate this to the Standard of Living Debate.

\*\* Contrast her portrait of Sir John Walsham with that drawn in McCord 1969b and faithfully reproduced in Dunkley, 1974 - all three should consult Walsham's letters to Chadwick (Chadwick Mss. 2049).

\*\*\* Chadwick was also frustrated in his attempts in the 1840s to use the Guardians for general politico-social information gathering.

\*\*\*\* This triple structure is used by some historians as a 'Checks and Balances' history: where Guardians, Assistant Commissioners, Central Office, or, even ratepayers, act as an 'agency of restraint and enlightenment' or 'bulwark' against 'Benthamite logic'.

Halevy has argued that the 1834 Act was passed because the 'country gentlemen' approved the economy involved (1923b: 127). That may be so - and they had an enduring role in its administration since, until 1896, J.P.s were ex-officio Guardians - but Senior wrote to de Tocqueville in the 1860s:

The Poor Law Amendment Act was a heavier blow to the aristocracy than the Reform Act. The Reform Act principally affected the aristocracy of wealth ... The Poor Law Act dethroned the country gentlemen.

(qu Beales, 1931: 331 fn.1)

Senior's statement that shopkeepers and farmers were partially enthroned (Ibid.) is supported by other evidence (Roberts, 1963: 368; Digby, 1975: 74f, Cf. her 1976).<sup>\*</sup> This aspect of the politics of the Poor Law has been studied by Brundage (1972, 1974, 1975) and debated by Dunkley (1973); with the former extending the work of D.C. Moore by seeing the years following 1834 as those in which the landed magnates gained power in the Unions. Dunkley's criticism tries, in the main, to make Brundage's empirical focus (Northamptonshire) 'a special case'; Brundage's response shows this to be false.<sup>\*\*</sup> Dunkley's own research (1974) shows the weakness of his case. In particular, Dunkley fails to relate the power of the greatest secular landowner (Londonderry) and the 'significant proportion of the destitute [who] were forced or induced to fend for themselves' (especially during the pitmen's strike of 1844), to the fact, which he quotes, that their

---

\* The Duke of Wellington saw what was happening (qu Halevy, 1923b: 126 fn2).

\*\* Admittedly, the magnates of Northants were great (Cf. Spring, 1953; Ward, 1966) and Althorp - the mover of the 1834 Act - became Earl Spencer (17,030 acres) on 10 November 1834.

owner had put them out of their homes and that owner (as Barker's M.Litt thesis makes absolutely clear) was the dominant force upon the relevant Unions, just as the Duke of Northumberland overshadowed the considerations of the Tynemouth Union. The latter example shows what care must be taken with examining occupations and affiliations of Guardians.\*

In short, by denying the validity of certain kinds of approach or evidence, historians have not seen how typical - how much a 'model' - the post 1834 Poor Law was.

---

#### The Roots and Results of the 1854/1870 Reforms

As previously, the literature here is vast\*\* and my intention is extremely limited. The period from 1780, with major divisions around 1830 and in the mid- 1850s, marks the start of a series of related changes into which we must fit the reforms associated with Trevelyan and Northcote. I refer to the growth of: an 'administration' separate from both the King's Household and any one political party; new institutions of State fiscal control\*\*\*; Parties themselves and 'H.M. Loyal Opposition' (Ford, 1964); a regulated system of Commons procedure; Ministers and Ministerial responsibility; Cabinet

---

\* I am most grateful to Val Gillespie for long discussions on all aspects of Poor Law administration and for the benefit of her work on the Tynemouth Union. On two agents, both Taylors, Cf. F.M.L. Thompson, 1963 p.171-2, 176. To show some idea of the magnitudes involved I provide some Poor Law Statistics in Appendix II below.

\*\* See sections (iii) and (iv) of Note 1(i), N/3 below.

\*\*\* Cf. Stern, 1950. Halevy (1912: 357fn2) discusses the 'budget'.

administration and Treasury 'control', and so on. The Civil Service has been under scrutiny, in fact, almost from the time when Parris (1968) considers the term appropriate.\*

The first period begins with the twin impulses of 'Economic Reform' suggested by Fox and Burke\*\* and those of the Wars against Napoleon\*\*\*. During the period 1780 to 1830 as Parris (1968; Cf. Finer, 1952b) shows, the 'permanent civil service' was initiated; marking the reduced powers of Royal patronage. A crucial change is noted by Farr: 'Public servants were formerly paid in grants of land, in perquisites, in fees, in gratuities, in the use of money left in their hands, and in a variety of indirect ways; which, within the last

\* The main Reports are discussed by Gretton, 1913; Cohen, 1941; Parris, 1969; Fry, 1969 and are listed in my Bibliography, Section B.1: 1854/55 (the main report is printed as Appdx.B to the Fulton Report); 1860; 1875; 1886; 1912; 1929; 1953 and 1966. This ignores the important 'Reconstruction' and 'Machinery of Government' reports and reorganisations, on the most recent of which see Russell-Smith, 1974; Thornhill, 1975. Work has hardly begun on relating changes in State organization to (1) enquiries into, and changes within, educational structures; (2) changes in the intra- and inter-national character of private capital's fiscal, distributive and productive enterprises.

\*\* Farr, 1848: 102f; Halevy, 1912: 20f; Gretton, 1913: 85-94; Barker, 1930: 34f; Cohen, 1941: Chs. 2-4; Finer, 1952b: 347f; Parris, 1968: 151f and Roseveare, 1973: Document 14.

\*\*\* Although the State's Ministry of Agriculture dates from a Board founded in 1889, the earlier hybrid Board, of the Wars against Napoleon, is significant: Halevy, 1912: 224f; Gretton, 1913: 136f. Stern (1950: 202) gives details of its public funding. He also reports on the 'invention' of the Consolidated Fund, 1787 and the Exchequer Loans Commission, 1793. On the Poor Employment Act, 1817 - from which the Public Works Loan Board originated in 1875 - See Flinn (1961, 1971). On earlier Commissions and Funds see Gretton, 1913 and Mantoux, 1928 - the latter's discussion of the Inclosure Commissioners is important.

fifty years, have, with great advantage to the public interests, been generally exchanged for salaries that appear in the public accounts.' (Farr, 1848: 103 - but Cf. Gretton, 1913: 107f)\*. Parris concludes, somewhat Whiggishly, that 'As the monarchy rose above party, so the civil service settled below party. Constitutional bureaucracy was the counterpart of constitutional monarchy' (1968: 164 Cf. his 1969: Ch.5 and Heasman, 1970: 353).

The period after 1830 has been studied by Willson's survey of Boards and Ministries (1955) which shows, first, the 'years between 1832 and 1855 ... as an interlude between the old 18th century administration, largely independent of Parliament, and the closely controlled "responsible" administration of the later Victorian era' (1955: 49). Secondly, his study of both the creations and abolitions of boards and ministries shows a pattern 'which differentiates the period before 1855 and after 1906 from the years between those dates' (1955: 47). Further, whereas before and after those dates fairly independent Boards were common, in between 'a large proportion of the small number of boards which were left ... [in England and Wales] were very closely controlled by Ministers' (Willson, 1955: 47-8).

Ministerial\*\* government, along with Governmental 'control' of the business of Parliament, were parallel changes in State administration. Schaeffer (1957) sees the inception of 'Ministerial departments' owes something to Bentham, J.S. Mill and Bagehot, but is the consensual view

---

\* Parris (1968) and Finer (1952b) both discuss why a 'spoils system' did not develop, as in the United States.

\*\* Cf. Hintze, 1908; Gretton, 1913: Chs. 3 and 4; Barker, 1930; Parris, 1969: Chs. 3-4, 7; Schaeffer, 1957. For the Commons: Fraser, 1960; Heasman, 1970; Fry, 1969: Ch.1.

amongst ruling groups by the 1850s (1957: 76f), Fraser (1960: 451f) and Heasman (1970: 354f) show that after 1832 Ministerial power within the Commons increased dramatically - with special days for Government business. Similarly, and again by the mid 1830s, different Departments of State employed their own 'drafting counsel' for their Bills. By the 1880s (Fraser, 1960: 458f) the Commons was seen as a legislative chamber rather than a part of the 'Council of the Nation'; and, by the last 25 years of the century, the Commons could be spoken of as 'obstructing' the work of Government (Ibid., 461). Of course, as in all these changes - since they involve individual biographies and enduring structures of significant symbolic 'power' - there is a considerable overlap. Hintze (1908: 22) uses a geological metaphor to 'find in the English Cabinet all the combined historical elements that have formed the ministries of today : the great offices of Court; the Secretaries of State, and the collegiate Privy Council' - he roots all three elements in the twelfth century.

It is among these many changes that we should locate the reforms associated with Trevelyan and Northcote.\* Furthermore, and remembering that the movement of the 1780s had effects which were not unknown in the 1830s\*\*, they had important predecessors in Sir Henry Taylor (1832; Cf. Schaeffer, 1957: 66f) and Sir George Harrison, the first permanent secretary to the Treasury (Torrance, 1968)\*\*\*. This was then a very

---

\* Biography is again significant: I supply some information as End-note 4.

\*\* See, for example, the 1837 Reports on Fees.

\*\*\* Harrison is a bridge between the 1780s and 1840s Reforms; Torrance makes this and much else clear in a neglected article. More generally, it is clear that some impulse toward administrative change came from (i) desires for economy and efficiency; (ii) early attempts at Treasury Control: Gretton, 1913:122f; Wright, 1969a,b; Parris, 1969:203f and Ch.8; Roseveare, 1973. For personnel see Sainty, Vol.I. Later Reports (e.g.1875;1886;1912) relate general reform to more Treasury Control.

general movement<sup>\*</sup>, which related - as all the sources show - reform of the Indian Civil Service and the Universities to 'Administrative Reform'. The intermingling of the key personnel - Macaulay, Trevelyan, Northcote, Jowett, Gladstone and Robert Lowe (a crucial figure in the 1860s - Cohen, 1941:121f) - is also well attested. The 'motives' have been clearly established since the time of Hughes' articles in the 1940s; and recent work (Hart, 1960, 1969) has not altered their findings. Rather less solidly established are 'the politics' and the matter of dating. Many standard sources (Fulton Report Ch.1, para.1; the historical chapter in the 'Evidence' to the 1912 Commission; Thornhill, 1975:2; Russell-Smith, 1974:passim, and so on) date the 'Civil Service today' from 'the nineteenth-century philosophy of the Northcote-Trevelyan Report' of 23 November 1853. However, Trevelyan and others (Northcote's 'equal billing' hardly seems deserved) investigated over a dozen offices and departments from 1848 to 1857<sup>\*\*</sup>. As Trevelyan told the Playfair Commission in 1875: 'The revolutionary period of 1848 gave us a shake, and created a disposition to put our house in order, and one of the consequences was a remarkable series of investigations ...' (qu Hart, 1969: 42)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>. Hughes argues that these special reports - especially that on the Board of Trade - are the main source of the 1854 recommendations: 'In these respects, the

---

\* Chadwick was much involved, I mention his A.R.A. involvement below; see also my third Chapter and First Appendix.

\*\* Cohen (1941:92) claims that the Home Office, the Foreign Office and the Military and Naval Offices were not investigated. This is incorrect (Hughes, 1942:61; Hart, 1960:103f) but these investigations were never published because of opposition (Hart, 1960:104f).

\*\*\* Cf. McGregor, 1951:156f. Trevelyan also refers here to what he called 'Chartist poison' (Hart, 1960:109f). Cohen (1941:92fn2) shows Disraeli pointing to 'gross scandals' in Customs in 1848; Hughes (1942:23) dates these from 1846.

report on the Reorganization of the Permanent Civil Service contained nothing that was new. It simply enunciated general principles instead of particular ones' (Hughes, 1949: 61). Although a Civil Service Commission was established, by Order in Council, on 21st May 1855, Open Competition was not even formally endorsed (by an Order in Council) until 4th June 1870. I detail later the very limited nature of the results of the 1854 Report.

From the Reports and the secondary analyses it seems clear that Trevelyan and others sought certain moral-political changes which were centrally expressed in terms of a 'division of labour' into two kinds of Civil Servant creating two kinds of educational effects.\* As Trevelyan wrote to the Editor of the Times ('not for publication') 'our high Aristocracy have been accustomed to employ the Civil Establishments as a means of providing for the Waifs and Strays of their Families ...' (qu Hughes, 1949:85). On 27th February, 1854, Trevelyan wrote to Gladstone\*\* 'The old established Political Families habitually batten on the Public Patronage. Their sons, legitimate and illegitimate, their Relatives and Dependents of every degree are provided for by the score' (qu Hughes, 1949: 210)\*\*\*. What Trevelyan sought to effect involved a 'division of Labour' (the term is employed in the report) whereby higher offices would attract 'the best portion of the best educated of our youth' (qu Hughes, 1949: 72); it was this which entailed the Balliol connection, and the Jowett 'Letter' (see that text and Hughes, Ibid., p.73 fn.1). But - as Trevelyan's letter

---

\* There is a contrast between Hart (1969: 72, 81) which seems to drain the reforms of all significant political motivation (as Beales, 1974, noted) and Hart (1960) which shows political considerations pervading the whole life of Trevelyan- e.g. his appreciation of Adam Smith [continued p.54] \*\*, \*\*\* see p.54.



to Gladstone (31 January 1854; urging publication of the Report) makes clear - it was also intended to have educational effects through changing the lower clerks: 'in its application to the lower ranks of society it is likely to be productive of very beneficial effects by prompting education, and impressing the rising generation with the value of character' (CT's emphasis; qu Hughes 1949:82; Cf. Hughes, 1942:51; 1949: 210f; 217 for similar texts). This focus is admirably displayed by the Dean of Hereford's pamphlet (Dawes, 1854).

As to the matter of Treasury control, Trevelyan wrote to Gladstone on 9th February 1854, with a plan to make 'the Treasury really a supervising Office' by employing in it 'officers ... selected from among the best men in the different Departments'; this 'would introduce a powerful principle of unity into the Public Service, ...'

---

and Burke (p.96) or his analysis of social structure (p.109f). She is so concerned to rebut analyses based upon middle-class push, that she fails to detect ruling-class pull. For the debate: Musgrove, 1959a, b; Perkin, 1961.

\*\* The famous Report was commissioned by Gladstone (Chancellor of the Exchequer) in March 1853. Earlier Gladstone had 'placed' Northcote on the Enquiry in progress into the Board of Trade (for Northcote's letter to Gladstone see Hughes, 1949:60) Both Northcote and Trevelyan (Hughes, 1949:215; Hart, 1960:97f) were keen to use patronage and semi-jobbing for their own kith and kin. Gladstone (according to a letter from him to Ld. John Russell in 1854) sought to effect a reform which would 'strengthen and multiply the ties between the higher classes and the possession of administrative power ...' (Hughes, 1942:28; for other parts of the same letter, Hart, 1969). Like Sir James Graham, and Queen Victoria (Hughes, 1942:43), Gladstone speaks of the aristocracy's 'acquired advantages, their insensible education, irrespective of book learning'; but he also speaks of 'the highly educated classes' in the same letter.

\*\*\* This shows how former Radical, even revolutionary, slogans (for which a man or woman might be imprisoned for seditious libel) become the commonplace of reforming rulers.

(qu Hughes, 1949: 207; Gladstone disagreed: Hart, 1969:74)

For the Fabians (notably the Webbs and Graham Wallas) Trevelyan was a kind of 'antecedent' of their own work<sup>\*</sup>; for J.S. Mill (to whom the Report was circulated) the notion of open competitive examinations 'appears to me to be one of those great public improvements, the adoption of which would form an era in history ... a great and salutary moral revolution' (qu Hughes, 1942: 35). Reaction to the report was in fact very mixed: the Westminster Review, like Chadwick, was uncertain; many, like Lingen, opposed the abolition of patronage (Cohen, 1941: Chs.7-8). Importantly, no legislation was brought to the Commons - despite a Cabinet Vote on 26th January 1854 to that effect. Hughes analyses this and concludes by highlighting the 'whig leaders' solid opposition (Hughes, 1949: 82).

Before considering the Report's consequences I want to mention 'pressure from without'. As McGregor has noted: 'After 1848, businessmen organized in Financial and Administrative Reform Associations ...' (1957: 151). The variety of these groups have been surveyed by Wootton (1975) and investigated in Hollis (1974). In a letter to Samuel Morley, the Secretary of the Administrative Reform Association, Chadwick claimed that the Association 'may take entire credit for the appointment of the Civil Service Commission. But for the agitation created by the association, Sir Charles Trevelyan, myself and other officers might have written, laboured and remonstrated in vain' (19

---

\* I think that the Webbs are right because, and not in spite of, Hughes' demonstration that Trevelyan sought 'to raise the social standing of the service, not to lower or "democratise" it' (Hughes, 1942: 23).

June 1856 qu Lewis, 1950: 199)\*. O. Anderson shows in her two thorough articles (1965, 1974) that it would be wrong to link the A.R.A. too closely with civil service reform, or to see it as following from the Crimean War scandals. Despite a few flourishes of demagoguery - when Dickens was involved\*\* - Anderson argues that the A.R.A. never intended to become a mass organisation - indeed its 'arrogant identification of ability with commercial experience antagonised both working men\*\*\* and governing classes ...' (O. Anderson, 1965: 241). Perhaps, in terms of elitism, McGregor is right to link the A.R.A. and similar associations to the Fabian Society 'a generation later' (1957: 151).

Finally, what of the consequences of the famous 1854 Report? The 'commanding heights' of the English Civil Service remain formed by 'sponsored' rather than 'contest' systems of entry and upward mobility. Cornwall Lewis' notion of 'limited competition' among selected candidates (rather than open competition among all comers) and Departmental responsibility, were the defining facets of the 1855-

---

\* Chadwick goes on to consider that if the Association presses on 'it will do more for the civilised world than any voluntary political association that we have had in our time or that I believe has heretofore existed' (qu Lewis, 1950:199 Cf. Wallas, 1908:249f). Lewis and Anderson believe Chadwick's writing was a liability for the A.R.A.

\*\* Dickens' 1855 Speech (very well set in context by the editor) is one of those texts which deserves extended treatment, not least for his relating of the A.R.A. to class struggle (Ibid., 203f) and his review of the Reforms since 1780 in one bold sweep.

\*\*\* For Chartist opposition see O. Anderson and Marx (Neue Oder Zeitung 5 June 1855 qu 1962: 428f). By contrast the Christian Socialists, especially F.D. Maurice, were highly favourable - Maurice saw Working Men's Colleges as a kind of A.R.A. (Anderson, 1965:240). On Christian Socialism Cf. Backstrom, 1974 and Saville's essay in his festchrift for Dana Torr (1954).

1870 reforms (Hughes, 1942: 42). R. Johnson's conclusion may be generalised to the last 120 years: 'Patronage ... was now being exercised through the educational institutions of the mid-Victorian intelligentsia ... this change of patronage, of course, redefined in subtle ways what it was to be a civil servant in both a social and political sense' (1969: 122). As far as Annan is concerned, the 'intellectual aristocracy' have their 'Bill of Rights' in the 'Trevelyan-Northcote [n.b.] report of 1853'; 'their Glorious Revolution was achieved in 1870-1 ... no formal obstacles then remained to prevent the man of brains from becoming a gentleman' (1955:257). One does not have to be Durkheim to notice how both these assessments are permeated with moral relations. But Parris is right to invert the normal clauses: 'The Administrative Class type was not created by open competition. Open competition served to perpetuate a type which had already come to the top' (Parris, 1969: 159, Cf. Torrance, 1968). Parris (1969: Ch.5) and Johnson (1969) show the coexistence of varieties of civil servants; in Parris' terms: Patricians, Plebeians, Zealots and Professionals.

Fay (1969) demonstrates that the 1854 Report was implemented cautiously<sup>\*</sup>; Parris - and the studies in Sutherland (1972) confirm - argues that 'neither the Northcote-Trevelyan Report, nor the setting up of the Civil Service Commission (1855), nor the advent of open competition (1870) killed' patronage (1969:50)\*\* Departmental sectionalism remained strong: only in 1936 was full inter-class promotion by examination established; in the 1920s the whole Civil Service could be seen as a 'University with separate colleges' (Lord

---

\* Fry (1969:Ch.2) stresses especial resistance in the Home Office; the Foreign Office (Cf. Cromwell, 1969) and the Board of Education (Cf. Sutherland, 1969b). \*\* On the growth of patronage, Cf. EndNote 5.

Bridges, qu Fry, 1969: 35). Harold Scott said of the same period that Home 'Office life was still influenced by the rhythm of the London season' (qu Fry, 1969: 44 fn1; Cf. Preston-Thomas, 1909; Cohen, 1941: Ch.8; Kelsall, 1955). Russell-Smith describes (1974: 19f) how Oxbridge syllabi dominated the open competition of the 1920s\*. Both the 'country house test' (much admired by Labour Cabinet Ministers) and the post-Fulton reforms (i.e. the sociology imbedded in 'Method II' appointments) are very close to the aims of Trevelyan and the other ancestors of the New Liberals.

---

### Conclusion

The debates are remarkable for their sustained sociological naivété\*\*. A not unrelated matter is the almost total absence of any Marxist intervention. A number of commentators have noted the covariation of laissez faire and State intervention but few if any have caught the point well phrased by Thompson

the main protagonists of the State, in its political and administrative authority, were the middle-class Utilitarians, on the other side of whose Statist banner were inscribed the doctrines of economic laissez faire.

(E. Thompson, 1963: 90)

---

\* For further details see Fulton Report, volume 3; Chapman, 1970. Allen (1975) reports Oxbridge educated entrants into the 'top grades' of the Home Civil Service to be 85% in 1960 and 57% in 1970. For wider studies of J.S. Mills's 'Aristocracy' of talent see: Annan, 1955; Guttsman, 1968; R.W. Johnson, 1973 and especially, Boyd, 1974.

\*\* But not so naive as some: Hugh Plommer wrote recently 'In our great days, not many years ago, the State merely kept the peace, repelled foreign enemies and maintained the physical framework of the country.' (Letter, Times, 20 April 1976).

The central restriction on these debates is a series of separations. First, despite actual use of the words 'ruling class' now and again, there is no single attempt to relate the State to class struggle; although, for example, Brebner or Aydelotte come close to understanding the crucial intra-class struggles amongst different fractions of the ruling classes. Henriques (1974) - to take the best example of a survey of the 'elements' of reform - never pauses to note, let alone examine, the supporting social-structural conditions which make it possible for any social formation to be divided into 'governors and governed'. Any 'situating' of the State - any State - as an expression of the social division of labour, is absent from these Debates, although some - notably Brebner and Polanyi, and some local Poor Law studies - point in this direction. Few understand the State as it was experienced - a social relation at once promoting (but, of course also restraining) the reproduction of a political classification; and suppressing alternative ways of being; or of conceptualising social life. Moreover this compartmentalisation separates 'morals' from 'actions'; ignoring how the former make possible the latter, how definite moral patterns sustain more easily comprehended 'rational' or 'intellectualist' sets of ideas. These are all matters to which my subsequent chapters address themselves.

A few commentators have recognised that State action was needed to accomplish laissez faire; but few follow through their frequent metaphor of 'holding the ring' as Supple<sup>\*</sup> has done: 'before we conclude that the first Industrial Revolution owed everything to the market

---

\* Apart from Marx (1858; 1867) see Kemp (1969:9) and Deane's discussion (1969: 207f) of the 'capitalist industry state'. Supple's 1974 paper is an extension of these arguments which I take up in Chapter Four below.

and nothing to government, it is worth remembering that the very characteristics of the market environment which distinguished Britain's position from that of other European countries were in large part a function of state action' (1971: 314f). Of course, laissez faire and State intervention have to coexist; the market laws which make the former morally and economically desirable are only achieved through the institutional supports provided by the latter. They are 'the back and front' of the ideology of a political economy of which Utilitarianism presents the Erastian face and Manchester liberalism (and the Economist) offer the Individualist visage. These State forms are wedded to other formations far wider than these debates have intimated - the transformation of a whole social structure through 'capitalization'; the formation of new class alignments; and shifting sociologies of 'the People' and 'the Enemies of the People'.

By failing to understand State formation in class terms the Debates have 'lost sight of truths' which were once understood. Halevy, once again, recognised that Utilitarianism was not at all 'a liberal system' but extremely authoritarian; and he understood how the Radicals, after 1832, made 'a systematic effort not only to make the state democratic but to make it strong' (1923b: 100-101). Equally, all administrative ideologies were themselves subject to qualification in terms of a wider political threat. This has been ably captured in a phrase of Peter Stansky (in his 'Introduction' to a reader made up of many of the texts of the Debate):

The powers that be are rarely so rigid that they will snap rather than bend; they attempt to preserve the old by accepting the new on their terms.

(Stansky, 1973: xii; Cf. McCord, 1972a: 95)

These general points are as true of the two other discussions. For example, in what sociological and structural sense was the Poor Law a model? In both its intentions and its class effects:

The New Poor Law, mitigated as it was by the goodwill of many individuals including devoted Guardians and Assistant Commissioners, was part of a body of class legislation ...

(Henriques, 1968: 371)

In a sense, there was continuous agitation against the New Poor Law from its creation in 1834 until the demise of the boards of guardians in 1929 ...

(Rose, 1970: 79)

That is, until the demise of ... The Public Assistance Committees? The 'renaming' of the workhouses? But the work of Peter Townsend, the experiences - historical and cumulative - of claimants in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s means we cannot close that story. We are talking about a structure of policy and an accumulation of experiences which are far more solid and enduring than nameplates and bricks and mortar. The morals of those social relations seem to me to be crucial. How could anyone see the Poor Law as laissez faire?

The same moral relations and political sociologies relate to Civil Service Reform. For all their criticism of Trevelyan, the Fulton Committee - as their discussion of 'professionalism' makes very clear (Report, 19-23) - see 'the administrator' as the key figure of their Reforms. This 'administrator' is to have a socio-political perspective which subordinates the work and judgments of 'experts' to a coherently Erastian outlook. Like Trevelyan also, Fulton Committee members relate their notions of 'administrative control' to the



recruitment of graduates and postgraduates with 'relevant' knowledge. But, as with all the Royal Commissions and other investigations since Trevelyan, they generate a similar 'blindness'\* in those who have commented upon their work. The focus on personnel and performance obscures that we are talking about the making of a particular State form.

It is the aetiology, in theory and practice, of that modern democratic Capitalist State, in the work of Marx and Weber, that the next chapter discusses, offering an analysis of their work as further criticism of the assumptions and paradigms of the historians, and, at the same time, a prelude to studies presented in the third and fourth chapters.

---

\* But see Nettl's paper (1965a) which is a very significant exception. Cf. Harvey, 1958: Ch.12; Miliband, 1969: Ch.5. The latter's polemic with Poulantzas is correct in one particular - the need to demonstrate the practical existence of social relations of control which simultaneously (though differently) sustain certain production and political 'forms'. This information is not, after all, difficult to collect. We can easily establish previous occupations (Lord Rothschild as Research Coordinator of Royal Dutch Shell and then convenor of the Central Policy Review Staff), and the subsequent occupations (Lord Armstrong's move from the effective Head of the Civil Service to the chairmanship of the Midland Bank) or the 'weaving' profiles of a John Methven (b. 1926: Local Government 1949-1957; I.C.I. 1957-1973; Office of Fair-Trading 1973-1976; Director-General, C.B.I. 1976 - ) or many other 'businessmen' in Whitehall. We now have close studies of the Cabinet Office (Hennessy, 1976) and the new 'machinery of government' (Clare, 1972; Thornhill, 1975) - including a detailed study of just how much power 'particular' State Servants have (Corina, 1976). We do not, in sum, lack 'facts'.

Chapter Two: An alternative strategy. Marx, Weber and the origins  
of the modern, democratic Nation-State.

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Marx (and Weber) on 'the peculiarities of the English'

2.3 On Herbert Spencer

2.4 Conclusion

## CHAPTER TWO

... on the choice of the State itself as a central theme for reflection. Today, when 'history from below' has become a watchword in both Marxist and non-Marxist circles, and has produced major gains in our understanding of the past, it is nevertheless necessary to recall one of the basic axioms of historical materialism: that secular struggle between classes is ultimately resolved at the political - not at the economic or cultural - level of society. In other words, it is the construction and destruction of States which seal the basic shifts in the relations of production, so long as classes subsist. A 'history from above' - of the intricate machinery of class domination - is thus no less essential than a 'history from below': indeed, without it the latter in the end becomes one-sided (if the better side).

P. Anderson (1974b: 11)

---

... the modern State ... is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests ... the State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests ... the State mediates in the formation of all common institutions and ... the institutions receive a political form.

Marx and Engels (1845: 79-80)

---

The whole process is a complete parallel to the development of the capitalist enterprise through gradual expropriation of the independent producers. In the end, the modern state controls the total means of political organization ... In the contemporary 'state' - and this is essential for the concept of state - the 'separation' of the administrative staff, of the administrative officials and of the workers from the material means of administrative organization is completed.

Weber (1918a: 82).

---

## Introduction

This section is neither a presentation of the Marxist view of the State, nor yet a sufficiently adequate summary of Marx and Weber on the State<sup>\*</sup>, although, hopefully, it makes a contribution to these discussions. The aim of this chapter is to establish an analysis of the taken-for-granted phenomena which underpin and 'make possible' the Debates discussed in Chapter One. At the same time the discussion provides a basis for the materials presented in subsequent Chapters.

Marx is concerned to offer an analysis of different social forms which relate to distinct modes of production defined by the social relations entailed in both a particular way of working and major social fissures between those who do, and those who do not, control profitable (productive) property<sup>\*\*</sup>. For Marx,

The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labour is pumped out of direct producers, determines the relationship of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and, in turn, reacts upon it as a determining element. Upon this, however, is founded the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby simultaneously its specific political form. It is always the direct relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers - a relation

\* I indicate materials relevant to such a presentation in Endnote 1.

\*\* For a thorough examination of Marx - along with many relevant points and quotations on the State - see Derek Sayer, 1975 and Ph.D. thesis, and the work of Hal Draper.

always naturally corresponding to a definite stage in the development of the methods of labour and thereby its social productivity - which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and with it the political form of the relation of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the corresponding specific form of the state. This does not prevent the same economic basis - the same from the standpoint of its main conditions - due to innumerable different empirical circumstances, natural environment, racial relations, external historical influences, etc. from showing infinite variations and gradations in appearance, which can be ascertained only by analysis of the empirically given circumstances.

(1864: 791-2 Cf. 1875: 330f).

This view is present in many other texts, particularly in The German Ideology (a work neglected by most who have attempted to abstract 'the' Marxian theory of the State). There, following sketches of a 'conception of history', Marx and Engels stress,

The conditions under which definite productive forces can be applied, are the conditions of the rule of a definite class of society, whose social power, deriving from its property, has its practical-idealistic expression in each case in the form of the State; and, therefore, every revolutionary struggle is directed against a class, which till then has been in power.

(1845: 87 Cf. Weber, 1920b: 182f).

In terms of the capitalist State, Marx, Engels, and Weber share the same perspective. In the words of the Manifesto of the Communist Party:

the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world-market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

(1848: 37 Cf. Weber 1920: Part IV).

For Engels, the State was not forced upon social formations, rather it expressed 'insoluble contradictions' produced 'at a certain stage of economic development' (1891: 586, 589 Cf. Engels, 1892: 427f). He noted the three features that give modern State apparatuses the appearance of being 'above civil society': creation of national (i.e. territorial) political units; a public power of repression (armed force, police, law, Church-State relations) and the creation of tax gathering rights and a corps of officials.

The shabbiest police servant in the civilised state has more "authority" than all the organs of gentile society put together; but the most powerful prince and the greatest statesman, or general, of civilisation may well envy the humblest gentile chief for the unrestrained and undisputed respect that is paid to him. The one stands in the midst of society, the other is forced to attempt to represent something outside and above it.

(1891: 587)

Weber's discussions are congruent with this view, especially his comprehension of 'legitimacy' and 'rules' in relation to political

authority (1918a; Cf. Ashcraft, 1972; Wright, 1975)\*. But it is unlikely that Weber would wholly support the way in which Marx gives validity to the content of law by showing its dependence on context:

The justice of the transactions between agents of production rests on the fact that these arise as natural consequences of the production relationships. The juristic forms in which these economic transactions appear as wilful acts of the parties concerned, as expressions of their common will and as contracts that may be enforced by law against some individual party, cannot, being mere forms, determine this content. They merely express it. This content is just whenever it corresponds, is appropriate, to the mode of production. It is unjust whenever it contradicts that mode.

(Marx, 1864: 339-340; Cf. Marx, 1845: 364f; Weber, 1914b: Sect. 7).

Nevertheless, Weber does provide a thorough discussion of the link between the modern Democratic State, 'Citizenship', 'The Rational State', and 'The Evolution of the Capitalistic Spirit' (1920: Part 4: Chs. 28, 29, 30). And it is Weber who argues

"Every state is founded on force," said Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk. That is indeed right ... a state is a

---

\* On the theme of legitimacy - apart from Gramsci - see the work of Offe and Habermas cited in the Bibliography. Albrow (1975) provides an introduction to Weber's sociology of law, but Cf. Mommsen, 1965, 1972. Note how sociologists such as David Lockwood and Parkin have made sensitive use of Weber's conceptions of class, status and power in order to investigate contemporary social forms, Cf. Corrigan, 1975c.



human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory ...

Like the political institutions historically preceding it, the state is a relation of men dominating men, a relation supported by means of legitimate (i.e. considered to be legitimate) violence. (1918a: 78)\*.

One writer in particular, from a Marxist standpoint, has pointed to this last emphasis in a most illuminating manner. For Gramsci,

If political science means science of the State, and the State is the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules, then it is obvious that the questions of sociology are nothing other than the questions of political science. If there is a residue, this can only be made up of false problems, i.e. frivolous problems.

(Gramsci, 1934: 244)

Gramsci's affirmation of the centrality of social relations, and social forms as the objects of historical materialist investigations, extends similarly to his valuable suggestion of the concept 'historic bloc'

in which precisely material forces are the content and ideologies are the form, though this distinction between form and content has purely didactic value, since the material forces would be inconceivable historically without

---

\* Trotsky's words (and their context) can be seen in Deutscher, 1954:370.

form and the ideologies would be individual fancies  
without the material forces.

(Ibid., p.377).

Moreover,

every State is ethical in as much as one of its  
most important functions is to raise the great  
mass of the population to a particular cultural and  
moral level, a level (or type) which corresponds  
to the needs of the productive forces for development  
and hence to the interests of the ruling classes ...

(Ibid., p.258)

The 'language' here - even given that it is, of course, a translation -  
shows a certain sociologism; an 'opening' to functionalist models,  
as it were. This is obvious in several other texts, for example,  
his (nevertheless important) discussion of homo oeconomicus (1948:  
208f) and in several parts of his manuscripts on 'State and Civil  
Society' (1934: II: 2).

A careful reading of the writings of Marx and Engels will  
reveal a series of ambiguities and tensions, demonstrating - significantly-  
that their theoretical grasp changed and developed as they learned from  
their own experiences. Whilst being conscious of these tensions  
and shifts, it is nevertheless possible to find a coherent strategy  
of State analysis in their work from the early manuscripts (such as  
The Holy Family) through to the analyses found in the writings on  
the Paris Commune and critical of various political programmes. The  
central focus, I suggest, is to be found in the attempt to relate the  
social division of labour (and class struggles) to the constitution  
and reproduction of the State. This is clear in the writings

specifically concerned with England that I discuss in section 2 of this chapter, but it is important first to establish the general shape of the theory being employed.

In their earlier texts full 'human emancipation' is related to the need to: transcend the 'alienation' of politics from people; 'overcome' categories like citizen; and, 'go beyond' 'substitutes for the community' such as the State. By the time of writing The German Ideology, Marx and Engels have understood these 'philosophical' problems through a more historical and materialist framework, they relate the State to the division of labour and to 'property' defined as 'the power of disposing of the labour-power of others'. That is

Division of labour and private property are ...

identical expressions: in the one the same thing is affirmed with reference to activity as is affirmed in the other with reference to the product of the activity.

(1845: 44; Cf. Weber 1920:Part IV; 1920b: Sect.2).

This, of course, prefigures the more commonly cited discussions of how 'capital is not a thing, but rather a definite social production relation' (e.g. 1864: 815). In The German Ideology they see the State as being partly constructed, partly captured, by ascendant classes through class struggles which appear to concern 'the franchise, etc., etc.,' (1845: 45f.). Political power, moreover, is required so that the dominant class can 'represent its interest as the general interest'\*. Marx and Engels are clear, in 1845, that the State-form

---

\* There is a profound deletion from the Manuscript of The German Ideology: 'In the main we have so far considered only one aspect of human activity, the reshaping of nature by men. The other aspect, the reshaping of men by men ... Origin of the State and the relation of the State to civil society.' (1845:48 fn). Cf. Marx' 'Draft Plan for a work on the modern State' (qu Ibid., p.669)

is 'internally related'<sup>\*</sup> to the mode of production (through a particular division of Labour) and therefore a true revolution must attempt the abolition of the State through an attack directly upon the social division of Labour<sup>\*\*</sup>. In a later part of the full text this is made admirably clear:

It follows from what was said above against Feuerbach [i.e. 1845: 87, 90, 96] that previous revolutions within the framework of division of labour were bound to lead to new political institutions; it likewise follows that the communist revolution, which removes the division of labour, ultimately abolishes political institutions; and, finally, it follows also that the communist revolution will be guided not by the "social institutions of inventive socially-gifted persons", but by the productive forces. (1845: 427; Cf. 1855f: 432).

This analysis of the capitalist State in terms of the means required to overthrow it is illuminating. A comparison of the writings of Weber (e.g. 1918b); Durkheim (1896) or Spencer (1884)<sup>\*\*\*</sup> on socialism, with their theories of the State, would emphasise the major difference in the approach of Marx (and, perhaps less clearly so, Engels). For Marx, the State has to be made and sustained and, because the existence of a State indicates a class social formation, Marx wishes to stress how the State is differentially experienced. In turn, this forms part of his demonstration of how one cannot

\* On 'internal relations' see Ollman, 1971; D. Sayer, 1975 and Ph.D. and Corrigan, 1975b.

\*\* On this see the work of Hal Draper and my own contribution to Corrigan, 1974b.

\*\*\* On Weber and Durkheim in context see Note 1 to Chapter 3; I discuss Durkheim more fully in Ch.4 below and Spencer in Ch.5 and later in this chapter.

strategically separate an 'economic basis' and a 'political/cultural superstructure'; however much we may find the metaphor employed by Marx himself. (Cf. Sayer, 1975). Two major criticisms of Proudhon exemplify this point: in his well known comment on Proudhon's ignorance of how 'definite social relations are just as much produced by men as linen, flax, etc' or in his emphasis on how 'slavery ... is an economic category' (1847:109f; 112) in the Poverty of Philosophy, Marx is prefiguring his less widely known sociological programme which stresses that enquiry 'from the standpoint of society'

means nothing more than the overlooking of the differences which express the social relation (relation of bourgeois society). Society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of interrelations, the relations within which these individuals stand.

(1858: 264-5)

Marx also relates the State as a regulatory agency to what he calls 'the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation' (1867:644) which produces surplus population, pauperism, and the industrial reserve army as part of the 'faux frais of capitalist production'.

But

society in its fractional parts undertakes for Mr. Capitalist the business of keeping his virtual instrument of labour - its wear and tear - intact as reserve for later use. He shifts a part of the reproduction costs of the working class off his own shoulders and thus pauperizes a part of the remaining population for his own profit.

(1858: 609f; Cf. 1867: 643f; Corrigan, 1976).

This, in turn, takes us back to a class analysis since Marx was aware of some political forces which attempted to harmonize relations between Capital and Labour. Like Marx, Gramsci also saw that

The confusion of class-State and regulated society is peculiar to the middle classes and petty intellectuals, who would be glad of any regularisation that would prevent sharp struggles and upheavals. It is a typically reactionary and regressive conception.

(1934: 258; Marx, 1848: 58-59; 1852: 121)

It is of course true that it is impossible for any State apparatuses to abolish the antagonistic contradictions which define capitalist production; but the above description indicates also how, in practice, the capitalist State is made and sustained as a regulatory agency. As Marx argued, in England it is the State which accomplishes the 'different momenta of primitive accumulation':

a systematical combination, embracing the colonies, the national debt, the modern mode of taxation, and the protectionist system. These methods depend in part on brute force, e.g. the colonial system. But they all employ the power of the State, the concentrated and organised force of society, to hasten, hothouse fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.

(1867: 751; Cf. 1858: 507)

As Engels<sup>\*</sup> explained in a letter in 1890: 'Force (that is, state power) is also an economic power!' (qu. Marx, 1965, Letter 228).

There are a number of contradictory strands which permeate the writings of Marx and Engels on these questions. These have never been fully established before and space limitations alone will make what follows extremely introductory. The sketch is necessary because academic analyses and practical political programmes have been drawn from this body of work as if it were not a 'guide' to action but a 'code' of law. There are in fact in these texts two tendencies which depict the State as an organism or as an organisation. I believe that these two distinct views follow from different understandings of what the division of labour means; on the one hand, that division was understood as a philosophical device to separate the State, Civil Society and the Economy (and it is this basis, moreover, which underpins those occasional sketches of a State which is really above classes and actually separate from relations of production). On the other hand, there is the link to the division of labour which I have discussed above. Even in this latter sense, however, Engels is able to provide a functionalist account in some of his writings, where phrases like 'Society gives rise to certain common functions which it cannot dispense with...' (qu Marx, 1965: Letter 228) are found (e.g. Engels, 1891, Cf. Marx, 1875: 332). The important point is that these two different notions

---

\* Engels' study of the force theory -especially The Role of Force in History - is a major (and largely neglected) extension of these kinds of remarks. See also Marx and Engels' several sketches of the peculiar nature of the German State form (Marx, 1845: 211f; Engels, 1891, 588). On the force theory: Engels, 1888; 1894: Pt.II, Chs.2-4.

of the division of labour, the philosophical—contemplative and the materialist—political, provide images of the State (as 'organism' or 'organisation') which result in quite different comprehensions of both how the capitalist State originates and is sustained, and how it is to be overcome. In terms of the latter practices, I have called the two opposed views the 'capture' and 'smash' theories; the former argues that it is the task of a socialist revolution to gain power (control of the State machine) and use that power to centralize (nationalize) all the productive property of capitalists. The other view argues that the State apparatuses of capitalism, being instruments which dominate the working class, cannot be the means of the latter's emancipation.

Not only, to my knowledge, has this been insufficiently clarified in recent Marxist writing, but a related series of shifts within the texts themselves has not been adequately studied. The above two views can be supported by texts written throughout the lives of Marx and Engels, but I wish to argue that a careful reading of Marx' work will show an early support for a notion of 'capturing' and 'using' state power; a period when both that view and his later views prevailed; and then a period when he clearly argues that the capitalist State apparatuses cannot be used, but must be by-passed through new social forms. Two such forms are often evoked: co-operatives, and, of course, the Commune of Paris.\* The text which is often cited, (for example, by Lord Chalfont in a recent television broadcast) in order to justify or expose Marx and Engels

---

\* On the co-operatives, including Marx's warning of their possible degeneration, Cf. Marx, 1864:16-17; Fedoseyev, 1973:436f. On the Commune, Marx, 1871 - especially the drafts; this remains the neglected text of Marx on the capitalist State.



as centralizing bureaucrats, is the programme at the core of the 1848 Manifesto with its constant refrain of centralisation (1848: 52-3). Very similar phrases are also used by Engels (e.g. 1892:429).

But Engels himself has explained to us how such a programme was founded upon a mistake, in an 1885 note to a circular issued by himself and Marx in 1850 (Marx, 1850: 183-4, fn). Marx and Engels saw centralization as part of the Revolution in the 1840s and 1850s; but soon recognised their error, seeing centralization as 'a pure instrument of reaction'<sup>\*</sup>. It was not necessary, however, to wait for a footnote to a different text to show why the Manifesto programme, and its image of the State as a necessary organism to be captured and used, rather than a specific kind of organisation relevant always to a distinct mode of production, was flawed. In 1872, Marx and Engels wrote a new 'Preface' for a German edition of their text and drew attention specifically to that Manifesto programme 'at the end of Section II':

That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded today. In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry ... in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February Revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that

---

\* Another significant amendment is made in 1869 by Marx to his 1852 text (Marx, 1852: 177 fn. Cf. McLellan, 1973: 246f). But already at the close of that text - in 1852 - he spoke of the need for socialists to 'smash' rather than 'perfect' the State (Ibid., 171). Cf. Draper; R. Hunt, 1974.

"the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

(1872: 31-32)\*

These matters are crucial, as I said above, not only for their relevance to socialist political practice but because they inform us further as to how we may understand the capitalist State and bourgeois political practices. It is in this sense that Marx' texts on the Paris Commune are so strikingly informative on the central questions of this thesis. When Marx writes that the

working class cannot simply lay hold on the ready made state-machinery and wield it for their own purpose. The political instrument of their enslavement cannot serve as the political instrument of their emancipation.

(1871: 227-228)

he is telling us about the capitalist State; as he is in many other passages which contrast the social potential of the Commune against the parasitic nature of the State (1871: 70f; 165f; 226f.)\*\*. These show clearly that the State is 'an instrument of class rule', a form of organization; not a neutral agency, or natural organism. They also show, crucially, that State power as such is not a purely progressive phenomenon; every facet of the State records, however slightly, some degree of domination by one class over another.

\* On this 'correction' see Lenin, 1917b:30 (Cf. his 1919 however) and Balibar, 1972. It is remarkable how many Marxists have taken the correction 'to heart'; without actually correcting the passage to which it refers. Engels (in a 1881 letter to Bernstein, qu. Marx, 1962: 557f) explicitly denies 'that the State means Socialism'.

\*\* Some of the cited passages are self critical of earlier formulae, such as 'Bonapartism'. This has not prevented the latter being torn from their context and used to "explain" both fascism and the U.S.S.R.!

It is important that we do not allow the centrality of these later texts to obscure the fact that I am discussing a pervasive element in Marx' thinking. To dissolve such a view it is worth concluding this introduction by quoting a most coherent passage (for my purposes) from Marx and Engels' German Ideology (some quarter of a century earlier than the texts just discussed). In the middle of a discussion concerning Law, they note

In actual history, those theoreticians who regarded power as the basis of right, were in direct contradiction to those who looked on will as the basis of right ...

If power is taken as the basis of right, as Hobbes, etc., do, then right, law, etc. are merely the symptom, the expression of other relations upon which State power rests. The material life of individuals, which by no means depends merely on their "will", their mode of production and form of intercourse, which mutually determine each other - this is the real basis of the State and remains so at all the stages at which the division of labour and private property are still necessary, quite independently of the will of individuals. These actual relations are in no way created by the State power; on the contrary they are the power creating it. The individuals who rule in these conditions, besides having to constitute their power in the form of the State, have to give their will, which is determined by these definite conditions, a universal expression, as law - an expression whose content is always determined by the relations of this class, as the civil and criminal law demonstrates in the clearest possible way.

...

Hence the State does not exist owing to the ruling will, but the State which arises from the material mode of life of individuals has also the form of a ruling will.

(1845: 365-366, 367)

The same anti-idealist strategy underpins Marx' polemic within the Communist League in the 1850s. He criticised his opponents thus: 'Will is put forward as the chief factor in revolution, instead of real relationships.' (qu Nicolayevski, 1956: 249; Cf. McLellan, 1973: 247f).

Apart from the works frequently mentioned, a recent essay by Wood elegantly summarizes the importance of what I have been trying to argue here.

Marx ... rejected the Hegelian notion that the organic unity of society is to be in any sense identified with the regulatory functions of the political state. Just as little is the state a power acting on the mode of production from outside, determining its form and controlling its historical destiny. The political state is rather a power acting within the prevailing mode of production, it is one of the instruments of production fashioned by the historical past and employed in the present by given individuals to satisfy their historically conditioned needs. The state is an expression, a determination, of the prevailing mode of production.

(Wood, 1972: 254; Cf. R. Taylor, 1973: 31)

---

Marx (and Weber) on 'the peculiarities of the English'<sup>\*</sup>

Much of the writing of Marx, (Engels<sup>\*\*</sup>) and Weber draws upon English historical experience. Thus, to take the most famous examples, not only did Marx' engagement with political economy in Britain (the writings of Irish, Scots and Welsh as well as English were involved) define many of his key concepts, but a careful examination of Parts VII and VIII of his Capital, I (1867) and Part IV of Weber's General Economic History will show a large measure of agreement. Both relate the capitalist State's formation to what Weber calls 'a rational organization of labor' (1920: 232), focussing attention on the recruitment and regulation of the labour force (Marx, 1867: Chs. 10 & 25; Weber, 1920: 227f) and stressing the significance of cotton manufacture (1867: Ch.15; 1920: 225; Cf. Mantoux, 1928). Furthermore, both pose the modern citizen, the bourgeois and his property, against the 'propertyless stratum ... a class compelled to sell its labour services to live' (Weber, 1920: 208) and agree that the capitalist State is organized to protect and extend the interests of the bourgeoisie, whether in alliance with the aristocracy or not (e.g. Weber, 1920: Ch.23; Marx, 1867: Part VIII). Apart from these specific discussions of English historical experience, their general methodology offers a means to demystify<sup>\*\*\*</sup> the illusions connected with the State, which appears to both

---

\* After this thesis was completed, Johnson's essay (1976) appeared; this offers a complementary analysis to what follows, relating the argument to the work of B. Moore, 1966, and P. Anderson, 1963, 1968.

\*\* I shall not be able to discuss Engels' contribution here - Cf. his, 1844a,b,c;1845;1874;1881a,b;1890;1892:391f. Compare Weber,1918a:100f.

\*\*\* 'Capital is a sort of cabalistic word like church or state, or those general terms which are invented by those who fleece the rest of mankind to conceal the hand that shears them.' T. Hodgskin, 1825, qu Marx, 1866:999-1000 fn8. On 'statolatry' Cf. Marx, 1845, 1871.

bourgeois and proletarian as 'not merely alien, but hostile and antagonistic'; it is, additionally, for the worker, intrinsic to capitalism, a fact of that life, somehow natural. Just as Weber and Marx show the relative (and, I stress again, constructed) nature of capitalism; so they show the artifices of the State. There are, moreover, a number of "exchanges" (similar to the famous examples analysed by Marx) which reproduce and support State relations as surely as commodity exchanges support capitalism.\* (Cf. Lukes, 1975).

Since I have employed the above theory in organising and criticising the material by historians so far presented, I shall not labour the points here. Instead I want to examine a series of comments made by Marx on the major English political parties and their relationship with the ruling classes. In making use of these insights I am not suggesting any slavish adherence to the specific factual descriptions given by Marx. On the contrary, several texts show all the signs of metaphorical shorthand and I offer a criticism of one such metaphor at the close of this section. It is as well to recall both that Marx was there - with all the advantages and disadvantages (compared, for example, to the historians discussed

---

\* Apart from Johnson's essay (1976), two other writers have made use of similar material. To Nairn I owe the crucial focus on how the Nation (State) has been successfully represented as superordinate to any other interest (and how Class is relatedly presented as divisive) which has had major implications for social democratic politics. (Cf. Nairn, 1970; 1972: espec. Sect.VI; 1975). Poulantzas' earlier study (1966) is in many ways superior to any of his later theorizations - that corpus of material reaches a sad nadir with Laclau's summary (1975) and Poulantzas' reply (1976) - the latter is an extraordinary text full of circular definitions (p.80) and complaints (p.68) that 'the facts' were not available in 1968!!

above) that this implies; and, further, these texts were largely produced as journalistic articles, speeches or letters. One wonders how similar pièces d'occasion of Marx' many critics would similarly stand any sustained scrutiny?

Marx<sup>\*</sup> returned again and again to the specific features of 'the British Constitution', trying to reveal 'the real features of Great Britain's political physiognomy' (1855cb:284); to solve the puzzle which he once summarised thus: 'The governing caste ... in England is by no means identical with the ruling class' (1855a:279). Equally, of course, there was the 'riddle' of the English proletariat, a contradiction between potential and performance. There are no more powerful texts on the practical and theoretical creativeness of

---

\* And Engels, as I noted above. Some of the exasperation that both felt can be seen in Engels' manuscript 'On Certain Peculiarities of the Economic and political development of England' (1892b) which reads in full: 'By its eternal compromises gradual, peaceful political development such as exists in England brings about a contradictory state of affairs. Because of the superior advantages it affords, the state can within certain limits be tolerated in practice, but its logical incongruities are a sore trial to the reasoning mind. Hence the need felt by all "state-sustaining" parties for theoretical camouflage, even justification, which naturally are feasible only by means of sophisms, distortions and, finally, underhand tricks. Thus a literature is being reared in the sphere of politics which repeats all the wretched hypocrisy and mendacity of theological apologetics and transplants the theological intellectual vices to secular soil. Thus the soil of specifically Liberal hypocrisy is manured, sown and cultivated by the Conservatives themselves. And so the following argument occurs in the mind of the ordinary person in support of theological apologetics, an argument that elsewhere it lacks: what if the facts related in the gospels and the dogmas preached in the New Testament in general do contradict each other? Does that mean that they are not true? The British Constitution contains many more conflicting statements, constantly contradicts itself, and yet exists, hence must be true!' Note that forty-eight years earlier Engels had thought 'the history of the social development of the English ... perfectly clear to me' (1844 letter, qu Marx, 1962:534).

the English workers, than those of Marx (e.g. 1854; 1856; 1862; 1864b). He saw them as embodying new social forms of organization and new conceptions. Some of the ambiguities\* of working class political struggles can be seen by carefully comparing Marx' frequently quoted sketches of the British road to socialism (peacefully, by universal suffrage; 1852c:361; 1855f:430 - after 1865 he actively supported the Reform League; Marx, 1962:539f) with his support for the social programme of the Chartists whom he saw as 'the politically active portion of the British working class' (1852c), fully democratic and part of a mass movement (1855e, f). Moreover, Marx explicitly qualified his depiction of this 'road' in terms of bourgeois counter-revolution (1871b:270). A different kind of ambiguity - one still unresolved in recent Marxist writing' - concerns how much emphasis to give to working class pressure for social reform compared with ruling class design; and, if they interact, which is primum inter pares? Although Marx explicitly grants creative power to working class pressure from without (he uses the term himself, 1862:478; 1852a:376; 1855e:287, Cf. 1864b), many of his texts analysing the

---

\* Engels, again, is clearer on this. In 1868 he wrote 'the proletariat is the tag, rag and bobtail of the official parties'; many of the new voters (post-1867 Act) having supported Tory candidates in an excess of 'cringing to respectability' (1868 letter qu Marx, 1962:545f). By 1879 (Ibid., 555f) Engels spoke of 'the workers' as 'divided politically into Conservatives and Liberal Radicals'. His famous remarks about the 'bourgeoisification' of English workers are based on this kind of analysis (Ibid., pp 537 (for 1858) and 560 (for 1882)). His remarks in the 1890s are, however, extremely perceptive on, for example, New Liberalism and the Fabians (Ibid., p.569f) and not long before his death Engels argued that in England 'once the workers know what they want, the State, the land, industry and everything else will be theirs' (Ibid., 584). The ambiguity about the State should again be stressed.



ruling class ignore (effectively) the working class as a pressure, although frequently indicate their presence as a threat or anxiety.

In keeping with the double image of (i) the State as an agent of assistance to capital (as mentioned above) and (ii) 'the capitalist ... as (historic) middle-man between landed property, or property generally, and labour' (1858: 505), in Marx' sketches of the genesis of both 'capitalist farmer' (1867: Ch.29) and 'industrial capitalist' (Ibid., Ch. 31), he offers a political understanding of 'Big landed proprietors' as 'in complete accord with the conditions of life of the bourgeois' and sees 'landed estates' as not 'feudal but bourgeois property' (1850b: 348f). After 1688, further, Marx sees the landed and the financial aristocracy as closely wedded (1855b: 420f); an alliance which was strengthened by the early period of the Corn Laws (1815 - c.1840); but much disrupted by the later period (1841-46) 'as the industrial bourgeoisie was displacing the financial aristocracy; and becoming the leading part of the middle class' (1855 j: 459, fn.2; 461, fn.1). Marx seems to see the financial aristocracy ('this brood of bankocrats, financiers, rentiers, brokers, stock-jobbers, &c.' 1867: 755) as (i) closely linked to the State (through the National Debt, through the 'Bank of England', as key personnel of the international credit system), and, (ii) truly 'transitional' in that they can only operate because they supply some need of, in turn, the landed aristocracy, (and the Court plus Royal/ State monopolies) and, then, the nascent and flourishing industrial bourgeoisie.

At this point, some indication of Marx' analyses of the two major Parties is relevant. He offered comments on the major Parties in 1852 and 1855, and also studied Palmerston and Lord John Russell

in some detail. Although he finds the Whigs a 'distastefully heterogeneous mixture' (1852b: 356), he comprehends them sufficiently clearly to see them as a fraction of 'English landed property', to relate them closely to both Dissent and profit (in its internationalist and 'progressive' tendencies), and to find them 'in harmony with the middle classes' (1855d: 286). In short

The Whigs are the aristocratic representatives of the bourgeoisie, of the industrial and commercial middle class. Under the condition that the Bourgeoisie should abandon to them, to an oligarchy of aristocratic families, the monopoly of government and the exclusive possession of office, they make to the middle class, and assist it in conquering, all those concessions, which in the course of social and political development have shown themselves unavoidable and undelayable. Neither more nor less.

(1852b: 355; Cf. 1855h, j.)

In 1855, Marx thought Whigs and Tories both 'fractions of the ruling class' (1855d: 285), but saw the Whigs as 'the cream' of the aristocracy (Ibid., 286). His sketches of Lord John Russell and his long quotations from Ernest Jones' election speech (1852c: 367) support his judgement just quoted by seeing the Whigs as more clearly the enemies of the working class than the Tories.

The Tories, Marx considers 'Guardians of the traditions of Old England': Protectionist, Church of England, and more closely representative of land-rents, therefore more conservative and nationalistic than the Whigs. By 1855 he considers the Tories the 'plebs of the aristocracy': a 'squireocracy, the Junker Party' (1855d:286, Cf. the text for qualifications of this last point). Both Tories and Whigs are part of the ruling class, or part of the

'English oligarchy', both behave in an opportunistic way in manipulating other movements, and both have a particular technique for extricating themselves from mass movements that become 'embarrassing', in electoral terms: "misunderstanding".

Such misunderstandings constitute the capital joke of England's "historical" development, and no one is more familiar with handling them than the free-thinking Whigs.

(1855f: 430).

Aside from his depiction of the Chartists, and a passing reference or two to both Peelites (a 'souvenir of a partyman') and the Radicals, Marx gives some attention to the Free Trade Party and the Association for Administrative Reform. The latter he sees as anti-Chartist (1855e) and linked to (expressive of) the 'money aristocracy' (1855f)\*. The Free Traders he considers to be 'the official representatives of modern English society' who demand

the complete and undisguised ascendancy of the Bourgeoisie, the open, official subjection of society at large under the laws of modern, bourgeois production, and under the rule of those men who are the directors of that production. By Free Trade they mean the unfettered movement of capital, freed from all political, national and religious shackles.

....

Necessarily, their last word is the Bourgeois Republic,

---

\* Marx seems to conflate, in part, the Free Traders and the A.R.A. (e.g. 1852c: 358); on the latter see O. Anderson, 1965, 1974 and part of my own Ch.1 above.

in which free competition rules supreme in all spheres of life; in which there remains altogether that minimum only of government which is indispensable for the administration, internally and externally, of the common class, interest and business of the Bourgeoisie ...

(1852c: 358, 359-60)\*

Stepping back from analyses of particular Parties and Personalities to the general issues partly discussed above it is possible to detect two kinds of statement about the 'British Constitution' which Marx makes. On the one hand, there are the indications of dominant bourgeois power; on the other, the bourgeoisie are still seen as compromised and contained. Taking the first tendential statement, we can find Marx stressing how the bourgeoisie

becomes so omnipotent that even before the Reform Bill puts direct political power into its hands it forces its opponents to pass laws almost exclusively in its interests and according to its needs.

(1850b: 349)

The franchise changes of 1832 are seen (in this tendency) as a victory for the bourgeoisie and a defeat for the landed aristocracy (1850b: 349f; 1853: 382).

Between this and the more or less opposite tendency there is a middle ground - the territory of Marx' famous analysis of 'compromise'.

---

\* It is relevant that it is from this starting point, from the Bourgeoisie as the enemy of 'Old England', that Marx moves on to speak of the pre-conditions for the 'social revolution of England' (1852c: 360, his emphasis).

Here he finds the British Constitution:

a compromise between the class that rule officially and the class that rule non-officially.

(1852ca: 422)

an antiquated and obsolete compromise made between the bourgeoisie, which rules in actual practice, although not officially, in all the decisive spheres of bourgeois society, and the landed aristocracy, which forms the official government.

(1852cb: 282)

a superannuated compromise, by which the general governing power is abandoned to some section of the middle class, on condition that the whole of real government, the Executive ... is secured to the landed aristocracy ...

(1855ca: 424)

It is in this connection that he offers the 'secret history' of the Ten-Hours Act:

The landed aristocracy having suffered a defeat from the bourgeoisie by the passing of the Reform Bill of 1831, and being assailed in "their most sacred interests" by the cry of the manufacturers for Free Trade and the abolition of the Corn Laws, resolved to resist the middle-class by espousing the cause and claims of the working-men against their masters, and especially by rallying around their demands for the limitation of factory labor.

(1853: 382)

But Marx then goes on to stress how the bourgeoisie counter-attacked (through the judicial decision regarding relays in 1850)\* and how

---

\* On this see my discussion of Leonard Horner in Ch.3 and App.I below.

the landlords and the Mill owners compromised. Although he never makes the point explicitly, there is no theoretical reason why his analysis of 'corruption' would not fit into this analysis of compromise; for Marx, after 1832 'bribery ... became the main prop of the British Constitution' (1855j: 453; Cf. 1852d).

The other tendency recognises a landed aristocracy - or, more widely, an English oligarchy - as the most dominant class (or class-fraction). By 1855 Marx was prepared to understand the 1832 Reform Act as (in Althorp's words) "'the most aristocratic act ever offered to the nation"' (1855j: 452); to see, in Lord John Russell's terms that

"the object of the Reform Bill was to increase the predominance of the landed interest ..."

(qu Marx, 1855j: 454; Cf. D. C. Moore; Nossiter, 1970)

Although Marx saw the English oligarchy (and the Church of England) as 'obsolete social forces' (1855g: 434) in his articles on the Sunday Trading Riots, he has to recognise their real power. In the second of the two articles (describing the 1st July 1855 'riot'):

Instead of the waving of fans in the air - the swishing of constables' truncheons. Last Sunday the ruling classes showed their fashionable physiognomy; this time they showed their state physiognomy. The background of the old gents with the friendly grin, of the stylish fops, the genteel superannuated widows, the beauties arrayed in cashmere, ostrich feathers and diamonds and fragrant with garlands of flowers was the constable with his waterproof jacket, greasy oilskin hat and truncheon. It was the reverse side of the medal. Last Sunday the masses were confronted by the ruling class as

individuals. This time it appeared as the state power, the law, the truncheon. This time resistance meant insurrection and the Englishman must be provoked for a long time before he breaks out in insurrection.

(Marx, 1855g: 443; Cf. B. Harrison, 1965a)

In the first of these articles, Marx had declared 'the English Revolution began yesterday in Hyde Park' (1855g: 436). What did he mean by this? He meant that he considered that a particular kind of visibility had now come to the English social landscape. In 1852 he indicated that a pre-condition for 'social revolution' was that the Bourgeoisie should conquer exclusive political dominion - that is to say, they had not done this by 1852. But when political dominion and economical supremacy will be united in the same hands, when, therefore, the struggle against capital will no longer be distinct from the struggle against the existing Government - from that moment will date the social revolution of England (1852c: 360)

In 1855, Marx spoke about a crisis which would reach such a height that

Then will the mask be torn off which has hitherto hid the real political features of Great Britain. Then will the two contending parties in that country stand face to face - the middle class and the working classes, the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat - and England will at last be compelled to share in the general social evolutions of European society. (1855ca: 426)

In a different version of the same article, Marx wrote:

The conflict between the industrial proletariat and the bourgeoisie will begin again at the same time as the conflict between bourgeoisie and aristocracy reaches its climax. The mask will then drop, which until now has hidden from the foreigner the real features of Great Britain's political physiognomy.

(1855cb: 284)

It is worth stressing, whilst these texts are still relatively fresh in the mind, how they could be summarised - without suggesting that Marx does this himself - by noting that the Whigs, as the Party that rules officially for the bourgeoisie (but, we might interject, at a price), is thus placed in a very contradictory situation. It has to serve the interests of the classes which it directly and indirectly represents without either allowing the Tories to lead a mass or popular movement against it, or abolishing the need for the Tories entirely. Marx was explicitly aware of this last point:

from the moment when the Tories are definitely overthrown, British history has no longer any room for the Whigs. The aristocracy once destroyed, what is the use of an aristocratic representation of the Bourgeoisie against this aristocracy?

(1852b: 356)

I make this emphasis at this point because it provides a 'class instinct' for Whig commitment to social improvement, to accompany any structural force which may operate. By the latter I mean simply that Marx' pre-conditions for the 'social revolution' contain a contradiction. It was, after all, Marx who first demonstrated,



convincingly, the structural priority (and autonomy) of State apparatuses vis à vis a nascent, recent and/or dominant form of profitable property and the class which possessed the latter. Even in the period of its full dominance, this class is represented by the State, which acts on its behalf with regard to the common affairs of the class. This implies that there will always be some analytical and practical difference between 'the economic' and 'the political' forms of class power. The 'struggle against capital' or at least, capitalists, must always be specific and thus 'distinct from the struggle against the existing Government'.

There is one metaphor (or ambiguity) in the texts of Marx examined above which has occasioned a number of quite fruitless attempts, of a Procrustean character, to fit English peculiarities to what is assumed to be 'proper' historical development. This engagement has somewhat obscured a fundamental confusion in the initial analyses. Marx uses the category-noun 'aristocracy' as if it were as significant, in his schema, as the term 'capitalist'; he implies that the former term, as much as the latter, reveals unproblematically a relation to the means of production. This is how he appears to read his own texts, and it is certainly how many others have read them; suggesting that this 'aristocracy' had a relation to some other non-capitalist mode of production, indeed several times he uses the term 'feudal'. Having made this theoretical move, he has thus to generate a complex set of relations to explain how the really dominant class (bourgeois capitalists) are not 'in power'. It is important to add that Marx' scenario was not his own invention; it was a working assumption for much political activity in the period under review, as several quotations from contemporaries will indicate in this thesis.

The point being made here is that the term 'aristocracy' does not, of itself, indicate any specific relation to any particular mode of production. It means the possession of a title (which once meant title to land, and other entitlement of an authentically feudal character). Marx causes similar confusion with the use of the adjectival category 'landed', especially when combined with 'aristocracy'. Edward Thompson's reply to P. Anderson's famous articles (which replicate but do not transcend these metaphors of Marx), the work of D.C. Moore, and others, have shown that this 'landed aristocracy' was a thoroughly capitalist class in terms of its vanguard elements. What Marx has been confused over is the fact that the whole style and personnel of British politics was dominated by 'the aristocracy' (and, in this way, by 'Land'). But here 'the aristocracy' are more of a 'status group' than a class. Indeed such they were. From the mid eighteenth century onwards, through marriage\* and capitalizing their holdings (Improvement as a dominant belief system begins within the landed estates), the English aristocracy penetrated the capitalist bourgeoisie. What Marx shows - and here, of course, his texts above are full of insights of great value - is how particular interests were articulated by different figures in the drama of agrarian, fiscal, and industrial capitalism.

This tentative suggestion has some force when integrated with the wider explanatory framework which I employ, in this thesis, which suggests that the particular dominance of the bourgeoisie in Britain rests upon the generation and sustaining of a particular image of the State which has had enormous influence on the structuring of politics. We are thus discussing two related kinds of separation:

---

\* I admit that the empirical evidence here is far from clear Cf. Hollingsworth, 1964; Thomas, M.Phil. thesis and 1972; and, for Scotland, Carter, 1972:285f.

structurally, according to Marx (and Weber), State apparatuses have to be separate from (represent) dominant classes in order to better articulate and orchestrate their interests. This is a particular form of social organization appropriate for capitalism and one of the reasons why such 'ready-made State apparatuses' cannot be used by socialist revolutionaries. Secondly, ideologically and historically, that necessary separation has generated and facilitated a passable (i.e. believed to be legitimate) notion of the neutrality of the State\*, of an agency to which appeals can be made. The two separations are crystallized perfectly in the internal sociology of the Labour movement which frequently speaks of 'the industrial' and 'the political' wings of 'our movement'. As a last point, it does not follow from this that the two most dominant sociologies of (revolutionary) politics current on the Left in Britain for the last twenty-five years are correct. One says that the above separation is wrong and that 'the political' must be injected (by special agents) into 'the industrial'. The other holds that the above separation is only to be healed in a post-Revolutionary situation, through the agencies of a victorious Party. On the contrary, a specific lacuna exists in those sociologies. Marx, (1854; 1862) spoke often of how the working class demonstrated future social forms in their current organizations of struggle - he saw the Paris Commune as a vindication of this, particularly with regard to precisely the question of the State. It is curious that nobody has made any attempt to found (historically and theoretically) a programme of (revolutionary) politics in Britain upon these insights of Marx.

---

\* Part of its 'non bourgeois' character being held to be its aristocratic and 'feudal' encrustations. Hence, also the whole anti-aristocracy 'bite' of Radicalism-Liberalism.

This is not at all irrelevant to the concerns of this thesis. It is only when we can begin to comprehend the suppressed alternatives (and my comment suggests that they were not simply suppressed, but deeply buried) that we can understand the 'shape' and 'weight' of the State apparatuses which still surround us.

---

On Herbert Spencer

Spencer<sup>\*</sup>, like Marx, was living through the period that this thesis comprehends. In his best-seller Education (1861), Spencer's modernity is revealed in his specification of a proper syllabus for History:

---

\* On Spencer see Abrams, 1968:66f; MacRae, 1969; Peel, 1971. I discuss Spencer's later writings on the State in Ch.5 below, paying attention to his essays The Man versus the State (1884). H. Spencer (1820-1903) was practically self-taught, he practised as a civil engineer for the Railway Companies from 1837 to 1842, then wrote as journalist for nonconformist and Radical journals until 1846, when he returned to his engineering. From 1848 until 1853 he was a sub-editor of the Economist, after which he lived on a legacy and income from his writing. Social Statics appeared in 1851; Principles of Psychology (1854); ... of Biology (1864-67); ... of Sociology (1873-1896). His most popular work was Education (1861). From 1864 to 1893 Spencer was a member of 'the X Club' of eight scientists (all F.R.S.) and himself, which met 240 times (Peel, 1971:18f) and was influential in securing election of its nominees to various boards, committees and societies. From 1855 Spencer suffered from some 'nervous invalidism' (Ibid., 21f). He knew Beatrice Potter (later Webb) well and she was to have been his amanuensis, until her espousal of socialism and Imperial Preference.

The thing it really concerns us to know, is the natural history of society. We want all facts which help us to understand how a nation has grown and organized itself ... the control exercised by class over class, as displayed in social observances - in titles, salutations, and forms of address ... Nor should there be omitted a sketch of the daily lives of the people - their food, their homes, and their amusements. And lastly, to connect the whole [my emphasis], should be exhibited the morals, theoretical and practical, of all classes: as indicated in their laws, habits, proverbs, deeds. These facts ... should be so grouped and arranged that they may be comprehended in their ensemble, and contemplated as mutually - dependent parts of one great whole. The aim should be so to present them that men may readily trace the consensus subsisting among them... and how the consensus of preceding structures and functions was developed into the consensus of succeeding ones. Such alone is the kind of information respecting past times, which can be of service to the citizen for the regulation of his conduct. The only history that is of practical value, is what may be called Descriptive Sociology.

(1861: 32-33)

It was, in fact, part of Spencer's life-project to offer such 'service to the citizen' in his voluminous writings. He tells us, in his Filiation of Ideas (1899) that he learned from his

father\* a particular 'consciousness of Cause':

The discovery of cause is through analysis - the pulling to pieces [of] phenomena for the purpose of ascertaining what are the essential connexions among them.

(Spencer, 1899: 534, my emphasis)

In 1879, he explained that his writing since 1842 had one ultimate purpose ... of finding for the principles of right and wrong in conduct at large, a scientific basis ... Now that the moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative.

(Data of Ethics, qu Peel, 1971: 84 Cf. Durkheim's similar project).

When Spencer was in his early teens, he was sent to live with his Uncle (Rev. Thomas Spencer) near Bath and there was influenced by that Uncle's ideas and tracts on the New Poor Law. His writings were against 'over-legislation' and for the lessons of 'suffering' as the best method of regulation; Schoenwald (1968: 701f) quotes from these and relates them to Herbert's own later work. At the age of fifteen, H. Spencer read Martineau's Illustrations of Political Economy (1835) and 'gathered something of a solid kind' from it

---

\* Peel, 1971: Chs. 1-3, gives much background on Spencer's early environment, familial and intellectual; Schoenwald, 1968, offers valuable extra information on Spencer's Uncle Thomas (d.1852) but in the context of an analysis which appears to suggest that Spencer's adherence to laissez-faire was intrinsic to his early anal experiences! Having said that, there is a whole dimension of specific 'character' about Spencer which does need analysis as Peel (1971) frequently shows.

(qu Peel, 1971: 63). At the age of twenty-two (in June 1842) Spencer wrote his letters in The Non-Conformist on 'The Proper Sphere of Government' (Spencer, 1899: 537f; Peel, 1971: 281, 285). In these texts he offers a view of the State (both its origins and its proper limits) which is substantially that used in his major texts for the rest of his life. Given his own work with Sturge and Miall for the Complete Suffrage Union, and his later correspondence with J. S. Mill in the 1860s when he opposed extension of the franchise, it is worth quoting a remark in one of these letters of 1842:

if it be conceded that the administration of justice is the only duty of the state, we are at once relieved from one of the greatest objections to the enfranchisement of the working classes.

(qu Peel, 1971: 281, n.74)

It is the main purpose of this section of my thesis to simply record the centrality of the State in Spencer's writings.\* Spencer himself recalls that the question which dominated his first major work (Social Statics) was 'What ultimate principle is it from which may be inferred the limits of State-action?' (1899: 538, he also relates the 1851 book to his Suffrage work); Schoenwald (1968: 692) regards that book as containing the core of Spencer's later writings; and, Peel (1971: 83f) stresses the importance of its subtitle: The Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified, and the First of them Developed. This work offers a sustained argument against the view of Bentham (and Hobbes) that moral behaviour has to be organised by 'external' means, by the State, or prescriptive legislation.

---

\* Cf. his 'question of questions' (1884: 91) discussed in my fifth Chapter below.

Instead, Spencer argues, there is now a 'new style of government - that of opinion, overcoming the old style, that of force' (qu Peel, 1971: 88). When he looked back on Social Statics, Spencer concluded that what he had 'formulated was simply an abstract statement of the conditions under which might equitably be pursued by each that self-satisfaction ... ethically warranted' (1899: 539). This sounds very much like one reading of Adam Smith, and (according to Peel, 1971: 93f; but denied by Spencer, 1899: 537) Spencer made use of Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments to establish a notion of enlightened self-interest which could 'mesh' almost perfectly with his espousal of evolutionary theories and his notion of the struggle for survival. He provided a theoretical accompaniment to this in his advice to parents concerning 'moral education'

Remember that the aim of your discipline should be to produce a self-governing being; not to produce a being to be governed by others ... This is what makes the system of discipline by natural consequences, so especially appropriate to the social state which we in England have now reached.

(1861: 131)

But, we should emphasise, this little homily about making the child who breaks a toy 'suffer' the consequences (by not having the toy) was to be as easily applied to the parents and child who are hungry, ill-clothed or -housed. In this connection, it is relevant to stress how Spencer's period with The Economist (he obtained the post through his Uncle Thomas' letter of introduction, Schoenwald, 1968: 705f) coincided with the cholera epidemic of 1848/49 when



15,000 people died in London alone. For The Economist, a permanent Board of Health would be "A Greater Plague than Cholera" (qu. Ibid., 706).

Finally, it is worth drawing some attention to how the division of labour relates to Spencer's conception of the State as a facet of what 'we call with perfect propriety' Society's 'organization'. Indeed, it makes society 'a living whole' (1876: 53f). It, along with the more general principles of evolution, accounts for the apparent conundrum that as societies change from homogeneity to heterogeneity, they become more coherent and integrated with increasingly specific and definite institutions, so that 'the civilized nation [is] consolidated enough to hold together for a thousand years or more' (1876: 77). Such a conception relates to his 'inductive' approach to the State (as presented in his Epitome, 1897) which relates the State to war ('government is initiated and developed by militancy')<sup>\*</sup> and to the administration of justice. Further,

Militant activities may become gradually less, and political agency may retire from various regulative actions previously exercised over citizens. But with the progress of civilization, the administration of justice continues to extend and to become more efficient.

(1897: 627)

Crucially, as 'trustee for the nation the State ... has to maintain

---

\* I relate the State and Warfare briefly at the start of Ch.4 below; Cf. Lenin's 'Special bodies of armed men ...' (1917b:9f).

the conditions under which each may gain the fullest life compatible with the fullest lives of fellow-citizens' (Ibid.) Indeed, 'beyond maintaining justice, the State can do nothing else without transgressing justice' and such actions are not only 'unjust in theory' they 'are also impolitic in practice' (1897: 628, 629). For Spencer, the division of labour and (enlightened) self-interest are forms of co-operation; the efficiency of any society (which is 'a growth' and not 'a manufacture') depends upon the 'direct relation between efficiency and prosperity [which] obliges all voluntary co-operations to work at high pressure' (Ibid.). Central to such a conception is the notion of 'character'<sup>\*</sup> and how that is to be formed; Spencer supports 'the natural method - the spontaneous adaptation of citizens to social life' (1897: 631).

By the latter date, of course (with the exception of some entrepreneurs, more in the United States than in England), Spencer's ideas were those of a minority, however militant, of the ruling class. However genuinely he represented a particular kind of Dissenting, provincial opinion in the 1840s and 1850s - quite possibly extending some elements in the individualist variants of bourgeois ideology (Cf. Finer, 1952a:Ch.1) - an anarchic (self-regulating) social formation with a minimal State was now unable to provide the required - and necessarily enforced - regulation of moral order which would assist the larger enterprises of limited competition. Amelioration alone, moreover would not suffice: Improvement must be national and systematic.<sup>\*\*</sup>

---

\* This forms a major aspect of Ch.4 below.

\*\* On Spencer and ameliorism Cf. Abrams, 1968 espec. p.75.

## Conclusion

For all the manifest disagreements in the analyses of Marx, Engels, Weber, and Spencer<sup>\*</sup>, there are some important similar stresses which taken together point to major omissions in the Debates summarised in my first Chapter. Additionally, these shared foci of theoretical attention have enabled me to determine an approach, and a conceptual vocabulary, which made 'more sense' of the theories of, say, Bentham or Smith, and which has provided the categories and classification of my central Chapters.

Centrally, these writers stress, there can be no investigation 'from the viewpoint of Society'. Social formations vary as to their centrally defining features - their productive core - this 'Property' is central to understanding the basis of 'justice' in the modern State. In varying ways they all see the State as related to the conditions which sustain a form of property - control, - ownership, and - use; as related, in short, to the class structure of society. Similarly - although the disagreements are by now becoming obvious - there is an attempt to relate State forms to the division of labour, to see through to the 'internal' nature of (State) regulation.

Weber's position is especially contradictory. On the one hand he stresses a territorial concept of the State and emphasises how any nation is a 'community of sentiment' (1914a: 176), although, even here, he mentions the importance of war and violence (e.g. 1918a: 78; 121f; 1920c:Sect.1). On the other hand, Weber is aware that the State (i) expresses the 'ethos' of the bourgeoisie (1906: 321);

---

\* I include in these remarks here the work of Durkheim, whose writings I analyse in Ch. 4 below.

(ii) has the following genesis

Out of this alliance of State with Capital, dictated by necessity, arose the national citizen class, the bourgeoisie in the modern sense of the word.

(1920: 249)

(iii) has a staff to enforce its particular rational order

Bureaucracy ... is fully developed in political and ecclesiastical communities only in the modern state, and, in the private economy, only in the most advanced institutions of capitalism.

(1914b: 196; Cf. 1915: 299)

Parties are ... only possible within communities that are societalized, that is, which have some rational order and a staff of persons available who are ready to enforce it.

(1920b: 194, this is almost Durkheim's view exactly).

and (iv) has imperatives of discipline (1920c). But Weber shares with Marx a stress upon the concealed nature of the State's class character. Whilst Marx speaks of the need to make the latter visible, Weber argues

The degree in which "communal action" and possibly "societal action" emerges from the "mass actions" of the members of a class is linked to general cultural conditions, especially to those of an intellectual sort. It is also linked to the extent of the contrasts that have already evolved, and is especially linked to the transparency of the connections between the causes and the consequences of the "class situation". (1920b: 184).

Of course, the disagreements are equally distinctive and are so great that it is rare for any discussion to even attempt to investigate similarities. But the latter should not surprise the historian (especially, one would have thought, any Marxist) insofar as these writers respond to an environment which shared certain (objective) features. The State was an irresistible datum. Nevertheless, the disagreements (part and parcel of their differing views of the working class, of socialism and hence, at base, of capitalism itself) have to be recorded. There is a distinction between Marx, Engels and Spencer and Weber over the possible 'withering away' of the State; for Weber (Cf. Mommsen) the increasing expansion\* of State and State-like agencies and social forms (e.g. corporations and bureaucracy) was a tendency of capitalism. For the others, the disagreement relates to the pre-conditions for the withering away: for Spencer this was to be accomplished with the increasing growth of capitalism and the class relations and division of labour appropriate to it. For Marx and Engels, in contrast, the State was inextricably bound with precisely that division of labour and those class relations and it was only when these had been transformed that the State's transformation and 'withering' could begin. This disagreement, however, should not obscure the extent to which Marx and Engels, and Spencer both focus on a relation (or set of relations) which are normally considered of no political significance, and unrelated to any conceptualization of State apparatuses. I refer here to the ways in which the State effects a reproduction of particular moral norms, attitudes and expectations for which Victorian writers frequently used the term 'character', whether in the singular or, importantly, the

---

\* For recent discussions of this expansion (as 'corporatism') see Note 4 to Ch.3, and my 'Afterword'.

National, reference. It is, of course, the central thesis of this dissertation that this moral regulation (and the moral relations thus sustained) are constitutive of State norms and forms, in the way which Marx' remarks on justice and Gramsci's insistence on the ethical nature of all States were both discussed above.

There is one thread of the above discussion to which it is necessary to return. This concerns Marx' discussion of the pre-conditions for the 'social revolution of England' which centre upon the possession, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, of both economic and political power. That this did not happen with the rapidity (or the symbolic violence) which he expected - and, in turn, that the nature of the transformation was complex as well as extended - has had obvious consequences in making that 'social revolution' itself complex and extended, and establishing some relatively unique class structures (the Labour Party, the T.U.C.) with those many 'feudal' adornments and encrustations which so infuriated Engels (and continue to irritate others, to this day)\*. Marx' other prognosis has also not happened: it was not the Tories who disappeared, but the Whigs were transformed, through splits, into the Liberals and the latter, through more splits, into the Labour and (recently) Nationalist Parties. The political scene has become more complex rather than simpler; and universal suffrage (which did not arrive until over 100 years after the First Reform Act) has not led to the kinds of transformations Marx envisaged. But Spencer was, of course, 'more wrong' but (equally?) influential,

---

\* England almost alone retains not only a monarchy, but also a 'State opening of Parliament' - the actual procedure of Parliament would also fit into my categories. The then President of the Privy Council uses the term 'mumbojumbo' to describe that body's organization (Crossman, 1976:33). His Diaries and Macmillan's discussion of, for example, how Churchill 'chose' the 1951 Cabinet are good sources to counteract any overdeterminedly 'rational' model of bourgeois politics.

through Hobhouse's synthesis of Spencer and Green, or, latterly through theories of 'convergence' or 'evolutionary universals'. This shows . that 'insights' are to be evaluated separately from 'policy directives', particularly when historical phenomena are concerned. And as these insights show, when applied to the materials of my first Chapter, without a theoretically informed approach we will not go 'beyond' phenomena.

---

Chapter Three: State formation: 'a national system of Improvement'.

3.1 Introduction

3.2 The Context of State Action

3.3 Whig-Liberalism and the sociology of intervention

3.4 State servants and State formation: four examples \*

3.4.1 Leonard Horner, Factory Inspector

3.4.2 J. P. Kay, Educationist

3.4.3 H. S. Tremenheere, Commissioner

3.4.4 E. Chadwick.

---

\* It is probably most useful, at this point, to read the four eclectic biographies given in Appendix I below which provide a continuous narrative depiction of the lives and careers of the State Servants plus an addenda on their incomes. This chapter can only provide illustrative cameos from those lives and careers.



## CHAPTER THREE

The purpose of State Intervention?

We have no Govt. in England. We are not able if we are willing to protect men ... in their Bargains with their Labourers ... the consequence is that the latter are paid more than the value of their Labour.

Duke of Wellington, 26 Feb. 1834, Mss.

(qu Longford, 1971: 360)

---

Whenever, for the purposes of government, we arrive, in any state of society, at a class so miserable as to be in want of the common necessaries of life, a new principle comes into action. The usual restraints which are sufficient for the well-fed, are often useless in checking the demands of hungry stomachs. Other and more powerful means must then be employed: a larger array of military or police force must be maintained. Under such circumstances, it may be considerably cheaper to fill empty stomachs to the point of ready obedience, than to compel starving wretches to respect the roast beef of their more industrious neighbours: and it may be expedient, in a mere economical point of view, to supply gratuitously the wants even of able-bodied persons, if it can be done without creating crowds of additional applicants.

C. Babbage On the principles of Taxation 1851

Used at the start of the second volume of Sir George Nicholls'  
History of the Poor Law (1854)

---

The task is an impossible one. If once you give a man the right to demand assistance, you have infected his life, and taken away the mainstay of human character, self-reliance. It is better to have an army of beggars to deal with than an army of paupers. The beggars we can deal with and control, and by degrees lead into better ways; the latter are our masters. It might be held to be a sufficient answer to the assertion that a Poor Law keeps off revolution, if we simply alleged the harm that obligatory public charity does to the national character and to individuals; we have no right to protect ourselves against revolt by wrong-doing, by binding our victims in the chains of a Poor Law.

W. W. Edwards (1879a: 321)

---

## 1. Introduction

In some ways the debate sketched in Chapter One does not pose antagonistic but complementary approaches to the questions I am discussing. Taken to their logical limits these arguments resolve themselves into giving causal priority and powers to sets of practices or clusters of ideas. This has had a curious consequence for the historiography of the British State - the actual history of particular State apparatuses, on the one hand, and the rich theoretical resources utilised by the builders of the State, on the other, remain understudied.

In the next two chapters I seek to show that there was indeed a 'revolution in government' in Britain through demonstrating the part played by some 'bourgeois revolutionaries' in transforming a State form known to contemporaries as 'Old Corruption' into a range of apparatuses which could be considered 'neutral institutions'. In this sense, to take a single example, Graham Wallas was correct to regard the Reformed Civil Service as 'the one great political invention in nineteenth-century England'<sup>\*</sup> and Bentham as a revolutionary (Wallas, 1925). It was not Methodism, nor any system of ideas, which were to constitute an effective antidote to socialism and class organization on the part of working men and women: it was these State apparatuses; themselves constructed against a range of pre-existing or potential class specific alternatives. As Marx and Engels recognised, in The German Ideology, the State determines the shape and content of possible (i.e. legitimate) politics; other

---

\* Wallas (1908: 249) See also his view that the Trevelyan-Northcote 1854 report "is one of the ablest of those State Papers which have done so much to mould the English Constitution" (Ibid., p.251).

activities are declared 'criminal' and 'lunatic'. Thus Robert Lowe could refer to all Trades Unions as containing 'the germs and elements of crime' (qu Briggs, 1954: 258). The State in Britain was and is constructed in such a way that a perimeter fence is drawn around some political activities which, as it were, inflate to occupy the epistemological space available - they become what is meant by the term 'politics'. Standards of behaviour are thereby donated - personal character and national character are seen to be co-extensive; and, public personae are the means through which The Constitution, the 'body politic', is sustained. Anyone familiar with how a Bevan or a Will Thorne was socialized into the procedure of the House of Commons; or how a Secretary of State related to 'his' or 'her' Department, will recognise the force of these remarks.

But I am not simply striving to link the commonsense experiences of contemporary Britain with the historical genesis of the constraints which sustain them; I am also addressing myself to a persistent trend in British historiography - the declaration of a 'missing link' which establishes the special uniqueness of Britain. The range of this notion, in this case that Britain lacked an 'adequate' or 'proper' bourgeois revolution, can be seen from its employment by Sir Keith Joseph and Perry Anderson. In a response to Professor Beckerman's article 'Growth: economics or sociology?' (1975) Joseph declared

Unlike some countries in Europe and the New World  
 e.g. Holland and the U.S., Britain never had a  
 capitalist ruling class or a stable haute bourgeoisie.  
 As a result, capitalist or bourgeois values have never

shaped thought and institutions as they have in  
some countries ...

(Joseph, 1975 Cf. his 1976:Ch.VI and my 'Afterword' below).

Aside from the well deserved onslaught it has received from Edward Thompson, for its obeisance before Other Countries' better revolutions, bourgeoisie, culture or sociology (Thompson, 1965)\*; Anderson's thesis is worth considering closely. In the 1963 'Origins ...' article we have a clear analysis of the imperfect nature of the English bourgeois class because of its weak revolution. In the 1965 'Components ...' analysis, this is extended to pose the question 'Why no sociology in Britain' (1965: 12f). Underpinning both kinds of statements are assumptions about the nature of the State in Britain. In 1963 Anderson argued that in Britain 'The modern civil service dates only from 1854. It is much more significant as a column of power than the army, and has undoubtedly had a braking influence on the Labour governments of this century ...' but it is not up to the standard of Other Countries (1963: 43). Ignoring the empirical inaccuracy of these sentences, we should note that in 1965 he relates this to the question 'Why did Britain never produce either a Weber, a Durkheim, a Pareto or a Lenin, a Lukacs, a Gramsci? ... The class which accomplished the titanic technological explosion of the Industrial Revolution never achieved a political or social revolution in England. It was checked by a prior capitalist class, the agrarian aristocracy ...' (1965: 12). Two observations are immediately in order. First, this appears to suggest a 'vanguard' role for the new productive forces and the class

---

\* But one example: 'This is an old European country. We have seen not only the rain which the new God brought to Other Countries but also the thunder and lightning - the bloody deluge.' (Thompson, 1965:349). Johnson's critique of Anderson and others (1976) appeared when this thesis was finished.

which possesses them; a view which Anderson has correctly shown to be false in his recent work (1974a: 204). Secondly, why is agrarian capitalism (and, more importantly, agrarian capitalists) separated off and given this curiously powerful (hegemonic?) role in terms of the political and social realms of power? We know of much inter-penetration, through marriage and fiscal arrangements from the mid eighteenth century; but, as importantly, we also know that this very area (agrarian capitalism) was the site of many struggles of a 'revolutionary' character within the far from homogeneous group of agrarian capitalists, as the work of D. C. Moore and others has shown.

But Anderson's suggestions are significant because I believe that the work I utilise and have undertaken here goes a considerable way to refuting his twin assertions concerning the weakness of bourgeois State power and the absence of a sociology within Britain. Philip Abrams has already shown how State activities and the origins of sociology are intertwined (1968); I hope to show how the State servants who created the major State apparatuses operated with a sociology which was as coherent, and as far reaching, as Fabianism. Indeed, as I indicate, in my fifth chapter below, the connections between both the modus operandi of Benthamites and Fabians, and, importantly, the way that some historians have treated these social groups, need to be brought into theoretical discussions.

Of course, Anderson's thesis is by no means the dominant force that I have perhaps suggested. Aside from Marx, whose empirical description is preferable (1867: Part VIII) apart from his theoretical significance which I indicated in my second chapter above; Weber

(1918a; 1920:Part IV); Elton (1953<sup>\*</sup>; 1972; 1973); Hill (1940) and others have shown that the inception of the 'industrial' revolution has to be placed within the Erastian revolutions of Tudor and Commonwealth times. By comparison the 'Glorious Revolution of 1688', when the King was 'contracted' by a bourgeois Commons, is a legal formality<sup>\*\*</sup>. During the century of 'law and order', beneath the surface of which we can now see the patterns exposed by both Namierites and Thompsonites (cf. his 1975, and D. Hay 1975); these Erastian gains were strengthened. The mid-eighteenth century saw the Inclosure Commissioners at work on behalf of a specific class - although with an attempt at 'welfare' in the 1757 Relief Act (Mantoux, 1928: 171) - in England; with a series of 'public works' schemes, with contract labour, on roads and bridges, in Scotland. There the State, through the Crown Agents operating estates forfeit after the 1715 and 1745 Scots revolutions had failed, had already pushed ahead the pace of development of production for the capitalist market; as was true in the Empire through the trading corporations (like the East India Company) that were licensed by the State. By the 1780s it is possible for Mantoux to describe the new manufacturing bourgeoisie in these terms

In spite of its recent origin, of the dissimilar elements which had gone to its making and of the

---

\* Note Elton's stress on the 'chronic instability' that accompanies his revolution - weak conciliar government until 1784 (1953: 421). Note also Roskell's criticism of Elton's general theory.

\*\* Cf. Aylmer, 1973. From this magnificent study I take my term 'State Servant'; we shall need many more volumes of the Sainty series before there can be a study similar to Aylmer for the 19th century. This is also the place to acknowledge the 'orientation' I received from Loades - not only his book (1974), but a lecture on the Tudor Nation I heard in 1971.

unequal moral value of its members, the manufacturing class soon became conscious of its own existence. Such class-consciousness, which is based on common interest, can make its appearance only where it is able to find expression. In this respect conditions in England were more favourable than in any other country. The freedom of the political system, and above all the traditional habit of petitioning, gave ample scope for advancing collective demands. For many years it had been customary for Englishmen to unite according to their needs or their opinions, to present complaints or suggestions to Parliament ... Thus it was natural and in conformity with innumerable precedents that the leading manufacturers should unite together for certain practical ends.

(Mantoux, 1928: 388-389; Cf. Marx, 1867: Ch.31)

The only trouble with the 'naturalness' of this 'freedom of association' is that it was increasingly denied to workers. During precisely that period which was most phenomenally 'laissez faire' - with the dismantling of regulation through legislation and judiciary and the advent of regulation by the market (aided by inspection) - we find a series of legislative enactments against both the 'freedom of association' of workers and, equally, against their own organizations for 'freedom of information'. The former have been documented by Mantoux, Marx, and E. P. Thompson; the latter by Webb (1955b) and Hollis (1970); but the concurrence of the dismantling and the stress on the class-specific nature of the new freedoms has been insufficiently



emphasised. The sociological significance of this can hardly be exaggerated: whilst many have sensitively shown how in the factory 'the absolute and uncontrolled power of the capitalist' (Mantoux, 1928: 417; Cf. E.P. Thompson, 1967; Pollard, 1963, 1965; Hunt, 1970, brings out the tyranny of paternalism) established new norms of discipline and behaviour; there has been insufficient attention to how this connected with two related historical facts. First, the severe controls imposed precisely by the State on the attempts by working people to understand the novel conditions which surrounded them - the legislation against the Corresponding Societies set a pattern of class legislation here. Second, if that 'tyranny' within the factory were to be sustained; forms of regulation which relate to the requirements of that production process must be applied throughout the whole social fabric. Within 'regulation' I comprehend the range of agencies established in the 1830s and 1840s which are 'internally related' to the more often quoted reforms of the 1860s and 1870s, or those of the Liberal Governments before the First World War. We are studying a historical movement that is continuous from the 1780s (although Thompson and Mantoux are well aware of the brutality of anti-worker legislation in the preceding eighteenth century) through to today - or rather the day before yesterday, since there is little doubt that the restructuring of State apparatuses which took place throughout Europe in the 1960s is qualitatively different\*.

The period of the Wars against Napoleon - which began, of course, as a War against certain 'theories and practices' of Revolution -

---

\* I try to sketch that difference in my Afterword.

produced a distinctive kind of State apparatus, a new kind of State Servant, and a piece of legislation which may exemplify precisely the genesis and historical continuum which I claimed above. The apparatus was the Board of Agriculture, ably discussed by Halevy (1912: Part 2. Ch.1) and Mantoux, whilst the key personnel - Arthur Young and Sir (later Lord) John Sinclair - are discussed by Mingay (1957, Cf. his 1972); Gazley (1973); and Mitchison (1962). It is entirely relevant to stress that Sinclair was the originator of the first adequate Statistical service - the Survey of Scotland. The War, apart from being a 'hothouse' for inventions and production, solidified forms of State control: whatever the "services" rendered by the creation of controls on the import of corn, they were a direct intervention by the State into the market. It is false to simply see this as an extension of practices which go back to the Tudor 'revolution'; the novelty resides in its national character. The same is true for the Poor Employment Act of 1817, which was produced by an administration (Cookson, 1975) more usually celebrated for its minimal State activity. The 1817 Act, as Flinn has shown (1961; 1971), intervened very directly in the 'labour market', brought forward experiences from the mid-eighteenth century (both from the Scots use of labour-gangs and the nature of Commissioners from the Enclosures), and established a pattern - both of 'public works' and of State fiscal controls which extends, via the Public Works Loan Board, to 1976. The 1817 Act was also, finally, an example of a certain kind of State administration - the use of Votes of Supply - which was typically employed at this time (Stern, 1950).

Equally, we should attend to the continuities from earlier periods. If the new legislation was class specific; so was that

which was retained and strengthened. Put besides the fluctuations in the number of capital offences (rapidly increased in the eighteenth and as rapidly decreased in the nineteenth centuries, but Cf. Beales, 1974) the continuities in the Master and Servant Acts until 1875 (D. Simon, 1954); the Game Laws (never fully repealed); and the sustained ambiguity<sup>\*</sup> regarding Trades Unions until today, seem of greater structural significance. Of the same order of experience and magnitude is the object status of women: until the case of Regina v Jackson in 1891 a wife was considered the property of her husband; until the legislation of 1882 began to change the situation, a married woman's relation to her 'own' property was extremely problematic (Rover, 1970; Rowbotham, 1973).

That is to say, in terms of the novel measures or the continuities, the laissez faire of these years was accomplished; by this I mean more than Therborn's nevertheless significant point that the 'principle of laissez-faire from the very beginning meant not state passivity but, basically, acceptance of the economic laws of capitalism.' (Therborn, 1974: 128). I am trying to show the sociological significance of this in terms of the agency through which State acts were performed. They cannot be construed in terms of aggregation: they are not a 'kind of market'-a series of ad hoc or at least uncoordinated, individual decisions which happen, cumulatively, to flow in one direction - they are the means through which that market is able to operate that way.

---

\* The continuity and ambiguity is established in the case law of the National Industrial Relations Court, 1971-1974, especially in the 'prosecution case' against the Railway Unions which connected Tudor 'revolution' and 1970s admirably.

It is no part of these two chapters to recount the history of the years after 1832. I hope to give some sketches of how the practices (Ch.3) and theories (Ch.4) of some key State servants demonstrate the bourgeois nature of the revolution in government which did take place. For convenience I have appended 'eclectic biographies' of these men in my first Appendix below, together with some indication of their antecedents and descendants, and their income. They should be referred to for a comprehensive chronological description of their lives which these two chapters hopelessly disrupt. What the biographies will show is that we are not dealing with self-made men. An apparently exceptional figure is Chadwick, whose profile has too long dominated our image of these early State servants. We are in the same territory as that of the 'self-made' cotton magnates, whom Dorothy Thompson (1974) shows to have been in fact 'made' by agrarian or fiscal capitalism\*.

Dorothy Thompson made her observation in a review of a work which my own study has attempted to complement - Foster's Class struggle and the industrial revolution (1974), although he uses a different starting point and his own methods, he has shown that a focus upon three towns (like my own upon three major State servants) can be extraordinarily revealing about matters which are not at all determined by the prime focus of study. Foster, along with Richards' study of a collection of M.P.s in his Ph.D., and I, are making the same kind of argument: what has been taken as a random assemblage of facts and incidents was, in Foster's words, 'a collective ruling-class

---

\* '... sons of country gentlemen or members of the professional class or businessmen. Their families had ... wealth and position...' is Roberts (1960: 152) description of State servants. There are, he concludes, 'few examples of really self-made men' (Ibid., 153).

response to a social system in crisis' (Foster, 1974: 3) - a strategy for capitalist growth.

---

## 2. The Context of State action

It is obvious enough into what historiographical contexts my sociological investigations could fit but it is perhaps worth stating their sociological significance. There has been, coextensive with the historians' debates summarised in Chapter one, and clearly related to the material sketched in Chapter two, much material produced on 'Development' by sociologists, economists, and other social scientists since 1945. Imbedded in these discussions has been an implicit notion of how the State related and should relate to 'Development': the situation is extremely contradictory - on the one hand, State 'interference' is recognised as a Bad Thing; on the other hand, the State is seen to be an (if not the) 'instrument of modernization', and 'gatekeeper' for the necessary importation of modern goods, ideas and expertise. The contradiction is sustained by a general lack of investigation of what State actions took place within the United States and the United Kingdom; who were, after all, both 'Developing' societies in their time. The relationship which informs my own discussion between State and class formation is a contribution to the ongoing critique of the work of Bendix, Lipset and others who, where they do not explicitly consider these matters unproblematic and 'solved', often seriously distort the historical experiences of different classes.

At the end of the eighteenth century one country within the British Isles was seen to offer to many visitors a comparison unfavourable to England. The Scottish Enlightenment has been well studied\* as have the major individuals: Ferguson (Lehman, 1930; Macrae, 1963); Millar (Lehman, 1962); Lord Kames (Lehman, 1971; Ross, 1972) and, of course, Adam Smith (Homowy, 1968; Skinner, 1967; Dobb, 1973; Robbins, 1973; Skinner, 1974 especially Forbes' essay). Less clearly stated, however, has been the way in which this Revolution was clearly connected to the major social revolution 'after the Forty Five' as A. J. Youngson titles his account (1973)\*\*.

Chitnis has recently surveyed the teaching of the University of Edinburgh between 1790-1826 (Ph.D. thesis, 1968); he shows the importance of Edinburgh education for (i) those denied access to English universities; (ii) subjects poorly taught at the latter, for example science and medicine. He shows the significance of Edinburgh University for categories of occupational groups within the whole of Britain. He also shows that central to an Edinburgh education was a 'philosophical core' which was reinforced in the debating and discussion clubs of the town, like the Speculative Society of Edinburgh. One central influence on this philosophical education was the moral philosopher Dugald Stewart (1753-1828)\*\*\*

---

\* Pascal, 1938; Meek, 1954, 1973; Macfie, 1955; Macrae, 1958; Swingewood, 1970a, b; Strasser, 1976: Ch. 3. Schneider, 1967, collects some texts.

\*\* Cf. Wills, 1972; Haldane, 1962; Smout, 1964, and, especially, Richards, 1973a; 1973b. Hechter, 1973, 1975, puts Scotland into a larger developmental context.

\*\*\* Stewart's father, Matthew (1717-1785) was a Professor of Mathematics and F.R.S.; for a time, 1775-1785, [Contd. on next page-p.124]

who was professor of moral philosophy from 1785 until 1809, giving lectures on political economy from 1800; by 1808/9 he had lecture audiences of 150 and more. Stewart's collected works, which appeared from 1854 to 1860, occupy eleven volumes; but his most influential work may have been his 'History of Moral Science' written for the Supplement to Britannica which also contained James Mill's essay on education (Mill was a student of Stewart). Stewart was a radical Whig who had visited France in 1788 and 1789; in the 1790s he was suspected of Jacobinism, but in 1806 was given a Whig sinecure worth £300 p.a. Francis Horner, the brother of Leonard, is considered Stewart's 'most receptive student'. Following Hollander, Chitnis considered Stewart<sup>\*</sup>, Ricardo, and Mill as the major disseminators of Adam Smith's views. Stewart did not contribute any specifically Erastian tendency in his presentation of Smith; on the contrary he was concerned to refute any possibility of a 'social contract' as with Hobbes, arguing that 'a great part of the political order which we are apt to ascribe to legislative sagacity is the natural result of the selfish pursuits of individuals' (qu Schneider, 1967: 112). Stewart also argued for a particular series of 'checks', including a popular assembly and single magistrates. He sometimes refers to 'the Legislator' in a Rousseau-ian fashion

---

[\*Cont. of fn on p.123], Dugald held this chair with his father and his own chair of Natural Philosophy; there was even one session, 1787/8 when he held three chairs (Moral Philosophy being added) and gave lectures in Greek and Sanskrit - Chitnis quotes a remark of Dugald's from this session: 'employed in premeditating two lectures - the one on the Air-Pump, the other on the immortality of the Soul.' According to DNB, Dugald often started work at 3 a.m.

\* McCullough, through the Edinburgh Review 1818-1836, and as first Professor of Political Economy at the new University of London, was his great popularizer.

(Cf. Goldmann, 1945). He followed Ferguson in seeing the 'nation-state' as doubly defined - first, through such 'external events' as the unification of France leading to a similar inter-country amalgamation in Britain; secondly, through a delicate analogy between nation and language. Both were constituted through experience over time; every nation and language has at the core of its constitution a 'spirit' to which new parts of speech, laws, and so on are 'referred'; thereby indicating what is ungrammatical and unconstitutional.

Stewart's ideas were influential on the group who formed the Edinburgh Review<sup>\*</sup> and through his pupils, who included Lord John Russell and Palmerston. Both Horner brothers and perhaps Kay were introduced to the ideas of Smith and Ferguson by Stewart; in Kay's case there was also the influence of Nassau Senior and Benthamite circles by 1832. Horner and Kay were life-long Whigs; so was Tremenheere, but in his case the influence came through the Edinburgh Review (to which he contributed three reviews) and from a particular reading of the 'wisdom of the ancients'. Of course there were other influences of family, education, religion and administrative 'style' - there is also the matter of the scientific pursuits of Dr. Kay, and Horner the F.R.S. and geologist. This last point is not trivial - Young has argued for a 'common context of biological and social theory' (1969, Cf. his 1972) in a study of Malthus' Essay on the Principle of Population (1798). In 1840 Spencer read Principles of Geology, by Charles Lyell, Horner's son-

---

\* On the importance of the Reviews, Fetter 1965; on the content of the Edinburgh (which started in 1802) see his 1953 article which claims it as a gentry magazine, compared with the Westminster (1824 -) which was much more middle-class and radical-intelligentsia-oriented.



in-law; also influential on Darwin's early work\*.

---

If notions of 'Evolution' dominate the last third, so 'Political economy' is the dominant doctrine of the first half, of the nineteenth century\*\*. Marx' work, in all its forms, offers a critique of this doctrine, exposing its partial and relative character and its reliance upon crucial sociological and cultural assumptions (Sayer Ph.D. thesis and his 1975). It was the view of a particular fraction of the ruling class and can sensibly be contrasted to other notions of 'natural' or 'moral economy' which could be found in the ideologies of those ruling and ruled in previous centuries. There were a group of Ricardian socialists (Cf. Lowenthal, 1911) who celebrated the basis of value in Labour; Radical Chartist economists were also able to socialize Ricardo.

Apart from these transformations through the 'lens' of working class experience, political economy had a genuine, and radical, cutting edge in exposing the 'costs' of Old Corruption, and more generally, in its critique of the power of Land. It is the reality of this Radicalism which makes possible the shifting alliances of the nineteenth century; central to these shifts is the changing content of the sociological amalgam 'the People'. In one kind of campaign the category would be filled by the bourgeoisie and workers against the landed nobility; in another, the latter and workers oppose the industrial bourgeoisie. In any of these campaigns there

---

\* Cf. Burrow, 1966; Jones Ph.D. thesis; Burrow, 1967; 1971; Roach, 1971. On the political use of history, Cf. Webb, 1955b:Ch.IV; O.Anderson, 1967.

\*\* Neither doctrine is dead; cf. Times editorial 30 June 1976.

were always residual categories - 'the mob', 'the Court' or 'the Irish' .

Political economy was progressive in two related senses. Using its own yardsticks it could declare a social formation governed by its laws to be 'more free' - this is the rallying point of Liberalism. Secondly, those yardsticks themselves determined a particular new way of understanding social change and human development. They claimed that the system of production and human relations which political economy simultaneously described and prescribed, cleansed of all 'residues' from former ideologies and production forms, would allow the raising of the material 'well-being' of all because it raised what we could call 'the moral average' of a given population. It is this moral content, which has, of course, a particular political and institutional strategy entailed in it, which seems not to have been sufficiently studied in the materials I have reviewed. It is crucial. It shows, on the one hand, that the differences between political economy and the social evolutionism of Spencer are not so acute; on the other hand, it shows why the focus on 'education' (or, I would argue, 'moral regulation') is so salient\*.

From these deeply buried notions\*\* of 'moral regulation' come the contradictions of political economy as a guide to action. Leaving aside, that is, the logical flaws which Marx established in

---

\* Spencer's book Education (1861) was his 'bestselling and most translated book' (Peel, 1971:3). Cf. my comments on Spencer in Ch.2 & 5.

\*\* Rosenberg, 1960, sketches Adam Smith's 'optimal institutional structure' to allow the 'market mechanism' to operate 'most effectively'. Cf. Finer (1952a:19f) for Chadwick, and my Chapter One above.

his many volumes of a 'critique of political economy' (Cf. Sayer, Ph.D. thesis): there is something of a vicious circle at the heart of the implicit State policy of political economy which goes a very long way to explain how different bodies of evidence could explain the same period of time as 'years of laissez faire' or 'a period of collectivism'. In the ideal world of equal human beings (all possessed, moreover, of the same amount of information) the equilibrium of the market would establish the best of all possible worlds through the spontaneous decisions of those human beings. Since that world has not yet been reached; since, that is, there are many who would not, spontaneously (i.e. without education and 'help'), act in their best interests, there is a need for moral regulation. If moral regulation is needed, why does this not deny the basic axiom of 'free trade'? Secondly, who is to be regulated and whom, regulator? The first point was dealt with by a seemingly ad hoc and pragmatic variation of the theory - beginning, of course, with declaring some human beings as 'unable to enter into contracts' and thus needing help. Similarly the theory of individual rights was diluted by declaring some actions as criminal or insane. That is to say, precisely to allow the genuine exercise of free choice there must be 'something' and 'somebody' else to create and sustain the conditions that make this choice free. The regulators were never clearly articulated in this theory; a shadowy assumption of the power of expertise was made, but even in its more radical forms (Bentham's words; Chadwick's practices) this is ill-conceived with regard to the connection with the political structure of Britain. I think this a relevant point; there is a peculiar 'autonomy' about Parliament in Britain which has thus far served to obscure the equally important 'autonomy' of the State practices. I very much doubt if

Parliament ever exercised much control over Executive government in this country; but the ideological focus has been supreme, even to the point of causing perceptions of historical experience to be slotted into the arbitrary and capricious time periods when particular men occupied particular seats within the Commons.

Although J. S. Mill was arguing for much of his life that the consequences of political economy were 'destructive' of the State, this claim will not stand examination, and, as I shall argue in my fifth chapter, Mill by the 1860s no longer subscribed to such a view. No simple dismantling of the Old Poor Law would establish the 'national system of improvement' which the Whig State Servants I study, desired. In fact, the Poor Law shows very clearly - as the last page of the 1834 report stated - the intermixture of 'economical' and 'moral' concerns. The Old Poor Law was wrong not because it entailed a particular kind of State intervention, but because it made men and women less able to be good. Evil was seen to be a product of environment and institutions. People must be given the chance to be good; the old forms of State action did not do this, they aided weakness and sloth. New forms of State intervention must establish the moral environment which fitted the new 'egalitarian' labour market.

It is possible to illustrate some of the above assertions through the literature of the popularizers of political economy. Although R.K. Webb (1955b) and others (Goldstrom Ph.D.; Tyrell, 1969) have examined aspects of this problem, none has yet related the spread of political economy to the issues I am discussing. Of the two popularisers I am examining, Harriet Martineau has eclipsed the work of Mrs. Marcet, but I shall begin with her. In 1816 Mrs Jane

Marcet published her Conversations on political economy ... (1816; 2nd ed, 1817; 3rd, 1819; 4th, 1821; 5th, 1824; 6th, 1827). The work utilised a popular form of semi-dramatic dialogue between an enquirer, who professes total ignorance in many cases, and 'one who knows', a worldly-wise, older person. In Mrs Marcet's drama there are two characters: Mrs. B. and Caroline, who between them ensure that the 'elements' of the 'science' of political economy are 'familiarily expressed'. The conversations were very competent (in my first Appendix, I report Horner's description of how McCulloch read them and used them as a set book in his London University lectures); they distinguish, for example, exchange and use values, and they show how wages are the price of labour. Indeed, in the first to fourth editions, the labour theory of value was given some space; in later editions this was attenuated. Anyway, in all editions we were told

Labour seems to be the natural and immediate cause of wealth; but it will produce little more than the necessaries of life until its benefits are extended by the establishment of such a government as can give security to Property. The spirit of industry will then be rapidly developed.

(Marcet, 1816: 81; 1824: 86; 1827: 87)

The whole conversation concludes by Caroline announcing: 'all that you have said reconciles me; in great measure, to the inequality of the distribution of wealth.' Mrs. B. opines 'Economy is a virtue incumbent on all: a rich man may have sufficient motives to authorise a liberal expenditure, but he can have none for negligence or waste; and however immaterial to himself the loss which waste occasions, he should consider it is so much taken from

that fund which provides maintenance and employment for the poor'.

In 1833, Mrs Marcet produced her John Hopkin's notions of political economy<sup>\*</sup> which brings together nine tracts, some originally published by the Glamorganshire Society for Improving the Labouring Classes and including: 'The Rich and the Poor: a fairy tale'; 'Population, &c. or, The old world' and 'Emigration; or, a new world'.

But it was the Conversations which were so influential.

Harriet Martineau wrote

I took up the book chiefly to see what Political Economy precisely was; and great was my surprise to find that I had been teaching it unawares in my stories about machinery and wages. It struck me at once that the principles of the whole science might be advantageously conveyed in the same way - not by being smothered up in story, but by being exhibited in their natural workings in selected passages of social life.

(Autobiography, qu Rivlin, 1947: 5)

Martineau (1802-1876) was a friend of Nassau Senior (who also knew the Marcets; Levy, 1943: 104f) and of both Horner (who was closer to the Marcets), Chadwick, and Tremenheere. But her Radicalism was genuine; she broke with Tremenheere - or, to be accurate, he with her, over Martineau's continuing support for the People's Journal in 1846. R.K. Webb's thorough biography shows Martineau's genuineness very well; not least in the way that she (and here Carlyle is exactly comparable) understood Chartism as the rallying

---

\* The British Museum wrongly catalogue this under HOPKINS, (J.), Labourer.

point for many sufferings (Webb, 1960: 212f; Curtis, 1976; Cf. Carlyle, 1839)\*.

But her radicalism is bounded by Political Economy. At the close of her pamphlet The Turn-out; or, Patience the best policy (1829)\*\* she declares 'though it is hardship to have low wages, anything is better than a TURN-OUT'. From 1832 to 1834, Martineau produced monthly, at 18 pennies each, 25 separate pamphlets, later collected as her famous Illustrations of political economy (1832-34). The 'summary of principles' prefixed to volume one demonstrates her adherence to true political economy. Tales 1 to 4 illustrate the production of wealth; volume one (p.147) states 'The interests of capitalists best determines the extent of capital; and any interference of the law is therefore unnecessary'; but, on the other hand (or is it really that different?), Tale 4 is a coherent anti-slavery account. Tales 5 to 21 deal with distribution and exchange - Tale 6 supports Malthus; Tale 7 (the famous 'A Manchester Strike') relays wage fund theory; and Tale 12, in volume 4 (p.114-5) demolishes the Labour theory of value by declaiming that there can be 'no measure of exchangeable value'. Tales 17 to 20 defend free trade, including a criticism of the Corn Laws (Tale 19) and colonial monopolies (Tale 20); in Tale 21 ('A tale of the Tyne') privileged trading corporations and combinations of workmen are equally criticised. Tales 22 to 24 cover consumption and taxation; expenditure (by the State) for defence is recognised in Tale 23 as is the necessity for provision for 'public order' and 'social

---

\* There is a portrait by Carlyle of Martineau in his Reminiscences (1932: 117-120).

\*\* Rivlin, 1947: item 585 catalogues this wrongly, using English Catalogue data; I have examined B.M. copy N.1801(1). I suspect it was a 'sponsored' publication.

improvement' but this must be 'limited'; just as (Tale 24) taxation must be 'just'. In the final tale ('The Moral of many fables') in volume 9 (p.140f) Martineau includes political economy as a department of moral science and concludes, like Coleridge (see my Appendix III) that 'we must mend our ways' and declares, in capitals, that the means and end of political economy is 'THE HAPPINESS OF THE GREATEST NUMBER IF NOT ALL'. (Her capitals).

The publication of these tracts was not easy (Webb, 1960: 112f). Seeing her task as the achievement of 'an active diffused morality' Martineau approached the S.D.U.K. (Cf. Smith, M.A. thesis) but they were not helpful; eventually the publisher Charles Fox agreed. The tracts sold about 10,000 each month. In their preparation Martineau used Blue Books, Norwich Public Library - especially Smith, Ricardo and Malthus - and information from Place and Hume. This self-instruction continued when she went on to write 1,642 leaders in the Daily News between 1852 and 1866 (Curtis, 1976: 27). More important than their general circulation is the specific contacts which Webb reports (1960: 123) with radical working men, like John Doherty; many of whom wrote to express their admiration for her work.

In 1833 Martineau produced her Poor Laws and paupers illustrated at the request of Brougham and for the SDUK. These tales illustrate the radicalism of political economy and liberalism very well. Like J.S. Mill, Martineau wishes to stress in her own words:

All social systems being remediable, the task of exposing the unhappy results of any, involves a definite hope of the amelioration which must, sooner



or later, follow the exposure.

(Preface to 'The Parish', 1833: Ch.1)

Of course, like Mill, and the Fabians, this 'exposure' always had its assumptions. In the fourth chapter, 'The Land's End', of this work, Martineau discusses 'the labour market' in a manner which both takes that market's inequalities for granted and is against any form of action, by the workers, to challenge the power of capital. This is very obvious in the specially commissioned pamphlet, written for the Earl of Durham's agent and intended for the pitmen: The tendency of strikes and sticks to produce low wages and of union between masters and men to ensure good wages (1834)\*. This pamphlet sympathises with the sufferings of workers following on 'fluctuations of trade', and further concedes the Combination Acts to have been 'a great injustice and tyranny' (they did not result from malice but from error). Nowadays, Martineau argues, 'men and masters' must work together\*\* since 'no unions of workmen ... can improve trade, or raise profits'; even if all the workers of the world combined 'there would be a greater depression' (p.13/14). She details how some strikes led to suffering and how some 'union delegates' are really the worst and most idle workers. There is much antiunion propaganda; including the relevant anti-strike legislation so that blacklegs can protect their rights, and an unidentified Trade Union account book is printed to show fraud.

---

\* This is not in the British Museum; a copy exists in the Literary & Philosophical Library in Newcastle as Tracts vol.105,no.1 at 331.87. It is item 574 in Rivlin, 1947, from whom I take the date.

\*\* She argued this 'bond' of Masters and Servants generated reciprocal responsibilities and was therefore against Factory Inspection. In the Daily News she argued 'As Masters instead of victims of their Inspectors, the manufacturers of the Kingdom will guard their work-people from accident better than Parliament and Secretaries of State could.' (qu Curtis, 1976: 287). This is Spencer's view also.

The proceedings of such unions are 'enough to sicken free men' (p.24). Of course these approaches had some effect; in 1844, for example, the Miners Association declared to the Coal Owners that they should combine to overcome the market and 'ruinous competition' 'a process which is alike ruinous to both parties'

labour and capital contending for the mastery; while the public, who are consumers, reap the benefit, without so much as soiling a finger in the dangerous undertaking of raising an article indispensably necessary to their comfort and existence.

(qu Fynes, 1873: 50)

As has been shown in other areas (e.g. Checkland, 1949; Gilmour, 1967; Clements, 1955; 1961) political economy increasingly became the arena for debate, rather than one of the subjects of debate.

But 'Ideas', even when as systematic (yet flexible) as those of political economy, are 'organised' by means of transmission and reception. We find State servants involved in private means of propagation and repetition which overlap with more obviously public institutions. Some of these means were ad hoc; some were short-lived; some were regional or very specialised - but in their perspectives, questions, and methods of work they resemble very closely dominant State institutions of the period. By this I refer to the system of both Commissions of Enquiry (central board; assistant commissioners; standard questions ...) and Inspectoral administration (central Office or Board, Inspectors and Assistant Commissioners, reports and letters ....). These had a great material weight, a considerable moral force which can be registered in the sheer volume of Parliamentary Papers and the unpublished materials of the different

Offices, Departments and Boards. These should be placed at the same level of significance as the letters between the 'great' families, and the journals and diaries of the period. This material echoes and re-echoes with repeated themes and phrases; a set of questions-and-answers which was further broadcast through the newspapers and Reviews of the epoch. There was debate and contestation, controversy and opposition, but this 'public opinion' was also being moulded and formed through an assumed consensus 'donated' by political economy. The studies of Michel Foucault on the 'episteme' (1961; 1963; 1966; 1968; 1969; 1972; 1974)\* illustrate what I am trying to indicate here.

Opposition existed 'outside': Coleridge and others sought to restore the moral economy of agrarian capitalism; the early socialists wanted a social economy based on co-operation. This opposition is not simply important in general terms but because it frequently took the form of proposals for a different notion of the State, for a different State policy. Further, we should not reduce human beings to simple vessels containing pure versions of these strategies - it was possible for analyses to co exist within one political programme; but for particular individuals - most significantly entrepreneurs and bankers - not to follow the logic and imperatives of the economic 'laws' of political economy was to severely damage their trading position. Out of these class interests arose a specific notion of the 'national interest' which was subject

---

\* I have gained from reading Foucault (e.g. his remarks on Ricardo, 1966:253f) with more technical discussions, both general (Dobb, 1973 Ch.1 'On ideology') and specific (Forbes, 1975) on Smith or (Moore, 1966) on Ricardo; Hamowy, 1968, on the division of labour; Hollander, 1968, on training...

to the same constraints.

What was taking place was not only the suppression of systems of ideas, but the suppression of their organizational forms. The crisis of political economy of the 1860s - and its attenuation into neoclassical and technical economics, on the one hand, and a range of administrative and sociological studies, on the other - was largely a crisis of doctrine rather than organizational form. To say this is not to declare one kind of crisis more real or more important for the historical actors concerned; it is to indicate the need for a different kind of 'appreciation'. By that time there had been accomplished a series of crucial redefinitions which marked the ascendancy of the bourgeois class (and the suppression of the organizational possibility of alternatives). 'Socialism' meant, in general terms, social reform and stood to Liberalism as the Radicals had related to the Whigs (Cf. Wolfe, 1975). For opposition that took a legitimate and political form there was only the organizational possibility of reform: working within a structure (and with epistemological resources) which negated the achievement of human values. The other phenomenal form of mass politics was and is known negatively as apathy (Cf. Yeo, 1974), which like deference (Cf. Newby, 1975a,b) is buried so deep that it is assumed not present. Apathy represents a positive response to historical experiences of a structure which appears impermeable and which is clearly oppressive. Apathy would also be the end-result of a series of co-ordinated attempts to incorporate workers as citizens, little by little, through franchise and other reforms. 'Apathy' and 'Reform' are the likely results of a State policy such as in fact developed. (Cf. Mill, 1848: 123f; Milnes, 1867; N. Young, 1967).

This configuration of institutional and epistemological constraints followed, as I have said, as much from 'private' as from 'official' activity. Pre-eminent amongst the former was the work of several organizations and societies. These were interconnected at the level of structure and membership. As William Guy argues (1870: 427f), just as the British Association for the Advancement of Science grew from the Royal Society in 1831, so the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science in 1857 grew from the Statistical Society of London (itself founded only in 1834)\*. Taking my analogy from Chadwick (Collins, 1913), I shall discuss those organized forms of the 'educational idea' and the 'statistical idea'.

The focus on educational or moral transformation begins with a public concern; indeed, Halevy (1923b) suggests that it is only through some such focus as educational transformation that we can unify all the legislative changes of the 1830s. But before then, at the very start of the nineteenth century, a private committee called the 'Manchester Board of Health' (founded in 1796 Cf. Keith-Lucas, 1953) called for State intervention on behalf of Apprentices. Sir Robert Peel (the Peel's father) inspected his own factories and introduced 'An Act for the preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices and Others' (this received the Royal Assent, as 42 George

---

\* For general stress on the importance of these societies see McGregor, 1957; Abrams, 1968. On the NAPSS Cf. Rodgers, 1952 (although he mis-spells Kay-Shuttleworth's name; and seems to think that Tremeneere was an Assistant Poor Law Commissioner until 1858). These societies were not popular: the membership of the Central Society of Education is listed in their Papers; Guy (1870:441) claims that, in 1869, the NAPSS had 1500 members; the Statistical Society of London and the Institute of Actuaries had 608 but the latter included 51 Peers and 31 MPs. On other Statistical societies, Cf. Cullen, 1975.

III c.73, on 22 June 1802; Mantoux, 1928: 468f; Sanderson, 1967:270f). This established a locally appointed factory inspectorate and was easily evaded as the abuses reported in the 1816 Factory Enquiry made clear, itself followed by an act in 1819 which forbade the employment of any child under nine years of age and restricted all nonadult labour to twelve hours per day<sup>\*</sup>. My point here is that Montmorency (1902: 210) describes the 1802 Act as 'the first compulsory Education Act': 'a curious compromise between the old Statute of Apprentices and the modern Education Act'. As such an Act it stipulated the curriculum, the place and personnel of instruction, much more clearly than most current Acts. But for all that, Montmorency (1902: 215) is right to see it as an attempt to maintain the old system of patriarchal apprenticeship 'where the apprentice was part of the familia ... [in] a factory such a relationship was practically impossible.' Montmorency also sees the connection between this and Bentham's writings of that time; in the same year (1802) Bentham was writing on 'education as a indirect mode of preventing offences'<sup>\*\*</sup>

The most neglected class must become the principal object of care. The less parents are able to discharge this duty, the more necessary it is for government to fulfil it. It ought not only to watch over orphans left in indigence, but also over the children whose parents no longer deserve the confidence of the law

---

\* Judging from section seven of the 1833 Act (3 & 4 William IV c.103) the 1819 Act was ignored. Note the exemption of Silk Mills from regulation until 1878, up until that date it was legal to employ nine year old children (de Montmorency, 1902: 213 fn1)

\*\* Brougham, amongst others, saw education as 'preventing that class from coming into existence amongst whom the criminals that infest society are created ...' Hansard, (Lords, Series III, XXVII: 1329)

with regard to this important charge - over those who have already committed crimes or who, destitute of protectors and resources, are given up to all the seduction of misery. These classes, absolutely neglected in most states, become the hotbeds of crime.  
 (qu Montmorency, 1902: 217f)\*

If this is insufficiently a manifesto, we can take as a rallying point the following:

We advocate, both for England and Ireland, the necessity of a national provision for the moral and industrial training of the young. In the old we cannot hope for much improvement. But the new generation springing up might be modelled to our will.

London and Westminster Review, January 1837

(qu. Halevy, 1923b: 105-6, fn.5)

As Finer has argued 'Any Benthamite was automatically an educationist, since his philosophy depended on the perfectibility of society through the free play of its members' enlightened self-interest' (Finer, 1952a: 150, his emphasis). Quite so, but was the 'idea' that specific to the Benthamites? One Whig pressure group was formed to discuss 'the question-of-questions' as its own Manifesto phrased it:  
 to show how all the social relations, the tone, and strength, of the national character, are dependent upon it; how civilization varies as its quality changes; how, in a short time, manners may be modelled by it.

(Papers C.S.E., I:26; Cf. Wyse, 1837)

---

\* This is very much the programme of Chadwick and Kay, as Johnson has stressed in the case of the latter and Finer for the former.

The 'it' here is education. The Central Society of Education was very short-lived (1837 to 1839 Cf. Parkin, 1975) but important. Its secretary B.F. Duppa described the 'objects' of the Society (Papers C.S.E., I: 1-26) in terms of a methodology

heaping fact upon fact, and argument upon argument, classifying and opposing, and, in the instances in which it can be done with safety, drawing a conclusion; and thus attempting to give to the theory of education a more scientific character than it has yet assumed. (p.2)

Tremenheere was a founder-member; Horner joined in 1838; although never a member, Kay's ideas (and his words) were often used. This attempt to give 'a more scientific character' is precisely one of the means through which other kinds of education were to be marginalised and rendered 'obsolete'. The State became part of the business of education-provision; a competitor in a field, shared by

the Churches and Chapels and the Endowed Schools, with no class opposition. This idea of competition, which Chadwick, for one, makes explicit (1887:Vol.2: 126f), is central to capitalism itself\*. In this way one kind of schooling becomes education; just as, more diffusely, some 'rational amusements' marginalize 'vicious and demoralizing habits'; and one way of bringing change about becomes social change itself (any other change being 'disruption' and 'break-down'). This is never, of course, total; 1984 always recedes and there are important areas of exception. But even in the case of the 'labour market' itself, the holy of holies of laissez faire theory, we have to be empirically accurate. Since Tudor times there were

---

\* 'Competition is the mode generally in which capital secures the victory of its mode of production' (Marx, 1858: 730).



specific supporting conditions - even if the whip was succeeded by 'less eligibility'<sup>\*</sup>. Similarly the law regarding Trades Unions, already mentioned, is internal to the Labour Market; as is any policy on educational provision.

In order to compete, the Radicals knew that they must have facts. The Central Society provided facts using, thereby, both Kay's material on pauper children and some early data from Horner on children in factories; (this recycling of data becomes increasingly common, cf. Bennett, 1846: Ch.5; reaching crescendo in the permeation of Fabianism and the 'placed' Parliamentary Question). As Duppa argued, the 'appreciation of Statistical information is gradually gaining ground ... vague generalities should be quitted, and the exact quantity of particulars of which a general assessment is made should be shown' (Papers C.S.E., I: 24).

The 'statistical idea'<sup>\*\*</sup> or movement was a victim of the competition procedure described above, since the collection and partial publication of Statistical information is now an affair of State. To some extent, of course, it always was. In 1798 Sir John Sinclair prefaced the Statistical Account of Scotland with a definition of statistics as 'the Population, the Political Circumstances, the productions of a country and other matters of State' (qu Cullen, 1975: 10). In 1833 - the year of the founding of the Manchester

---

\* In 1900 9% of those convicted in summary courts were whipped. The punishment was only abolished (outside of schools and the Isle of Man) in 1948, the last recorded application being 1930 (Walker, 1972: Table, 1.2).

\*\* On the interpretation of 'Sanitary' and 'Statistical' ideas Cf. Keith-Lucas, 1953 (but note Hennock, 1958); Abrams, 1968; and Wohl, 1968: 193f.

Statistical Society and the formation, within the Board of Trade, of a Department of Statistics under G.R. Porter - the Penny Cyclopaedia defined statistics as 'that department of political science which is concerned in collecting and arranging facts illustrative of the conditions and resources of a State'. (qu Cullen, 1975: 11). Brown (1958:80f) has noted that statistics was 'taken to mean the collection of facts descriptive of a state: its geographical features, climate, population, resources, scale of trade, and habits'. The last word reminds us that the moral dimension was there from the start. As late as 1870, William Guy (1870: 440) defended a definition of Statistics as the 'science of States'. According to Cullen, the movement 'began in the 1830s, flourished in the late 1830s and 1840s, but then began to wither' (Cullen, 1975: ix). In 1833, aside from the two relevant events just mentioned, the British Association founded a Statistical Committee\* with Malthus as the chairman; Kay was active in the founding of the Manchester society; Horner was a member of the B.A.A.S. Committee from 1834. In 1834 the Statistical Society of London was formed (Cullen, 1975: Ch.6). As to the Board of Trade work - G.R. Porter was the brother-in-law of Ricardo and an active member of the S.D.U.K. (Cullen, 1975: Ch.2; Cf. Brown, 1958; Prouty, 1957). Porter's Progress of the Nation (3 vols 1836; 3rd ed., 1851) is best compared with Moser's Social trends (1970 onwards, as supplemented by Halsey, 1972) but even to make this suggestion emphasises the degree to which it is now practically improbable for there to be any competition

---

\* This established area committees. For one relevant report see BAAS, 1839, on collieries near Tyne and Wear. This prints its questionnaire in full and gives the results for one single village (Hetton). It also shows the moral focus of these activities; as do other apparently technical surveys, e.g. Porter, 1838; Edgell, 1838 - note the 'equivalence' here of the terms 'moral' and 'social'.

with the State in information gathering and display.

In 1837, as a consequence of the Registration Act of 1836, itself a response to demands from Poor Law officials (like Kay) and Factory Inspectors (like Horner) for accurate details of birth, together with Chadwick's ideas regarding accurate records of causes of death; Dr. William Farr was appointed sub Registrar General. The top post was given to Lord John Russell's brother in law T.H. Lister; and the local officials, much to Chadwick's anger, were chosen by the Boards of Poor Law Guardians; of the 2193 appointed by the end of 1838, just under half were existing Poor Law Officers. (Cullen, 1975: Ch.2). Despite the occasional case of 'conscience', or a wider movement (for example, resistance to the 1971 census); we take this yielding up of data concerning our persons, whereabouts and possessions for granted.

Cullen concludes his recent study:

The statistical movement began, as it was to remain (though less definitely so) a movement of the reforming establishment, Whig to Liberal in politics, nonBenthamite (yet not consciously anti-Benthamite).

(1975: 82; Cf. his analysis of personnel, Ibid., 102f).

He attaches to that statement, the footnote 'some Benthamites were statisticians; a very few statisticians were Benthamite. Chadwick was Chadwick' (Cullen, 1975: 187 fn56). Quite so, a view I (and Beales, 1974) would endorse. But this does not mean that the political connections and class perspectives do not need stressing. There is, for example, the focus on strikes; in a single issue (May 1838) of the Journal of the London Society there is Boyle's report on strikes

in the Potteries and the Society's 57 item questionnaire:

No.34. Can a loss of life be either directly or indirectly attributed to the strike?

No.35. Were any ill effects visible in the criminal calendar attributable to the strike?...

No.36. Did the people while unemployed contract degrading habits?

Whilst Cullen agrees with the analysis given here (and that of Johnson, 1970) when he says that the 'purpose of education was revealed as the conversion of one class to the value system of another' (1975: 145); he seeks to argue that much statistical work was 'semi-voyeurist fact gathering' (1975: 137). I disagree. At first, all facts were of equal value; and, equally important, the educationists and the statisticians were as one in not seeing education as simply technical instruction. Therefore all actions and beliefs had to be recorded - at work, at home, at play. The Tyne and Wear committee asked 'How many houses have gardens attached to them?... Have they generally pictures on the wall [of their houses]... of what kind?' (B.A.A.S., 1839)

This notion of 'statistics' as a servant-science for other more "philosophical" concerns is explicit in Prince Albert's\* presidential address to the fourth International Statistical Congress in 1860

Our statistical science does not even say that this must be so; it only states that it has been so, and leaves it to the naturalist or political economist to

---

\* Albert recollected that the first President of the Congress had been Quételet 'from whom I had the privilege, now twenty-four years ago, to receive my first instruction in... mathematics' (Albert, 1860: 281). Quételet was influential with Marx, with Kay, and with Durkheim.

argue that it is probable from the number of times in which it has been found to be so, that it will be so again so long as the same causes are operating.

(Albert, 1860: 280)

To mention one spectacular import of ideas (in the person of the Prince Consort) serves to remind us that these 'ideas', and movements, were set in an international comparative context which often gave the questions their precise urgency and political impact. I mean here two related matters: first, my sense of State formation in Britain is informed by knowledge of State formation in other countries and by tentative steps toward a comparative framework<sup>\*</sup>. Second, the actions and theoretical perspectives thought appropriate by these State Servants were informed by a similar conscious comparison. It is in this context that the upper class 'Grand Tour' should be reconceptualised as genuinely an extension of necessary education - journals were kept and long letters sent, both detailing this or that remarkable feature of morals or habits. I would include here also the tours within the British Isles, the Scottish comparison, in particular, was significant for Tremenheere or for Nassau Senior. Besides this 'private' activity, there were also officially-sponsored information-gathering expeditions, aside, that is, from the steady stream of reports obtained through the Diplomatic Corps. Europe, including Tsarist Russia, and the U.S.A. were visited for quite specific comparative purposes by all the major State Servants. The translation of major studies of foreign systems (for example's Horner's translation

---

\* I provide (Endnote 1, Ch.3) a brief discussion of these materials; comparative studies are still distorted by theoretical confusions.

of Cousin's report on Holland<sup>\*</sup>) and the inclusion of foreign witnesses before Commissions of Inquiry was a related and complementary activity. This kind of impetus to State formation has, of course, been noted - I shall discuss the studies which relate War and the Nation-State in Chapter Four - but usually very narrowly or crudely, as, for example, in those studies which show the economic impetus of Foreign policy.

---

### 3. Whig-Liberalism and The Sociology of Intervention

Although I am committed to a serial presentation of the practices of the State Servants whom I have studied, as contrasted with the exemplary presentation of their 'sociological analysis' in the following chapter, I shall first present an outline of what I see as the general features of the State style of the early years of the nineteenth century in Britain. I shall not return to the issues of the debate summarised in Chapter One, nor explicitly return to my conclusions presented at the end of Chapter Two; but they are clearly attended to at each stage of the argument.

One key question would seem to be: How, given a commitment to laissez faire (and 'cheap government'), could so much State activity be accomplished? MacDonagh is right insofar as he points up the transforming quality of the relationship between certain practices and

---

\* Cousin's survey of Prussia, translated by the wife of the legal theorist John Austin in 1834, is quoted favourably by the C.S.E. (Papers, I: 14f).

the theories which were supposed to inform them. State servants made use of pre-existing practices - they all received their own positions through patronage and were active in furthering the careers of their friends and relations by similar means\*. They also extended new practices - it would seem that both the Factory Inspectorate (and therefore other Inspectorates) and the Assistant Commissioners followed a pattern established by officials such as revising barristers who had a 'circuit'. But MacDonagh and others are wrong to thereby 'drain' these State apparatuses of any guiding theoretical strategy. True, the State servants did not necessarily express anything that was especially new - they were not alone, for example, in relating crime (and pauperism was a crime in this sense) and education in such a way as to stress the need for Erastian moral regulation\*\* but much of Kay's 1832 pamphlet and the 1834 Poor Law Report (the work of Nassau Senior and Chadwick almost entirely) are important texts because of their authorship. That is to say that it matters that a particular set of views is held by those who are carrying out certain practices, for the latter give organized force to the former.

In arguing thus I am suggesting that MacDonagh's and Roberts' paradigms of 'growth' are specious - they do not reveal the particular logic of different practices (which shows, in turn, what Marx would call the 'conditions of possibility' of the modern democratic State as such). Moral regulation is inevitably constitutive of State

---

\* Chadwick is a transitional case here - interested in a career open to talent (because of his treatment by the Patrician Whigs) and 'placing' his own nominess wherever he could.

\*\* The two rare versions of the pamphlet Poor Rates (1844a, b) are exemplary here.

formation. In that sense Spencer's criticism of Mill is quite justified. But Spencer (e.g. 1884) - no more than latter-day purists, whether technical (Stigler, 1975) or general (Sir Keith Joseph) - cannot show how the free market which is supposed to provide a just solution could exist without forms of regulation and constraint. Significantly, most such critiques of State power begin by agreeing that 'we all' need agencies for 'law and order', without indicating how those concepts are themselves problematic. In fact, much middle-class response to the State is extremely contradictory - calls for better State services and less Public expenditure are combined. This was present in the mid-nineteenth century also in the form of a reluctantly agreed 'trade off' between less crime and more education (higher rates and taxes). Thirty-four years before T. H. Green's similar formulae in his defence of 'Liberal legislation', the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett argued

a just expenditure in education would relieve us  
of the overwhelming burden under which we now  
labour in these three evils ...

[poor laws, police, and prisons']

(Bennett, 1846: 43)

What I have found in their practices, informed by an articulate 'sociology', is that major State servants established a sociology of intervention. They seek to show to their political paymasters and, often directly, their 'economic paymasters' (the mineowners, millowners and others) that the old forms of social order are attenuated, if not dissolved, by new relations of production. For, the old 'moral' or 'natural police' has faded into insignificance; a new regulation, a new policing is needed. But this overt 'law and order' is, itself,



only a temporary measure; the real change must be accomplished at the level of systematic socialization, through schools and churches. If demoralization is constantly feared; it is remoralization which is desired.

What kinds of persons intervened? I call them State Servants - not simply civil servants - because they saw themselves as relating directly to political power. They were all (and Chadwick is a partial exception again) the social equals of the great political families, although they were not of Burke's 'Great Oaks' themselves, they dined with them and entertained them. But they were also servants<sup>\*</sup> and some politicians treated them as such; Johnson (Ph.D.) cites the instance of Lord Wharncliffe with regard to Kay. Lord Derby was asked, in the mid century, why he did not complain that Greville (the Clerk to the Privy Council and 'an ardent Whig') did not attend on him but sent the Deputy Clerk. Derby replied 'When I ring I never notice whether it is John or Thomas who brings up the coals' (Preston-Thomas, 1909: 3)<sup>\*\*</sup>. But by 1884, Sir Charles Dilke

---

\* A similar 'social distance' is revealed in the Clerk to the Privy Council's reply, when the Lord President asked him, in 1967, whether the Queen "preferred the Tories to us.." he said "I don't think so. The Queen doesn't make fine distinctions between politicians ... They all roughly belong to the same social category in her view". (Crossman, 1976: 33).

\*\* This book is extremely valuable and serves to supplement the account I am giving. Preston-Thomas was a Civil Servant from 1859 to 1900. His book provides evidence for: (i) the gentlemanly nature of the duties, the length of holidays, the extensive travelling done (p.27;76); (ii) continuing links between civil servants and the press (discussed by Kitson-Clark, 1959); Thomas wrote for the Morning Post (p.34f) and for the Economist in 1891 (p.159f); (iii) the opening of mail from and to foreigners in Britain (p.51); (iv) the adhoc nature of much State response to 'crises' (p.43f); and (v) the continuing search for foreign solutions to domestic problems; for example, his study of the Elberfeld scheme in 1872 (p.120f.) Cf. Ch.5 below.

(president of the Local Government Board, addressing the Macclesfield Poor Law Conference) described the post of Poor Law Guardian as 'the best possible training of a man for the service of State in its highest Capacities' (Aschrott, 1902: 221 n.1).

The State servants I am studying have been depicted by W.L. Burn thus: 'they were servants of the State because they were interested ... because they had formed opinions which an official position allowed them to translate into action' (Burn, 1964: 223-4). This view (which is also employed in the work of McCord, 1967b; 1974) is correctly criticised by Richards (Ph.D. thesis, Conclusion) who is almost alone in recognising the historiographical implications of the empirical fact that the State and its servants did not have a monopoly of wisdom:

Working people clashed with government because both sides, on the basis of their own research and experience, had reached contrasting conclusions on what constituted social need.

We now have much evidence that, to take a single example, O'Brien presented a coherent critique of this State policy - and of the political economy which underpinned it - as the work of Thompson (1963), Hollis (1970: Ch.6; 1973) and Plummer (1929) shows. But - and this is my major point - the form of State activities owes much to precisely these clashes of analysis and action. It is wrong to have a history (and sociology) which has 'class struggle' in one box and 'State formation' in another; the two are inextricably co-extensive as Marx established.

However justifiable it is for workers to claim that their situation was improved by Inspection (and both Horner and Tremenheere were thanked

by workers, and applauded by Marx, for this) these State servants served the needs of a particular constituency. They were 'gentlemen' advising and relating to 'gentlemen' - coalowners, guardians, mill-owners and so on. The creation of Inspectoral norms\* was eased by this similarity of class. It was also eased by the gentlemanly\*\* and 'professional' character of State employment at this level. W.J. Reader has argued that at the end of the 18th century the older 'trio of professions - law, medicine, and church - 'derived most of its standing from connection with the established order in the State' (Reader, 1969: 23) hence also, perhaps, the term used within the civil service of 'established' (when a person's post is made permanent); as well as the more generalized term Establishment. In 1851, 'gentlemanly' professions were defined as those 'more or less connected with the State' (Ibid., p.149). So much so, indeed, that 'the Lancet, speaking for general practitioners, could complain in 1855 'The State has never yet done justice to our profession' (Ibid., p.59). As T.H. Escott summarised in the 1880s: 'professions in England are valued according to their stability, their remunerativeness, their influence and their recognition by the State' (Escott, 1885: 337). This 'recognition' moreover was intensely regulatory: through 'statutory officers' (which certain bodies had to employ); 'statutory tasks' (which could only be performed by a stated professional); and the Registers maintained by the Privy Council (or other similar Councils) recording certification of each professional on a charter.\*\*\*

---

\* This is part of a more general problem discussed by Johnson, 1969.

\*\* Cf. Roberts (1960: Ch.V passim).

\*\*\* None of this denies that for the ruling classes professionals were (and always will be?) servants. My sketch here is perhaps (of necessity) somewhat overdrawn.

This is a good example of how what appears as a neutral technique (like the census) can control the content of what is done; marginalizing other ways of doing the same activity - making those 'other ways' inadequate, inferior, and illegal.

The 'revolution' I am discussing entailed precisely such procedures. Central to it was Inspection - which involved not simply forms of gathering and monopolising information of a political as much as a technical character, but also involved what I propose to call 'broadcasting' certain kinds of regulatory information. First, we should note that forms of mutual communication and standardisation were instituted amongst Inspectors and similar officers in the same kind of work. Secondly, we should note the frequent occurrence of the practice whereby an individual inspector acts as a bearer of relevant information about a technical or 'moral' procedure from the 'best' institution (factory, mine, school or Union) in his area to all the rest. In this way, and frequently in full consciousness of their mission, the Inspectors embodied the definition of the Capitalist State given by Neil Lockwood

Firstly to stave off a crisis which may put in question the existence of the capitalist class.  
Secondly to enforce the change demanded by capital of labour. Thirdly to enforce/mediate that change within the capitalist class.

(Lockwood, 1970: 6)

A variant pattern entailed the provision, from above, of exemplary institutions established by full or partial public funds. Both model institutions acted as 'moral beacons', illustrative of exemplary transformations, playing a vanguard role vis à vis other institutions of the same type.

Acceptable in terms of status, often already known through familial or political connections, these State servants 'spread the word' from the best to the median institutions which they supervised. There were, of course, 'bad' institutions whose existence, in that form, threatened the overall strategy for that sector; introducing 'irregularities' into the labour market, for example. With such institutions prosecution was always a last resort - the glaring contrast with the laws relating to the institutions of labour is worth stressing - instead, words of warning direct to the owner, or his agents (or to a key Guardian or Governor) were to be preferred. Often this 'advice' took the form of a comment from another (equal) owner or local figure and/or from some national political figures who had local influence. This systematic 'broadcasting' was later formalised, of course, through what are still innocuously called 'administrative circulars' on the one hand; and the regional and national conference of 'local' officials, on the other. I do not wish to suggest a smooth progress here; such meetings were often the site of struggles within a particular kind of capital activity - between, for example, the mine owners of the North and those of the Midlands. It was frequently the case, however, as the century progressed that the capital-intensive, larger employers would increase the pressure for a rigorous application of the law against the smaller firms who flagrantly disobeyed it. Similarly, by the 1850s antiTruck Associations are being founded and funded by large employers.

As far as negative evidence is concerned, we have only to note the frequency with which the Commons called for returns and reports on the activities of these new State servants. This becomes, in time, transmuted subtly into the Commons 'audit' of a practice which

had its own momentum and partial autonomy. Relatedly, Treasury control is not really an issue for the kind of practices I am describing, (although it becomes crucial in terms of the much more technical supervision of the Mining Inspectors after 1850, for example) because it was, in terms of the momentous revolution which it accomplished an extremely cost-effective set of procedures.

Inspection has, of course, been studied - best by Harris (1955), but also by Roberts, Parris and, in relation to education, by Ball - but these authors often do not seem aware of what they are studying. Joseph Fletcher, for example<sup>\*</sup>, in his 1851 book calling for more State aid to education, wrote:

the instrument of Inspection, while it is one of which the public will never stand in awe, because it is so easy to remove a misbehaving inspector, is of sufficient power to accomplish all that the State can desire.

(Fletcher, 1851: 33; qu. Ball, 1963: 242)<sup>\*\*</sup>.

An equally significant perspective was indicated by Kay, speaking of Inspectors, when he wrote in 1853

Their labours have also spread among the humbler classes a general sense of the vigilant care of the Government for their well-being, and thus, among other concurrent causes, have promoted that political repose which has characterised the English poor,

---

\* Secretary to the Royal Commissions on Handloom Weavers and Children's Employment (1842), in 1842 one of the secretaries of the London Statistical Society, Tremenheere's successor as H.M.I. for British & Foreign Schools, until 1852 - he is a representative example.

\*\* Henriques 1974, 175f, offers a general discussion of inspection.

while the whole of Europe has been threatened with a Socialist rebellion, has suffered the confusion of Democratic revolutions, and the revulsion of military despotism.

(Kay, 1853: 88; also qu Ball, 1963: 1)\*

Over a quarter of a century earlier, Brougham had generalized the same point

It is highly useful to the community that the true principles of the constitution, ecclesiastical and civil, should be well understood by every man who lives under it. The great interests of civil and religious liberty are mightily promoted by such wholesome instruction; but the good order of society gains to the full as much by it.

(Brougham, 1825: 5; Cf. Webb, 1955b; Hollis, 1970)

P.E.H. Hair, and to a lesser extent MacDonagh (1967: 84-86), sustains my point for the more technical areas

the imposition of regular mines inspection by State officers in 1850 was necessary not only to force the owners to do what had not obviously been in their economic interest to do but also enabled them to do

---

\* Three-quarters of a century later, David Glass informs us, Sir Cyril Norwood, in 1929, argued that elementary education had prevented 'Bolshevism, Communism, and theories of revolt from obtaining any real hold upon the people of this country' (Glass in Ginsburg, 1959: 326). Paul Corrigan's Ph.D. thesis shows that no actual victory was won at all since, as Jack Common argued in 1938 (p.60-61) what he revealingly called 'the council school' was 'in origin quite alien to working class life ... it is not 'our' school... The government forced them on us... school in working class life expresses nothing of that life; it is an institution clapped on from above.' Cf. Willis, 1976.

what, without State and legislative backing, they would most likely never have been able to do: discipline a traditionally unruly labour force in strict, tedious and often wage-reducing cautionary procedures.

(Hair, 1968: 560)

Brebner, in that perceptive 1948 paper, had footnoted how 'the factory inspectors of the [eighteen-]thirties secured the co-operation of the "good" manufacturers, and thereby the growth of intervention, by agreeing to enforce the regulations upon their "rascally" competitors ...' (p.66, fn.9). Webb (1955a: 357) has similarly stressed the importance of moral persuasion rather than formal prosecution.

Edmonds (1958), Ball (1963) and Johnson (Ph.D.; pp. 76f) all stress how HMIs spread educational ideas; of course they had considerable sanctions to 'enforce' their ideas and they also offered 'suggested' curricula and reading materials, as Ball discusses. E.C. Tufnell in 1837 made the same point in relation to the Poor Law, in a letter to the Commissioners : 'far more can be done by indoctrinating the Guardians through the agency of the assistant Commissioner' ( MH 32/69 6 Feb 1837)\*. Harris (1955) is the fullest study of Inspection; 'a dynamic process' as his half-title page states. Despite his Whiggish tone (and acceptance of Martineau's analysis of the Old Poor Law as objective, pp. 32f) he shows how many kinds of money grant were linked to Inspectoral rights. He also offers as first, of seven 'convincing reasons' for inspection: 'one of the

---

\* Quoted Richards Ph.D. p. 224. I acknowledge here how much I have gained from Dr. Richards' work which complements my own so exactly.



major purposes of central control is to secure the enforcement of a national minimum standard' (p.9).

We are thus pointing to the transmission (and reproduction) of particular social relations - relations of production in a sense clarified in Chapter Two - 'enforced' by State action in a complex procedure which, in turn, increases (establishes) the State agencies which are doing the inception and regulation. The forms of that regulation varied empirically. But whether one examines local conflicts (as Foster has done) or national policies (as Richards and I have done) the impression of a strategy rather than an ad hoc collection of incidents is overwhelming. Nothing said here ignores the existence and the genuineness of Christian and humanitarian perspectives or that much legislation was a 'reaction' to forms of 'pressure from without'. Politics matters in terms of timing and detail; but there is a dialectic at work here between constraint and construction. The State Servants are themselves not free agents - the limits of their effectiveness are set by the profitability of the most efficient enterprises and institutions in the sector which they supervised. But if they were themselves regulated, how much more constraining was the combined effect of both their (State) constructed limitations and barriers which declared some forms of schooling, politics, organised social literacy, and so on, illegitimate; and the regulating rhythms of capitalist production itself, upon those whose market position was extremely weak as a class, let alone as sections or, worse, individuals within that class.

The same holds true for the 'models' of improvement in each sector. Indeed Inspection only works when it has such a basis in material relations. In the case of Tremenheere, not only does he

spread the word from more efficient to less efficient colliery; his reports also introduce a particular educational scheme - the 'prize schemes' to encourage a particular kind of educational activity amongst owners, agents and pit workers alike (Cassell M.Sc. thesis; Tremenheere, 1857). In Horner's case there is praise for the improving manufacturer and millowner - apart, that is, from 'intervention' by giving a particular interpretation of legislation, or praising and circulating the antistrike tract of a manufacturer. Related to circulation within each 'circuit', there is the national circulation effected through (i) returns to central office and (ii) meetings of all Inspectors. Relatedly there is the extensive circulation - running to thousands of copies in Tremenheere's case - of the printed reports back to the employing class in the localities.

In the case of 'model' schools and Poor Law Unions there are the two different aspects already mentioned: on the one hand 'models' established from above; on the other, 'models' discovered and defined from above. Both apply, as I discuss later, to the career of the schoolteacher. In his 'official' pamphlet Recent measures (1839a: Ch.4) Kay discusses a 'Model school' in precisely these terms; and Smith (1923: 180f) reports that Kay wanted a model school in every HMI's district. There are strong traces of Kay's influence in the Edinburgh Review's comment on the Committee's work in 1842 (p. 137f) where the model school concept is discussed in relation to the basis existing in the Battersea Training College privately founded by Tufnell and Kay

It is this combination of means and methods which I think constitutes the 'national system of improvement' to which the State

Servants refer their own activities. Despite Hampson's criticisms (1976: 794) I therefore support the suggestion made in Roberts' recent book (1976) that 'Improvement' (Cf. Briggs, 1959a) is a contrapuntal antidote to 'Revolution' and requires as much study. My only correction, not in itself minor, would be to suggest that 'Improvement' is revolutionary.

---

State Servants and State Formation: four examples\*

Leonard Horner

Leonard Horner's key service to the State was that of mediation: 'without men of open mind and moral stature such as Horner' argues Henriques (1971: 19), in a recent survey of the early Factory Acts, 'the pioneer experiments in enforcement could have stoked the fires of class conflict ... most inspectors were sufficiently detached to hold some sort of balance between masters and men'. Marx goes further, and joins the factory operatives who sent testimonials on Horner's retirement and at his death: 'Horner ... rendered undying service to the English working class.'

---

\* What follows should be supplemented by (i) the first Appendix of this thesis which gives eclectic biographies of the four State servants; (ii) Chapter 4 on their 'sociology'; (iii) the studies cited. The only comparable general survey is given by Roberts (1960: Chs.5f) but (a) his theoretical perspective is flawed as I indicated in my first chapter; (b) he concentrates on School Inspection. But it is the only similar survey. Later contrasts are provided by Kelsall, 1955; Chapman, 1970.

He carried on a life-long contest, not only with the embittered manufacturers, but also with the Cabinet, to whom the number of votes given by the masters in the Lower House, was a matter of far greater importance than the number of hours worked by the 'hands' in the mills.

(Marx, 1867: 225 fn.1; slightly different translation given in Penguin, 1976, edition, p. 334 fn.10)

In establishing Horner's contribution I shall not repeat familiar discussions and controversies concerning the changing relations of factory production\* or the Factory Acts themselves\*\*. Horner (1785-1864) forms part of that Whig formation and connection whose existence is an integral aspect of State formation. His elder brother, Francis (1778-1817) was briefly an M.P. and helped found the Edinburgh Review\*\*\*; there is much evidence that Leonard benefitted from being Francis' brother. But their conjoint 'generating milieu' is equally significant: from Edinburgh Whiggery came Brougham; Cockburn; Jeffrey; and Murray. To briefly recall my remarks above (Cf. Appendix I below): both Francis and Leonard were tutored by, and friends of, Dugald Stewart; both read and discussed Adam Smith; Francis was a correspondent of Malthus; Leonard read Dugald Stewart's article for the supplement to Britannica

---

\* The thesis of Kuczynski, 1945:Ch.2, as extended by Foster, 1969, is particularly important in relating legislation, inspection and intra-capitalist differences.

\*\* Two doctoral theses are in progress - indications may be obtained from Martin, 1969; Carson, 1970a,b; Cf. Robson, 1934; Blelloch, 1938; Djang, 1942; Thomas, 1948; Ward, 1962; Lubenow, 1971:Ch.5 and Henriques, 1971.

\*\*\* I preface my biography of Leonard with a sketch of Francis' life.

in draft. After education in High School and University in Edinburgh, Leonard Horner was made a partner in his father's linen business; he was also briefly an underwriter at Lloyds. Leonard was also a scientist - his studies in geology earned him a Fellowship of both the Royal Society (of London) and that of Edinburgh; he was made a Fellow of the Geological Society in its second year, 1808; and served as one of its secretaries for several years after 1810, was VicePresident in 1828 and President twice, in 1846 and 1860.

By 1812 Leonard was already interested in modern theories of education<sup>\*</sup>; in that year he recommended his brother to visit a model school. During the next twenty years, Leonard established three different 'circles' of friendship: first, Edinburgh Whigs and other 'progressives' of that city - with them he helped found both the Edinburgh School of Arts (in 1821, the 'first' Mechanics Institute, which became Watts Institution, and later still the Heriot Watt Institution and University) and the Edinburgh Academy. Secondly Horner was friendly with the popularizers of political economy - such as Mrs Marcet and J.R. McCulloch, as well as various 'intellectual families' - the Darwins; the Galtons; and the Mills. His scientific pursuits (and his Edinburgh base) led to friendship with Lyon Playfair; and two of his daughters married into the Lyell (geology) family. Third, he was accepted in very 'High Society': the Hollands; Labouchère; Baring. Aristocratic families and Prime Ministers and Home Secretaries are mentioned in the 1820s and 1830s. Later he seems to have had little shortage of dining companions when on 'circuit' as an Inspector - particularly when he was based in Manchester.

---

\* In the second endnote to this Chapter I discuss Horner's educational ideas and his two Edinburgh ventures. Note there the links with Brougham.

Given that background, he is not an unexpected choice for Brougham's recommendation, in 1828, as the first Warden of London University; a post which Horner found was not congenial and he resigned in 1831. Before that post he was already in correspondence with Sir Robert Peel (Senior), possibly sending Peel a memorial by his friend Jeffrey, on the Combination Acts. (Peel, 1891: 379-380). On retirement from London he and his family moved to North Germany. The circumstances which occasioned Horner's choice as a commissioner to assist in the 1833 Factory Enquiry are obscure; it is probable that the Whig connection will suffice. Thomas (1948: Ch.4) and Ward (1962: 94f) provide adequate accounts of the Commission and its reports (P.P. 1833 XX) but it is worth stating here the casualness of the voting<sup>\*</sup> which accompanied many of these 'innovations'. On 19th April 1833 by 74 votes to 73 the Commons agreed to a Commission (Halevy, 1923b: 111; Thomas, 1948: 45). Although it may be true to describe the 1833 Central Commissioners as "Disinterested men, cool, analytical and unsentimental, strongly approved of by J.S. Mill ... disciples of the great Bentham ..." (Ward, 1962: 94); it is not true of Horner. Indeed, Finer (1952a: 67) reports Chadwick considering that Horner sent in a 'useless' report to the Centre; Roberts (1960: 163) confirms this and shows Chadwick's antipathy to many appointments at this time. One letter

---

\* Smith (1923: 73 fn.1) gives the voting on 16 August 1833 on the educational grants-in-aid as 50 to 26; this clashes with the best modern account (Alexander, 1974) which states the vote as 52 to 28 (p.81). Their point (p.80 and n.14) that attendance was not sparse (average for Supply days being 63 MPs) confirms my point exactly. The 'politics' of these issues did not reside in their administration; but in the more obvious ideological clashes. This may mean we have to consider work on voting in the Commons carefully.

survives of Horner's work (Memoir, I: Vol.I: 282): writing from Stroud in Gloucester, he said

Many of the manufacturers we have seen are extremely opulant, and so far from there being any necessity for new laws to protect the children employed in factories here, any interference would be sure to do harm.

This is in marked contrast to his views expressed to Tremenheere in 1840; or his criticism of laissez faire in 1850; these tend to show how the political economy he had imbibed was changed through experience.

At the conclusion of his work for the Commission, Horner returned to Germany. The Report codified Chadwick's distinction between agents capable of making contracts (males around age 13), and others (all children below 9), with an intermediate category: (young persons and women). This classification of labour appears again and again in Parliamentary Papers until the twentieth century, with the first category gradually changed. The first category had to be 'free'; the second category had to be 'protected by restriction' and the third, intermediate category, had to be 'regulated'. So that the factory system should not be 'damaged' the Report recommends the introduction of the relay system; to protect a wider system, it is worth adding, they also recommend the crucial educational clauses. Education and Inspection are thus linked. But Inspection was also linked, in the Report, to requests from 'several eminent manufacturers' who wanted to ensure a general 'obedience to any legislative measures' (Thomas, 1948: 57; Foster, 1969: 5 ). Some of the Opposition to the eventual Bill also reveals

this; for some opponents the Bill was designed for 'a few great Mill Owners' only. Thirdly, Inspection, in the Act of 1833 (Section 17) was linked directly to the failure of the 1802 legislation. (Thomas, 1948: 68f).

Althorp's Bill became law as an 'Act to regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom' (Royal Assent, 29 August 1833; see Horner's own analysis in his 1834 pamphlet). The original Inspector for Scotland, Ireland and the North of England, Musgrave, retired in October 1833 and Horner was approached\* through his friend Francis Jeffrey to whom Lord Melbourne, the Home Secretary, had made a 'gift' of the post. Horner accepted immediately. Horner is frequently regarded as Senior Inspector, although he was formally simply one amongst the others, Thomas (1948: 98 fn.14) calls him 'outstanding'; Henriques (1971) considers him a 'virtual leader'; R.K. Webb (1968: 242) agrees with both the testimonials from the Cotton Operatives who called Horner 'Chief Inspector of Factories'; and for Sir James Graham in 1842 Horner was 'Inspector-General of Factories' (Graham, 1907, Vol.1: 343). The Act, apart from enforcing the regular reports of the Inspectors, established (Section 45) that they must meet at least once a year in conference to try to secure uniformity. At these meetings\*\* - as with the

---

\* Horner probably owed the 'approach' to Brougham. On 15th February 1833 (Brougham MSS 737) Horner wrote to Brougham indicating his 'desire to obtain some employment in my own country' and on 26 Nov 1833 (Ibid. 175-79) he thanks Brougham for suggesting his name to Lord Melbourne. There are over 40 letters from Horner in the Brougham MSS. from 1821 to 1859 - they show Horner's superior knowledge of social structure.

\*\* PRO.LAB 15 Records these meetings; The first quarto volume extends from 1836 to 1844; the first meeting [Contd. on next page(p.166)]



general correspondence\* - Horner frequently takes the lead; it is, for example, frequently his methods of work, or his regulations, which form the basis for subsequent joint methods or regulations. Horner's first published report (P.P. 1834 (596) XLIII) is dated 28 November 1833. On 29th he wrote to Mary, his daughter, from Belfast, saying that the millowners there 'naturally dislike the Act, like any other interference, but they say that if they were to have one, that which has been passed is very little open to objection ... They have all said that they will actually co operate in all the provisions which concern the education of the children, and indeed in any other' (Memoir, I: Vol.1: 287)\*\*

Horner conceptualised himself, in relation to the Civil Service, as a free agent, responsible directly to political officers of the Crown. As he wrote, it was 'the absence of all control, except that of the Secretary of State, and the independence of action which I feel ...' (Ibid., p. 288)\*\*\*. He often speaks of writing his reports personally for Lord John Russell or Sir George Grey. This feeling of direct access, of 'freedom of action', is essential to the constitution of an Inspectoral identity which could sustain Whig (patrician) distance from Trade.

---

[\*\* contd. from previous page] recorded is from 8th to 16th September, 1836; the second folio volume extends until 1849, it is indexed (unlike the first) and shows equal entries for R.J. Saunders and L. Horner.

\* PRO HO 87 records the early 'case law' and discussions over, e.g. conditions of service for the Inspectors and their subInspectors/Superintendents.

\*\* He reports similar views from owners in Scotland and Northern England (Memoir I: Vol.1: 288f).

\*\*\* Cf. letter to his wife 5 Oct 1837 (Ibid., 350)

Horner mentions in his first official reports that when he arrived in Glasgow he found the 1833 Act imperfectly understood so 'I prepared and published, in a cheap form, a small pamphlet, which I entitled "The Factories Act explained" ', and he reprints the pamphlet in his report. The publication, in its original form (1834) extends for twenty-seven pages and has a preface which states:

This publication is intended chiefly for the Working classes ... as [on visits to Factories] I can have only a very limited personal intercourse with the operatives, I take this mode of communicating to them, what I have said to their employers.

Glasgow, 7 March 1834 L.H.

The pamphlet, apart from presenting the main features of the 1833 Act, also includes a summary of the amending Act of 1834 (4 & 5 William IV c.1; 20 February 1834) changing the definition of month from 'Lunar' to 'Calendar'. Horner appends some 'Remarks on the origin, nature and tendency of the Factories Regulation Act' which review events in the early 1830s and draw out how the Act is part of a 'general' system of 'legislative restraints' (Horner, 1834:19f). Apart from providing his own 'Plan for working with relays of children in factories'<sup>\*</sup> Horner counters any argument about the loss of earnings for families from relays by asking (rhetorically) 'how much greater cause of complaint would there have been if the Ten Hours Labour Bill had passed?' (Ibid., p.23)

---

\* This entailed children aged 9 to 13 working from 0600 to 0900 and 0930 to 1400 for Five days; and additionally 1500 to 1900 on the sixth day, a working week of 46.5 hours plus, as 'time ... at the disposal of the millowner, for cleaning &c', 1.5 hours. Horner acknowledges the help given to him by 'a gentleman of most extensive practical experience as a Cotton Spinner'.

Probably the most important theme in the pamphlet is Horner's stress on education; Horner considered it 'a peculiar merit of this Act, that, by preventing children from being fully employed in the Factories, between nine and thirteen years of age, time is given to them to acquire a thoroughly good and useful education' (Ibid., 24). Horner supplies the content of 'good' and 'useful' thus: the children

will receive a good education, and have religious and moral principles so instilled into them day by day for a long period as cannot fail to make an impression upon their characters ... Daily application, for some years, of a well organised system, will alone give fixed religious principles, habits of moral rectitude, and a taste for pursuits worthy of a rational and responsible being.

(Ibid., 23, 24; his emphasis)

Horner's letters and reports<sup>\*</sup> agree with this priority for education, and with the content indicated here. As Henriques has correctly summarized: 'To the Inspectors, education, or [N.B. PC ]moral training, was the main purpose of the law' (1971: 15). Here the technical-legal regulation and the politico-moral provision flow into one another.

By mid 1836 Horner was the premier Inspector of Factories in terms of area. On 9th June 1836 Robert Rickards resigned through illhealth and Horner took over as Inspector for Lancashire, Yorkshire, the North Midlands and North Wales on 14th June.<sup>\*\*</sup> In March 1837

---

\* Cf. the appendix on factory schools to his 1838 reports (P.P.1837-8 [131] XXVIII) and his special report on the educational clauses (P.P. 1839 (42) XLII). On education: Robson, 1931; Thomas, 1948:Ch.11; E.L. Edmonds, 1958; Sanderson, 1967: 271f.

\*\* Horner was succeeded in Scotland and Ireland [Contd. on next page]

Horner requested a reduction in area, but the request was ignored; in July 1837 the Inspectors (LAB 15/1 f.75) entered a joint plea for reorganization as a letter to Lord John Russell. On 3rd August the new proposals were resubmitted and on 8th August they were approved (HO 87/1 f.88; PP 1839 (159) XIX). Through this Horner took back the Northern counties (Cumbria and Northumbria) and gave away most of Yorkshire and part of the Midlands to one Inspector; and North Wales and the rest of the Midlands to another. This left him with 1484 mills and, by late 1836, five superintendents.\*

Horner was active in the educational and statistical movements of the 1830s: he was a member of the Central Society of Education from 1838 and of the Statistics Committee of the British Association from 1834; he also attended other meetings, for example of the Manchester Statistical Society. Horner studied overseas developments in education and translated Cousin's report on public education in Holland in 1838. Ball argues that 'the only real foreign influence on the development of the [Educational] Inspectorate came from Holland' (Ball, 1963: 6)\*\* Horner's educational intentions

---

by James Stuart who has been well studied, by Henriques (1970). Note here the influence of patronage, despite the resistance of Chadwick and others. Stuart was an exception to many of the consensual practices of the Inspectorate, especially over relays (Ibid, 45) and Horner and Stuart frequently clashed (Ibid., 43f).

\* Copies of Horner's regulations to millowners and circulars to his Superintendents can be studied (P.P. 1836(483)XLV;215f; P.P. 1837(67)L: 9f). For other administrative matters see Djang, 1942; Thomas, 1948 *passim*, who reports Horner's attendance at meetings in detail. Horner's innovation of 'telling children's age by their teeth' (Ward, 1962:64) and his pressure for birth certificates, are significant.

\*\* Ball (1963:3) details other reports on foreign schemes: Pillans, Horner's friend, in evidence to SC and in the Edinburgh Review reported on the French schemes; In 1834 Cousin's report on Prussia was translated into English.

were not only aided by the sections of the 1833 Act, but by the letter from Fox Maule to all Inspectors in 1836 asking that the educational clauses be

strictly enforced ... no doubt, serious inconvenience will attend ... strict execution; but their Lordships ... do not consider themselves justified in allowing any further latitude ...

(P.P. 1837 (74) XXXI, p.2)

Sanderson's recent survey (1967) highlights the work of Horner and has found two contrasting (but not contradictory) perspectives amongst the Lancashire employers. For some there was a commitment to employee effectiveness which echoed the traditional paternalism of a Master for his Servants<sup>\*</sup>. Such employers were praised by Horner. But there were also employers who were hostile to the enforcement of educational clauses; and, following the above 'Instruction' from Fox Maule, Sanderson shows Horner increasing the proportion of prosecutions for 'educational offences' (Ibid., 275). What is important here (recalling the work of Kuczynski and John Foster already mentioned) is that Sanderson can show that the major division between these two groups concerns the size of the workforce: small firms resist enforcement; larger firms anticipate the regulations. But matters are not that simple, of course; some large employers resist inspection and enforcement for two reasons: they object to intervention by a State which they do not regard as representative of their interests; secondly, they do not see why employers should bear a cost which should be communal.

---

\* I am thinking here of the paternalism of Crowley (Flinn, 1957) or smaller paternalists (Cf. Hunt, 1970). On problems of 'factory discipline' Cf. Pollard, 1963; 1965; Thompson, 1967.

Complexity increases when we discover that both kinds of employer analysed by Sanderson are present together in those groups who founded the Manchester Statistical Society - in one case (the Greg brothers) different members of the same family take different sides. Sanderson considers that the major disagreement was over means - crudely, who should be made to pay; but his analysis is also congruent with the quotation of Neil Lockwood which I used above - for some employers the State increasingly becomes a constituent of their profitability.

Sanderson points to the significance of a pamphlet issued in London in 1837: Nassau Senior's Letters on the factory Act<sup>\*</sup> includes a long detailed letter from Leonard Horner (Leeds, 23 May 1837). Senior's major aim, as is well known<sup>\*\*</sup>, is to prove that 'the whole net profit is derived from the last hour' (Senior, 1837:12, his emphasis). In two letters to Poulett Thomson, President of the Board of Trade, Senior tries to argue that Inspection weakens the ability of U.K. industry to compete; that the work

---

\* On Nassau Senior in general see Levy, 1943. On this pamphlet, written by Senior after a semi official tour with Lord Lansdowne's son and others, Cf. Ibid., 107f. Horner appears, from this account, to have been present (he may have been a member) at the regular monthly meeting of the Political Economy Club in May 1837 when, with Chadwick in the chair, the ideas of the Letters were discussed, both LH and Senior speaking.

\*\* Marx (1867:Ch.9;Sect.3) devotes some space to this, using Horner's Letter to refute Senior. Marx also reports that Senior's 'battle cry' was really against Ten Hours legislation 'In the London Economist of the 15th April 1848, the same cry was again raised by James Wilson, an economic mandarin of high standing: this time in opposition to the 10 hours bill' (Marx, 1867:229). On The Economist, Cf. Gordon, 1955.

is so easy that long hours of work are practicable. His account also admits that the Factory Act has increased the hours of adult spinning operatives and diminished their pay. Regarding the educational clauses, Senior reports that larger manufacturers were calling for Government provided schools and teachers and for the requirement that 'after a given time no child shall be admitted to a factory until it can read and write fluently' (Senior, 1837: 22). Senior closes by saying 'I only repeat my own words in the Poor Law Report'

The factory work-people in the country districts are the plumpest, best clothed, and healthiest looking persons of the labouring class that I have ever seen. The girls, especially, are far more good-looking (and good looks are fair evidence of health and spirits) than the daughters of agricultural labourers.

(Ibid., p.23)

One does not have to be Bronterre O'Brien to ask for comments on the factory work people of the towns and for a comparison between the labouring class (whether male or female) and the ruling class! When Senior offers a comment on 'Manchester operatives' he does admit they were 'sallow and thinner' but adds

my only wonder was that tolerable health could be maintained by the inmates of such houses [as those in 'Irish Town, or Ancoats, and Little Ireland']

(Ibid., p.24)

This has the effect of shifting attention to the 'racial' or

'domiciliary'<sup>\*</sup> characteristics of the group considered.

Finally, but importantly, Senior reports opposition from employers to Horner's 1836 request for an extension of Inspectoral powers; opposition is evident from such works as R.H. Greg's The factory question (1837, qu. Thomas, 1948: 105f). Senior adds a familiar twist - the flight of British capital; he opines that if Horner's request is granted 'a considerable number of the educated and intelligent mill-owners ... those who have the sensibilities of gentlemen, will cease to follow their occupation within the British Isles' (Senior, 1837: 27).

Horner's letter to Senior is firm. He takes issue with every point of fact cited by Senior: rates of profit; injuries to children in employment; actions by Inspectors or Superintendents. Equally he concedes some of Senior's ideological points, over minimal interference<sup>\*\*</sup>, for example; or that all over the age of 13 years are 'free agents'. He takes the offensive, however, when stressing how brief and fleeting was Senior's contact with factory life; arguing that therefore Senior could not interpret his sources of evidence: 'the most honest men sometimes view things through a medium that distorts the truth' (Horner, 1837: 32).

---

\* Senior goes on to talk of these districts being built by 'small speculators with an utter disregard to everything except immediate profit'. Senior knew the area through reading Kay's 1832 pamphlets and materials produced by the Manchester Statistical Society.

\*\* Thomas, 1948, and Ward (1962: 127f) report a related procedure called 'mitigation' which enables some employers to evade the law through pleading with the Inspector.



Horner argued that the Penalties fund (of fines from offences under the 1833 Act) should be used to equip schools and offer grants in aid (P.P. 1839 XLII 355f). His advocacy of the education of factory children led to early contact with Kay. In 1840 Horner was able, with the help of Kay, to secure the suspension of the requirement, by the National Society, of the learning of the Established Church's catechism in factory schools, where the parents so requested (Memorial, II: 27, letter 30 April 1840; P.P. 1840 (261) XXIII). In 1853 Horner suggested that the Penalties fund be used for establishing and extending 'lending libraries' in factory schools and appends his own list of books which combined 'amusement and instruction' whilst being 'at the same time free from every immoral and irreligious taint' (P.P. 1852-3 [1642] XL 548, 551, Appx A). He seems unaware that the Committee on Education of the Privy Council had a list of recommended books. (P.P. 1851 (103) XLIII Scedule A; Cf. Ball, 1963 and Johnson Ph.D. thesis).

Horner, like many of the State servants, was aware that what he was concerned with was education for a particular class, whose habits and values differed radically from those of his own class (including those taught to his own class). He made the point in his 1837 Letter to Senior

length of attendance at school is the more  
 necessary for the children of the lower orders,  
 because they are cut off from those opportunities  
 of moral and intellectual cultivation, which  
 the children of more wealthy classes enjoy, from  
 the conversation of educated persons around them.

(Horner, 1837: 31)

He repeated this point in his official report on the educational clauses:

Independently, therefore, of all considerations of justice to the children, that they shall not be cut off from the advantages of education, and of a wise State policy, which forbids that the children belonging to any class of the community should be placed in circumstances which render it impossible for them to be trained up in religious and moral habits, a daily attendance at school is necessary, to secure them from risk of injury by excess of bodily labour.

(P.P. 1839 (42) XLII, p.355)

This ignores that there were rich but alternative values - including those which must be called 'religious' and 'moral' in the working-class home and community. But the notion of the working-class family as a deficient moral entity had a long history. The H.M.I. Rev. H. Mose<sup>e</sup>ly noted in the Minutes of the Committee on Education in 1847

Their home education leaves them ignorant of ... a thousand things, the knowledge of which is necessary to a right intelligence of the relation in which we stand to one another, and to the Government of the country, but which we never think of teaching to our own children, because they pick them up from the ordinary intercourse of society.

(qu Ball, 1963: 117; Cf. Johnson, 1970).

What is really at issue is two fold: firstly, the provision - by compulsion - of a set of politico-moral values injected into the curricula of schools for working class children; secondly, and therefore, a belief that education is not simply (to use the cliché) 'the three Rs'. As Horner said in his 1840 pamphlet:

It cannot be too often repeated, so long as the delusion is so prevalent as it is at present, that a child who knows how to read is not educated, but has only made the first step in that intellectual, moral, and religious training, which alone constitutes education, and which can only be given by a long continued attendance in a good school.

(Horner, 1840: 17)

By 1840 Horner was involved, with Ashley<sup>\*</sup> in Parliament, and it seems<sup>\*\*</sup>, with Kay and Chadwick outside, in attempts to have more factory regulation established through legislation. From March to July Ashley's Select Committee had taken evidence from 26 witnesses (P.P. 1840 X; six reports; Thomas, 1948:Ch.12; Ward, 1962: 200f). In June Horner was in contact with Chadwick, partly to have his 1840 pamphlet 'noticed'. In July Horner attended Parliament to hear Ashley speak and met him (Memoir, I: Vol.2:Ch.1; Memoir, II: 28f; Richards Ph.D. thesis) and in the same month (according to Richards' PhD thesis, at Horner's request) Kay, Chadwick, Ashley and Horner met.

Horner wrote two relevant letters in this month; the second on 6th July mentions that the four would consult about tactics. The

---

\* On Ashley-Shaftesbury Cf. Bready, 1925; Finlayson, 1974.

\*\* See the Biographies in my Appendix, and Richards Ph.D. thesis, pp.190f.

first states:

I have had a conference with Mr. Chadwick and Dr. Kay who are quite likely to give Lord Ashley all the help they can, and to bring the immense staff of the Poor Law Commissioners, about 4,500 persons, over the Kingdom, to aid in the enquiry.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2, 5.7.40)

On the 13th July 1840, H.S. Tremenheere recorded in his Journal Met Mr. Leonard Horner, Factory Inspector, at the Council office today. He said that since his appointment - in 1833 he had not met six Mill Owners who expressed any sympathy with, or regard for the improvement of, the labouring classes in their employ!

(qu Webb, 1955a: 361 fn.25; Webb, 1960: 110, fn.1)

Following Ashley's successful motion of August 1840, the Children's Employment Commission was established in October with Horner, T.J. Saunders, Thomas Tooke and T. Southwood Smith as the Central Commissioners, and 20 Assistant Commissioners. (Richards Ph.D., p.193f; Thomas, 1948; Ward, 1962: 210f). On 6th October 1842, Horner wrote from Manchester to Chadwick, recording Horner's estimation of the Commission 'as a great step in [? the] moral improvement of the people' (Chadwick Mss. 1051). This is congruent with the stress on the need to investigate moral conditions in the instructions to Assistant Commissioners reprinted with the first Report. The Commission met from 1840 to 1842; its first report, concentrating on Mines, was issued in May 1842; the second, in January 1843, on Trades and Manufactures. The first led (helped

along by the political events of 1842 as sketched by Mather (1970) and the subsequent Tancred Midland Mining Commission report) to the 1842 Mines Act and Tremenheere's appointment as first Mines (Mining) Inspector (Commissioner) from December 1843.

Sir Robert Peel<sup>\*</sup> did not seem to think that the May 1842 report was useful (Sir James Graham, as we shall see, thought it positively dangerous). On September 2nd Peel wrote to Graham

I wish we could appoint a Commission to ascertain the real truth as to the state of the relations between the employers and the employed in Collieries. I think it would be found that there are practical grievances - possibly not to be redressed by law - of which the employed have just reason to complain. What law cannot effect, exposure might.

After suggesting to Graham that the collieries were making such profits that the workpeople could be better paid and that there were 'galling regulations ... which justify complaint', Peel added

Without appointing a Commission, could we get such a man as Horner, or one of the best of your Poor Law Commissioners, to make a tour through Staffordshire and Shropshire, and get at some part of the truth at least, without ostentatious enquiry? (Peel, 1899: 543)<sup>\*\*</sup>

On 17th September 1842, Graham wrote to Peel

I own to you that I am afraid of an inquiry by a

\* On Peel, see Gash, 1974; 1976; but I find Beales' (1974) comments very useful in reshaping the image of this Tory reformer.

\*\* Cf. Ibid., p.547, where Peel asks Graham to think about a similar enquiry into the 'manufacturing districts' on Sep. 9th 1842.

new Commission into the want of moral and religious instruction in the manufacturing districts which have recently been disturbed.

I have no doubt that a frightful case of brutal ignorance and heathenish irreligion might be clearly established; and I am convinced that it is the paramount duty of the Government to apply a progressive remedy to an evil of such magnitude and danger. But, if you issue a Commission, you will excite to the utmost the hopes and fears of rival factions; the truth will be exposed in a light somewhat exaggerated, and the Government, which exposes to view so great a national deformity, ought to be prepared with an adequate remedy. A Commission is most useful to pave the way for a measure, which is preconcerted; take for example, the Poor Law Inquiry; it is often most embarrassing where it discloses the full extent of evils for which no remedy can be provided, as for example, the inquiry into the condition of the handloom weavers. I might add Lord Ashley's investigations into the sufferings of children employed in factories and mines.

(Peel, 1899: 549)

From an entry in Ashley's diary (7 May 1842; qu Bready, 1925: 270-271) Graham's animosity was very real:

The Report of the Commission is out - a noble document. The Home Office in vain endeavoured to hold it back; it came by a most providential mistake into the hands of members; and though the Secretary of State for a long

while prevented the sale of it, he could not prevent publicity, or any notice of motion.

Ward (1962: 213) has argued that Horner's experiences on the Commission altered his views concerning employers; but, from the entry in Tremeneere's Journal we know Horner had no high opinion before he was appointed to the Commission. Similarly - and again prior to the Commission's appointment - a careful reading (between the lines) of the joint Inspectors' comments on Ashley's Select Committee reports of 1840, reveals a critical attitude toward factory owners (P.P. 1840 (218) XXIII).

The first report of the Commission (P.P. 1842 [380] XV: 261) refers to the subsequent discussion of 'moral conditions' which is found in the second report (P.P. 1843 [430] XII). Here the need for a universal education is stressed by highlighting

low moral conditions ... evinced by a general ignorance of moral duties and sanctions ... this absence of restraint is the result of a general lack of moral and religious training.\*

Provision, moreover, must be compulsory since parents 'urged by poverty or improvidence, seek employment of their children as soon

---

\* Horner's letters in 1841 show him reporting the lack of schools in the Stalybridge area to the National Society, the British and Foreign Society, and the Committee of Council. When Graham reported to Peel (21 December 1842) that Horner had drawn up the educational clauses of the proposed Factory Bill with Saunders; Graham added that Horner 'has influence with the Dissenters' (Peel, 1899: 549). Cf. Horner's conversation with Tufnell (Memoir I:2:35f).

as they can'. Secondly, we can find here that subordinate ideology of many other similar Reports: education and training is linked to the value of labour (power) since 'the best educated men are the most valuable workmen, the most regular in their habits.'

During 1842 Graham and Peel drew up a Factory Bill with a strong educational emphasis; all the Factory Inspectors were consulted (Thomas, 1948: 194). The Factory Bill of 1843 aroused much opposition - there were 11,600 petitions from the Dissenting lobby (Ibid., p.197) since the Act envisaged a general taxation and a privileged position for the Church of England. The Bill was withdrawn. On 6th February 1844, Graham introduced an amended Bill which also showed the influence of the Inspectors in many specific clauses. The debates were as strong as in 1843 and consideration of the Bill was suspended (Thomas, 1948: 201f; Ward, 1962: 285f; Henriques, 1971: 15f).

Senior's view of 1837 were used against Ashley in the latter's attempt to extend Graham's restrictions from women and children to adult men. Graham upheld the distinction between adult men\* and the rest; the former 'stimulated by the honest desire of earning as much as they are able' should not be 'interfered with'. Ashley's final attempt to convert a Factory Bill into a Ten Hour Bill was defeated by Peel's threat to resign. According to Ward (1962: 287f) Peel 'urgently' tried to collect evidence from Horner to defeat

---

\* In a debate on 22 March 1844, Graham objected 'in principle' to the regulation of the labour of adult women. Indeed, he so feared a 'new social State' that he withdrew the Bill pro tem on 25th March 1844 (Thomas, 1948: 204-5)



Ashley's proposals. Certainly Horner recorded the final achievement of a relatively straightforward Act 'to amend the laws relating to Labour in Factories' (which came into force 6th June 1844) with the comment that it 'was a great triumph for Graham, who deserved it' (Memoir I: Vol.2: Ch.4).

The 1844 Act was important for the work of the Inspectorate: reports were now to be six-monthly rather than quarterly (the latter date from 1st January 1837: P.P. 1837 (74) XXXI p.37); Subinspectors\* (as the former Superintendents were now to be called) and Inspectors were to be paid for their travelling expenses. The 1844 Act also drew the Inspectorate together, and subordinated it collectively more firmly to the political Centre, as Thomas shows (1948: 260f). After 1846 individual reports were collectively vetted and any circular sent to any one Inspector by any official body had to be circulated to all of them. The Inspectors had had a uniform code since 1836 (P.P. 1837 (73) XXXI p.88f). The half-time system which the 1844 Act institutionalized was only finally abolished in 1918 when there were still 70,000 children being so educated (Thomas, 1948: 213fn.24; Blelloch, 1938 passim)

By 1845 Leonard Horner was already 60 years old, although he was not to retire for a further 15 years. His range of activities and interests is wide by any standard - especially as his work for the Geological Society increased during the first term of his Presidency\*\*. His social contacts remained wide. This is not an

---

\* Under the 1844 Act Subinspectors were to be paid £300 p.a.

\*\* He had to seek permission from the Secretary of State - again note Horner's mode of address: 'my superior officer, Sir James Graham' (Memoir I: Vol.2 letter 1 Dec 1844 to Charles Bunbury his son-in-law)

irrelevant point to Statecraft; it is a false understanding of social relations which leads to the separation of after dinner conversations from the more solid Blue Books and Archives. I will illustrate this with one incident concerning Palmerston and Kay's Gawthorpe Hall elsewhere, here I simply want to recall two points. In 1837, as Thomas (1948: 109f; Cf. H.O. 87/1) shows, the four Factory Inspectors were asked by Lord John Russell to send him 'any information which you may be able to furnish regarding the state of trade, the wages of labour, and the state of tranquility or excitement' in their districts. We know that other Inspectors also sent in 'extra' reports of this character. Their sources of information were frequently dinner companions. Fielden, in the House of Commons on 17th July 1840, was able to quote a document which showed that the Inspectorate was being used for spying. In defence, I must stress, the Government spokesmen defined the duty of all Inspectors as to acquire information about 'the condition and habits of the working classes' and to 'keep the Government informed' and, importantly, both Ashley and Disraeli supported the Government. Peel and Lord John Russell went further and justified spying as such for State purposes. Equally typically, perhaps, the man who had been the source of Fielden's information was dismissed with a certain fanfare; then quietly re-employed at a reduced salary, and later restored to his former salary.

Of course some afterdinner conversations were more important than others. In 1846 and 1847 Horner dined with Kay's friend Benjamin Heywood and met Sir Thomas Arbuthnot, the Commander of H.M. Forces in that district. Arbuthnot, Horner wrote to one of his daughters, 'receives regular reports<sup>\*</sup> from the officers subject

---

\* Sainty (1976) gives an account of the £529,000 Secret Service money spent between 1830 to 1886; he also indicates [Cont. on p.184]

to his command, and these he makes a monthly digest of, and forwards to Sir George Grey and the Duke of Wellington, to keep them acquainted with the State of the Manufacturing Population, which in these times of dull trade is very important' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 115).\*

In fact, as I argue in Chapter Four below, any specifically technical-practical reports only make sense within a wider moral-political framework.

Fielden's Act - the Ten Hours Bill - was passed in May 1847. This restricted all workers under 15 and all women workers to a working day of 11 hours and a week of 62 hours immediately; from 1st May 1848, the day was to be 10 hours and the week 58. Fielden was now 'the Workers' Friend' since Ashley had resigned on 31st January 1846 over Corn Law repeal. Fielden linked the reduction of worktime for young people to

religious instruction, without the knowledge of which it is vain to hope that they will be a creditable or even a safe community.

(qu Thomas, 1948: 293)

His April 1846 Bill was defeated, despite support from Sir George Grey, through Graham's opposition. In June 1846 Peel was defeated and Lord John Russell's administration formed, which included Sir George Grey as Home Secretary. In January 1847 Fielden introduced his Bill; on 19th February 1847 this had its second

---

[\* contd. from p.183]£140,000 spent in 1809-23 alone. On the general use of spies, the best sources are Darvall,1934; and E.P. Thompson,1963.

\* I am not suggesting this is a curious activity for any State, I merely show the involvement of various State servants in it.

reading without a division. On 3rd May what was now practically a Government Bill passed by 151 votes to 88; there being no delay in the Lords or with the Royal Assent, the latter was given 8th June 1847 (Cf. Marx, 1853).

Immediately Horner (P.P. 1847-8 [900] XXVI p.111f) and the other Inspectors report infringements and evasions (Thomas, 1948: 298f; Ward, 1962: 366f; Henriques, 1971: 16f). Horner inserted the main clauses of the 1847 Act in several newspapers. By now he realised that the relay system meant in practice that 'no restriction of the hours of ovrk could be enforced' (Ibid., p.159)\*. But with the 1848 revival in trade not only did infringements and evasions increase but the 'class struggle' between different fractions of the same class took a new turn. In that year the magistrates bench at Atherton dismissed Horner's case against a manufacturer working relays; other magistrates followed this precedent (Thomas, 1948: 303f). When Horner and the others appealed to the Home Office legal department they were not helped (H.O. 87/2). The Inspectors all agreed - either the law is enforced or abandoned; although one, Stuart, Inspector for Scotland, said he would ignore relays in his District. The crisis would be resolved, Cornwall Lewis told Horner, by fresh legislation.

Meanwhile Horner got on with some basic sociology: a survey of over 200 workers in his district in October 1848 'to ascertain the feeling of the work people of the factories as to the Ten Hours Act; whether the law passed ostensibly for their benefit is considered to

---

\* In 1848, Horner argues that the relay system is unfair to 'the millowners who obey the law' (P.P. 1849 [1017] XXII p.138). One of the firms prosecuted in 1848 was the Engels' Cotton Mill, for operating a relay system (P.P. 1849 [1084] XXII p.7).

be so by themselves' (Memoir I: Vol.2 26 October 1848). He found that people preferred shorter hours even if they had less wages; Horner's conclusion was 'I feel quite sure of this, that there will never be a return to twelve hours of work.' The fullest analysis of Horner's survey (P.P. 1849 [1017] XXII) is given by Smelser (1959: 304-312)\*.

As a consequence, Horner recognised the political dangers of the evasions already mentioned and the new attitudes of the magistrates. Further, one of Horner's subinspectors (Ryder) tried to prosecute a mill owner (Mills) for operating a relay system. Mills was fined £5 but appealed to the Court of Exchequer. Judgement was given on 8th February 1860\*\* - for Mills, against Ryder, Horner and the 1847 Act. The 'Barons of the Exchequer' (as the Times of 11th February 1850 aptly called them) considered that the 1844 and 1847 Acts had not established that all workers covered by those Acts should finish together, although they must start together and have their meal breaks at the same time (Thomas, 1948: 311f; Ward, 1962; 371f). Horner's (private) response was bitter and direct:

---

\* The total interviewed was 1153; of whom 67½% of the men, and 54½% of the women, preferred 10 hours' work a day and of the total 74½% were against returning to the 12 hour day. Horner himself interviewed 212 operatives (P.P. op. cit., p.15) or 265 (Ibid., Appendix). In an earlier report (P.P. 1847-48 [957] XXVI, p.3) Horner reported a survey by a "manager" who had found, of his 623 workers over 16, 480 for 11 hours' work a day, and 143 for ten hours' work. Cf. Smelser, 1959 generally (esp. Chs.11 and 14) and his 1963, but note the criticism of Anderson 1971a,c, 1973 and Cf. Thorpe, 1973. I am most grateful to Dr. Anderson for sending me his 1973 paper.

\*\* The full text was printed in the Champion 9 March 1850 and is reprinted in Thomas (1948: 422-425).

There is a very great degree of excitement among the factory operatives by the cruel disappointment to their hopes by the decision of the Court of Exchequer. I am inclined to think that it is as well that things have taken the turn they have done because there must now be an Act of Parliament to settle the question... The Government has behaved in a very discreditable way in this matter; so soon as doubt was thrown on the true meaning of the Act ... they should have brought the subject before Parliament. If they attempt to infringe upon the Ten Hours' Act, they will be assuredly beaten soon or later, for it has taken deep root in the good opinion of the operatives ... It quite disgusts me to hear the cold, calculating economists throwing aside all moral considerations, and with entire ignorance of the state of the people who work in factories, talking of its being an infringement of principle to interfere with labour. Why interfere with the use of capital in any way then? and do we not see laws passed every year to check the abuse of the application of capital, when it is productive of great moral and social evils\*.

Note here, the important shifts of perspective which Horner has made since the early writings on these questions in the 1830s.

---

\* The 'structural similarity' to some of the arguments given by Coleridge is very relevant to note here.

Moreover he concludes

If I were free to write, I could from my experience make such a statement as would show the fallacious reasonings, and bad political economy, of these very economists, who, with their extravagant extension of their doctrine of laissez faire, bring discredit upon the science they cultivate.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2:158, Horner's emphasis)

When the Government did introduce a Bill, it was a bitter disappointment to the Central Committee and members of the Ten Hours movement. It was a compromise act: in the words of the Champion (qu Thomas, 1948: 324) 'the meanness of the Manchester School has triumphed over the honour of the English gentleman'. Children - incredibly - were excluded from regulation<sup>\*</sup>; only 'young persons and females' were restricted to the hours between 0600 and 1800 (0700 to 1900 in winter) Mondays through Fridays, and were not to work later than 1400 on Saturday. It was not, finally, until 1853 that Palmerston urged through a Bill, almost without debate, which regulated the employment of children in factories along the lines of the hours given for young persons and females. Of course this Act had then to be extended, through a series of amending Acts, to widen the definition of factories and factory work, but with the 1853 Act the 'normal day' had arrived for the British working class and with it, therefore, shiftwork and 'overtime' which continue to operate to this day. Although the 'normal week' has been reduced fairly steadily; the week worked has remained

---

\* Moves to include children were defeated by votes of 102 to 72 and 160 to 159 (Thomas, 1948: 323).

much more constant\*.

It is as well to qualify the image of Horner which follows from his remarks in 1850 by noticing a parallel - and for him not a contradictory - activity. In October 1854, Horner wrote to his daughter from Manchester

I will desire our Clerk at the Factory Office to send you a pamphlet on the late strikes, so sensible, so good in all respects, that I am doing all I can to give it extensive circulation. I have got a bookseller here to get a supply, and drew up a handbill for him, which he had printed for distribution among the mill owners. I enclose a copy of it. The author of the pamphlet is Mr. Samuel Robinson, brother of the late Lady Heywood ...

(Memoir, I: Vol.2: 242)\*\*

Robinson (b.1794; Cf. Cullen, 1975: 108) was a radical-Liberal cotton manufacturer, 'a member of the Greg-Kennedy 'clan', founders of the Literary and Philosophical, and Statistical, Societies in Manchester and improving paternalistic employers. Robinson's Friendly letters ... from a manufacturer to his own workpeople (1854)

---

\* The following are taken from United Kingdom in figures, 1972-76 eds.

	1951	1966	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Hours worked per week (full-time male manual workers overtime included)	47.8	46	46.4	46.5	45.7	44.7	45.0	45.6	45.1	43.6
% manual workers with three or more weeks holiday	1	4	10	15	52	67	76	85	98	99

Cf. Sillitoe, 1971: 106-7 and relevant issues of Government Statistics.

\*\* I have been unable to trace the handbill at the P.R.O. or in Manchester. My thanks must go to the Local History Library at Manchester Public Library for searching and for supplying a photocopy of Robinson's 1854 pamphlet.



relate to the bitter Preston strikes which, as I shall illustrate below, caused much concern to Palmerston at the Home Office.\*

Horner was the implacable foe of certain kinds of working class activity, thereby qualifying the image which Marx's footnote in Capital continues to broadcast. Robinson seeks to convey to 'his workpeople' 'THE LAW, as it is called, of SUPPLY AND DEMAND' (Robinson, 1854: 6, his capitals) which must lead to an 'alliance between capital and labour' in which, of course, the latter must be subordinated to the former. Why so?

fix in your mind these two great truths ... the first, -  
That Labour is a commodity like other commodities:  
the second, That, like other commodities, it has  
a varying value according to circumstances; and  
that its value, or, to speak more correctly, its  
market-price, at a given time, depends upon and is  
fixed by the proportion that exists at that time  
between the supply of labour and the demand for it.

(Ibid., p.6-7)

Since 'profit is the wages of the manufacturer' (p.9, his emphasis),  
and since the labourers cannot work(earn) without the capitalist

(Ibid., Letter VII)

Why is FREE-TRADE IN LABOUR not to be allowed  
also?

...

It is acknowledged on all hands, that you have a

---

\* Horner's statements are put in context by the packets marked 'Preston' and 'Manchester' in the H.O.45 5244 file for 1854 - normal weekly and daily (telegraphic) reports were sent from civil and military officers of State. Palmerston's laconic comments contrast with his anxieties discussed in relation to Cardwell and Kay below.

perfect right to sell your labour in the dearest  
market. What right can you have to prevent the  
employer from buying it in the cheapest?

(Ibid., 23, his emphasis and capitals)

'Equality' here is precisely situated in a context of inequality.

In his 70th year, Leonard Horner wrote to his daughter from  
Manchester

During all the time I have held my office, I have  
never passed so disagreeable a time as during the  
present soujourn in Manchester, from the injustice  
I have met with from many of the leading Mill owners,  
who have been raised into violence and passion by  
having been called upon to observe the law about  
fencing dangerous machinery, which would entail some  
trouble and expense, and they have vented their rage  
upon me.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2: 247)\*

Two years later he wrote to the same daughter

I never went there [Manchester] with so much reluctance  
arising no doubt from the disappointment of my hope  
that an improved superannuation Act would have passed,  
so as to enable me to retire.

(Ibid., p.271)\*\*

This pressure - old age (illness?) and poverty (relatively) meant  
that Horner did not go to the Annual British Association meeting

---

\* On the 1856 Act Cf. Blelloch, 1938: 630; the restrictions which  
favoured the employer were not reversed until 1878.

\*\* On Superannuation see: Farr, 1848; P.P.1850(337)IX; Cohen, 1941:Ch.12.

in Dublin in 1857, the first meeting he seems to have missed since the 1830s.

In the year of his retirement, 1859, a series of incidents took place which showed the continuing vulnerability of the Inspectorate to external criticism<sup>\*</sup>. The major incident turned upon the resignation of subinspector William Graham. The secondary accounts show that the subinspectors were not infrequently 'unsatisfactory'; Edmonds says this was true of five of the first fifteen (Edmonds, 1958: 89 Cf. Henriques, 1971: 11-2). It is also noteworthy that Horner's announcement in a report (P.P. 1859 Sess 2 [2583] XIV) that he was due to retire, led, according to a letter from Cornwall Lewis to Palmerston 'to an immense number of applications for his office' (Palmerston Papers, qu. Parris, 1969: 62). On 12th December 1859 a pension of £550 was allowed to Horner under the Superannuation Act of that year and he retired. The delegates of the Cotton Spinners of Manchester sent him a Testimonial (Memoir, II: 48-50).

In September 1860 Horner wrote to his wife reflecting on Inspection. It was, he considered,

a great experiment, and twenty five years of testing the soundness of the measure have shewn that moderation to the hours of work are perfectly compatible with an ample remuneration for the capitalists.

His work has been part of 'the benevolent and wise interference of legislation on behalf of the oppressed factory population.'

---

\* I give these related incidents in some detail in Endnote 3 to this Chapter following P.R.O. material. The crucial point is that Horner was not 'sacked'; he resigned.

But, significantly (as with his references to the emancipation of slaves), he warns

the application of the principle to other employments would require great forethought and a perfect acquaintance with the nature of the employment proposed to be interfered with. There is also this great difficulty, that all legislation would speedily become a dead letter, without a similar system of inspection to secure the observance of the law, and that implies a very large expense.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2: 291f)

Horner's prognosis was very largely what took place, as I briefly indicate below, especially with regard to an administrative practice which has held true for about 140 years: 'minimal prosecution'. In July 1836 Horner wrote to his Superintendents of the Lancashire and related District

in enforcing the Act you must take into account the difficulties which the millowner has to contend with, often dependent upon local peculiarities; and you must by every means in your power endeavour to render the operation of the law as little burdensome as possible, whenever any information or assistance which you can afford will aid the mill owner in his desire to come as near the fulfilment of the letter of the statute as his particular circumstances will admit of.

(P.P. 1837 (67) L, 9; my emphasis PC)

In 1837, in the general code he used for the next twenty years, Horner urged his superintendents

Where irregularities are met with, it is but justice to be slow in imputing these to wilful or gross negligence - although, he is quick to add, the excuse of 'ignorance of the law' is not generally any longer valid. He sought to have obedience of the Act effected by

explanations, respectful admonition, and warning.

Where offences 'which appear ... to deserve the penalties of the law' were found, the Superintendents were to take them up at first with the owner so as to distinguish between 'unintentional oversights' and 'wilful disobedience of the law ... gross and culpable negligence'. (P.P. 1840 X p.155). In 1972, the Robens report on safety at work explicitly endorsed minimal prosecution, suggesting that in reality the Inspectorate was an advisory service. As in Horner's time (we may recall his difficulties in obtaining legal advice) there is no trained prosecution counsel retained by the Inspectorate; each has to prepare his own prosecution.

Carson's accounts of this area complement my own remarks thus far; although he seems historically naive with regard to the aetiology and actual 'politics' of the Factory Acts (Carson, 1970a, b). He does show, however, the weakness of enforcement procedures - of 661 recorded offences he studied, in only 10 cases (i.e. 1.5%) was there an actual prosecution: all resulted in pleas of guilty and average fines of £50. The same held true even for repeated offences. Another facet brought out by Carson is the various stages in the 'construction' of crime and punishment - the stages ( and time intervals) favour the manufacturer. Inspectors tend not to 'jump stages': if Firm X has not had both a warning visit and a warning letter, they will not move to start a prosecution (Carson,

1970b: 402f; updated by Gillie, 1976: 3). This is familiar to sociologists of crime: as Sudnow has shown with his notion of 'normal crime' - there are always prior categories (which have to do with the person and the context) which determine what is an appropriate action and 'name' to be affixed by law 'negotiation' agencies (Sudnow, 1965).

Relatedly, it is worth mentioning that this Inspectorate was not made part of the agencies of the State which dealt with Labour until the Department of Employment was formed. This separation - which is not a contingent/accidental Matter<sup>\*</sup> - as with the similar separation of Trade (and Industry) from Finance; or with the 'antiquated' and 'comic' procedures of the Commons, represents real blocs of interest. That the regulation of factories had been kept distinct from the administration of Labour is more curious because of the well documented<sup>\*\*</sup> pressure from Trades Unions for stronger controls and more State interference in this area.

By 1867, through a series of amending Acts, most large scale machine manufacturing was covered by the Factory Acts and thus subject to Inspection. In 1867 a consolidating Statute was passed, not replaced until the major Statutes of 1937, 1961 and 1974. Between 1867 and 1937 a wide range of service industries were brought within the Factory Acts - for example laundries in 1891; docks in 1895 and railway companies in 1901. The Minimum age for work was 10

---

\* On Labour administration see Davidson, 1969; Caldwell, 1959. On the relative constancy of 'divisions' of the State compare Farr, 1848; Chapman, 1970; Clarke, 1975. Cf. Appendix II below.

\*\* 63% of 2000 workers surveyed wanted more State interference in safety-at-work areas (Times 13 January 1975 p.14). This was a very anti-State (i.e. antiNationalisation) survey.

in 1878, 11 in 1891, 12 in 1916 and 14 in 1918, when the half-time system was abolished (Blelloch, 1938). As Robson shows, however, in his survey of the years from 1918 to 1933, there was still much to be done (Robson, 1934). In terms of the Inspectorate, there were 55 in 1888, 138 in 1902, and about 300 in 1939. In 1974 there were 714 factory inspectors, about the same as a single West German Province, and they had 205,000 registered workplaces to supervise, allowing, in theory, a visit every four years. In 1972, on a conservative estimate, there were about 12,800 relevant accidents (900 of them fatal) - recall, here, that mines and quarries, for example - and off shore rigs - are excluded - ; the average fine was £52 for contravention of the safety, and £40 for contravention of the health, regulations (Stewart, 1974).

On 1st January 1975 the new Health and Safety at Work Act came into force; Wilson's survey of its workings shows why such Inspectorates could not previously be located in any State apparatus designed to 'articulate' clashes of interest. Wilson argues that 'the law assumes a lack of polarisation' (Wilson, 1976: 16). Once again the evidence demonstrates that what is at issue is not an unproblematic 'process' of 'object', which the progressives amongst us could simply demand more of, but that safety marks the site of a struggle over whom/what is to be protected. One ex-factory Inspector spells this out, remarking

The very odd relationship that had been built up by the factory department [sic] with the employers over the last 150 years - a very friendly relationship. Things should be done voluntarily and not because the employers are made to do them.

(qu. Wilson, 1976: 16)

In the first full year of the new system there were three million serious industrial accidents; three workers were killed each day. There were 2,208 prohibition orders and 4,189 improvement notices. One man - a Union safety representative - was sacked for calling in the Inspectorate. This issue serves also to illustrate the differential constitution of 'risk': the resources of the Asbestos Information Council versus a few individuals; including several widows of men who have died from asbestosis-cancer. Wilson reports that when the Inspector arrived at the factory where the Union safety representative worked, the Inspector ordered the worker to leave the factory. It is these actual experiences repeated countless times, which negate what many have celebrated as the progressive core of the new Act: the incorporation of a whole section entitled 'General duties of employers to their employees' (Cf. Allsopp, 1976). Horner's progressive employers' ideology has now become embodied in statute law.

---

James Phillips Kay Shuttleworth

In the case of the man I shall call Kay throughout<sup>\*</sup> - as with Chadwick - there is not only an abundance of primary and secondary material; but several accounts of the latter sort are exactly

---

\* Kay married in 1842 and was then Kay-Shuttleworth; he gained a Baronetcy in 1849; he seems to have dropped his medical 'Dr.' from the time of his marriage.



relevant to my own discussion<sup>\*</sup>. The sociological and historical emphasis upon education as an object of study is a theoretical datum in its own right. It has had, however, two disadvantageous consequences: first, the educational intent, content and significance of apparently technical, nonEducational State activities has been downgraded; second education as such has tended to become a rather unproblematic 'Good Thing' - even for Marxists, it has often been seen as a neutral technique. Relatedly, the ways in which education as a class specific form of coercion and constraint articulates with wider State practices has been diffused. In short, the struggle over the meaning and content (i.e., at base, the class control) of education has been lost from historical vision.

Kay (1804-1877) was involved in the formal provision of education all his life; he was influential both before he became Secretary to the Committee (when he was working as a General Practitioner and later as an Assistant Poor Law Commissioner) and, equally, after his retirement in 1849 when he lived on his estate near Manchester, until his death in 1877. The studies of De Montmorency (1902) show how intermingled are the growth of the State and educational provision since the Tudor Settlement. Kay is important not because he embodies that tendency; nor for his focus on what he called in 1850 'a national system of education'; nor, thirdly, in his linking of crime (including socialism) with lack of such a system - in their different ways, so did Lovett, or Coleridge, or Bentham. What is distinctive is that Kay, with Horner and Tremenheere, and T. H. Green, works with a certain definition of education. First, he appreciates that there are different kinds

---

\* Cf. above all, the work of Richard Johnson; Hurt; Goldstrom.

of pupils to be educated - there are the children of Kay's own class; the children of the aristocratic families; and the children of the labouring classes. The latter, further, are not homogeneous; there are pauper children, factory children, and children in country districts. As to those whom Kay or Horner would call 'our children' Kay's work on endowed schools or with Giggleswick Grammar School, demonstrates his outlook here, as does a speech in 1856 on (precisely) 'Middle class education'

In cities like Manchester and Birmingham, it is important that the middle classes should have an opportunity of combining domestic training with public instruction\* ... The time has arrived when you must entertain the question of forming Borough or High Schools, so situated in all the suburbs, as well as in the heart of this great city, as to be accessible in every neighbourhood ... The future progress of trade and commerce ... are ... dependent on the existence of a comprehensive and efficient system of middle class education.

(Kay, 1856: 20, 21).

But Kay also recognised educational change as a part of necessary social changes including changes in living and production patterns. If education of the right (class specific) type was not provided, alternative organizations existed to provide education of the wrong type. Like many commentators of the time, Kay pointed to 'ignorance' as what was to be feared; whereas really he was concerned with alternative knowledge-practices. William Lovett

---

\* A remark critical of 'private boarding schools' that lack 'the moral discipline of the family'. Contrast his view of the working class family.

saw this when he spoke of the contrast between

a large portion of the hawks and owls of society  
 ... seeking to perpetuate that state of mental  
 darkness most favourable to the securing of their  
 prey

and

another portion, with more cunning ... for admitting  
 a sufficient amount of mental glimmer to cause the  
 multitude to walk quietly and contentedly in the  
 paths they in their wisdom have prescribed for them.

(Lovett, 1876: 134)

As W. B. Hodgson complained to the National Association for the  
 Promotion of Social Science nine years earlier:

the inconveniences of total darkness were more and more  
 recognised and the advantage of at least a sort of  
 twilight state of mind were more and more perceived;  
 but it may be questioned whether the noonday blaze of  
 knowledge was not more dreaded by the educational  
 patrons of the lower classes than eventide blackness  
 of total ignorance.

(1867 qu. Sutherland, 1971: 9)

Hence the radicalism of James Hole and his cry Light! More Light!!

J. P. Kay first became aware of class poverty in the second  
 year of his medical studies at Edinburgh University when he worked  
 in the New Town Dispensary<sup>\*</sup>. His studies there and in Manchester  
 produced his major work: The moral and physical condition of the

---

\* For an introduction to the significance of Edinburgh through  
 the major work of Dr. Chitnis, see my eclectic biography of Kay below.

working classes in Manchester, of which there were two editions in 1832<sup>\*</sup>. Kay reprinted this work as the first of his Four periods of Public education (1862). In his 1877 Autobiography Kay sees the 1832 book as following from the cholera epidemic of 1831 onwards and admits 'much of this pamphlet lay beyond the province of the physician' (1877: 12). He also links the pamphlet to the formation of the Manchester Statistical Society and it was probably the first edition that led to Kay's contact with Benthamite Radicalism through Nassau Senior<sup>\*\*</sup>. This led unaccidentally (as Finer stresses) to Kay's contact with Chadwick and his behaving 'as though impregnated with Benthamite notions' (Finer, 1959: 21, Cf. Perkin, 1969: 269). But the contact (not to say 'penetration') of a social and ideational character could have followed from Kay's anonymous Whig-Liberal pamphlet of 1831 A letter to the people of Lancashire concerning the future representation of the commercial interest.

The point being, surely, that it might be more sensible to allow the possibility of simultaneous generation, and then mutual reinforcement, as far as certain ideas and practices go; rather than the archaic notions of unique discovery and slow diffusion favoured by Finer and other 'ultras' of the Benthamite camp. Certainly the Westminster Review (18 (136) April 1833, Article VIII) welcomed Kay's 1832 book with much applause. The reviewer agrees with Kay that

---

\* Johnson analyses the differences between the two editions in his Ph.D. thesis in pages 36f. (Cf. his 1970). He sees (a) Chalmers; and, (b) London Benthamite Radicalism, as crucial. Bloomfield's analysis (1961) shows Kay and Chalmers regularly corresponding from 1833.

\*\* Kay was regularly dining with Nassau Senior; who was a member of the Newcastle Commission in 1858-1861 (Cf. Levy, 1943).

- (i) 'The natural tendency of trade is, as there shown, to diffuse wealth through the various orders of society ...' (p. 385)
- (ii) 'The Boards of Health recently established in conformity with the Orders in Council should be constituted permanent organized centres of medical police ...' (p. 387)
- (iii) 'Manufacturing capitalists of the large towns [must] ... break down the barrier that separates the rich from the poor, [there must be] unremitting exertions ... to prevent the growth of the jealousy which divides the capitalists and the labouring classes.' (p. 392)
- (iv) The 'humanitarianism' - their agreement with Kay for an improvement in habitations, a reduction in working hours, a repeal of the Corn Laws and an adequate system of education - is predicated on fear: 'The labouring population is ... so vast a power, that the policy which should dare to neglect its interest would be bold even to madness' (p. 395)

The Manchester Statistical Society has been studied in much detail (Wilkinson, 1875; Ashton, 1934; Elesh, 1972; Cullen, 1975: Ch.8). The context of its formation is more relevant here than the content of investigations undertaken. The prime movers were Kay and William Langton (chief cashier at Heywood's Bank), who had worked together, in March 1833, to found the Manchester and Salford District Provident Society. The Statistical Society was formally

founded on 21st September 1833 by Benjamin Heywood, the two Robinson brothers (Samuel<sup>\*</sup> and James) and two of the three Greg brothers (Samuel and W. R.) and S. D. Darbshire - all of whom except Heywood (who, like Henry Newbery another founder, was a banker), were cotton manufacturers<sup>\*\*</sup>.

Kay took part in several investigations - in Sheffield, Leeds, Liverpool and in Derbyshire (the latter with W. R. Greg), as well as Manchester. In Liverpool he was aided by the police; this seems fairly common; the first reported survey (to the 1834 British Association) used police districts for the sampling frame (Transactions, BAAS, 4, 1834). Most of the reports illustrate themes I have already emphasised; the last paragraph of the Society's report on Liverpool (written by W. R. Greg and Langton) caused some surprise when read to the British Association in 1836. It reads

For the attainment, therefore, of this object (viz., a system which should provide a good and suitable education for every child of the State), of which every one in the

---

\* This Samuel Robinson was the author of Friendly Letters (1854). Intermarriage was the defining feature of this group: see Elesh (1972: 285) for a kinship chart - Samuel Robinson was son-in-law of John Kennedy, one of whose daughters (Rachel) married Chadwick in 1839; both Robinson's were brothers-in-law of Heywood; two of Heywood's daughters married two sons of Langton.

\*\* Elesh (1972: 281) gives a shorter list than Cullen (1975: Ch.8) - Langton; Kay; S. and W.R. Greg and Heywood. Elesh considers all of them Unitarian and Whig; all being educated outside of England (4 in Scotland and 1 in Europe). Wilkinson (1875) gives a longer list adding two Kennedy's, one of them (John) Chadwick's future father-in-law, J.A. Turner, J. Murray and W. McConnel.

present day will admit the paramount importance, what resource is left but in the active agency of Government? an agency which surely might be so conducted as in no degree to interfere with the spirit of British institutions. The task is certainly one of great magnitude, and cannot fail to meet with both honest and interested opposition. But the country ought not, on this account, to shrink from it; and we feel persuaded that the establishment of a Board of Public Instruction would be hailed by all who have seen the glaring deficiencies of the present state of education as the first step in the performance of a duty which is imperative with every enlightened Government.

(qu Wilkinson, 1875: 15)

By 1834 the Manchester Society had 28 members; in 1835, 40 and in 1837, 52. Elesh (1972) has analysed 51 members, of the 1833 to 1840 period, for whom biographical data\* could be traced: Nonconformism and Whiggism are the dominant traits. Ashton (1934), Elesh, and Cullen all sketch the surveys undertaken by the Society.

In 1832 Kay had worked for the election of Poulett Thomson as Member for Manchester. Contact between them continued:

In January 1834 Poulett Thomson [then VicePresident of the Board of Trade] was in Manchester and held a conference with ... Kay ... Kay was told there was no chance of the Government adopting an extensive scheme of enquiry. The organization required was beyond the means of government,

---

\* Seven of them became MPs: R.H. Greg; James Heywood; Mark Phillips; J.A. Tone; G.W. Wood; Richard Cobden and T. Potter (Elesh, 1972:413).

the electors would not stand the expense, and in any case Britain was a free country in which such governmental snooping would be resented and resisted.

(Cullen, 1975: 26)\*

The next few years were to show Poulett Thomson to be wrong on all counts; systematic investigation ('snooping') was underway through the Statistical Movement, and, for example, through the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws.

Kay's 1877 Autobiography suggests that his possible career as a physician was compromised and even threatened by his stand for Reform - not simply for extension of the Franchise, but his 'conviction of social danger' (1877: 16). His health was also troubled - probably from overwork during the epidemics. The offer he received (through Chadwick and Nassau Senior) to become an Assistant Poor Law Commissioner for East Anglia in early 1835 was accepted. Kay's Autobiography reports that he 'had read with horror the reports' in the 1834 Report and came to realize (even more) that 'The sanitary questions were only part of a great system of amelioration. It was first indispensable to put out the fire of agrarian discontent ...' (1877: 16). This appointment gave Kay the chance to do this through learning about the agricultural districts, to 'understand their organisation and social state seemed to be indispensable, if I could ever hope to be of use in promoting the success of national education' (Ibid., p.19)\*\*

---

\* Cullen uses Mss. notes appended to the unpublished Transactions held in Manchester Public Library. Poulett Thomson had been taught by J.R. McCulloch.

\*\* For East Anglia Cf. Digby, 1975; for the Poor Law in rural areas: Brundage; Digby, 1976; for Pauper education, Duke, 1976. According to Kay's evidence to the Select Committee on the Poor Law [Contd. on p.206]



The latter phrase may well have been hindsight; but his first report, (written within 11 days of taking up his appointment on 11th July 1835; P.P. 1846 (572) XXXVI), shows his interests clearly. A lot of the work was done in Manchester since it concerned 'the Migration of labourers from the Southern Rural Counties of England to the Cotton Districts of Lancashire' (1835) and Kay's family and friends had much experience as employers.\* The 1835 report is that familiar mixture of general philosophizing, case studies, and wide quantification, culminating in those all too smug Q.E.D. conclusions that mark out much of Poor Law writing. This is not to deny the value of data on, for example, 1832 wage rates, or rural versus urban diets. (Cf. Kay, 1837; 1838c). Kay regularised the scheme with the use of contracts and migration agents; his aim being to 'relieve certain districts of a manifestly surplus population' (1877: 20)\*\*.

Kay's first full report on the area (1836) contains much evidence about the unpopularity of the New Poor Law - including small, but armed, risings against the officers, recently surveyed by Jones (1976). Everywhere Kay found 'lack of discipline' and 'deplorable moral states'; he is especially critical of the apprenticeship system for its restraints on labour (Kay, 1838e). In several of his East Anglia studies he draws a contrast with

---

Amendment Act in 1838 (P.P.1838(202)XVIII Vol.1) he originally took charge only of Suffolk; Norfolk was added in February 1838.

\* Apart from Engels (1845) there is a good account of one (enforced) migration in Blincoe, 1832; relevant also to comprehend "Manchester". On the use of workhouse orphans in the 1860s see Marx (1867).

\*\* Kay's migration report was very unpopular with ultra-Tories and workers alike (Finer, 1952a: 124).

Manchester where there was greater freedom of labour. In East Anglia the old Poor Law had been a 'fatal social disease' which 'took all the health from the relations of labour and capital'. In his Autobiography he recalled

The progress of degeneracy was rapid until many parishes were burthened with a sullen, useless, incapable and demoralized body of workers ... These evils existed in their greatest form where the gentry were non-resident...

(1877: 23)

In order to dismantle this system, Kay sought the advice of [Sir] Francis Head\* who suggested - through a complex, and mildly satirical, analogy with fox hunting - that Kay 'take no denial ... do that and you will succeed' (1877: 25)\*\*.

In 1837 Kay carried out the first of his many general commissions for the P.L.C., an investigation of distress amongst Spitalfields weavers (1837). This is in many ways - and by any standards - a very cruel document, undiluted by the more usual mention

---

\* Sir Francis Head (1793-1875) soldier, statesman 'colonial adventurer' was Assistant P.L.Comm. for Kent until Nov. 1835 when he became deputy Governor (and a baronet) of Upper Canada. In 1867 he was made a Privy Councillor. He is not to be confused with Sir Edmund Head (1805-1868), no kin, scholar, F.R.S., and friend of Tremenheere from Winchester days. Edmund, an ally of Cornwall Lewis, was Assistant P.L.Comm first for South Wales and then (succeeding Kay in 1838) for London. In 1841 Sir James Graham made him a full Commissioner and in 1847 he became Governor of New Brunswick, in 1854 Governor General of Canada. (DNB) .

\*\* Although reporting (in a private letter) to Chadwick (24 Jan 1836) 'All is quiet here. We have a good name in Suffolk'; Kay asks when, and to where, he is to be transferred. (Chadwick Mss.1130)

of the failings of employers. The latter are excused through 'commercial embarrassment'. In contrast, there are weavers who are 'ordinarily so destitute of resources beyond the immediate fruits of their labour' that they have to be subsidized by charity, by borrowing money, and by advances from their Masters. Nowhere, a singular absence for Kay, is there a 'family budget'.

I think that there is much to be gained from understanding Kay's educational work as a single sweep. The focus is there in the 1832 'pamphlet' and it is there in the 1860s pamphleteering against Lowe - of course it matters (empirically) that Kay was a major State Servant only until 1849. But what remains constant - and often quite explicitly so - is the linking together of necessary modes of action (forms of State) and his educational objectives. This can be illustrated in what appear as clearly non-educational texts - his correspondence with the Poor Law Commission (M.H.32/50 1837-1838) - these show him time and again returning to the need for a good secular education (cf. Kay, 1839:44) not only to remoralize the working classes, but to overcome the clashes and contradictions within the ruling classes between (i) different religious groups (ii) the centre and the locality. On 10th December 1838, Kay sent the P.L.C. a detailed Report on the State of Satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Poor Law (MH 32/50) in which he makes a number of significant socio-political distinctions: the first, between urban and rural areas is obvious; the second - where he talks of the 'qualities' (p.1) and 'social characteristics' (p.4) of different communities, is not. The major defect he sees is 'jobbing' by petty shopkeepers and some Guardians, this 'direct plunder' is greater in towns than in the country. It is these

'jobbers', Kay argues, who are most voluble in complaining against Government interference because it threatens their extra forms of income and power. For this reason, Kay argues, a strong central executive is necessary, together with repeal of all local enabling Acts, otherwise the 'Chief fortresses of the country [will remain] in the hands of the enemy' - uncontrolled local power is as bad, for Kay, as the Old Corruption of the preReform centre. Here, unknowingly(?), Kay echoes an earlier report of Chadwick (Finer, 1952a: 129f).

Eighteen months later, Kay reports to the P.L.C. on 'The nature and extent of my duties' (M.H. 32/50 644a:9 June 1840). He details his workload as one third to one half 'educational' (he had been appointed to the Secretaryship of the Committee on Education from 26 August 1839, although he had been working for the Committee from June of 1839); a third or under with his Unions and Pauper Schools; and under a third at the Council Office. He apologises to the Commissioners for not submitting his 'diary', 'since I lost the services of my clerk'. In fact his workload by any standards was extremely heavy. According to the Returns published on 30 March 1840 (P.P. 1840 (385) XXIX 271f) Kay had worked 1566 days between 1835<sup>\*</sup> and March 1840 and made 619 visits to Unions and Schools. As I said, from August 1839 Kay was Secretary to the newly formed Committee on Education of the Privy Council. Between 11th July 1835 and 30 March 1840 there are about 1423 possible working days (this crude figure is derived from the simple abstraction of all Saturdays, Sundays, Christmas Days and Good Fridays from the

---

\* The return quoted has Kay appointed from January 1835; the more usual (Smith, Ball) date is 11th July 1835 (P.P.1846(572)XXVI).

calendar total) - Kay was thus working overtime\*.

Kay was also an active Fellow of the Statistical Society of London (founded in 1834), being a member of their committee on the condition of the working classes (Cullen, 1975: 99f). This committee also had the Board of Trade Office's G.R. Porter and the Radical M.P. R.A. Slaney as members. E.C. Tufnell was one of the Society's secretaries; another, from June 1842, was Joseph Fletcher (Cf. Fletcher's letter qu Kay, 1839a:83-86). The above working programme is even more remarkable insofar as we know that Kay did make journeys abroad as I have detailed in my Appendix I. This travel was part of a wider movement in 'learning from Abroad'<sup>\*\*</sup> that has been mentioned and involved translations of foreign works, articles in the important Reviews and evidence to various Commissions on the importance of the foreign schemes. Kay's trips to Holland seem to have been particularly important (Cf. Kay, 1838d; 1839a:Ch.2; 1840a; 1868:25f; 1877:64-68); Horner's translation work and Ball's comment (1963:6) have already been quoted to show the general significance of Dutch educational schemes.

It is, of course, Kay's work on pauper education which links

\* We have other evidence that the taking of unpaid leave of the whole of August was customary. But Kay and others at the Office were 'denied the recreation which is usually allowed at certain periods of the year' Privy Council Minutes 4/19 (qu Ball, 1963; 197; Johnson Ph.D. p.272).

\*\* Kay's brother Joseph produced his two volume comparative study on European social conditions in 1850, and in 1853 (Wilkinson, 1875: 17) the Manchester Statistical Society printed his comparative study on pauper education in Germany and England.

his Poor Law work and his years at the Committee on Education. The historic series, which we can refer to under a generic title The training of pauper children (1838a,b,d,; 1839b; 1840a,b; 1841a, b) interweave with the doctrines embodied in the Minutes of the Education Committee or in the 'pamphlet which I had been instructed to write' for that Committee: Recent measures (1839a). Kay himself traces the ideas of 'pupil teachers' and 'model schools' to his Eastern counties experience. Kay approached pauper families, and pauper children, with a set of questions 'framed' by his work in Edinburgh and Manchester slums which related the physical and moral environments of given sections of the working class. Under particular conditions, so ran Kay's 'sociology', the working class family (and community) is insufficient as a moral agency. This has been clarified in the work of Johnson (1970) and Hurt (1971: Ch.1). The case established against the pauper family (who would thus 'contaminate' or 'infect' their young into passive dependence<sup>\*</sup>) was generalized to the whole working class. The 'contamination' was, of course, different as both Kay and one of his HMIs, Tremeneere, recognised quite clearly. Existing schools run by and for working class children and adults offered alternative knowledge. The school which Kay offered was thus to take the children from these relations (and organization of knowledge) and locate them in a different set of relations productive of a different knowledge. This is not, in any way whatsoever, to suggest that Kay was unaware of the demands and requirements of a changing labour market<sup>\*\*</sup>. He

---

\* Even with the pauper families, Kay's own reports show that the children were NOT dependent and passive but that neither boys or girls 'had at all a proper notion of right or wrong, morality or immorality' (1841 qu 1877: 33).

\*\* Digby, 1975 admirably relates the labour market to the Poor Law. Cf. Hollander, 1968.

was emphatic on this very point

the object of setting the children to work is, not to make a profit of their labour, but to accustom them to patient application to such appropriate work as will be most likely to fit them for the discharge of the duties of that station which they will probably fill in afterlife.

(1838b:24 Kay's emphasis; for almost identical words, Cf. his 1838a:243).

It was this which was to regulate labour, not brutality and the whip or cane<sup>\*</sup>. Moreover,

Intellectual proficiency being an object of inferior value to the establishment of good habits, care should be taken that this proficiency is not attained at the expense of those moral qualities, by the persevering development of which alone good habits can be formed.

[Thus] the sympathies of the children, as well as the attention of the master, are directed to the proper objects of education, as distinguished from mere instruction.

(1838a:251, his emphasis)

It is of course only to be expected, within this general perspective, that Kay would stress the inadequacies of working class women who lack 'the habits or skill of a housewife', in being able, for example, to prepare nourishing but cheap food. In his gloss on the 1846

---

\* Kay's antipathy to corporal punishment (shared by Tremenheere) is revealed by Kay's 1841b - recently published (with the Commissioners' extremely revealing comments) but already known through Smith (1923:69f).

minutes, Kay declared

To remedy these evils it has been proposed to make the school itself a means of instructing and training girls in the arts of domestic economy (1862a:493; Cf. his varying curricula for female pauper children: 1838a,b,d,; 1839a; 1840a,b; 1841a)

What we are discussing here is the moral regime appropriate for a future group of workers (and their supporters); but we should also note the structure and policy implications of the argument. This is clear in the symbiosis between B.F. Duppa and Kay. Duppa, Secretary of the Central Society of Education (of which Kay was not a member), was a practising educationist at Ealing Grove School. Kay illustrates some of his remarks through quoting Duppa's report: 'a sound foundation ... laid; habits of industry and cheerfulness while at work -- habits of order and arrangement in the management of expenditure...' (qu Kay, 1838a:242; Cf. Kay's similar slogans discussed by Johnson, 1970: 110). Duppa, in turn, in his article in the Papers of the C.S.E. relies extensively upon Kay's work, reproducing large sections of official reports.

Although it is always possible to dispute the influence of any one individual on this or that matter of policy or precept; it is clear beyond any such doubting that Kay's work exercised a general influence on the thinking of Whig practitioners. The letter of 4th February 1839, from Lord John Russell to Lord Lansdowne (qu Maclure, 1969: Doc.3), for example, shows the 'working consensus' very well. Notice there the stress on 'combining moral training with general instruction.' Indeed, there is much to be gained - interms of



historiographical understanding, for example - in recognising the various impulses which went to forming State educational policy at this time. This is the emphasis of Beales' (1974) review article which draws upon a detailed study by Alexander (1974) and Paz. The latter argue that the period after 1833 should be understood as a Whig initiative rather than either an ad hoc series of 'administrative' moves or political 'panic' responses to external pressure. The work of the antiWhigs (largely the Peelites among the modern historians) has been able to make much of Butterfield's pamphlet critical of the "Whig interpretation of history". But, simply, things are connected; modern institutions do have historical origins. Alexander and Paz bring out very clearly, for example, the ways in which State officials wished to use the Treasury Grants, of the 1833 to 1839 period, to establish model schools (e.g. in 1834, p. 84; in 1835, p. 86, ). They conclude

the role of the Whig leaders must be reassessed.

It seems clear that the Whigs, particularly Russell and Rice, were by no means hostile or indifferent to education, responsive only to the initiatives of Radicals, or, after the foundation of the Committee of Council, of civil servants ... There is a Whig record of continuous and creative concern in which 1839 appears as an important milestone.

(Alexander, 1974: 88)

In June or July of 1839 Kay started work as Assistant Secretary of the newly founded Committee of the Privy Council on education\*.

---

\* The 'Education Department' has been studied at length by Johnson (Ph.D. and 1969). Cf. Hurt, 1971:Ch.6; Bishop, 1971: [Contd. on p.214]

He continued his Poor Law work until December 1842, retaining responsibility for London Poor Law Schools. In early 1839 he and E.C. Tufnell had established a (private) Normal School at Battersea (where Kay, his mother and sister lived until the School was taken over as one of their Training Colleges by the National Society). About the same time Kay was granted £500 to expand the work at the Norwood\* School of Industry (Smith, 1923: Ch.4).

Teachers\*\* were a key element in Kay's educational strategy; he stresses in his 1877 Autobiography the 'transforming power' of the training college, 'which would convert the raw and awkward youth' of a pupil teacher 'into a well mannered and self-possessed master conscious of what was his duty and able to maintain authority in performing it.' (1877: 62). In 1861 he publicly sketched an 'untransformed' teacher, 'broken down in character' and unable to create or sustain the 'social bond' (P.P. 1861 (231) XLVIII: 6). In 1877 Kay recalled that in the early years of the Committee of Education

---

Ch.3. Generally: P. Musgrave, 1968:Chs.1-3; Bagley, 1969:Ch.1; Wardle, 1970:Chs.1-4; Sutherland, 1971; Little, 1973. On Religion, Cf. Cavanagh, 1940; Best, 1956. On Economics, Cf. West, 1975a,b.

\* In early 1840 the first Norwood students entered Battersea to train as pupil-teachers. MacLeod moved from Norwood to become Master of the model school at Battersea.

\*\* On teachers see Tropp, 1957; Hurt, 1971:Ch.4; Johnson Ph.D. passim and Pamela Horn's illuminating discussion of teacher training (1976). Studies of individual schools are important, cf. P. Silver, 1974; Johnson Ph.D., 299f. I am grateful to the Reference Librarian of Blyth Public Library who allowed me to examine the logbook of Blyth National School, 1863-1882.

I had been led to reflect on the future staff of schools. Of what element was it to consist? How were they to be prepared? What was to be the organization... As I proceeded to examine its relations, I found it to be, ... in a great degree a financial question. (1877:63)

From what class could we confidently hope in England to draw a sufficient supply of pupil teachers? Their emoluments, from whatever source derived, must be moderate... It was not likely therefore that, for many years, pupil teachers could be obtained from any other than the best families of the manual labour class, or from those of the humbler tradesmen. There was the greater need that a prolonged and exact preparatory instruction, continually tested by examination, should be followed by that transforming education which could only be given within the walls of a training college. So long as the pupil teacher lived in his parents' cottage, his manners and habits would necessarily be much affected by their influence.

(Ibid., p. 66; Cf. Johnson, 1970: 110f)

In 1846 Kay argued that

The social tendency of the plans contemplated in the Minutes of ... 1846 are ... to raise the character and position of the schoolmaster ... to make arrangements for rearing a race of more highly instructed masters by the establishment and support of a larger number of Normal schools ... to render the school popular among the poor ... These combined influences will, it is

hoped, raise considerably the standard of instruction among the humbler classes, and promote the growth of a truly Christian civilisation.

(1862a: 493; Cf. Kay, 1872; 1876)

This last remark is valuable in so far as Kay admitted in 1877 that much of his hopes and plans, his 'system' as he called it, was concealed from everyone - 'even from my most intimate friends' (1877: 67) at the time. Changes were contemplated 'without any premature disclosure of the conception of a general system' (Ibid., 67). This concealment may be why Matthew Arnold, for one, considered Kay a 'managing and designing' Secretary (qu. Roberts, 1960: 149). Kay knew full well that his general system, if it were made public, would cause alarm. Kay recognised, however, as with several remarks by the Webbs\* demonstrating 'socialism all around us', what was being accomplished. Kay stated this in his 1853 book - and the quotation has been used by MacDonagh and others to justify their theories of State formation. Describing the 'advance of the Education Department', Kay argued this consisted

chiefly in the increase of the public grant and of the number of Inspectors and normal schools, the principles of a great public policy were in operation and were silently attracting to themselves, like centres of crystallization, a mass of precedent and authority, which was destined to become irresistible.

(Kay, 1853: 6)

---

\* This reference to the Webbs is not whimsical (Cf. my Chapter 5 below) especially if their discussion of the State, - see the last footnote to Appx III on Coleridge below, for example - is read alongside that of Kay in his 1853 book.

Johnson, and others have demonstrated how Kay was aided in his grand designs by the transfer, little by little, of Poor Law officials (and practices) to the 'Education Department'.

In the same way, we have to understand the Inspectorate<sup>\*</sup> and Kay in terms of this 'strategy' with regard to teachers, and the wider class perspectives revealed in Kay's analysis. The first two Inspectors were appointed in December 1839 - Allen and Tremenheere. Kay's Instructions<sup>\*\*</sup> are extremely detailed as was the questionnaire which the Inspectors were expected to complete during and after a visit to a school. An Inspector had to be, as Kay phrased it during his polemic with Lowe in 1861, a 'moral arbitrator' and not 'a mere scholastic calculating machine' (P.P. 1861 (231) XLVIII: 4; Cf. Kay, 1846: Ch.2). Up until 1846 the Inspectorate was 'a compact and manageable corps of eight men, all of whom were in close, continual and personal communication with the Secretary [i.e. Kay]' (Johnson Ph.D. thesis p.365). The Inspectors met regularly from 1846 in formal conference (Ibid.; Ball, 1963: 203f). Since adequate discussions<sup>\*\*\*</sup> exist, I do not propose to say anything further on the Inspectorate, having, hopefully, situated its existence in relation to Kay's own strategy.

---

\* On the Inspectorate, apart from my own discussion of Tremenheere below, see the work of: Johnson - espc. Ph.D. thesis 364f; Hurt, 1971 Ch.2; Ball, 1963; E.L. Edmonds, 1960, 1963 - Ball and Hurt give good biographical sketches; Edmonds is good on the nonState Inspectorate.

\*\* Kay's Instructions can be seen in the Minutes 1839-40 onwards; Ball discusses them and reprints the Questionnaire. A full version is given in P.P. 1851(103)XLIII: 55f); extracts:Goldstrom,1972b:Doc.24; McClure, 1969: Doc.5.

\*\*\* Johnson's Ph.D. work and Ball (1963) work out the intraInspectorate differences; Roberts, 1960:Ch.6 offers a more homogeneous survey.

As I have argued, Kay did not simply see educational policy by the State as necessary instructional and moral 'schooling' of the humbler classes for their 'station'. He also saw State policy as necessary because of alternative threats - from organized working class groups. This is true from the start to the end of his life. The closing pages of the second edition of his 1832 classic (themselves embodying the major tenets of political economy), for example, explain that the

increase of the manufacturing establishments, and the consequent colonization of the district, have been exceedingly more rapid than the growth of its civic institutions ... the remote influence of arrangements has sometimes been neglected ...

(1832: 79-80)

These 'arrangements'<sup>\*</sup> are concerned with conditions within and outside the new factories. Kay also sees the Irish as 'one chief source of demoralization ... of the people' of the district. (p.80). What happens is two fold - the contradictions run right through Kay's work - the population is said to become

physically less efficient as the producers of wealth  
- morally so from idleness - politically worthless  
as having few desires to satisfy, and noxious as  
dissipators of capital accumulated.

(p.81)<sup>\*\*</sup>

And 'The ignorant are, therefore, properly, the care of the state'

\* 'Morality is therefore worthy of the attention of the economist' When an 'uncivilised race' like the Irish 'assist the production of wealth... their barbarous habits and consequent moral depression must form part of the equation.' (p.82).

\*\* Kay couples this with a critique of 'the present restrictions and burdens of commerce' (8f.) including the Poor Law (pre 1834).

(p.93). Yet, - and Kay was much more aware of this by 1839 as we shall see - this inert mass is alive and seething:

the working class become the prey of those who flatter their passions, adopt their prejudices, or even descend to imitate their manners.

(p.94, his emphasis).

For

Alarming disturbances of social order generally commence with a people only partially instructed.

The preservation of internal peace, not less that the improvement of our national institutions, depends on the education of the working classes.

(p.95), his emphasis.\*

Either the working classes are ignorant (and physically less efficient as labour power - a nice Chadwickian point this!), or they are informed, but with the wrong ideas! Of course both were true, as R.K. Webb (1955<sup>b</sup>) and Hollis (1970) have shown; but it is relevant to see how Kay, and others, played on both kinds of 'anxiety'. He also showed, of course, the evils of trades unions:

No combination [of working people] can permanently raise the wages of labour, above the limit defined by the relation between population and capital...(p.107)

The power of these unions, to create disorder, or to attain improper objects, would be destroyed, if every

---

\* As I showed with Horner, Kay is clear that 'the poor man will not be made a much better member of society, by being only taught to read and write. His education should comprise such branches of general knowledge as would prove sources of rational amusement...' (p.97); the same page stresses the need for 'correct political information...' (Kay's emphasis).

assault were prosecuted, or the violation of the liberty of the subject prevented by the assiduous interference of an efficient police. The radical remedy for these evils is such an education as shall teach the people in what consists their true happiness, and how their interests may be best promoted.

(p.111)

By 1839, the emphasis is more clearly on fear of the organised and informed working class.

A great change has taken place in the moral and intellectual state of the working classes during the last half century. Formerly, they considered their poverty and sufferings as inevitable, as far as they thought about their origin at all; now, rightly or wrongly, they attribute their sufferings to political causes; they think that by a change in political institutions their condition can be enormously ameliorated.

(1839a: 42)

At one period Luddism prevailed; at another, machine-breaking; at successive periods the Trades' Unions have endeavoured in strikes, by hired bands of ruffians, and by assassination to sustain the rate of wages above that determined by the natural laws of trade ... The Chartists think that it is in the power of Government to raise the rate of wages ... They are confident that a Parliament, chosen by universal suffrage, would be so completely under the dominion



of the working classes, as to carry these measures into effect ... Now the sole effectual means of preventing the tremendous evils with which the anarchical spirit of the manufacturing population threatens the country, is by giving the working people a good secular education, to enable them to understand the true causes which determine their physical condition, and regulate the distribution of wealth among the several classes of society.

(p. 43-44)

To restore the working classes to their former state of incurious and contented apathy is impossible, if it were desirable. If they are to have knowledge, surely it is the part of a wise and virtuous Government to do all in its power to secure to them useful knowledge, and to guard them against pernicious opinions.

(p. 44-45)

Next to the prevalence of true religion, we most earnestly desire that the people should know how their interests are inseparable from those of the other orders of society; ...

(p. 46)

The theme continues in 1846:

There are social disorders not attributable to defects in the physical condition of the people. The mobs of machine breakers ... ignorantly attempted to destroy the chief source of their own domestic well-being, and of the national prosperity. The Trades Unions, which

have endeavoured to limit the number of workmen in the best-paid employments; to prescribe a minimum of wages; to impose a uniform standard of earnings for the young and old, the feeble and robust, the industrious and the negligent, and to withdraw the workmen from the control of their masters, have for long periods rendered the working classes, particularly in Ireland and the mining districts, the victims of their ignorance ... These are examples of a class of evils which arise from ignorance. It is difficult, but perhaps possible, to repress such evils [by the means of repressive law and order measures]. The statesman who endeavours to substitute instruction for coercion; to procure obedience to the law by intelligence rather than fear; to employ a system of encouragement to virtuous exertion, instead of the dark code of penalties against crime ... to replace the constable, the soldier and the gaoler by the schoolmaster, cannot be justly suspected of any serious design against the liberties of his country, or charged with an improvident employment of the resources of the State.

(1862a: 453, 455-6; his emphasis)

Quite so; and Kay rams this point home with the second appendix to this 1846 work, reprinted from the 1839-40 edition of the Working Man's Guide Book: 'The origin, procedure and results of the strike of the Operative Cotton Spinners of Preston, From October, 1836, to February 1837'. This was written by W.H. Ashworth and commissioned by the Manchester Statistical Society (Wilkinson, 1875: 15).

Lastly, in the year of the founding of the T.U.C., in his 1868

Memorandum, Kay remarks

The anti-social doctrine held by the leaders of Trades' Unions as to the relations of capital and labour, and their consequent organization to limit the freedom of workman and Master by a system of terror, have been again exposed by inquiries... Parliament is again warned how much the law needs the support of sound economic opinions and higher moral principles among certain classes of workmen, and how influential a general system of public education might be in rearing a loyal, intelligent, and Christian population.

(1868:6; Cf. Kay 1859; 1860; 1862b; 1864a; 1865 and, above all, 1866a, discussed in my Chapter Four below).

Of course Kay was not alone in holding to this perspective, it is after all the dominant - that is not to say 'hegemonic' - perspective of the ruling classes in nineteenth century Britain. But Kay was well-placed to execute many of these ideas: to attend to that serious imbalance between the ever-advancing production forms, which exercised their own controls within and partly beyond the workplace, and forms of sociation and control of political and moral relations between the classes.

In 1842, Battersea, Kay's strategy, and Kay himself - that 'able and indefatigable Secretary' - were praised by the Edinburgh Review (April 1842) in a review of the popular edition of the Minutes of 1839 to 1841. The review is also interesting in indicating the possible impermanence<sup>\*</sup> of the Committee of Council - the Review

---

\* On this issue Cf. Finer, 1952b; 1959; Hintze, 1908; Gretton, 1913; Schaffer, 1957; Parris, 1968; 1969.

welcomes its continuance. They also are pleased that Gladstone is not a member.\* The Edinburgh Review's 'surprise' did not extend to Charles Greville; he was a 'semi permanent institution' as Clerk to the Privy Council from 1821 to 1859, whose relations with Kay have been discussed (Johnson, 1969 and 1970).

The Review was discussing a new Tory Government. We have some insight into the views of this new Government in the Graham and Peel letters and papers. In December of 1842 Graham wrote to the Bishop of London that the 'ignorance of large masses of the population is ... inconsistent with the peace of the community' (Graham, 1907:Vol.1: 342) and, in February 1843, Graham said in Parliament

The police and the soldiers have done their duty, the time is arrived when moral and religious instruction must go forth to reclaim the people from the errors of their ways.

(Hansard, series iii, Vol.66:col.78 Cf. Graham's speeches on 'Distress' Ibid., col.675f)

Mather (1959; 1970) has shown that 1842 was experienced by the Government as a general crisis (Cf. Peel-Graham exchanges in Peel, 1899:Ch.18; Gash, 1976: 221f gives a very partial account of this exchange). It is as well to remember that these letters show regular opening of mail, as well as those weekly reports which I discussed (in connection with Arbuthnot) in the section on Horner above.

---

\* On Gladstone's opposition to 'what is termed a national system' as he put it; Cf. Johnson, Ph.D., p.45f; Best, 1956.

In January 1842, Graham wrote to Kay to stress that:

I am afraid that law and civil rights must be upheld by Power, and cannot with safety be left to the unaided protection of moral influences or even of religious restraint.\*

In July, 1842, Kay sent Graham a letter from Gawthorpe Hall, to which Graham replied:

I am glad that you are residing on your property and I am willing to hope that your influence, good advice and good example may win back the poor deluded workmen from the error of their ways... I am sure you can point out to your neighbours the madness of concessions made to threats and violence.

(qu Smith, 1923: 139)\*\*

Kay, as might be expected from the quotations I have given, sent a long letter back to Graham (qu Smith, 1923: 140f) which Graham sent on to Peel (Prime Minister) with the following gloss:

Enclosed is a letter from Dr. Kay Shuttleworth. Every man has his nostrum. The Clerk of the Council for Education thinks that moral training and normal schools will restore peace. These instruments are not to be despised, and have been too long neglected; but cheap bread, plenty of potatoes, low priced American bacon, a little more Dutch cheese and butter, will have a more pacifying effect than all the mental culture which any Government can supply. (Peel, 1899: 541)

---

\* qu Johnson Ph.D. thesis, p.124 - this letter is not available in Graham's published letters (1907, 2 vols).

\*\* This letter is also not published.

To Kay, Graham wrote

Your anticipation of outbreaks in the manufacturing districts are well founded ...

I am most desirous that the education of the rising youth should be the peculiar care of the Government.

Its neglect is one of the chief causes of the evil spirit which now actuates large masses of the community. But a change of policy in this respect comes too late as a remedy for the existing danger. It may be a prevention for the future, but the immediate danger is urgent, and a scheme of National Education is too slow in its effects to meet evil which is at our door.

The truth is that in all classes passion predominates over reason, and I am afraid that law and civil rights must be upheld by power, and cannot with safety be left to the unaided protection of moral influences or even of religious restraint.

Do not imagine that I underrate the importance of these great instruments for good; but evil is so strong that they cannot effect everything, and unbounded reliance on their efficacy is no less delusive than their neglect is unpardonable.

(Graham, 1907: Vol.1: 329)

But on the same date (30 August 1842), Graham had written to the Earl of Powis (who was very directly involved; Golby, 1974):

I am afraid no legislative remedy can be applied to the undoubted evils which prevail to an extent most dangerous to the public peace. They are inherent in the state of society at which we have arrived and which is highly artificial. It will be seen that a manufacturing people

is not so happy as a rural population, and this is the foretaste of becoming 'the workshop of the world'.

(Ibid., 328-9).

But Kay had been consulted by Graham and would be again (in relation to the 1843 and 1844 Factory Bills, for example).

The development of the Department has been studied in the light of the debate indicated in my Chapter One by Johnson, who concludes his thesis by suggesting that the Department fits the MacDonagh 'model' reasonably well - just as his 1969 paper sees Kay's 'style of administration' in the 'Chadwick-Simon-Trevelyan-Porter-Hill modus operandi' - but he stresses that changes in social philosophy have also to be properly studied. He (and others, e.g. Hurt, Bishop, Sutherland) shows that by the time of the institutionalization of the Board of Education we are faced with a Department in which 'the Office' has triumphed over 'the Inspectorate', who are now subordinated civil servants with much more restricted work tasks and programmes. Lingen's entry into power<sup>\*</sup> coincided with the period up to both the Forster Act and the Order in Council of 1870 concerning 'open competition'. Charles Trevelyan had been one of the many contributory factors in Kay's collapse from overwork in 1848 (Johnson Ph.D. 330f; J. Hart, 1960: 96). Apart from what I have said in Appendix I below I shall not discuss Kay's illness and retirement in 1849 - except to suggest that there may have been a 'general crisis' of State institutions of the mid forties in Poor Law Administration, Health, and Education, which may point to some

---

\* On Lingen: Bishop, 1968; 1971:Ch.4; Hurt, 1971; Johnson Ph.D. Chs.6-8 and 1969:134f.

general 'malaise'. Of course, the Trevelyan-Northcote investigations precisely date from this time (Cf. McGregor 1951: 157f). Relatedly, I wonder whether the subsequent 1850s and 1860s were a time of 'stalemate' insofar as the individual studies we have point to the 'piecemeal' and 'minor' nature of the legislation.\*

The major crisis for the Education Department began with the 1846 'managerial clauses' (Kay, 1877: 70f; Smith, 1923: 179f; Ball, 1963:Ch.8; Johnson Ph.D. Ch.4; 1969). According to Smith (1923: 186) Kay was increasingly convinced of the need for the 'influential laity' to be concerned in School management. Johnson shows the relevance of the issue for State control:

This criteria of proper control informed both the inspectors' reports before 1846 and departmental practices ... It is clear that ... technical advice [over trust deeds and management clauses] became the pretext for control.

(Johnson, 1970: 115)

For Kay, these Minutes (as I showed in one quotation above) were concerned to 'raise the tone' of State education; they tried to dilute the power of the Clergy\*\* ; to blunt the attack of the voluntaryist group - and, note, to criticise

the utilitarians and economists, who declared that

\* Positive evidence can be found in Finer, 1952a: 501f; negative evidence is the 'weakness' of the standard histories.

\*\* His autobiography had the page on the controversy with Archdeacon Denison excised, leaving the impression of Edward Baines as 'main enemy'. Denison's charge that the 1846 Minutes were 'Whig villainy' does not seem true; Peel and Graham approved them in advance in 1844 (Smith, 1923: 161-3).



education was to be provided on the laws of supply and demand without any interference from the Government.

(Kay, 1877: 71. Cf. West, 1975a,b)

This attempt obviously had some political backing - Kay's own text - 'by direction of the Committee of Council' claimed Kay (1862a:435) - was published in advance of the 1846 Minutes. Nearly ten thousand copies of Kay's The School in its relation to the State ... were sold (Bloomfield, 1960; Johnson, Ph.D. p.224 fn.4)

In this book Kay does not stress the 'managerial clauses' Controversy overmuch; in the relevant chapter (IV) he poses the notion of a 'combined school' against a 'comprehensive system'; the former subordinates religion to State education (all children learn 'the basic principles' of Christianity); the latter subordinates education to religion in denominational schools with State grants-in-aid. Kay seems (1862a: 510f) to favour the former, but, as usual, he is cautious.\*

By later 1848 Kay was seriously ill and in December 1849 he formally retired. During the crisis there had been a steady intake of 'the Balliol men': October 1846, Lingen; May, 1847: Matthew Arnold; February 1848, Frederick Temple; November, 1848: Francis Sandiford and in 1848, Francis Palgrave. But Kay's removal from

---

\* In an earlier letter to Lord John Russell (qu Smith, 147f) Kay had touched on these issues. On School Managers Cf. Gordon, 1973, 1974; he and I in my Appendix I, discuss Kay's antipathy to the secular Lancashire (later National) Public School Association in the 1840s and Kay's support for the Manchester Church Education Society (Gordon, 1974: 87f).

office seems to alter neither the structural tendency (as opposed to the tactics and methods) nor Kay's influence on educational matters at the politico-ideological level. Within the Lancashire Whig-Liberal Party he was a significant force; in 1863 he became High Sheriff; he was also concerned with various ad hoc Relief bodies and his eldest son became a Liberal M.P. in 1868. Secondly, he continued to be an influential member of the educational lobby and the wider social science 'caucus'. As an example of the first, we may take his participation in the 1857 Conference of the 'Friends of the Education of the Working Classes' (Cf. Hill, 1857) and, of the second, his work with the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, on whose Council he served from 1859 to 1872 and for whom he read important papers in 1859, 1860 and 1866. Some of his educational publications sold widely - his Letter to Earl Granville (1861c) had an immediate printing of at least 9000 copies (Bloomfield, 1960:A17) and his speeches were featured not only in the expectable Manchester Guardian, but in the Times. He was invited to give extensive evidence to several commissions (notably the Newcastle Commission of 1861); he worked, with E.C. Tufnell, on Endowed Schools reform; and he was a member of the Devonshire Commission on Scientific Education from 1870 to 1873. His second collection of papers - Thoughts (1873) - is representative of this work; I shall discuss it in Chapter Four below.

I argued above that formal divisions between what is 'political' and what is 'social', between formal State activities and apparently private functions, are unhelpful in reconstructing the movement and development of the State in Britain. Certainly, as I have mentioned,

for Graham and Peel private activities were political - hence their scrutiny of the mails; hence also, as I discussed above, the agreement between Lord John Russell and Peel over the legitimacy of State servants acting as spies. I want to detail one incident, not previously discussed in terms of these issues, which illustrates the interpenetration of State and private realms and shows also something of the cohesiveness of the English ruling class.

In 1854, Kay invited some friends to attend the opening of the Padiham Trade School (on Wednesday 11 January) which Kay saw as a model for future State fostered higher education for the 'artisan class'. As might by now be expected the purpose of the School was political: to combat the 'delusions' fostered by Trades Unions and as an additional means to establish 'harmonising relations' between Masters and Men. 'A Master who ceases to think that his workmen are a part of his machinery ... will have solved the mystery of trades unions' (Smith, 1923: 249). Kay's speeches\* are worth study in their own terms; not least the 'Manifesto' (no other word will do) which terminates with the notion of Trades Schoolmasters as an army for the 'defeat of Chartism' because 'Before such a system socialism will disappear like a mist before the sun.'

(Manchester Guardian 14 January 1854 p.9 col.IV)

---

\* They appeared in the Manchester Guardian in the wrong order - the first part 18th, and the second part 14th, January 1854. Kay produced a small booklet: Education essential to the success of trade and commerce (Manchester, 1854, 12 pages). There is only one copy known to survive - too frail and damaged either to lend or copy - in Manchester Local History Library. I am again most grateful to the diligent staff there who sent me copies of the Guardian articles and an annotation to show the differences in the pamphlet. Cf. Kay 1856; Smith, 1923: 247f.

One of the guests of honour, whose speech follows that of Kay, was Dr. Lyon Playfair, a friend of Leonard Horner and the new head of the State's Department of Science and Education. Playfair, without consciously knowing it, was also playing the role of spy for Palmerston who was concerned about the 'Disturbances' (to use the Home Office's own term) in Preston.

In the 'disturbances' group of Home Office papers there is an illuminating packet (H.O. 45 5244) which opens with a note from the Home Secretary, Palmerston, suggesting to the Board of Trade that 'some person' connected with that Board be sent 'to the Manufacturing Districts where the strikes [are] for the Purpose of communicating confidentially with the workmen and their Employers so as to ascertain the [?"true" - illegible] state of feeling.' Palmerston adds that such a person must make it clear to 'Each Party' that he 'is not authorized to act as mediator. P. 6/1 - 54'. On the 9th January the Board of Trade responded that such activity might be open to very serious misconstruction as it would appear to indicate an intention of removing the question from the province of Police and making it a matter of trade, or in effect to contemplate the possibility of the interposition [sic] of the Government in arranging the rate of wages.

Palmerston added a note to the Board's reply: 'This may rest as it is, the strike is mainly over. P. 14/1 - 54.'

In fact on 13th January 1854 a letter had been sent directly to Lord Palmerston's home (it was not formally received as a State paper until 15th April 1854) from Whitehall Gardens by Edward

Cardwell\* . Cardwell reports that he had asked Playfair, whom he knew to be visiting Kay Shuttleworth at Gawthorpe Hall, to acquire all the information he could for Cardwell. The latter also reports that 'last week' he had discussed this with Palmerston. He makes it explicit that Playfair did not know what the letter was for, or to whom it would be shown. The letter opens

'Strikes / Liverpool 12th January 1854 / Private'

Playfair reports that he met 'at Kaye [sic] -Shuttleworth's Education meeting' the editors of the Manchester Guardian; Manchester Courier; Preston Guardian; Preston Chronicle and a reporter from the Manchester Examiner\*\* ; all of whom 'passed the Day at Gawthorpe Hall, sleeping there'. Playfair also notes that 'Sir J. Shuttleworth gave a powerful address on strikes in his opening speech of the new school' which shows that Kay's message came through. Playfair then reports his various conversations and the general conclusion that the strikers are weakening:

the moral force of the working men's cause has  
suffered much from their bad conduct.

But he also reports that although, as may be expected, some of the non-affected manufacturers had sent a 5% levy of their profits to help their Preston colleagues; the Barnsley manufacturers had an interest in seeing the strike in being (since Barnsley and Preston products compete in the same markets), and the Blackburn masters

\* This is Viscount Cardwell (1813-1886) then President of the Board of Trade and future reformer of the Army. Cf. Sainty, Vol.3 p.39 and DNB. On spies Cf. Darvall, 1934:Ch.14; Thompson, 1963; Sainty, 1976.

\*\* If such meetings were common - and their discussions so unanimous - it means we should challenge the usual assumptions of the 'benefits' of a plurality of newspapers in each locality in the 19th century; one class, it seems, was never represented. Cf. Webb, 1955b; Hollis, 1970.

actively encouraged the Preston strikes to force up Preston masters' costs, which are thought to be too low. All manufacturers, however, adds Playfair, fear any rise in wages brought about through 'the dictation of the workmen'. Playfair concludes that

the Government had done right in not taking any active steps in the matter, as the question is too important for capital to be hastily involved.

Houses like Gawthorpe Hall were centres not simply for plotting and character assassination over the port, but were nodal points in transmission and transformation of visions of society. They provided a context in which facts could be construed; for many years of the century, after all, the annual and more regular reports of the Inspectors and Commissioners were not arid and factual exercises, but included as much general philosophy as reportage.

In a speech at Gawthorpe Hall in January 1866 (reported at length in both the Times and the Manchester Guardian)<sup>\*</sup> Kay is in his most Whiggish of moods, making the forthcoming Reform Bill of 1867 an 'outcome' of educational provision since 1832 and, thereby, linking that provision, in turn, to the Reform Act of 1832. His criticisms of Lowe should not be allowed to obscure their basic agreement; much of what Kay is saying is, after all, only a different formulation of the famous remark of Lowe:

We must now prevail upon our future masters to learn their letters.

(qu Shannon, 1976: 889)

---

\* Both January 26th 1866; in the Times as 'The School in its political relations'; in the Guardian as 'The relations of elementary education to the Franchise'.

Kay argues that he had 'all his life, regarded a system of national education<sup>\*</sup> as the indispensable preliminary to an extension of the franchise ...'. He reproached his 'struggling fellow countrymen' only with failing to see that the means to the end they desired 'must be the school' (Guardian text, p.3 Col III). The end? Simply, the admission of their order within the Pale of our representative constitution.

This is also practically the title of Monkton Milnes' contribution to the 1867 Essays on Reform. The work 'Pale', by the way, is no mere hyperbole; Gladstone rejoiced that, in 1867, the working-class were now

our fellow-subjects, our fellow-Christians,  
our own flesh and blood...

(qu Perkin, 1969: 319)

Gladstone was one of those, (Matthew Arnold was another), who praised Kay's 1868 Memorandum, which declared that the Government's intentions concerning popular education

are a natural consequence of the recent great extension of electoral power among the classes supported by manual labour... All are agreed that a well-ordered system of national education, reaching to the most ignorant and destitute, would be the firmest foundation in which our widely spread electoral power could rest.

(Kay: 1868: 6)

---

\* It is as well to recall that T.H. Green was at this point of time an Assistant Commissioner for the Taunton Commission; and to read Kay's remarks and prescriptions with Green's 'philosophy' in mind. These are matters to which I return in my fifth Chapter below.

Kay then criticises Lowe\* for endangering this system by his dogma and false economy. Lowe, when introducing the Revised Code on 11th July 1861 declared

Hitherto we have been living under a system of bounties and protection, now we propose to have a little free trade.

On 13th February 1862, Lowe stated of the new system

If it is not cheap, it shall be efficient;  
if it is not efficient, it shall be cheap.

(qu Kay, 1868: 13 fn)

Kay responds not simply with argument, but with the testimony of statistics (1868: Appx 9) and expert witness (Ibid., Appx 8).

Kay's final publication (he died, at his new London home, 68 Cromwell Road, on 26 May 1877, aged 72) is a review of Forster's Act\*\*

---

\* Robert Lowe (later Viscount Sherbrooke) 1811-1892, used the Times editorially to support his policies (Smith, 1923: 267 fn1). Lowe was at Winchester (with Cardwell) from 1825, at Oxford (University College) from 1829: BA (Classics/Maths.) 1833; MA, 1836; Called to the Bar (Lincoln's Inn) 1842. In Australia 1842-1850 (lawyer and politician). MP Kidderminster 1852-1859; Vice President of the Board of Trade 1855 to 1858; Privy Councillor 1855; MP Colne, 1859-1868. Vice President Committee on Education 1859 to resignation 1864. First MP for University of London 1868-1880; Chancellor of the Exchequer 1868-1873; Home Secretary 1873-1874. Created Viscount, 1880. Ughtred Kay Shuttleworth recalls his father taking him to the Commons to hear Lord Robert Cecil debating with Lowe (Ughtred, in Smith, 1923: 339f; from DNB this was 12 April 1864). Briggs (1954) brings out Lowe's similarities with the antiDemocracy of de Tocqueville; like Tremenheere, Lowe had a particular country that showed the dangers of ultraDemocracy - for Lowe it was Australia; for Tremenheere, it was America. Cf. Chapter Five below.

\*\* For the post 1870 developments see Sutherland, 1969b; Little, 1973.



which Kay saw as an extension of his work since 1839. According to Kay (1876: 688) Forster's Act had found a system in 1869, of over one million scholars in 13,644 inspected schools with 25,342 teachers and pupil teachers. He quotes the Education Department's report of 1874-5 to show that there were then 2,250,000 children and about 27,000 schools; since Forster's Act nearly 2,000 Board and 2,700 voluntary Schools had been built. By 1875 there were some forty training colleges. This connects what is clearly the 'modern' system of State primary Education with the past; Kay also raises two themes which dominate contemporary discussion concerning such education. He points to the

poverty, ignorance and apathy of parents, and the frequent migration of families.

(1876: 704)

This leads to 'irregularity in school attendance'.

The claims of industry on the labour of children also limit the daily school time, and prematurely terminate it.

(1876: 705)

Kay warns

the habit of regular school attendance is not soon formed in children, nor the desire to secure it soon inspired in uneducated parents. Poverty, apathy, ignorance and vice will present a vis in ertiae, that will resist and exhaust for many years all efforts of persuasion or compulsion. The claims of labour have been adapted to a social system in which the school only partially existed...

(Ibid., p. 698)

---

H. S. Tremenheere

Tremenheere (1804-1893) was for R.K. Webb 'a Whig Inspector', for Ball (1963:70) 'in modern terms, he was a sociologist', and for Holmes (MA thesis Ch.4) an 'amateur sociologist'. In an editorial note to their selection from Tremenheere's Journals (I was there), the Edmonds argue that he

may be regarded as one (if not the) prototype of that small body of 'Prefects' who helped nurse into being the modern democratic State by mediating successfully when it was needed.

(Ibid., p.134) \*

Tremenheere was a State Servant from 1838 until 1870, being 'responsible' (on his own story) for at least fourteen Acts of Parliament \*\* - his claim is justified in at least two cases \*\*\*. Equally important, perhaps, as any direct claims of this sort, was his influence as a producer of 'official' views on, for example, the population of the mining districts, or the different groups of

\* So long as it is equally understood that Tremenheere's class were also 'imbued with an instinctive paternalism toward their dependents.' (H.S. Stephenson, Chief Inspector of Mines, I was there, p.xi)

\*\* All 'having for their object the amelioration of the condition of the working classes' DNB and S.G. Tremenheere, 1925:85. See I was there p.114f for Tremenheere's own list of 14 acts 'to which my public work gave rise'.

\*\*\* There is evidence relating to the Bleaching and Dyeing Act 1860 in HO 87/3 Letters of 8 June and 8 August 1860; for the Bakehouses Regulation Act, 1863 Cf. P.P.1862 [3027]XLVII; 1863 [3091]XXVI; 1865(175) XLVII; 1866(394)LXVI and Marx, 1867:174 and passim. Marx makes extensive use of the Commission documents which Tremenheere wrote.

workers not yet covered by the Factory Regulation Acts. (Webb, 1955a: 353; Holmes M.A. thesis 116f). I stress the general quality of his work. Even to list his 'specific' posts (for his was a 'roving' Commissioner after 1859) of H.M. Inspector (1839-1843); Assistant Poor Law Commissioner (part-time 1842-44); and Commissioner for Mining Districts (1843-1859), ignores how he interpreted each of these in the most general way possible. He, like several of these State Servants, was often working for more than one Department at the same time; thus he sent several reports to the Poor Law Commission via the Education Committee of the Privy Council (I was there, 48f).

Sutherland has recently stated that the 'Education Department continued to recruit its inspectors and examiners through patronage until 1914' (Sutherland, 1969b: 263). The first appointment began that tradition: Tremenheere was canvassed for by both the Cornwall MPs and by several others. One of the MPs (Sir Charles Lemon) described Tremenheere to Lord Lansdowne as 'the only Whig in the family'; Lemon, Talfourd (another of his backers) and Tremenheere were all founder members of the Central Society of Education (Parkin, 1975; CSE Papers), the secretary of which (B.F. Duppa) had apparently casually met Tremenheere and suggested the post of H.M.I. to him. Lansdowne, it seems, already knew of Tremenheere since, in letters and when they met, he mentioned Tremenheere's Edinburgh Review pieces; Tremenheere was also known to the Times, enough to welcome his appointment in November 1839 (Hurt, 1971: 40 fn ). Tremenheere had previously been a revising barrister on the Western Circuit; his Journals report how he was

intent upon the general subjects of political

and social interest then occupying the public mind.

Foremost among them, or nearly so, was the great question of popular education.

On his circuit he carried relevant volumes, including that of Brougham\*

full of stirring facts showing what an immense need there was for a large system of improvement\*\*.

Like the other State Servants Tremenheere never lost this twin focus; he saw that 'system of improvement' as being centrally achieved through 'popular education'. But perhaps more than the others, for he was more closely a patrician Whig than a Liberal, he saw it as part of his task to educate and advise the bourgeoisie, particularly those he often described as having 'only' money and no breeding. Several of his administrative methods reflect the latter as I shall indicate.

Tremenheere's first task, as an HMI, was to investigate schools in South Wales. He arrived in Newport on Christmas Eve, 1839, and stayed with Edmund Head (a friend from Winchester) at Pontypool Park. On Boxing Day he studied a map and met 'several gentlemen'. It is only 'after a few days, when I had obtained a good idea of the state of affairs, 'that he started 'on my Inquiry'.\*\*\*

---

\* His political perspective is also clear from his two visits to the socialist centre near Blackfriars, the Rotunda, after which he noted that 'Brougham has lost caste with them' (I was there; Webb, 1955a:354)

\*\* These quotations come from his journals in I was there; but see his reviews 1837, 1838, 1839 for similar views; there is a valuable letter from Tremenheere to Chadwick (Mss, 1988, 16 January 1858) in which Tremenheere states that amongst 'All my friends... of the oldest Tory school ...I was considered a scarcely endurable political heretic'. His 'friends were sore stricken by the Reform Bill...'

\*\*\* Kay's instructions to Tremenheere are given [Contd. on next page]

He then visits cottages and takes evidence 'testing it by ascertaining what the Agents and employers had to say to it'. It was always his policy to show drafts of his final reports to those whose views and practices he was summarising.

Tremenheere's work is discussed in the Edinburgh Review<sup>\*</sup> article already mentioned in connection with Kay. The Review makes his report on South Wales the subject of a special comment, noting his attention to the quality of the teachers and the nature of the schools and agreeing with him that both are insufficient to discipline the minds, and therefore raise the taste and habits, of the population. Like Tremenehere they see that the teachers and school are too much like the homes and parents of the children; this makes the whole community vulnerable to 'any rash or designing anarchist' (Review p.117). In contrasting Tremenehere's report on Cornwall they agree with him in finding the 'soil' (i.e. the human beings) there 'more favourable'; but, thus far, little has been done: inadequate teachers, materials and buildings are mentioned. Finally, Norfolk schools provide a contrast in that the schools that have been established there appear to be subject to a boycott because of the 'feeling of hostility and aversion towards their employers' held by the 'great

---

P.P. 1851 (103) XLIII 53f. Typically Tremenehere's Journals (and most of the secondary accounts) see him as going 'to inquire into the causes of the late outbreak among the mining population called Frost's rebellion' (I was there, p.37)

\* Vol.75, April 1842. On his HMI career see Roberts, 1960; Ball, 1963; Johnson, Ph.D; Edmonds, 1963. I shall not repeat much of this information - in particular Tremenehere, like many of the HMIs, gives much technical information on teaching methods in his reports collected in the first volume of the Minutes.

mass of the population', some of whom are handloom weavers.

One of the particular skills possessed by several of these State servants was their ability to write quickly. One major Inspection undertaken by Tremenheere illustrates this - his examination of the Greenwich Hospital Schools. Tremenheere notes in his Journal (I was there, p.51) that his reports to the Poor Law Commission, with E.C. Tufnell, concerning the Pauper Union schools of Manchester and Liverpool, 'attracted the attention of the Admiralty'. The Minutes (P.P. 1841 [317] XX 110) published the letter from the Governor of Greenwich Hospital to the Secretary to the Lords of the Admiralty (7th August 1840, sent on by the Admiralty on the 10th and by the Committee (i.e. Kay) to Tremenheere on 11th). Tremenheere's Journal (I was there pp.51-2) records that he did not wish to go ahead without a letter from the Admiralty protecting him from interference of any officials at Greenwich or Admiralty staff in general. According to a letter to his brother Henry (Ibid., 52-53) Tremenheere was in the School for three days and then started work on his report, which he had already (as was his usual custom) talked over with Kay. By 9th September the Report had been completed, for Kay sent it that day to the Admiralty. The printed report extends for eight folio pages, plus two and a half further pages of timetables. On 1st December 1840 Kay wrote to the Admiralty to remind them they had had this report for nearly three months; on the 14th the Admiralty appears to have established a subcommittee of the Office of Woods to consider the Report. On 20th January 1841 they reported that

the allegations of Mr. Tremenheere's Report

[were] borne out by the ... officers [whom they

had questioned]. We agree with Mr. Tremenheere ...

that for whatever service the children are intended;  
 their education should be grounded on religious  
 instruction\*, and that a greater degree of order,  
 regularity, and discipline is necessary to fit  
 them for any situation.

(P.P. 1841 Ibid., p.123)

The committee accepted almost all of Tremenheere's specific  
 recommendations.

In his general criticism of the school Tremenheere made points  
 characteristic of his reports already mentioned. But he stressed  
 two kinds of demoralization: the ability of girls and boys to meet  
 unsupervised, and, the lack of any aspect in the education provided  
 that would make girls and boys 'correct in their habits' - they  
 could thereby not resist the 'vicious influences' they would encounter  
 in the various sea ports in which they would work. He offered, as  
 part of his criticism, a detailed timetable - régime would be a  
 better description; this is very severe. Although he, like Kay  
 was against corporal punishment (and had it stopped at Norwood,  
 Cf. I was there, p.51), he cheerfully established\*\* a timetable for  
 the upper and lower schools which involved rising, Mondays through to

---

\* Tremenheere's focus on religion was much more Coleridgean than  
 the other State servants here discussed; for him it was more the  
 basis for any civilizing, and all moral, discipline.

\*\* In many ways Tremenheere was unquantitative - preferring always  
 the moral dimension - but his reports do contain 'hard data' and his  
 statistical discussions (1842, 1843) show he was numerate. But he  
 always sought to use statistics morally; when a Commissioner, he asked  
 for statistics to be collected so that the 'whole country could see  
 the enormous tax they ... pay... arising from the restriction of  
 labour' (P.P. 1847 [844] XVI: 11)

Saturdays, at 5.30 a.m. without breakfast until 8 a.m. The severity was in his staffing establishment, where he lists annual salaries of £12 to £13 for Labourers; it is also present in his eagerness to restrict the numbers of pairs of shoes handed out to the pupils.

In 1842 Tremenheere produced his infamous report on nine British and Foreign Schools in the Metropolis. What the Dissenters objected to was not simply his criticism of the Lancastrian system of education (although there is evidence here that Kay and Tremenheere worked consistently against Borough Road in favour of Battersea methods); but because the whole Inspection reeked of what had always been feared - bias. Agreement had been reached with both the Church of England, and with the Church of Scotland, that the religious bodies had the right of nomination concerning Inspectors for their schools. No such agreement existed with the schools of Dissenters. (Ball, 1963: 52f). I think that the Eclectic Review (1842) were right to call Tremenheere an 'avowed foe' of the B. & F. Schools. As they footnote to that expression

We are informed, on unquestionable authority, that in visiting British schools, Mr. Tremenheere has invariably depreciated the system adopted by the society...

(Ibid., p.486)

They were also right, on Tremenheere's own account<sup>\*</sup>, to see the latter's reports as

published under the direction of an individual,  
(we allude of course to Dr. Kay) pledged to  
another system.

---

\* See the quotation from his Journals in my Appendix I below, App.37.



Kay and Tremenheere (the latter also because of his Anglicanism) could not support a system which did not provide an 'agent of transformation' in the person of teacher, and pupil teachers, in the schools. The matter was, in that sense, not a matter of 'the facts'; from Tremenheere's own accounts, for example, there were schools 'as bad' in Norfolk or Monmouth. It is also true, and relevant, that when the British and Foreign sent a Deputation to see Tremenheere (in 'my chambers in the Reform Club') they could not find a 'single error of fact or unfair conclusion from any of the facts' (I was there, p.45). In response to Tremenheere's Report, and what they saw as Kay's campaign, the Eclectic Review wished to establish free trade in Religion, laissez faire with regard to Christian doctrine. They quote Henry Dunn

The great and golden rule for governors in relation to religion, - Protect and let alone, is a simple deduction from the Bible.

(Ibid., 1842: 501)

The outcome was that an Inspector acceptable to Dissent - Joseph Fletcher - succeeded Tremenheere; but Fletcher, as I quoted above, was committed to a dynamic policy with regard to the State which did not fit the above slogans of Dunn.

Ball (1963: 54) agrees with Lord Wharncliffe's verdict on Tremenheere when she quotes it - he was able but 'tactless'. The administrative response was a familiar one, Tremenheere was put on 'standby duties' - various short term projects that did not cause conflict with the British and Foreign Society. Although the 1842 Mines Act should have come into force in March 1843 (MacDonagh,

1967: 62<sup>\*</sup>) nothing was done until September of that year partly because Sir James Graham, the Home Secretary, was uncertain as to the value of the Act (Cassell M.Sc. p.2f). On 25th November 1843, Graham told Tremenheere that 'The Government had determined upon appointing an Inspector of Mines and Collieries (in reality Commissioner of Enquiry on the State of Mining Population) with an additional salary of £100 a year and a promise from Sir J. Graham that I shall have the duty of attending to the District Schools as Assistant P.L. Commissioner pro.tem.'. Later, Lord Wharncliffe told Tremenheere that he might remain an H.M.I. for occasional duties (I was there, p.47). In revising his Journals in retirement, Tremenheere added to his parenthetical comment quoted above, against the word Inspector: 'a misnomer for I had only to do with the people' (qu I was there, p.46 fn.2) Although these Poor Law and Education appointments, or promises, were never, it seems, honoured, MacDonagh shows the educational relevance of Tremenheere's reports as a Commissioner (MacDonagh, 1967: 63). Indeed the Letter of appointment<sup>\*\*</sup> sent to Tremenheere by Manners Sutton (Chief Clerk at the Home Office) invites him to do this. Apart for instructing him to

secure to the Laborers [sic] employed in Mines  
and Collieries, the benefits which have been  
guaranteed them by Parliament;

---

\* I discussed some of the antecedents of the Act above; it received the Royal Assent 10 August 1842. Cf. O.P. Edmonds, 1963; MacDonagh, 1967; Cassell M.Sc. thesis and Tancred's Midland Mining Commission (P.P. 1843 XIII); Mather, 1970; Phillips, 1974.

\*\* For the Children's Employment Commission 1840-1842, Cf. my discussion under Horner above. These documents are in the P.R.O. H.O. 87/1 series (f.286) and H.O. 45 339/2a: H.O. to Treasury, 23 November 1843; Trevelyan to H.O. agrees the salary and conditions.

he was also told to report to the Home Secretary

from time to time ... respecting the general  
state and condition of the persons employed  
in the Mines.

In the preceding letter to the Treasury, it is clear that Graham had been much affected by Tancred's report - it is mentioned by name. In both the letter to Tremenheere, and the letter to the Treasury, there is mention of complaints that call for immediate investigation - above all (1) the employment of women; and (2) the Truck system, within which Graham includes cash-payments in the Beerhouse.\* Tremenheere saw these Instructions as giving him

a fine scope for applying my mind to the serious  
social problems that were giving so much anxiety to  
statesmen. I was left - and it was a great  
compliment - to take my own course in carrying out  
my duties.

(I was there, p.57)

In September 1844 Tremenheere uttered this prayer

May God prosper the work I have done and which  
I have before me, to the moral improvement and  
the improved physical comfort of those who  
cannot speak for themselves - the collier and  
the mining population.

(Journals, IV: 196 qu Holmes M.A. thesis p.144)

Tremenheere's prayer - like Horner, his paternal attitude to the working class is very clear here - is genuine. He needed much

---

\* On 27th May 1856 Manners Sutton wrote to Tremenheere describing Truck as 'a system by which most serious injury is inflicted on the Labourers' H.O. 87/111 folio 288.

energy. There were some 2,500 collieries employing over 120,000 people throughout England, Wales and Scotland in 1843. The Act, moreover, was not what Ashley and others had fought for; powerful opposition had considerably diluted it - the organisation of Lord Londonderry and the Newcastle Coal Trade Office was again demonstrated\*. According to Ashley himself, the amendments made to his Act by the Lords had ruined it (Hansard 6th August 1842)\*\* . It is definitely to Tremenheere's credit (Cassell M.Sc. thesis Ch.8; MacDonagh, 1967: 64f) that the 1850 Mines Act instituted a technically qualified underground Inspectorate. The numbers were, however, trivial: four in 1850, six in 1852, 12 in 1855, 24 in 1873, 92 in 1944 and 188 in 1950 (Cassell Ibid., Ch.9; MacDonagh, 1967: 77). P.E.H. Hair has shown (using figures which he knows to be very incomplete for the early decades) that deaths in the North East Coal Mines alone, from 1800 to 1849, totalled over 1,650.

Tremenheere's methods of Inspection were to circularize\*\*\* the owners and Agents in an area to be visited with extracts of the 1842 Act. He also employed specific 'letters of introduction'. He interviewed first 'leading men among the work people' and then put their testimony before the Agents and owners:

I took both sides into my confidence and, as it were,

\* On Londonderry and the Office see Cassell M.Sc. thesis Ch.1; Bready, 1925:267f; O.P. Edmonds, 1963; MacDonagh, 1967:61f; Heeson, 1974: 240f.

\*\* Ashley was especially bitter since he had met Londonderry and already agreed to lower the minimal working age from 14 to 10; and agreed that those in work aged 9 and over could continue.

\*\*\* Like Horner, Tremenheere also circulated (in his person and his reports) both technical and sociological information on best practices and methods.

brought both sides together, through myself.

(I was there, p.59)

He consulted the relevant Inspectors of Factories to find the best 'Firms of Attornies' to whom he sent the 1842 Act and instructions to collect relevant evidence; if sufficient were collected for a prosecution, Tremenheere sent this to the Home Office and asked the Home Secretary to prosecute. It should be stressed that there are a number of 'interpretation stages' built into this, each of them affording an opportunity for political friendship and pressure to 'translate' a prosecution into a warning; a warning into a caution; a caution into a friendly word, and so on. But Tremenheere did not even try to carry out the Act in some instances. He applied the above procedure

except in a few localities where the seams of coal were so small that the labour of boys was essential to the working of the Mine.

(I was there, p.59)

Here he simply gave a warning; even this was not done where 'the capital embarked in collieries in the very small seams had been large'. As late as ten years after his appointment (in 1853 or 1853) Tremenheere also refused

a peremptory order from a new Permanent Under Secretary which instructed him to enforce the Act. Tremenheere responded that the practice would

continue until those particular seams were worked out and not 'til then. I heard no more of it.

One wonders about the 'peremptory order' since much of the support given to Ashley's 1842 Act had come from thick-seam Owners, they would not be pleased to see their competitors able to employ much

cheaper labour. This general sensibility to the variable labour 'requirements' of (capitalist) mine working marks out many of Tremenheere's actions.

It contributed, for example, to his original desire that the Print Works Act, rather than the Factory Acts - in relation to their respective educational régimes - be applied to Mines. He conferred in this matter with Leonard Horner, and Tremenheere also seems to think that he had the support of the H.M.I., the Rev. W.J. Kennedy (P.P. 1852-3 [1679] XL, p.10). But the next year he reports that the scheme had been opposed by the Education Office (P.P. 1854-5 [1993] XV p.7f; Cassell M.Sc.). By 1855, Tremenheere's original request for 150 hours of education within each six months for all children in the mines under 14 years of age, has been reduced to 100 hours each six months (P.P. 1856 [2125] XVIII p.16f). By the 1860s he seems to have accepted the inevitability of the half-time system (1861; 1865a:4).

Tremenheere, in common with the other State servants sought to encourage 'correct views' on a number of issues. More than the others (although perhaps he was closer to Chadwick in this<sup>\*</sup>), however, he also sought to educate the ruling class in their duties. He circulated large numbers of his reports for example: 1000 or so from the mid 1840s; 2000 by 1850, as many as 3,500 in the mid 1850s and then a steady 750 from 1854. (I was there p.60f; H.O. 87/3 8 Aug 1854; 2 Aug 1856). He also attempted to enlist the help of Harriet Martineau

---

\* There were regular letters from Tremenheere to Chadwick from the 1840s onwards - Tremenheere clearly discussed his reports with Chadwick at some length; in the 1870s onwards the position was reversed, Chadwick sent many pamphlets in draft to Tremenheere.

to produce a journal to oppose the Mine's Advocate, which had been an important unifying influence on the Northumbrian pitmen in 1843 and 1844. This did not come about - largely because Martineau was too radical for Tremenheere; indeed they finally parted company when Martineau continued to support the radical Peoples Journal\*.

I have already noted that Tremenheere's Instructions gave him (as he recognised) a very wide scope for investigation and consultation. Two incidents illustrate how his administrative methods reflected that scope. First, in 1845 he met and discussed their grievances with a strike Committee in Newcastle. As he noted in his Journal

There was at that time a decided aversion, both on the part of Employers and the Government, to have any communication with such committees.

(I was there; p.64; Cf. Webb, 1955a: 358-9)

Here Tremenheere is mediating in a clearly modern sense; a direct comparison would be with George Askwith the anti-hero of Dangerfield's Strange Death of Liberal England\*\* In the same way Tremenheere was in the vanguard in his recognition of the need for what he called a 'Justice Man' to settle disputes as to the weight and quality of the coal dug by individual pitmen or teams. This is close to - but still not the same as - the modern Check Weighman - a union official. More relevant (and, again, like Askwith) is the reasoning which led

\* I was there, pp. 62, 63, 74; Cassell, MSc p.32f; Webb, 1955a:357; 363f. On the break Cf. Webb, 1955a:363 fn32 and Webb 1960.

\*\* Cf. Caldwell, 1959; Davidson, 1969; Askwith, 1920; Halevy, 1919. For 'employer-socialism', Cf. Halevy, 1921; Church, 1971; Nichols, 1975; Ramsay, 1977. Dangerfield's book was originally produced in 1935 Cf. T. Wilson, 1966; Meacham, 1972 and the crucial work of Desmarais, 1971; 1973; 1974; 1975

Tremenheere to consider suggesting a 'Justice Man' - it was to take this problematic area 'out of the hands of the agitator' (P.P. 1856 [2125] XVIII ).

Sir James Graham when he heard that Tremenheere had been discussing matters with a Strike Committee was 'in a great state of alarm' reports Tremenheere 'but when he saw my reports he was mollified' (qu Webb, 1955a: 359). In 1842 (Cf. Peel, 1899) there are several examples of letters which show Graham aware of the dangers of the rigid attitudes of the coalowners; I also quoted Peel above to the effect that he thought what we would today call 'excess profits' were being made by the owners. But when Graham wrote, in 1844, to one of the largest owners and Lord Lieutenant of County Durham (Londonderry) he said that a Trades Union

is a serious evil, and is proof of a deep seated malignant malady in the heart of the Nation; but it must be treated with great Caution; and with some forbearance.

(qu Heeson, 1974: 253)

Interestingly, when Tremenheere does refer to the meeting with the Union in his official reports it is to link unions and their restrictive practices through which 'they are getting higher wages for less work' (P.P. 1847 [844] XVI).

In 1845 Tremenheere sought to encourage the provision of an efficient water supply\* and police force in the Airdrie district of

---

\* One of the important aspects of the long Chadwick-Tremenheere correspondence is the way that they learn to synthesize their views - Chadwick had earlier criticised Tremenheere for ignoring these environmental factors.



Lanarkshire. He circularized local gentry to this effect, submitted a draft Bill to the Home Office, and attended a public meeting in Glasgow. He was censured for all these activities by Sir James Graham, who had already warned him in January 1844 about some possible dangers of his methods of work. Now, Graham hopes that Tremenheere

will perceive that the unauthorized [intervention] of an officer of the Government in the discussion of matters, which however important they may be, do not come within the limits of his official duties, is likely to weaken his authority.

Tremenheere is told to contact the 'Gentlemen' again and to ensure that they understand that these views have been those of Tremenheere alone. Tremenheere apologized (I was there, 70f) He should perhaps have asked for his duties to be more technically defined\*.

Tremenheere's part in the extension of Inspection has been accurately told elsewhere (O.P. Edmonds, 1963; MacDonagh, 1967; Cassell M.Sc. thesis). After his meeting with the Strike Committee Tremenheere went to meet local Agents. They were not fools: Nicholas Wood (Lord Ravensworth's Agent) was first President of the North of England Mining Engineers Society; Charles Morton (Lord Londonderry's Agent) became an Inspector under the 1850 Act and had been associated with Martineau and Tremenheere before; and T.J. Taylor (the Duke of Northumberland's Agent) was a skilled engineer and mineowner himself. This group took the lead in communicating with other agents in discussing the 'advisability' of better Inspection. In 1847 they

---

\* H.O. 87/1 1.1.1844; 27.1.1845. Tremenheere includes the two relevant Local Acts amongst those for which he claims some responsibility.

called a meeting in London, which Tremenheere addressed. But the majority rejected the proposals. In the same year the Darley Main disaster occurred; Tremenheere had to compile a special report on it (P.P. 1849 (1051) XXII ) in which he recorded his views on the need for a technical Inspectorate. His reports on the system of Inspection in Belgium, France and 'Germany' were also widely known. Special scientific Inspectors were already employed to investigate major explosions - Leonard Horner's son-in-law Sir Charles Lyell and Dr. Lyon Playfair had both been thus employed\*.

It was in fact major explosions that did most for increased Inspection. The Economist, for example, agreed, after the 1845 Jarrow explosion, that legislative intervention between employers and employed was needed since

in the present contract between these two parties -  
the coal owners and the coal miners - there is no  
sort of equality ...

(Economist 30 Aug 1845; qu Cassell M.Sc. Ch.8)

In 1849 the Lords established a select committee on Dangerous Accidents in Mines, taking lengthy evidence from Tremenheere and from scientist-reformers like Matthias Dunn. The committee reported in favour of a qualified inspectorate and the registration of mining plans, but against the use of coercion and significant sanctions. Whilst this Committee had sat the Home Secretary had received a technical report on Inspection; and, a meeting in Durham (including

---

\* Cf. Cassell M.Sc. thesis; Edmonds; MacDonagh; P.E.H. Hair; Heesom, for further information on these points.

pitmen and Agents) had petitioned for legislation. Finally in July 1850 a Government Bill on Inspection was published, in the Lords. It was very weak in terms of sanctions:

£5 - £10 for obstructing an Inspector ...

£10 - £20 for failing to notify the Home Secretary of a fatal accident and its probable cause.

(qu MacDonagh, 1967: 75 fn.3)

But, despite this weakness, Brougham and Londonderry both opposed it; the former saw in such a Bill

unjustifiable interference with the rights of labour and property

(qu Heesom, 1974: 243)

Londonderry defied the Government to find an Inspector who would be as concerned with safety as the existing agents and owners (Ibid; this echoes the views of Harriet Martineau quoted above). Concessions were made and the Act received the Royal Assent on 14th August, with four Inspectors gazetted in November 1850: Tremenheere had been consulted as to their suitability (I was there, p.69)

The initial instructions issued to the new Inspectors are very analogous to the methods of work of Tremenheere or the Instructions to his staff issued by Horner:

You will not fail to act with courtesy and forbearance in your official intercourse with all parties, and you will encourage a good feeling and understanding between the miners and their employers

(qu MacDonagh 1967: 76 fn.5)

It is equally relevant to note that the Inspectors' 1854 Report shows that of 1759 deaths in mines in England and Wales in the 1851-1853 period only 2 cases of manslaughter were prosecuted - both against other pitmen. None were prosecuted against management or owners. No cases of negligence were taken up at all (P.P. 1854 (1845) XXI 165f). Further more, the Home Office had a 'sociological' category of acceptable death:

common casualties which might occur in any  
kind of employment

(H.O. 87/3 3 December 1850)

and instructed the new Inspectors they should not attend the inquests for these pitmen. Of course, even where they did attend they frequently reported (often with irony or open disgust) the ways in which the verdict 'accidental death' obscured the causes of, and the responsibilities for, the deaths.

Tremenheere was subsequently involved in extension of Inspection. For example, on 29th April 1854 he gave evidence to a London conference of Coal Owners and Agents, which had been called and organised by the Coal Trade Office of the North East and was chaired by Sir Nicholas Wood with whom Tremeneheere had corresponded in 1847 (Webb, 1955a: 366; Cassell, M.Sc. : Ch.11; Cf. MacDonagh, 1967: 76f; O.P. Edmonds, 1963: 216f).

I mentioned that in his original Instructions to Tremeneheere Sir James Graham had stressed the problem of Truck. Tremeneheere's understanding of Truck indicates some of his key sociological ideas (more fully discussed in Chapter Four) and how those ideas penetrate his practice as a State Servant. He was concerned that Truck prevented

the existence of a middle class, and thus removed the kinds of stability which would follow from the presence of that class. In the same way, he often complains in his reports that there are no Churches in the area. He speaks in his Journals of such institutions as 'centres of power ... the aristocracy, the church, the municipal institutions' (qu Holmes thesis)\*. It is worth repeating here that by the 1850s it is possible to find AntiTruck associations funded and organised by the larger Iron- and Coal-masters and opposed by workers who objected to the higher prices and lack of credit of the nonTruck shops, (Cassell M.Sc. Ch.7). For Tremenheere 'proper' schools, 'proper' shops and 'proper' institutions establish a middle class:

precisely in those localities where their valuable influence and instrumentality are most wanting, as the connecting link of society between those who gain their living by the work of their hands and those who accumulate vast fortunes by the skilful direction of that labour.

(P.P. 1852 [1525] XXI: 12-13; Cf. P.P. 1844 [592] XVI: 26-28 for similar words)

Without these influences 'anarchic socialism' is a likely result because the

sympathies of the labouring class are already very strongly directed against the capitalist, by those numerous anarchical publications which are daily addressed to them ...

---

\* Cf. P.P. 1846 [737] XXIV: 25f; P.P. 1849 [1109] XXII: 19; P.P. 1856 [2125] XVIII: 32f, and Tremenheere, 1852; 1865b; 1882; 1893.

Such publications promote ideas of restriction of output and are copied from the Socialist literature of the continent, of from lectures and addresses of itinerant advocates. (Ibid., 13, 14 Cf. Preface to Tremenheere, 1852; 1865b; 1882)

It would, one supposes, be too much to ask that Tremenheere and the others be recognised as 'itinerant advocates' on their circuits for their clients.

After the other Inspectorate was established, as several of the secondary sources stress, Tremenheere devoted his energies much more fully to educational topics. Central preoccupations of this time were his prize schemes and leaving certificates. These were complementary: the schemes<sup>\*</sup> were means to 'induce' children 'to attend more regularly and to stay a little longer at school' and were aimed at 'the sons of small tradesmen and superior artisans' (1857: 173, 175). In the case of the latter, which focussed attention on the majority of children, where Tremenheere argued parental and public opinion, plus the 'demands of the labour market', made it 'impossible to prevent this early removal of children.. ..' (Ibid., 181); the leaving certificate, linked to centrally prepared public examinations, were to make education relevant to

---

\* The schemes started in South Staffordshire (P.P. 1851 [1406] XXIII, Appx A; 1857:173); by 1856 there were schemes in Staffordshire, Shropshire, Northumbria; S. Wales, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire (P.P. 1856 [2125] XVIII, p.16). 12 schemes are described in his 1857 (pp. 176f) and 2756 candidates mentioned in 1858 (P.P. 1859 Sess.2 [2566] XII p.22). By 1861 there were 23 schemes (P.P. 1861 (354)XLVIII, pp.9f). Apart from his own accounts, Cf. Cassell's thesis Ch.VIII and E. Hopkin's article in History of Education Society Bulletin, 15 (Spring 1975) 24-37 which Durham University was unable to locate in time for me to use here.

parents and employers who all too often dismissed it as 'schooling' (1857: 183f). Tremenheere acknowledges that these 'school certificates' would not count as much as: (i) a bright and intelligent eye and a 'bodily framework apt for labour'; or (ii) good 'relatives and connexions' (Ibid., 186f). But they may be relevant: (a) where competition is most strong, or (b) for clerical work. The main point to note, perhaps, is Tremenheere's denial of the 'homogeneous' nature of elementary school children; he saw, instead those needing 'mere rudiments' and those who require 'something more'.

Tremenheere's general educational views can be found in his long evidence to the Newcastle Commission and his 1865 paper to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. Simply and starkly

A great mass ... is growing up without any education at all.

(Tremenheere, 1865a: 12)

But, care must be taken here since an examination of Tremenheere's evidence to the Newcastle Commission and his open disagreement with E.C. Tufnell (in the Second Report of the Royal Commission on Agricultural Employment, P.P. 1868-9 [4202] XIII ) show up important, apparently, anti-Erastian views. In his 1861 Evidence he argues that his prize scheme has shown that working -class parents can be persuaded to contribute more to school costs; he therefore argues that the large annual grants to schools and training colleges should be gradually reduced and finally abolished. His reasons are worth examining. Twenty years ago (1840)

it was essential to the general welfare, in the then existing state of society, that greatly

increased facilities should be given for bringing elementary education within the reach of the whole labouring class ...

(P.P. 1861 (354) XLVIII p.2)

Twenty years ago it was absolutely essential to the public safety and well-being that a great effort should be made by the Government to extend elementary education more widely among the labouring classes ... through the instrumentality of the elementary school.

(Ibid., p.15)

This scheme has failed: the 'anticipations have not been realised' on the one hand, since most children leave as soon as possible\* . On the other, paradoxically, State provision has succeeded in making itself redundant. 'Public opinion' has changed

The whole country can no longer be fairly called upon to pay the school fees of those ... well able ... to pay them themselves.

(Ibid., p.15)

He thus sees (i) the 'superior class' being happy to pay; (ii) others encouraged by prize schemes and leaving certificates\*\* now being prepared to pay; (iii) 'the exaction of higher school fees in proportion to the capabilities of the parents to pay them' (Ibid., p.17). ~~On my~~ own reading, in terms of the 1861 paper alone, he in fact

\* 'As regards the rest, this small minority belongs ... to the superior class of artisans earning from 1 1. to 2 1. a week ... (Ibid., p.2)

\*\* This is quite close to 'payment by results' being linked to a change in the nature of Inspection Cf. Tremenheere, 1857; 1861 Evidence, Appendix A.



does not answer his own question

How are the elements of a sound education to be diffused among the mass of the working classes without that cost to the Government which experience proves to be entirely thrown away?

(Ibid., p.16)

The answer has to be found in the work of his later years as a State Servant in the steady extension of the Factory, and other, Acts which included educational clauses. This, it seems to me, forms the basis of the disagreement with Tufnell mentioned above. Whereas the latter calls for full State schooling, (but then quotes Burke on the limits of Government); Tremenheere opposes the provision of a minimum age below which no child shall work<sup>\*</sup>

I have shown it inexpedient and ~~unnecessary~~ that the Legislature should interfere with existing habits ... but he calls for the enforcement of provisions connecting the obligation of school attendance with wages-earning employment as this is the 'only sound principle ...' (P.P. 1868-9 [4202] XIII).

In his paper to the NAPSS (1865a) Tremenheere shows how the half-time system involved in the Factories Act has been extended from the 1830s onwards. He was reporting as one of the two surviving Commissioners of the 1862 Children's Employment Commission that eventually produced six reports<sup>\*\*</sup>. He reports to the National

---

\* It was not until 1944 that it was made illegal to employ a school child full-time in 'factory' employment.

\*\* For this work see my biography and bibliography of Tremenheere's activities, the 1862 Commission had HST, Tufnell and [Contd. on p.261]

Association that the number of children, young persons and women 'under regulation' were

Under the Factory Acts in 1862: 573,898

Under the Extension Act in 1864: 30,000

Covered by the Commission thus far: 1,200,000

(1865a: 12-13)

Eventually, with the various Acts of the '70s the half time system was extended and remained in being until 1918.

But Tremenheere's apparent anti-Erastianism is not a simple matter. Did he not record in his Journal that Forster's Act of 1870 was one of those for which Tremenheere felt responsible? In the Autumn of 1846 he had dinner with Cobden and Bright and they were hostile to his face; saying:

You humanitarians will ruin the manufacturing industries of the country ... you are all 'theorists' and don't know the mischief you are creating.

(I was there Ch.4; Webb, 1955a: 362)

Certainly, as I shall discuss in Chapter Four, Tremenheere saw, at the end of his life, that he had been opposed by political representatives who felt they were following the ideas of Bentham (I was there, p.99) which Tremenheere re-interpreted as

[\*\* Cont. from p.260]R.D. Grainger originally, but Grainger died in 1864. At this time Tremenheere was also Commissioner for Bakehouses; he and Tufnell went on to become Commissioners on Agricultural Employment... Cf. P.P.s: 1854-5 [1943] XVII; 1861 [2797] XXII; 1862 [3027] XLVII; 1863 [3091] XXVII; 1863 [3170] XVIII; 1864 [3414] XXII; 1865 (175) XLVII; 1865 [3548] XX; 1866 (394) LXVI; 1866 [3678] XXIV; 1867 [3796] XVI; 1867-8 [4068] XVII; 1868 [4149] XIV; 1868-9 [4202] XIII; 1870 [70] XIII; 1870 [221] XIII.

the mere art of massing wealth apart from all  
moral considerations

(I was there, p.115)

Tremenheere was also, as I indicated above, perhaps more patrician than the other State Servants. In 1854, for example, he wrote to Chadwick from Pall Mall in response to Chadwick's request for information concerning jobbing and corruption in the U.S.A. Tremenheere gives him some facts and then adds:

Take care in your (if it is your) proposed new mode of appointing Civil Servants, to offices of Trust, that you do not get un-common clever fellows from some 3rd rate place of Ed<sup>n</sup>, who

[p.3]

will sell public documents to the first Newspaper that offers a good price, just at a moment when nobody ought to know any thing about them.

(Chadwick Mss. 1988; 9 June 1854; qu. Lewis, 1950:189)\*

I still feel, finally, that the most neglected feature of Tremenheere, which he shares with the other State Servants I am discussing, is the sheer extent of their work. Ignoring his pamphleteering after 1870; Tremenheere served in major positions from 1839 to 1870. Aside from his regular and special reports as HMI or Commissioner for Mining Districts; Tremenheere produced a set of special reports on particular industries which extend to 4,000 folio pages; there were altogether ten reports for the two Commissions of the 1860s together with as many volumes of evidence. I have

---

\* Another area of disagreement between Chadwick and Tremenheere is revealed in an 1842 letter (qu Lewis, 1950:179 fn.3) which records Chadwick's opinion of de Tocqueville as 'that inaccurate observer and rash generaliser'.

already referred to the formal circulation of some of this material - Tremenheere himself saw to that; but there were, of course, the more public systems - Parliamentary Papers went to MPs, Newspapers, the Reviews and, in their turn (and Tremenheere himself was, like Senior, very adept at this) the Reports were used in subsequent Papers and Books<sup>\*</sup>. It seems to me worth placing on record - whatever the qualitative and quantitative problems of assessment there may be, the sheer weight, i.e. moral and material force<sup>\*\*</sup>, represented by a set of institutional 'arrangements' which made the construction of certain images, and their sustaining through such amplification, possible.

---

Edwin Chadwick

Chadwick (1800-1890) has not only been much studied but the biography by Finer (1952a) makes it clear that Chadwick was precisely the kind of revolutionary State Servant I have been discussing. But the fact that, in Chadwick's own words, he was making 'a revolution... in public administration' (1844 letter qu Finer, 1952a: 71) does not

---

\* There is also the 'private' State activity of his letters which feature strongly in the HO 87/ . series - although HST was not up to Kay's standard here, compare M.H. 32/48-50.

\*\* The reference is, of course, to Marx: '... the power of the State, the concentrated and organised force of society ... Force ... is itself an economic power' (1867:751) Cf. Engels to Schmidt 27 Oct 1890: 'Force (that is state power) is also an economic power' (Marx, 1965: 424), see my discussion in Chapter Two above.

seem to have been absorbed. Rather Chadwick has seriously distorted our image of State service at this time: first, his 'disciple' relationship to Bentham has been severely overstressed (part of the misinterpretation of Bentham I have already discussed) to ignore his moral and political commitments. Secondly, his persona and manner has become the stereotype for the new official, whereas he was a transitional type, part Lingen (sans Balliol, of course), part Horner or Tremenheere (sans Whig connections) and part Kay (without his medicine or his estate).

Chadwick founded, in the words of the Chairman of the Chadwick Trust to the Royal Sanitary Institute, 'the Chadwick school of thought' (Collins, 1913). Apart from being a whole ten apostles of Bentham as far as Finer is concerned (Finer, 1959); for the Webbs, Chadwick's

investigations were of great value in their  
influence on British Statesmanship  
(Webb, 1929a: 169)\*

Richardson, Chadwick's epitomist, wrote in 1862

In plain words [Chadwick] is a radical reformer,  
minus every apparent trace of the radical tendency.

---

\* In contrast with the others I have not attempted a full listing of Chadwick's official and private publications; Cf. Finer, 1952a: 516f for very full lists. Chadwick, 1887, is a two volume epitome. In 1884 Tremenheere wrote to Chadwick that 'St. Chad ought again to be a household name & made familiar by his statue being erected at the outfall of all the main Sewers in the Kingdom.' (Chadwick Mss. Tremenheere to Chadwick 5 December 1884). This correspondence shows the extent of the consensus amongst very different State Servants.

His political art conceals his art, and that which  
 from another would appear downright heresy comes  
 from his hand as harmless as though it meant nothing  
 under the sun

(Richardson, 1862: XVIII)

For the Webbs, again, Chadwick showed a  
 desire for administration by a national bureaucracy  
 with only supervisory elected bodies.

(Webb, 1929a: 235)

Richardson agrees and summarises Chadwick's 'administrative maxim'  
 regarding the Poor Law as: that

the initiators of relief should be ... permanent,  
 responsible, and well-qualified paid officers,  
 and ... the unpaid officers should only be  
 charged with supervisory functions.

(Chadwick, 1887: II: 324)

In many ways Chadwick's 'sanitary idea', as long as we recognise  
 the moral dimensions involved, embodies much more coherently how  
 the capitalist State (the State of the bourgeoisie, whether in  
 farming, finance, trade, or factories) has to attend to the reproduct-  
 ion of effective labour-power. (Cf. Finer, 1952a: 154f; 209f;  
 293f; 338f and Chadwick, 1887). His major themes - the labour  
 market, 'efficient' environment, adequate policing - demonstrate this  
 more general concern. Collins (1913: 320) gives a sketch of the  
 membership of the Chadwick school of thought: Dr. Southwood Smith;  
 Dr. William Farr; Dr. J.P. Kay, plus Lord Ashley (with whom Chadwick  
 sustained a monumental correspondence) and Florence Nightingale.

Collins then asks 'What, in fact, was Chadwick's sanitary idea?'

He considers it to have been a particular methodology<sup>\*</sup>, which demonstrates the limits of fate 'by getting behind fate itself', 'by getting at first principles', at causes. It entails a commitment to investigation, direct investigation, to find the antecedents of 'disease and crime' and then action, social action, to change those antecedents. This seems to me to be a particular sociology: involving a sensitive environmentalism and a series of moral categories<sup>\*\*</sup>. It appears to be a matter of facts, but is it?

In 1829 Chadwick described the 'idea' thus:

it is only from the most extended collection of facts, in which the disturbing causes are merged in the most general effect, that the general principle can be displayed with the certainty requisite of safe action.

(Chadwick, 1887: I: 63)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

---

\* Of course this methodology was not Chadwick's private property. Wilkinson's analysis (1875:19) of the papers of the Manchester Statistical Society (1853-1874) finds one third of the 122 total on sanitary questions. Cf. Cullen, 1975: Ch.4.

\*\* This is excellently displayed in the Times 7 December 1974 in the second leader 'Built-in crime' commenting on a news-story on the work of the 'sociological branch' of the Department of Environment.

\*\*\* In itself this is not surprising, Benthamism (in this) was not unique. Mill in his Logic (1843): 'That every fact which begins to exist has a cause, and that this cause must be found in some fact or concurrence of facts which immediately preceded the occurrence, may be taken for certain' (qu. Mill, 1973: 63-64). This ignores (a) the differential experience/constitution of the 'same' facts; (b) that power may sustain a particular construction of facts, a paradigm may aid error.

The practice of these State Servants was conducted as if they construed this method in the light of

the following principle: The determining cause of a social fact should be sought among the social facts preceding it and not among the states of individual consciousness ... The function of a social fact ought always to be sought in its relation to some social end.

(Durkheim, 1895: 110-111; his emphasis).

Individualism, in fact, occupied an unstable and ambiguous position in political economy (and in laissez faire; Cf. Mill's reasons for exempting 'education' from his General Law of 'Let Alone'). Although the conception of 'market' sustained the notions of pure individualism (the 'hidden hand' bringing order to spontaneous ad hoc decisions based on personal needs and desires); the conception of 'society' (and its correlate good, or wise, government, i.e. the State as such) could only operate with categories which were greater than the individual (like class) and which saw the 'elements' of those aggregate categories as exhibiting similar responses of covariation to similar stimuli.

Recall, in this connection, Kay's 'discovery', both in Edinburgh and again in Manchester, that, as it were, 'medical science was not enough'; to improve the physical condition of the people he was treating and studying, meant having to improve their moral condition<sup>\*</sup>. At work here is a particular notion of 'environment' which is as much

---

\* Chadwick's comment on Tremenheere's first report (Chadwick Mss. 2181/4 item 23) makes the contrary point - the physical environment cannot be ignored in making moral progress.



moral as physical; or, to repeat Kay's point: there has to be social and political action in order to ensure physical (physiological) improvement. A recent survey would give support to the Chadwick 'sanitary idea' in this:

The evidence suggests that any model of explanation covering famine, mortality, and epidemic disease cannot be reduced to the simple interaction between nutrition and infection... Neither medical advance nor greater agricultural productivity were the salient conditions ... but the structural and functional improvements effected by modern governments and their citizens.

(Post, 1976: 36, 37)

Indeed, left to themselves individual bourgeois and aristocrats would have established purely local schemes, if any.

Chadwick sought to create a basic national minimum standard of 'moral' and physical sanitation. His huge sanitary inquiries, or the more specific, more medical, local enquiries he established whilst Secretary to the Poor Law Commission<sup>\*</sup>, or such schemes as the registration of births and deaths (and the certification of causes of death); are all related to this single idea. But that basic sanitary idea is related to the labour-market which Chadwick knew to be different from the 'ordinary' commodity-exchange markets; labour-power was not simply any commodity. Chadwick's main experience begins, after all, with his service on both the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and the 1833 Factory Enquiry Commission -

---

\* For a recent survey of Poor Law medical services, Cf. Flinn, 1976.

he part-authored both reports<sup>\*</sup>, and then became the Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners. Chadwick claimed to have 'devised the machinery' of 'less eligibility' (Finer, 1952a: 70) but Finer is able to show, by page comparisons between Chadwick's texts and Bentham's Panopticon that the idea was centrally that of Bentham (Finer, 1952a: 72f). Finer's claim is that if we knew more of Chadwick's unpublished work on the Poor Laws, we would have to revise our opinion of him (Ibid., Ch.3); I doubt this since Finer says the unpublished material is contained in brief form in the evidence Chadwick gave to the 1834 Select Committee on Drink. Perusal of that text - unless it is to add the strong moral element that I have already stressed - would not cause any modification in what I have written. It is relevant to my discussion above that Chadwick sought to establish 'less eligibility' quickly and without exception; he foresaw what would happen if the P.L.C. proceeded - as they in fact did - unevenly and slowly: by 1838 there were still over 1000 parishes with 2 million people in the North with no experience of the Act (Finer, 1952a: 113f)

Collins' 1913 paper tends to support my earlier argument; in my terms he calls the 'sociology' of the 'old sanitarians' to the aid

---

\* Levy (1943: 837f) and Finer (1952a: 30f) contend for their respective subjects (Nassau Senior, and Chadwick) in terms of authorship of the 1834 Report. Chadwick and Senior had known one another since 1829 and they continued to co operate, often sending each other proofs of material for comment (Levy, 1943). Senior sent his Suggestions on popular education, and Chadwick several papers on the half-time system, P.T. and so on. Senior continued to be concerned with pauper matters - see his 1846 letter to Lord John Russell (Levy, Appx.14) and his 1859 memorandum on Pauper education (Ibid., p.179f).

of the new scientists. This kind of contrast is made in a number of studies of different Departments of State: between an old guard and a new type of civil servant. Johnson (1969) shows this for education; Djang (1942) and others for the Factory Inspectorate. It is equally dramatic in the case of Tremenheere's moral surveys and the reports of the four, technical, Inspectors of Coal Mines after 1850; or when John Simon and his medical doctors replaced Chadwick and his 'political' doctors (Kay, Farr, Southwood Smith Arnott ...). The 'sanitary idea' (no more than the 'educational' or 'statistical') was never a crude environmentalism; no more than Inspection was simply an administrative device.

In 1831, in a remarkable article in the Examiner (20 February, reprinted Chadwick, 1887: I: 163-169) Chadwick discussed 'The real incendiaries and promoters of crime'<sup>\*</sup> in which Chadwick argues that the prime duty of the State is 'the education of the people' especially in 'the habit of reading', especially of tracts. His evidence to the Buckingham Select Committee on Drunkenness (Chadwick, 1887: I: 109-125; Finer, 1952a: 70, 87) has a similar emphasis on education as 'a counteracting agency'<sup>\*\*</sup>. Like the others, Chadwick's educational focus never left him, but he gave it his own special emphasis. In the 1880s he admirably stressed the connection between the 'physical' and the 'moral' in a Memorandum on 'Education drill'

---

\* A revised version 'Taxes on knowledge' appeared in the Westminster Review March 1831 from which 5000 offprints were taken and circulated; (Finer, 1952a:31,35). On Chadwick's manipulation of the press (Ibid., 197f) (Cf. Clark, 1959); for circulation of the 1839 report (Finer, p.172).

\*\* There is disagreement between Richardson and Finer on Chadwick's views on allotments; for the 1834 Committee see Harrison, 1968; on James Silk Buckingham see N. Pearson Ph.D. thesis.

naming three reasons for drill

1. Sanitary or Bodily...
2. Moral - For giving an early initiation to all that is implied in the term discipline, VIZ:- DUTY. ORDER. OBEDIENCE TO COMMAND. SELF-RESTRAINT. PUNCTUALITY. PATIENCE.
3. Economical ... adds, at a trifling expense, to the efficiency and productive value of pupils as labourers or as foremen in afterlife.

(Chadwick, 1887: I: 194-5, his typography)\*

The administrative measures which Chadwick promoted (with the others) - Inspection, Commissions\*\*, the use of expert advisers, the gathering of information, the inception of forms of registration - have as their basis an understanding of the labour market, on the one hand, and, equally, some notion of the 'nation' which is related to competition. As Collins and Richardson are aware 'The Health of Nations' is internally related to 'The Wealth of Nations' (the former stands as much for the early nineteenth century as the latter).

For Chadwick

The State must be not only policeman, but also relieving officer, school-teacher, factory Inspector and medical officer of health.

(Lewis, 1950: 178)

---

\* His speech to the TUC in 1885 is very similar to this (Chadwick, 1887:I:Ch.9, Cf. Chs.11,12,13). Note his use of the same term as Kay - 'afterlife' - after-training would be better.

\*\* Finer (1952a:39) notes that there were over 100 Royal Commissions established between 1832 and 1846.

The Poor Law administration was a machinery [sic] for enforcing competition, for creating a highly competitive labour market, and keeping it so. (Finer, 1952a: 475).

Even his most apparently physical studies show the enduring political concerns I am discussing. The 1842 Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Classes (Chadwick, 1887: II: Chs.1-20; Finer, 1952a: Book V: Ch.1) was widely circulated: over 10,000 copies were given away free (every Mechanics Institute was sent a copy); J.S. Mill<sup>\*</sup>, Nassau Senior, and James Stephen approved. What was the heart of the report?

It shifted the emphasis from the improvement of the dwelling-house to its extensive sanitation and drainage. Furthermore, it propounded a system ... (Finer, 1952a: 211)

Aside from the sections on 'Financial Sanitation', and his relating of the health of workers to the health of the army, Chadwick stresses the

beneficial influence ... of the capitalist who stands in the double relation of landlord and employer. He will find, that whilst an unhealthy and vicious population is an expensive as well as a dangerous one, all improvements in the condition of the

---

\* Lewis (1950: 183 fn.11) remarks that Chadwick 'invariably' sent J.S. Mill his texts in draft; but we have seen this was true of Nassau Senior and, possibly as significant, H.S. Tremenheere.

population have their compensation.

(Chadwick, 1887: II: 126; written 1842)\*

Even so 'innocent' a subject as Public Walks are brought within the same framework: do they not 'rival pleasures that are expensive, demoralising and injurious to health'? Chadwick gives two examples: a 'gentleman near Cambridge' held a ploughing match which competed with a local fair, thus 'the fair was suppressed by withdrawing its profit'. In Manchester, 200 or more parks, museums, and gardens were opened (when they would normally be closed) to compete with a Chartist demonstration

the effect was that not more than two or three hundred people attended the meeting, which entirely failed...

(Chadwick, 1887: II: 127f; written 1842)

Is this Laissez faire? Is it even free(fair) competition? Of course not. It is the intervention of political power (who, after all, could declare museums open?).

If, however, Tremenheere represents the 'limiting case' of the patrician Whig State Servant, there is little doubt that Chadwick represents that of the modern, much more bourgeois and anti aristocrat, Liberal. He suffered much from the Whig and Tory ruling circles (Cf. Finer, 1952a: 119f; 152f; 243f) and was, after all, sacked twice

---

\* The same approach is clear in Chadwick's Poor Law work, Cf. his 1841 'survey'; also Cullen, 1975:Ch.4, for Chadwick's statistical philosophy. Note: 'I never shrink from examining those rascals ['the Trade Union agitators'] ... vide first report of the factory Commission ...'. Chadwick to Tremenheere 4 September 1844 (Chadwick Mss.).

in 1847 and 1854, and then pensioned off. Because he lacked patrician security he favoured new methods as against 'mere shouts and shouters'. He accused Tremenheere, for example,

I think that in respect to [sic] the Truck system you have too much given in to mere shout and followed in their wake. The instances you give convince me that payments in kind, openly and avowedly made may be as necessary and beneficent to the

[p.4 ]

manufacturing as it is undoubtedly to the agricultural labour in the advancing countries [?] of agriculture ... If I were setting to work as a capitalist to improve the condition of the work people I would insist upon payments in kind ...

I would supply them not only with food but with clothes & with homes and would beat every other improver ...

(Chadwick Mss 4 Sep 1844; 2181/4 item 23)

Chadwick did not want money to go to

that ignorant & mischievous set, the beer shop keepers & the small village shop keepers. These last must be superseded ...

(Ibid.)

These beliefs inform Chadwick's attitudes to Administrative reform (Lewis, 1950; Finer, 1952a: 475-487; Chadwick, 1855, 1857; 1859a,b; 1862; 1871; Cf. Mill, 1862). Chadwick worked with Dickens and others in the Administrative Reform Association from 1855 (O. Anderson, 1965; 1974a; Dickens, 1855). He clearly regarded 'Health of Towns', to use his own abbreviation, as an administrative

reformation as much as any sanitary change<sup>\*</sup>. In the 1840s Chadwick corresponded with Trevelyan on reform and submitted a 90 page memorandum on Civil Service Reorganisation. This (Lewis, 1950: 183f) shows his antipathy to both (national) aristocratic and local patronage. It also comes close to a contempt for the inefficiency of democracy, praising the effectiveness of Commissions with full legal powers and a corps of supporting Inspectors. Whilst welcoming open competition for junior (i.e. initial) civil service posts, Chadwick also stressed (1855: 375f) the value of internal promotion. He also recognised that the curricula of examinations was crucial for providing efficient civil servants as can be seen from his 1857 and 1862 papers to the British Association and his 1859 address to the Statistical Society of London (1859b). But he was not simply pro expertise in an academic sense, he also had in mind what we would call 'time and motion' study, to establish the accountability for service in return for payments made to every individual person engaged, and getting out the total cost of each transaction.

(qu Lewis, 1950: 187)

Following this measurement, argued Chadwick, the Service could

---

\* Tremenheere recognised this in his letters to Chadwick in the mid 1880s: 'I am glad that a movement has begun for raising the status of the Sanitary Officers by better pay and more national terms of appointment' (5 Dec 1884, Chadwick Mss. 1988). He 'cordially sympathises' with Chadwick on the latter's long battle against 'Vestralisation' (8 April 1886, Ibid) and exclaims 'What horrible mischief makers are jobbing and Ignorance! And how hard it is to raise the patient British public against them!' (5 December 1886, Ibid)



be restructured not through personnel changes, but through relating persons and tasks.

The wider motives behind Chadwick's apparently technical discussions are fairly clear. First he saw the changes he proposed as contributing to efficiency; in one paper (1859b) he talks of introducing valuable competition within the Civil Service. Secondly, he wanted to speed two kinds of 'breaks' with past forms of State: (i) the links between the great families and the major administrative positions of State; (ii) the patronage which flows from party-political office to administrative office; in this he foresaw the possibility of 'corruption by popular vote'. It should be clear from the above that Chadwick is suggesting, to use his own term, semi-open competition: patronage\* would place candidates on an initial list and those listed would then compete. This is not true reform; no more than is a curriculum skewed toward Oxbridge traditions (Chadwick, 1871).

Probably Chadwick's distinctiveness, compared with the others I have discussed, is his implicit suggestion time and again that politicians (and contest politics) are unreliable. It is to Finer's credit (although few historians seem to have taken note of this) that he recognises such impatience with democratic politics (if the adjective is fitting for pre1918 Britain), in many of Chadwick's and Bentham's ideas. Chadwick, after all, did little to hide it.

---

\* Patronage has in fact grown: 'there are now 304 public bodies to which ministers can make appointments, ... at a cost to the tax payer of £2,500m. a year.' (Times, 28 June 1976). Cf. the important articles by Edelman, 1975a,b,c,d; and my Afterword below and Endnote 5 to Ch.1.

In 1844 he wrote to Tremeneere, in a letter critical of the latter's first report as Commissioner:

Such investigations are a new element in Government, and it is important that the public, the Houses of Parliament, and the Government itself\* should on every opportunity be impressed with the importance of a special agency ... and with the respect for it [sic] in tracing out principles of social and political economy which otherwise would be unattended to, and in arresting popular delusions and suppressing the power of mere shouts and mere shouters.

(Chadwick Mss. 2181/4 item 23)

In 1859 Chadwick declared to the Society for the Amendment of the Law (in subsequent publication J.S. Mill indicated his strong support)\*\* that he had never known one such 'investigation'

which did not reverse every main principle and almost every assumed chief elementary fact on which the general public, parliamentary committees, politicians of high position, and often the commissioners themselves, were prepared to base legislation.

(Chadwick, 1859a: 127 emphasis removed)

In the same year, in a paper to the Statistical Society of London, he argued that

bad morality, anti-social feelings and painful sense

\* Note the separation here.

\*\* Chadwick, 1887:II:126; Shonfield, 1967:10. Richardson calls this part of his epitome: 'The development of statesmanship as a science by the investigation of the phenomena of State necessities'. Alan Ryan (1974:Ch.7) brings out J.S. Mill's views on these matters, and the influence of de Tocqueville.

of individual insecurity, pervading and corrupting all society, and extending to the Commons House itself, have their remedies in the advance of correct economic science and sound legislative and administrative principles ... the advance of economic science will not be by hypothetical assumptions, as to what will be done ... but by well examined and complete collections of facts as to past experience on which to found safe practical rules for future guidance.

(Chadwick, 1859b: 420 Cf. 1857; 1862; 1871).

What Chadwick often called the 'open method of inquiry'<sup>\*</sup> was far from open. It was restricted as to questions (the laws of political economy could not be examined), participation (all enquiries were class biased), and perspective (examining the increased effectiveness of capitalism in Britain). What it frequently meant was that enquiries, in Graham's revealing phrase of 1842, were 'pre-concerted': a few central Commissioners established the framework for, and sifted all the evidence resulting from, the inquiry. They then 'broadcast' a report which expressed a version of reality. It is this version which determined the policy debates.

The form of State surveillance and administration which Chadwick seemed to admire - and Finer may be right (1952a; 1959) in suggesting it to be the logical product of Benthamite 'versions' of political economy - was parallel to Parliament: a series of standing Commissions linked to the Privy Council. This would be a permanent

---

\* It was very close to Webb-Fabian permeation: setting the terms of debate Cf. Finer, 1959.

**PAGE  
NUMBERING  
AS ORIGINAL**

## Chapter Four: The Sociology of Moral Order

4.1 Introduction

4.2 War, Nationalism and the State

4.3 Internal Law and Order

4.4 Class Structure and Public Opinion

4.5 Spiritual Production

4.6 Conclusion

## CHAPTER FOUR

'... all political revolutions ... originate in moral revolutions ...

Hamburger (1965: 282)

To overthrow a political power, it is always necessary, first of all, to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter-revolutionary class.

Mao Tse-tung, Speech to the Tenth Plenum, 8th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, 24 September 1962.

. . . . .

An acquaintance with the general facts of modern history is, after all, but an introduction to that accurate knowledge of affairs which can only be gained from the study of Biography ... In very long periods of time, or in certain critical conjunctures, the operation of general causes may be traced with considerable certainty; but, in the details of particular events, the opinions and actions of a few eminent individuals are generally quite decisive; and, while the eyes of the multitude are fixed on the great movements of politics or war, the governing springs are generally concealed from their view.

James Mill, Edinburgh Review (17, 1810: 39; qu Halevy, 1934: 307)

. . . . .

The crown and glory of life is Character. It is the noblest possession of a man, constituting a rank in itself, and an estate in the general goodwill; dignifying every station, and exalting every position in society. It exercises a greater power than wealth, and secures all the honour without the jealousies of fame. It carries with it an influence which always tells ...

Character is human nature in its best form. It is moral order embodied in the individual. Men of character are not only the conscience of society, but in every well-governed State they are its best motive power; for it is moral qualities in the main which rule the world. Even in war, Napoleon said the moral is to the physical as ten to one. The strength, the industry, and the civilization of nations - all depend upon individual character; and the very foundations of civil security rest upon it. Laws and institutions are but its outgrowth.

Samuel Smiles, Self-Help: the art of achievement illustrated by accounts of the lives of great men (1859: 246) Cf. his 1863

. . . . .

Introduction<sup>\*</sup>

Discussing 'the Moral Revolution, that profound change in the national character [n.b.] which accompanied the Industrial Revolution', Perkin argues that

Between 1780 and 1850 the English ceased to be one of the most aggressive, brutal, rowdy, outspoken, riotous, cruel and bloodthirsty nations in the world and became one of the most inhibited, polite, orderly, tenderminded, prudish and hypocritical'

(1969: 280)

This is also the conclusion of Malcolmson's Popular recreations in English society, 1700-1850 (1973). He, like Perkin<sup>\*\*</sup>, shows the deep historical roots of these changes. Perkin's attempt to offer a 'true explanation' of what he ambiguously styles 'the moral evolution' is revealing of a general weakness of his whole approach, the granting of primacy to 'ideas'.

The true explanation is that the moral evolution was the imposition on the whole society, and particularly on its upper and lower levels, of the traditional puritanism of the English middle ranks.

\* I take the title of this chapter from Locke's study of the French Legitimists (1974: Ch.4): a subtle essay.

\*\* He notes that the Society for the Suppression of Vice and Immorality (1802 onwards) 'was a conscious revival of the Society for the Reformation in Manners of 1698' (1969: 281 fn.1) The latter has been studied by T. Curtis (1976). The ambiguity over the term 'State', (admirably shown by the very long entry in the Oxford English Dictionary), is relevant to stress here.



But it was a traditional puritanism in a variety of mutated forms, some of them surprisingly secular and, at least in the philosophical sense, hedonistic\*.

The most important mutation [n.b.] was the change from exhortation of the various ranks to support existing society by doing their duty in that state of life to which it had pleased God to call them, to the demand for a new and higher morality than that associated with the traditional ruling class.

(1969: 281)

One antecedent for this 'explanation' is, of course, Weber's work on the ethical implications of particular facets of Protestantism. In his essay on the Sects, Weber argues

it is not the ethical doctrine of a religion, but that form of ethical conduct upon which premiums are placed that matters ... The premiums were placed upon 'proving' oneself before God ... and 'proving' oneself before men ... Both aspects were mutually supplementary and operated in the same direction: they helped to deliver the 'spirit' of modern capitalism, its specific ethos: the ethos of the modern bourgeois middle classes.

(1906: 321; Cf. 1920: 249)

---

\* Johnson notes 'Certain aspects of working-class culture ... were not condemned outright, commonly the more folksy, Merrie-England aspects' (1970: 110); for Marx 'Protestantism, by changing almost all the traditional holidays into workdays, plays an important part in the genesis of capital' (1867: 276, n.2)

These explanations do not suffice. They ignore, in brief, problems of agency. If the viewpoint and morals of one particular class is to become (apparently) societal this implies, minimally, the subordination of viewpoints of other classes, and, maximally, the employment by that class whose views become (or appear to become) dominant, of some means of enforcing such views. It is worth stressing immediately that this enforcement need have little, if any, 'internal' reference for dominated groups so long as it eventuates in certain patterns of behaviour, either negatively (some actions no longer take place) or positively. Sociologists frequently elide role-performance and role-commitment.

The moral revolution which Perkin and others have sketched results from State activity taking the place of the more or less private associations of former times<sup>\*</sup>. One set of values becomes dominant - and provides the pervading content of legal norms and practices - because one sort of property becomes dominant. This is qualified only in the way that Marx's "compromise" is evident in almost the whole range of the State Servants' theories and practices summarised in Chapter Three - the pure values of the cash-nexus are attenuated by the values of the landed estate, by 'concern'. This in no way diminishes the power of private capital but it suggests why the State takes the specific forms that it has.

Sixteen years ago David Lockwood argued

A dominant class has never existed which did not

---

\* '... the State becomes an institutional device... by which groups seek to secure ends which, in other circumstances, they might conceivably secure by private means' Supple, 1971: 307.

seek to make its position legitimate by placing highest value on those qualities and activities which come closest to its own. In modern industrial societies - to a greater or lesser extent - the dominant values underlying status distinctions have been those of the entrepreneurial and professional middle classes.

(1958: 209 Cf. Miliband, 1969: Chs.7 and 8)\*

But we need to relate to that, Nettl's 'fruitful way of defining politics', which is to

characterize it as the one social area of normlessness - where the very process of action is concerned not with the implementation of, or deviation from, established norms but with the business of establishing norms in the first place. Such a conception necessarily postulates a vacuum that contenders - in the form of political parties or other groups - attempt to fill with the norms that they competitively offer as legitimate for the whole society.

(Nettl, 1968: 588)

Except, of course, we are not talking about this 'pure' situation - there were class-specific, pre-existing moral repertoires and

---

\* Cf. Parkin's analysis of how 'what is essentially an evaluative matter can be transformed into an apparently factual one by virtue of the legitimating powers of the dominant class' (1971: 83) and Cranston's argument, in the context of a discussion of 'human rights', that 'To establish that a thing ought to be is the way to persuade people that it shall be' (1974).

regimes against which the middle class\* organised themselves.

As James Mill argued in 1826

Those who have observed the workings of human nature upon the greater as well as the smaller scale, are well aware that every class or combination of men have a strong propensity to get up a system of morality for themselves, that is, conformable to their own interests; in other words, to urge upon other men, as good, such lines of conduct as are good for them, whether good or evil to other people.

(1826: 255)

He continued his survey of 'The State of the Nation' by stressing that

The value of the middle classes of this country, their growing numbers and importance, are acknowledged by all.

(Ibid., 269).\*\*

---

\* Musgrove (1959b:100) suggests that a 'middle class way-of-life' - 'Domestic servants, a fee-paying education for the children, the necessary standard of dress, housing, furniture and entertainment'- required at least £200 p.a. 'in the second half of the nineteenth century'. Newsweek provides a list of British 'traditional middle-class characteristics - drive, daring and ruthlessness - but also tenacity, altruism and sacrifice' (qu Times 26 October 1976, p.2 Col.I) Briggs (1956) is the best study of 'middle-class consciousness'.

\*\* Brougham, in 1831: 'By the People, I mean the middle classes, the wealth and intelligence of the country, the glory of the British name' (qu Briggs, 1956: 69). [Contd. on next page, p.288]

Two years earlier the same magazine, the Westminster Review, had argued 'In this country at least, it is this class which gives to the nation its character' (qu Simon, 1960: 78). Sir James Graham appears to agree with Mill. Writing his Corn and Currency in the same year, he brings together several points:

I know no bound but public opinion. The seat of public opinion is in the middle ranks of life - in that numerous class, removed from the wants of labour and the cravings of ambition, enjoying the advantages of leisure, and possessing intelligence sufficient for the formation of a sound judgement, neither warped by interest nor obscured by passion.

(qu Briggs, 1956: 69)

I have frequently stressed, following the lead of Halevy, the importance of education for this (class) control and creation of 'public opinion'. A writer in the Journal of the London Statistical Society urged more:

moral combined with intellectual training by which the mind is taught to discern, and the heart is led to feel the great object for which man is created, and the duties which he is called upon to fulfil in this stage of his existence.

(qu Cullen, 1975: 141)

We are talking about moral order - a classification by which

[\*\* contd. from previous page] It is useful to contrast Burke's definition: 'the people are of adult age, not declining in life, of tolerable leisure ... and some means of information, above menial dependence: i.e. about 400,000' of 1795 (qu White, 1957: 48); which has a residual 'the rest', and the similar residual 'the population' in the 1860s. Cf. text 1.15 in Guttsmann, 1969.

people and things could be grouped and valued - and a social formation experienced as both changed and changeable. Michel Foucault has shown in several studies and theoretical explications the definitional power of what he calls the episteme. Various forms of systematic order may serve to reinforce (echo back, as it were) basic hierarchies and power-relations. Landscape, for example, may exhibit this constructed 'lawfulness' (Arnheim, 1968: 153)\*. In the urban context the plan and parts of the city may act in a similar manner\*\*. I suggested above, in Chapter One, that particular buildings - the new Workhouse, the Board Schools, the Chapels and, in many towns (Blyth, in Northumberland, has a striking example), the new Police Stations; plus the older Church, Big House, Castle or Gaol - are forms of social architecture: visibly indicating where major bases of power, and by contrast, powerlessness, are to be found in the social structure. We, after all, 'read from' the Pyramids the powerlessness of the slaves.

But such systems of moral order operate also to provide contrasts. Whether correct or not, images of a past stability may be one of the yardsticks against which to judge a more problematic present. There was a quite general argument - important because it is present in all classes in Britain - which extends well into the middle of the nineteenth century, that some earlier period was natural than the present. Its solidarity and control were effected

---

\* Cf. Barrell, 1974.

\*\* Cf. Thrupp, 1965; Harvey, 1973: 238f and some of the illustrations, e.g. of waterworks, in Brockman, 1973. Of course, the real moral order is perhaps best displayed in the dominant characterisation of town and country - see Williams, 1973; Merrington, 1975; and, above all, 'Nation and community: a landscape and its morality' by F. Inglis (1976).

without effort or design; it had, in a word: a 'natural police'\*.

In contrast, as Sir James Graham wrote in 1842, present 'evils... are inherent in the state of society at which we have arrived, and which is highly artificial' (Graham, 1907:I: 328). As Tom Taylor, Assistant Secretary to the General Board of Health, addressing the N.A.P.S.S. in 1857, said

I cannot but attribute the neglect of local duties, not to ever-encroaching officialism, but to ever-increasing selfishness - the result of excessive addiction to money making - of concession to the daily larger demands of each man's private business upon his time and energies - of a forgetfulness of the claims of all classes of society upon each other - of that want of sympathy between rich and poor mainly due to the vast operations of the new industrial economy created by steam power which tends to accumulate great capitals in single hands, and to group huge masses of workmen about particular centres of labour ...

(1857: 476-7; Cf. Lambert, 1962b: 127)

Perhaps I can best emphasise and illustrate both facets of

---

\* There is a very clear evocation of this (the term is used) in M.D. Hill's evidence to the S.C. on Juvenile Crime (qu Coleman, 1973: Text 27). The contrast would be with the 'social police' of Nassau Senior, especially if we recall he used that term to describe the intentions of the 1834 Poor Law. Time and again through the century some Erastian action or other was described as equal to (but cheaper than) more policing, or as 'the cheapest police' for the task in hand. Again our current usage denies this wider cluster of social meaning (and social tension).

moral order - as a means of conceptualising a given moment and as a means of comparing the present with the past - through two texts from editorials in the Times. I shall then briefly examine the two often cited 'causes' of English social stability: the Methodist creed and the extension of the suffrage. Under a heading 'The Cycle of Discipline' in a long leader of 29th November 1975 the Times declared

A number of different influences on Britain made the Victorian age an era of strict discipline in national, social and personal life. Some of the influences were economic, with the need for personal saving in the early stages of individualist capitalism giving great advantages to thrift, and with a large number of strong-minded individual factory owners and other businessmen leading the industrial revolution. Other influences were religious, with the great strength of English nonconformity and of the evangelical wing of the Church of England. The evangelical diaries and memoirs indeed show an agonizing tension of individual conscience. Other influences were imperial. Only highly disciplined people could have organized so vast an empire with so few men. The Victorian educational institutions were designed to operate with the discipline which Victorian life required; so were the Victorian penal institutions.

Returning to this theme almost eleven months later, under a heading 'The Discipline of Events', in a longer leader of 27th October 1976, the Times spoke of 'failures... of two kinds'<sup>\*</sup>

---

\* I use the Times materials as symptomatic here. [Contd. on next page]



There has been a failure of moral purpose and there has been an economic failure, largely consequent upon it.

The economic failure springs so directly from the failure of moral purpose that it is right to look at that failure of purpose first. At some point in the post-war recovery, probably in the late 50s, the sense of national discipline which had supported Britain for a long period of history started to weaken, and to weaken rapidly. Britain had always been noted for being a country with a strong sense of order, and a willingness to bear the disciplines that are necessary for national success. This discipline had enabled the British to build up the broadest and most civilized empire since the Roman, which was a matter of great pride to them. The discipline in British factories had made British craftsmanship a guarantee of quality throughout the world. It was not merely a class discipline, but one accepted in the British culture.

---

[\* Contd. from p.291] J. Grimond, for example: 'The very heart of our affairs is eaten by a canker. That canker is the lack of any morality - that is to say, any attention to the general interest - any assertion of the golden rule ... The Labour Government has no sense of the constitution.' Speech to the Insurance Debating Society, Lloyds, 20 October 1976 (qu Times 21 Oct 1976 p.2). The Chairman of Lloyds (in the fourth 'Social Responsibility' Sermon at St Lawrence **Jewry** on 2nd November 1976) agreed: 'He spoke of "collapse of national morale, arising from the collapse of national morality"...' (Times Business Diary, 3rd November 1976) Cf. material by Hailsham (1976) and Macmillan (summarised Times 21 Oct 1976; Listener 21 Oct 1976), especially the latter's perception of a new 'animosity ... between people of different classes ...'.

The Times is right to point, in both texts, to the centrality of imperial and industrial experiences as the core of the discipline and order which it considers has now gone. Weber has provided an excellent account of the content of capitalist factory discipline.

No special proof is necessary to show that military discipline is the ideal model for the modern capitalist factory, as it was for the ancient plantation. In contrast to the plantation, organizational discipline in the factory is founded upon a completely rational basis. With the help of appropriate methods of measurement, the optimum profitability of the individual worker is calculated like that of any material means of production... the psycho-physical apparatus of man is completely adjusted to the demands of the outer world, the tools, the machines - in short, to an individual "function".

(1920c: 261)\*

Pollard (1963, 1965) and E. Thompson (1967) have studied the creation of factory discipline in some detail. They have drawn out the moral order of the factory and the implications for the whole of the life of the worker (and their families). What the Times argues above, as Ditton has shown, is that the making of a labour force, which Pollard and Thompson show to have happened in the 1780-1830 period, is necessarily repetitive. Not least because the factory (as with any capitalist enterprise) is based upon a set of procedures, a discipline, and an order which has

an unspoken constant: the lowest possible pay that will ensure the retention of the majority of the

---

\* The work of Gorz or Braverman or Beynon will demonstrate the contemporary validity of Weber's typology for modern high-technology factory work.

labour-force. This moral constant survives any procedural differences ...

(Ditton, 1976: 533; Cf. Ramsay, 1977).

The point to stress here is that despite that constant, and its disciplinary implications<sup>\*</sup>, the moral order is fragile. State servants in the early nineteenth century were especially concerned to find an equivalent to the former 'natural police' to bring to bear upon the nonwork-time of the working classes. They sought, in sum, to regulate the morals of the working classes in such a way as to facilitate the smooth operation of labour discipline, not least to keep that 'unspoken constant' silently operating, and to keep the 'real physiognomy' of the State invisible.

Amongst the many explanations<sup>\*\*</sup> offered for 'stability' in England, the 'aid' given to capitalist production by religion - especially Methodism - has been much stressed.<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Whereas Halevy

\* I do not want to suggest anything approaching a victory. I do not imply at all that workers have ingested the neutrality of the factory order. Indeed, as I quoted in the case of what was revealingly called 'the council school', we have much evidence to the contrary. For example, the former Industrial Correspondent of the B.B.C. reports that 'Company songs are used by some corporations in both the U.S. and Japan as a method of nurturing dedication. This would be unthinkable [n.b.] in Britain. As one British businessman sagely remarked: "If we had a company song, people would only start putting their own words to it."' (Turner, 1971: 471, n.1).

\*\* I shall not deal directly here with the integration thesis as such; for useful, if partial, critiques Cf. N. Young, 1967; Moorehouse, 1973.

\*\*\* An excellent and typically sensitive consideration of this theme is provided by Edward Thompson's review of Robert Moore's study of pitmen and methodism in County Durham (Thompson, 1976). Sections v - viii, of Part (c) of Endnote I to my first Chapter [Contd. on p.295]

sees Methodism as making the bourgeoisie, and thus the workers, 'non revolutionary'; Hobsbawm - in contrast - argues that 'Methodism advanced when Radicalism advanced and not when it grew weaker' (1957b: 32). E.P. Thompson stresses 'that Methodism obtained its greatest success in serving simultaneously as the religion of the industrial bourgeoisie ... and of wide sections of the proletariat' (1963: 391). He is a little unfair to Weber in not stressing the latter's explication of the disciplinary code at the heart of the rational order of capitalism which I quoted above; but right to show the significance of Methodism in relation to the 'Moral Economy of the Factory System', as Ure called the section of his Philosophy of Manufactures (1835), in which he wrote

It is, therefore, excessively the interest of every mill-owner to organize his moral machinery on equally sound principles with his mechanical, for otherwise he will never command the steady hands, watchful eyes, and prompt co-operation, essential to excellence of product ...  
(qu E. Thompson, 1963: 397).

Thompson notes (as also do Semmel and Perkin) the overlapping areas of the doctrines of Methodism, in relation to the industrial bourgeoisie; and Evangelicalism, in relation to the aristocracy and professionals.

There is also agreement as to why Methodism (and, more generally, Non-Conformism) appealed to the working class<sup>\*</sup>. Three

---

[\* Contd. from p.294] give the materials studied on the 'religious' question. The Halevy 'thesis' is available in his 1906 and 1912 texts (but Cf. the different approach in his 1919 and 1934 studies). It is critically reviewed by Hobsbawm, 1957b; E. Thompson, 1963:40f. Ch.11; Perkin, 1969:Ch.9:Section I; Tholfsen, 1971:Sect.III; Semmel, 1971, 1973.

\* Some quantitative sense is needed at this point. [Contd. on p.296]

facets are stressed: indoctrination and 'the psychic consequences of the counter-revolution' after 1795 (Thompson, 1963: 412 Cf. 50) being of one kind; the significance of the organizational forms and rituals of Methodism, being different. It was the latter which offered the potential threat of working-class self-organization without "appropriate" leadership which several State Servants (notably H.S. Tremenheere) typified as 'ranting'. This was most true of the Primitive Methodists<sup>\*</sup>; the Census of 1851 suggested that their 'trespasses against what may be thought proper order will most likely be forgiven when it is remembered ... for every convert added to their ranks, society retains one criminal, one drunkard, one improvident the less' (qu D.M. Thompson, 1972: 155).

Methodism - as Christianity in general - affords a consensual milieu, but it also offers a segmental series of status-linked 'cells' within that consensus. It was most crucial, perhaps, in making available a leadership-style and a 'permitted' strategy for conducting disputes and disagreements. In this we are dealing with a sub-set of that larger focus on 'character' with which this section began. An exclusive commitment to religion as the 'cause

---

[Contd. from p.295] Total weekly (mainly Christian) activity (attending a public centre of religion) involved about 38% of the population in 1851; 24% in 1900 and 15% average 1965-1970 (Listener 18 March, 1976 p.333 Cf. Times 10 August 1976). E. Thompson estimates that in the 1790s 'about 80,000 made up the Methodist Societies' (1963: 49); Perkin estimates in 1851 'at most c.3 million Methodists (not all working-class) out of a total working-class population in England and Wales of c.14 million' (1969: 355 fn.3).

\* There were 200 Primitive Methodists in 1811 and 7842 in 1820, (Thompson, 1963:436 fn.2). Hobsbawm (1959:134f) considers these, by the last decades of the 19th century, more 'a sect of trade union cadres' (Ibid., p.138) Cf. Thompson, 1976.

of English stability would ignore both the major constraints of capitalist work discipline work discipline, and moral institutions outside the farm, office or factory. It is to these political relations that we now turn.

In introducing what appears to be a 'more specialized' focus of attention, we should be aware that here is an instance where our vocabulary obscures past and present simultaneously. As Philip Abrams argued some twelve years ago:

It is impossible not to see how decisively political life is conditioned by national character.

I use the term national character deliberately.

... much of what political sociologists are doing is little more than an attempt to explain systematically what an older generation had in mind when they spoke of national character or used terms like 'not ready for democracy'.

(Abrams, 1964: 54)\*

Another strand of continuity between that 'older generation' - within which one must include the Fabians (and T.H. Green, plus major State Servants, I would add) - and contemporary sociology, is provided in Lukes' succinct review of neo-Durkheimian analyses of 'political ritual' (Lukes, 1975)\*\* . After a critique of how

---

\* Cf. 'In its influence upon a nation, the set social system will count as ten, whilst any political method will count as one' F. Harrison(1867:267-8). Abrams goes on to discuss the salience of 'political culture' and 'political socialization'; in Endnote 1 to this Chapter, I review the literature on the latter topic.

\*\* It is as well to demonstrate my distance from neo-Durkheimian analyses by repeating that the moral order which I hope to explicate is one of the ways in which a social formation is held together - as a construction or accomplishment requiring power and agency.

(to use my own perspective) such analyses reproduce official problems and extend work once done by State agencies, Lukes stresses how 'the ritual of elections, alongside that within legislatures, law courts and the administration, ... play a significant role in legitimating and perpetuating the political paradigms or representations collectives which contribute to the stability of the political system' (1975: 305).

It is in this light that we should consider the work of D.C. Moore (and others<sup>\*</sup>) on the nineteenth-century changes in the franchise and electoral districts. In a curious way Moore is supplying us with Whig history - a study of Whig (and Tory) intentions - and celebrations of their achievement; rather than Liberal-Fabian history which sees each franchise reform as a staging post on the road to freedom. Moore's work is important since it represents an attempt to take sociology to history; although, to be sure, this is not an imposition from 'outside' - the class perspective was there in the 1840s, and the sociology was available in several of the contributions to Essays on Reform (1867, e.g. Young: Ch.12; Cf. Halevy, 1923b: 63).

With Moore's work<sup>\*\*</sup> we are compelled to return to the grounds of Marx's "compromise" (discussed in the second Chapter above).

\* Moore's work is now available as a book (1976). Cf. Nossiter's studies, now also in book form (1976).

\*\* E. Thompson (1965:318-319) also locates laissez-faire as emerging in 'the great agricultural corn-belt' (Cf Spring, 1953:289f for Earl Fitzwilliam's reading of Smith and Ricardo): 'capitalist farmers, improving landlords, and greater millers and corn-merchants' opposed protection. Moore generally (and in his 1965 study) [Contd. on p.299]

Moore shows (1961, 1966) that one constituent of the intentions behind the 1832 Reform Act was the sustaining (and recreation) of 'deference communities' as part of Burke's 'State of Habitual Social Discipline' or what J.S. Mill called, in 1831, the 'natural state of society'

that ... is where the opinions and feelings of the people are, with their voluntary acquiescence, formed for them.

(Spirit of the Age, qu Moore, 1966: 46)

More generally, Moore and others see these legislative changes as related to the need to keep Parliament sovereign (here 1831-2 represents a negative example which it was not desirable to repeat). This accords directly, of course, with that 'making of the Nation' which accompanied much of the construction of classes, and is informed by Burke's definition of Parliament, in 1774, as

a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole - where not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole.

(qu Beer, 1957: 615)

This is, in part, the old Tory view which we can find Graham (qu.

---

[Cont.d from p.298]has examined such a genesis and Cf. Clark, 1951; Spring, 1953; Ward, 1966; Aydelotte, 1967b; and F. Thompson, 1968. Horner's letters (Memoir, I: Vol.2:89,92) give a good contemporary analysis of the class fractions involved. The work of Brundage and Digby is also very relevant to Moore's general thesis of continuing 'landed' power; Appleby debates 'Agrarian Capitalism or Seigneurial reaction?' in North-West England, 1500-1700 (1975), showing, in passing, how the kinds of labour, and their markets, changed.



Herrick, 1948: 183f; Cf. Graham, 1907) or Derby and Disraeli (qu. Herrick, 1948: 187; Ward, 1974) expressing clearly. But it is also a Whig view, as Lord John Russell made clear in 1854 (qu Marx, 1855j: 454; Herrick, 1948: 184; Moore, 1967: 47f. Cf. Wilson, 1974).

Indeed, Moore's great service (which the criticism of Hennock, 1971, or Beales, 1974, does not alter) is to show the permeation of similar images and models of the hierarchical and the corporate throughout the ruling classes, despite their open clashes. The sociology he draws from 1832 and 1867 (and, as with Herrick, his analyses of the intervening Acts and strategies) is of a ruling class attempting to re-form society in its own image of what a 'natural balance' would be. The flexibility of the specific means should not be allowed to obscure the shared 'paradigm'.

Of course, Moore is also aware that we are discussing a changing world and a transformed ruling class. His analysis of the Repeal of the Corn Laws (1965; Cf. 1967:50f; 1969) is predicated (as Marx, 1864: 626f.) on two kinds of farmer: one more fully capitalist and the other more concerned to protect certain 'social relations' - a small version of the old 'moral economy'. Moore, Brock and Nossiter have shown how the working class franchise was reduced after 1832. This is one consequence of Reform. Another facet would be the extended and particular manner in which successive layers and types of worker are brought into the arena of 'the voting population'. Equally important - here Moore has been much misunderstood (e.g. by Davis' otherwise very subtle study, 1974) - the flexibility and, again, the extended manner<sup>\*</sup>, in which the new kinds

---

\* An excellent discussion of this acculturation is provided by Arnstein (1972).

of interest were articulated in the Commons, requires the greatest possible emphasis. Here a too-literal reading of the apparent phenomena ('Land'; 'Deference community'; or 'Aristocracy') obscures how one condition for strategic stability is the greatest tactical flexibility, not least regarding who shall be accepted as genuinely powerful. When William IV, for example, offered a definition of the 'natural influence' of the Peers, he could equally be defining the power of Capital:

It is natural that they should possess influence over those to whom their property enables them to give employment and subsistence; and it is desirable that a useful union should thus be promoted between the upper and lower classes of society...

(4 February 1831; qu Davis, 1974: 80) \*<sup>z</sup>

Similarly, to say (as did Grey of the MPs of the first Reformed Parliament) that 'the influence of property has prevailed' (qu Ibid., 81) is not to deny the basic (defining) social relation of property - whether landed, fiscal, commercial, or industrial - 'the power of disposing of the labour-power of others' (Marx, 1845: 44). It is the slow acculturation of the controllers of new forms of property that is one facet of Reform. \*\*

Another was to establish one politics - that of Parliament and Parliamentary Parties - as the norm, as 'proper' politics. Like

\* Cf. George Nicholls (a Poor Law Commissioner) in his Prize Essay (1846), especially on the 'promotion of general well-being' by 'possessors of property' i.e. capitalists.

\*\* It is worth noting here the 'residual' instances of the 'property franchise' - the City of London and the House of Lords (for hereditary Peers) - this qualifies our notion of true vote democracy (one adult, one vote), even if only in apparently 'local' instances.

all the key concepts of moral order this only becomes articulated at times of perceived crisis. Thus Ronald Butt - in a critique of the views of Michael Meacher (1974a) called 'Dangerous doctrines that keep the class war alive' - explains one of the conditions which make "political rituals" possible when he wrote in February 1974:

Probably the worst aspect of the threatening political battle is that, whether or not there is an election, the essential struggle will take place outside Parliament. For three hundred years [i.e. since 1688 ? P.C.] the British people have managed to keep almost all their main struggles within the parliamentary arena. As new social groups have sought political influence commensurate with their changing position in the social structure, they have been able to find it inside the House of Commons, fighting their fights within the rules of parliamentary order and avoiding class conflict. The decision of the Labour Party to go into Parliament as representatives of the broad mass of organised working people was the greatest single victory for the orderliness and humanity of the parliamentary process.

... the fabric of the nation is in some danger.

(Butt, 1974: 14 Cf. Wilsher, 1974)

Finally, these Reforms - of ritual and image - tried, literally rather than figuratively, to cope with the glaring contradiction (often mentioned in this thesis) between ideology and reality in the social structure of the nineteenth century: an ideology of individualism

and a reality of classes. And that returns us to our main theme - for, as Marx and Engels argue:

out of this very contradiction between the interest of the individual and that of the community the latter takes an independent form as the State, divorced from the real interests of individual and community ... It follows from this that all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, the struggle for the franchise, etc., etc., are merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles of the different classes are fought out ...

(Marx, 1845: 45)

. . . . .

## 2. War, Nationalism and the State<sup>\*</sup>

It is common to define the State in terms of its exclusive monopoly of 'legitimate' violence and of 'justice', i.e. its work as an adjudicator between contending groups. I wish briefly to examine the first here, and the second in my next section; before moving to what seem to me equally significant (but largely neglected) formative relations on the making of State apparatuses.

Ultimately the State - any State - can only be comprehended by historical and comparative study.<sup>\*\*</sup> This is important not simply

---

\* Some of the indications of priorities shown in my Second Appendix, Part Two are relevant here.

\*\* In EndNote 1 to Chapter Three, I indicate some resources for such a study: the work of Hechter (1973, 1975) is especially relevant here.

as a methodology, but because of the extent of conscious copying, that is 'Learning from Abroad', indicated above. As Supple argues

Frontiers are more than lines on a map: they frequently define quite distinctive systems of thought and action. The state is, of course, pre-eminently such a system; and it is therefore through the history of nations that we must begin any empirical study of the role of the state in the international phenomenon which we call the Industrial Revolution.

(1971: 301)

This directs us to the right questions providing we recall that 'distinctive systems of thought and action' can be forcibly introduced and sustained. As Hintze emphasises in the case of England (1897: 168; 1902) 'frontiers' are constructed by conquest: first, Wales (1500?), then Scotland (1603, 1706), and then Ireland (1801) were subdued and drawn into the (English) Nation. This conquest, of a cultural-political character, can take place through private, semi-public (the great Chartered Companies), and official-military means.

How even temporary conquest can effect rapid cultural-political changes is shown clearly by the Napoleonic conquest of Europe. Internally, in the case of England, as has been mentioned, the Wars against Napoleon, accelerated a number of trends and tendencies relevant to State ideology and formation. Apart from - crucially in many ways - producing a national military hero in the Duke of Wellington (whose political influence has been somewhat underplayed in most

accounts) - those Wars did much to engender a 'passable' sense of national identity in England and, less securely, in Britain. This sense of nationality is paradoxically reinforced by many of the Radical and socialist appeals to 'Ancient Rights', e.g. to the Saxon Constitution. Anti-French propaganda - the "cunning of reason" produced that happy similarity between 'Jacobite' and 'Jacobin' - was extremely powerful\*. This has been related to nationalism by Newman. He concludes

one must not underestimate the unifying force of modern nationalism, nor overlook the peculiarly bourgeois and anti-French character which this seems to have taken in England ... it was indeed in some measure thanks to the French Revolution ... that an aggressive and specifically "anti-French" sort of nationalism, empirical, constructive, earnest, moral, comfortably pseudo-religious as well as Evangelical rose ... to become a unifying and embracing feature, perhaps a distinctive sub-conscious vessel, of British middle-class consciousness in the early nineteenth century.

(1975: 418)

Many writers have shown how this nationalism was orchestrated and forced downwards (and, we must again add, outwards - against the Celts and other conquered peoples of the English Empire) against alternative expressions. Kiernan argues that 'class resentment [was] artificially diverted into xenophobia' (1965: 35). He stresses

---

\* Cf. My Appendix III on Coleridge below.

that

the modern State ... had many antecedents, but its full emergence required a conjunction of political and moral as well as strictly economic factors.

(1965: 34 Cf. G. Williams, 1974b)\*

Several historians have seen 'warfare' as 'one of the most powerful factors' in State formation and the generation of new social policy (Briggs, 1961: 252). This is made the central theme of the comparative surveys of Hintze (1906), Bean (1973), and Finer (1975). Like Weber, Hintze stresses (although he cites Spencer rather than his own countryman) that all 'State organization was originally military organization ... for war' (1906: 181). He further suggests that such organization must be related to 'the structure of social classes'\*\* and to 'the external ordering of states'. But both Hintze and Bean - although useful surveys of the material basis for English exceptionalism (small size, insularity, strong Navy, and so on) - focus on too early a period for our purposes. Finer, in contrast, is concerned with 'the modern state'\*\*\*. He reminds us,

---

\* For a discussion of nationalism see Nairn (1975). Note how the Editor of the Times sees the 'failure of our present policies' to be that 'they have not created a loyalty to the European nation ... There is limited time to make the idea of Europe a personal loyalty to the People of Europe'. (Europa, 3(4) 1976).

\*\* In Endnote 2 to this Chapter, I review relevant statistical information relating to the Armed Forces and civil-military relations in Britain.

\*\*\* Although Finer "congratulates" Marx for his notion of 'the study of society in motion' (1975:90) his essay is marred by a vulgar conception of force and Marx. For example: 'only minds like those of Marx and Engels, obsessively concerned with conflict could so continuously harp upon the role of armed force as the sole force [Contd. on p.307]

however, that the most recent conquest of England - that of the Normans (possibly the Roman imperium was as important in its fashion) - effected an administrative unification far greater than any other European country (Cf. Kay, 1859: 130f). His second theme is his stress on the pervasive attention to officer-quality or leadership-style from the Tudors until ... 1854? 1871? 1914?. The organizational facet of this theme is the persistence of local affective solidarity within army units. This arrangement persisted when retainers and retinues were transformed into regiments of the line. One of Cardwell's reforms was to replace line regiments by County- and Celtic-regiments, and to establish County Depot Towns (Barnett, 1970: 278) \*.

It is important to stress the intersection of Property and 'officership'. Bond argues this as a general theme, illustrating the point by a remark of Lord Palmerston: 'It was only when the Army was unconnected to those whose Property gave them an interest in the welfare of the country, and was commanded by unprincipled adventurers, that it would ever become formidable.' (qu Bond, 1963:

---

[Cont. from p.306] creating and maintaining the State' (Ibid., p.89) Marx and Engels did not - but a cursory inspection of Professor Finer's own writings might suggest that he did!

\* The use of colours, for a further example - relevant to Durkheim's notion of the social solidarity of 'the flag'- continued until the Boer War. Another instrument of internal cohesion - very necessary given the major and minor mutinies of Army and Navy personnel - was ritualised public flogging. This continued in the Army until 1868 in peacetime and 1880 in time of war. Remembering this - and the impressment tactics of the Navy; it is as well to recall shipboard and army-camp life when assessing the validity of Perkin's 'moral revolution'.



239) \*.

None of this is to suggest, of course, that Britain was a militarised society\*\*, or that militarism permeated the ruling class ethos, as was more clearly the case in Prussia-Germany. But there was both an important influence on 'civil' State strategy\*\*\* and a certain 'reservoir' of militaristic feeling that could be drawn out in moments like the 'Relief of Mafeking' jingoism, or the 'white feather' activity of gentry ladies in 1914 to 1918. Writing in 1976, after seven years of evident military activity within, we are insistently reminded, 'a province of the United Kingdom' it is obvious that we cannot forget that 'other England' of the colonies and former colonies within which militarism had a much more obvious influence - one thinks especially of India. The use of troops in Ireland generally; in Scotland - for example against the Highlanders in 1880s, against the working class in Glasgow in the 1910s; and, in Wales (Llanelli and Tonypandy in 1911) and their ready employment as a strike-breaking force in Britain as a whole, means that we cannot as easily "think away" armed force ('bodies of armed men') as some accounts, which overstress English exceptionalism, seem to suggest. It is clear from workers' accounts, for example, that the employment

---

\* This is a curious argument when put beside modern notions of 'professionalization' which suggest that the latter makes the army less political, more stable etc. For Palmerston the professional soldier would seem to be an 'unprincipled adventurer'.

\*\* In EndNote 2 I give some indication of how much influence the military had over civil affairs in the nineteenth century.

\*\*\* Some modern instances of influential military idioms and images are included in EndNote 2.

of Naval and Army forces during 1926 was not simply a symbolic matter: another of 'Mr. Churchill's aberrations', like Tonypany, or the use of Guardsmen in the siege of Sydney Street.

The Wars against Napoleon - and those earlier suppressions of 1715 and 1745 - engendered not only a particular nationalism; they also emphasised how the category 'gentleman' was superordinate to that of 'officer', despite the usual coupling as Officer and Gentleman'; it is a point we shall return to.

. . . . .

### 3. "Internal" Law and Order

There is a danger in posing the 'natural order' of Land against the 'artifice' of Factory Town. The patronage relations of the former were founded upon visible inequality sustained by force.

A ruling class organizes its power in the state. The sanction of the state is force, but it is force that legitimized, however imperfectly, and therefore the state deals also in ideologies. Loyalties do not grow simply in complex societies: they are twisted, invoked and often consciously created. Eighteenth-century England was not a free market of patronage relations. It was a society with a bloody penal code, an astute ruling class who manipulated it to their advantage, and a people

schooled in the lessons of Justice, Terror and Mercy.

The benevolence of rich men to poor, and all the ramifications of patronage, were up-held by the sanction of the gallows and the rhetoric of the death sentence.

(Hay, 1975a: 5; Cf. Linebaugh Ph.D. thesis)\*

As Elton has shown, the Tudor settlement involved policing of a particular type (1972; Cf. Loades, 1974)\*\* . Peace, in the 'natural order' of landed England was always kept by force, and that 'order' was restored (again and again) by repression and fear. 'Law and Order' and 'Public Order' are constructions of an ideological character which have their basis in violence:

It has to be recognised that the power and security of the governing establishment has played a major role in ensuring the peaceful evolution of British society.

(Quinault, 1974b: 16)

\* MacDonald in her 'Theory testing with the Nation-State' (1976:Chs. 5-7) provides a thorough review of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theories of crime. She thus complements the work of Hay et al (1975b) or Thompson's volume on the 1723 Waltham Black Act (1975) which has a valuable closing section on Law and the State. On eighteenth-century crime see Beattie, 1970, 1974. For attempts to relate crime to the spread of (enforced) capitalist relations see D. Jones, 1974; and 1976; R.J.B. Knight, 1975; Linebaugh's thesis and 1972 remarks and Ditton 1976b. The locus classicus remains D. Simon's study of 'Master and Servant' legislation (1954; Cf. Corrigan, 1976).

\*\* Raeff's comparative study of police-states- with several of the articles in Tilly (1975d) - are extensions of this point. Cf. (again) the entry for 'State' in the Oxford English Dictionary and the aetiology of the crime of 'Treason'.

The persistence of famine -, hunger-, and food-riots (Cf. Thompson, 1971; Shelton, 1973; Stevenson, 1974; Tilly, 1975b) is as important a constituent of English 'Law and Order' as either the generation of new forms of control\* (along with new crimes and moral categories, e.g. 'idle time'), or the related reaction to trades unions and combinations, Luddism (Darvall, 1934; Cf. Cookson, 1975; White, 1957; Thompson, 1963), or Chartism (Mather, 1953, 1958, 1959, 1965, 1970; Cf. Golby, 1974)\*\* . Darvall's 'The Machinery

---

\* The forces used at Peterloo, where people gathered to listen to speeches, were the Yeomanry; by 1839, the Home Secretary could send a detachment of Metropolitan Police against the Chartists, gathered in the Bullring in Birmingham to listen to the public reading of Newspapers (the national utility of the police was also demonstrated when they were sent to Antigua as a 'peacekeeping force' in the 1960s). But in 1844 Lord Londonderry used (his) militia against (his) striking pitmen in County Durham. For studies of the police, apart from Darvall and Mather, see Critchley, 1967; Tobias, 1967; 1972a,b; 1975; Chesney, 1970; Pearsall, 1973 - for the extensions after the 1829 Act: Hart, 1955, 1956; Parris, 1961, 1969 and - especially - Storch, 1975. The debate in the late 1880s, as to whether the L.C.C. should take over the Metropolitan Police (Evans, 1889; Stuart, 1889) - like the work of Chadwick (1829; 1868; 1884) - is very revealing as to the perceived national and political role of London police - Cf. Maudling, 1973, 1974. A good County study is Midwinter, 1968c; and Bayley (1975) and Mosse (1975) provide comparative materials.

\*\* According to Christopher Walker (B.B.C. 'World at One' 22nd March 1976) the Treason and Felony Act, 1848, is still in force. It is worth noting here the 'availability' of common law offences (and punishments) to strengthen statute law, most notably in the use of conspiracy charges. Here is a particular instance of a general theme - what many people see as 'irrationalities' in State procedure are extremely significant in terms of both their moral weight and their advantage as weapons in what they show to be clearly, the negotiation, rather than the administration, of justice.

of Order' (1934:Ch.12) and Mather's Public Order (1959) are perceived and constituted through a wider moral framework that defines them. This framework is supported by the historical experiences of different classes, and fractions of classes. It is this set of relations which donate key concepts, such as 'Character', which are used to relate criminality (as a personal characteristic) to the nation (as a healthy Being) long before any sustained scientific theory, such as evolutionary biology, could be drawn on (not only by Spencer but by the Webbs also) to ground class opinion (evaluation) as scientific law (fact).

I wish only to make visible policing and the Law<sup>\*</sup>, rather than the particular forces of control, or specific pieces of legislation or means of punishment. It is when the operating milieu is made visible - as a moral order (desired, achieved, endangered, and reinforced) - that we can see how moral regulation and State formation are co-ordinate practices of a ruling class ruling. The studies cited - plus the famous essay by Silver (1967) or Critchley's recent survey of 'policing' (1973) provide sufficient indications of the possibility of this kind of work. Policing meant far more than a special body of men with particular powers; similarly, when the word 'police' is used in early nineteenth-century Britain it means a system of protection and prevention, partly involving individual Police Office men, partly the Law, but partly matters of habit, training, - in short, particular social relations between groups.<sup>\*\*</sup>

---

\* Working-class identification of 'the police' as 'the Law' (as "here comes the law...") is only one facet of this; see broadsheets and songs for similar perceptive analyses, e.g. Carpenter, 1888:songs 22 and 23.

\*\* As Mayhew showed, as far as the costermongers [Contd. on p.313]

In the case of 'the Law' there is little to add to studies by Renner (1928) or Commons (1924) both of whom stress, in the words of Friedmann's important review essay about the former, 'The function of property in modern English law' (1950)\*. Weber noted

In England centralized justice and notable/[aristocratic] rule have been associated ... England, which in modern times was the first and most highly developed capitalist country, thereby retained a less rational and less bureaucratic judicature. Capitalism in England, however, could quite easily come to terms with this, especially because the nature of the court constitution and of the trial procedure up to the modern period amounted in effect to a far-going denial of justice to the economically weak groups.

(1914b: 218)

A particularly striking 'internal' account has been given by Lord

---

[Contd. from p.312] of London were concerned the police were their politics. As late as 1872 we can find the use of the term 'sanitary police' as meaning far more than individual officers and prescriptive regulations (Journal of the Royal Society of Agriculture of England, 8 1872: 352-62) and a new 'invention', like street lighting, might be hailed as 'the best police' there could be.

\* I tried to indicate above, with respect to Factories or Mines Legislation, and more generally, how new forms of property related to this general point. Several of the essays in Kamenka (1975b) are relevant to this theme. Recently a particular problem associated with regulation by law has been overproduction: in 1973 there were 2,300 Acts and Statutory Instruments, covering 9,000 printed pages (Times, 23 January 1975); in 1975 there were 13,000 pages of similar Law (Times, 15 October 1976) - both exclude Administrative Circulars, Local authority regulations and 'internal' rules.

Justice Scarman in the 1975 Hamlyn Lectures:

A short reference to two of the somersaults of English law can illustrate the superb flexibility of its muscles. It conserved and regulated the feudal system for centuries: but when the divine right of kings, feudal tenure and the burden of feudal services was laid to rest finally in the 17th century, the law adjusted itself without any sign of stress to the principles of the freedom of man - limited only by the need to preserve society itself - a philosophy of which Locke was the finest English exponent. When freedom was found to leave the problems of the weak and socially exploited unsolved, the law changed direction under the guidance of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill.

(qu Griffith, 1975: 38)

John Griffith comments:

Lawyers were then, as they are now, the most conservative professional group in society ... The reforms [of the 'change of direction' quoted above] had nothing to do with the common law and everything to do with political protest, government, and Parliament.

(Griffith, 1975: 38)

This underemphasises the degree to which Law expresses, and lawyers operate within, social forms determined by production and exchange relations - as Marx argued (1864: 339)\*. Therefore Law is extremely flexible, within the wider determinations and tendencies of class alignments. Thus, whilst Law generally reflects property rights

---

\* Cf. Chambliss, 1974; 1975 and my discussion of Bentham in Chapter One above.

and enforces them, it may, in specific instances indicate tensions and conflicts between different kinds of property.

It would be false to give the impression that when we speak of 'Public Order' as constructed, we are referring to a conspiratorial (i.e. fully conscious) set of intentions. The ruling class has a code and an order internal to its own complex construction and reproduction. It is as well to address some remarks to these constraints, which a recent study of 'Elites' has shown to be crucial. Giddens (1972b; Cf. Stanworth, 1974) considers that 'recruitment', 'structure', and 'power' are key dimensions involved in any study of elites; with regard to the second he notes how both social and moral integration are entailed, and that the latter

refers to the degree to which those in elite positions share common ideas and a common moral ethos.

(1972b: 350)

I wish to examine briefly how the 'gentleman ideal' - and beyond that the maintenance of aristocratic styles and culture - was reproduced through public school notions of service. I then wish to examine one area where this ideal and 'law and order' intersect: the personnel of the County Magistracy in midnineteenth-century England.

In one important sense the domination of the 'landed gentleman' ideal is not difficult to explain: the aristocracy of the large landed estate, and the many and varied institutional complexes which serviced that group, continued as visibly rich and powerful until 1914 if not beyond (Guttsman, 1968, 1969; Arnstein, 1972). Smiles' mid-century notion of character was specifically related to 'The True Gentleman' (1859: Ch.13) but, characteristically, he suppressed the material bases of the qualities he prized - independ-



ent means and expensive (exclusive) education. The Public Schools and the older Universities of Victorian Britain were largely geared to reproducing gentlemen:

Not only did the classical curriculum - tailored to civil service examinations - favour the cultural background of the landed family, but the whole education system actually made gentlemen by the same indoctrination that made rulers. Students from non-gentry origins were stamped with the gentry's traditional outlook.

(Wilkinson, 1963: 127. Cf. Arnstein, 1972: 230f)

Hypolite Taine, in the 1860s, recognised how aristocratic ideals were systematised through a series of related clubs, each with their specific rules and procedures but all resonating with the same spirit (Cf. Coleman, 1974: 99f). The similar 'gentlemanly liberalism' of the Oxbridge universities has been studied by Roach (1959), Stone (1975), and Rothblatt (1975).

In all these clubs (social contexts of class similarity) there was a particular discipline at work - itself, quite possibly, reinforced by the internal rules of the aristocratic family - which involved particular kinds of sponsored self-regulation<sup>\*</sup>. Raban has noted that the Public School 'was first of all an intensive education in rank. There were dozens of rigid, interlocking, hierarchies in one house ... Everyone had someone to grovel to, and the most common of all offences was "cheek" ...' (Raban, 1975, review-

---

\* Cf. 'much of our business conduct is still subject to self-discipline, a sort of mixture of the honour system tempered by the old-boy network and strengthened by self-regulatory panels or boards' (Roll, 1976).

ing Simon, 1975). Dunning (1975) has examined the 'fagging' system, in this perspective\*.

Apart from Arnstein, Coleman has recently investigated the possible relations between the dominance of the gentleman ideal and entrepreneurial and managerial competence in Britain in the nineteenth century (1974). He offers the interesting suggestion that it may have been precisely the common pattern of 'gentrification' (the withdrawal of second-generation industrialists from Trade to Land) which opened the areas of management and entrepreneurialism to talent 'from below'. There is much to be said for this - provided that we see the movement taking place in several directions at once. The 'aristocracy' was far from totally landed, and, even where it was landed, gained much from industrialisation through the exploitation of mineral rights, way-leave dues, increased property values in town and country, and so on. Certainly, as I discuss in my fifth chapter below, contemporaries saw Public School education as one of the means by which the sons of industrialists were turned against their fathers' way of life. The contrary view is expressed by Matthew Arnold; bemoaning the end of aristocratic patronage he noted in 1863 'far too many of Lord Ravensworth's class are mere men of business, or mere farmers, or mere horse-racers, or mere men of pleasure' (qu Spring, 1963: 273).

In terms of occupations - leaving aside the vexed question of whether there is a group of 'professionals' who stand in relation to

---

\* Given the mention of flogging in the Army and Navy; one should never forget that the same 'moral technology' was applied in the Public Schools. Non-physical moral pressure must have been as agonising in those 'total institutions'.

aristocratic power as 'agents' stand in relation to aristocratic wealth - Lord Percy describes landed families as belonging to a service rather than a governing class (qu Spring, 1960: 59). This needs qualification. No Cabinet between 1830 and 1900 had less than 41% 'aristocratic element'; the only two below 50% were Gladstone's 1868 and 1892 Cabinets: the average for the period was 71% (Arnstein, 1972: 210). The only 'true commoner' in the first Cabinet of the 20th century was Joseph Chamberlain (Ibid., p.208f)! There is much useful information on aristocratic careers in Reader's study (1966); the core of many professions was seen to have some relation to that perceived set of 'moral relations' possessed by a gentleman\*.

Lord Percy also argued that 'large private responsibilities do tend to form in their possessors a certain talent for public affairs. A certain talent, but one that is apt to be restricted in its range ...' (qu Spring, 1960: 58). As one writer noted in 1862: 'At the first whisper of duty, magistrates act, county magistrates assemble, and volunteers turn out' (qu Spring, 1963: 275). Halevy (1912: 37), describing the situation in 1815, writes

The landlords were ... the true rulers of the English provinces. From among them, according to long-established custom, was chosen the body of justices of the peace. \*\*

\* Some Public Schools, in the early nineteenth century, taught 'a curiously named subject, Moral Relations, which seems to have been a form of elementary economics...' Cooper (1959: 24-5) in his biography of the first Earl of Durham.

\*\* 'The aristocracy controlled all the machinery of government' Halevy also declares (1912:221). Surveys of the national elite that show aristocratic power and influence are Guttsman, 1968; R.W. Johnson, 1972 and Boyd, 1974. For the Cabinet see Laski, 1928 and Willson, 1959. The best setting for county power is F.M.L. Thompson (1963:Ch.5). On their local governance, see also Webb, 1922. [Contd. on next page, 319]

State power, for the majority of the population until the 1840s - in rural districts much later than this - was represented by the magistrates (Marshall, 1974). Two detailed studies of Warwickshire, 1830-1870 (Quinault, 1974a) and Lancashire (D. Foster, 1974) confirm the influence of 'social qualifications based on the nature of a true gentleman - intelligence, social acceptability in the eyes of brother magistrates, property, and the absence of any connexion with trade' (Ibid., 49)

In the making of a peaceful modern society the magistrate deserves to rank with the police constable as one of the principal agents of order.

(Quinault, 1974a: 212)

Brundage and others (Spring, 1963: 275-6; Arnstein, 1972: 213f) have shown, whether by statutory provision or by 'legitimate influence', that the landed remained 'true rulers' until the 1880s and beyond. At both central and local levels, the landed aristocracy alone could supply personnel to take part in largely unpaid (although not unprofitable) and time-consuming political affairs. We have noted previously how it was generally argued that men of Property (or Substance) alone would act to preserve what is best. The Duke of Wellington, commenting on a scheme of Sir James Graham for Local Courts, wrote (in November 1842) that such courts would 'destroy the influence of the landed gentry, and of persons of education and good social manners and habits'. He proposed an alternative system:

A scheme of this kind would be safe, and might save

[Contd. from previous page] Arnstein's work has now been carried forward in his article 'The myth of the Triumphant Middle Class' Historian 19, 1975 (205-221) which came to hand too late for proper integration into my text. It is an important study.

us from the revolution which would be the consequence of depriving the gentry of property and education, of their influence in the several counties in which they reside.

(qu Graham, 1907: I: 355)\*

The fullest survey of 'social composition' (of the magistracy) is that given by Zangerl (1971) who finds even in the Boroughs in 1841 the gentry making up 45% of the magistrates, and as late as 1885 (again in the Boroughs) they constituted 11.6%; the County figures were: 1841, 77.1% and 1887, 68.1%. He shows the whole structure of rural law and order (and of course all Justice above the level of summary courts) to be dependent upon sponsorship and selection from above - the influence of the Lord Lieutenant being particularly significant.

All these studies - like the studies of the 'clubs' and 'institutions' of the aristocracy - show the flexibility mentioned above:

Assimilation, rather than disturbing the established order of social relationships, reinforced the value system of the landed classes. The circle of landed allies on the county bench merely expanded to include bourgeois individuals as well as Anglican clergymen, doctors, barristers and military officers.

(Zangerl, 1971: 125)

---

\* This notion of the moral significance of the gentry is a pervasive theme in State Servants' reports; it forms a counterpoint to their notion of 'model institutions' examined above.

#### 4. Class Structure and Public Opinion

From the above it should be clear that the moral order of the ruling classes was a contradictory phenomenon. Within its various facets and expressions the ethos of the middle class was shaped by the eidos of a landed gentleman (Cf. Madge, 1964).

In examining how the State relates to that contradiction - through the operating sociologies of the State Servants - we are also investigating how they handle a more antagonistic contradiction between the ruling and ruled classes which follows from the differing moral relations of capital and labour. Marx, in an exclamation, moreover, against 'the Comtists', once summed up my project when he wrote:

They do not know that every social form of property

has 'morals' of its own ...

(1871, draft text, p.191)

This is what Gramsci meant in his depiction of 'homo oeconomicus' discussed above - and, as we shall see, very much what Durkheim often means when he tries to elucidate social conditions. At base such 'morals' are what one class (which owns and controls property) expects from another (which does not). But, importantly, there is a significant element of reciprocal 'tension' in moral relations, crystallised around the notions of 'legitimate authority'. Both in terms of the general regulation of moral relations (and forms for the institutional expression of moral solidarity) and, crucially, in 'attending to' the style and setting of 'legitimacy', State apparatuses were and are dominant. These are not problems which are unknown to

sociologists\* but their studies lack a particular dimension: they fail to comprehend differential (historical) experience of the State.

Paul Corrigan, in a comment which extends my necessary excursions concerning 'Force' and 'Law and Order' above, recently pointed out

Throughout the western world, states are characterized by one of the two major symbols of control in capitalist society; the tank or the community worker.

(Paul Corrigan, 1975: 57)

---

\* On the 'diversity of morals': Ossowska has examined 'social determinants', and Barnsley differential ethics (apart from the work of Mannheim and others on configurations of ideas and beliefs). In some senses (limited, I would argue, by a chronic form of ahistoricism and a curious utilitarian notion of everyone's equal power to define everyone else, including different varieties of one's own 'Self') such a project forms the starting point for deviancy studies - two, more sensitive than normal, are Rock (1974) and Clarke (1975). Cf. Steiner, 1973. But if we turn to the widely disseminated 'new' or 'critical' criminology we actually find - incredibly - no discussion of the genesis of either the concepts or the practices of 'Law and Order'. The State is invoked, the Police are mentioned, but they are data of a 'natural' type - Parsons would place them in his 'environment' conceptual box. Some of the best work has been done (i) on 'words of power', linguistic codes and relations (e.g. Hegy, 1974; Whitley, 1971); (ii) following Foucault's lead - especially Scull's discussion of the 'highly significant redefinition of the moral boundaries of English society' in his study of 'medical men as moral entrepreneurs' (Scull, 1975). The counterpart to the fear of organised and educated working people, was fear of 'the mob' - the criminals, the mad, the beggars, the unclean, the unregulated, and, in important senses, the morally free - the true sovereign subject of Liberalism! (Cf. Pearson, 1975:Ch.6).

We have seen, following the work of D.C. Moore, that before there can be community ( or, for that matter, social) workers, it is necessary to construct and sustain communities. This was, of course, partly a physical matter - the creation of factory towns during the first half of the nineteenth century and their structuration in terms of class territory in the second half - but it also involved moral relations and codes of affective solidarity.

Central to the latter was moral regulation focussed, as we have seen, through education. The latter was never, however, narrowly defined. Sir Llewellyn Woodward considers one facet of the Age of Reform to have been 'the organisation of leisure with indirect educational results ...' (1962: 495) and James Hole, in his discussion of 'Social Education', wrote:

There are some agencies which, though they cannot be classed as schools, have an educational influence of the most powerful kind. That view of education which limits it to mere scholastic instruction, is narrow and incomplete. Let any one analyse the influences that have formed his own character ... Just so with any community, whether comprising a nation or a town. Whatever tends to render the conditions of social existence more favourable - physically, intellectually, or morally, - has an educative tendency.

(Hole, 1860: 106)\*

---

\* It is instructive, in terms of the long 'educative tendency' of English political rituals, to compare Miall's The Franchise as the means of a people's training (1851; Cf. Peel, 1971: 71f) and Monkton Milnes' "On the admission of the working classes as part of our social system," the third of the 1867 Essays on reform.



One way in which many of the aforementioned contradictions were handled, and educative tendencies systematised, was through 'public opinion' as defined by W.H. Mackinnon in 1828:

that sentiment on any given subject which is entertained by the best informed, most intelligent and most moral persons in the community, which is gradually spread and adopted by nearly all persons of any education or proper feeling in a civilized state.

(qu Peel, 1971: 70)

We may date such 'public opinion' from the 1790s (Briggs, 1959a: 114)\* and see it as constituted within the wider framework of that specifically bourgeois nationalism which was analysed in the first section of this chapter. Moreover, as Hamburger had made clear (1963), it is a constructed phenomenon which is subject to definitional transformation by those with power. That is to say - often through the use of the technique of 'misunderstanding' discussed by Marx (1855f: 430) - 'public opinion' can be defined away as 'special pleading', 'popular clamour', or ill informed shout. The last category (a paraphrase of Chadwick's views as discussed in Chapter Three above) is central to what I am discussing. What was to count as fact (and therefore the central core of acceptable 'public opinion') increasingly turned upon categories and data collected by (and therefore emphatically defined by) State agencies. The first fifty years of the nineteenth century were the era of data gathering - through the movements analysed in previous chapters. From this nexus,

---

\* From the same date - and the same new forces - we can speak of 'The Provinces' (Read, 1964).

moreover, sociology was also made - or rather a particular kind of sociology (and, more widely, social science) became an ingredient of how public opinion was to be constructed and acceptably transformed (Abrams, 1968).

Lord Percy (Cf. Spring, 1960, 1963) not only considered that the landed gentleman had a restricted area of influence, he also considered that kind of influence as unlike (and largely antithetical to) 'public opinion'. What I am suggesting is that the central paradigm of ruling class ethos in Britain is defined by these three nodal points: the 'gentleman ideal', 'public opinion', and (specific) State forms and styles. Neither fully-fledged landlordism (Reaction), nor unrestrained capitalism production relations (Crema-Stistics\*) could have engendered the particular social eidos, internal to the ruling class compromise, imposed ('shoving civilization downwards') upon the ruled classes; which dominates the social structure of England and, less securely, the rest of the British territories. 'Public opinion' marks the power and significance of industrial and financial capitalists happy to call themselves a 'middle class'; it registered a severe constraint upon what the State could achieve - except where this 'State' was experienced through personae of the 'gentleman ideal' at local and at national levels (Cf. Appendix, I).

Moral regulation was taking place even when the emphasis was

---

\* This is Tremenheere's term. He defines it as 'the mere art of massing wealth apart from all moral considerations' (I was there, 115). He and Horner both identify Benthamism (and political economy) as 'in great favour with employers of labour especially in the manufacturing districts' (Ibid.) Cf. Appendix III for Coleridge's "moral economy".

upon apparently neutral and trans-class activities such as fact gathering, through questionnaires and statistics. State formation was entailed in instances where seemingly private and personal matters were being regulated. The registration of dates of birth follows requests from Factory Inspectors and Poor Law Assistant Commissioners and - aside from explicitly moral statistics (Cullen, 1975:Ch.5) - simple fact recording had its moral implications. Henriques shows this in her study of Bastardy and the New Poor Law, where the Registrar General prefaces his sixth annual report by a discussion which included the following quotation from Bernoulli's Handbuch der Populationistik (1841);

Illegitimacy is in itself an evil to a man; and the State should seek to diminish the number of these births, and carefully enquire to what circumstances any increase is to be ascribed  
(1844, qu Henriques, 1967: 124)

Pervading all moral regulation was the notion of Improvement - several of the State Servants arguing that this must be achieved through a 'national system' - there must be standards, a national minimum, and so on. The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science was founded to relate 'the improvement of the people' and 'social economics as a whole' and G.W. Hastings, its first Secretary, was clear on the nature of 'mutual influence':

do we not find that each one of the social problems  
[n.b.] we have been in any way at pains to  
unravel strikes its roots into the substance of the  
nation, ramifying through a hundred secret crevices  
into classes apparently the most removed from its

influence?

(1856, qu Mitchell, 1968: 1-2)

Brian Harrison<sup>\*</sup> has shown the interconnection of State Activity and such 'social problems' in his studies of 'Drink' (1968; 1971; 1973c), 'Religion' (1967a), Sunday Trading (1965a), sexuality (1967b), and animals (1973b) - he has also provided general studies (1965b; 1974). The second of these demonstrates that investigations of these areas would lead to substantial modification of the Debate discussed in my first Chapter above - although his distinction between 'social' and 'moral' reform goes very far towards attenuating the power of his argument. He does show, however, that where 'moral' imperatives could be adduced it was far easier to (i) achieve a coalition across normal intra-class divisions, and (ii) establish limitations upon 'free choice', 'free trade' and the 'laws of supply and demand'. His essay (1974) is also important in linking together, for example, J.S. Mill and T.H. Green and in providing a chart of the agencies of moral reform and indicating their links. He is also able to demonstrate that 'all moral reformers saw law as the adult's equivalent of schooling' (1974: 301).

Once we are prepared to comprehend the covariation in stimuli experienced by the working class in terms of moral regulation and State activity, certain features of the dominated class' political physiognomy become explicable. Edward Thompson, in one of his extended criticisms of the Anderson-Nairn thesis, has emphasised what was taking place with particular clarity. On the one hand,

---

\* B. Harrison's work has 'opened many doors' for me in many places in my thesis as a whole; his papers (especially 1967a) offer additional comment on the 'Moral Revolution'.

the workers, having failed to overthrow capitalist society, proceeded to warren it from end to end.

(1965: 343)\*

On the other,

each advance within the framework of capitalism simultaneously involved the working class far more deeply in the status quo .... Each assertion of working-class influence within the bourgeois-democratic state machinery, simultaneously involved them as partners (even if antagonistic partners) in the running of the machine.

(1965: 343-344)

And, he might have added, they could begin to conceptualise their own social formation in terms of just this imagery: of a machine, of which, if they could gain control, they would be the masters. But he seems far from confident - at least he uncharacteristically does not declare it - that this was a desired and (largely) constructed 'social state' as such studies as those of John Foster or P.G. Richards' thesis have indicated. Working-class leaders and representatives were hedged around by moral ideals - as to character and respectability - and severely (i.e. forcibly) restrained by 'Law and Order' - and encapsulated within the rigid paradigms of 'being British' - and taking part in a system which by its very workings subordinated the majority (even though the latter

---

\* He rightly points to the importance of the period when 'the characteristic class institutions of the Labour Movement were built up' (Ibid.) without stressing how their construction was both extended and subject to radical revision through external attack - the relationship between the Courts and Trades Unions is exemplary here.

generated the power and the wealth of the social formation) ...  
 The wonder has always been to me, not the degree to which local and national working class leaders 'compromise' their ideals; but that there remain (and are constantly reproduced) any solidly materialist goals and objectives within working class 'reformist' and 'defensive' organizations.

Tholfsen has identified the core of this acculturation as the:  
 ethic of improvement: elementary schools, Sunday schools, Mechanics Institutes, mutual improvement societies, reading rooms, libraries, temperance societies, friendly societies, co-operatives, savings banks, churches and chapels. To a striking degree, implicitly and explicitly, in ritual and litany, these institutions celebrated the ideal of improvement in all its forms.

(1971: 63)

He had earlier noted

Both in politics and in social life there was the same tendency to describe goals in moral and idealistic terms. In both spheres to be reasonable meant accepting the arguments of social superiors. Liberalism was not a narrowly political doctrine, but an expression of the mid-Victorian ethos. As such it was extremely effective in attenuating conflict and fostering co-operation...

(1961: 246)\*

---

\* Tholfsen also stresses that 'A salient feature of this ['cohesive'] culture was the tendency to invest ordinary activities with the highest moral significance ...' (1971: 61). The changes in working class clubs are important here, Cf. Price, 1971; J. Taylor, 1971; but n.b. Shipley, 1971.

What we are discussing here is the dialectic of 'Reform' and 'Repression' (Cf. Miliband, 1969: Ch.9) through which the organised strength of a class, experiencing their conditions of life as 'an internal colony' (Cf. Engels' a race apart, 1845), was dissipated by violent dispersal and suppression accompanied by sponsored/alternative provision and 'dependent development'. The Police State and the Educational State co-exist.

Perkin's discussion of 'The Institutionalization of the working class' (1969: Ch.9, Sect.3) gives emphasis to the significance of friendly societies, co-operative trading and, importantly, the craft-, regional- and sectional-consciousness of organised workers. It is necessary, once again, to emphasise the tremendous power of the simple fact of work itself, and of production relations<sup>\*</sup>, as the bedrock from which all other forms of class control (wrongly called social control by many commentators<sup>\*\*</sup>) are sustained.

Much of what I have discussed above was commonplace amongst State Servants and, more important perhaps, foreign observers. Baernreither (who was an Austrian politician) produced his English associations of working men (with a preface by J.M. Ludlow, Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies) in 1883. This gave, in the words of Ludlow, a 'large and clear ... view of the

---

\* See the pattern of 'industrial relations' drawn out by Ramsay(1976)

\*\* 'Social control' would be possible only in a social formation with a high degree of egalitarian and conscious (i.e. collective) comprehension of the internal procedures and resources available to them. One fundamental 'law' of such a system would be a persistent Challenge to apparently 'objective' constraints. For one sketch see the views of Brønterre O'Brien in the 1830s; for another, Corrigan, 1974.

great associative movement of the English nineteenth century working class in all its forms' (1883:ix). For the author, the combination of 'legislation, self-government and self help' which he described was to serve as a 'model for other European States' (Ibid., xii). In England

the working classes by their unity and their consistent and quiet conduct, have brought about a period of reform ... by means of a series of co-operating and mutually supporting institutions.

(1883: xiii)

during the last forty years a complete revolution has been going on in the lives of a large number of English workmen ...

(Ibid., 5)

Quoting from Miss Edith Simcox, delegate of the dressmakers' union, Baernreither emphasizes 'gradual development'

"A Social war would not right the wrongs which a state of social or economic war had produced; but a revolution may yet be effected in the minds or consciences of the community, which will find its expression in a radical reformation of the theory and practice of the economic world."

(qu Ibid., 86)\*

---

\* I cannot emphasize the value of these kinds of works (Cf. Aschrott, 1902, on the Poor Law - or, for that matter, of course, Halevy's work) - all the points I have made are illustrated here - the significance of 'public opinion', the notion of 'sympathy' between employer and employed and, above all, 'in no other country can be found more comprehensive, conscientious, and impartial investigations into social questions' (1883:5). Like Marx, Baernreither never inquires as to the power-relations which such investigations display.



Gosden (1973) has studied the structure and operation of 'self-help' institutions and the operating ideology of the later co-operative movement is available in Holyoake's internal account (1906; Cf. Acland, 1886). But the most centrally relevant account of these institutions is provided by Barry Supple's essay on 'Legislation and Virtue' (1974) which stresses how, for the Victorian ruling class,

in the last resort the welfare of the poor as a class was assumed to lie in changes in the values and habits and priorities of individuals... Put crudely, the working class were expected to adopt the cardinal middle-class socio-economic virtues ... if the state had a role in this process it was to help to overcome the obstacles to a better educated and more prudential working class.

(1974: 213)\*

Offering his own contribution to a debate about compulsory health insurance, in 1880, H.S. Tremenheere begins by stressing the

---

\* Supple qualifies this, and gives a fundamentally ameliorationist version of Erastian policy, towards the end of his paper. It is worth noting that the ruling class also had their appropriate forms of self-help - the way in which Taine considered Schools and Universities to be club-like can be extended through national and local clubs (some sort of significance must be attached to the fact that the Old Etonian Raquet and Tennis Club still holds an annual dinner at Boodles). But the formal organizations are also important: for example, the Stock Exchange. Or: 'On the premise that those with a higher education tend to live longer than others, the University Life [Assurance Society] was set up in 1825 by graduates of Oxford and Cambridge' (Advertisement Times, 22 February 1975).

extent of support for the measure by referring to a memorial presented to the Royal Commission on Friendly Societies (1872-1874) in 1872, to which was attached a list of signatories including:

the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, 6 bishops,  
17 lay peers ... 35 M.P.'s ... 37 Chairmen and 8  
deputy-chairmen of Boards of Guardians ... 52 Justices  
of the Peace ... and nearly 90 clergymen ...

(qu Tremenheere, 1880: 276)

It should be stressed that this 1872 Memorial included the notion of compulsion; as does Tremenheere's own scheme of 1880, which entailed deduction by employers of one twelfth of the wages of workers aged fourteen until they reach 21 years old -using, again it should be stressed, existing legislation\* enabling deduction of school-fees. Tremenheere reports on many similar activities taking place, discusses schemes such as his own, and notes

The cry of "Let us alone" has been raised against all the great measures of material and moral improvement which have distinguished this century, from the first Sir Robert Peel's Act of 1802 ... to the present day. But, on good cause shown, public opinion has sanctioned the widening of the sphere of statutory regulation. This measure would strengthen the existing institutions that have done so much to help on the progress which the working classes have made in self-reliance ...

(1880: 887-888; Cf. H.S.T. to Chadwick, 3 June 1889).

In an article the following year, also following on from the 1872 Memorial, Tremenheere criticises working-class burial societies

---

\* Consolidated: Sect.25, Factory Act, 1878.

and urges the provision of a compulsory insurance by the State (1881). Sixty-one years later, in a classic document of social policy - within which the political category 'submerged tenth' is transformed (morally) into 'ten per cent problem families' - Our Towns (Women's Group, 1943: 10f),\* we find a similar sustained attack on working-class burial societies. Eventually, of course, a Death grant scheme was established.

---

This intervention by Tremenheere, towards the end of his life, occasions a return to the views of the four State Servants already extensively illustrated in my previous Chapter. Moral order so thoroughly pervades their theory and practices of State formation\*\* -

---

\* This requires far more attention - or as much - as (say) Beveridge; it offers a striking series of instances of continuities from the moral impulses of Benthamite Radicalism in its stress on the need to transform working-class habits. It followed from the discovery - by the wives of the lesser gentry - of what working class women and children were like, following evacuation from larger towns in the 1939-1941 period. Above all - aside from eugenic notions about 'the race' (remember the context in which it was written!) - the Chadwickian messages about labour-power, on the one hand, and concerning property-rights, on the other, come out clearly: 'Respect for other people's property is not innate, but is actually contrary to human instinct; it has to be inculcated. Those in whom it is lacking are not so much perverted as socially untrained' (Our Towns, p.47).

\*\* Cf. 'Historians of government may be justly criticised if they fail to distinguish between the growth of the machinery of government, and the development of a social philosophy that informs it and really makes it work.' (Johnson Ph.D. thesis, 509,n).

and their operating assumptions in or out of office, in public statement and private letter - that to offer a proportional representation of their views<sup>\*</sup> would duplicate the extent of this thesis as a whole. Instead I shall exemplify those concerns - my Bibliographies indicate the resources upon which those examples are based.

On September 4th 1844, Chadwick wrote a letter to H.S. Tremenheere commenting on the latter's first report as a Commissioner for Mining Districts, which Chadwick had seen in draft. (Chadwick Mss. 2181/4: 23) As I showed above, Chadwick criticises Tremenheere for not sufficiently emphasising the need for physical as much as moral improvement. He also offers a most informative discussion:

The observations as to the want of civil organisation, for the new districts are important ... I think however you give undue prominence to church extensions. The remedies first in order are: infant schools: juvenile schools for the young: police force better organised ...: restrictions on the sale of fermented liquors, remedies against strikes Vide Constabulary Force report S66 to to [sic] 96 et seq: and lastly better appointed religious teachers, after the preventing of immorality by the prevention of overcrowding for which see the Health of Towns evidence.

---

\* One previous survey may stand as an example of what is lacking: Roberts (1960:Ch.6); he wrongly characterises every single one of the State Servants I have studied; as does Perkin (1969: 268).

Civil organisation is here equated precisely with moral regulation by external intervention of class power in new districts. This is precisely, of course, what underpins Chadwick's views and actions in connection with the Poor Law, the Factory Inquiry, and the Constabulary Report. The Police Force recommended by the latter was precisely connected (Finer, 1952a: 126f; 164f) to the Poor Law of 1834 (Cf. Chadwick, 1829; 1863b; 1868; 1884 for this theme).

Finer has so ably demonstrated Chadwick's Erastian philosophy (1952a: 22f, espec. 55-56) that there is little to add, as far as his period in office is concerned. But between his enforced retirement and his death Chadwick was both active and influential\*. I noted above how in the 1880s Chadwick showed a sustained concern with 'all that is implied in the term discipline' and how his focus on 'sanitary' questions - or, more widely, Public Health - was related to ensuring the moral and physical means that make the discipline of capitalist production possible. Centrally he was concerned about the physical condition of the labour power available to English capital (and, equally, whether or not the working class could supply a fit army). He sought, as he phrased it, 'the improvement of the physical strength and aptitudes, mental as well as moral, of the population' (1860: 575). By the latter he meant

---

\* Cf., as examples not discussed here, (i) the extensive correspondence between Chadwick and Tremenheere in the 1880s concerning the latter's corrections of the former's pamphlets; (ii) Chadwick's two papers on Education (P.P. 1860 (120) XLIII) which celebrate - in E.C. Tufnell's words - 'the moral results of the half-time school system' (Ibid., 70f) and which J.S. Mill considered 'of the very highest value' (P.P. 1867-8 XXVIII Vol.2, 61-66).

'the British workman'<sup>\*</sup> whom he compared with the 'inferior refuse of other nations' in terms of its past performance militarily. He showed that two Normans (!!), 3 Danes, 3 Norwegians, and 5 'Easterns' were needed to equal the productivity of one fit and healthy 'British workman' ! Responding to the Smith report on diet, the Economist (of 8th October 1864) - to show again the breadth of the consensus - editorialized:

That in a country choked with rich men, in a time of unexampled prosperity, and under a free trade regime, there should be counties in which one half the population have insufficient food, is a fact which makes a philanthropist almost despair. The only real remedy is an increase in wages to be repaid by higher cultivation, the use of machinery and the increase in power to be obtained from the human machine when you give him enough oil. That point, the actual loss to the employer from insufficient food, deserves to be studied more closely.

(emphasis in original)<sup>\*\*</sup>

For Chadwick - better food, physical training (1864: 13 - related explicitly to the need for 'action in concert' with 'large manufacturing processes'), and improved sanitation - are the means to

\* Chadwick attaches an interesting note (1864:9) objecting to the terms 'working classes' and 'manual labourers' preferring 'wage classes' since 'An industrial leader, the head master of a manufactory, is often really the hardest working man in it'.

\*\* After reading Rowntree's Poverty, in 1901, W.S. Churchill said 'the American labourer is a stronger, larger, healthier, better fed, and consequently more efficient animal than a large proportion of our population ...' (qu Bruce, 1973b: 128). These images of the working class - as machines or animals - cannot be too heavily emphasized.

increase productivity. Moreover

if the principles of economical and social science which I have indicated in their relation with the means of intellectual, moral, and physical improvement<sup>\*</sup>, be duly regarded and applied, the conditions of the manufacturing population ... [will] be brought up to a high state of moral and social advancement.

(1864: 26-27)

Leonard Horner was also directly concerned with factory discipline and, as with Tremenheere's views over the 'Justice Man', he saw the need to enforce a more apparent fairness within workplace relations, including safeguarding of machinery, better physical conditions of work, and, towards the end of his Inspectorship, some moderation in the machine-pacing of the workforce. The 'humanitarianism' here needs qualification, however beneficial its effects. Its moral content, as usual, is best displayed in Horner's writings on education which are extensive. In his foreword to his translation of Cousin's work he wrote

It must be abundantly clear by this time, that the maxim "laissez nous faire," however true in matters of trade, is applicable only to a limited extent in education ...

(1838a: xvi)<sup>\*\*</sup>

---

\* This Trinity formula is a useful mnemonic for Chadwick's paradigmatic beliefs - see, after all, the 1834 Poor Law Report or his 1841 survey of Employers' opinions on how to increase the value of Labour.

\*\* Some insight into Horner's vision of 'moral order' [Contd. on p.339]

His prime focus here was

how they ['the lower orders'] shall be elevated  
from a state of mere animal existence to the proper  
station of moral, intellectual and responsible beings.

(Ibid., xvii)

Moreover he linked this proposal to that 'other great measure for improving the condition of the labouring classes, the Poor Law Amendment Act' (Ibid., xviii).

In his debate with Nassau Senior, Horner was concerned to restrict child-labour to ensure that 'good habits' were 'fixed' through 'the moral training of the child' (unfatigued by labour) 'until it has attained its thirteenth year' (1837: 31). After that age, he agrees with Senior, the workers are 'free agents'. Three years later his pamphlet On the employment of children in factories (1840) aimed to convince manufacturers of the advantages of regulation (including education) of their workforce. Apart from the moral advantages - a trained worker is more efficient, less prey to agitators, and so on - Horner also stresses that such regulation is 'for the sake of the honest

---

[Contd. from p.338] may be seen in his depiction of why the School of Arts was 'healthful' in 1851: "Look to the soundness of our constitution; to our sober, temperate habits ..."; the 'control of a small body of educated and experienced persons' was no doubt important (1851: 4). Horner's correspondence with Brougham and Chadwick is frequently on such themes, but although, in 1859, he thinks Chadwick right to praise the 'half-time system' ('the half-timers made quite as much progress as the full-timers') he warns Chadwick that 'nine-tenths of the employers of children care nothing about them...' and a good national half-time system would involve many more Inspectors - might not the Chancellor of the Exchequer be alarmed by such expense? (Chadwick, Mss. 1051; Cf. Brougham, Mss. e.g. 13496; and EndNote 2 to Ch.3).



mill-owner who strictly obeys the law, but is exposed to unfair competition from the easy evasions of it by his less scrupulous neighbour ...' (1840: v). That is, the moral regulation has to extend to the bourgeoisie.

Horner returns to the central themes of political economy in his praise and promotion of Robinson's pamphlet (1854)\*. Ten years earlier, in a letter to his son-in-law Charles Bunbury, Horner declared

No man can regulate the rate of wages, and no possible combination of men can do it, so long as competition is free. If there is a redundant population in a low moral state, and free competition, there will be a constant tendency to the lowest rate of payment that will sustain animal life, and there is but one cure for the dreadful evil of a country swarming with mere human existences in my opinion, viz., bringing out the higher qualities of those existences; in other words, raising the moral condition of the population to that state of right feeling that people will not marry without the knowledge that they can keep up themselves and their offspring, in the exercise and enjoyment of those powers by which man is raised above mere animal existence. To bring about that higher moral state of the great mass of the population, there must be an extensive call upon that portion of the

---

\* These Friendly letters, like many of Horner's letters, show the 'sympathy' and 'duty' of the 'gentleman ideal' very clearly - Cf. Sir Charles Snow (1843) and George Nicholls (1846: 26) on the duties imposed on possessors of property. Both show that where there is no 'civil organisation', the workers generate their own institutions and ideas.

community where there is the greater amount of wealth, in order to provide those things which no effort of the less wealthy ever can provide: good dwellings, good schools, good religious instruction, good amusements, good government.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2: 79-80, part qu Memoir, II: 39)

This notion of the need to partly restore, partly create, the social bond between the propertied and their servants is a dominant theme in the work of Kay and Tremenheere. Kay's sociology is a pervasive influence in his different occupations; and, more than the others, we can see how it was constructed as was partly demonstrated in the previous Chapter. Here one should emphasize his notion of the 'transforming power' of education (1877: 62) as a secular counterpart to what Edward Thompson has called the 'transforming power of the cross'. This, in turn, serves to remind us that any such transformation relies upon an offensive on behalf of one set of values against another. The 'saving' power of education is also clear in Kay's many works on the training of pauper children - not least in his insistence upon their strict segregation, and their being given more eligible 'treatment' (educationally), to defeat the 'infection' of pauperism.

In his earliest major study (1832: 111f. and the Westminster Review agreed with him as we noted) Kay urged employers to visit the homes of their workers to establish a necessary bond of sympathy, and defeat agitators. He suggested in his analysis of East Anglia that greater 'evils' existed 'where the gentry were non-resident' (1877: 23). The centrality of character-training (differentiated for different classes and different fractions within classes) pervades his work as has been discussed above. Here we should perhaps recall

that from the 1840s Kay was a 'local squire' (as he calls himself in his Sermons, 1862b; Cf. Smith, 1923; my Appendix I below).

The consistency of Kay's concerns is also revealed in the recurrent use of a particular metaphor (e.g. 1832 and 1860) to demonstrate the vulnerability of a moral order (which, for him is partly natural and partly historical) to combinations\* of workers who do not obey its 'laws'. He sees the exercise of power by these groups (the term Trades Unions is often used) as equivalent to 'volcanoes' or 'central fires'; he also sees them as akin to a foreign invader, which is equally revealing. In his Public Education (1853) Kay argued:

The connexion between ignorance and irreligion is demonstrated - pauperism and crime are proved to flow from the same source - the depraved and ignorant are known to our police as the dangerous classes [a term used also by Snow, of Manchester, 1843: 20, P.C.] who give a desperate impulse to popular tumults - as the fermenting leaven of discontent - or the explosive power of sedition. (1853: 45; in this work Kay indicates his debt to Chalmers as in 1832, second edition).

Another permanent theme of Kay's concerns the existence of 'evils everywhere requiring the immediate interference of legislative authority' (1832: 112). For, as he wrote in 1846 (in a work circulated 'by authority'):

---

\* Bagehot thought 'a political combination of the lower classes, as such and for their own objects, an evil of the first magnitude' (1872: 277). For Robert Lowe all Trades Unions contain 'the germs and elements of crime' (qu Briggs, 1954: 258).

The authority of Government, especially in a representative system, embodies the national will. There are certain objects too vast, or too complicated, or too important to be intrusted [sic] to voluntary associations; they need the assertion of power ...

(1862a reprint: 451)

That is, 'A Christian State has collective Duties' (1853: 277f). After characterising the 'doctrine of the voluntary party' as that 'the State has no morality'; Kay counters by arguing from the real world: the State does interfere on behalf of some moral values. He cites the 1834 Poor Law as a major example\*. Since this is the case 'where is the moral agency of the State to stop?' (1853: 281). He closes his discussion by quoting Dr. Vaughan

"Government MAY be a moral teacher to the extent that it MUST be a moral administrator."\*\*

(British Quarterly Review, August 1847;

qu Kay, 1853: 282, typographics his).

Kay's notion of moral order rests upon both scientific methods and Biblical authority. Some of the central texts here are his addresses to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (1859; 1860; 1866a)\*\*\*. Time and again Kay relates social and natural 'progress' (i.e. change) as in one address (1866a) later

\* He elsewhere - in an Address to the N.A.P.S.S. - sees this as 'essentially a measure of police', 'to increase public order, and with it the security of property' (1859: 135).

\*\* Kay gives many examples of 'moral administration' and 'links in the chain of moral causation' (1853:287f. Cf. his 1860 papers).

\*\*\* Cf. his Address to Kendal Working Man's Club, 1865a.

reprinted by him as 'Laws of Social Progress, as illustrated in the history of the manual Labour class in England' (1873:Ch.1) or in his relating of 'moral and physical forces' (1860, partly reprinted 1873:Ch.13). This is usually done in a thoroughly Whiggish fashion, such that even Cromwell - 'a dictator' - is given some applause for respecting 'the distribution of property'. The 'settlement of 1688', of course, receives much praise and negative examples are drawn, from Abroad, with the help of de Tocqueville, Macaulay, and McCulloch's Commercial dictionary of statistics.

Kay also relies upon statistical notions of a more theoretical character in his attempt to show 'how all the elements of our social state inevitably react on each other' (1859: 149): the theories of Quetelet\*.

M. Quetelet ... ascertained that the same probabilities [of natural science] could, from experience, be predicated respecting the recurrence of phenomena, involving in a much greater degree the moral constitution of man.

(Kay, 1860: 81)

Quetelet's Sur l'homme ... (1835) was partly translated as A Treatise

---

\* On Adolphe Quetelet (1796-1874) see the very good discussion in L. MacDonald (1976:62-66 and 264f). Quetelet was tutor to Prince Albert and highly influential with Durkheim (Cf. 1897:300f). Marx also made use of his work (e.g. 1853b) but noted 'it is not so much the particular political institutions [= social state? PC] of a country as the fundamental conditions of modern bourgeois society in general which produce an average amount of crime ...' (Ibid., 235). Cf. my discussion of 'Spiritual Production' below where we shall see Marx making this a general strategy of his analysis, and where a contrast with Durkheim will be drawn.

on Man ... (1842) and turns on the following thesis:

Society includes within itself all the germs of all the crimes committed, and at the same time the necessary facilities for their development. It is the social state, in some measure, which prepares these crimes, and the criminal is merely the instrument to execute them. Each social state supposes, then, a certain number and a certain order of crimes, these being merely the necessary consequences of its organisation.

(1842)\*.

Kay explicitly (and many others as coherently if implicitly) used these insights - coupled with a peculiar admixture of Man's power to change Nature and God's creation of a Divine Order which must be obeyed - to offer a sustained examination of precisely those 'peculiarities of the English' which have formed the agenda for many sociologists. Apart from praising the frugal and respectable working man, and his co-operative shops and friendly societies (1866a: 102f Cf. 1864b; 1865a); Kay asks "Why did capitalism develop so well in England?" and gives answers based on (i) 'our Protestantism' (1860: 91f, which almost explicates the Weber thesis) and (ii) the dominance of 'moral obligation' (plus the predominance of law and the State) over merely 'economic laws' (1860: 89f, with which Durkheim and Parsons would agree)

Above all

It is impossible either to limit the pernicious

---

\* Quetelet's other major work was Du système sociale et des lois qui le régissent (1848. Cf. Maus, 1956: 17f)

influence of pauperism or crime to [sic] the wealth and productive power of the country, or to combat them effectually without employing moral transformatory as well as economical repressive forces for their extirpation ... sanitary measures reach even the moral nature of man. They are part of civilisation ...

(1860: 92)

we must take systematic measures to instruct the people from their youth upwards in economic laws, and in the history of our liberty, and to instil in them a reverence, founded upon sound principles, for institutions which are the growth of the traditions, habits, and associations of all classes, which derive their life and strength from an intelligent freedom, but would perish under ignorant and presumptuous innovation. If we neglect this education long, we simply prepare, either in Parliament or in the country, a reign of demagogues, under whose rule a destructive democratic revolution may disturb, if not destroy, all the securities of property, and the sources of national prosperity.

(1866a: 102)

H.S. Tremeneere certainly thought of himself as engaging in a general instruction of the origins of 'our liberty' - as much to the bourgeoisie (of whose breeding he was often unsure) as to the working class, particularly the newly enfranchised of the latter for whom he wrote a series of pamphlets towards the end of his life. Their flavour is fully revealed by their titles (and their distribution by the

Liberal Unionist Association in London): Why have I the vote?  
and how should I use it? (1889) What to avoid and why. Addressed  
to working men (1890) How good government grew up, and how to  
preserve it. (1893) Like Disraeli, in a remark to John Bright in  
 March 1867, for Tremenheere all his life 'The Working Class Question  
 is the real question, and that is the thing that demands to be  
 settled' (qu Tholfsen, 1961: 226; Cf. Milnes, 1867).

We have seen (Chapter Three and Appendix I) how all these  
 State Servants had some familiarity with 'political economy' and  
 that some read much history, legal theory and philosophy (whilst  
 some, like Horner or Kay, had more definitely scientific knowledge  
 also). In the case of Tremenheere there is a much more sustained  
 attention to classical social theory. That is not to deny, as we  
 have also seen, that he also studied contemporary materials. On  
 12th February 1841 he recorded in his Journal his reading since  
 September 1840: the list includes: Ranke ('admirable'); Greek  
 Testament; Shakespeare; Dante; 'Reports on the training of Pauper  
 children by Kay'. He also read about: Psychology; Ireland;  
 Education; Agriculture; Medicine; and Arithmetic, plus some  
 sermons (qu Holmes M.A. thesis, 142-143). Above all, it was de  
 Tocqueville's<sup>\*</sup> portrayal of the United States as a negative example<sup>\*\*</sup>  
 which struck Tremenheere as correct. His Journal entries, of May

---

\* Chadwick (Cf. Lewis, 1950) had a low opinion of de Tocqueville;  
 Nassau Senior thought highly of him (Levy, 1843: 163; 186) and  
 produced his Correspondence and conversations with ... de Tocqueville  
 (1834-1859) 2 vols 1872. On Mill and de T. see Ryan, 1974.

\*\* Anti-U.S.A. feeling was commonplace in e.g. the Quarterly or  
Blackwood's (Fetter, 1965: 432f).



1840, reveal his deep Whiggism\* :

De Tocqueville's book, 2nd part, just published, shews clearly that Democracy as it exists in America is tending rapidly there to the degradation of human nature. It is clear also that our mixed Government of Aristocracy and Democracy is the most capable of all to raise it [i.e. 'human nature' P.C.] if only the Aristocratic Arm will do its duty.

(I was there, Ch.5)

The points which de T---- [sic] has placed in a new light are chiefly these:- That Democracy, hitherto considered to threaten perpetual Revolutions will lead thro' [sic] Peace to a Despotism ... That social insulation exists much more than in aristocratically formed communities ...

(qu Webb, 1955a: 362-363. Cf. Holmes thesis Ch.5)

For Tremenheere - and it is as well to stress that he took this to his reading -

Good habits grow up insensibly until they become a part of the national manners ... if allowed to fall into neglect, they are soon lost. And when lost, what formerly rested on habitual usage, unquestioned ... must now be re-established, if at all, by argument, & appeals to first principles.

(P.P. 1845 670 XXVII, 36; Cf. his book reviews, 1837, 1838,

---

\* The term Whig has recently been applied to Dr. Rhodes Boyson ('A Victorian Whig...' Times 19 January 1976) and Lord Annan ('A Whig...' Ibid., 9 August 1976) even though the former is a Conservative M.P. and the latter (according to the Sunday Times Magazine 15 August 1976), a Fabian. The term shows a class rather than a political perspective.

1839).

We have here the familiar admixture of the natural-organic ('growth' that is 'insensible') and the historical-constructed ('falling into neglect' and 're-established').

Although Tremenheere attached an Appendix to his Manual of the principles of Government (1882: 211f): 'M. de Tocqueville and other authorities on the "Old government of France and the Revolution"', the contents of his major work (1852; 1865b; 1882) are dominated by the 'political wisdom of the ancients'. He explains, however, in the 'Preface' to this work that his purpose is modern and practical: to counteract the 'Literature of the Poor' (to use the phrase from the famous editorial of the Times 2nd September 1851, which Tremenheere uses as his frontispiece). He also sees this private work of provision complementing his public work of exposure. The varying titles of the work - 'political wisdom'; 'the franchise'; 'government' - and the inclusion of modern writers in later editions - including Dugald Stewart and Burke; Lord John Russell and J.S. Mill - show the flexibility of Tremenheere's Whig sociology.

Far more than the others, as we have seen, Tremenheere saw himself as providing a moral code for the new men of money 'without breeding'. He considered many coal owners

men who had, themselves or their Fathers, risen from the ranks, and really did not realize how much harm had sprung from their very limited view of their duties.

(Memoir, III qu Webb, 1955a: 357-358)

His official reports often speak of Masters merely paying weekly wages and doing nothing else. Whereas

to remove our lower population from its present state, all the efforts of those in superior stations of every class are required; & [sic] I think it equally clear ... that for all time it will ever require the unremitting exertions of the powers of authority, intellectual and social (under the guidance of Christian faith), of the upper orders of society, to prevent the lower from retrograding in civilisation & bringing down the rest with them. (Journals, qu Cassell thesis, 22-23; also (?) letter to H. Martineau qu Webb, 1955a: 362).

In his last Report, Tremenheere wrote

to raise the general standard of morals and intelligence in this district [Staffordshire] must long remain the principal object to which the minds of all within it who look beyond the material object of the passing moment must be directed  
(P.P. 1859 Sess.2 [2566] XII, 13).

For Tremenheere, capitalism had certain sociological consequences:

where large masses of the labouring classes had been rapidly collected & left to themselves ... [they] will sink below the level of the surrounding population, in habits, manners and morals, in affections towards those around them, and towards society and the State ...  
(P.P. 1849 [1109] XXII: 19)\*

---

\* I must emphasise again how Tremenheere's [Contd. on next page]

But such dangers had a remedy. They proved how absolutely essential it is to the harmonious working and to the progress of society that those placed in stations of influence should be unremitting in their endeavours to use their own superior knowledge, wealth and opportunities, towards removing the obstacles to the moral progress of those below them in the social scale, and multiply the means of their improvement.

(Ibid., p.20)

In 1854, he still thought the employers needed more 'knowledge of the art of governing' (P.P. 1854 [1838] XIX, 20) because the relation 'between masters and men is only a degree removed from one of social war' (Ibid., 23)

Sufficient has perhaps been said above (Chapter Three) of Tremenheere's general commitment to education - like the other State Servants he shared a belief in 'moral training' (P.P. 1852 [1525] XXI, 39f); unlike them he established his own special 'Prize Schemes' (1857; 1861). But it is necessary here to stress how Tremenheere saw education as one means of teaching Masters and Men the moral order in which he believed.\* In 1845 he complained that

---

[Contd. from p.350] reports are all classical studies of moral order in particular communities. They need study as a whole rather than this thematic illustration. It is only my desire to show the shared nature of the commitments I am discussing that prevented me from a completely singular focus on Tremenheere. That he took this to his State-craft is clear from his Reviews (1837, 1838, 1839) which stress both 'moral order' and 'national character'.

\* 'our own form of society is the best, [Contd. on next page, p.352]

'so little is done to instruct them [the workers] , or to make them feel a community of interest with their employers' (P.P. 1845 [670] XXVII, 12). Twenty-four years later, speaking of Northumberland and Durham, he asked:

Are the mass of the boys destined to colliery labour now receiving that instruction [in science and practical knowledge], and are they subjected to that amount of mental and moral training, which affords a responsible expectation that they will form, when they grow up, a more enlightened class than those who have gone before them?

(P.P. 1859 Sess. 2 [2566] XII, 37).

In a letter to Chadwick (March 21st, no year indicated, Chadwick Mss., 1988) Tremenheere sadly admits to a partial defeat:

It is provoking and disappointing to think that all the vast efforts, public and private, of the last fifty years, to diffuse the power of reading, among the young of the wage classes, are thus seized upon as an instrument for their destruction, morally and physically.

He is here commenting on Southwood Smith having 'lately exposed in the Times' works drawn from 'the vilest garbage of the French Press'. He wants the 'objects of government' to include the means

---

[Contd. from p.351]& our own constitution in Church & State: & will remain so long as there is truth in History, & human nature remains what it is.' Letter to Harriet Martineau, 7th September 1845, qu Webb 1955a: 361. Note the basis in 'human nature' again. Cf. Coleridge's views discussed in my Appendix III.

to punish those who shamefully labour to pervert and destroy all good [moral? blotted] training, by providing on the largest scale cheap works of corruption.

It was, after all, Tremenheere who had done much, since the early 1840s, to draw to the attention of many different 'authorities' the extensive sale of works of 'anarchistical' and 'socialistic' character amongst the pitmen.

Tremenheere's last Liberal Unionist pamphlet (written not long before his death<sup>\*</sup>) begins by defining a 'good Government' in terms of its following consequences:

As property is safe, capital accumulates. The capitalist gains confidence and freely employs his money in his own country; trade and commerce increase; skilful and industrious workmen multiply; all classes partake of the good results produced, and a great, wealthy, and powerful country is formed.

(1893: 3)

He admits that this 'state' is an historical product of 'many struggles' during which the 'National Character' was being formed. Similar struggles will be needed to sustain that Character, especially to protect it from 'professional agitators' (Ibid., 6f) who are even now demanding 'a working day of eight hours'. Education alone can sustain 'National Character' and defeat agitators. Educational forms suggested by Tremenheere are 'Schools of Housewifery' as in

---

\* It has a long 'P.S.' dated '20 February 1893' (1893: 25-28) on 'Mr Gladstone's Secret'. Tremenheere died in September of that year; from a letter attached to the B.M. copy (partly quoted in Chapter Three above) the pamphlet circulated in April 1893.

Belgium; 'Continuation Schools; and 'Addresses of Public Men'.

By these several means great help is given to  
the formation of good sense and matured opinion  
which is the real ruling power of the country.

(1893: 12)

Moreover - after a Party Political advertisement for the 'Conservative  
and Liberal Unionist Party' - Tremenheere believes that soon these  
several means and the government of that Party

though the progress may be slow ... will have achieved  
a task never before accomplished by a great nation.  
She [England] will have created a vast working class  
possessing well-balanced minds, capable, in  
conjunction with the great middle and the higher  
and wealthier classes, of taking their full share  
in the government of a country and an Empire  
such as ours.

(Ibid., 13)

---

There remains one important point concerning these four State  
Servants to which no direct answer has yet been supplied: Were  
they Benthamites? For Perkin (1969: 268 - who relies heavily upon  
Roberts, 1960) 'Leonard Horner, Kay-Shuttleworth ... Tremenheere ...  
Chadwick ... were conscious Benthamites'. They were not; if the  
phrase means what it seems to imply. If it means that (whether  
they knew it or not) they were carrying out some grand design of  
which Benthamism was part prediction and part prescription, then  
the answer is a trivial 'yes' and we are in the country of Roberts'

'spirit of the age' analysed in Chapter One.

This was not a matter on which these State Servants were silent\*.

It will be recalled (from Chapter Three) that Leonard Horner wrote in 1850

It quite disgusts me to hear the cold calculating economists throwing aside all moral considerations and with entire ignorance of the state of the people who work in factories, talking of its being an infringement of principle to interfere with labour.

(Memoir, I: Vol.2: 158)

We have also seen above (this Chapter) Horner's opposition to any universal principle of laissez faire - seeing its 'extravagant extension' in 1850 as 'bad political economy' (Ibid.)

We also noted above (Chapter Three and this Chapter) that Kay found certain matters 'too important' to be left to private regulation (1832: 112; 1846:451; 1853: 277): for example the Government cannot

treat the pauper as a mere animal. The moral conditions of his being must be recognized.

(1853: 288).

What, for example, is cheap labour? In the solution of this question it is not possible to neglect all moral considerations

(1860: 85)

---

\* Several of the notions of Coleridge's 'moral economy' apply here (Cf. Appendix III).



wealth may be purchased at too great a price - ruinous to individual happiness or to the wellbeing of a State, because at a price inconsistent with moral laws ... [such immorality reacts] on national security by introducing a ferment of disaffection, and an element of moral and social weakness into the State.

(Ibid., 87)

Many of his papers (from his famous pamphlet of 1832 to his addresses of the 1860s) stress the 'rashness' of 'relying solely on material development for the stability of our institutions and property'. For

There is no true economy in trade which neglects the force of a trained intelligence in developing its resources, or of a higher morality in making perfect the order of its organisation and the security of its property ... A policy which forgets or neglects the intellectual and moral improvements of the manual labour class, and depends only on their physical force, is at war with the best interests of humanity, and deserves the defeat which will be its unavoidable result.

(1865: 110)

With H.S. Tremenheere we have so much data (again) that the following must be seen as illustrating a general perspective. Soon after his appointment as H.M.I., Tremenheere noted in his Journals how bad the employer-employee relations were ('except in a few great Works')

Nearly the whole body of employers acted on

Bentham's theory\* that the masters had no responsibility beyond paying the men their wages; everything else that they wanted the men had to do for themselves. In the words of Carlyle, "Cash payments were the sole nexus between man and man".

(I was there, p.38)

In his letter to Harriet Martineau (of 7th September 1845, already quoted above), Tremenheere argued

The short sighted Utilitarianism ... is responsible, as it seems to me, for much of the formidable demoralization & disaffection of large masses of the lower classes.

(qu Webb, 1955a: 362)

By the mid-1850s, Tremenheere found that "Laissez-faire" continued to be the watchword of a large number of Members [of Parliament] from the Manufacturing Districts ...' (I was there, Ch.5). After he had listed the Acts for which he claimed some responsibility, Tremenheere indicated that they had been 'strenuously opposed by the small but energetic Radical Party then in the House of Commons'. He then wrote:

The doctrines of Jeremy Bentham were then [he is looking back from the 1880s] in great favour with employers of labour especially in the manufacturing districts.

Their purpose was "Laissez Faire" - "let us alone to manage and provide for those in our employ. If we find them employment and give them good wages we have

---

\* Tremenheere also opposed Bentham's views on the franchise - e.g. in his major work (1882:198f) where he uses J.S. Mill against Bentham .

done our part; they must then do the best they can for themselves. Governments have no right to interfere between Masters (and men). We capitalists provide them with work; we have a right to manage them as we please."

This doctrine was stigmatized at the time by many solid writers, more particularly by German authorities, who maintained that such a mode of proceeding had no right to shelter itself under the principles of political economy and if they did, political economy deserved another name; it should be called "Crema-Stistics", the mere art of massing wealth apart from all moral considerations.

(I was there, p.115)

And then there is Chadwick. Finer has clearly shown, as I have several times stressed, the bifurcation of Benthamism and political economy (eventuating in the 'anarchistic' views of Spencer and Manchester Liberalism or the 'collectivist' views of Webb and the Fabians) which enabled Chadwick time and again to attend to features of the supporting conditions of political economy's market by addressing himself - and State action - to moral regulation. There is little need to do more than remind Perkin of that argument and proof. But I have also shown, in many texts not used by Finer - especially some letters exchanged with Tremenheere - how unorthodox was Chadwick in his understanding, or, better, use, of political economy. In the Chadwick Papers there is an interesting bundle (Chadwick Mss., 85): 'Notes on political economy, 1852 -'. This offers - but rather in the unstable manner of a shaken kaleidoscope -

insights into how Chadwick thought his way free of some dogma of Benthamism and political economy. But let it not be thought that here - or in the case of the others - we have any effective emancipation from the dominant motifs ( and motives) of capitalism: many of the notes and drafts on this bundle consist of an insistent calculation of the profitability of some wars, some ways of peace-keeping, some ways of rearing, feeding and keeping healthy the wage classes, and so on. His distance from the usual content of Benthamism is illustrated by (i) a document 'Memoranda of principles of Political Economy contributed to the science of Edwin Chadwick...' (n.d.) and (ii) two untitled and undated texts on laissez faire. These argue (a) many 'measures of prevention involve the maintenance of laissez-faire in the economical sense'; (b) 'the government has to solve an almost insoluble problem'; and (c) the 'liberty' that 'was made to yield to the claims of morality' was dangerous. Chadwick's example of the latter is that basis of so many sociological "theories" of 'Society's self-regulation': street traffic.

---

## 5. Spiritual production

In Capital, IV, Marx argues against Andrei Karlovich Storch, Academician of St. Petersburg, whose lectures of 1815 were delivered to Grand Duke Nicholas -

In order to examine the connection between spiritual production and material production it is above all necessary to grasp the latter itself not as a general category but in definite historical form ... If

material production itself is not conceived in its specific historical form, it is impossible to understand what is specific in the spiritual production corresponding to it and the reciprocal influence of one on the other. Otherwise one cannot get beyond inanities. This because of the talk about "civilisation". Further: from the specific form of material production arises in the first place a specific structure of society, in the second place a specific relation of men to nature. Their State and their spiritual outlook is determined by both.

...

... Storch deprives himself of the basis on which alone can be understood partly the ideological component parts of the ruling class, partly the free spiritual production of this particular social formation.

(1863: 285)

Marx goes on to use a similar theoretical strategy against Nassau Senior's 'Toadyism to the Bourgeoisie and the Bourgeois State' (Ibid., 287f).

It is in this light - illuminating to many Marxist theoreticians of the State - that we can comprehend the work of Samuel Smiles and Emile Durkheim. The former argued in 1859<sup>\*</sup>

---

\* According to R. Harrison (1968:269) Smiles' Self-Help sold 250,000 copies from 1859-1904; 20,000 of them in the first year. His Industrial Biography (1864) sold 15,000 copies in its first year. But who bought/read Smiles? Crossick (1976:324f) reports that although Smiles lived for over twenty years in S.E. London (from 1854) there is no evidence that 'any working class institution sent him [Contd. on next page]

Morals and manners, which give colour to life, are of much greater importance than laws, which are but their manifestations. The law touches us here and there, but manners are about us everywhere, pervading society like the air we breathe. Good manners, as we call them, are neither more nor less than good behaviour; consisting of courtesy and kindness; benevolence being the preponderating element in all kinds of mutually beneficial and pleasant intercourse amongst human beings. "Civility", said Lady Montague, "costs nothing and buys everything".

(Smiles, 1859: 251)

We have noted above, in Chapter One, that Mill's critique of Bentham stressed the latter's failure to comprehend any regulation that was not external ('pain' and 'pleasure'). This is equally true, as some of the discussion and quotation in Chapter Three and immediately above showed, of the way in which the State Servants understood Benthamism. The above quotation from Smiles, taken with that which opens this Chapter, directs attention to forms of regulation which are internal. Almost a quarter of a century earlier than Smiles, in his anonymous essay 'Signs of the Times' (Edinburgh Review, June 1829) Carlyle argues the need for morals and moral force as an essential complement to 'mere political arrangements'\*

---

[Contd. from p.360] a single invitation to dinners or festivals...'. Again see, e.g. Shipley (1971) for an alternative kind of collective self-help - extending the Corresponding Societies of the 1790s; O'Brien's "combinatory culture" of the 1830s and so on.

\* His essay turns on a critique of how 'Civil government' is conceptualised as 'the Machine of Society'.

Wrongly, he considers, 'It is no longer the moral, religious, spiritual condition of the people that is our concern, but their physical, practical, economical condition, as regulated by public laws ... Men are to be guided only by their self-interests. [The State's] duties and its faults are not those of a father, but of an active parish-constable.' (1829: 70-71)\*

The specific mode of material production dominant in nineteenth century Britain required, for its efficient operation, a degree of noncoercive legitimate authority permeating (just as Smiles shows) the whole social fabric. The particular kind of moral regime expressed by State agencies enforced a particular kind of spiritual production (donating the dominant symbolic motifs of an era - for example the notion of 'Taste'). A civil code was represented as if it were civilisation - in-general; a natural rather than an historical product (Cf. O. Anderson, 1967; R.K. Webb, 1955b:Ch.4). Some 'wisdom of the ancients' was reliable; some was not. Equally some political economy was broadcast far and wide (the laws of supply and demand) and some was not (the labour theory of value). The opinion of one Birmingham J.P. was recorded in the Minutes of the Privy Council's Committee on Education in 1845:

I have no other conception of any other means of forcing civilisation downwards in society, except by education.

(qu Johnson, 1970: 97)

In this connection it is as well to recall that Marx was amongst the first to show that civil society always has a specific content:

---

\* Note how in his Chartism (1839) he is critical of 'Laissez Faire' (p.187f).

The term "civil society" emerged in the eighteenth century, when property relationships had already extricated themselves from the ancient and medieval communal society. Civil society as such only develops with the bourgeoisie; the social organisation evolving directly out of production and commerce ... has, however, always been designated by the same name.

[i.e. 'Bürgerliche Gesellschaft']

(Marx, 1845: 48-49).

For this very same reason William Morris could declare in the 1880s

I must tell you that my special leading motive as a socialist is hatred of civilization; my ideal of the new Society would not be satisfied unless that Society destroy civilization.

(qu E.P. Thompson, 1976b: 104)

This civilisation - the maintenance of working arrangements of capitalist production, modified by State regulation and the gentleman ideal ('duty', 'caring' and 'sympathy') - was not simply constructed by regulation, it was also orchestrated. Locke (1974) whose chapter title I have made my own, begins his discussion by referring to a study of Dickens<sup>\*</sup> by Orwell (1939) in which the latter argues

---

\* One important facet of Dickens is his approval of police: as Orwell notes 'The only officials who Dickens handles with any kind of friendliness are, significantly, policemen.' (1939: 471) For analysis of the moral message of the 19th-century novel see Raleigh, 1968; Keating 1971, and - especially - Faber's Proper Stations (1971; espec. Ch.6 'Ladies and Gentlemen'). The State as an emergent theme of fiction has not been widely studied. In the contemporary medium - the dominance of police - and military - (especially spy-) genres is important.



If you hate violence and don't believe in politics,  
the only major remedy remains education. (p.464)

in every attack Dickens makes upon society he is  
always pointing to a change of spirit rather than  
a change of structure ... A "change of heart" is in  
fact the alibi of people who do not want to change  
the status quo (p.468) \*

As always, what he appears to want is a moralized  
version of the existing thing - the old type of school,  
but with no caning, no bullying and underfeeding, and  
not quite so much Greek. (p.467)

I am not suggesting that these remarks are totally accurate with regard to Dickens. What they offer is an excellent depiction of the regulatory force of 'the Gospel' according to Smiles. The Gospel emerges, as Peter Cominos (1963) has shown, in the late-Victorian 'Respectable ideology which was integrated into Respectable relations'. The allegiance to 'civility' cuts across intra-class divisions and unites thereby, for example, Matthew Arnold, Frederic Harrison, William Lecky, and Cardinal Newman. Cominos' study of medical texts needs to be related to the more sensitive work of Scull (1975) on moral regulation. Both show how apparent negations of the moral system - the cult of 'characters' and 'eccentrics' for example - reinforce the class nature of the regulation. Aristocratic pranks and eccentricities are harmless and indulged as national stereotypes; similar actions, outside the internal regulation of

---

\* Notice, however, that Dickens is considered (by Orwell at the very end of his essay, 1939:504): 'a nineteenth century liberal, a free intelligence, a type hated with equal hatred by all the smelly little orthodoxies which are now contending for our souls!.'

e.g. working class communal institutions, are considered vicious, degrading and dangerous when practised by workers. The destruction of the Hunt passing in full cry might be contrasted with the damage done by Chelsea's 'Shed' (a fraction of their supporters).

A sociologist who has much to say on these questions is Durkheim (1858 - 15 November 1917). In his great work on the Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1912: 208, fn.4) he responded to his critics:

Since we have made constraint the outward sign by which social facts can be the most easily recognized and distinguished from the facts of individual psychology, it has been assumed that according to our opinion, physical constraint is the essential thing for social life. As a matter of fact, we have never considered it more than the material and apparent expression of an interior and profound fact which is wholly ideal: this is moral authority. The problem of sociology - if we can speak of a sociological problem - consists in seeking, among the different forms of external constraint, the different sorts of moral authority corresponding to them and discovering the causes which have determined these latter.

For Durkheim - as he made clear in another response to critics -  
moral

maxims are actual, living sentiments ... If, then, we ascribe a kind of reality to them, we do not dream of supposing them to be the whole of moral reality. That would be to take the sign for the thing signified.

(1897: 315)

And he adds in a note on the same page 'We start from the exterior because it alone is immediately given, but only to reach the interior.' Three years later he criticised Simmel's formal sociology (one antecedent of the aridity of much contemporary theorising) for its dichotomisation.

By what right are the container and the content of society separated, and separated so radically? Only the container is claimed to be of a social nature; the content is not, or only indirectly so.  
(1900: 357; Cf. 1914; 1924).

The investigation of moral relations and authority is the central theme of Durkheim's life project. From his two dissertations - the study of Montesquieu (1893) and that 'attempt to treat the facts of the moral life': The Division of Labour (1902) - through his major studies of methodology, suicide, primitive classification and, especially, Professional Ethics (1904) to his later work - above all the essays gathered as Sociology and Philosophy (1924) and by Wolff (1960)\*; Durkheim is attempting to demonstrate the covariation of social and moral relations. His Moral Education (1907) for example, discusses the following 'elements' of morality: 'the Spirit of Discipline'; 'Attachment to social groups' and 'Autonomy, or self-determination' (Cf. his 1906, 1911).

Giddens is right to emphasise, as the conclusion to his study of Durkheim's political sociology, how the latter 'was rooted in an

---

\* I trust this compass makes it clear how much my brief study must omit from this work. For a study of Durkheim in context see T. Clark, 1968; for his epistemology, Cf. Worsley, 1956; other works are indicated in EndNote 1 to Chapter Three.

attempt to re-interpret the claims of political liberalism in the face of a twin challenge<sup>\*</sup>: from an anti-rationalist conservatism on the one hand, and from socialism on the other' (1971: 513). Durkheim's 'liberalism' stands a point-for-point comparison with its English counterpart in his opposition to Church and Landed power, in his criticism of accumulated and 'obvious' wealth, and, above all, in his focus on moral regulation via education and the family. The major modification is perhaps as significant as these similarities: Durkheim's antipathy to the individualism of utilitarian political economy (as, for example, in Spencer). This sustained animosity, moreover, led to his opponents calling sociology a 'new State religion or religion of the State'. Parsons has reported (1968: viii, fn.4) that the major interpretation of Durkheim current at L.S.E. in the 1920s was as 'the apostle of the "unsound group mind" theory'.

In Durkheim's recognition of how the Division of Labour changes the moral structure of personality and how the old 'mechanical solidarity' changes to 'organic solidarity', many of the phenomena of the nineteenth century in Britain stand illuminated. But I wish to show how Durkheim's sociology is itself characteristic in 'taking the State for granted'; so much so, indeed, that many of his elisions of 'State Regulation' and 'Society' have been mystified into current theories of 'social control'.

---

\* In Chapter Five I shall indicate - after Abrams, 1968 - how the New Liberalism (and new sociology) of the 1890s in Britain was also formed against these twin impulses - plus a point which Clark shows clearly (Cf. Richter, 1960); the impact of nationalism, imperialism and war.

Like Weber, Durkheim was a social-democratic Liberal, who recognised the State as an essential feature of capitalist society. Given that he lived in France, and worked with an Erastian educational system, this is hardly surprising. For Durkheim the State becomes necessary when the natural order (and its 'sense of place', (1904: 102f) becomes attenuated. The sense of individual position does not have the same 'moral power'. The relation 'Individual:State' is mediated for Durkheim (and also Weber) by a series of 'secondary associations':

the State presupposes their existence ...

No secondary group, no political authority ...

(1904: 45).

it is out of this conflict of social forces that individual liberties are born ... [the groups] form one of the conditions essential to the emancipation of the individual.

(Ibid., 63)

Without these groups, the State cannot 'be itself' (Ibid., 100).

In his Division of Labour (1902) Durkheim relates his notions of 'solidarity' and 'regulation' by arguing that when the Division of Labour does not produce organic solidarity - which does not suppress competition but moderates it - 'it is because the relations of the organism are not regulated' properly.

There is, above all, an agency upon which we are all tending to become increasingly dependent, that is the State.

(1902: 227)

Two years later, his major study of political relations begins, as

do Bentham and Green, for example, with a definition of 'political society' as

one formed by the coming together of a rather large number of secondary social groups, subject to the same authority which is not itself subject to any other superior authority duly constituted. (1904: 45 - this is related to Montesquieu).

Having established such a definition,

let us see what the morals are that relate to it ... the essential rules of these morals are those determining the relations of individuals to this sovereign authority, to whose control they are subject.

(Ibid., 46)

Let us see how the State can be defined. It is a group of officials sui generis [n.b. P.C.], within which representations and acts of volition involving the collectivity are worked out ... The representations that derive from the State are always more conscious of themselves, of their causes and their aims. These have been concerted in a way that is less obscured ...

(Ibid., 49-50 Cf. translations in Giddens, 1972:191f) \*

---

\* Very directly comparable here are Ernest Barker's definitions of 'State', 'administration' and 'government' which conclude by quoting a definition of the administration as ensuring 'the daily life of the State, and of its sub-divisions, by discharging the public services' (J. Barthelemy, Le Gouvernement de la France, qu. Barker, 1930: 3).

It is in this light, I suggest, that we need to reconceptualise the 'off-stage' regulation evoked in Durkheim's Suicide - where the State's moral authority is obscured in the following kind of discussion of the 'law of justice'

Either directly and as a whole, or through the agency of one of its organs, society alone can play this moderating role; for it is the only moral power superior to the individual, the authority of which he accepts.

(1897: 249)

There is a similar concealed politics involved in Durkheim's declaration

Strictly speaking, the State is the very organ of social thought.

(1904: 51)

Everything that occurs ... is capable of reaching the "social brain", by paths specially destined to assure these communications, so that the state is kept up to date ...

(1896: 53)

Even Parsons - who has done most to extend notions of 'social control' (although here, to be sure, there has been as much emphasis from 'radical'writers) and 'system values' from an alleged basis in Durkheim's work - demonstrates this point

The moral component of the conscience collective is social: first, in that it is made up of values that are common to, and shared by, the members of society; second, in that through the processes of

socialization the new members of society undergo a process by which these values are internalized; and third in that there are special mechanisms which reinforce the commitment ... so that deviation is counteracted by curative mechanisms.

(1967: 29)

If we penetrate these bland phrases with Durkheim's insights from the Division of Labour we shall recognise why these (otherwise mysteriously generated) 'societal values' are not 'social', have to be taught and taught again and supported by mechanisms of a curative (punitive) character, i.e. why there must be a State.

Weber<sup>\*</sup> and Durkheim both devoted some attention to socialism. In his lectures, Durkheim demonstrates an awareness of the class nature of the social formation in which he lived.

there are two movements under whose influence the doctrine of socialism is formed: one which comes from below and directs itself toward the higher regions of society, and the other which comes from the latter and follows the reverse direction ... according to the place occupied by the theoretician, according to whether he is in closer contact with workers, or more attentive to [n.b. P.C.] the general interest of society, it will be one rather than the other ... The result is two different kinds of socialism: a worker's socialism or a state socialism ...

(1896: 61-62)

---

\* Cf. Weber's Lecture to Austrian Army Officers (1918b). On Durkheim's studies of socialism, Cf. Wolin's letter, 1974.



There is similarly no innate reason why Durkheim's notions of social fact need lead to the 'societal' one-dimensional interpretation of social relations, which has often been sustained by reference to his work. If a 'social fact is every way of acting ...' (1895: 13) and we 'consider social facts as things' (Ibid., 14), we should also note that

A thing is a force which can be engendered only by another force. In tendering an account of social facts, we seek, then, energies capable of producing them.

(1895: 144)

The clash of social things (constraining moral ethos and 'ways of acting') is the motive force of much State action in nineteenth century Britain. It - like the spiritual production of the State Servants and social philosophers ('ideologists of the ruling class') - relates intimately to the historically-specific forms of material production established during that epoch. Durkheim's sociology of the State not only offers many subtle insights into these procedures. In providing the option (as it were) of a systematic misreading of the State as if it were Society-as-a-whole (and thus imagining Society as self-regulating), Durkheim parallels much social-democratic theory and practice. This has created and sustained an image of the neutral State: an independent moral arbiter to whom appeals may be made, and a machine to be captured and used.

---

## 6. Conclusion

The above investigations seek to expose the dialectic of constraint and construction, i.e. conscious design, in the linked procedures of moral regulation and State formation in nineteenth century Britain. The thesis is further illustrated, in the following Chapter, by reference to the aetiology of the Liberal Reforms of the early twentieth century and the somewhat overstressed 'causal power' granted to the ideas of T.H. Green.

The moral order whose sociology I have traced was not a unitary phenomenon - different classes related to it in different ways and there were many areas of 'normlessness' within which the different classes contended for the definition of such key terms as 'legitimate' and 'authority'. Two quotations - taken from two highly pertinent discussions - may serve to illustrate this diversity-within-unity. The moral order here indicated, as John Mepham has argued of bourgeois ideology in general,

within serious limits ... works, both cognitively and in practice...

(1972:19; Cf. Geras, 1971; Sayer, 1975 and Ph.D. thesis)

But we must not be overwhelmed by the fact that some forms of official morality - and its representations must always be passable, they can never be the result of mere (external) imposition - seem totally dominant. As Skillen argues - and we can read 'nations' in the place of 'notions' -

Even in the best regulated notions the dominant order is threatened; and official morality is one mark of this threat.

(1974a: 15)

It is relatedly important to stress how this moral order - and even more the State apparatuses through which it is sustained - has acted to effect two separate kinds of ideological and political 'unity'. First, individuals within the industrial, fiscal, agrarian, and commercial bourgeoisie have been united (Marx shows how their 'natural state' is fissiparous, 1845: 69f; 1847: 123f; 1858: 286f) and a 'social bond' with the great aristocratic families has been formed. Second, the 'ethic of improvement' and the 'code of Respectability' has established paths of progress for leaders from working class organisations. Nairn's thesis - that Nation is superordinate to Class in 'the English ideology' - is substantially correct and this was accomplished without 'Wars of Independence' or 'Fascism' - although, as I stressed - Napoleon's threat - and, which I did not stress, the advent of Queen Victoria - played a far from insignificant part\*.

But - and here Anderson and Nairn and many others are far from correct - we must not see the moral order which has been depicted in this thesis as internalized in a societal belief system; or use a fundamental misreading of Durkheim to celebrate moments of "society's self-worship" such as the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, II, or the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill. Nettl has argued

Though especially strong in Great Britain, the notion of consensus is not uniquely British. It is a feature of all sophisticated societies. But the first problem is: whose consensus? For consensus is not so much the product of compromise as of elite

---

\* As - again, I must repeat - did the subordination of subject peoples in the 'United Kingdom' (Cf. Hechter 1973, 1975).

ascendancy and its acceptance. In Britain it is, I maintain, presently a Whitehall consensus. It was not always so. But the political emasculation of the aristocracy as a condition of its survival, together with the remarkable decline of importance of formal politics ... in favour of the executive and its chief, the Prime Minister, has led to the quiet emergence of the Snow-men [a reference to C.P. (now Lord) Snow - P.C.], the upper civil-servants and their mores. Their influence on the professions was socially logical and predestined, their influence over business a more drawn-out and difficult process. Efforts are being made to draw in the Trade Unions and the arts, though with only limited success as yet.

(Nettl, 1965: 41; Cf. EndNote 4 to Chapter 3 below)

The same point has been made from a different perspective: that of social equality. Mannheim was aware of the ways in which formal sociology had developed only a limited consciousness of how equality has to be defined (1936: 249f). T.H. Marshall provides a similar insight when he argues

'Capitalism' - or the market - lives by recognizing and rewarding inequalities, and depends on them to provide the motive force that makes it work .... Democracy, one might say, legitimized inequality (since you do not tax stolen goods), with the help of the trade unions.

(1972: 29; Cf. Goldthorpe, 1969; Meacher, 1974).

Marshall further translates (knowingly?) Marx's distinction between

use- and exchange-value in terms of the fundamental social problem (of a capitalist social formation):

The trouble is that no way has been found of equating a man's value in the market (capitalist value), his value as a citizen (democratic value), and his value for himself (welfare value).

(Ibid., 30)

He is correct, finally, to stress also that 'Capitalism is most dangerous when it is weak and frightened, not when it is strong and confident' (Ibid., 31)

But we do not have to rely upon such 'theoretical' objections to the notion that the moral order of capitalism is internalized and forms the 'psychic being' of all the humans defined by it (except, of course, the 'mad' and 'criminal'). Since the 1790s - parallel precisely to the time-span and events outlined in this thesis - working people have thought, dreamed, imagined and worked for anti-Parliaments (Parssinen, 1973) quite different from the State, moral order and political economy used against them. In 1893, in his important Lecture on Communism, William Morris offers a judgement on 'progress' in terms of a set of resources which are well beyond the dominant moral order. Above all (and here his views are directly relevant to the following Chapter) it is important to stress how he understands Reform as 'the sickness of hope deferred' and how he judges new 'schemes of administration' in terms of their 'use in educating the people into direct Socialism' (1893:10, his emphasis)\*.

---

\* Published first as Fabian Tract, 113 in 1903; reprinted 1907. I am most grateful to N. Pearson for drawing this text to my attention - on Morris, see Pearson Ph.D. thesis, and E.P. Thompson 1976b.

In March 1917, Alex Gossip (General Secretary of the National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades Association since 1906) wrote in his Union's Journal

the State as constituted means really the Landlord and Capitalist class, at whose disposal are always the whole civil and military force of the State ... the whole governmental system is organised primarily in the interest of property and the State is propertied interests. Our class should not overlook this.

(qu. S. Harrison, 1962: 34)

A few months later the deLeonist William Paul concluded his excellent study The State:

Our analysis has shown that the State is the weapon by means of which the ruling class preserves "order" in a system rent with the class struggle and conflicting social interests.

(1917: 196)

By now, of course, we are discussing matters which were to be theoretically and practically reconceptualised by the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. After that point the terrain has changed - and the British ruling class was absolutely clear on this seeing simple 'knowledge' of events in the new Soviet State as dangerous, they practised all the tactics we have encountered in this thesis - censorship, alternative news provision, repression, and reform<sup>\*</sup>. We saw, further, how Sir Cyril Norwood, in 1929, held

---

\* On these matters Cf. Carr, 1953: 134; S. White, 1974; 1975; Daily Herald, 1917. On the British Press and 1905, see W. Harrison, 1974. Fear of Bolshevism in the 20th century very largely took the place of Fear of (the French) Revolution that had dominated the Victorian ethos in the 19th.

up 'Bolshevism' as an enemy which elementary education had kept out of Britain. Some of the most acute repression during the 1926 General Strike was focussed upon anyone found circulating "Bolshevik" propaganda.

Just as Marx was able to refer to a 'political economy of Labour' which was different from that of Capital, so we can point to different moral relations. The dominant moral order works - i.e. is in being - because it is based upon a material order (that is a world) held one way up by historically-specific relations of production and State apparatuses formed for their maintenance. In experiencing that moral order, the working classes also experience the power and force which holds the world one way up. Their experience of the State is therefore quite analytically separable from their role-performance which sustains that order without internalizing it. For this reason - apart from the tensions and structural crises of the whole world-wide mode of capitalist production - the State apparatuses of modern Britain are constantly engaged (flexibly and subtly) in reproducing and enforcing a moral order. These investigations have shown how that order was both a selection from available alternatives (moral economy, social economy) and acted to suppress or marginalize other images of social life.

---

**Chapter Five: On 'Institutions considered as ethical ideas'**

**5.1 Introduction**

**5.2 The Paradox of T.H. Green**

**5.3 Ethical socialism, New Liberalism, and the crises of  
political economy**

**5.4 Fabianism and Benthamism**

**5.5 Conclusion**



CHAPTER FIVE

The rights and liberty of a nation can only be preserved by  
Institutions.

Disraeli (qu Longford, 1971: 324)

. . . . .

We are all agreed that the State must increasingly and earnestly  
concern itself with the care of the sick and the aged, and above  
all, of the children. I look forward to the universal establish-  
ment of minimum standards of life and labour ... and I would recommend  
you not to be scared in discussing any of these proposals, just  
because some old woman comes along and tells you they are  
Socialistic.

W.S. Churchill, 1906 (in his Liberalism and the Social Problem,  
1909 Qu. Cornford, 1962: 288)

. . . . .

For Hobhouse and the ethical school ... Human institutions were  
best viewed as the products of rational thought and common purposes  
... This, of course, was the central proposition of the political  
and ethical philosophy taught at Oxford by T.H. Green ... The belief  
that an extension of the role of the state presumed an increased  
sense of public responsibility which, in turn, presumed a more  
developed conception of the common good by each individual, was

the core of the ethical school's social philosophy ... In Britain academic sociology had three distinct and competing sources of inspiration and only one of these, moral philosophy as taught at Oxford, had an immediate impact and showed unusual powers of survival.

R.J. Halliday (1968: 387, 392, 395)

. . . . .

Philosophical statism freezes the imagination within the official compartments. Alternative visions, whether in the minds of radical thinkers or in the practice of revolutionary movements, are simply excluded from the academic argument. To get beyond statist apologetics, even far enough to turn back to see what could be learned from it, requires unearthing these visions and in particular rediscovering the movements, the communes and the workers' councils that have sought to replace state and capitalist rule with popular and socialist power.

Skillen (1974: 13; Cf. Weeks, 1976).

. . . . .

## 1. Introduction<sup>\*</sup>

McGregor has spoken of

the conventional accounts of the growth of social policy in the century before 1914. They stress two periods of legislative activity; one in the thirties and forties, the other during the administrations of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith.

(McGregor, 1957: 146)<sup>\*\*</sup>

He goes on to contrast to conventional accounts that of Beales' 1945 Hobhouse lecture which saw social policy as 'an organic process within industrial society', rather than 'the practical embodiment of humanitarian zeal'. Beales' approach is now by far the most common to be found in interpretations of social policy or the Welfare State; this can be confirmed by noting the discussion of 'needs' and 'society as a whole' in such representative texts as Forder (1970: 1-2), or Bruce (1973a: 2-3).<sup>\*\*\*</sup> This is also true of the very influential article by Briggs (1961) and the apparent critique of 'functionalist' accounts given by Goldthorpe (1962), whose definitions of 'social policy' and 'social problems' weaken his project to situate the State in class terms.

Briggs has claimed that the 1834 Poor Law 'set the frame-

\* I take my title from Bonsanquet (1920:Ch.11); to anyone familiar with Parsonian sociology, the ideas of both the Green school of ethical philosophers and those of the ethical socialists have a contemporary ring.

\*\* Cf. the whole of this article.

\*\*\* Cf. Lafitte, 1974; I am not sure that George (1972, 1976) and Wilding escape this charge.

work for social policy for the rest of the century' (1959a:276; Cf his 1961; 1968) which is true so long as we understand the institutional intentions of the Poor Law in the framework provided by my preceding chapters. First, as McCloskey has argued,

any system of poor relief must alter, among other things, the amount of labor supplied and its wage (McCloskey, 1973: 421)\*

As Brougham had said introducing the 1834 Bill in the Lords, its main purpose was

that men should be paid according to the work they do - that men should be employed and paid according to the demand for labour, and its value to the employer - that they who toil should not live worse than they who are idle...

(Hansard, April 1834 qu B. Inglis, 1971: 386)\*\*

Secondly, the Poor Law, from the start had very strong moral purposes; indeed, one might argue (as did the authors of the 1834 Report's final sentences) that the regulation of the labour market was a means to facilitate the better moral (i.e. self-) regulation of all classes. But, as the two contrasting quotations which open my third Chapter made clear; once begun such regulation extends horizontally (I mean here the extra duties added to the Poor Law

\* Cf. Tucker, 1975. On the labour market and the Poor Law in rural areas Cf. Brundage, 1974; Digby, 1975 and the reports of Tremenheere and Tufnell from 1868 onwards: Cs. 4068; 4202.

\*\* This was recognised at the time by the different Opposition forces - Coleridge saw the schemes as the 'price' paid 'for having labour at demand' TableTalk (qu Inglis, 1971:390); O'Brien saw the Law as placing the 'whole of the labouring population at the utter mercy and disposal of the monied and property owning classes' Northern Star, February 1838 (qu Rose, 1970: 81).

Guardians) and vertically (different areas of social life are regulated); as it must if the State is to ensure the complex reproduction of relations of production which are, genuinely (within the capitalist paradigm of thought and action), in the national interest.

In this sense, we need to root the provision of various forms of service and assistance, by means other than the market mechanism, much further back than Briggs himself would argue. Radicalism in the early 19th century had embraced the 'idea of using organised power through politics and administration to determine the pattern of welfare services' (1961: 229) and had at its core (indeed this is the cutting edge of Radicalism) 'the conviction that societies can be shaped by conscious policies designed to eliminate "abuses"' (Briggs, 1961: 229-230). Briggs, in giving a twentieth century aetiology to the phenomena of welfarism, falls victim to the Fabian history which he castigates, particularly when he argues that

Society had to do something about poverty once it was given facts about its extent...

(Briggs, 1961: 253) \*

Briggs explains much more, as he also reveals the power of particular 'institutional arrangements' to assist reformist ideas to flourish, when he states

---

\* For a contrast to these assertions Cf. the arguments of G.S. Jones, 1971; 1974- especially the last few pages of the latter. Briggs makes much of the Booth and Rowntree surveys, but, as I have shown, before 1850 (see Wohl, 1968), these matters were known. There is a general underestimation of this early recognition of the deterioration of the 'physical stock' of the working class; see Chadwick's 1860s papers, and Churchill's response to reading Rowntree in 1901 (qu Bruce 1973b: 128).

the extension of the suffrage, which to Webb was decisive, was relevant primarily in that it provided the working classes with an instrument whereby they too might attempt to control the state. What Senior, Chadwick (and Bagehot) most feared, Webb, Bland, and the Fabians most hoped. Bland [in 1889 in the first edition of the Fabian Essays\*] noted "the sort of unconscious or semi-conscious recognition of the fact that the word 'state' has taken to itself new and diverse connotations - that the state idea has changed its content". He argued that working people had themselves changed from fearing it as an enemy to regarding it as a "potential saviour".

(Briggs, 1961: 239)\*\*

These relations between the franchise and State action need to be fitted into the wider 'socialist' perspectives of the time.

---

\* It was in this that Webb claimed that a protective State was already established, like Chadwick he argued 'All this has been done by "practical men", ignorant, that is to say, of any scientific sociology... Such is the irresistible sweep of social tendencies, that in their every act they worked to bring about the very Socialism they despised.' (qu Briggs, 1961:232). The linking of sociology and Socialism is noteworthy.

\*\* As Briggs shows (Ibid.,240) there was as early as 1884 resistance to this variant of Fabian-Socialism - working class opposition to State action has its origins in the London Corresponding Society ideals of the 1790s and continues through, for example, the anti Nationalization movement of Noah Abblett and other South Wales Miners in the 1910s. Too much of this has been dismissed as 'apathy' or 'obscurantism' and 'archaism'; (for the early years see Parssinon, 1973; for the later see Holyoake, 1906:610; B. Harrison 1967a:115f; 1967b:254).

In 1888, in his lecture to the Hampstead Society for the Study of Socialism, Sidney Webb had argued

the French nation was beaten in the last war [1871] because the German social organism was, for the purposes of the time, superior in efficiency to the French ...

(Our Corner, 12 August 1888 qu Wolfe, 1975: 282)

Webb's first lecture to this Society, in 1885, had been an exposition of 'the methods of social reconstruction taught by Auguste Comte' (Ibid., 183 Cf his Ch.6) and the 1888 lecture was called 'Rome: a sermon in sociology'. Webb's reference to Bismarkian Germany was not unique. The German Emperor, in a speech to the Reichstag in 1881, referring to the AntiSocialist laws of 1878, said

A remedy cannot alone be sought in the repression of socialistic excesses; there must be simultaneously the positive advancement of the welfare of the working class. And here the care of those workpeople who are incapable of earning their living is of the first importance.

(qu Dawson, 1891: 110)

The subsequent Bill was prefaced by the following remarks, arguing that such 'sympathy' was

a duty of State-preserving policy, whose aim should be to cultivate the conception ... that the State is not merely a necessary but a beneficent institution ...

(qu Ibid., 111)\*

---

\* Dawson was an expert on German social legislation, being sent there later to study labour registration; Davidson, 1969:256f. Braithwaite, 1957, reports Lloyd George's close study of German social policy; of 'learning from Abroad' and early 'Germanization' see Halevy, (1923b: 98f).

A.J. Balfour, who was influenced, it is claimed, by both Webb (Young, 1973) and T.H. Green (Pelling, 1965: 11), indicated that he understood the implications when he argued

Socialism will never get possession of the great body of public opinion ... among the working class or any other class if those who wield the collective forces of the community show themselves desirous to [sic] ameliorate every legitimate grievance and to put Society on a proper and more solid basis.

(qu Fraser, 1973: 123)

To say this is not to suggest any unanimity amongst the ruling classes and one needs to recall that the facts of the franchise did not empirically substantiate any notions of incorporation as suggested in 1867 by Milnes and others. As late as 1910 only 58% of adult males (and that was 28% of the adult population) had the vote; full franchise reform (one person one vote) is a post1950 reality\*.

It was Labour which caused the crises of political economy and similar dogmatic policies. Ideologically, how was Labour, as an Interest, to be articulated within the 'orchestra' which made

\* But as late as 1970 the electorate was only 96% of the adult population (Butler, 1975:200). The best discussion of these issues is Blewett, 1965. Maehl, 1975 shows how one group had to struggle to register for the vote; Moorehouse, 1973 and Chamberlain, 1973, show the implications for contemporary sociological theory. There is no space here to relate the Poor Law to franchise matters, but the moral point is indicated by the loss of voting rights for any pauper, on the one hand, and - until 1896 - the automatic right of JPs to sit as Guardians without election. More generally Cf. the work of D.C. Moore and T.J. Nossiter.



up the National Interest, when it was so spontaneously and obviously capable of generating and regenerating perspectives, strategies, and analyses of its own? Practically, how could Labour be incorporated as either a full partner in capitalist enterprises (when those enterprises operated by extracting more from the majority 'partner' in order to keep the enterprise in being in a competitive world), or a segment of the citizenry, represented in all those splendid selfgoverning or national representative institutions, when they were so weak in character? For Labour was not whole, its character was defective. The policy I have thus far indicated - and it was a constituent of radical Toryism, the New Liberalism and much 'socialism' - was aimed at the vanguard of the working class in two senses: the most respectable segments and the best organised, 'the labour aristocracy' (itself a far from homogeneous collectivity).

Capitalism could not produce more than a thin stratum who satisfied these criteria. What of the rest, largely without Trades Unions, lacking the vote, constantly without work, often 'on the move'...? The practical crisis here took the form of continuing and extensive deliberations about the Poor Law which, by the mid 1860s, looked to a 'State Friendly Society' (an idea floated by Mill, 1841: 157; and echoed loudly by Webb, 1890: 104<sup>\*</sup>) linked to the new Post Office<sup>\*\*</sup>. The articles of the Rev. J.Y. Stratton are

---

\* I give the relevant quotations at the close of Appendix III below.

\*\* Stratton's 1868 pamphlet on this theme was originally appended to Tremenheere and Tufnell's Enquiry report (P.P. 1867-8 [4068-1] XVII). Tremenheere, Stratton, and Trevelyan all sent in similar ideas as submissions to the Royal Commission on Friendly Societies, [Contd. on p389]

fairly typical in his desire to separate paupers from men whose 'want has resulted from misfortune or the visitation of God'. The latter, the 'aged or infirm proper [are] not to be separated from their wives on coming "into the House"' and are generally to be treated 'with kindness and even some indulgence' (Stratton, 1872: 78). The remainder of 'idle and vicious paupers' are to be treated harshly in a real workhouse, where they shall produce their own maintenance. Stratton also established a scheme which entailed the 'insurance principle' almost a decade before the more usually cited article by Blackley (1878) which summarises much of the evidence before the Royal Commission, drawing, again, on the experience of trade union clubs in Germany which operate a compulsory insurance. It is this element which Edwards (1879b) finds so objectionable, in terms of its impracticability; but he also objects to all such schemes as 'bad political economy', citing J.S. Mill to support him.

But, despite the criticism of those like Edwards who supported classical political economy, despite the work of the Charity Organisation Society; poverty was increasingly seen to be a complex phenomenon not reducible to defects of character<sup>\*</sup>. The Poor Law institutions, for example, were now multi purpose authorities; J.S. Harris dates this change from 1885 (Harris, 1955: 22f. Cf. Hay, 1975: 41f). And 'Bad Political Economy', as Edwards and others called it, was everywhere evident in what Pelling refers to as

the spasmodic and haphazard action of the legislature in extending the sphere of State activity. It was in the

---

[Contd. from p.388] headed by Stafford Northcote. Cf. Tremenheere, 1880, 1881 discussed above. Of course much of this was a return to the intentions of the authors of the 1834 Report, never carried out.

\* This in no way denies the empirical fact that 'poverty' has been rediscovered by politicians and academics at roughly ten year intervals in this century.

latter sense that Sir William Harcourt could say in 1889 that "we are all Socialists now".

(Pelling, 1965: 11)

Even though, in a famous quotation, Balfour showed a fine sense of my thesis in brief when he said

Social legislation is not merely to be distinguished from Socialist legislation, but is its most direct opposite and its most effective antidote.

(1895; qu Miliband, 1960: 37 fn.1; Fraser, 1973: 129; Hay, 1975: 35 Cf. Young, 1973).

In rapid succession (Hay, 1975: 33f) Chamberlain, in his famous Circular of 1886; Lloyd George; and Churchill, become convinced of the message of many others, that poverty was 'a social disease' to use the words of the Rev. W.E. Chadwick in 1905. Poverty, argued this Chadwick, 'like sickness must be treated scientifically ...' (1905: 22) and so he called to his aid social science:

Suppose that in every parish we could have even one or two experts in social science -men and women of long experience, of wide knowledge, and of clear judgement- who could be induced to visit every case of poverty ... who would then recommend a course of treatment.

(Chadwick, 1905: 18)

He was writing for the S.P.C.K. and much missionary zeal existed at the national level (Cf B. Harrison, 1974) and locally (Hughes, 1974); and, of course, the missionaries did not have to be religious. The Universities founded their Missions deep in the darkest of 'Darkest England', and from those depths many an equivalent of the Bitter Cry of Outcast London was issued (Cf. Wohl, 1968; G.S. Jones, 1971). Indeed, as I hope I have indicated, it was a demand of those

early State Servants - and the statistical and educational movements - that accurate reports concerning the unknown were needed as a basis for policy. The missionary zeal continued for many years. Dame Enid Russell-Smith, for example, reporting on her experience as a Civil Servant in the years 1925 to 1935, considers that

many administrators in departments dealing with different forms of social service regarded themselves almost as missionaries deeply involved in the improvement of social conditions and emotionally bound up with the success of the schemes for which they were responsible ... there was all the enthusiasm of innovation. We were all full of hope ...

(Russell-Smith, 1974: 82-83)

To repeat my earlier cautionary remarks, there was a variety of tendencies in this period. For example, Preston-Thomas - who added the word 'work-shy' to the English language in 1904 (1909, p.543) - has a preface, to his valuable memoirs, by John Burns, then President of the Local Government Board. There Burns argues that

the disease of poverty is not merely an ailment of the body politic ... it is too often a failing of the mind ... a corrosion of the soul ... and often a lack of moral courage in the counsellors and governors of the community.

(Preston-Thomas, 1909:viii)

but he also sees the Poor Law as

a means of humanising to an enormous extent the apparatus and method of local charity and of medical provision ... no country in the world is so generous to its indigent and sick

(Ibid., v-vi)

He reports the fall in all classes of paupers per 1000 population from 62.7 in 1849 to 25.7 in 1908; and a fall in the relevant Rate from 1s 8½d to 1s 5d at the same dates, although the total cost had risen from £5.75m to £15m.\*

The above remarks and illustrations set the scene for my discussion; I have employed them to show (i) the range of agreement amongst nevertheless 'contending' groups; (ii) something of the context within which we can make sense of T.H. Green and the Liberal Reforms of 1906 to 1914. I hope, further more, that the relevance of the theories and practices of earlier State Servants to such a discussion is obvious, I shall not labour the point in what follows.

What I propose to discuss in the following pages are very large issues about which there has recently been a considerable literature\*\*.

---

\* Cf. Henry Sidgwick's comments, dated 1888, to Aschrott's extremely valuable 1902 survey of the Poor Law which is 'learning from Abroad' in reverse.

\*\* Hay, 1975, provides a short survey; Cf. Letwin, 1965; Matthew, 1973; Emy, 1973; M. Freedman's D.Phil thesis and Hennock 1976. On Fabianism - the new study by Wolfe is central, but Cf. Sweezy, 1949; Hobsbawm, 1964c; and on Wallas, Wiener, 1971. On the Labour Party, aside from Pelling, 1965, Cf. Miliband, 1960; Marwick, 1967; McKibbin, 1974; Coates, 1975. Hay is quite right to call for attention to Halevy (1919; 1932) and Dangerfield (1935) (Hay, 1975:63; 69). On the 'national efficiency' question see Semmel, 1960; Searle, 1971.

I first wish to indicate some paradoxes in the normal causal significance given to the ideas of T.H. Green in the genesis of the Liberal Reforms and the Welfare State. I shall then review what I see to be the significant sociological relevance of the literature on the New Liberalism and Ethical Socialism in terms of my own thesis. I shall conclude the chapter with some relevant connections in the political style, and Erastian objectives, of Fabianism and Benthamism.

---

## 2. The Paradox of T.H. Green

When Laski published his account of the State in the mid-1930s he began with a chapter of about 100 pages called 'The Philosophical conception of the State' (Laski, 1935, Ch.1). In contrast the next chapter is called 'State and Government in the Real World'\*. In 1940 Laski argued

under the philosophic auspices of Green ... the main gains of the legislation of the last fifty years are to be recorded.

(Decline of Liberalism, qu Richter, 1964: 269)

It is a very popular view: Davidson (1969: 239); Clarke (1974: 162); Birch (1974: 16); Hay (1975: 35) and Wolfe (1975: Chs.5/7) are quite explicit in giving all or some credit (i.e. causal significance) to T.H. Green's ideas alone, or as part of a more general

---

\* I choose Laski because George (1976) considers his a representative Marxist account (but contrast Hobson, 1931 or Borkenau, 1937). For Green's influence on Laski see A. Birch, 1964:99

phenomenon<sup>\*</sup>. The most astonishing claim must surely be that of Richter

Green's teachings probably had their greatest practical weight during the Liberal governments of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith when the Cabinet and Commons, the newspapers and reviews, and the universities were all full of men who had been Green's students at Oxford, or who knew his ideas through his books or numerous academic disciples. For example in the 1906 election 31 Balliol graduates were elected to the House of Commons, of these 23 were Liberals. Four Balliol men were in the Cabinet.

(Richter, 1956: 444 fn.4; my emphasis).

In fact, a careful reading of Richter's own work (1956, 1964) or that of Wolfe (1975) shows a quite different picture, not least by locating Green amongst the Evangelicals.<sup>\*\*</sup> The point is, however, not to show simply the non-uniqueness of Green's ideas (although that is important); but to show the sociological content of the general philosophies which he articulated, and, equally, to stress their dependence upon theories and practices which I have sketched

---

\* Green is also given credit as a sociological founder (Cf. Halliday, 1968 as quoted at the start of this Chapter) and as a philosopher (Cf. Collingwood's 1939 Autobiography qu Passmore, 1966:56; Srinivasan, 1969:182). Note, however, the lack of consideration of Green in Bertrand Russell, 1946.

\*\* Green, Bosanquet, F.H. and A.C. Bradley were all (as was Hobhouse) the sons of Evangelical clergymen. I. Bradley (1976:200f) shows that even Green's conversion to agnosticism was a common event, as was Green's desire to preserve the 'moral teaching' of Christianity without 'the superstition'. Green was the first lay Tutor ever at Balliol (Richter, 1956: 446 n.11); but witness Green's two Lay Sermons, analysed by Richter and others.

in preceding chapters. Green and others addressed themselves to the institutional arrangements of capitalism through specifying the relevance of 'foreign' ideas as much as practices. It is as well to add that Greenism, like the New Liberalism, was a very transitory phenomenon; coextensive only with the instability occasioned by Labour, before the latter had been relatively comfortably contained in its 'own' representative institutions of a truly national character: the Labour-Party-in-Parliament.

The best corrective to the general view is provided by a thorough analysis of the content of Green's work (for which there is no space here). Srinivasan has done this and concludes that

Green was not doing anything unique ... not Green but an intellectual Aristocracy and the momentum of reform were responsible for the ushering in of the Welfare State.

(Srinivasan, 1969: 176, who follows Annan, 1955 and A.H. Birch, 1964: Ch.7)

Beatrice Webb saw Green as part of a wider movement exemplifying 'a new consciousness of sin among men of intellect and men of property' (qu Richter, 1956: 469).

Before I examine these claims\* (and thereby modify the language of Srinivasan or Webb) it is as well to examine a paradox about Green. There have been two great debates about the aetiology of 'Reforms' in social policy in Britain as McGregor indicated at the start of this Chapter; in the earlier case (the reforms of the 1830s) there is scarcely a mention of the possibility of idealist philosophy, exemplified in the work of Coleridge, being influential; whereas in

---

\*A complementary examination of such 'claims' is provided by Collini's recent article (1976) whose exegesis is much more thorough than my own.



the latter case (the Liberal reforms) almost all credit is given to the idealist philosophy of T.H. Green. In both cases this singular emphasis on one body of ideas and one 'true begetter' (Bentham or Green)\* seriously distorts the historical account; more generally, such an approach downgrades the institutional 'resources' and political strategies involved in the inception and accomplishment of social policy.

The other paradox concerning Green is that we are actually told rather little about him in Richter's study. The facts\*\* of Green's life are important. He was born in 1836, his mother (the daughter of a vicar and the neice of an Archdeacon) died when he was one year old; his father, a vicar, educated T.H. Green himself until the age of fourteen when he went to Rugby in 1850; in 1855 he entered Balliol and in 1860 he was made a Fellow and temporary lecturer in ancient and modern history. He was a member of a University Society (Old Morality) to whom he read some papers; and he won a University prize in 1862 for an essay on morals. In the same year he signed the 39 Articles to obtain his M.A. and began some (never completed) translations of Christian ethical texts. In 1864 he failed to obtain the chair of moral philosophy in Aberdeen and in that year was appointed a civil servant: full-time Assistant Commissioner to the Taunton Commission on schools for the Middle-class, for whom he worked until 1866. In that year, at the age of thirty, he obtained his permanent tutorship at Balliol, failing to obtain (in 1867) the Wayneflete Chair. In 1867/1868 Green began to

---

\* As does a similar focus on Beveridge in relation to the 1940s social legislation.

\*\* I follow DNB and Walsh, 1967, here. Almost none of these facts are to be found in Richter!

lecture on philosophy; but in 1867 he also gave four lectures on 'The English Revolution' to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. In 1871, at the age of 35, Green married the niece of J.A. Symonds, Charlotte (they had no children); the following year he was re-elected to the tutorship (with some support from Jowett who had the Mastership from 1870). Green joined the U.K. Temperance Alliance in 1872 and established a coffee tavern in 1875. In 1874 he was elected to the Oxford School Board (he had been a governor of King Edward's School, Birmingham, since the late 1860s); and he was a Town Councillor in Oxford from 1876. In 1875-6 Green produced an important edition of Hume's works, with a long preface critical of empiricism. At the age of 42 - and already ill with 'heart disease' - he was elected to the Whyte Chair of moral philosophy in 1878. Green lectured on Ethics (later collected as his Prologomena to Ethics and published in 1883, selling only 17,000 copies between 1883 and 1949; Richter, 1964: 294) and Political Obligation (published as Lectures on the principles of political obligation in 1883, this had an initial print order of 15,602 copies, Richter, Ibid). In 1881 Green delivered his most partisan lecture 'Liberal legislation and freedom of contract'. He died 26th March 1882. His collected works extend only to two volumes (the third is Nettleship's hagiographic Life) and are mainly full of slight pieces; they appeared from 1886 to 1888.

Green's educational work for the State requires a little more comment. The Taunton Commission was headed by Labouchère, now Lord Taunton, and included Baines, Forster, and Temple. Green may have secured his appointment through T.D. Acland<sup>\*</sup>, 11th Baronet

---

\* The Aclands are and were a very political family; [Contd. on p.398]

Liberal M.P. and Commissioner, who was father of A.H. Acland, a Fellow, and later Bursar, of Balliol<sup>\*</sup>. The Schools Inquiry Commission, which was supported by Tufnell, Kay and Tremenheere, and examined the endowed schools (other than the nine 'Clarendon' Schools); had most of its fiscal recommendations carried in the Endowed Schools Act of 1869; but a second Bill, which was dropped, introduced by W.E. Forster would have controlled curricula and teachers. Green's work was not marginal; in the formal report his views on the content of 'a clerk's education, namely, a thorough knowledge of arithmetic, and ability to write a good letter'<sup>\*\*</sup> are quoted. Green investigated the area around Birmingham, and presented a 145 page report on King Edward's School, Birmingham, a 105 page survey of schools in Staffordshire and Warwick (both P.P. 1867-68 XXVIII Vol.8), as well as contributing to the general report on the Midlands (Ibid., Vol.10). What is striking about his reports is their continuity from the sort of ideas and texts analysed in my earlier Chapters, and the closeness of fit which he desires between (i) particular kinds of education and school and specific social groups; (ii) the needs of the labour market and particular curricula; (iii) the 'moral' environment and the location of different schools. His Liberalism is most evident in his opposition to both classical education and Public and (private)

---

[Contd. from p.397] the 15th Baronet Richard Acland founded the Commonwealth Party in 1940. Burke's Peerage.

\* A.H. was a Liberal M.P. 1885-1889, cf his 1886 article: he was Vice-President of the Education Department and Chairman of the Committee on Examinations of 1911.

\*\* P.P. 1867-68 XXVIII, Vol.I, p 21; Cf. MacLure, 1969:Doc.13; Curtis, 1965: 155f. Green's conception seems also to have influenced the Ridley Commission's discussion of clerical work in the Civil Service (Cf. C.5545, para.11).

commercial schools. Like the earlier State Servants he also has an idea of the consequences of model institutions; for example:

a well-endowed grammar school ... if it could be imported into the Potteries ... if it did something to check the vulgar tendency of the larger capitalists to send their sons to schools where they only learn to despise their homes ... would be no slight gain.

(P.P. 1867-8 XXVIII Vol.8: 194)

But he was also aware of the need to facilitate a 'mobility of talent'

If it is asked, finally, why it is to be wished that the grammar schools should supersede private schools, the answer is that the former may, while the latter scarcely can, help a boy to get beyond the intellectual position to which he was born.

(Ibid., p.207; Cf. 159f)

In sum, his report (and the whole Inquiry) indicate the arrival of both new labour needs (commercial clerks of varying types) and new fractions of a ruling class. With regard to the latter, Green (and other Commissioners) wish to remove Tory, Church of England, control of endowments (Ibid., 2f; 234f).

---

Richter seems to me to be on safer ground when he argues

Like Benthamism and Manchester Liberalism, Green's Idealism is both an effect and a cause. It could not

have been accepted at all were it not responsive to existing forces: but once formulated, it exerted a certain independent power by its definition of the situation ...

(Richter, 1964: 226)

In fact, Green, and the legacy of Green, operates in this manner because of the sociological assumptions it conveys with the philosophical prescriptions. Green's sociology tells what should be by now a familiar story. In his Lectures on the 1870 Education Act, for example, Green castigates the old Tories and Liberals for spending far too much on public and private charity; if there had been a 'system of properly organised schools'

we might by this time have had not only a thoroughly educated, but a socially united people.

(qu Richter, 1964: 337)

Green's philosophy<sup>\*</sup> extends the work of the State Servants I have described and it shares their values. Property, for example is sacred (PP220f; Haldar, 1927: 68f; Forsyth, 1971: 2f) and markets, especially the labour market (P224) must be free, although, like the Radicals before him, Green excepts landownership from this since 'Land is different' (P229)<sup>\*\*</sup>. Using Rousseau and Kant<sup>\*\*\*</sup> to criticise John Austin and to modify Hegel, T.H. Green wishes

\* I follow here Ritchie, 1887; Fairbrother, 1900; Haldar, 1927:Ch.2; Bosanquet, 1937; Vereker, 1964; Passmore, 1966; Walsh, 1967. Green's major text (1881) will be cited by P[aragraph] number.

\*\* Green also exempts alcohol and Trades Unions.

\*\*\* On Rousseau see Gerth, 1953:195; Waldman, 1967; On Kant and Rousseau see Cassirer, 1945; Goldmann, 1945; Della Volpe, 1962 and the Symposium in Journal:History:Ideas, 32, 1971.

to justify his argument that 'Will not force is the basis of the State'\*. For Green, 'society' alone could accomplish 'moral liberation ... for the individual' (qu Ritchie, 1887: 146; Cf. Fairbrother, 1900: Ch.4; Richter, 1964: 228). As Kant phrased it: 'Rational beings alone have the facility of acting according to the conception of laws, that is according to principles, i.e. have a will' (1889: 29), so Green argued

The condition of a moral life is the possession of will and reason ...

(Works, II: 337 qu Fairbrother, 1900: 73 n.2)

He sought to investigate the moral function served by Law in relation to these principles. In this framework, Green argued in his Lecture on Liberal Legislation in 1881,

It is the business of the State ... to maintain the conditions without which a free exercise of human faculties is impossible.

(qu Richter, 1964: 283-284; Cf. Vereker, 1964: 154)

Law was a 'system of rules by which rights are maintained' (P94), and civic institutions 'render it possible for a man to be freely determined by the idea of a possible satisfaction of himself ...'

they enable him to realise his reason ...

so far as they do, in fact, thus operate; they are morally justified.

(P7; Cf.P113f; Fairbrother, 1900:108; 127-9; Haldar, 1927: 58f)

---

\* This argument is defeated in advance; Cf. Marx, 1845: 365f

The State is a form 'which society takes in order to maintain' morality (P138); for 'the idea of social good is represented by or realised in, the formation of States' (P13):

for a member of a State to say that his rights are derived from his social relations, and to say that these are derived from his position as a member of a State, are the same thing.

(P141; Cf. P114)

As such, the State (and Laws) should always be obeyed; even 'bad' laws, for the alternative is anarchy and anomie (P144f). This view also imposes a homogeneous view of social relations, indeed Green explains the lack of rebelliousness, in what he clearly sees as a society of structural inequality, by

common ways of feeling and thinking which a common language and still more a common literature embodies (P123; Cf. Bosanquet, 1920: 270f; R.M. Hare, 1967)

Like the Radicals, and the State Servants, Green saw the system of production, that is 'capitalism or the free development of individual wealth' (P230), as relatively blameless; it was a variety of archaisms (particularly in the case of landholding) and 'the failure of the state' and, more widely, legal and moral factors, acting as restraints on capitalism, which should be blamed. Capitalism, in the form of accumulation of capital (P225) or simply any property holding, entailed appropriate ethical institutions, without which the 'real' individualism - to which Green and other New Liberals (and ethical Socialists) were committed - could not be achieved.

Before I briefly consider the legacy of Green, I want to clarify

a remark I made concerning Green's influence on the Fabians. Wolfe (1975) speaks of Arnold Toynbee's 'Oxford mentor, T.H. Green' (p.221) and describes the 'similarity of outlook' between Wallas, Toynbee and Green - 'a form of puritan asceticism transmuted into social conscience' (p.229 fn.36). In fact, Wallas and Olivier went to Corpus Christi ('dominated by Utilitarian philosophy and Whig politics') where their tutor helped keep the college 'free of Idealism from the early eighties' (p.220 fn.12). Webb, Wallas and Olivier studied the 'basic works of Comte' (p.223) and the major influence on Olivier was J.S. Mill's Political Economy, whilst Wallas' lectures in 1890 were acceptable to C.S. Loch and the Charity Organisation Society (p.231). It was this trio, Webb, Olivier and Wallas who 'led the attack on Marx at the Hampstead meetings [of the Fabians] and subsequently took over the leadership of the society itself'. It was these three\* who set the tone of Fabian Essays: evolutionary, gradualist, Erastian reform. (p.180f). I do not challenge the similarity of outlook but show, with evidence from Wolfe himself, how we must locate their similarity outside any one particular source of influence, - in the making of the whole New Liberal-Ethical Socialist bloc\*\*

Nicholls sees the period 1880 - 1914 as one of contention between negative and positive liberals (1962: 117); he places Bentham, Bright and Spencer in the first category, and sees them as ideologists for developing capitalism; and puts the Webbs, T.H. Green and Hobhouse in the second category of ideologists for

---

\* Webb and Olivier were both in the 1924 Labour Cabinet; Webb (Passfield) alone in 1929-31.

\*\* A further example might be found in Bosanquet's translating Schaeffle's Quintessence of Socialism (a work very influential amongst Fabians) which Marx showed to be profoundly anti-proletarian in his 'Notes on Adolph Wagner' (ed. T. Carver, Oxford, Blackwell, pp.179f. esp. p.187).



established capitalism (1975:1)\*. Such a classification does not help us in placing Bernard Bosanquet (1848-1923) in many ways a true successor to Green's philosophy (as Hobhouse was a true follower of Green's politics). For Bosanquet, the State included 'the entire hierarchy of institutions by which life is determined' and 'is constantly reminding us of our duties ... [by] instruction and authoritative suggestion' (1920: 139; 141). Like Green, Bosanquet is ambiguous about the practical relations between 'positions', power, and authority; and generally he is far more abstracted and mystical than Green. But his philosophy is 'realized in his practice as a leading figure in the Charity Organisation Society\*\*', arguing

True social work, independent of the public power,  
is the laboratory of social invention.

(1920: xxxviii; Cf his praise of Follett, 1918;

Nicholls, 1975: 89f)

Bosanquet's work is more sociological than Green (he draws, for example, upon Durkheim; 1920: 259f); as can be seen from his discussion of 'the social system' (p.269) or the State (p. 363). There is a good illustration of this in Bosanquet's lecture to the Fabian Society which offers a sociological critique of political economy along with some sharp analysis of the contradictions inherent in the Fabian programme, where he argues that their view of Society is that of moral individualism which conflicts with their notions

\* Nicholls' work is very flawed as Weeks has shown in an important contribution which should be more widely known (Weeks, 1976).

\*\* Founded in 1869 as the 'Society for organising charitable relief and repressing mendicity', in 1910 it became the 'Society for organising charity and improving the condition of the Poor'. Cf. Weeks, 1974, for similar links between Malthusianism and Family Welfare.

of Economic Socialism (Bosanquet, 1890: 368)\*. His discussion of the State as sui generis - 'The Nation-State as an ethical idea' - at the close of his 1920 book (in a chapter which has given its title to this part of my thesis) connects directly with contemporary discussions of institution among sociologists.\*\*

Haldar recalls L.T. Hobhouse sitting in 1916

in a garden annotating Hegel ... when a German air raid took place ... "In the bombing of London I had just witnessed the visible and tangible outcome of a false and wicked doctrine" ...

(Haldar, 1927: 296, quoting Hobhouse; contrast

Bosanquet's praise of war: 1920:xlvi).)

Alan Ryan has argued, in a review of Owen (1975) that there is much to be said for Hobhouse's short essays

If there is anything to be said against ... The State [which Hobhouse wrote after the incident just quoted] it is that the transition from Hegel to the Zeppelin dropping bombs on London is made too swiftly and too unqualifiedly

(Ryan, 1975: 1019 col.4)

In fact this incident is far more significant than these anecdotes might imply, as Haldar realises

\* Cf. Hobson, 1931 and Bosanquet in Sociological Review, 1909.

\*\* Cf. Parsons, 1945; Wells, 1970:6f; Gouldner, 1970: 199. Durkheim is the obvious comparison, as I tried to show in Chapter Four above; he argued that the state 'be defined as a group of officials sui generis ... whose responsibility it is to work out certain ideas which apply to the collectivity [of a] more conscious and deliberate character' (qu Durkheim, 1972: 192) Cf. Bendix, 1960; Richter, 1960; Clark, 1968 and Giddens, 1971.

One reason, perhaps the chief reason, of Professor Hobhouse's hostility to the idealistic theory of the State is his belief that it encourages the tendency to resist all proposals to reform and reconstruct society.

(Haldar, 1927: 303; Cf. Barnes, 1948)\*

As early as 1893, in his book The Labour Movement, Hobhouse had argued

A due regulation of economic conditions would provide for physical as well as for moral health; far from denying the teachings of biology would use them to promote the evolution of a noble species (qu Weiler, 1972: 156).

L.T. Hobhouse (1864-1929, son of an Archdeacon and Professor of Sociology at LSE from 1907) has been much studied\*\*; he is best understood where he 'belongs': within the relations of New Liberalism. But it is worth noting the varied inspirations he admits to:

As an undergraduate at Oxford (1883-1887) I was greatly interested in questions of social reform ... I rather innocently took Herbert Spencer's evolutionary theories

---

\* It was possible to adopt a more instrumental attitude: J.S. Mann explained to the Aristotelian Society in 1899: 'If we can only so apply Hegel's conception of the State as to get everyone to vote and to take some interest in politics, it will not have been conceived in vain, however untenable it may be in itself' (Mann, 1899:98; Bosanquet was VicePresident of the Society). On this theme Cf. Hare, 1967 and Skillen, 1974.

\*\* Cf. Abrams, 1968; Weiler, 1972; Griffin, 1974; Clarke, 1974; Owen, 1975. The best starting point is Collini (1976)- note especially the implications of his concluding sentences.

as the last word of science, and though attracted by T.H. Green's social and ethical outlook I could not see in his metaphysics a valid philosophical solution ... It occurred to me, however, that Green's 'Spiritual principle' might represent an 'empirical' rather than a 'metaphysical truth', that it might be identified with the Comtist conception of Humanity...

(qu Abrams, 1968: 86-87)

This project, involving J.S. Mill, as well as Comte and neo-evolutionary theory, is sensitively discussed by Weiler (1972) whilst Griffin, in a complementary study, illustrates the centrality of Hobhouse's notion of 'harmony' (1974). Such a project led Hobhouse to define the State in 1924 as 'the community organised for certain purposes'.

But:

The hope to eliminate force altogether from the State is Utopian, because it implies that the will to conform to the conditions of common life should become not merely general but rigidly universal ... But force is only a reserve. The main function of the State is regulation which the bulk of us willingly accept when we know what it requires of us.

(1924: 53)

In his critique of Bosanquet, Hobhouse had indicated this Fabian-style linking of the State and democracy:

In the democratic or humanitarian view it [the State] is a means. In the metaphysical view, it is an end. In the democratic view it is the servant of humanity in the double sense that it is to be judged by what it does

for the lives of its members and by the part that it plays in the society of humankind.

(1918: 137; Cf. Nicholls, 1962: 126)

Again, it is almost superfluous to note the similarity to many modern formulations of sociology's project; the conflation of the agency of regulation with the whole social formation (note, here, the talk of 'members'), obscures precisely the social relations which specifically constitute society as such.

---

### 3. Ethical socialism, New Liberalism, and the crises of political economy

For Ernest Barker, J.S. Mill 'serves, in the years between 1848 and 1880, as a bridge from laissez-faire to the idea of social readjustment by the State, and from political Radicalism to economic Socialism' (Barker, 1915: 190). This is the thesis of one of the major studies I have already cited: Wolfe's From radicalism to socialism, the first major study of Fabianism to use a range of papers previously unstudied. The second chapter of his work, like the work of W. Thomas (1971a), argues that we should distrust Mill's own Autobiography along with Mill's 'General Law' of laissez faire (Cf. Mill, 1973: 312f but note the exclusion of education for very political reasons). From the 1860s (although he traces this to the 1830s), Wolfe sees Mill as waging 'a virtual crusade against the "laissez faire" principle' (Wolfe, 1975: 50). Roach (1957) and Ryan (1974) make similar points, but, importantly, they see Mill, in Roach's words,

becoming sceptical of the results achieved by democracy. In Representative Government, (1861 [:Chs.5,6]), he had pointed out that a popular assembly was not fitted to conduct administration or to frame laws, and that one of the great problems of democratic government is to combine popular rule with the skilled administration of the modern state.

(Roach, 1957: 58)

Central to Wolfe's discussion is a review essay by J.S. Mill from the Edinburgh Review<sup>\*</sup>; this begins by (i) separating the 'Forms of Government' question from the issue of centralization as such; and (ii) admitting there can be no general principle with regard to the latter; we must consider the 'special kinds of work to be done' (1862: 323). The real issue here, extremely relevant to the concerns of this chapter of my thesis, is that there are various forms of State power: the authority of law and the 'authority of office'. Mill distrusts the latter because it extends the evils of jobbing and patronage. Mill acknowledges that 'new economical and social phenomena', and 'the enlarged scale' of all operations create new kinds of problems; he does not challenge the necessity for State interference (1862: 334-345) but stresses that the 'mode of State interference is crucial'. Even that which he sees as acceptable - Inspectors, Tribunals and Commissions; must not 'weaken the stimulus to individual effort' (p.346)<sup>\*\*</sup> Mill concludes that 'Few

---

\* According to Wolfe this is not included in J.S. Mill's Collected Works; I take its attribution to Mill from him.

\*\* The notion of Mill and many others that State action is antithetical to middleclass effort is very much alive: a representative text would be Roy Lewis' 'How the middle class are slowly being taken over' (Times 17 February 1975) and cf his 1976 review of Hutter, 1976, on this theme.

Englishmen ... would grudge to the government, for a time, or permanently, the powers necessary to save from serious injury any great national interest ...' (p.355).

The fact that we can now see that J.S. Mill's previously considered dogmatic adherence to laissez faire (and a minimal State) was modified, is part of what this thesis is arguing should be a general reconceptualization of both the genesis of the British State apparatuses and the part played in this by theories of 'moral order'. The materials presented in the third and fourth Chapters above should indicate why a crisis of political economy - and, more generally, of all social theories - would be an expectable feature from the 1870s onwards. In what follows I shall present some brief cameos of representatives and positions in the debate about that ideological crisis. As I have indicated above, I believe that the central figure of this crisis - the nature of Labour - has been considerably underplayed (but Cf. Abrams, 1968: 60); equally I suggest that through this debate we can more nearly see how the battle over the existence and core of sociology is directly and internally related to the battle over the nature of the State. This double-genesis, of sociology and the State, provides a mutually supporting paradigm of thought and action drawn on by new Liberals, Fabians and the whole progressive movement. As counterfactual confirmation of this - a point I return to in my final Afterword below - we find that the only major attack on the Liberal (social-democratic, or Welfare) State to be launched since 1945 is based upon a particular version of classical political economy. That is to say: such an attack from within sociology is epistemologically improbable.

In 1865<sup>\*</sup>, three years after J.S. Mill's review, Frederic Harrison discussed the limits of political economy in the first volume of the Fortnightly Review<sup>\*\*</sup>. Annan considers Harrison's Order and Progress (1875) to be

the one political treatise of the period (other than the works of the English pre-Marxists) which challenges laissez-faire economics and argues that the duty of the State is to promote a moral society.

(Annan, 1952: 204; Wolfe, 1975: 46f)

Harrison prints at the head of his 1865 article a quotation from Comte

The phenomena of society being more complicated than any other, it is irrational to study the industrial apart from the intellectual and moral.

Philip Abrams has argued that there was a general 'crisis of economic experience' from which 'Geddes and Hobhouse, Rowntree and the Webbs pieced together their sense of vocation' (1968: Ch.6). But he is equally aware that the crisis had as many external as internal features; this 'vocation' was also formed against a clearly alternative socialist analysis of society. The moral sciences (and within that, sociology) were posed against the materialist bases of the socialist alternatives. In turn, the possibilities of the vocation described rested upon the solid achievements by formal and informal State provision from the 1830s onwards (Abrams, 1968: Chs. 2 to 4).

---

\* What follows is very limited indeed; I ignore, in particular, religion, literature and eugenics. Different surveys can be found in the literature I cite, plus the last chapters of Perkin, 1969.

\*\* For the importance of periodical literature see Freedman's D. Phil thesis, and Mowat, 1969: 94.



Alfred Marshall was appointed 'College Lecturer in Moral Sciences' at St John's, Cambridge, in 1868. He 'turned to economics only after he had graduated, and then approached it via metaphysics, psychology and ethics ... in his thirtieth year [i.e. 1871/2] he was still debating whether to give his life to economics or psychology' (Routh, 1976: 20; Kennedy, 1957). In July 1888, Henry Sedgwick Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, wrote a laudatory preface for Aschrott's study of the English Poor Law, in which he reports his reading the work in German in 1886 and agrees with that author that 'any workhouse is "defective" which is not leading back the pauper wholly or partially to the habits and sentiments of self-supporting labour' (Aschrott, 1902: xii).

In 1870 J.E. Cairnes gave his inaugural lecture at University College, London, which takes issue, inter alia, with the old Guard such as R.A. Lowe (Wolfe, 1975: 55f. Cf. Lowe's speech in the Commons, 12 March 1868). In fact this debate goes back to the pre-Reform contests (Cf. Herrick, 1948) as can be seen from the 1867 Essays on Reform, the first of which deals with the 'utilitarian argument against reform as stated by Mr. Lowe'.\* What can be found in many of these texts (for example it is common to Harrison's article and Cairnes' lecture) is a redefinition of the classical tenets of political economy in two distinct ways which eventuate, in fact, in a very technical conception of economics and a programme for what is recognisably sociology. Whether this is done to defend political economy or to attack it, the consequences are curiously the same - to remove moral (i.e. sociological) and policy considerations from

---

\* The starting point for political sociology should probably be these 1867 Essays, especially those by Leslie Stephen and A.V. Dicey, the latter's 'Balance of Classes' owes much to Bagehot.

economics proper. Cairnes, for example, wants to defend the validity of political economy because he feels that the identification between political economy and laissez faire has led to the 'alienation' of the former from the minds of the working class. This economic ignorance has extensive consequences:

bankruptcies, commercial crises, conflicts of capital and labour, Sheffield outrages, excesses of population, pauperism, internal insurrections, international jealousies ... This metropolis in its eastern quarter could just now supply some striking illustrations ...

(Cairnes, 1870: 264)

But it is the 'spectre of socialism - that rank growth of economic ignorance' (Ibid.) which makes the above list the agenda for radical Liberalism and ethical Socialism alike.

At the British Association in Dublin in 1878, J.K. Ingram<sup>\*</sup> gave his Presidential Address to section F on 'The Need for Sociology'. This neatly identifies the two dimensions of the crisis which I have mentioned: sustained distrust of political economy which takes working-class (p.178) and intellectualist (p.179) forms. Ingram makes three charges against political economy: the separation of economic phenomena from all other; being 'vacuously abstract'<sup>\*\*</sup> particularly in its treatment of labour as 'an instrument of production'; and failing to recognise that 'the nature of a social fact of any

---

\* J.K. Ingram (1823-1907) successively Fellow, Professor of Anatomy; Professor of Greek; Librarian and ViceProvost of Trinity College, Dublin; Contributor on political economy to 1888 Britannica and Palgrave; self declared Comtist. (Who was Who).

\*\* This is very close to Marx's charge of 'vicious' or 'forcible abstraction' made against political economy Cf. Sayer Ph.D. and 1975.

degree of complexity cannot be understood apart from its history' (p.187)\*. Of course the sociological critique of political economy subsequently founders upon the removal, from sociological vision, of production (and relations of that character); or, if they are 'allowed' they are taken as the basis of, not the problem for, investigation. More recently, history has also been removed from the sociological agenda (Abrams, 1972a,b,c).

In 1878, R.A. Lowe entered his defence of political economy in the Nineteenth century, where he concludes

The future is all for the sociologists, and I am inclined to think it will long remain so ... Setting aside physics and mathematics ... I claim for political economy a success more brilliant and more lasting than any other of what are loosely called the moral sciences ...

(1878: 868)

He attacks sociology (asking if 'there exists at the present time such a science' p.860, as Henry Sedgwick demanded in 1885 at the British Association, Cf. Abrams, 1968: 82f) and refutes the concerns of Cairnes, Ingram and others as to whether the working classes do not like political economy: 'The object of science is not to please or conciliate'.

Another defender of laissez faire (and political economy?) was Spencer\*\*. Although bodies of doctrine are always subject to

---

\* This is also close to Marx (Cf. his 1846:Ch.II) but Ingram follows it with a quotation from Spencer and a discussion of Sir Henry Maine.

\*\* Spencer (1820-1903) is best approached through Peel, 1971. For more detail Cf. Spencer, 1897; 1908; Schoenwald, 1968; Evans-Pritchard, 1968; Macrae, 1969. For Spencer-Comte relations see Spencer, 1864; Eisen, 1967; Peel, 1971: 125f. See also my discussion of Spencer's early work in Section three of Chapter Two above.

interpretation in terms of pre-existing commitments and strategies. For example, Macrae (1969: 48f), Young (1972) and Jones (Ph.D. thesis Ch.8 espec. 320f) all agree that Spencer's essays collected as The Man versus the State in 1884<sup>\*</sup> draw upon Darwinian evolutionary theories<sup>\*\*</sup> in order to oppose what Spencer saw as Socialism. Yet in 1886 Annie Besant, for example, could claim 'I am a socialist because I am a believer in Evolution' (qu Wolfe, 1975: 262-3); indeed, Jones (Ph.D.) sees Spencer as arguing against Socialist Darwinism in general<sup>\*\*\*</sup>. Kidd's Social evolution (Cf. Peel, 1971: 236f) shows that there is no necessary contradiction between a commitment to evolution and a belief in Etatism; such a view underpins the work of Hobhouse and of the Neo-Hegelians. Freedon argues (D.Phil Ch.2) that sociology in Britain was not established on the basis of any evolutionary theory, although it was influential, clearly, in particular variants: eugenics and 'social engineering' (Abrams, 1968: 120f; Peel, 1971: 233f).

Spencer's views have contemporary spokesmen; a recent study concludes that 'the gains [of State regulation] are not worth the costs' (Stigler, 1975: 19) for

---

\* These essays can be seen in summary form in Spencer, 1897: 624-632 and are supplemented by Spencer's response to Huxley: Spencer, 1871.

\*\* See Jones' thorough Ph.D. thesis; Young, 1970, 1972; Williams, 1972; Pollard, 1968:Ch.3. For Spencer-Darwin relations See Jones Ph.D. Ch.8 and Macrae, 1969: 22. Like Darwin, Spencer first learned his evolution through Lyell's geology: Macrae, 1969: 21; Peel, 1971:127f.

\*\*\* For example in the work of Joseph Dietzgen (Cf. MacIntyre, 1974; Buick, 1975); Kautsky absorbed much evolutionary theory, converting Marx into Darwin as Colletti (1968) and Goldman (1970) have shown.

The superiority of the traditional defences of the individual - reliance upon his own efforts and the power of competition - lie precisely in the characteristics which distinguish them from public regulation ... It is of regulation that the consumer must beware.

(Ibid., 188; Cf. his rooting of this theory in the classical texts of Smith)

Spencer reviews all State measures (actual and contemplated, along with their fiscal consequences) to show a 'new Toryism' at work which 'restricts still more the freedom of the citizen'. In what is clearly an attack on New Liberalism (and may include Green's ideas, Cf. p.95 where Spencer talks of 'Oxford graduates'), Spencer argues that the nature of agency is irrelevant to the Debate: the State cannot assist in moralization at all, it can only be negatively, never positively, coercive. Spencer's Malthusianism, and his fundamentalism, are best seen in his arguments regarding the necessity of suffering (p.83f). He is aware that what is at issue, as his long discussion of the Poor Law and School grants-in-aid makes clear, is 'a certain type of social organization'.

The question of questions for the politician should ever be - "What type of social state am I tending to produce?"

(1884: 91)\*

He recognises that what I have been arguing in fact took place: particular policies lead to the circulation of certain ideas (p.93); a 'small body of officials'

---

\* Spencer's deep individualism is revealed when he declares that 'The defective natures of citizens will show themselves in the bad activity of whatever social structure they are arranged into' (1884: 110). Cf. his reliance upon political economy (Ibid., 132f). Bristow (1975) provides a thorough investigation of Spencer and the Liberty and Property Defence League.

coherent, having common interests, and acting under central authority, has an immense advantage over an incoherent public which has no settled policy.

(1884: 94)

Spencer's aim is to put 'a limit to the powers of Parliaments' (1884: 183):

The great political superstition of the past was the divine right of Kings. The great political superstition of the present is the divine right of Parliaments.

(Ibid., 151)\*

For Spencer 'the social arrangement of human beings' is part of the 'Order of Nature': the sins of legislators have their root in seeing society as 'a manufacture, whereas it is a growth' (p.147). Following Jevons (1882) Spencer opposes 'social contract' theory and Bentham's notion of conferred rights; he argues a theory of natural rights. In his postscript, specifically to refute a critical comment from Cairnes, Spencer modifies this somewhat by saying that he supports both 'societal evolution' and 'individual action' (1884: 190f). Peel (1971: 237f following Abrams, 1968: 66f) is right to show how this combination poses a threat to the various neat binary classifications of ideologies which are often produced; it is also worth stressing that it was precisely a focus on national efficiency (often through analogies with organic biology), and fears of the deterioration of the species, that led to more and more of those measures which Spencer so opposed\*\*.

---

\* 'The time may not be far off when the phrase "national interest" acquires the same adverse connotations as its predecessor "the Divine Right of Kings"' (Rapaport, 1967).

\*\* According to Sklair (1970:66) 363,755 copies [Contd. on p.418]

Spencer was not alone in calling sociology to the defence of ancient virtues: Maine's critique of Liberalism in his Popular Government (1885, six editions by 1909) was an extension of his work of historical sociology (Cf. Burrow, 1971; Bock, 1974, 1976). Roach (1957) shows that major Liberals - Lowe, Maine, Selbourne, Goschen, James Stephen and A.V. Dicey - were already critical of Liberalism before the break over Irish Home Rule\*. He also roots the growth of Liberal Imperialism in this disquiet (Cf. Matthew, 1973; Emy, 1973).

The recent studies\*\* of Freedon (D.Phil), Clarke (1974) and Wolfe (1975) confirm the accuracy of Abrams' analysis in 1968:

In the thirty years before 1914 many British intellectuals came to see the new sociology and the new Liberalism - the Liberalism of free education, unemployment insurance, town-planning, old-age pensions, guaranteed minimum wages, and a managed labour market - as theory and practice of a last stand against socialism.

(Abrams, 1968: 60)

---

[\*\*Contd. from p.417] of Spencer's work circulated in the USA alone 1860-1903; by the latter date, the Study of Sociology (1st ed 1872) was in its 21st ed. Relatedly, Wolfe (1975:266f) reports Lester Ward's Dynamic Sociology (1883) as influential amongst Fabians.

\* This is not to minimise the fury Gladstone aroused. Tremenheere's letters to Chadwick show this. On 13 April 1886 he wrote to Chadwick 'It rejoices me to see that you have joined the patriotic band of iconoclasts in battering that double faced Janus our Premier' (Chadwick Mss.1988). See also Tremenheere's 'Postscript' in his 1893 pamphlet (25-28).

\*\* There is much of value in Mowat's 1969 survey; esp. pp.91f.

Clarke is right to point to the amalgam of forces involved here: new Liberals, ethical socialists and reformers of various Christian sects. I would like to follow William Morris (1893) in calling them social democrats. Marx and Engels described this form of 'Conservative, or bourgeois socialism' in 1848 as aiming at

administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations [of production]; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labour, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work, of bourgeois government.

(Manifesto: Marx, 1848: 59)

Four years later Marx noted how

The peculiar character of the Social-Democracy is epitomised in the fact that democratic-republic institutions are demanded as a means, not of doing away with two extremes, capital and wage labour, but of weakening their antagonism and transforming it into harmony.

(Eighteenth Brumaire: Marx, 1852: 121)\*

When the Progressive Review was founded in London in 1896 the editor (William Clarke) was both a Fabian and a journalist with the

---

\* Marx is here discussing the particular conditions of France which I think lead him to tie socialdemocracy to the pettybourgeoisie; that element always supply its intellectualist ambiance but it is centrally the normal State form of mature, large-scale, oligopoly capitalism. The programme that Abrams points to rests, of course, on very solid materialist foundations; when these are made unstable so too does Parliamentary politics change. For two perceptive accounts of this Cf. Goldthorpe, 1969 and Meacher, 1974a. Cf. Note 4 to Chapter Three.



Liberal Daily Chronicle; his collaborators were J.A. Hobson; J.R. MacDonald; Charles Trevelyan and H. Samuel (Clarke, 1974:10; he stresses the significance of the 1889 founding of the L.C.C.) Like Chadwick's 'Friends In Council' group; Spencer's 'the X Club'; or the more public Political Economy Club; these new Progressives had their 'Rainbow Circle' which met regularly from 1894 to 1920 and included Hobson, J.R. Maidment, Wallas, Trevelyan and Samuel (Freedon D. Phil Ch.6). As with the early Radicalism, their 'sociology' involved a shifting definition of 'The People' (for example, in Lib-Lab progressivism) in order to persuade 'the working man to acquiesce in ... the existing distribution of wealth'. This also entailed 'an elastic use of the concept of socialism' (Clarke, 161f). The term 'new Liberalism' only dates from 1889 (Clarke, 1974: 166 fn.24) but this 'elasticity' is earlier: in 1885 Joseph Chamberlain spoke of 'the Poor Law as Socialism'; and Henry Sedgwick spoke of a 'general socialistic enthusiasm' (qu Wolfe, 1975: 217f). After Hobhouse joined the Guardian in 1889 Beatrice Webb enthused about it 'as practically our organ' (qu Clarke, 1974: 165; Cf. Weiler, 1972; Owen, 1975). Analysis of the writings of Hobhouse for the press substantiate the above remarks. From this admixture the Labour Party was created<sup>\*</sup>. By 1924 Hobhouse argued that

moderate Labour - Labour in office - has on the whole represented essential Liberalism, not without mistakes and defects, but better than the organised party since

---

\* On the origins of Labour Party theory Cf. Winter's study of the Webbs; GDH Cole; and Tawney (1974); Adelman, 1972; Miliband, 1960; and the texts in Hobsbawm, 1948 and Bealey, 1970. A very relevant study is McKibbin, 1974 and the comparison of the surveys of Labour MPs is very rewarding: Review of Reviews (June 1906), New Society (13 December 1962), and Ibid., (2 December 1976).

C[ampbell] B[annerman]'s death

(qu Clarke, 1974: 178; Hobhouse's emphasis)\*

Towards the end of his life, Hobhouse offered the following classification of the political spectrum:

Communist and Theoretic Socialist;

Ordinary Labour and Good Liberal;

Bad Liberal and Ordinary Tory;

Diehard.

(qu Nicholls, 1962: 127)

The criticism of Labour given by Hobhouse, Keynes, Wallas and others was: that when not in office it was often 'extreme' and in or out of office it lacked intellectuals in control.

The purposes of progressive doctrine are excellently surveyed in Freeden's D.Phil thesis. Redefinitions of the past were a frequent feature of these years as I have mentioned. John Rae, for example:

Cobden, with all his love of liberty, loved progress more, and thought the best Government was the Government that did most for Social Reform.

(1890: 435)

Rae establishes the 'English doctrine of social politics' which stands out clearly 'from the practice of laissez faire' and presents at the same time, 'a distinct face against the modern German theory of State Socialism' (Ibid)\*\*. Social politics, claims Rae,

---

\* Weiler (1972:154f) shows that Hobhouse took his theories of Rent from Hobson and the Webbs. The theme of the 'moderate core' of the Labour Party is a feature of about one Times editorial a month after the February 1974 election.

\*\* He says this and quotes Cobden's 1838 praise of the Prussian State as the best in Europe on the same page! [Contd. on next page, p.422]

distinguishes

Socialistic legislation from sound and wholesome  
 Social Reform ... if we are all Socialists now ...  
 it is not because we have undergone any change of  
 principles on social legislation, but only a public  
 awakening to our social miseries.

(Rae, 1890: 439)

In their desire to serve (in T.H. Green's phrase) 'the cause of social good against class interests' (qu Freedon p.1) the new Liberals and the ethical Socialists were at their most radical in the area of distribution rather than production relations (Freedon Ch.3 Sect.2); not least because the fastest way to increase purchasing power was to raise the spending abilities of the poorest groups. Both Freedon and Hay (1975: 57f) stress that this period saw the stabilisation of the category 'Public Expenditure' as the relation between Budget policy and social welfare was established.

But the central donation of the progressives to Social Democracy in all its variants was the notion of the State as a neutral regulator. This pervades the arguments against monopoly (Freedon D.Phil Ch.3 Sect.2) and 'waste' (Ibid., Sect.3) and merges with both the notion of 'national efficiency' (Searle, 1971) and that of 'body politic' as a social organism (Hobson, and Wallas). The State was to be a secular God or Umpire intervening wherever 'evil' should be found. The moral content of the proposed institutions is clear (Cf. Freedon Ch.4). Hobhouse, Hammond, and Hobson all helped

---

[\*\* Contd. from p.421] Rae published his Social Reform versus Socialism in 1912 (Freedon D.Phil 221f) and was a bitter opponent of nationalization.

to write an anti-working-class paper called The Speaker, one of whose editorials was called 'Towards a social policy'. This argued, as with the 'insurance principle', that a graduated income tax was needed in order that those who bear the cost of government may know that they pay, how they pay, and when they pay.

(qu Freeden Ch.3 Sect.4)\*

But I hope I have shown that this ground was well prepared; the critique of the Radicals in the 1820s and 1830s was precisely of this form. Their opposition to the Poor Law was not a blanket condemnation of some abstract notion of 'State interference', but interference by some State agencies representing certain political powers. They, as much as the New Liberals, knew that institutions had to assist in the self-help and self-regulation of people, and, equally, that some needed more 'help' than others. They knew full well, also, that institutions could not make people moral (although they may restrain them from gross immorality, hence the police forces); that only a revolution in moral values could do this.

We are talking about a ruling class perspective. Let an old Liberal - in fact a LiberalUnionist, close this section. I wonder, with the possible exception of part of the last sentence, how many progressives would disagree with Tremenheere in October 1892? He

---

\* Cf. election literature urging it as 'the sacred duty of every citizen who sympathises with the People, to use all his best energies to secure the election of a Progressive Majority and so help to stay London's further degeneration ...'. Progressives supported 'FUN, but are determined to suppress FILTH'. Tracts BM.8139 df 16(8) their typography.

closed his pamphlet How Good Government Grew Up and How to Preserve It (1893: 24) with this quotation from William Lilly's Century of Revolution (1890). A well-regulated Democracy, says Lilly, is a stage of organic growth, a state of society issuing from the history of the world and the nature of things; a political fact, the result of long continued development; the latest term in a movement that has been in progress since the beginning of European civilisation. It reminds the wealthy of their responsibilities; it recognises the value of man as man; an individuality in which is implanted the germ of progress, and the right to all possible freedom in his efforts to attain it ... This is a Democracy that will not allow itself to be led away by the discounters and jugglers of universal suffrage, but which is schooled and governed by the strong and wise.

---

#### 4. Fabianism and Benthamism\*

Reading Finer (1952a; 1959) it is impossible not to see the many

---

\* Apart from the sources mentioned, the best source is still Mary Mack's 'The Fabians and Utilitarianism' (1955), which gives the Fabian view of Utilitarianism (Cf. Webb, 1922:104f). Cf. McGregor, 1957; Perkin, 1969:261f; 324f. and my own discussion in Chapter One above. I shall not be able to demonstrate the full permeation of Fabian personnel but, for example, Wallas' remarks on the Civil Service need to be related to his service, with J.R. Clynes and Philip Snowden on the MacDonnell Commission of 1912-1914 on the Civil Service, where his/their notes of dissent (e.g. Cd.7338:109f) make valuable reading.

similarities between these two views of social organization. Finer perceptively locates Chadwick (as I would Fabianism) as collectivist: 'his emphasis was on the term "national", the stress was on public rather than private'. 'Benthamism ... led either to complete bureaucracy or complete anarchism ...' (Finer, 1952a: 25). Cobden, Bright, and Spencer are clearly anarchists in this depiction, and the State Servants, Chadwick and all the progressives are bureaucrats. But we can find this in the self-announced theories and practices of major Fabians: in Graham Wallas' remarkable depiction of 'Bentham as political inventor' in 1925\* or in the remarkably Chadwickian chapter 'Official thought' in his famous book which declares that the 'permanent Civil Service' is the 'real "Second Chamber," the real "constitutional check" in England' (1908: 249).

But there are other similarities, most centrally, perhaps in the social relations of Fabianism\*\*. I mean this in two senses:

---

\* Wallas has been very well studied in Wiener (1971) as amended by Collini's 1972 review which notes Wiener's apparent ignorance of 'Abrams' already classic discussion'. Cf. Wolfe, 1975: 228f. Wallas lived from 1858 to 1932.

\*\* Cf. Sweezy, 1949; Hobsbawm, 1964c; MacBriar, 1962; Clarke, 1974; Wolfe, 1975; Walker, 1976; Himmelfarb, 1976 and MacKenzie, 1976. Sidney Webb, Baron Passfield (1859-1947) was a civil servant for thirteen years from the age of 19 to 32. In 1885 he was called to the Bar and in 1886 obtained a thirdclass LL.B. from London. From 1892 (when he had to leave the Civil Service) until 1910 he was LCC Councillor for Deptford, helping to found both the LSE and the New Statesman. 1922-1924 he was M.P. for Seaham; created a Peer in 1927. Beatrice Webb (née Potter) 1858-1943, friend of Spencer and assistant to Booth; was historian of the co-operative movement. They married in 1892 and had no children. Most of their books were genuinely joint productions. Their DNB entry is very perceptive, especially on their book Soviet Communism (1935) with its adulation of The Plan.

first, elitism of operation:

"Nothing in England is done", Webb wrote to Edward Pease in October 1886, "without the consent of a small intellectual yet practical class in London not 2,000 in number. We alone could get at that class ..."

That was, and in some ways remains, the Fabian purpose.

(MacKenzie, 1976: 10; Cf. Walker, 1976)

Second - and here perhaps Marx's categorization of social-democracy as petty-bourgeois is close to the mark - in their 'internal relations'. Just before his death Siegfried Sassoon wrote to his major student:

By the way I knew something about the Fabian movement [sic] as Uncle Hamo's brother-in-law, Sydney Olivier, was active in it. And my younger brother knew the Olivier girls and Rupert Brooke who was in love with one of them. I wasn't so devoid of social conscience as you have assumed!

(Times Literary Supplement 12 March 1976:290; Cf. Annan, 1955).

Stressing how the Fabians ('almost all of them young people scratching a living as clerks and journalists') were 'looking for congenial companions on the fringes of London's literary and political bohemia,' MacKenzie supports my assertion with his quotations. For example

"The Fabians", Edith Nesbit wrote to a friend in February 1884 soon after the society was founded "are quite the nicest set of people I ever knew"

(MacKenzie, 1976: 10)\*

---

\* This is clear also from Beatrice Webb's My Apprenticeship and Our Partnership; and Sidney Webb's 'Coefficient Club' (Cf. Semmel, 1960)

The Fabian Society was founded on the 4th January 1884; Fabian Essays were first issued in December 1889 (27,000 copies being sold in the first eighteen months, Wolfe, 1975: 293 fn.2). Like Clarke (1974: 175f), Wolfe (1975:Ch.3) locates the origins of Fabianism in the politics of Land Reform, particularly in Hyndman's contributions to the Nineteenth Century, and his book England for all. For Hyndman, the State was always 'Good in essence', even the Poor Law was 'communistic in principle'; every extension of 'State rule' was thus a 'stepping-stone to socialism' (Cf. Hyndman, 1881:Ch.4; Tsuzuki, 1973; Hobsbawm, 1948). Henry George's Progress or Poverty (1882; 100,000 copies sold in one year) had much effect, according to Shaw and Max Beer (Wolfe, 1975: 90 fn.68) but George became an anti-socialist in the U.S.A. from 1886). Both Joseph Chamberlain and Lloyd George (the latter with his renditions of the hymn 'God gave the Land to the People') used rhetoric of this character - against: landed wealth, the aristocracy, the monopolists, the visibly wealthy and the obviously powerful.

The Fabian notion of the State and State action was not particularly different from that shared by most progressives. They articulated Darwinian-Spencerian notions, as well as 'the new philosophy of British Idealism' (Wolfe, 1975: 273); they also opposed Oxbridge élitism. The antiSpencerian D.G. Ritchie (a Fabian himself from 1889 to 1893, Wolfe, 1975: 283 fn.89) gave lectures to the Society in 1888 which were later published as Darwinism and politics (1889; Wolfe, 1975: 274 n.65). Although some Liberals (Cf. Clarke, 1974: 162f) were residually committed to a strong variant of Individualism and thus suspicious of all attempts to impose reform without moral change, most of the progress-



ives saw the State as a neutral intervener, and many imbued it with a moral dignity and 'rights' greater than any other claim. The Fabians, following T.H. Huxley, linked national efficiency to Darwinism and added a particular notion of the need for a moral crusade to save the 'British social organism'. And, as Wolfe shows (1975: 282)

Webb's socialist theory invites comparison with that of his sometime Fabian colleague, the idealist philosopher, Bernard Bosanquet, who also [my emph. PC] combined a sweeping assertion of the moral authority of the State - the 'higher self' of every citizen - with a continuous defence of individual liberty and the economics of free trade.

Bosanquet, moreover, translated Schaeffle's The Quintessence of Socialism in 1889 and this was 'widely and approvingly' read by Fabians (Wolfe, 1975: 270 n.54). This comparison with Bosanquet is given added emphasis in Himmelfarb's remarkable 'reading' of Beatrice Webb's 'obsession' with science (for explicating the process of life) and religion (for donating its purpose). Beatrice described herself as declaring at a dinnerparty with the Lord Chancellor (Haldane) and his wife:

the two big forces for good in the world were the scientific method applied to the process of life, and the use of prayer in directing the purpose of life

(qu Himmelfarb, 1976: 789, col.2)

Winter (1974) and Weeks (1976) in their very different ways have illustrated the tensions and ambiguities in the 'socialist' view of the State current in Britain at this time. As usual, Halevy's

essays of 1919, 1921 and 1922\* convey perfectly the sociological content and impact of progressive doctrines. He was the first to realize (a set of practices we are still experiencing) that the 'policy of social peace' was a series of attempts to find the institutional equivalent of Parliament to contain the industrial class-struggle (1919: 121-122). But he reports the Webbs as desiring to 'go further'; he quotes their "happy formula":

Our goal, as socialists, is the elimination of capitalism, but not of the wage system. Far from wanting to abolish the wage system, we want to universalize it. We want all men, instead of being divided into wage-earners and profiteers, to be equally, if not with the same rank, paid functionaries of the State.

(qu Halevy, 1921: 125 Cf. R.K. Webb's note Ibid.; and Halevy, 1922: 153f. Paul, 1917:178-192, is a very able critique)

This is, of course, the 'last word' of the Collectivism which is one wing of the modern social democratic State.

---

## 5. Conclusion

As I indicated in my Preface, this Chapter has a subsidiary place in my thesis and acts as an Epilogue to the central arguments

---

\* Halevy reports (1921:124) whom he met and talked to - Fabians, Guild Socialists and he visited 'the home of British Bolshevism':- the mines of South Wales.

of the previous text. But when we are dealing with the very complex filiation of ideas, lineages of the State and the fragile construction and destruction of political alignments it is necessary to keep a very broad time-scale in mind.

What I have sought to show here is the degree to which T.H. Green's ideas - and philosophy in general - have been given a far too great causal significance in the aetiology of the Liberal Reforms. This period is marked by a number of crises and consequent reconstructions of ideological and political paradigms. As with my whole narrative the real basis of the working-class Socialist alternative has not been represented, neither have the attempts by the major parties to penetrate the new mass publics\* been properly integrated into the account.

Nevertheless, hopefully sufficient has been presented to show how recent historiography points to a new interpretation of those Liberal Reforms, the origins of the Labour Party and related issues. In sum, I have argued that we cannot think away the work of the State Servants from the 1830s to the 1870s in their construction of major and enduring State apparatuses and practices, together with a marginalization of non-Erastian alternatives. To talk of a State perspective by the 1870s is not at all idealistic; whether we base ourselves on the terrain of the ruling or ruled classes. Much of the new theory of the 1880s and beyond must be seen as descriptive justification rather than a priori prescription.

---

\* B. Harrison's work on Tory agencies (1973a) and Hanham's sketch of Liberal 'organizations for working men' (1963); along with the accounts of Roach (1957), Cornford (1963), and Perkin (1969) are all relevant here.

Wallas was right to see the Civil Service (i.e. the modern State)  
as the political invention of the nineteenth century.

---

## A F T E R W O R D

It is important to register a number of crucial changes which have so transformed the State in Britain that the sketches of the genesis of the modern, democratic Nation-State which I have offered are no longer sufficient\*. This will avoid misunderstanding.

Since I began work on these themes, in the late 1960s, there have been at least half a dozen major structural (including ideological) 'shifts' which have begun to substantially alter the institutions, practices, and ideologies of the State in Britain. They follow, of course, from the ending of British Imperialism and from the subordination of British industrial capitalism to external control and ownership, despite the persisting world significance of British fiscal institutions. But there is more to this than a simple story of decline. To suggest, sociologically, that we are in 'an era of imperialism', should imply some serious attempt to comprehend changes in the nature of the State. Like the old Nation-State, the new conglomerates of States have their origins in competition; war is, after all, only competition carried to its apogee. The new forms of permanent alliance (NATO, SEATO, CENTO) are quite different from the treaties and alliances of former epochs, despite the continuity of certain concepts such as 'spheres of influence'. But, appearances notwithstanding, the basis for these

---

\* Apart from a lack of historical depth, studies such as Miliband (1969) also need 'correction'. The so-called renaissance of the Marxist theory of the State is largely based upon the need to comprehend changes since the mid 1960s.

new 'Stateconglomerates' is not warfare but production, distribution and exchange. This has had the effect, particularly in capitalist Europe, of attenuating the National State institutions. The exactly contrary effect is visible in the 'new' countries of the capitalist world market, where 'enlarged' States act as necessary 'gatekeepers' for flows of capital, commodities and labour. In sum, more clearly than at any previous time, the relations between State forms and the world-market are now available for inspection and theorisation. My thesis errs in providing only an 'inward' reference which needs complementing by showing how the State is made through competition against external forces.

In the preceding pages I have indicated, by footnote and aside, the contemporary relevance of some of the arguments presented. It would be quite wrong if these indicators were taken literally, as if they provided an explanation of the State apparatuses which now exist. Periodization is always extremely tentative this close to events, but the July measures of 1966 provide a convenient benchmark from which to begin. Since that date the following changes have had such an effect as to modify the actions and reactions whose aetiology I have sought to provide: the most complete restructuring of the national and local State as has been ever undertaken in British history; the advent of the European Economic Community and, simultaneously, the arrival of 'nationalism' and 'regionalism' as real political forces within the British State (the war in Ireland is the most severe expression of this facet of the State's physiognomy); discussion and generation of a widespread ideology concerning 'social responsibility' in 'business' (the participation movement is clearly related to this). To this list, we should add a series of extremely

revealing episodes and tendencies following the two General Elections of 1974 (themselves, of course, important events): discussion of the 'need' for voting reforms; extensive and innovatory criticism of the 'dictatorship' of the Civil Service, including a rapid increase in assaults on various Customs and Inland Revenue officials; calls for the need for a check on Parliamentary power, most clearly in the Hailsham theory of an 'elective dictatorship'; and, most significant of all in many ways, the new political theories associated with Sir Keith Joseph, monetarism, and the Institute of Economic Affairs\*.

The criticism of the Civil Service has been most apparent in its populist variants which we may exemplify from the Daily Mail declaration:

The plain fact is: We're being run by a secret elite  
that has lost its nerve

(17 June 1975; Cf. editorial, 26.2.1976)

This shades into anti-political rhetoric of a particular character:

Our rulers seem to be both blind and deaf. They  
dwell in a land of their own, living off a diet of  
Civil Service briefs and party propoganda.

They make pretentious speeches about the British disease.

But the truth is that THEY are the British disease.

They are the slowcoaches holding back the class.

(editorial, 18 October 1976, their typography)\*\*

---

\* Despite the size of these changes, there is little literature (but Cf. my note 4 to Ch.3). On the restructuring both Russell-Smith (1974) and Thornhill(1975) show how the 26 Departments of 1956 became 17 in 1972 and that five giant Departments dominate. The advent of, e.g. special advisers, the Central Policy Review Staff, [Contd. on p.435]

The whole set of changes sketched above has been accompanied by a new 'openness' in discussion; the period from 1966 to 1976 has seen the entry into common (political) discourse of terms and theories which were previously at the margin of academic and political discussion. Terms like 'State', 'class', 'capitalism'; concepts like the 'profit/wages equation' and value-added per worker; and social theories which are militantly defended, thus:

Like it or not, our society is based on the theory of capitalism!

(Harris, 1974 in Times 4 December 1974)

have emerged from the shadows and now form the substance of speeches and articles by Conservatives. Two quotations can illustrate this. From the Right of the Conservative tradition Nicholas Stacey (writing from the Reform Club about 'an informed nation') argued

To understand how the modern State hangs together, the production, distribution and exchange functions must be broadly understood by all who, in whatever job, will earn an income.

(Financial Times, 1976)\*

From the Centre-Left of the same tradition, Robert Carr argued:

I believe very strongly, with [sic] what I think is genuine Tory principle, that there should be intervention

[\* and \*\* contd. from p.434] and patronage (see my Ch.1 and Moorehead, Times, 4-7 October 1976) all need to be related.

\*\* One sort of response is to be found in Sir Douglas Allen's lecture 'Ministers and their Mandarins' (summarised, Times 14 October 1976)

\* I am grateful to Harvie Ramsay for drawing this letter to my attention.



in the economy for social reasons and [my emphasis, PC] to deal with a situation where competitive forces are not working properly.

(qu Listener 26/6/1975; Cf. Harris, 1972; Gamble, 1974)

The move towards Theory by various Conservative politicians is a very noticeable feature which has received corporate expression in the document The Right Approach (1976) which employs de Tocqueville, exactly as, for example did J.S. Mill or Tremenheere, and his notions of 'character' and 'habit', to show how unEnglish is the ('Marxist') Labour Party. The theories of Joseph and Hailsham are worth more than a mention since they relate directly to classical debates summarised in this thesis. In both cases, to begin with, it is noteworthy that each theorist discovered the 'problem', to which he addresses himself, only after they had vacated high political office. To that extent the phenomenon is not new, the deep undertow of electoral pragmatism remains at work.

It is not only the frankness of Sir Keith Joseph which is noteworthy, it is the direction of that against received Conservative pragmatism (including a repudiation of his own actions in the past). His speeches frequently cite socialist works (e.g. Glyn and Sutcliffe) or try to show what an Erastianiser was Marx, and there is a strong empirical basis to many of his arguments. Thus, it is true that semi-Socialism has intractable 'inherent contradictions' (1976:9) or, to give the subtitle of a 1974 speech, that 'Intervention is Destroying us'. But it is not this accuracy - the 'us' being a particular kind of community, of course - which is remarkable; nor is it his extended argument for the 'market economy' based upon the

notion that inflation is caused by Governments and is a worse 'evil' than unemployment: what is most noteworthy is his similarity with the State Servants I have studied above in his desire to capture and mould public opinion. This is the 'opportunity' that should be seized (1976: 72):

We have the big task of opening the public's eyes to what is practicable. Governments are only free to act within the constraints set by public opinion. It is my job and the job of the Centre for Policy Studies now being set up to show what can be done, indeed what has been done, in nearby humane societies.

(1976: 10)

It is not, however, simply that public opinion must be correctly informed so that it can constrain wrong Government - Joseph is also concerned that a machine (the State) exists which can all too easily slip into the hands of a non-bourgeois elite. I noted above (Section 1 of Chapter Three) how Joseph considered there had not been a bourgeois revolution in Britain; that is why he can argue

The objective for our lifetime, as I have come to see it, is embourgeoisement. ... \*

Our idea of the goodlife, the end product, and of embourgeoisement - in the sense of life-style, behaviour pattern and value-structure - has much in common with that held by Social Democrats, however much we may differ about the kind of social economic structure best capable of bringing about and sustaining the state of affairs we desire.

...

---

Cf. Paul Johnson's various writings of 1976 on congruent themes, especially his contribution to the 'Jubilee Britain' supplement to the Times (5 January 1977) which advances the thesis that Socialism should have meant the embourgeoisement of the working class!

Our job is to recreate the conditions which will again permit the forward march of embourgeoisement, which went so far in Victorian times and even in the much maligned 'thirties', when home-ownership made such strides.

(1976: 55, 56, 57)

But it is when he returns to the lack of a bourgeois revolution that Joseph presents a whole cluster of ideas which have been woven through my thesis. What follows represents, I suggest, the complaint of one facet of political economy (the anarchist, competitive, entrepreneurial) against another (the collectivist, managed, and bureaucratic):

Britain never really internalized capitalist values, if the truth be known. For four centuries, since wealthy commercial classes with political standing began to be thrown up following the supercession of feudalism and the selling off of monastic property, the rich man's aim was to get away from the background of trade - later industry - in which he had made his wealth and power. Rich and powerful people founded landed-gentry families; the capitalist's son was educated not in capitalist values but against them, in favour of the older values of army, church, upper civil service, professions and land-owning. This avoided the class struggles between middle and upper strata familiar from European history - but at what cost.

If you re-read the original Fabian essays, you will find in them much of the upper middle class professional and service families' disdain for commercial

folk, for the businessman, the industrialist. The idea that the government ought to run everything, rather than private individuals or companies, which forms the core of Socialism, is not new at all. It is pre-capitalist, upper-class. In a sense it meant the militarization of society; for the army is organized as Socialists would organise an economy. It meant the bureaucratization of society, with the civil service running everything instead of just something.

(1976: 60-61)

The novel features of Hailsham's theories are rather different; they are best seen in his lecture 'Elective Dictatorship' (extracts, Times 15 October 1976). His 'problem' is, in fact, the same as that of Joseph and others: on the one hand, they fear that a powerful instrument has been fashioned to serve the class they represent and that this State machine may be used against them; on the other hand, they express the deeper uncertainties of all political philosophies when their 'material preconditions' have become practically extinguished. For Joseph the major constraint on the State is to be public opinion; for Hailsham a series of institutional changes are required, including a Bill of Rights (Cf. Griffith, 1975), a written constitution, and further use of referenda. However these fairly major changes are couched within a framework which sees 'tradition' as the 'cement' of our social order:

the best way of achieving continuity is by a thorough reconstruction of the fabric of our historic mansion. It is no longer wind or weather proof. Nor are its foundations still secure.

(Times, 15 October 1976: 4)

The effect of the Hailsham proposals would be to increase, as he would express it, 'the rule of law' since the courts would police the central and devolved agencies. In this, of course, his suggested changes are congruent with the gradual diminution of controls by elected assemblies in favour of appointed boards which is a central feature of the reorganization of the State since the mid-1960s\* and is most noticeable in the case of the National Health Service, the 'utilities' (Water, Electricity, Gas), and the policy councils (e.g. for Planning at Regional levels). As Hailsham himself notes, moreover, the Judges have begun already to demonstrate what this would mean; he cites recent cases (such as Tameside or Laker Skytrain), it would have been more to the point to have cited the longer historical sequence regarding Trades Unions. Finally there is a strong contradiction between the Hailsham and Joseph prescriptions. Many accounts exist to show the traditional nature of the judiciary, as an elite; they rarely exemplify those bourgeois virtues that Joseph desires to become more extensive. Although the Judiciary have rarely, if ever, systematically supported the ruled class (as a class) against the ruling class; neither have they 'brandished' and 'celebrated' the virtues of the entrepreneur.

. . . . .

One last point. Even if the next ten years were to bring the complete destruction of the United Kingdom State through absorption 'upwards' into the E.E.C. and similar institutions or disintegration

---

\* This is most noticeable in the Central Policy Review Staff document A Joint framework for Social Policies, which is an extremely overt declaration of Chadwickian themes, as the Times made clear in a leader 'The Making of Social Policy' (24 May 1975), which comments on a Cabinet discussion of the CPRS proposals.

'downwards' into national and regional State apparatuses, some of the fundamental props of the State (any State) I have summarised would remain. The State, after all, reflects the production relations of the social formation it represents: the capitalist State reflects (and regulates) a particular social and technical division of Labour, and sustains the required conditions for production. One should not see the possible 'absorption' or 'disintegration' as marking the 'withering away' of the State; this requires a far wider transformation. That does not deny, of course, the possibility of such a 'wider transformation' however difficult this thesis has shown that to be.

. . . . .

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

NOTES

APPENDICES

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

## Note 1

1. The Debates(a) Standard of 'Living':

Taylor, 1975, is the best summary (his 1974 introduction varies his earlier conclusions, 1960) and Flinn (1974) is the best review on the much narrower subject of wages (the best statistical source is still the Bowley, 1898 onwards, series, although Hunt, 1973, has added much regional information). The major texts are: Hobsbawm, 1957; Hartwell, 1959, 1961, 1963; Hobsbawm, 1963, 1964a; Hartwell, 1965a, 1972. See also: Thompson, The Making (1963:Ch.10); Burnett, 1966; Neale, 1966b and Inglis, 1971. I detail the literature on the related (but rarely considered) Poor Law below.

(b) 'Class'

Hollis (1973) is not only a good selection, but displays the cultural evidence that must be employed. Cf. Bestor, 1948; Williams, 1956; Bendix, 1957, 1960, 1963; Briggs, 1956; 1960; Beer, 1957, 1969; E.P. Thompson, 1963, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1971 (Cf. Coats, 1972b and Genovese, 1973), 1975; P. Anderson, 1963; Nairn, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1970; J.M. Main, 1955; Tholfsen, 1954, 1961, 1971; R.B. Rose, 1965; Neale, 1966a, 1968; Foster, 1966, 1974; N. Young, 1967; McCord, 1967a; Poulantzas, 1968; Guttman, 1968, 1969; Tyrrell, 1970; Church, 1971; G.S. Jones, 1971, 1974; Himmelfarb, 1971; Arnstein, 1972; R. Young, 1973; B. Supple, 1974; Neale, 1975b. On The Family: Smelser, 1959, 1963; Collier, 1964; M. Anderson, 1971a, c, 1973; McKendrick, 1971.

On Occupations: Levi, 1885; Booth, 1886; Day, 1927; Hobsbawm, 1964b; Armstrong, 1966; Chaloner, 1969; Nicolaus, 1970; M. Anderson, 1972; Gray, 1973a, b; Rowe, 1973b; Hopkins, 1975.

(c) 'Ideas' IGNORING SOCIALISM

Cf. Halevy's History; Barker, 1915; Vereker, 1964; Perkin, 1969. Annan (1955) covers the 'intellectual aristocracy'.

(i) Political Economy/Benthamism:

Mill, 1838; Webb, 1922; Wallas, 1908, 1925; Halevy, 1934; Pascal, 1938; Checkland, 1949; Coates, 1950; Robbins, 1952, 1973; Mee k, 1954, 1973;



## Note 1 continued

(c)(i) continued:

Clements, 1955, 1961 (Cf. Malchow, 1976); Schaeffer, 1957; Coats, 1958, 1960, 1967, 1972a; Roberts, 1959; Finer, 1952a, 1959; Rosenberg, 1960; Winch, 1963; 1971; Hamburger, 1963; Goldstrom, 1966; S. Moore, 1966; Gilmour, 1967; Hollander, 1968, 1971; Hamowy, 1968; Tyrrell, 1969; Himmelfarb, 1969; Dobb, 1973; James, 1973; Rosenblum, 1973; Henriques, 1974; Forbes, 1975.

(ii) Ricardian Socialism:

Lowenthal, 1911; E. Thompson, 1963; Hollis, 1970.

(iii) The Mill Family:

W. Thomas, 1969, 1971a, b, 1974; D. C. Moore, 1969; Ryan, 1969, 1974; Mazlish, 1975.

(iv) Francis Place:

Thomas, 1962; E. Thompson, 1963; B. Harrison, 1968; Rowe, 1973a. Cf. Place's papers, 1970; 1971.

(v) Religion:

Census of 1851: Mann, 1855; K. Inglis, 1960; Pickering, 1967. Best, 1967; Crowther, 1970; Treble, 1970; D. M. Thompson, 1972, 1974; Hanham, 1973; B. Harrison, 1973a, b.

(vi) Methodism:

Halevy, 1906, 1912: Part 3, Ch. 1; Wearmouth, 1948; Hobsbawm, 1957b; Tholfsen, 1961, 1971; E. Thompson, 1963: Ch. 11; Stigants, 1971; Hey, 1973; Sammel, 1973.

(vii) Other:

Evangelicalism: Halevy's History; Bradley, 1976. On Ashley-Shaftesbury Bready, 1926; Finlayson, 1974.

Christian Socialism: Holyoake, 1906; Saville, 1954; Backstrom, 1974.

Moral Agencies: Neale, 1972a; Binfield, 1973; Shiman, 1974; B. Harrison, 1974.

(viii) Secularism:

E. Thompson, 1963, 1964; R. B. Smith 1967; Royle, 1971, 1974.

.....

(d) 'Voting' IGNORING CHARTISM

The most important studies are those of D. C. Moore, T. J. Nossiter and Blewett on the Franchise, and Aydelotte on Commons' voting.

## Note 1 continued

(d) continued

Cf. Young, 1867 (and other of the Essays in Reform); Herrick, 1948; Hobsbawm, 1948; Foord, 1964; Maehl, 1967, 1975; McCord, 1967a; Vincent, 1966, 1967; Neale, 1967a, b; Heasman, 1970 (Cf. Fraser, 1960); Himmelfarb, 1969b; F.B. Smith, 1969; Fraser, 1970; Wright, 1970; Wilson, 1974.

Parties: Beales, 1967, 1971.

Local studies: Chaloner, 1958, Dyos, 1968, 1973; Hennock, 1963, 1973; Dunrabin, 1963 and Finlayson, 1960 are general studies. For London: Rude, 1971; Sheppard, 1971; Schmiechen, 1975. For Leeds: Hennock, 1966, 1973; Fraser, 1971a, b, c, d, ; 1972. For Birmingham: Briggs, 1947, 1952; Tholfson, 1954; Hennock, op.cit. Others: Wright, 1969; Newton, 1966; Neale, 1966b. For the North East: Burn, 1956; McCord, 1967b, 1969a, b; 1969c; 1972b; Mawson, 1970; Rogers, 1971, 1974; Manders, 1973a, b; Heesom, 1974a; and the work of T.J. Nossiter.

(e) 'State'

General surveys: Cromwell, 1966; Sutherland, 1970; Taylor, 1972 (Cf. Collini, 1974; O. Anderson, 1974b).

(i) Laissez faire vs. State Intervention:

Mantoux, 1928: Part 3 Ch.4; Beales, 1945; Polanyi, 1945; Lipson, 1946; Brebner, 1948; Carr, 1951; McGregor, 1951; Briggs, 1961; Goldthorpe, 1962; G. Kitson Clark, 1962: 96f; Gordson, 1955; Burn, 1964; Crouch, 1967; Hanson, 1972; George, 1972, 1976; Thane, 1974; McCord, 1974. A major study remains Perkin, 1969.

(ii) The 'Revolution in Government' debate:

Coates, 1950; Blaug, 1958; O. MacDonagh 1953, 1955, 1958a, b, 1961 (Cf. Burn, 1963), 1962a, b, 1967; Parris, 1960, 1969: Ch.9; Roberts, 1957, 1959, 1960; Lambert, 1962a, b, 1963; Hart, 1965; Midwinter, 1966, 1968b; Gutchen 1961 (Cf. Midwinter, 1967, 1968a, c, 1969); Hume, 1967; McCord, 1969b, 1972a; Brundage, 1972, 1974; Peelaw, 1974; Harvie, 1974a; P.G. Richards Ph.D. thesis and the studies in Sutherland, 1972.  
On the Board of Trade: Prouty, 1957; Brown, 1958; Parris, 1965.  
On the Treasury: Torrance, 1968; Wright, 1969a, b; Roseveare, 1973.

Note 1 continued; Note 2 begun

(e) continued

(iii) The Civil Service

Gretton, 1913; Cohen, 1941; Finer, 1952a, b; G. Kitson Clark, 1959; Gladden, 1967; Parris, 1968; Fay, 1969 are the general studies. The best introduction to 'official thought' is J. B. Bourn's memorandum to Fulton (Report, Vol. 3; 423f) and the historical first Chapter to the 4th MacDonnell Report (Cd. 7338, 1912). On the Higher Servants: Kelsall, 1955; Fry, 1969; Chapman, 1970. Sainty is working his way through all the Ministries providing excellent lists of all staff.

For general surveys within the nineteenth century: Roberts, 1960; Parris, 1969: Ch. 8. For particular individuals: my Appendix I, R. J. Wilmot Horton: Ghosh, 1964; Brynn, 1972; Johnston, 1972: Ch. 4; J. Backhouse: Middleton, 1974; Cromwell, 1969; Jones, 1975.

(iv) On the 1854 Reforms:

Taylor, 1832; Hughes, 1942, 1949; Hart, 1960, 1969; Torrance, 1968. On the Ministerial System: Hintze, 1908; Gretton, 1913; Schaeffer, 1957; Willson, 1955; Fraser, 1960; Clarke, 1975. On the Cabinet: Laski, 1928; Willson, 1959.

(v) Nation-States:

Apart from Hintze: Barker, 1930; Kiernan, 1965; Supple, 1972; Bean, 1973; Newman, 1973; Finer, 1975 and the material listed in Note 1 to CHAPTER THREE below.

(vi) Informal Erastian Agencies

McGregor, 1957; Abrams, 1968; Hollis, 1974. On the Administrative Reform Association: O. Anderson, 1965, 1974a (Cf. Dickens, 1855; Lewis, 1950). On Statistical Societies: Cullen, 1975; On the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science: Rogers, 1952. On the Central Society of Education, Parkin, 1975.

---

2. Jeremy Bentham

(Following Helvy, Harrison, Everett, Parekh). Born, 1748, the son of a lawyer of 'Jacobite sympathies' who was 'of some standing

## Note 2 continued

in the City of London' and 'a well-to-do- middle-class and Tory family' (Harrison, 1948:vii). As to Bentham's own politics: Leavis (1950:33) considers him Tory-inclined; Bentham himself attended Wilkes' trial as a Tory sympathizer. The influence of Ricardo, Place and Mill seems crucial (Dinwiddy, 1975, is a good account). Bentham was educated partly at home and partly at Westminster School until the age of 12, when he entered Queen's College, Oxford; he took his B.A. at 16 (having studied much science as well as classics) and entered Lincoln's Inn, returning to Oxford to hear Blackstone lecture. He lived on £103 a year (plus some income from writing and quite large fees for consultation) until 1792. He read avidly in what we would call social science (notably Hume, Beccaria, Helvetius, Hartley and Priestley) and practised home chemistry and physics, whilst studying engineering. By the age of 20 (Himmelfarb, 1969:196f) he had made his 'discovery' of Legislation and his commitment to produce a science of it. His writing is voluminous: the existing (Bowring) Collected works numbers eleven volumes of 600,000 words each; there are 173 boxes or portfolios, with about 350 pages in each, in the Bentham Mss. at University College and there are a further 1,300 letters (not in the Bowring ed.) held in the British Library. Much of the work was produced through collaboration, particularly with James Mill, and with Chadwick, his Secretary from 1829. Works relevant to this thesis include the Fragment (1776); Introduction to the Principles of Morals (1789) and the rambling materials of the Constitutional Code.

From 1792 Bentham had £700 a year inheritance. He met Mill in 1808. From 1812 onwards Place was another disciple. In 1824 Bentham helped fund and found the Westminster Review. Bentham was a shareholder in Owen's New Lanark. He died in 1832.

One particular incident is worth noting. In 1785 Jeremy went to Russia to visit his brother Samuel and help the latter establish a model colony on Prince Potemkin's estates in the Ukraine (Harrison, 1948:viii; Everett, 1966:35f). It is worth stressing: (i)

Note 2 concluded; Note 3 begun

we know (Alston;Sinel;Starr) that these imports of 'foreign experts' typify much development within Tsarist Russia (the second edition of Aschrott's study of the English Poor Law was, after all, commissioned by the Tsarina); (ii) this overseas travelling was a learning experience:Smith(Dobb,1973:41f) learned much whilst in France and Switzerland in the mid-1760s. Whilst in Russia, Jeremy wrote a brief treatise on political economy.

Samuel Bentham (1757-1831,Jeremy's younger brother) was Inspector-General of Naval Works in England 1796-1805 and Everett (1966:76f) suggests that Samuel's tasks there- to cut out aristocratic corruption and to 'rationalise' the dockers- may have been directly influential on Jeremy's Code. Certainly we do know that the London Docks were directly influential on State Policy, in the 1810-1830 period (Pudney, 1975:186f) when casualization was being forced on dockers by employers and State, in the 1880s (G.S.Jones,1971) when that same casualization was being condemned for its 'morals', and in the 1960s when the same regime was attacked and altered because it had given far too much power to the dockers (Devlin Report; Jones-Aldington Agreement). The Thames Police, moreover- of which J.Bentham and Patrick Colquhoun were the "true begetters"- predates, by some 30 years, Peel's so called 'first' police force (Everett,1966:67f).

.....

### 3. The Poor Law

Rose(1972) surveys the literature, as do the essays in Fraser(1976b). Texts are given by Rose,1971 and Bruce, 1973b.

The best analyses remain Beales, 1931;1948.

I do not list here twentieth century studies, this is not to deny that the 'paradigm' of 1834 still lives on, for reasons explained by Marx (1867:Ch.25 Section 4), since we still have a variety of specifically coercive labour markets (Cf.Corrigan,1976).

#### (a) Pre 1834:

Ppund,1971;Oxley,1974;Coats,1960;Blaug,1963,1964 (Cf.Taylor,1969); Huzel,1969;McCloskey,1972;Baugh,1975;Tucker,1975.

Note 3 concluded; Note 4 begun

(b) 1834 Poor Law:

Aschrott, 1902 remains the best survey. Cf. Webb, 1910, 1922, 1929a, b; Roberts, 1963; Henriques, 1968. Rose, 1966a; Midwinter, 1967; McCord, 1969b, 1972a, 1976; Hanson, 1972; Fraser, 1973, 1976a; Brundage, 1972, 1974, 1975; Dunkley, 1973, 1974; Bythell, 1974; Checkland, 1974 and the studies in Fraser, 1976b.

(c) Local Studies:

Longmate, 1974 and Anstey, 1973 discuss Andover; Digby, 1975, the Eastern Counties. For others: Lewis, 1964; Fraser, 1971b; Smith, 1974; Caplan, 1970; Griffin, 1974; Conquest, 1975. For Ireland: MacDonagh, 1962; Scotland: Mitchison, 1974; C.S. Loch, 1898.

(d) Anti-Poor Law Movement:

E. Thompson, 1963, 1971; D. Jones, 1976; Rose, 1966b, 1970; Hollis, 1970; Edsall, 1958; On Rayner Stephens: Ward, 1958, D.A. Johnson, 1973.

.....

4. Trevelyan and Northcote

Charles Edward Trevelyan (1807-1886) was 'a keen whig with no leanings towards the Radicals' (Hart, 1960:109; Cf. Perkin, 1969:269 who considers Trevelyan a Benthamite). He was not always liked by his political masters: in 1843 Sir James Graham considered C.T. 'a blockhead' (Brown, 1958:61) and his use of the Press (Hart, 1960: 93) angered politicians, Sir Robert Peel- following CT's writing publicly about Ireland- called him 'a consummate fool' (Kitson Clark, 1959:31). Trevelyan entered the Indian Civil Service in 1826 and served the East India Company until 1838. From the 21st January 1840 to the same date in 1859 he was Assistant Secretary to the Treasury; (being paid £2,000 p.a. until early 1845 and £2,500 p.a. thereafter; plus an extra £2,500 when he served as Commissioner<sup>for</sup> Relief in Ireland- for comparison (Sainty, Vol.I:27) reports Chancellors of the Exchequer after 1831 as having £5,000 p.a. or £7,500 when also First Lord). C.T. was knighted 27 April 1848. In 1859 he became Governor of Madras.

Cf. Torrance, 1968; Parris, 1969; Hart, 1960, 1969; and Sainty, Vol.I. On the Trevelyans see Annan (1955) and D.N.B.

Note 4 concluded; Note 5 begun

Stafford Henry Northcote (1818-1887):

Private Secretary to W.E.Gladstone 1842-1845; Legal Assistant to the Board of Trade (after Gladstone ceased to be President) 22nd March 1845 until 1850, although not qualified in law until 1847. From 3.1.1850, one of the Secretaries for the Great Exhibition. Succeeded to Baronetcy 17 March 1851. MP:1855,Wigan;1858, Stamford; 1866,NorthDevon. Financial Secretary to the Treasury, 21 January to 24 June 1859. President of the Board of Trade, 6 July 1866 to 8 March 1867. 1874: Chancellor of the Exchequer. 1885: Created Earl of Iddesleigh. (Sainty, Vols. I, III; DNB).

.....

#### 5. Patronage 1870 onwards

The way in which 'educational' replaced 'familial' (more narrowly political) patronage is displayed in all the major Civil Service Enquiries. Wider educational implications are evident, e.g. in the first recommendation of the 1912 MacDonnell Report (Cd.6209:101). There are reciprocal recommendations between the Taunton Commission, concerning relevant commercial subjects, and the Ridley Commission on Establishments.

In the Appendix to the third MacDonnell Report, Professor F.B. Jevons writes

The highest education given at the University [ of Durham ], involving as it does the moral as well as the intellectual training of the whole man, does tend to promote the efficient discharge of their functions by members of the Civil Service.

(Cd. 6740 Appx. XXV, p.307)

The MacDonnell Commission entirely supports my argument- they show the growth of patronage. In 1919 there were 5947 nominated posts, compared with 4142 in 1881. From their ten years survey(1901-1910) it is clear that nomination filled more posts than all other kinds of entry combined:

27,369 Open Competition;

7,669 Limited Competition

62, 568 Nomination

(Cd. 6210: Appendix, Q.325 and Annex 1).

This trend has continued.

Ch. I, Note 5 concluded; Ch.2, Note 1 begun

The late Maurice Edelman (1975a,b,c,d) and others (Moorehead,1976) have shown some 304 organizations dispensing patronage of about £2500 m.a year for around 10,000 'places'. Wedgwood Benn, in a review of Wilson's Governance of Britain (in the Bristol Evening Post, qu Times 30 October 1976), has shown the use of these patronage powers by one Prime Minister.

Parallel to the control of entry by either educational or patronage 'filters' has been a middle class populist critique of the Civil Service. This is evident in the Daily Mail editorials against 'a secret elite'.

One example brings together my statement that patronage persists, with the work of others (e.g. Boyd,1974) on the class nature of entrants to the Higher Civil Service. The (London) Evening News of 26th October, 1976, has the following editorial:

'So Easy

We have often wondered what it takes to get to the top in Whitehall.

This is Lord Crowther-Hunt's view, as expounded to a Commons committee investigating the Civil Service

"Be born in classes one or two, go to public school, read classics at Oxford..."

Simple, isn't it? As simple, indeed, as being born with a silver spoon in your mouth.'

---

## CHAPTER TWO

### 1. Marx and the capitalist State

Any survey has to begin with class (Cf.Poulantzas,1974; and Westergaard, 1975) or, more narrowly, Marx's political theory (Cf.R.N.Hunt,1974; M.Shaw,1974;Blackburn,1976;Therborn,1976:Ch.6)

#### (i) Important Discussions

Engels,1888,1891,1894:Part II Chs.2-4(Cf.Hodges,1965;Coulter,1971; G.S.Jones,1973; Adamiak,1974).

Lenin,1895,1899(Cf.Harding,1975;A.Hunt,1976);1917a,b;1919.

Lukacs' political writings (1967,1968).

Gramsci (discussed below).



## Note 1 continued

Cf. Chang, 1931; Hal Draper, 1962a,b (Cf. Weydemeyer, 1852), 1970, 1971, 1974 and his forthcoming two volume study; Borkenau, 1937; Sanderson, 1963; Miliband, 1965; Lefebvre, 1966: Ch. 5; Ollman, 1971, 1975; A. Wood, 1972- the latter has been most influential on my thesis, as has Neil Lockwood's 'Note' of 1970.

(ii) Other material:

(a) On Hegel-and-Marx: Marcuse (e.g. 1955); Hyppolite, 1955; Coletti, 1969, 1974; Althusser, 1970a; Avineri, 1972 .

(b) Philosophical discussions: Skillen, 1972, 1974; Miller, 1974; Beirne, 1975.

(c) Historiographical discussions: P. Anderson, 1962, 1965; T. Nairn, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1970, 1975; E. Thompson, 1965, 1974; Poulantzas, 1966.

(d) Multi-State studies: R. Murray, 1971; Warren, 1971, 1972; Poulantzas, 1973 (Revised as 1974: Ch. 1).

(iii) Specific sub-debates:

(a) On Gramsci: G. Williams, 1960, 1974; Fiore, 1965; Genovese, 1967; Merrington, 1968; Martinelli, 1968; Pozzolini, 1968; Kiernan, 1972; Todd, 1974; Bates, 1975; Boggs, 1976. Gramsci's ideas have been influential in the debate indicated at (ii) (c) above and in cultural studies, Cf. R. Williams, 1973b, 1974, 1975.

(b) The Poulantzas-Miliband debate: Poulantzas, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1973, 1976 (Cf. Althusser, 1970b; E. Balibar, 1972; Girardin, 1972- and above all- Rancière, 1973) and Miliband, 1969, 1970, 1973. Laclau offers a summary (1975).

(c) Recent work:

In Germany: Habermas and Offe.

In France: Apart from Althusser et al, studies by Lefebvre and others, relate the State to 'everyday life'.

Two review articles of such trends are given by Gold et al (1975).

(iv) Economy-management and the State:

Mattick, 1969; Glyn, 1971, 1972; Yaffe, 1973a, b; Vaizey, 1973; M. Meacher, 1974a, b; Gpugh, 1975 (Cf. Fine, 1976); Vaizey, 1976; Glennerster, 1976; Peston, 1976; Holland, 1976; Gamble, 1976 and the issues of the journal Politics and Money from 1970. For the U.S.A. see Baran, 1966; O'Connor, 1973;

Braverman, 1974:Ch.14 Note 1 concluded and issues of Monthly Review 1974 onwards CHAPTER TWO

Two studies of modern conservatism in the U.K. are relevant here:  
Harris,1972;Gamble,1974.

Note:

It must be stressed- with some force- that almost all these debates are marked by a sterility which makes their study by anyone about to undertake historical investigation singularly unrewarding. Moreover, where there once was some commitment to historical investigation- in particular individuals or in the substance of these Debates- there has been a recent shift toward greater aridity. Even Miliband, for example, does not emphasize overmuch how his own study(1969) relates- or may be related, to historical study, including his own of socialism (1962). Perry Anderson appears to recognize the same pattern as I have sketched here- his two books on the State (1974a,b) carry an implicit mea culpa; made explicit as the 'afterword' to his survey of 'Western Marxism'(1976).

It is only right to add that many of the great classics of Marxist historiography- Christopher Hill or Edward Thompson- show only implicitly what the theoretical implications of their investigations might be.

What seems to have happened is that both 'orthodox' and 'cultural' Marxists (the contrast I am drawing would be embodied in contrasting Eric Hobsbawm and Raymond Williams) find the State a problem. For the orthodox the State follows changes taking place in the productive base; for the cultural, the State tends to have an ad hoc, fragmentary role. But we have to see that State apparatuses not only have to be constructed (and meanings established for social categories) but sustained. Cf Corrigan, 1975b; Sayer Ph.D. thesis.

....

On Weber: I have indicated the sources in Note 1 to Chapter 3  
Cf E.O.Wright,1975 and Albrow,1975

---

## Note 1

1. 'State Formation'

General: Anderson, 1974a,b; Hintze (1897,1902,1906,1908); Weber; Barker; Bendix (1964) and Nettl(1968). Recent general surveys include Eisenstadt, 1973 (which has a hundred page bibliography; the assumptions of much of this work has been challenged by Alford,1974) and Tilly,1974d.

Apart from the specific studies of 'Other Countries' mentioned below, it is vital- again- to emphasise both the general learning from Abroad that we know took place, and the specific 'hothouse' for many British Erastian Innovations: India. The standard source remarks: 'By 1834 the [East Indies] Company had lost its entire trading monopoly and commercial character. It became a new kind of corporation, purely administrative and subject to the British Parliament. Meanwhile it was evolving a machinery of Government...' (Misra,1959:1;Cf.Philips,1940).

(i) Tsarist Russia

Lenin, 1895,1899;Alston,1969;Starr,1972;Sinel,1973;Yaney,1966,1974.

(ii) 'Germany'

Henderson,1958;Jacob,1963;Schieder,1954. On Weber: Mommsen,1965,1972; Giddens,1972;Dibble,1968,1972;Ashcroft,1972;Scaff,1973;Beetham,1974. For Michel's "iron law" in context: Nettl,1965;Cook,1971.

(iii) France

Mitchell,1971;Kemp,1969:Ch.3; Locke,1974. On Durkheim: Mitchell,1931; T.Clark,1968. Durkheim was sent by the French State to study in Germany and report on what he learned.

(iv) United States of America

In 1955 E.S. Mason opined: ' Most Americans are unaware of the extent to which the Federal and State governments promoted the early economic development of the United States through the provision of social capital...' (qu Baran, 1957:139-140 fn 10).

Cf. Commons, 1924(On Commons, Harter,1962); Aubrey,1949,1951; Spengler,1956;Harsthorne,1956; W.A.Williams,1966,1969; Baran,1966; Domhoff,1967;Weinstein,1967;Gutman,1973; Horowitz,1975. Wolin's review essay(1974) and McGraw's survey of the literature(1975) are very useful. C.Wright Mill's The Power Elite(1956) has recently been vindicated: Domhoff, 1974; Freitag, 1975 (Cf. Sweezy,1951;Domhoff, 1968).

Note 1 concluded; Note 2 begun

(v) Bureaucracy

Albrow, 1970; Hill, 1972. Cf. Subramaniam, 1967 and Sheriff, 1974.

(vi) Other topics

As well as comparisons of the above - between countries of similar character- we also need studies which compare 'the State' in different modes of production. Within the capitalist mode of production Fascism is clearly some kind of limiting case: Cf. Salvemini; Krausnick, 1965; Poulantzas, 1970 (and Rosenberg's review of the literature, 1976). As to Feudalism, Cf. P. Anderson, 1974a,b, and the essays in Tilly, 1974d and Kamenka, 1975b. As to socialism, Cf. Socialist construction and marxist theory, by P. Corrigan, H. Ramsay, and D. Sayer (Macmillan, 1977) and For Mao, by the same (Macmillan, 1978).

\*\*\*\*\*

2. Leonard Horner's educational ideas and schemes

On 25 July 1812 Francis Horner wrote to his younger brother reporting on his visit to a village school, at Enmore, Somerset, during his 'circuit' as a barrister. Leonard had recommended this visit. Francis' letter also shows that he had read a pamphlet recommended by Leonard: The Village school improved... by John Poole. Despite the gratefully acknowledged help of the University of London's Institute of Education Library staff, I have been unable to find the first (1812) edition of Poole's pamphlet. The British Library has both the second (1813) and the third (1815). These show why both brothers liked the pamphlet and the school. Both admired, in Francis' words 'the just sense of equality' which they thought they saw as a consequence of the 'mixture of farmers' boys with those of their ploughmen'.

The Enmore School and this letter from Francis (included in Leonard's 1843 Memoir of his brother) seem to have been of wider significance. In 1847 Richard Dawes (later Dead of Hereford) published his Hints on an improved and selfpaying system of national education... which

## Note 2 continued

Katharine Horner sent to her father (Leonard). In his reply to his daughter, Leonard shows he admires Dawes' ideas- 'especially... the bringing of the children of the employer and employed into the same school; the effect must be to humanize both, and create a right feeling between them'. (Horner, Memoir I:I:27 September 1847). In 1850 he reports (Ibid., 2:174f) that he has 'struck up an intimacy and active correspondence' with Mr. Dawes and had visited the latter's model school. Dawes had told Horner how much he found Francis' 1812 letter, and Leonard's translation of Cousin's work, valuable. Horner also seems to have read Dawes' Observations... (1849) Thus it is, in microcosm, how model institutions are 'broadcast'.

But, as Chapter Three discusses, Horner- and other State Servants- were not (except possibly within the smaller communities of rural society) adherents of the mixing of the classes in education; recognising a different regime being appropriate for different groups. Horner shows this in his two ventures of the 1820s.

In 1821\* Leonard Horner was active in founding what the Prospectus and Annual Reports call the 'Edinburgh School of Arts for the education of mechanics in such branches of physical science as are of practical application in their several trades'.\* Horner was Secretary from 1821 to 1827, and returned to give several Addresses (e.g. Horner, 1851). On Whitsunday 1852 the School was transformed into the Watt Institution and School of Arts and housed in Adam Square, being partly supported by the new Department of Science and Art. By 1872 the College had moved to a larger site and its courses broadened: German, Sanskrit and Hindi being added in 1866; French dated from 1843 (in 1844 there were 169 students in this class

---

\* I am most grateful to Alex Anderson, Librarian of Heriot Watt University, who saved me- by providing many scarce materials- from repeating errors to be found in D.N.B. and Martin(1969). I follow: Memoir, I:I:195f; Memoir, II:19f; School of Arts, Reports; Horner, 1851; Boyle, 1973. In the Brougham Mss. there are several letters from Horner to Brougham about the Edinburgh School in the 1820s (8651; 10662; 8652) and in the 1850s (24412; 7566).

## CHAPTER THREE

## CHAPTER THREE

## Note 2 continued

which gave fifty lessons for five shillings, Memoir,II:35). Latin was added in 1874 and Greek in 1876. Patrick Geddes was a lecturer in biology in 1886. Female Students were admitted in 1869.

On 12th August 1882 (through the Education Endowments(Scotland) Act of that year) funds from the George Heriot trust endowed the Watt Institution(' for technical and general education for the industrial classes of both sexes'); thereafter it was called Heriot-Watt college, although the formal inauguration took place only on 10th January 1889. In January 1966 the College became Heriot Watt University; in December of that year the University moved to the new Riccarton site where, in October 1971, its sesquicentenary was celebrated.

On his retirement as Secretary, in 1827, Horner gave a speech, arguing that

no individual would venture to maintain now, what was a very prevalent opinion not many years ago, that the safety of the State requires those who work to supply the wants of their more affluent neighbours, should be kept in a state of ignorance. I believe that there is no man whose opinion is entitled to respect, who is not convinced that the happiness and security of the country will be increased in proportion as education is extended throughout the whole mass of the population.

(School of Arts, Reports, 1827:10)

The prospectus of the School (first issued on 19th April 1821) emphasises 'tradesmen' and 'practical science'. It mentions lectures, collections of instruments and a library being established. Fees were 7s 7d a quarter. When the School was opened in October 1821, 272 tickets for students were sold. During the whole session a (further? total of?)452 tickets were sold: 111 of the students

---

\*1st report, p.16 gives this data. Ibid., 42-50 gives the list of subscribers(Boyle,1973:Appx.IV, reprints it). B.F.Duppa gives an analysis of students' occupations in his report on the School (C.S.E. Papers, I,1837)

Note 2 concluded; Note 3 begun

being cabinet makers, joiners or wrights; 38 smiths, and there were the same number(27) of clerks as masons and marblecutters; no other groups had more than 19 representatives. At the ending of the first winter session, 24th April 1822, 250 students enrolled for a second session, during which total enrolment reached 430. The Stress of the School of Arts was practical- see, for example, his address to the 'Fruit soirée' in 1844 (Memoir,II:33f; Ibid., p.38, reprints the soirée handbill). It was not to be like a Mechanics Institute giving 'general information to the working classes' but to attend to the latter's 'professional education'. To some extent this tendency is still true of Heriob Watt University which, in 1973, lacked a Faculty of Arts, and the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies had neither a sociology nor a politics department.

....

Horner's other venture\*\* was precisely complementary to the School. With <sup>H</sup>enry (later Lord) Cockburn, Horner founded the Edinburgh Academy, funded by subscription of £12,000 and opened in October 1824: the Academy was devoted to classical education and middle-class children. At the first prize-giving- 29th July 1825- a certain Archibald Tait won several prizes, only to be expected, perhaps, from the future Dean of Carlisle, Master of Rugby and Archbishop of Canterbury.

---

### 3. Horner and 1859

I follow here H.O.87/3 and the special packet H.O.45/6755 in the PRO. On the 14th April 1859 Horner sent a letter to the Home Office reporting a letter of resignation of Subinspector William Graham, employed in Horner's district, dated 13th April 1859. On the 15th the Home Office minuted the appointment of Frederick Wilson\*\* (a former Clerk in the State Paper Office) as replacement for Graham. On 5th

---

\* I follow Memoir,I:I:210f; Memoir,II:24f; Martin,1969:421.

\*\*Nothing in administrative history is as treacherous as names. H.O. to Horner 14 June and Horner to H.O. 17th June 1859 both mention the man as Frederick Bullen.

## Note 3 continued

and 6th May two letters from the Inspector of the National Provincial Bank (Manchester) to the Home Office enclose certificates, not honoured by H.M. Paymaster-General, totalling £369 10s 0d and which the Bank had encashed, in March 1859, in favour of William Graham. Graham had since paid the Bank £100 as a kind of refund. On 7th May a letter was sent from the Home Office to the Paymaster-General stating that no claims from Graham for expenses or salary were to be met. On 21st May the National Provincial's Inspector write directly to Horner saying that Mr. Graham could not now be traced. On 23rd, Horner sends this on to the Home Office. So far, then, it is the pecuniary misbehaviour of Mr. Graham which is the major factor.

On 30th May, a Michael Heathcote wrote a letter to the Home Office alleging misconduct by Leonard Horner: (i) that Horner had wronged Heathcote's brother John (Superintendent/Subinspector in Horner's district from 1834 to 1844): 'Mr. Horner procured his dismissal on an unfortunate charge of having written an anonymous letter, which letter he was never permitted to see'. (ii) Horner was negligent in his supervision of William Graham, 'nephew' (alleges Heathcote) 'as I am told of Sir Jas. Graham'; and (iii) Horner's general negligence follows from his living out of his District and writing or agreeing reports whose accuracy he could not guarantee. On 1st June this letter, with a brief note asking for comments, was sent to Horner. On 3rd June he replied denying most of Heathcote's points. H. Waddington, at the Home Office, marked Horner's reply: 'This is a very unsatisfactory Report'. On the 18th the Home Office wrote to Horner in those terms, saying that Horner knew Graham to be guilty of misconduct of a 'very serious nature' but did not report it. Why, furthermore, had Horner continued to allow Graham to submit reports when Horner knew them to be false? On 17th June Horner replied, he admitted that, as an 'act of mercy', he had overlooked Graham's frequent lies on the matter of borrowing money; but, Horner claims, he only subsequently discovered Graham was falsifying his reports.



Note 3 concluded; Note 4

On 21st June 1859, the Treasury Solicitor wrote to say that the Government could not and would not pay Graham any money, nor would they honour any certificates. This letter was sent on to Horner on 25th June. On 11th July, the Home Office heard that Graham had been seen in Salford claiming money as a Government Agent (six days after his letter of resignation) on 19th April.

A new Government was now in power and Cornewall Lewis the new Home Secretary. He directed that a letter be sent to Horner saying that in future the Inspectors must report to the Home Secretary on the actions and behaviour of their Subinspectors.

Horner was not sacked. Indeed on or just before 12th July, Waddington wrote to Horner about two memorials which Cornewall Lewis had received and asking whether Horner thinks more Subinspectors needed. Horner replied, 13th July, noting that since 1850 he had drawn the office's attention to 'systematic overworking' by Inspectors and their staff (P.P. 1859 Sess. 2 (169)XXVII:2f). Horner resigned, as soon as he knew the new Superannuation arrangements were adequate, between 31st October 1859 when he signed the half-yearly report of the Inspectorate and 14th December 1859 when his absence is remarked by his former colleagues. But as late as July 1860, the Home Office is still writing to him about the Graham affair.

.....

#### 4. Chadwick's ideas and contemporary concerns

A number of commentators have seen centralisation, collectivism, or corporatism as suddenly with us. One measure of the ideological crises of the 1970s is the variety of analyses being offered: Shonfield thinks us under-governed; Pahl and Winkler think us over-governed; Rose thinks government weak and Vaizey thinks it so strong that he could declare, with the arrival of Phase III, 'Capitalism is over'.

Cf. Beer, 1969:427f; Harris, 1972; Gamble, 1974; Pahl, 1974, 1975; Winkler, 1976; Shonfield, 1967; New Society 24 July 1969; Times 9th December, 1974; Rose, summarised Times 18th August 1976, p.2; Vaizey, 1973 and my 'Afterword' above. Amory's sketch of Peter Jay is highly relevant to many of these debates (1976).

---

## Note 1

1. Political socialization

In one sense the whole of this thesis concerns political socialization along with the creation of a political culture, and the agencies which sustain particular images of 'the political'. Philip Abrams is empirically (as well as theoretically) right to see many modern studies as continuing that older tradition of normative, prescriptive philosophizing. A recent author explained the aim of his study (The political mind and the political environment) as 'developing a theory of political consciousness that will give us an insight into the public's mind'. He hoped his work would contribute to 'raising the level of citizen consciousness and heightening the democratic spirit of mass politics in America' (Bennett, 1974:xviii; Cf. Ibid., Ch.7) There is a good critique of this vast literature in Hirsch (1971:Ch.1).

Apart from older studies of 'adolescents' (e.g. Himmelweit, 1952); the consequences of stratified education for political images (Elder, 1965; Abramson, 1967; 1970) or for the elite (McQuail, 1968- Cf. my own discussion in Chapter Four); and U.S. studies of children (e.g. Greenstein, 1969)- 1971 saw a tremendous explosion of published studies in Britain: in Sociology (Dowse, 1971); Sociological Review (Stradling, 1971b); British Journal of Sociology (Polk, 1971); British Journal of Political Science (Dennis, 1971) and further away: in Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology (Musgrave, 1971). Apart from pointing to May 1968 - a three year 'lag' is reckoned the norm from insight to print- I can offer no immediate sociological comment.

The problem with all these studies is their naivete: (i) homogeneous images and symbols are discussed; (ii) differential power (agency) is not; (iii) history- that the images may be constructed- seems generally to evade theoretical grasp. But Ideas do not fall from the sky- neither do they naturally develop- they come from social repertoires which are made available from historical experience and its enforced interpretations. Even the term 'historical experience'

## Note 1

needs to be carefully explicated- on the one hand, it is not some thing(s) that we have (or not), but some ways that we are; on the other, the ways that one is forced to be are both 'those ways' and 'that being forced', the latter negating (or making fragile) the former, and when that force (the being forced to be) is removed, so also it becomes possible for quite other images, from other achieved ways of being (communal, class specific, and so on) to be expressed publicly. This is a Revolution.

If May 1968 gave an impetus to the studies mentioned above, they have learned little from it. One social relation which it pushed to the fore concerned the mode of knowledge production in bourgeois universities: the discovery that the manner of being taught matters as much or far more than the (variable) content. Applying the theories of Austin (derived from speech acts) we can say that to be taught X or Y that way is to be given far more than facts, theories and some connecting devices. Here, as elsewhere, the fact/value dichotomy will not hold.

The general lack of attention to historical origins is all the more curious given the overt nature of that 'older tradition' which was very conscious of its task of elucidating how citizenship education ('civics'; O-level British Constitution, etc.) was to be accomplished. Charles Merriam (in his The making of citizens,...1931) summarizes an eight-nation study of 'methods of civic education'. Much of this could have been written by any of the State Servants or T.H. Green or the Fabians (Cf. Our Towns, 1943). Merriam wishes to enable 'the construction of citizens' because 'heavy expenditure of the State for the maintenance of internal order, police, prisons, and courts, is largely due to... failure in political training' (1931:330). This last refers not only to 'the enemy or the criminal outlaw' but also the type who is neither... [but is] resistant to the general process of socialization...' (Ibid., 329). The early history of the London School of Economics shows similar attention to the need to create 'good citizens'.

Where we do have historical studies, we find some significant constants. Stradling (1971a) compared data about English schoolchildren's identification with images and public figures in 1900 and 1969.

Note 1 concluded; Note 2 begun

To take only identification with Monarch and Prime Minister.

	1900		1969	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Monarch	8%	18%	8%	17%
Prime Minister	5%	2%	4%	2%

But one should not leave Stradling, without allowing his somewhat open-mouthed analysis of these findings to stand for the ahistoricism of so much sociology. Stradling suggests that his findings may go so far as to actually show that 'children were being socialized to support the political system as long ago as 1900' (1971a:122).

---

## 2. Civil-Military Relations

For a comparative survey, see the articles in Ralston (1966).

A good study of the Armed Forces in 1815 is given by Halevy (1912:45-106). Between 1815 and 1821 these forces were reduced from 680,000 to c.100,000 (Preston, 1956:100). See also: Barnett, 1970; Barker, 1930:50-54; A. Roberts, 1975; Edmonds, 1975; Young, 1975.

Information on the internal structure of the Forces in the nineteenth century is given by:

Bond, 1974; Lloyd, 1974, for the ordinary ranks of Army and Navy respectively;

Otley, 1968, 1970, 1973 for the elite (and the limited nature of Cardwell's reforms).

Hanham's study (1973) is particularly relevant in showing how the English forces drew upon the subject peoples. The slaughter of thousands of Scots, Irish, Welsh and other colonised peoples, particularly Indian, in the service of English conquest should not go unremarked in any study of the State, especially since Finer, for example, ignores this and claims: 'wholly native armies were a product of the nineteenth century' (1975:102).

In terms of military influence in nineteenth century Britain Harries-Jenkins shows the percentage of officer-Peers in the Lords to have been approximately:

10% on 1837; 15% in 1853; 27% in 1855 and 35% in 1898 (1973).

For the Commons:

Note 2 concluded  
Young(1867 Cf. Halevy, 1923b; Harries-Jenkins,1973) analyses the  
1833 Parliament and gives 271 against 'Army and Navy': 54  
Officers exclusive of Guardsmen; 58 Guardsmen; 48 Militia; 56  
Yeomanry; 44 Volunteers; and 11 Naval (p.327). Significantly these  
are all part of the 'Aritocratic Element' which totals 326 out of  
652.

For the influence of military idiom and style in the twentieth  
century, Cf. Edmonds, 1975.

Desmarais' work (1971;1973;1975) shows how the Military influenced  
the Organisation for the Maintenance of Supplies (and, his 1974  
paper shows how this was copied by the U.S. Federal Government).  
A similar influence can be seen in the Regional Seats of Government  
discovered by the 'Spies for Peace' fraction of the Campaign for  
Nuclear Disarmament in 1962/3 and in the new network of Emergency  
Services Planning Officers linked to the Home Defence College in  
Yorkshire- a net work which seeks 'to utilise peacetime services  
to meet war time needs and major emergencies'(Advertisement, Times,  
11 February,1975, my emphasis).

Finally there remain (as the States of Emergency declared in 1972 and  
1974 showed) many officials in Britain whose posts carry reserve  
powers of a military character- the ability to create special local  
'Law' and to use 'Force' (without local or national permission).

---

## APPENDICES

### CONTENTS

	Appendix Pages
I: BIOGRAPHIES*	1 - 54
Leonard Horner	1-17
J.P.Kay Shuttleworth	18-32
H.S.Tremenheere	33-41
E.Chadwick	42-46
Addenda on their income	47 -53
II: STATISTICS**	55-69
Table I: Absolute numbers of Civil Servants 1797- 1976	56-59
Table II: Departmental and hierarchical structures 1797 to 1973	60-63
Table III: State Expenditure 1790-1970	64-65
Table IV: Poor Law Data, 1800-1900	66-69
III: S.T.Coleridge and "the Revolution in Government"	70-

---

\*For Bibliographies of their writings see below, Bibliographies, sections B1 and B 2. The careers indicated here may be put into a wider context through comparison with (i) the Sainty series; (ii) Roberts, 1960; and the appendices to such studies as those of Ball(1963) on the HMIs , Jones (1971) on the Foreign Office, or the more general sketches in Sutherland, 1972b.

\*\*These statistics are elementary and provisional- fuller information can be drawn from other sources, notably the major inquiries into the Civil Service. Those given here are illustrative, exactly on a par with the addenda to the first Appendix on the incomes of major State Servants- pointing to the theoretical significance (for us) of neglected, and knowable, information about them and their context.

---

LEONARD HORNER

Leonard Horner (1785 to 1864) lacks a biographer and, worse, has not lacked hagiographers. His own book on his elder brother Francis (L.H. 1843) is superior to both the memoir volumes constructed by his daughter and granddaughter\* upon which my eclectic biography rests.\*\*

Leonard Horner was born in Edinburgh on the 17th January 1785, the son of John Horner, Linen merchant, and Joanna, the daughter of minor landed gentry. Francis, Leonard's elder brother, had been born on 12th August 1778.

It is necessary to briefly sketch some of Francis' life since both brothers exchanged long letters and the elder was a great influence on (and had great 'influence' for) the younger. Francis\*\*\* by 1792 was attending lectures at Edinburgh University, including those given by Dugald Stewart the moral philosopher. In 1796 Francis moved to London to study law but he continued to study political economy and 'sociology' in Smith, Turgot and Millar from 1799 to 1802. In 1802 Francis helped found, with Brougham, the Edinburgh Review, and contributed to it until 1809 (the D.N.B. lists all his contributions). In 1806 Francis was elected Whig M.P. for St Ives, being made a member of the Whig Club the following year. He lost his seat in the General Election of 1806, but was elected in July for Wendover. From 1806 he was a correspondent of Malthus. In 1807 Francis was called to the English Bar, having been studying at Lincoln's Inn, since 1802, and the Temple, since 1803;

---

\* These are listed as L.H. Memoir I, and Memoir II in the bibliography, the second contains material on Francis Horner.

\*\* I have also used standard histories and the article Martin, 1969.

\*\*\* For Francis' life I follow LH 1843 (Francis, Memoir I); Memoir II of both of them and D.N.B.

he had been called to the 'Scotch' Bar in 1800. In 1808 he set up home in Lincoln's Inn. In 1810 Francis chaired the Select Committee on Bullion Payments (whose views were disputed by Coleridge in The Courier and approved by Ricardo in the Morning Chronicle). In May 1811 Francis spoke in favour of the Bullion report, but its proposals were defeated. In 1812 Francis lost his seat in the general election of September, but was returned for St Mawes in April 1813.

From 1806 or so, Francis maintained a correspondence with Malthus - writing about education and, extensively, the Corn Laws.\* In the letters on education, Francis frequently declares 'I regard the establishment [of national education] as our best preservative against fanaticism'. (FH, Memoir, I: Vol.2: 109f.). In 1811 he met Malthus for a weekend-long discussion on this and related topics (Ibid., 86f). The 'Corn Law' letters show a solid Free Trade spirit, coupled to a 'Whiggish' distance and that 'Edinburgh philosophy' which is a feature of Leonard's work. Thus, Francis sees behind the 1815 Corn Law proposals an 'audacious and presumptuous spirit of regulation, by the wisdom of country squires, [of] the whole economy and partition of national industry and wealth'. (Memoir, II: 14). He understands Free Trade as 'natural law':

If the consequence of 'high farming' and curious cultivation be a progressive rise of the price of produce, an importation of partial supplies from countries which by a ruder agriculture can furnish it cheaper, [this] seems the provision laid by Nature for checking too exclusive an employment of capital

---

\* Some of these Corn Law letters are available in both Memoir volumes.



upon the land least fit for culture. (Memoir, II:15).\*

On 20 March 1815, the Common Council of the City of London passed a vote of thanks to Francis and Alexander Baring for their attempts in opposing the Corn Bill.

In 1816 Francis fell ill and travelled to Pisa in Italy with Leonard and their joint friend John Murray. On 8th February 1817 Francis died in Pisa.

It would seem to be true that, in the words of the Publishers' note in Chambers' Instructive and entertaining Library 1849 condensation\*\* of Leonard's 1843 Memoir of his brother: 'The career of Francis Horner is one of the most exemplary which biography can present to the young'. The D.N.B. concurs, devoting more space to Francis' 38 years than to Leonard's 79. The list of signatures for a subscription towards the Westminster Abbey monument to Francis\*\*\* contains 86 names: 5 Dukes; 2 Marquesses; 12 Earls; 11 Lords; 1 Lady; 4 Viscounts; 6 Knights; 2 Rt. Hon.; 6 Hon; and 19 MPs (2 of them being also Knights).\*\*\*\* There were also 16 names from India.

. . . . .

---

\* Francis presents a similar argument in favour of Malthus in 1807 (FH, Memoir I: Vol.1: 406).

\*\* On 23 Aug. 1848 Leonard wrote to his son-in-law Charles Lyell that an advocate, Mr Burton, of Edinburgh was carrying out this condensation (LH, Memoir I: Vol.2: 142).

\*\*\* The list is given (FH, Memoir I: Vol.2, Appx.G); the monument illustrated in the frontis. to this vol.

\*\*\*\* The editor of the Times (Rees-Mogg, 1976) includes Francis Horner as a true monetarist.

Leonard was educated like his brother at Edinburgh High School (where he met Brougham). He attended lectures in Mathematics given at Edinburgh University by Playfair, and those on Moral Philosophy by Dugald Stewart, in 1799; although he did not formally enter the University until 1802, when he studied Geology and Chemistry. We know that he was studying Smith in 1803 since Francis commended him for it. Francis considered that 'in some points' (he mentioned the fifth chapter) Smith 'is not quite right' but insisted:

There is less chance, however, of being led into false opinions by the 'Wealth of Nations' than by almost any other book on that kind of philosophy.\*

A reminder - confirmed, incidentally, by the wording of Smith's reconstructed tombstone in Canongate Parish Church in Edinburgh - that Smith was considered to offer philosophical wisdom.

In 1804 Leonard was taken into partnership by his father, he moved to London where he met his future wife Anne Susan Lloyd.\*\* Before his marriage he toured the Highlands in 1805/6. In 1807 the Geological Society was founded in London and in 1808 he was elected a Fellow of the Society for which he performed secretarial duties from 1810 and acted as Vice President in 1828 and was twice President (in 1846 and 1860). In 1813 he was elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society (of London) and the Royal Society of Edinburgh for his work on geology. His geological papers are listed in DNB (Cf. Martin, 1969: 416f).

---

\* quoted FH Memoir I: Vol.1:235; and LH Memoir I: Vol.1:5; my emphasis added.

\*\* A section on personal relations closes my biography.

By 1810 Horner was accepted into intellectual circles in London that included both Benthamites and 'High Society'. He became friendly with the Marcets. He also made several tours with his brother, as he phrased it 'half for political economy and half for geology'; on one trip they met the fathers of both the famous Galton and Darwin. He frequently visited both Dugald Stewart and Lyon Playfair. Leonard was interested in education: he recommended his brother to visit Poole's model school. The recommendation shows that he must have read the first edition of Poole's book (1812). In 1847 Leonard recalled that knowledge of that school demonstrated the value of 'bringing the children of the employer and the employed into the same school; the effect must be to humanize both, and create a right feeling between them' (LH, Memoir I: Vol.2: 121). The same source mentions that Poole was writing to Leonard in 1847.

By 1813 Leonard was an underwriter at Lloyds and not liking the work but enjoying the social company: Baring, Labouchère and the Hollands. After the defeat of the French army in Holland in 1814, Leonard went there to find contracts for his firm. He kept a detailed Journal (Memoir I: Vol.1: 33-68) which stresses the 'complete toleration in religion and universal diffusion of instruction among the lower classes'. (Ibid., p.52). On his return he left Lloyds. In 1815 he read the proofs of Dugald Stewart's 'History of Moral Science' that appeared in the 1818 supplement to Encyclopedia Britannica. In 1815 Horner returned to Edinburgh, but moved back to London when Francis fell ill. Like the Marcets, LH regarded the ending of Income Tax in April 1816 as 'the greatest triumph the country has obtained over the Court for a very long time' (Memoir I: Vol.1: 95); which shows that eighteenth century notions of politics were very much alive. Just before his departure to Italy,

LH congratulated Mrs Marcet on her Conversations on Political economy.<sup>\*</sup>  
 On the trip to Italy with his brother and Murray he kept a detailed Journal (Memoir I: Vol.1: 105-139). Francis' death affected him greatly.

On Leonard's return to Edinburgh in 1817, he was involved in an investigation into the Infirmary and from that time he becomes a prominent figure in City circles - especially amongst Whigs. He maintains frequent contact with Dugald Stewart, Lyon Playfair and Henry Cockburn. By 1811 he is the 'obvious' choice to chair Whig Dinners, including the 1822 Fox Dinner. By 1820 LH had begun work on the Memoir of his brother which he completed in 1843, this involved detailed reading of Francis' works and contact with many of the latter's friends. In 1821 Leonard helped to found the Edinburgh 'School of Arts for the Education of Mechanics in such branches of physical science as are of practical application in their several trades'.<sup>\*\*</sup> LH remained secretary of the School until 1827 and frequently returned to deliver addresses (Cf. Horner, 1851). A complementary venture, in which Henry Cockburn was also involved, was the Edinburgh Academy, planned from 1821 but opened in 1824 after a public subscription of over £12,000. The Academy was devoted to a class and an education which complemented the School of Arts already mentioned, since the Academy provided a classical education for middle class children. (LH Memoir I: Vol.1: 210f; Memoir II: 24f; Martin, 1969: 421).

---

\* Marcet, 1816. In 1819 LH reported that McCulloch had read this book three times; in 1821 McCulloch recommended it in his lectures. (LH, Memoir I: Vol.1: 104, 158, 198).

\*\* A note about LH's educational ventures is appended to Ch.3 above. There is much data on this in the Brougham Mss(8651f. ; 10662f.) this source also shows Brogham's influence on Horner's career e.g. over the Factory Inspectorship (Ibid., 737, 17579).

Leonard continued to have national 'High Society' contacts however. For example, on 20 March 1826 he dined with the Duke of Somerset, Lord Prudhoe (the Duke of Northumberland's brother) and Lord Morpeth. He also corresponded with Peel concerning Trades Unions and Peel replied (Peel, 1891: 379-380). There is no doubt at all that much of this 'access' and 'attention' followed from his brother's influence. But it was his old School and University friend, Brougham, who invited Leonard in 1826 to become the first Warden of London University, a post LH took up in 1827 when he and his family moved to London. His time at the University was 'stormy' as is shown in Martin's account (1969: 423f), and Horner was obviously relieved when he resigned (LH, Memoir I: Vol.1: 255). Whilst Warden, Horner purchased what we would now call 'a second home' at Leatherhead, from where they visited the Mills (James and J.S.) at Walton.

Apart from other reasons, Horner was glad to resign in 1831 because he had been troubled by illness. This may have led to the move of the family to Godëborg, near Bonn, and to Horner turning down the offer, in 1832, of the sinecure post of Treasurer to the Bank of Scotland. Instead Horner worked on his geology. He was in London to deliver a paper in February 1833 when he was asked to act as a Commissioner - investigating the West Country - on the Factories Enquiry Commission of that year (P.P. 1833 XX). The Central Commissioners included Chadwick and Southwood Smith. The Commission\* reported in June 1833 and in July LH returned to Germany.

As the Inspector of Factories appointed for the Northern Districts - which included the whole of Ireland and Scotland - died in October 1833,

---

\* On the Commission Cf. Bready, 1926: 182f; Ward, 1962: 94f; Finlayson, 1969: 42f; Ward, 1970: Vol.2, Doc.33; Lubenow, 1971: 140f; Llewellyn, 1972: 111f; Fraser, 1973: 236f; and Halevy, 1923b: Ch.2.

the post was made available to Horner through his friend Francis Jeffrey, it being in the gift of Lord Melbourne, the Home Secretary. As Horner's letters make clear (Memoir I: Vol.1: 287f) LH did not see his new duties interfering with his other interests or work, for example writing articles for the Penny Cyclopaedia and Penny Magazine; attending the British Association and other scientific meetings; or holidaying in Paris in August. Horner attended every annual meeting of the British Association until 1857, when he was 72 years old. At the September 1834 meeting he was made a member, with Chalmers and Heywood, of the newly established Statistics Committee of the B.A.A.S. (Transactions, 4, 1834: xxx). In this connection we should note his attendance at the Manchester Statistical Society's meeting in June 1837.

In 1834 a translation of V. Cousin's work on Prussian education was published (Ball, 1963: 3 fn.61). Professor Pillans, a friend of LH since at least 1821, had already provided evidence on the value of many Continental innovations (such as Inspection) in his 1834 evidence to R.A. Slaney's Select Committee on Education. Pillan's report on Guizot's schemes had been published in the Edinburgh Review of 1833. It is thus not surprising, especially given his concerns since at least 1812, to find the particular way in which LH interprets the Act under which he was appointed. In 1834 Horner privately published his pamphlet Factories Regulation Act explained which he reproduces in his report (P.P. 1834 (596) XLIII). There he describes the purpose of the 1833 Act as 'bettering the moral condition of the children'.\* This is also clearly the intention of government; in their circular withdrawing

---

\* This focus on education is brilliantly established by Halevy, 1923b: Ch.2; Cf. E.L. Edmonds, 1958; Sanderson, 1967: 271.

the progressive raising of the minimum working age, they doubly emphasise the need to enforce the educational clauses (P.P. 1837 (74) XXXI).

Horner's own report on these educational provisions (P.P. 1839 (42) XLII) stresses the 'wise State policy' for focussing on 'moral habits'. And the philosophy is present in his 1844 address to the School of Arts in Edinburgh.

Horner's appointment did not seem to alter his 'circles.' He continued to dine with the highest in the land: in February 1836 he ate with Melbourne (PM) and T. Spring Rice (Chancellor of the Exchequer). In 1836 Horner succeeded Rickards as Inspector for the Lancashire, Yorkshire, Derbyshire and North Wales district. Copies of his circulars to his subordinates and employers in that district have been published - the stress on minimal prosecution is noteworthy.\* In September 1836 there is the first full meeting\*\* of all the Inspectors which lasted a week and in October of the same year the system of quarterly reports was agreed. On 14th October it was agreed that Inspectoral communications to the Office (and amongst themselves?) be free of postage stamps. Horner often mentions in his personal letters that he is at work on a quarterly report (Memoir I: Vol.1: 350) which he usually sees as destined personally, in this case for 'Lord John Russell'. His private letters also mention special enquiries undertaken for other Government Departments, e.g. the Board of Trade in February 1836. This overlap of private and public work was carried over, in 1837, into the publication of letters to Nassau Senior on the Factory Acts (Horner, 1837; Senior, 1837; Marx, 1867: 225).

---

\* P.P. 1836 (483) XLV 215f; 1837 (67) L: 9f.

\*\* P.R.O. LAB 15/1; H.O. 87/1 are the sources.

By mid 1837 Horner had established several significant contacts in Manchester - for example with Benjamin Heywood, at whose house he often stayed (Memoir I: Vol.1: 341 (for 1837); 354 (for 1838). In August of 1837 he started work on his translation of V. Cousin's report on education in Holland; this appeared in 1838 with a long introduction by Horner. By 1838 Horner was a member of the Central Society of Education as the lists of members show (Papers C.S.E., 1838, 1839) and in that year he visited Cousin within the same month as J.P. Kay and George Nicholls.

In July 1839 LH attended Parliament in connection with the debates on Factory Legislation; but the Bill was withdrawn and another Commission established. In August Horner dined with Peel (then in Opposition). In November his wife visited Norwood. In April 1840 LH and Kay's acquaintance is established through LH's use of Kay's support to persuade the National Society not to insist that children at factory schools learn the Church of England catechism if the parents objected (Memoir I: Vol.2: 30 Apr. 1840; Memoir II: 27). In July 1840 LH attended Parliament to hear Ashley speak; on the first occasion Ashley lost his chance to speak as the quorum was challenged. On 5th July, Ashley did speak and called for a Royal Commission on the Employment of Children. In June Horner had written to Chadwick to draw the latter's attention to Horner's 1840 pamphlet\* and, on the day of Ashley's speech, Horner Chadwick and Kay met and discussed with Ashley how they could collectively and individually aid him (Memoir I: Vol.2: 5 Jul 1840). On the

---

\* Chadwick MSS have five letters from LH to EC. The first (13 Oct 1836) reports LH sending materials on 'Factory matters' to EC; the second (28 Dec 1837) donated a copy of Horner's translation of Cousin; two in 1840 (21 June and 6 Oct) report the two meetings; the fifth (24 Dec 1859) contains LH's comments on EC's 'Half-time' proposals.



13th of the same month LH met Tremenheere at the Privy Council Office and told him of the general disregard amongst employers for the well-being of their workers (Webb, 1955a: fn.25; Webb, 1960: 110, fn.1). On 20th October LH, R.J. Saunders, Southwood Smith and Thomas Tooke were appointed as the Commission on the Employment of Children (Bready, 1926: 267f; P.G. Richards Ph.D. thesis, 193f). Their first report (P.P. 1842 [380] XV) on Mines, reprints their instructions to sub-commissioners, section 12 of which asked about 'moral' conditions. The first report refers these responses to the second report (P.P. 1843 [420] XIII), on Trades. There, at least two thirds of the recommendations relate to a lack of any national system of education. Although the first report on Mines was not published until 1842, it had been completed by 16th November 1841 and it, together with Tremenheere's Midland Mining Commission report, formed a background to Ashley's Mines Act of 1842, under which H.S. Tremenheere was appointed. The reports of the 1840 Commission also led, on the one hand, to the Print Works Act of 1845, and on the other, to the steady extension of the Factories Regulations to more and more areas of employment, extensions which were the result of the Factories Inspectors and the special Commissions of Tremenheere and Tufnell in the 1860s.

LH's letters of this time show some contrasts. In 1841 he argues for the repeal of the Corn Laws and the Government 'doing something considerable for national education'. In 1842 he is for the 'giving up' of 'a great part of our overgrown Colonial possessions'; in 1850 he gives a sustained criticism of any 'extravagant extension of their [the economists] doctrine of laissez faire'. He also maintained his scientific work by reading the literature of geology, including that of his son-in-law Sir Charles Lyell whose work was held to be influential

on both Spencerian and Darwinian notions of evolution. He also attended the Royal Society and Geological Society meetings where possible. He was on sufficiently close terms with the Darwins to be told of their intended move to a house near Bromley (this is now the Darwin museum) and there are important letters from Charles Darwin to LH in the latter's memoirs showing how much Charles appreciated LH's 1860 Presidential address to the Geological Society, which challenged the geological assumptions of Genesis in the Old Testament. Horner appears to have read the Origin of the Species twice.

In September 1843 LH stayed with the Kay-Shuttleworths at Gawthorpe Hall where LH admired Kay's allotment scheme and his provision of instruments, and a teacher, for his estate's village band. In 1846 LH dined with Sir Benjamin Heywood, discussing politics with Sir Thomas Arbuthnot, Commander of H.M. Forces in that district, whom he also met again in March 1847. These informal meetings should not be overlooked; in 1846, for example, Horner had a long talk on Famine with the Vice President of the Board of Works of Ireland. In May of 1843, when his daughter Frances married Charles Bunbury and LH visited the latter's parents home (Mildenhall), Horner remarks on the Bunbury senior's cottage and allotment scheme, especially for its 'good effects .... upon his people, physically and morally' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 75; his letter to Bunbury on agriculture and political economy is discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 above). Horner's 1846 letters show how closely he followed the Repeal of the Corn Laws; in one letter Horner describes himself as a 'well wisher to Liberal measures'.\* But his 'liberalism' did not

---

\* The patrician qualities of Whiggery (revealed also by Tremenheere) are clear however in Horner's view of Cobden. In 1846 he doubted if Cobden 'is fitted for official life .... he would be thrown into a society and sphere so totally new ....' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 102); Cf. Tremenheere's I was there Ch.4.

stop his supporting a particular kind of reform of the Royal Society in 1846 - he was vociferous in his support for 'limitation of numbers' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 98-99, 107).

Indeed it is not surprising that the DNB says so little of his employment as a Factory Inspector; Horner himself not infrequently reports in his letters how he 'fitted in' a factory visit between two scientific expeditions or social visits. On several occasions he brought his hosts or guests with him to look round the factory. When Horner visited the Nasmyth factory in Manchester in 1846 he had the steam hammer demonstrated to him and reported how that factory has sent a steam hammer 'off the day before [23? October 1846] for the copper and gold works at Ekatarinburg on the Asiatic side of the Urals' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 105).

Horner also mentions his reading - on one occasion it is to contrast the vulgarity of Fielding or Dickens to the beauty of Scott; on a second a detailed comment on the contents of one issue of Edinburgh Review (March 1847); on a third, comments on Pascal and Hume. It is as well to recall that by 1846 Horner was 61 years old; six years later he found Uncle Tom's Cabin 'painfully interesting' but it did not make him feel that one could go 'to the length of abolition, except by very gradual steps, both for the sake of the owners and the slaves themselves' (Memoir I: Vol.2: 205).

Horner's flexibility is seen in his opposition to the anti Ten Hours Act movement (which he calls 'bad political economy'). In 1852 he joined the revived Anti Corn Law League and was present at a small meeting which raised £27,700 in 25 minutes (Memoir I: Vol.2: 4 March 1852).

He had earlier reported his survey of opinion amongst factory workers: he found that they preferred shorter working hours to more pay. In 1848 he 'rejoiced' in the fall of 'the retrograde government of Louis Philippe and Guizot' and in 1851 his language against Napoleon's coup d'état is singularly violent. But he sees with different eyes, it seems, when he examines domestic politics: the death of the Duke of Wellington 'forms quite an epoch in our history'; the Great Exhibition is remarked in terms of the people's 'enthusiastic loyalty' which 'must have made a deep impression on the multitude of foreigners', not least because there were so few obvious signs of repression (Memoir I: Vol.2: 181). He was in close touch with Harriet Martineau (calling her simply 'Harriet' in 1849) and called on her in Ambleside in August 1855, just before another visit to the Kay Shuttleworths.

I must admit that the sheer breadth of the cultural-intellectual engagement is a major characteristic of these State servants which has been overlooked. Here was a man in his late 60s corresponding with George Stephenson, who was building the Alexandria-Cairo railway, about soil samples and rock types so he could prepare his 1860 address on the geology of Genesis. In March 1857, Horner sat down and read Hume's History of Great Britain so he could better explicate Shakespeare's 'Richard II'. But the following incident is best illustrative of the 'heroic' (and no satirical intent is involved here, rather I am thinking of a dramaturgical figure - these were, after all, heroes of an epic: The Great Transformation) qualities I am trying to convey.

After his retirement at the end of 1859, LH and his wife continued to travel and one such trip took them to Italy in 1861. Here, this 76 year old man wandering around a small Italian town, finds a statue to one Sallestio Bandini that claims (for Horner could read such a claim) the man here honoured prefigured Adam Smith in the science of political economy.

Horner goes to the local library and reads works in Latin, French, German, Italian and English to discover that this Bandini wrote a treatise for the Prince of Tuscany in 1737 but it was first published 15 years after Bandini's death in 1775. The treatise had called for free trade and had evoked the laws of supply and demand. But Smith is vindicated. In 1862 LH translated Villari's history of Savonarola (it was privately printed in 1863) and is urging his daughter to keep up with Gladstone's speeches. In 1863 he reads Huxley's Lectures and relates them to the work of Darwin. Three months before his death he reports on his newspaper reading: intensive on Italy; brief on the Civil War in the U.S.A. and occasional on politics in Britain.

Horner died on 5th March 1864 and is buried in Woking Cemetery. On his death the Operative Cotton Spinners\* of Lancashire sent a testimonial to his two daughters; as they had done when Horner retired.\* The Inscription on Horner's Monument is reproduced in print (Memoir I: Vol.2: 367).

. . . . .

### Personal

LH married Anne Susan Lloyd in June 1806; their first daughter was Mary Elizabeth (1808-1873), who married, 12 July 1832, [Sir] Charles Lyell (1797-1875), the geologist and adviser on mining accidents. They had no children. The second daughter was Susan (b.1814) who married Chevalier Pertz, Librarian of the Royal Imperial Library in Berlin. The Horners' third daughter was Frances Joanna (1816-1894) who married,

---

\* Texts: On Retirement, Memoir II: 48-50; On Death: Memoir I: Vol.2: 374-5. The Secretary, Maudsley or Mawdsley, was on both.

in May 1844, [Sir] Charles Bunbury (1809-1886) son of Sir Henry Bunbury of Mildenhall, Suffolk. The fourth daughter was Katharine (1818-1915) who married Charles Lyell's nephew, [Colonel] Henry Lyell (1804-1875). The Horner's only son Francis was born in 1820 and died in 1824. Horner's wife died on 22nd May 1862.

The marriage between Henry Lyell and Katharine produced a son [Sir] Leonard Lyell (1850-1926) created 1st Baron Lyell in 1914 after serving as M.P. for Orkney 1885-1900. His son was Charles Henry Lyell (1875-1918) M.P. for South Edinburgh, 1910-1918; his grandson, Charles Antony Lyell (1913-1943, posthumous V.C.) was succeeded by the 3rd Baron, born 1939.

The marriage between Charles Bunbury and Frances produced a lineage which led to Sir H.N. Bunbury, the editor of Lloyd George's Ambulance wagon: the memoirs of W.J. Braithwaite (1957). But the antecedents are equally significant. The son-in-law of Horner was the son of Sir Henry Bunbury, 1778-1860, the seventh Baronet; his father (1750-1811) had been the second son of the 5th baronet. It was the sixth Baronet (Thomas, 1740-1821) who had been M.P. for Suffolk for forty three years; Sir Henry served as under-Secretary of State for War 1809-1816 and Whig Liberal M.P. for Suffolk from 1830-1834. Horner's son-in-law, Sir Charles James Fox Bunbury\* became High Sheriff of Suffolk.

---

\* The sources make clear the three roots of the Bunbury family: Fox (Henry married first a daughter of Charles James Fox's brother); Napier (Henry's second wife was a sister of Sir Charles Napier; one Bunbury son carries the third given name of Napier to this day); and St Pierre (the baronetcy is a cadet branch of the Norman family St. Pierre).  
SOURCES: DNB; Who was who; Kelly's Handbook; Burke's Peerage.

Until Horner settled in London, he and his family moved between Edinburgh and London; when he settled in London he lived in Rivermede near Kingston, then moved to the Grove, Highgate (the house next door to Coleridge's former residence) then to a new house in Twickenham, and lastly Montague Place.

JAMES PHILLIPS KAY (SHUTTLEWORTH)

J.P. Kay (1804-1877) has not only a very full biography (Smith, 1923) and autobiography (Kay, 1877), but also a full bibliography (Bloomfield, 1960) and even a listing of his deed box (Bloomfield, 1961). He has also been studied in precisely the context of my own concerns (Johnson, Ph.D. thesis; Ball, 1963; Hurt; Bishop and so on). This does not, of course, make matters simpler; but it does mean that some matters can be referred back to those sources. Kay changed his name on marriage to Kay-Shuttleworth; apart from indicating that when it happens (and when I quote the usage of others) I propose to save myself twelve letters and call him simply Kay.

Kay was born on 20 July 1804, the son of Robert Kay (1768-1834) a cotton manufacturer and nonconformist Radical Liberal. Kay's mother, Hannah (Phillips, 1770-1853), was also an active nonconformist. Kay was educated in Rochdale at the Leaf Square Grammar School until he was fifteen when he went to work on his uncle's farm, near Rochdale; he lived in Bamford Hall and was a Sunday school teacher in Bamford. In 1824 he went to Edinburgh to study medicine; there he became a senior President of the (student) Royal Medical Society and published a paper in their Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal.<sup>\*</sup> According to Kay's Autobiography,<sup>\*\*</sup> he became a 'clerk' at the Edinburgh New Town Dispensary in his second undergraduate year and this gave him his first contact with

---

\* As with Horner's geology, I ignore Kay's medicine - details are in Smith, 1923; Bloomfield, 1960. Cf. Chitnis Ph.D. thesis.

\*\* Founded in 1815, this may be the dispensary investigated by Horner in 1817.



extensive poverty. He recalled

I necessarily became familiar with the foulest slums in which these wretched population seemed continually perishing. Their habits, wants and sufferings were constantly before my eyes, I came to know how almost useless were the resources of my art [i.e. 'medical science' P.C.] to contend with the consequences of formidable social evils. (Kay, 1877: 4-5)

Taken with medical practice in Manchester in the long vacation of 1825, and his attending lectures on anatomy in Dublin in 1826, this led Kay to expand his scientific reading to encompass 'the best works on political and social science .... [I] obtained more and more insight into the grave questions affecting the relations of capital and labour and the distribution of wealth, as well as the inseparable connection between the mental and moral condition of the population and their physical well being.' (Ibid., p.5).

Aside from his own self-education, we know that the Edinburgh of the 1820s was alive with political and moral discussion. The University of Edinburgh was an international centre for medical education (Chitnis Ph.D. thesis, 1968). According to this source from 1790 to 1826, 2309 doctors graduated from the University and there were 272 diplomates of the Royal College of Surgeons in the same period.\* In an analysis of

---

\* I am grateful to Dr Chitnis for drawing my attention to his thesis and article. He stresses that there is, of course, some overlap between M.D. and diploma awards but the annual MD figures show the trend: 1811:43; 1818: 103; 1825: 140.

86 graduates, Dr Chitnis (Ph.D. thesis Ch.5; 1973: 179f) has shown the high proportion that became teachers - eight professors of medicine at the new University of London were graduates of Edinburgh; other major occupational groups were: administrators of medical law, medical scientists and 'public health workers'. In the last category we would follow Chitnis in mentioning Kay, Arnott, J. Hume M.P., and T. Southwood Smith. But along with this spread of talent we need also to remark the curricula of Edinburgh - aside, that is, from extra curricular education. This is surveyed in Chitnis (1973): for example, in 1807, there was a Chair established in 'Medical jurisprudence and police' and in 1826 a course in 'Medical police' - given Kay's own statements it is not difficult to see the aetiology of the 'sanitary idea' in this mixture. Johnson has already suggested (Ph.D. thesis, 1968, 23f) that Edinburgh may well have been as important as Benthamite Westminster. I agree, but would want to follow Beales (1974) in stressing the significance of the Whig connection.

At the start of a fever outbreak in 1826, Kay was employed as a 'clerk' at the rapidly established Queensferry Fever Hospital; from there he moved to become first 'clerk' to the clinical wards, and then resident 'clerk' to the medical wards, of the Royal Infirmary, Edinburgh. Kay graduated M.D. in August 1827, having presented his thesis on muscular action; in December he set up as a general practitioner in Mosley Street, Manchester. In 1828 he became Senior Physician at Ardwick and Ancoats dispensary and founder-promoter of the North of England Medical Journal in which he published five articles. One defended Malthus; a second examined the 'physical condition' of the poor; the others were more

narrowly medical.\* His Autobiography comments on all these experiences *extend* those already quoted concerning the early years in Edinburgh. But his whole understanding - whether his reading or his practice - was, like the terrible disease itself, brought to a fever pitch by his work during the 1831/2 cholera outbreak when he was a physician of the Knott Hill Cholera Hospital.

Not that Kay had been silent on political matters until that time. In 1831 he published an anonymous Letter to the people of Lancashire concerning the future representation of the Commercial Interest which revealed 'his faith in Liberal Whiggism' and his 'allegiance to Lord John Russell' (Smith, 1923:20). In 1832 Kay worked hard to secure the election of Poulett Thompson as M.P. for Manchester. In the same year Kay's remarkable pamphlet on the 'moral and physical condition of the working classes' was published in two editions (Johnson details the significance of the differences Ph.D. thesis pp.35f.; 1970: 101f.). The Benthamite reaction to Kay's pamphlet (Westminster Review, 1833) concentrates on using it to support their general strategy.

In March 1833 Kay and William Langton (b.1803, chief cashier at Benjamin Heywood's Bank; two of Langton's daughters married two of Heywood's sons) founded the Manchester and District Provident Society. In September 1833 they and others founded the Manchester Statistical Society (Ashton, 1934; Elesh, 1972; Cullen, 1975: Ch.8). At the end of 1833 Kay had come to the attention of important circles insofar as he was consulted by Cornwall Lewis about the Irish Poor, quite possibly

---

\* In 1834 Kay published an account of Asphyxia for which he was awarded the Fothergill Medal of the Royal Humane Society in 1845. This, together with two articles on blood circulation (one in the Journal mentioned, the other in the Cyclopedia of Practical Medicine, 1834) are considered Kay's major medical contributions.

because of his reports on the 'Irish' areas of Manchester. In 1834 Poulett Thomson and Kay consulted about the utility of Statistical Societies like the Manchester for the information 'needs' of the State. By July 1834 there were 28 paid up members of the Manchester Society (which is analysed more fully in Chapter 3 above) and in that September the Society delivered a report to the British Association Statistical Section, itself only founded the previous year (Transactions B.A.A.S., 4, 1834). In this same year Kay produced a paper on dispensaries in which he was critical of 'overindulgent' charity and too much State interference. Kay also gathered statistical information from other towns (e.g. Liverpool) and districts (e.g. Derbyshire). He was concerned with the production of a second paper read to the British Association, in 1837, on Liverpool (Kay, 1877:15).

Some time in 1833 or 1834 Kay was introduced to James and J.S. Mill by Nassau Senior whom he had met through mutual acquaintances amongst the Manchester bourgeoisie. He visited London and took part in Benthamite discussions. From these connections, and Nassau Senior was instrumental again, Kay was offered the post of Assistant Poor Law Commissioner for the Eastern Districts sometime in 1834<sup>\*</sup>. His Autobiography (pp.17f Cf. Smith, 1923:29f) reports that for health and 'political reasons' - he did not feel that he could be as influential as a doctor - he was dissatisfied with his medical work.

Kay moved home in July 1835 and almost at once had written his first report on the migration of agricultural workers from his new area to his

---

\* According to P.P. 1840 (305) XXXIX p.271 Kay was appointed in January 1835; according to P.P. 1846 (512) XXVI and Smith, 1923:35 it was 11 July 1835. He was paid only from the latter date. Cf. P.P. 1838(207) XVII, Vol. I; 1842(449) XXVI, p.5.

old (from East Anglia to Lancashire). This text shows how he interweaves environmental and moral data, statistics and philosophy (Kay, 1835). The same trend is evident in his general reports (1836) and 'special' studies: on Spitalfield weavers (1837), or agricultural labourers' earnings (1838c). Of course it achieves its high point in his reports of an educational character, for example the series which it is convenient to title 'Training of pauper children' (1838a,b,d,,1839; 1840a,b;1841a) supplemented by such unpublished materials as his report on the Punishment of Pauper Children (Kay,1841b: Cf.Kay,1877:Ch.4; Smith, 1923:69f). Although Kay was never a member of the Central Society of Education his ideas and actual texts were drawn upon - B.F. Duppa's 1839 article is almost a direct reprint of materials by Kay. Much of Kay's work reflected liaison with others- notably E.C. Tufnell\* - and the educational tours which Kay made, with others. With Tufnell he went, in 1837, on such a tour of Scotland; they both went to Europe in September 1839.\*\* Tufnell was one of the secretaries of the Statistical Society of London which had been founded in 1834; by July 1838 (if not earlier) Kay was a Fellow of the London Society; in May of 1838 he was a member of that Society's committee on the condition of the working classes - other members were G.R. Porter, J. Heywood; R.A. Slaney and E. Romilly (Cullen,1975:99f).

In 1838, with George Nicholls, Kay visited Holland, Belgium and France - in Paris he met V. Cousin, whose educational ideas he was already familiar with. In September of 1838 Kay, with the schoolmaster McLeod, again visited Holland and north Germany. On his return from this trip he was

---

\* Edward Carleton Tufnell (1806-1886) Eton, Balliol B.A. 1828, Lincoln's Inn 1827. Tufnell's brother was a Whig MP. Tufnell was: Assistant P.L. Commissioner 1835-1847; HMI for Poor Law Schools 1847-1861; Commissioner at Large (with Tremenheere) 1862-1871. He was a friend of Horner, Kay and HST.

\*\* This absence lasted six weeks (Kay to Ld. John Russell 11.10.1839) i.e. Kay was absent during the crucial preparation of the Minute of 24 Sep. 1839 (Ball, 1963:44f, 78; Cf. Smith, 1923:Ch.3; Johnson Ph.D.: Ch.2)

directed to become Assistant Commissioner for the Metropolis and he moved to London. Some of his work had already focussed on London; apart from that cited, in May 1838 Dr. Kay and Dr. Arnott had produced a report on Fever in the Metropolis. On 10th December Kay submitted, to the P.L.C., his extremely valuable report 'On the State of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Poor Law' (1838f; MH/ 32/50).

Most sources agree that Kay's letter of 29th October 1838 to Ld. John Russell was extremely influential. In early 1839 Kay was consulted by Lord Lansdowne about possible Secretaries for the proposed Committee of the Privy Council on Education (hereafter simply 'the Committee'). Kay proposed three names (none of them his) but on 1st March 1839 Lansdowne asked Kay to take the post and Kay accepted - providing, he requested, that he could retain some oversight of pauper schools in London, especially the Norwood School of Industry. Kay was succeeded as Assistant P.L. Commissioner for the Metropolitan District by [Sir] Edmund Head, school- and college-friend of Tremenheere, who accompanied the latter on his first H.M.I. visit to South Wales in 1839. Although he was appointed as from 26 August 1839, Ball (1963:27) reports Kay at work by 1st June; by July he was writing with authority to the National Society and in that month his Recent measures were circulated 'by authority'. Also in 1839, aside from the six-week visit they made to Europe, Kay and Tufnell established Battersea Normal School with their own funds.\* Both Battersea and Norwood were visited by domestic and foreign politicians (Kay, 1877: 58f; Smith, 1923:60). In 1842 Battersea became a more public institution,

---

\* This section condenses a lot of evidence: Kay, 1839a; 1841a: Ch.6; 1861a; 1877:59f; Smith, 1923: Ch.3; Ball, 1963; Johnson Ph.D. and 1969; 1970. Smith (1923:83fn.1) confirms Ball's report of how early Kay started work for the Committee.

with a grant-in-aid and rights of State inspection (Smith, 1923:115). In 1844 the National Society took it over completely (Ibid., 121). At this latter date Kay's mother and sister moved from the house in the grounds that they, and frequently Kay, had occupied since 1839. Kay continued for some years to work for the P.L.C. as can be seen from the letter books and the succinct report 'The nature and extent of my duties' in the public archives (M.H. 32/50 644a).

Given the significance of 'the religious difficulties of national education in England' (Best, 1956) it is worth trying to clarify Kay's own religion. His parents were dissenters. He seems to have been cautious to the point of silence. Smith, for example, considers the attacks made on Kay by the 'Church group' (which included Gladstone, Johnson Ph.D. p.47f) to have been unfounded since Kay was a communicant of the Church of England. For Richard Johnson, Kay was 'a liberal protestant by conviction and an Anglican by convenience and social aspiration' (Ph.D. thesis<sup>p65</sup>/cf his, 1969: 123f). Hurt argues that the exact nature of Kay's religious beliefs requires further research (Hurt, 1971: 23). That Kay was an active Christian is not doubted. His eldest son declares that Kay and his wife 'were members and communicants of the Church of England, but in no narrow sense' he mentions that they both went to 'Chalmer's Scotch Presbyterian Church in George Street, Bryanston Square, as an alternative to the Parish Church which they attended more regularly' (U. Kay-Shuttleworth, 1923: 331). Chadwick's estimates of Kay's 'Practical Christianity' in 1841 are discussed by Finer (1952a:151f). We know also that Kay opposed the Lancashire (later, National) Public School Association in 1847 for its secularism, and that he wrote to the Rev. Close (later Dean of Carlisle) praising the Evangelicals against the 'Anglican Romanising' Party (Smith, 1923: 191). By his 1862 sermons Kay

also demonstrates his Church of England allegiance clearly, as he did in 1871 when he built a parsonage on his estate. The Biblical texts which pepper his addresses to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science are less informative. Finally, perhaps, what matters is that Kay was able to successfully subordinate his religion to a more powerful, but equally moral, practice of State power.

Kay's instructions to the new H.M.I.'s stand as emblematic of his 'efficiency' and how he has translated and fused his earlier concerns (right back to the Edinburgh days) into his new office of State (P.P. 1851 (103) XLIII 55-69; Cf. Ball, 1963: Ch.4; Johnson Ph.D. 76f).

We should note the huge questionnaire (Ball reprints it) which Inspectors had to complete at each visit. In general Kay's career as Secretary (as he was called, his real post was Assistant Secretary) to the Committee has been well studied, not least by himself. Johnson, in particular (Ph.D., 86f; 1969; 1970) has shown how Kay 'imported' Poor Law methods and personnel. Political pressure seems to have been less significant than both that of Treasury and religious groupings; the change of government in 1841 made little difference.\*

Kay's irregular activities (his articles on Pestalozzi in the Times of 1842 for example) led to criticism from established powers (Greville spoke of 'muzzling' Kay, qu. Johnson Ph.D. p.113). It may have been pressure from that kind of 'Establishment' that led to Kay relinquishing his Poor Law work; Smith quotes a letter from Cornwall Lewis which more or less asks Kay to go, which he did in December 1842.

---

\* Note that at least one influential commentator, (Edinburgh Review 1842) found it surprising that the Committee persisted from Government to Government and that Kay's employment continued.



In February 1842 Kay married\* into the Shuttleworth name and the Estate; he spent some time of each year there until his retirement in 1849. On the estate the new 'lord of the manor' or 'squire' founded a village school, an allotment scheme and aided a brass band. From the first, Gawthorpe Hall (and less so his London house) were social centres\*\* where, for example, in February 1845, Lord Ashley dined in the company of H.S. Tremenheere (first Commissioner for the Mining Districts).

Kay's welcome for the Whig victory of Russell and the return of Lansdowne to the Council in 1846 should not obscure that the key ideas of those 1846 Minutes had been accepted by the Tories and Wharnccliffe in 1844; indeed, their deep roots are to be found in Kay's own 1839 ideas (Ball, 1963: Ch.8). Kay's 1846 text (reprinted 1862a: Ch.3) attacks Baines\*\*\* in particular and the 'voluntary group' in general. He supports State action for such 'great and worthy objects' (1862a:423), reporting in his Autobiography (1877: 69f) that he was instructed to issue the 1846 pamphlet. In 1847 Inspection was extended to Recommendation and Kay was collecting suggestions from the Inspectors for a list of recommended textbooks for use in Schools which were grant aided; the list appears in the 1847-8 Minutes (Ball, 1963: 115f)\*\*\*\*. Kay was also involved in extra advisory duties - regarding, for example, the education of the 'coloured races' in the 'British Empire' (Smith, 1923:206)\*\*\*\*\*.

---

\* I close this section on Kay with a note on personal relations.

\*\* Cf Johnson, 1969 for Kay's social network. His eldest son supplied the list 'Sir James' friends' which Smith (1923) made his second appendix.

\*\*\* Smith (1923:159 fn1) gives Baines recantation of 11 October 1867; on Baines Cf. Fraser, 1974.

\*\*\*\* On Schoolbooks Cf. Goldstrom Ph.D. and his 1966; 1972a; on school libraries and children's reading: Ellis, 1971; 1976; Reid-Smith, 1973.

\*\*\*\*\*Smith (1923:207) suggests that Kay influenced the 1854 education scheme of the East India Company.

I mentioned that Kay gave one reason for his move from medicine to public administration, and Manchester to East Anglia, as ill health. According to Smith (1923: 212f) there is evidence of Kay's falling health as early as 1844 - both Smith and Johnson (Ph.D. Ch.6 and 1969: 111f) mention a 'crisis' within the Department, and further Treasury restrictions. Both also document the frequency with which Civil Servants fell ill with 'chronic congestion of the brain'. Suddenly, on 9 December 1848 Kay fell insensible on the floor of the Privy Council office - remaining unconscious for a quarter of an hour. There is little doubt from the consensus of the sources that the subsequent enforced absence of Kay was seen by many as an opportunity to change personnel. On 20 December 1848 Kay wrote to Ld. John Russell offering to retire and requesting a reorganization of the work of the Office. He returned to work in early 1849, but offered again to retire so that the politicians could appoint 'any person whose ability, experience, and political views justified the confidence of the Committee' (qu. Smith, 1923:219). Ld. John Russell offered him retirement and a Privy Councillorship which Kay seems to have accepted. In April 1849 Kay left for a six-month tour of the Continent. On his return, as Lansdowne wrote to him, the Office no longer needed him; 'Lingen and Temple have both been doing very well.'<sup>\*</sup> On 11th December Lansdowne wrote to tell Kay that he and Ld. John Russell thought a baronetcy should be preferred on Kay. Kay agreed and the baronetcy was gazetted on Christmas Day 1849. Although Kay never returned to work, he was paid £1000 in calendar 1850 (P.P. 1850 (260) XXXIV p.324).

By November 1850 Kay was sufficiently recovered to deliver a speech in

---

\* On Lingen, and the Balliol connection, Cf. Johnson Ph.D. Ch.6 and his 1969; Bishop, 1968; 1971. Jowett's letter of congratulation to Lingen of 8 Jan. 1850 is revealing (qu. Johnson Ph.D. p.341).

which he announced the 'problem' to which he had devoted, and would devote, his intellectual energies to be 'the establishment of a system of national education' (Manchester Guardian 6 Nov. 1850). In January 1851 he approved the Manchester and Salford Boroughs Education Bill (Ibid., 11 Jan. 1851) and Smith (1923: Ch.8) details similar local involvements. Kay considered trying to enter Parliament at this time; but he declined an approach in 1853 and another in 1865; in the latter year he also declined (?) an approach to make him a special member of the Privy Council. His 1853 book attempted to justify the Whig educational policy of 1839-1846; it rehearses familiar themes: the debt to Chalmers; the 'connexion between ignorance and irreligion' (Kay, 1853:45) plus some quite subtle material on the State's collective duties.

Kay maintained his politico-social connections: he met in 1854 Monkton Milnes; Harriet Martineau; Lords Brougham and Shaftesbury, and Dickens' friend Miss Burdett Coutts. In this year his speech 'Education essential to the success of trade and commerce' (1854), like his 1856 address 'Medical and middle-class education', shows his involvement with 'higher' or 'further' education (Cf. Smith, 1923: Ch.10). From 1857 onwards he was involved with the East Lancashire Union of Mechanics Institutes, writing their first annual report himself. In June 1857 Kay attended the Conference of 'The friends of the education of the working classes', chaired by H.R.H. the Prince Consort; Kay chaired Section C to which Tremenheere gave one of his papers on prize schemes. (Cf. Hill, 1857). At the final meeting, with Earl Granville in the chair, Kay moved, and Baines seconded, a motion in support of prize schemes. In 1857 Kay worked for the election of Lord Cavendish as an M.P. In 1874 Kay stood with Lord Cavendish as Whig-Liberal M.P.s for N.E. Lancashire; both were unsuccessful. Cavendish's father, the Duke of Devonshire, chaired the

1870 Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction of which Kay was a member.

In 1858, the Newcastle Commission on Popular Education was established; Kay gave extensive evidence and submitted his 1861 letters to Lord Granville, in April (1861a) and November (1861d - this sold nine to ten thousand copies). In 1859, 1860 and 1866 Kay delivered papers to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. These are extremely coherent and, I argue, significant texts which are analysed in chapters three and four above. Kay was on the Council of the NAPSS from 1859 to 1872 (Smith, 1923: 284). The material collected in his 1873 volume Thoughts shows his orientation to social science admirably.\* This volume also contains his 'Manual of suggestions for relief committees ...' (1863?) which relates to 'distress' in Lancashire in the 1860s. From 1861 Kay was Vice Chairman (Lord Derby was Chairman) of the Manchester Central Relief Committee; in 1862 he was Secretary of the Cotton Districts Relief fund. In the latter year Kay's sermons were published (Benjamin Heywood's son Abel published them for Kay in Manchester); they were issued as tracts (no.1 was 1½d; 50 cost 5/6d and 100, 10/-). In 1863 Kay was made High Sheriff of Lancashire and in 1865 served on the emergency county committees established during the cattle plague. In 1866 his focus on education continued in his battle with Lowe; but they were clearly on the same side on some issues as Kay's speech 'The relations of elementary education to the franchise' (Manchester Guardian 26 Jan. 1866; reported by the Times same date as 'The School in its political relations') makes clear. Kay's real onslaught on Lowe is in

---

\* One review of Kay's novel Scarsdale (1860) considered it 'a valuable contribution to thought on the great problem of social science' (qu Smith, 1923: 258). In 1873 Kay published Ribblesdale: a second novel; I admit to reading neither.

Kay's 1868 Memorandum which Matthew Arnold read in proof and which he, Lords Lansdowne, Granville and Derby, plus W.E. Forster and E.C. Tufnell all praised (Smith, 1923:289). Kay claimed that he directly influenced Forster's 1870 Act; certainly his eldest son, Ughtred (later first Lord Shuttleworth) spoke in Parliament in its favour, having first secured his seat at Hastings in December 1868. Kay continued to fight educational battles, including work on endowment schemes with E.C. Tufnell (Smith, 1923:212f).

Kay caught 'Roman fever' in 1869, and spent much time abroad. In 1877 he spent the winter on the Riviera but in May 1877 he fell ill and died at his London Home (68 Cromwell Road) aged 72 on 26th May 1877.

. . . . .

### Personal

Kay had four brothers: Robert (1808-1873) was a major calico printer near Rochdale; Joseph (1821-1878) became a QC and a Palatinate Judge as well as author of important works on social conditions and free trade<sup>\*</sup>; Edmund Ebenezer (1822-1897) became a QC, a Privy Councillor and Lord Justice of Appeal in the Supreme Court; and Thomas, who emigrated to New Zealand. Kay had one sister (1806-1869) who died unmarried. On 24 Feb. 1842 Kay married Janet Shuttleworth (1817-1872) who was the heiress of Robert Shuttleworth<sup>\*\*</sup> who had died in 1818.

---

\* E.g. Education of the poor in England and Europe (1842); Social condition of the People in England and Europe (1850; 2 vols) and Free Trade in Land (various eds., prefaced by John Bright).

\*\* Robert Shuttleworth was born in 1784, married in 1816 and died in 1818 when Janet (Kay's wife) was not yet one year old. His wife (Janet Marjoribanks) married again and so Janet was the full heiress from 1838. The Shuttleworth lineage extends back to 1330 and includes MPs and High Sheriffs in the 17th and 18th centuries. Cf. Burke's Peerage.

Kay changed his name and acquired the estate, and the armorial badge of the family - consisting of a sailor, a weaver and many shuttles. Janet gave birth to five children: Janet (1843-1914, unmarried); Ughtred (1844-1939); Robert (1847-1934); Leonard (1849-1900) and Stewart (1851-1887). Kay's wife Janet was ill from 1853 and lived abroad much of the time until her death.

Ughtred was a Liberal M.P. for Hastings from 1869-1880 and M.P. for Clitheroe from 1885 to 1902; he was made a P.C. in 1886 and created Baron Shuttleworth in 1902. The first Baron's two sons, Lawrence (b.1887) and Edward (b.1890), were both killed in 1917 in the First World War. The eldest Lawrence had two sons, both were killed in the Second World War - the eldest Richard (b.1913), in the 'Battle of Britain' in 1940; and the other, Ronald (b.1917), in North Africa in 1941. All four progeny had been educated at Eton and Balliol; Lawrence and Edward were both barristers of the Inner Temple. The fifth Baron (b.1917), Charles Ughtred inherited his title in 1940; he too was wounded in the Second World War (M.C. 'invalided home'); he was educated at Eton and Magdalene College. When he died in 1975 he left a net estate of £190,589 (Times 19.6.1976).

HUGH SEYMOUR TREMENHEERE

H.S. Tremenheere (1804-1893) lacks a biographer but we know a good deal about him. Apart from Boase and the D.N.B., there are: S.G. Tremenheere's family biography; the Webb 1955a masterpiece; the work of the Edmonds and the theses of Cassell and Holmes - all supplement Tremenheere's own writings, including his volume I was there.

Tremenheere was born on 22 January 1804, in Gloucestershire, the eldest son of Colonel (later General) Walter Tremenheere (1761-1855) of the Marine Corps. The Tremenheere's are (according to Boase and S.G. Tremenheere) of 'ancient Cornish stock'. HST's father had been for a short time governor of Curaçao. He had been appointed by Admiral Lord Hugh Seymour from whence derive the given names of the Tremenheere I am studying. His father was involved in administrative duties in various militia towns; he was, for example, on the staff of the Military Academy, Woolwich, when his second son, George Borlase (1809-1896) was born. Tremenheere's father was aide-de-camp to William IV from 1829 to 1831, for which he received the Royal Guelphic Order in 1832. The promotion to General came for Tremenheere's father at the age of 92, in 1854; he died the following year on 7th August 1855 at the age of 93 and 11 months. Hugh Seymour had three brothers and two sisters. For a full, exhausting, family study see the work of S.G. Tremenheere.

HST went to various schools, including Midhurst, 1814-1817, from where he went to Winchester (1817-1823) where he met many influential people. When HST became Head Boy he was already friendly with B.F. Duppa,\* later

---

\* Duppa was also an active member of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge (Cf. Smith M.A. thesis; Webb, 1955b:Ch.3). Duppa was instrumental in securing HST's appointment as one of the first H.M.I.'s.

secretary of the Central Society of Education, of which HST was a founder-member (Parkin, 1975 and C.S.E. Papers). Whilst HST was at Winchester the 1818 'riots' took place and an account of them exists in HST's papers. In 1823 he won a scholarship to New College Oxford and went there on 30 January 1824. In 1825 he reports that he was learning Italian and improving his French (he had very good Greek and Latin already). In the Easter vacation of 1826 he took a tour of 1,864 miles, by coach, with his Uncle, Henry Pendarves Tremenheere, which included England, Wales and Scotland. In 1827 HST was President of New College JCR and gained his B.A. in October. He then went on the Grand Tour which lasted until 1829; he was made a Fellow of New College in 1828 and held that Fellowship until his marriage in 1856. In 1830 he entered chambers with his brother John Henry (1807-1880). In that year HST visited the Rotunda at Blackfriars, and heckled the 'socialists' he heard there at one meeting; and paid for the printing and circulation of some anti-atheist literature, at another. In 1832 he received his M.A. and served as a Special Constable in the Reform Agitation. In 1834 he was called to the Bar of the Inner Temple (where Chadwick was admitted in 1830).

Whilst he served as a general barrister and latterly on the Western revising circuit, between 1834 and 1838 HST (i) had met E.C. Tufnell, L. Horner and G.R. Porter; (ii) was a member of the 'movements' of statistics (Cf. Cullen, 1975) and 'educationalists'. HST was a founder member of the Central Society and a reader of Brougham; by 1842 his contributions to the London Statistical Society carried the suffix 'Fellow'; (iii) had published important reviews in the Edinburgh Review (1837-1839); (iv) rejected a post in India that would have paid him £3000 p.a. (Holmes' Thesis and the Edmonds clash on the date, it was either 1838 or 1839).



From an apparently casual encounter with Duppa, and some canvassing on his behalf, HST was approached by Lansdowne to be one of the first HMI's. Lansdowne revealed in his letters and at their meeting that he knew of HST's Edinburgh Review items and knew HST to be both a Whig and an Anglican. HST's appointment, as Inspector of the British & Foreign Schools, was finalised either on 29 November (Ball, 1963:35) or 9th December 1849 (P.P. 1851 (103) XLIII:28f). HST was sent to inspect Schools in South Wales (Kay's letter is in P.P. Ibid., 53-54); he met and travelled with Edmund Head (a friend from Winchester and Oxford). The area was still 'politically troubled' by the aftermath of 'Frost's Rebellion'; the myth is still repeated (Tremenheere seems to have started it!) that he went there to discover the causes of the latter. Tremeneheere's report was completed by 1st February 1840. By the end of that year HST knew Charles Knight, the Chambers brothers and Harriet Martineau; in May he determined to write 'a popular account of the wisdom of the Ancients' and he was reading de Tocqueville avidly. (Journal 11 May 1840 qu. Webb, 1955a:362-3). In the same month he dined with Kay and met there Carlyle (whom he quoted on the 'cash nexus' in his Journal, qu. I was there p.38). He then inspected schools in Norfolk. In London in July he met and talked with Leonard Horner and on the last day of that month he inspected a British and Foreign School in Lewes which had misappropriated funds and, on his report, their grant was withdrawn. On 11th August, at the direct request of the Admiralty, he inspected Greenwich Hospital Schools.\* From 9th November the Council Office (Kay?) instructed the Inspectors to keep a diary (Ball, 1963: Ch.5) but HST refused (as did the other HMI, the Rev. John Allen appointed for

---

\* Kay's letter of instructions is given P.P. 1841 [ 317 ] XX 110-110; the Report by HST was finished on 8th September and is printed P.P. Ibid., 111-122; it was very critical and led to many changes. I analyse it in detail in Ch.3 above.

National Society Schools at the same time as HST) and their refusal was accepted. Years later Tremenheere recalled in his Journal,

one thing I never could take without resenting it - the pretensions of subordinate officials in public offices. There are always probably a few such - men without much breeding - but according to my experience of 31 years the great majority of them are too much gentlemen of the world to offend in that particular.

(I was there, p.49)

This shows those flashes of Whig-paternalism that are evident in Horner; the same elitism is very evident in HST's later correspondence with Chadwick over Civil Service Reform.

From 1841 or so HST acted as an Assistant Poor Law Commissioner; although I can only trace payment for 30 days work, he records that many of his reports for the P.L.C. were sent 'via the Office'. There was, of course, a considerable overlap, as with HST's Inspection of Norwood, or (with 'my friend' E.C. Tufnell) of the Union Schools of Liverpool and Manchester.

In 1842 HST produced his report on London British and Foreign Schools; for a critical review of this, see the article on Inspection in the Eclectic Review, (1842), but contrast the praise for Tremenheere in the Edinburgh Review (1842). Ball notes that the Lord President, Wharncliffe, considered HST 'tactless' but 'a most valuable man' (Ball, 1963:50). HST certainly seems to have worked very closely with Kay, as he recorded in his Journal

Kay Shuttleworth and I had devised nearly the whole of my employment as an Inspector from the beginning, with a view to the manner in which OUR IDEAS ON EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT could best be brought before the public.

(I was there, p.47, his emphasis, my capitals)

But, politics being what it definitely was (and is), HST had to keep what we would today call 'a low profile' in 1843 - March saw the publication of his report on privately run 'Schools of Industry'; and in April he investigated the Home and Colonial Infant School Society's Training School in Gray's Inn Road (Ball, 1963: 149). It is clear that several offers were made to him. He rejected the suggestion (of 'my friend' Chadwick) that he become a second Under Secretary of State with the Poor Law Commission. HST's reasons are relevant:

In office work I could originate nothing. In the work I had undertaken [i.e. Inspection and later Commissioner] I felt I should have opportunities of originating a few things at least ...

(Journal, qu. I was there, p.63)

Sir James Graham vetoed a suggestion that HST become a special HMI for district Poor Law Schools. Eventually he was appointed 'Inspector of Mines' to use the nomenclature which is sometimes employed. In fact, as HST noted in his Journal on 25 Nov 1843, he was 'In reality Commissioner of Enquiry on the State of the Mining Population' (qu. I

was there, p.47).\*

As his new post carried a salary of £700 p.a. (£100 more than that of his HMI's salary) - plus expenses - HST's financial position was improved. From 1844 to 1859 he produced annual reports in which the political and the 'sociological' are far more obvious than the 'technical'. The contrast is best made with the (genuine) Mines' Inspectors reports after 1850. His central focus is moral regulation; the attempt to 'plot' different sociographic variables. He thus concentrates upon such phenomena as 'restriction of output' (mentioned in every report) or 'socialistic literature' (Cf. the reports for 1849, 1850 and 1852) or, centrally, education (Cassell's thesis, Chs. 5 and 6 brings this out). Where appropriate he recommends counter measures, altering thereby the admixture of the variables he has isolated - this is clear from his suggestions for 'prize schemes' (Tremenheere, 1857; 1861).

He sustained his contacts with Kay and with Horner, whom he approached when seeking the more general adoption of the educational scheme embodied in the Print Works Act, since this suited the labour needs of the Mining Owners who could not use the relay system. HST travelled abroad each year, often extending his 'usual' two month's leave, as he did for his trip to the U.S.A. in 1851\*\* ; his Journal references to

---

\* This definition by HST is perfectly consistent with his letter of appointment of 14 December 1843 (HO 87/1 folio 286) and the letter of authorisation from the Treasury (HO 45 o.s. 339/2a). In both cases the 'job description' includes reporting on the general state and condition of the population. By the 3rd volume of the Inspectors Letter Books (H.O.87) it is clear that the clerks did not know how to accurately index HST's work.

\*\* On this trip see the packet HO 45 o.s. 3502 and the Appx. to P.P. 1852 (1525) XXI. His official visits included France, the Netherlands; Belgium and parts of 'Germany'.

Russia in 1852 are instructive (I was there, Ch.4). In 1854 he was in the Crimea 'as a spectator' but carried back some despatches. Each year from 1844 he was allowed a very large number of copies of his own report for distribution on his own account, 1000 was common in the 1840s, and 2000 in the early 1850s (for one year HST records 3,500 copies). By 1854 the figure was 'only' 750.

Less officially (since HST certainly did not divide the two) - and apart from his service as a Special Constable in 1848 when he carried his 1832 truncheon 'with pride' - HST produced a series of relevant publications. There were three, separately titled, editions of his 1852 work The political experience of the ancients (1852; 1865b; 1882) which uses as its opening 'text' the famous editorial of the Times 2 September 1851 on 'Literature of the Poor', which, in its turn, may have been influenced by HST's own accounts, from Staffordshire in 1849 and Newcastle upon Tyne in 1850, of 'infidel' and 'anarchistic' literature circulating widely (Webb, 1955b). These works are permeated with De Tocquevillean notions that the U.S.A. is 'ultrademocracy' - the changes in title reflect Tremenheere's attempts to relate that to changes in Britain. In the same year as the second edition, he gave an address to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science which was also published separately (1865a). From 1868 to 1870 he was President of the Royal Geological Society of Cornwall.

Whilst still Commissioner for Mining Districts, HST investigated Bleaching works. After he has ceased the former work he undertook a series of different investigations. Although the 1862 Children's Employment Commission (six reports) and the 1867 Commission on Agriculture (four reports) are important, the investigations of Lace Manufacture,

Journeyman Bakers and Bakehouses, together with investigations consequent upon the 1845 Printworks Act total 4,250 folio pages in the Irish Universities Press reprint. From the 1860s he was maintaining a frequent correspondence with Chadwick and actively engaged in assisting the latter in the framing of some of his publications.

In 1870, HST considered that Forster's Bill followed on HST's recommendations. On HST's retirement he was made a C.B. In his letters HST expressed a liking for 'idleness'; in 1880 and 1881 he produced his articles relating to schemes which would encourage 'saving' and 'thrift'. In 1882 he produced his third edition of his standard work; writing to Chadwick on 14 July 1885 (Chadwick had told HST's brother Charles that HST ought to reprint his 1852 work, HST reported that he had) HST says

The British public, however, has not thought the concentrated political wisdom of the world worth 3/6. I have accordingly just had it got ready to be hawked about at 1/-.

(Chadwick MSS, folder 1988)\*

In the late 1890s Tremenheere produced a series of pamphlets aimed at a working class audience, focussed on the newly enfranchised and their duties. In a letter from HST to George Boase of April 1893\*\* he wrote

Allow me to present to you a couple of copies of my last Pamphlet just published. As I have entered my 90th year it will in all probability be my last.

---

\* In this letter he clearly regards Chadwick and his wife as amongst his 'oldest friends'.

\*\* This letter is affixed to the British Library copy of HST's 1893; Press Mark 8139 df 16(9).

It is being widely circulated by the Liberal Unionist Association, as my former ones were.

In 1891 he produced a new Translation of Aristotle's work on the Athenian State.

On 16 September 1893 he died at Thurlow Square.

. . . . .

### Personal

HST seems to have been troubled by some debts until the death of his father in 1855 when he sold some (if not all) of the lands he inherited from his father. These debts may be related to the burden which an earlier bequest (from his uncle Henry Pendarves) of property had placed on him. It may also have explained why he did not marry until 1856 (when he lost his New College Fellowship).

In 1856 HST married Lucy. She had been born Bernal-Osbourne, daughter of an M.P. and Deputy Speaker. She was the widow of Vicesimus Knox, Recorder of Saffron Walden. Lucy gave birth to two daughters, Florence Lucy Bernal and Evelyn Westfaling. Lucy died in 1872. For the collateral and descendants see S.G. Tremenheere's family biography.

In London Tremenheere had several houses - in Pall Mall, in Park Lane, and in Thurlow Square, where he died.

EDWIN CHADWICK

Chadwick (1800 to 1890) has two excellent studies, an epitome, - and is featured in almost any discussion of the nineteenth century State.\* My account can be brief.

Chadwick was born near Manchester on 24 January 1800; his father, James, was a teacher and newspaper editor, and 'an associate of the advanced liberal politicians of his time' (D.N.B.). Chadwick's father edited the Statesman, the Western Times, and moved eventually to New York, where he died. The family's move to London in 1810 interrupted Chadwick's education which continued by private tuition. At the age of 15, he entered a solicitor's office. He lived by this means, and, later by his journalism. The important part of the latter was that it drew him to the attention of Bentham who noticed particularly the 1829 article in the London Review, on Preventive Police, and the previous year's item in the Westminster Review, on Life Assurance (which contained the 'sanitary idea'). From 1829 he thus enjoyed the company of Nassau Senior, the two Mills, and in 1830 he became Bentham's secretary, being left part of Bentham's Library and a small legacy in 1832. In 1830 Chadwick had been called to the Bar of the Inner Temple. By the time of Bentham's death, according to Finer (1952a: 29) Chadwick had

---

\* I have used DNB and follow the standard sources. For the best account see Finer, 1952a (his chronology, pp.541-544) and Cf. Collins, 1913; Lewis, 1950, 1952; Richardson, 1862; 1887; Chadwick, 1887; Cullen, 1975: Ch.4. In a study such as Lubenow, 1971, Chadwick, Peel, Ashley and Russell all have similar index entries - contrast Horner and Kay; there is no entry for Tremenheere in Lubenow or Finer.



cemented two lifelong friendships: with Nassau Senior (cf. Levy, 1943) and with Richard Whately (cf. Goldstrom, 1966).

In 1832 Chadwick was appointed an Assistant Commissioner, for London and Berkshire, to the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws; he became a main Commissioner in 1833 and wrote, with Nassau Senior, most of the final report and much of the 'press notices' and similar advance material that circulated widely. In 1833 he was also one of the Central Commissioners of the Royal Commission on the Employment of Children. In the year of the Poor Law Report, Chadwick gave extensive evidence to the Select Committee on Drunkenness, chaired by James Silk Buckingham (on the Committee, Cf. B. Harrison, 1968). In 1834 Chadwick was appointed Secretary of the Poor Law Commission and elected a member of the Political Economy Club; in advance of the former appointment he had drawn up, for the Cabinet, a memorandum which saw the Poor Law as a form of police; an idea which was also central to much of Nassau Senior's thinking as Beales has made clear (1931; 1948). Chadwick was marginally involved with the establishment of both the Statistical Section of the British Association and the Statistical Society of London in 1833 and 1834 respectively.

He had hoped to be a full Commissioner on the Poor Law, but as Secretary he was very influential. He also worked away at other related matters: in 1838 he was a member of the Royal Commission on the Constabulary and in the same year he established the medical-statistical enquiries of Kay, Arnott and Southwood-Smith (Cullen, 1975: Ch.4). He also secured Dr. William Farr's appointment as sub-Registrar-General. In 1839 he married into the Manchester bourgeoisie when he married Rachel Kennedy, daughter of John Kennedy. In 1840 he went abroad to investigate the Poor Laws and health provision of European countries; some of his

report is included in the 1841 Report on the training of pauper children.

In 1840 he had a series of meetings with Kay, Horner, Ashley and others about factory legislation. In this year Kay suggests that he first proposed to Chadwick a survey of urban sanitation (Kay, 1877: 18) and in 1842 there appeared Chadwick's Sanitary Report (Cullen, 1975: 56f). Chadwick followed this up with the Royal Commission on the State of Large Towns and the 'Health of Towns' Association. In 1844 Chadwick and others founded the 'Friends in Council' - J.S. Mill, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Dr. Arnott and Chadwick were key members - to discuss questions of political economy. 1844/46 were years of crisis for the Poor Law Commission, which was dissolved, and Chadwick was effectively sacked, from 1st June 1847. In 1848, after his two year's work on the Sanitary Condition of the Metropolis Report, 'on the recommendation of Prince Albert' (D.N.B.) he was made a C.B. and in that year he became a Commissioner on the newly formed General Board of Health. He remained with the Board until its duties were divided between the Local Government Office and the Medical Committee of the Privy Council in 1854 when he was retired with a pension of £1000 p.a.

From 1854 Chadwick was active over the whole spectrum of Reform questions - civil service reform (Cf. Lewis, 1950 and Chadwick, 1855; 1858; 1859a; 1871), and 'the sanitary idea' being salient. He was on the Councils of the Royal Society of Arts and the British Association; he also headed a Section of the latter and a Department of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (Finer 1952a: 487). He gave papers to these bodies, and the Statistical Society of London, and also wrote on health (Chadwick, 1860; 1863b; 1864a) and 'policing' (Chadwick, 1863a; 1868; 1881); he went back and revised former texts (for example in 1884 he revised his 1829). His 1887 unpublished memo

on tricycles for the police is not farcical; read carefully it contains the same arguments as those advanced in the 1960s for car as opposed to foot patrols. He retained a vast circle of contacts and friends as his correspondence shows; Mill, for example, praised his 1859 paper on 'Statesmanship as a science'; in 1865, to take another example, Chadwick met Napoleon III in France and was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Moral and Political Science of the Institute of France. In 1871 Chadwick presided at the Sanitary Congress and was President of the Association of Sanitary Inspectors in 1880s. In 1885 he lectured to the TUC on the need for Trades Unionists to do physical training. He was knighted in 1889.

In 1868 Chadwick stood unsuccessfully as Liberal M.P. for Kilmarnock; his correspondence with Tremenheere shows him assiduously gathering information about how to appeal to the miners' vote (for his earlier attempts see Finer, 1952a: 49f).

On 6th July 1890 Chadwick died at his house at East Sheen.

. . . . .

### Personal

In 1839 Chadwick married Rachel Dawson Kennedy of Ardwick Hall, daughter of John Kennedy (d. 1855) a partner in one of the 'largest spinners in the kingdom'. One of Rachel's sisters married Samuel Robinson, a millowning friend of Horner. Kennedy was one of those who had moved from Scotland to Lancashire at the start of the cotton 'boom'. The size of this movement can be seen from an examination of the other entries for 'Kennedy' in D.N.B.. We have a very informative account of the

'successive steps' by which 'this poor Scotch boy become one of the leading men of Manchester' in Smiles Industrial Biography (317-323). Kennedy belonged to that group of 'improving' mill owners and bankers who established libraries and schools for their employees, founded the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society and the Statistical Society, and exercised a strong influence on the empirical content of 'Manchester Liberalism'.

Rachel Chadwick gave birth to a son, Osbert, in 1842 (Finer, 1952a: 5<sup>\*</sup>); Osbert attended the Woolwich Royal Military Academy in 1850 and joined the Royal Engineers in 1864, retiring in 1873 to work as a Chartered Engineer, specialising in sanitary projects and acting as consultant to the Crown Agents for all such Colonial projects. He died (unmarried?) on 27th September 1913. Rachel gave birth to a daughter, Marion, in 1844, who died (unmarried?) in 1928, in which year she contributed a 'short character sketch' of her father for the Chadwick Trust (Finer, 1952a: 513-4 reprints this). It stresses the twin features of Bentham which Chadwick attempted consciously to copy: 'passion' and 'fanaticism'. Like Bentham, Chadwick saw his enemies as 'enemies of humanity'.

---

\* Who was who says 1844, unlikely given the birth of Marion also in 1844.

## ADDENDA TO APPENDIX I

Incomes of State Servants

Preamble: Chadwick and Kay spent much of their time administering "the poor", whether adult or children; this is not to imply that those that Horner and Tremenheere supervised were not poor; simply that they were in work. As comparison with the figures which follow I refer to the debate on 'standard of living' mentioned in Chapter I above - especially the summary volume edited by Taylor (1975) - or the 'social history of diet' provided by Burnett (1966). Studies of Wages and Earnings are available both generally - Levi, 1885; Bowley, 1898 onwards - and for specific occupations, for example, Agricultural labourers (Purdy, 1861; Bowley, 1898); Pitmen (Hooke, 1894). For a recent general survey of 'Trends in real wages, 1750-1850' see Flinn (1974; Gourvish, 1976). The gulf between 'the administered' and these Servants is so great that it is almost superfluous to present the incomes of the former. However, in the case of agricultural labourers (with servants - indeed they were considered servants until well after the 1914-1918 War - the largest occupational category in Britain until very late in the century) the weekly average wage for the United Kingdom moves thus:

1795	1833	1850	1869	1880
s/d. 8/11	11/4	9/6	12/7	13/7

Source: Bowley, 1898: 706-707

Of course, as that source (and Purdy, 1861), makes clear there was a considerable variation between and within regions.

In the case of pitwork, total earnings per week ('including house rent which is given gratis, and coals') where there was a full weeks work:

1811	1820	1835
s/d. 24/8½	18/9½	19/9

A different series, for male colliers only, is:

1850	1860	1870	1883
s/d. 19/6	25/8	24/5	26/3

Source: (for both series) : Levi, 1885: 136,137.

The daily rate for a six hour day in 1890 in different collieries:

South Staffs.	Durham	Northumberland
s/d. 4/8	5/8	6/2

Source: Hooker, 1894: Table A

Finally, in the case of the textile workers, Baines estimated the earnings of sorters in the Leeds woollen mills to be:

1805	1825	1835	1855	1883
s/d. 31/1	29/3	26/9	20/8	26/0

Chadwick estimated the earnings of throwsters in silk mills in the Manchester area to be:

1839	1849	1859	1883
s/d. 13/0	13/0	17/0	17/0 to 20/0

The comparison for the cotton factories is as follows

	<u>Chadwick's estimate</u>	<u>Ellison's estimate</u>
	1859	1880-1882
'operatives' :	400,000	686,000
wages per week:	10s 3½d	(c. 16/1½d)*
wages per annum:	(c.£26/15/2d)*	£42
total wages per		
annum :	£10,653,000	£28,812,000

\* Derived by PC by arithmetic calculation from the given figures.

A final series for Bolton cotton spinning and weaving shows the danger of all such general series.\* Weekly average wages:

s/d.	1850	1860	1870	1883
Minders	43/0	34/6	40/0	46/0
Weavers <u>per loom</u>	4/7	5/2	4/9	5/6
Winders (total)	9/0	10/0	9/0	11/6

Source (for above four tables): Levi, 1885: 115-121.

---

LEONARD HORNER

From 1804 LH was a partner in his father's firm; this provided a sufficient income for himself and his family ( and their prodigious travelling), he did no other work (although he was for a time an under-writer at Lloyds) until 1827 and from 1831-1833.

As Warden of London University (Oct. 1827 to Spring 1831)

£1,200 p.a. SOURCE: Martin, 1969: 424

As Commissioner in 1833:

£200 (plus £5.5s a day expenses)

SOURCE: J.T. Ward, 1962: 95.

As Inspector of Factories (Nov. 1833 to Dec. 1859)

£1000 p.a. (plus expenses)\*\*

SOURCES: P.R.O. H.O. 87/1, 13 Sep. 1836;

P.P.1834(256)XLI:3; 1846(187)XXV:10.

As Pensioner (Jan. 1860 to death)

£550 p.a.

SOURCE: P.R.O. H.O. 87/3, 20 Dec. 1859

. . . . .

---

\* Cf. Thorpe, 1973, for an investigation of Bolton.

\*\*There is some doubt about when expenses started, compare sources.

JAMES P. KAY (Shuttleworth)

Dr. Kay was a clerk to various dispensaries and finally a full physician, he may also have been given allowances from his father. His father died in 1834, but his brother Robert seems to have taken over the family firm.

As Assistant Poor Law Commissioner (1835 - 1842).

<u>Year</u>	<u>£ p.a. As Salary</u>	<u>£ p.a. As Expenses</u>	<u>£ Total</u>
1835 (part only)	157	133	290
1836	700	660	1360
1837	700	902	1602
1838	700	635	1335
1839	700	1315	2015
1840	675	413	1088
1841*	600	---	600
1842*	600	---	600

SOURCE: P.P. 1840 (394) XXXIX for 1835/39;

P.P. 1846 (572) XXVI for 1840/42.

Further information on total Poor Law costs may be found in P.P. 1849 (in 161) XXX; this gives the total cost, 1835-1848, to have been £564,191. *for Central Administration.*

As Assistant Secretary to the Committee of [Privy]

Council (1839 to 1850, although Kay resigned Dec. 1849)

1839 (est. 4/12 of £1000 ?)

1840 (£1000?)

\* A note is appended to the source saying that from 1st Oct. 1840 Dr. Kay did not receive allowances 'he having no district'. Cf. P.P. 1842(449)XXVI, p.5.



1841. (£1000?)  
 1842. (£1000?) Note: He was being paid by the Poor Law Board until the end of 1842.  
 1843-1849 £1200 p.a.  
 1850 £1000 p.a.

SOURCE: P.P. 1850 (260) XXXIV

#### As Landowner

In 1842 he married into an estate worth 'more than £10,000 a year'.

SOURCE: Johnson, 1969: 124.

#### As Pensioner, other Government work

He was paid almost a full year's salary for 1850, although he had resigned; his work for commissions and relief bodies would have been paid for.

#### As Author

Most of his books did not sell well or widely, but Bloomfield reports that over 10,000 copies of Kay's 1847 pamphlet were sold (1,400 @ 2/6d and 8,320 @ 3d). This is a contrast to only 100 copies of Kay's 1853 book, between its publication and 1858. Although Four Periods (1862a) was a slow seller, the second chapter (Recent measures, of 1839) may have sold widely as a separate publication. Kay probably subsidized such items as his Words of Comfort (1862b) and his collection: Thoughts and suggestions (1873)

. . . . .

H.S. TREMENHEERE\*

Until 1839 HST received allowances from his relations and, after he had qualified, his fees as a barrister. He also had a Fellowship at New College from 1827 to 1856.

As H.M. Inspector of Schools (1839 to 1844)

	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d
Apr/March	As Salary	As Expenses	Total
1839/40	132/6/0	35/17/0	168/3/0 **
1840/41	465/0/0	79/0/6	544/0/6 **
1841/42	600/0/0	23/1/5	623/1/5
1842/43	600/0/0	10/19/0	610/19/0
1843/44	396/0/0	119/11/11	515/15/0

SOURCE: P.P. 1851 (103) XLIII 28-29

As occasional Assistant Poor Law Commissioner

R.K. Webb (1955b:356, fn11) and I (Holmes' M.A. thesis being silent on this matter) can only trace the single payment of £42 for 30 days work on an inquiry in November 1842 into Pauper Schools of St Pancras, although both of us have found mention by HST and others (e.g. Kay) of several other tasks done for the P.L.C. by H.S.T.

SOURCE: P.P. 1846 (572) XXVI

---

\* These figures are to be preferred to those of Tremenheere's Journal which are inaccurate, as they are also regarding dates; for example H.S.T. estimates his H.M.I.'s salary as £700.

\*\* From 1840 HST received an allowance of £100 p.a. from an Uncle. Homes' M.A. thesis (p.28) estimates his total income in calendar 1840, from all sources, to have been £900.

As Commissioner for the Mining Districts (1844 to 1860)

£700 p.a. (plus expenses)

SOURCE: P.R.O. H.O. 45/339/2a

Note: Additional income was forthcoming:

(i) Payments for 'extra duties' e.g. £100 in 1850

SOURCE: P.R.O. H.O. 87/2 <sup>21.</sup> / Dec. 1850

(ii) Payments for some travel abroad e.g. £106 from  
the Treasury for a U.S. tour

SOURCE: Holmes' M.A. thesis, p.27

As Commissioner-at-large

The 'normal' payment here seems to have been c.£50 a month  
plus expenses

As Landowner

After 1855, HST seems to have had some income from sales  
(and rents?) of property he inherited.

As Author

I have discovered no indication of whether he made any  
money from his writing. I doubt it.

EDWIN CHADWICK

Until 1832 Chadwick lived from his journalism (Finer reports, 1952a: 34, the Examiner paying Chadwick £160 in one year) and from his income as a solicitor. From 1832 he also had a small legacy left him by Bentham and from that year until 1834 he was employed as an Assistant Commissioner to the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and as a Central Commissioner on the Factory Inquiry Commission.

As Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners (1834 to 1847)

£1,200 p.a.

SOURCE: P.P. 1840(394) XXXIX.Cf. 1846 (187)XXV,p.2

As Commissioner on Sanitary Conditions (1846 to 1848)

c.£1,000 p.a.

SOURCE: Cf. 1850(720)XXXIII Section K\*

As Secretary to the General Board of Health (1848 to 1854)

£1,500 p.a.

=SOURCE: P.P. 1849(268-vii)XXXI;1851(504)XLII;1852(573)LIII;  
Cf. 1857-58(223)LII.

As Pensioner (1854-1890)

£1,000 p.a.

SOURCE: Finer, 1952a:488

Note: At his death, Chadwick 'left the not inconsiderable fortune of £47,000 in trust (pending a life settlement to take care of his family)...'(Finer,1952a:512).

.....

---

\*The sources are quite contradictory here: P.P.1847-48(327-VII)XL states the total Commission costs as £2,500 for fiscal 1846,1847 and 1848; and P.P.1847-48(609)XXXIX Section N reports that only allowances and not salaries were to be paid.

A P P E N D I X T W O.STATISTICAL DATA

- Table I Absolute numbers of Civil Servants, 1797-1976
- Table II Departmental and hierarchical structure, 1797-1973
- Table III State Expenditure, 1790-1973
- Table IV Poor Law Data, 1800-1900

\* \* \* \* \*

Note:

These figures are supplied to give some indication of the gross magnitudes and changes involved in what this thesis discusses. Their inclusion does not imply an addiction to the belief that more (and more) facts are in themselves productive of better sociological or historical answers. On the other hand, far too many discussions do take place without the slightest indication of the minorities and majorities involved.

All the figures used (like any statistics) are subject to problems of interpretation\*. To make full sense of what I provide, the statistics must be taken back to their original contexts, including, perhaps above all, the circumstances which led to their being established.

Finally, in passing, it is worthy of record that in the period when statistical representation of social reality was advancing rapidly - -above all because State apparatuses, at national and local levels, generated both the need for, and the numbers themselves - the Civil Service itself was frequently able (and this is especially true of the Treasury) to avoid being counted. Or, if counting was unavoidable, we find on many occasions varying data - depending on where a particular year comes in a series, and, above all, what the series was meant to prove as a comparison.

---

\* On general difficulties with Blue Book evidence, especially in the social history area, see Johnson's essay (1973).

TABLE I.

Absolute Numbers of Civil Servants.\*

<u>Year</u>	<u>Civil Servants</u>	<u>Total Cost of Salaries</u>	<u>U.K. Population Censal Data</u>
1797	16,267	£1,373,561/3/1d. <sup>1**</sup>	
1801			10.5m (excludes Northern Ireland)
1805	20,221	£1,939,641/7/1d. <sup>2</sup>	
1810	22,931	£2,822,727/7/11d. <sup>3</sup>	
1811			11.9m (excludes Northern Ireland)
1815	24,598	£3,202,439/5/5d. <sup>4</sup>	
	27,365 II	£3,763,100. II <sup>5</sup>	
1819	24,414	£3,167,441/17/10d. <sup>6</sup>	
1821	26,243	£3,694,519. <sup>7</sup>	15.4m
	26,880 II	£3,772,085. II <sup>8</sup>	
1822	18,000 to 20,000 'Crown Offices' <sup>9</sup>		
1827	22,912	£2,788,907/11/9d. <sup>10</sup>	
1829	22,579 II	£3,099,291. II <sup>11</sup>	
1831			17.8m
1832	21,305	£2,819,622. <sup>12</sup>	
1835	23,578 II	£2,786,278. II <sup>13</sup>	
1841	20,500 'Public Administration' <sup>14</sup>		20.1m
1846	16,353 'Assessed posts'	£2,304,339 'for such posts' <sup>15</sup>	
1851	39,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		22.2m
	51,000 'Public Administration' <sup>14</sup>		

\* For particular departments see many studies cited above, e.g. the Sainty series, or Roseveare on the Treasury, and so on.

\*\* Sources, and comments are given at the end of the Table, where a Key to recurring abbreviations will be found.

For pre-1797, see Gretton, 1913 : Chs 1-2; Cohen, 1941: Chs 1-2.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Civil Servants</u>	<u>Related-Data</u>	<u>U.K. Population Censal Data</u>
1853	41,140 <sup>17a</sup> (1849/53 average :39619 <sup>17a</sup> )		
1860	32,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1861	64,300 'Public Administration' <sup>14</sup>		24.5m
1870	54,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1871	73,600 'Public Administration' <sup>14</sup>		27.4m
1875	c. 660 Staff (excl.12529 Post Masters) c.9200 Established Clerks (excl. 5446 Telegraph Instrument Clerks)		
1880	57,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1881	81,700 'Public Administration' <sup>14</sup>		31.0m
1890	79,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1891	2% of labour force in Central or Local Government.	18	34.2m
1900	116,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1901		16.3m GB working population	38.2m
1902	107,782 Established NI <sup>19</sup>		
1910	280,000 NI <sup>16</sup>		
1911	135,721 Established NI <sup>19</sup>		42.0m
1912	5% of labour force in Central or Local Government <sup>18</sup>		
1914	282,420 NI 779,520 Total <sup>20</sup>	65,000 women (58,000 in the Post Office) <sup>21</sup>	
1919		170,000 women <sup>21</sup>	
1920 Apr.1	380,963 NI <sup>20</sup> 381,700 NI <sup>21</sup> 368,910 Established NI <sup>19</sup>		
1921			44.0m
1929	150,500 NI (excl. Post Office) <sup>22</sup>		

17b

<u>Year</u>	<u>Civil Servants</u>	<u>Related Data</u>	<u>U.K. Population Censal Data</u>
1930	312,500 NI <sup>16</sup> 306,154 Established NI <sup>19</sup> 789,254 Total <sup>20</sup> 8% of Labour force in Central or Local Government <sup>18</sup>		
1931			46.0m
1938	206,300 NI (excl. Post Office) <sup>22</sup>		
1939 Apr.1	387,000 NI <sup>16</sup> 376,491 Established NI <sup>19</sup> 580,891 Total <sup>20</sup>	98,400 women <sup>23</sup>	
1947	705,500 NI <sup>23</sup>	271,100 women <sup>23</sup>	
1950	484,300 NI (excl. Post Office) <sup>22</sup> 685,000 NI <sup>16</sup> 972,174 Total <sup>20</sup>		
1951	11% of labour force in Central or Local Govt. <sup>18</sup>	23.8m UK working population	50.2m
1955	635,700 NI <sup>23</sup>	201,700 women <sup>23</sup>	
1960 Apr.1	637,374 NI <sup>23</sup>		
1961			52.7m
1965 Jan.1	697,600 NI <sup>23</sup>	236,000 women <sup>23</sup>	
1966 Apr.1	661,986 <sup>24</sup>		
Jul.1	507,600 NI (excl. Post Office) <sup>22</sup>		
1968 Jan.1	758,209 <sup>25</sup>		
1969 Apr.1	699,400 <sup>26</sup>		
1971 Apr.1	498,425 NI <sup>20*</sup> 17% of labour force in Central or Local Govt. <sup>18</sup>	25.0m UK working population	55.6m
1973 Apr.1	700,200 <sup>26</sup>		
1975 Apr.1	701,370 <sup>24</sup>	25.2m UK working population	56.0m
1976 Apr.1	747,614 <sup>24</sup>		

KEY

II = Includes Ireland

NI = Non Industrial

\* Total excluding Post Office was 700,085<sup>20</sup>



SOURCES

1. PP 1828(522) XVI (qu Gretton, 1913 : 111; Cohen, 1941:23; Finer, 1952b:346.) None of the secondary sources indicate the limitations of these figures for 1797, 1805 and 1810. As the Return makes clear, there were substantial omissions, e.g. of over 2,000 London Customs Officers.
2. PP 1828 *ibid.*
3. PP 1828 *ibid.*
4. PP 1828 *ibid.* (qu Halevy, 1912:36 fn 2; Gretton, 1913:111).
5. PP 1835 (609) XXXVII.
6. PP 1828 *ibid.*
7. PP 1830 (386) XVII.
8. PP 1833 (514) XXIII.
9. Hansard, qu Halevy, 1912:36 fn 2.
10. PP 1828 *ibid.* (qu Gretton, 1913:111; Finer, 1952b:346).
11. PP 1830 *ibid.*
12. PP 1833 *ibid.* (qu Gretton, 1913:111; Roberts, 1960:14f).
13. PP 1835 *ibid.*
14. Booth, 1886:363.
15. Farr, 1848:111.
16. Gladden, 1967 fold-out chart.
- 17a. PP 1856 (337) IX Appendix 7.
- 17b. Playfair Commission: C 1113-1; C 1226 Appx D; C 1317 Appx D.
18. Westergaard, 1975:172.
19. Cohen, 1941:164.
20. Butler, 1975:239.
21. Cohen, 1941:189.
22. Fulton Committee. Vol. 4 Treasury Memorandum 4.
23. Gladden, 1967:4.
24. Excludes Post Office. Parliamentary answer, 2 August 1976.
25. Excludes Post Office. Fulton Committee Vol. 4 Ch 2.
26. Excludes Post Office . Facts in Focus, 1974:115.

\* \* \* \* \*

TABLE II.

Departmental and Hierarchical Structure.

On the Tudor, Stuart and Commonwealth State, cf. Elton and Aylmer. The key offices were and are Secretaryships of State and their Departments.

'From 1688 to 1782 there were two main Secretaryships; one for the Northern Department [i.e. the Northern Powers of Europe], one for the Southern ... [which dealt] with Southern Europe and with Irish and Colonial affairs.' Cohen (1941:23 fn 2).

In 1782 the Home Office was created from the Southern Department; the Foreign Office from the Northern. (Ibid.)

(i) Departmental strengths.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Treasury</u>	<u>Customs</u>	<u>Excise</u>	<u>Home Office</u>	<u>Foreign Office</u>	<u>Source</u>
1797	142	6004	6580	26	24	1
1810	154	8808	7473	31	31	2
1815	154	10807	7639	31	34	3
1819	118	10873	7986	30	34	4
1821	141	10891	8024	30	33	5
1827	118	11346	6491	29	48	6
1829	117	10058	6347	30	41	7
1832	115	9459	6377	30	39	8
1846	96	4900	5237	34	39	9
		<u>Customs &amp; Excise</u>	<u>Inland Revenue</u>			
1851	105	11803	6188	84	85	10
1853	91	5134*	6148	36	46	11
1910	-	4500*	5600	-	-	12
1950	-	14200	49700	-	-	13
1965	1700	16200	57700	15400	10200	14

KEY

- = no data.

\* Customs only.

SOURCES

1. PP 1828 (552) XVII (qu Cohen,1941:34f). Note limitations reported only in the primary sources.
2. PP 1828 ibid.
3. PP 1828 ibid. (partially and inaccurately quoted Halevy,1912: 36 fn 2).  
PP 1835 (609) XXXVII gives slightly different figures.
4. PP 1828 ibid.
5. PP 1830 (386) XVII. Treasury figures include Commissariat.  
PP 1833 (514) XXIII gives slightly different figures.
6. PP 1828 (552) XVII.
7. PP 1830 (386) XVII. Treasury figures include Commissariat.
8. PP 1833 (514) XXIII. Treasury figures include Commissariat. (qu Gretton,1913:113f; Roberts,1960:14f).
9. Farr, 1848:111. These are only 'Assessed Posts'.
10. Gladden,1967: Chart. The Home and Foreign Office figures are for the Home and Foreign Departments; their equivalent for 1853 would be c. 111 and c. 134 respectively.
11. PP 1856 (337) IX. Excludes Political Offices.
12. C 5748-1 Qs.20,602; 20,605.
13. Fulton Report, Vol. 4 Treasury Memorandum 4.
14. Gladden, 1967 : Chart. The Foreign Office figure includes the Commonwealth Relations Office.

\* \* \* \* \*

A very revealing indication of priorities is found by reworking data given by Sir Richard Clarke (as at 1.4.1973):

DEPARTMENT	SENIOR STAFF* (Number)	TOTAL STAFF (000s)	CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION (000s)
Foreign & Commonwealth	187	12.6	4.6
Defence	121	272.7	16.8
Trade & Industry	106	20.4	5.7
Treasury**	94	111.6	5.8
Environment	92	74.7	6.1
Health & Social Security	70	81.3	7.3
Scotland	38	11.3	4.2
Home Office	35	28.3	3.8
Agriculture	34	15.7	3.6
Lord Chancellor	29	14.9	0.2
Civil Service***	27	13.4	1.0
Education & Science	27	4.3	2.1
Employment	26	34.9	1.7
Cabinet Office	25	0.6	0.6
Wales	8	1.0	0.9
Posts and Communication****4		0.5	0.3

SOURCE: Clarke, 1975, ranked by ordinal value column 1.

Notes: \* Under-Secretary and upwards

\*\* Includes Inland Revenue, Customs & Excise

\*\*\* Includes H.M.S.O. and Central Office of Information

\*\*\*\* In 1969 the Post Office became a Public Corporation

.....

In Comparison with the Church of England and the Royal Navy, the Civil Service has not become that much more weighted to the top.

<u>Church of England</u>	1915	1976
Total Clergy	15 000	11 000
Total Bishops (Diocesan & Suffragan)	66	106

SOURCE: Times, 28 October 1976, letter from Rev R.E. Meredith.

<u>Royal Navy</u>	1913	1976
Total Strength	115 052	68 163
Total Admirals	29	68

SOURCE: Times, 25 October 1976, letter from M.Taylor

\*\*\*\*\*

(ii) Hierarchies.

Apart from the sources cited, from which very complex 'profiles' could be extracted, hierarchies are displayed in the following.

1846

Farr found of 'Assessed posts' totalling 13,540:

8,704 with salaries not exceeding £100p.a. being paid a total of £18,791

4,836 with salaries exceeding £100p.a. being paid a total of £1,278,806.

(Farr, 1848:113)

1853

The Superannuation Inquiry found:

3388 Superior Officers

10461 Established Clerks

25780 Persons on mechanical tasks

1466 Office-keepers, messengers, etc.

(PP 1856 (337) IX Appendix 7)

1947-66

Treasury Memorandum 4 to the Fulton Committee gives complete figures (and a graph) for the above years ; samples are:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Administrative</u>	<u>Executive</u>	<u>Clerical</u>	<u>Clerical Assistant</u>
1947	3056	50,727	160,191	104,469
1952	3041	72,014	144,509	70,576
1957	2595	67,827	119,970	63,830
1962	2537	72,327	126,258	66,567
1966	2508	79,953	130,129	75,667

(Fulton Report Vol. 4;273)

1968

Of a total (including 225,051 Post Office workers) of 758,209, Fulton reports the above groups (numbers and percentiles) on 1.1.1968:

2784 (0.4%)      91,066      140 177 (18.5%)      89,268 (11.7%)  
(12.0%)

(Fulton Report Vol. 4,12; Cf. Chapman, 1970:Chs.1 & 2)

TABLE III.

State Expenditure.\*

Year	GNP per capita : £. (A)	Index	Total Govt. expenditure per capita : £ (B)	Index	B as % of A
1790	10.1	100	1.2	100	12
1800	10.3	102	2.3	180	22
1810	10.3	103	2.4	191	23
1820	12.1	120	2.1	169	17
1830	13.8	137	2.0	164	15
1840	16.3	162	1.7	140	11
1850	19.4	193	2.2	179	11
1860	22.3	221	2.5	202	11
1870	25.3	251	2.4	191	9
1880	29.2	290	2.9	232	10
1890	40.4	401	3.4	272	8
1900	44.7	443	6.4	519	14
1910	45.8	455	5.5	444	12
1920	49.6	493	13.0	1048	26
1926	46.4	461	11.9	960	26
1932	48.2	479	13.8	1113	29
1938	59.6	592	17.9	1444	30
1946	57.2	568	29.5	2379	52
1951	67.2	667	27.1	2185	40
1956	74.8	743	27.2	2194	36
1961	81.1	805	30.6	2468	38

SOURCE: Veverka, 1963:Table I (Cf. Stern,1950;Flinn,1961).

Period	<u>PERCENTAGE RATE OF CUMULATIVE INCREASE PER ANNUM:</u>		
	Population	GNP	Government Exp
1790-1961	0.8	2.0	2.7
1790-1890	0.9	2.3	1.9
1890-1961	0.5	1.5	3.7

SOURCE: Veverka,1963:Table II

\*Data for 1900-1967 can be found in Halsey,1972:Tables 12.21 etc.

United Kingdom State Expenditure, 1910-1973

	% of GNP					
	1910	1937	1951	1961	1971	1973
Social Services	4.2	10.9	16.1	17.6	23.8	24.9
Justice & Law	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.8	1.3	1.4
Military & External	3.5	5.0	10.8	7.6	6.6	6.4
Rest	4.4	9.8	17.4	16.1	18.6	17.8
Total	12.7	25.7	44.9	42.1	50.3	50.5
Borrowing Requirement	1.7	1.9	2.2	3.6	1.7	5.9

SOURCE: Gough, 1975:60 (Cf. Gamble, 1976).

For comparative purposes, note:

Government Expenditure as % of gross domestic product:

	U.K.	U.S.A.	Japan	W.Germany	France	Italy
1970	38.4	33.7	19.2	35.9	37.6	33.7
1974	44.8	...	23.8	41.5	38.0	...

... = No data.

SOURCE: Parliamentary answer, Times, 1 November 1976

National Debt

6.2% of GNP is owed as Interest on the National Debt. This interest totalled c.£5000 m in 1975-76. Wilsher estimates that 25% of this interest, i.e. c.£1200 m is paid to certain individuals within Britain.

SOURCE: Wilsher, 1976.

Interest per capita on the National Debt in the U.K. was

1970	1975	1976(est)
£25.4	£49.8	£86

National Debt per capita (converted to sterling) at 31.3.1975:

Belgium, £1,080	Netherlands	£540
U.K. £ 820	W. Germany	£390
Ireland £ 630	Italy	£340
Luxembourg £540	France, est.	£190

Denmark, £50

SOURCE: Parliamentary answer, 29 October, 1976; Times, 8.11.76

.....

Note: The above charts all show the influence of War. What they conceal is sudden spurts in expenditure. For example the Board of Trade makes such leaps forward in the 1797-1832 (Gretton, 1913:118) and 1900-1914 (Davidson, 1969:227) periods.

\*\*\*\*\*

T A B L E			IV	
POOR	LAW	DATA	1800 -	1900

In 1803 there were just over a million paupers in England and Wales or almost one in nine of the population. In 1850 and again in 1870 there were still almost exactly the same number... but in a much larger population they represented... about one in eighteen and one in twenty respectively.

(Perkin, 1969:421)

During the first year [of the new Poor Law], boards of guardians were set up in 112 unions which together comprised 2,066 parishes, and, during the second, in 239 unions comprising 5,800 parishes. In July 1837 of the 13,433 parishes of England there were only 1,300 to which the reform had not yet been applied, and the population of those 1300 parishes was less than a quarter of the entire population of the Kingdom.

(Halevy, 1923b:285, after Annual Register, 1837).

By 1839 250 new workhouse buildings dominated the social and actual landscape... by 1845 there were 594 unions established, with 8,000 paid officers and a payroll of £400,000.

(after Longmate, 1974:287,118).

By 1850, Best shows (using Webb data as a base) that nearly 19% of the population were dependent, directly or indirectly, on Poor Relief. In that year the Treasury paid out nearly £100,000 for medical officers and teachers within Poor Law Unions.

(Best, 1971:147; Purdy, 1860:317)

Following official Returns, Marx noted the following numbers of Paupers in England and Wales:

1856: 851,369; 1863:1,079,382; 1864:1,014,978; in 1865:971,433.

He argues that 'the fluctuation up and down of the numbers of paupers reflects the periodic changes of the industrial cycle...'

(Marx, 1867:653 and passim).

.....



Expenditure on Poor Relief, England and Wales, 1801-1861

Year	% National Income	£ per head population
1801-3	1.80	0.47
1811-13	2.20	0.66
1821	2.40	0.58
1831	2.00	0.50
1841	1.05	0.30
1851	0.95	0.28
1861	0.86	0.29

SOURCE: Mishra, 1976:Table I (after Mitchell & Deane)

For comparative purposes, note:

(a) Social security expenditure as % of all central government expenditure

1950	1965	1970	1975	1976-77(est)
16.6	21.8	22.4	20.2	20.7

SOURCE: Parliamentary answer, Times, 8 November 1976.

(b) Supplementary benefit:

(i) Claimants and dependents as % of U.K. population

1967	1971	1975
7.3	8.5	8.3

(ii) expenditure as % of G.N.P.

1967	1971	1975
1.11	1.28	1.17

(iii) expenditure as % of public expenditure

1967	1971	1975
2.24	2.61	2.03

(iv) total expenditure and amount per head, 1974-75

G.B.	£831 m	£15.3
Scotland	£ 95 m	£18.2
Wales	£ 49 m	£17.9

SOURCES: (i- iii) Parliamentary answer, 20.10.76, Times, 1.11.76

(iv) Parliamentary answer, 19.10.76, Times, 25.10.76

.....

<u>DATE</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>		<u>NUMBER OF PAUPERS</u>	<u>B % A</u>	<u>Expenditure on Poor Relief per capita</u>	
	(A)	(B)			<u>Source</u>	<u>Purdy</u>
	England & Wales					
1801	9, 172,980	750,000	8.1	—	—	
1803	9, 210,000	800,000	8.6	8/11	8/9½	
1813	10, 506,000	1331,000	12.7	12/8	12/5½	
1821	11, 978,875	1400,000	11.7	11/7	11/6¼	
1831	13, 297,187	1369,000	10.2	10/0	9/8¾	
1841	15, 906,741	952,000	5.9	6/0½	5/11¾	
1851	17, 773,324	941,315	5.3	5/7	5/6½	
1861	19, 902,713	883,921	4.4	5/9¾	—	
1871	22, 501,316	1037, 360	4.6	7/0	—	
1881	25,714, 288	790,937	3.0	6/3½	—	
1891	28, 763,673	759,730	2.6	6/0	—	
1900	31, 881,365	792,367	2.4	7/3	—	

— = No data

SOURCES: Nicholls, 1898:Vol.2:Appx 1; Aschrott,1902:Appx XII; Smart,1909;Webb,1929b:Appx II:Rose, 1972:Appx A. Every single one of these sources disagrees with some of the figures in the others. Since Purdy(1960) provides slightly different per capita figures I have given these.

For an attempt to come to grips with the problem of 'Unemployment' Cf Dessauer,1940, but note the criticisms of Digby (1975:73 fn 7).

Post 1900 figures for poverty in general and unemployment may be found in some of the above sources, plus Rose, 1971; Halsey, 1972; and Butler, 1975.

Two forms of evading the label 'pauper' existed.

On the Friendly societies, see Gosden,1961,1973.

On Emigration see Nicholls, 1898:Vol.2 Appx II and Marx<sup>4</sup> 'Forced emigration' (qu 1962,386-390). For Ireland, see the recent revision of the figures undertaken by O.Graða (1975).

.....

"THE USELESS CLASSES"

<u>Date</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>POPULATION</u>	<u>PAUPERS INDOOR AND OUTDOOR</u>			
		<u>England</u> <u>&amp;Wales</u>	<u>Scotland</u>	<u>Ireland</u>	<u>Total</u>
1861	24.5m	842,700	117,000	54,600	1,014,300
1871	27.4m	977,200	123,000	73,000	1,173,200
1881	31.0m	758,000	99,300	119,000	976,300

SOURCE: Booth, 1886: Appx D ,corrected version.

"PAUPERISM IN OLD AGE "

Paupers per 1,000 population England and Wales  
1892/3

<u>Age</u>	<u>In Paupers</u>	<u>Out Paupers</u>	<u>(only)</u> <u>Medical</u>	<u>Total</u>
- 16	10	35	6	51
16-59	12	14	6	32
60-64	59	61	12	132
65-69	68	125	13	206
70-74	88	208	17	313
75-79	99	271	24	394
80-	103	273	37	413

SOURCE: Booth, 1894:241.

\*\*\*\*\*

## APPENDIX III: COLERIDGE AND 'THE REVOLUTION IN GOVERNMENT'.

Many reasons would justify some mention of Coleridge in relation to the central themes of this dissertation. There is first the testimony of J. S. Mill who wrote in 1840\*

The influence of Coleridge, like that of Bentham, extends far beyond those who share in the peculiarities of his religious or philosophical creed ... He has been, almost as truly as Bentham, 'the great questioner of things established'; for a questioner needs not necessarily be an enemy. By Bentham, beyond all others, men have been led to ask themselves, in regard to any ancient or received opinion, Is it true? and by Coleridge, What is the meaning of it? ... These two [Bentham and Coleridge] agreed in being the men who, in their age and country, did more to enforce, by precept and example, the necessity of a philosophy ... every Englishman of the present day is by implication either a Benthamite or a Coleridgian.

(Mill, 1840: 99, 101, 102-3).

Secondly, my treatment of Coleridge must stand for all those neglected influences on the making of State apparatuses which Burrow (1976) has argued must be comprehended. Along with classical languages and writers, the State Servants I and others have studied are eloquent as to their debt to religious and literary

---

\* Kennedy (1957) discusses Mill and Coleridge (ch.8) and Cf. his 'Prospects for Bentham and Coleridge' (Ch.11).

ideologies and images. Coleridge himself captured the power of these 'general ideas' as: 'a color [sic.], as it were, lying on the public mind, as a sort of preparation for receiving thought in a particular way, and excluding particular views ...' (1819:338)\*.

For Coleridge changes in, what we might now call, 'paradigms' of this kind were 'the most important Revolutions in the Beliefs and opinions of Mankind' (Courier, 14 December 1818, qu Coleridge, 1819: 81). Two years earlier he had emphasised the same\*\* point:

... all the epoch-forming Revolutions of the Christian world, the revolutions of religion and with them the civil, social, and domestic habits of the nations concerned, have coincided with the rise and fall of metaphysical systems ... It is with nations, as with individuals. In tranquil moods and peaceable times we are quite practical. Facts only and cool common sense are then in fashion. But let the winds of passion swell, and straitway [sic.] men begin to generalize: to connect by remotest analogies; to express the most universal positions of reason in the most glowing figures of fancy; in short, to feel particular truths and mere facts as poor cold, narrow and incommensurate with their feelings. (Coleridge, 1816: 14-15; Cf. Durkheim, 1912)

. . . . .

---

\* Compare Marx' notion of 'general illumination' (1858: 106f).

\*\* Again it is worth noting the structural similarity and contrast between Marx and Coleridge - metaphysics counterpoints materialism almost exactly. We may take this as indicating how the critique from the basis of 'moral economy' is faulted from the start; and how the two approaches offer quite different definitions of 'the problem of order'. But both offer effective criticisms of political economy.

Political poetry has a long tradition in Britain, as has the exposition of a philosophy in poetic diction. I regret that I must neglect Coleridge's poetry, but the tradition may be best exemplified in the work of the Augustan satires (Cf. Lord, 1974). Erasmus Darwin's The Temple of Nature (1803) is, by contrast, a very 'scientific' poem.\* Richard Payne Knight's The Progress of Civil Society (1796) is both philosophical and political. Knight makes use of classical sources - Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, Book V (Cf. the 1951 text: 199f) is closely followed - and Book Six was written 'during the reign of the Jacobins in France' (1796:xxiii). Like Coleridge, Knight's poem utilises a 'sociology of development' which contrasts images of 'former times' - 'When first the forms of civil rule began' - when States were small and simple, and

Persuasion, more than force, obedience taught,

As mutual interest, mutual safety sought.

Commerce and trade were not, at first, destructive until they

\* But Primer (1964) brings out Darwin's debt to Essay on Man. Erasmus Darwin was an M.D. and F.R.S. He died in 1802. The poem extends for 174 pages and the philosophical notes for 124 pages. It was not a 'popular' work: the quarto edition cost 1 guinea; the large paper ed., 1½ guineas. Coleridge met E. Darwin in January and February 1796 when selling The Watchman. E. Darwin founded the Derby Philosophical Society in 1783; in the 1830s, William Spencer, father of Herbert, was Secretary (Peel, 1971:Ch.2, Sect.3). E. Darwin was the grandfather of Charles Darwin who, along with his father, was a correspondent and friend of Leonard Horner. Horner's son-in-law, the geologist Charles Lyell, influenced both Spencer and Darwin to think of evolutionary ideas (Macrae, 1969:21; Peel, 1971:127,133). This might indicate something of the claustrophobic interconnections, of a social and theoretical kind, which permeate this period.

they produced particular kinds of concentrations of population. Knight's index of this part of his poem (lines 342-428) states that he is tracing the 'calamities' - the French Revolution's Jacobin phase - to 'manufacturing and commercial mobs'. Moreover, as a note appended to the section makes clear:

America having no great manufactories, had none of these mobs, and was therefore able to go through her revolution in peace. England had none in the time of Charles I, and the Long Parliament, and little, to what she has now, in the year 1688.

(Knight, 1796: 141-142)

This is, I insist, an obviously sociological theory, it appears to be about demographic change, but the poem makes clear it is about class formation and moral changes. When population was but 'Thinly diffused' all was well,

But when, for trade in busy crowds they join,  
Or throng the caverns of the gloomy mine,  
Men growing capital, their swarms, collect  
And nice arrangement different arts, connects;  
The gathering multitudes, that thus unite  
Each others passions, quicken and excite;  
Feel courage from their actual numbers rise,  
And learn their lazy rulers to despise

(1796: Lines 384f)

Again like Coleridge, Knight extends animosity to other familiar targets: Knight prefers a 'militia of property' to a standing army; he opposes opulent nobility; cruel and vindictive punishments; and, State corruption ('The useless office, and the sanction'd bribe').

But Knight also serves to remind us of the effect upon ruling class 'psychology' of the French Revolution. Knight fears 'Gaul's dire hydra'. Lord Cockburn, lifelong Whig and friend of Leonard Horner, recalled in the 1850s that

Grown-up people talked, at this time [of the Terror in France] of nothing but the French Revolution and its supposed consequences ... If the ladies and gentlemen, who formed the society of my father's house, believed all they said about the horrors of French bloodshed, and of the anxiety of people here to imitate them, they must have been wretched indeed ...

(qu Webb, 1968: 131 fn1)\*

. . . . .

Not only did such events provide the skeleton of Coleridge's political biography; all was, for him, essentially moral and political. In 1800 he said that he wanted to write a work called 'Essay on the Elements of Poetry' but 'it would in reality be a disguised System of Morals and Politics --' (qu Woodring, 1970:11). In what follows I shall concentrate solely on Coleridge's prose works of a deliberately political character.\*\*

---

\* Cf. Newman, 1975; Harrison, 1965:219f; E.P. Thompson, 1963:Ch.6.

\*\* Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) is important for many reasons-- his poetry and his philosophy being most salient. A good collection of essays is that of Brett (1971); general biographical sketches I have used are: Carlyle, 1851; Felling, 1930; Willey, 1949:Ch.1. The best approach to the poetry, in this connection, is that of Woodring, 1970. On Coleridge's philosophy see Emmet, 1971; Coleridge lists his reading of Kant (1819:459) and of Schelling (1819:465), and see also his 1817b: Chs.8-9. The best treatment relevant to this thesis is that of Kennedy, 1957, plus the work of Colmer and Calleo.



Coleridge's concerns are far more constant than the usual 'Jacobin-to-Tory' caricature has indicated. John Colmer argues (1971: 249) that Coleridge's 1795 'Bristol political lectures remain of permanent interest, since they contain the seeds of all Coleridge's later thought.' Of course, seeds are not plants, and Colmer adds that in the years before Coleridge produced The Friend (i.e. 1795-1809), Coleridge studied German Idealism (visiting what is now Germany in 1798 and 1799), 'read most of the works of European political philosophy ... and ... acquired ... wide experience of practical politics ... [including] acting as a high-ranking Public Servant in Malta.' (Colmer, 1971: 254)\*.

In 1795, Coleridge gave a series of public lectures on various topics of the day. Cobban's collection of 209 documents shows the typicality of Coleridge's efforts. In Coleridge's 'Lecture on the Two Bills'<sup>\*\*</sup> a particular criticism is given of Grenville's and Pitt's Bills against sedition and assembly. Coleridge here focuses on the moral nature of the State, as he does in his Watchman articles (1796) and the Morning Post article (1800) on Pitt. The stress here is upon the difference between essential constitutional changes and pragmatic political adjustments or 'mechanical reforms' (e.g. of the suffrage). For Coleridge particular governments reflect the state of the constitution, as 'more the effect than the cause'.

---

\* On the Malta experience: Colmer, 1959: Ch.4; Coburn, 1960; and Coleridge's Notebooks 1974.

\*\* delivered 26 November 1795, at the Pelican Inn, Bristol, 'Admittance One Shilling'; later published as The Plot Discovered.

Of course, these lectures contain much that Coleridge later repudiated - his criticism of the 'prejudices of Rank, of Superstition, of Wealth' (1795: 272), and his depiction of the Acts of Pitt as 'Gagging Acts', are two examples. Although he still called them 'Gagging Acts' in his Notebooks of the 1830s, Coleridge had written to the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, in March 1817, urging 'you must curb the press, or it will destroy the constitution of this country' (qu Coleridge, 1817a: 151 n2). His criticism of the Acts reflected his estimation that they revealed weakness not strength. For Coleridge the State was founded neither on Hobbes' coercion, Locke's Individualism, or Rousseau's 'Reason'<sup>\*</sup> but on moral rights and duties. As he phrases it in the Friend (1809):

Hobbes has said that laws without the sword are  
but bits of parchment ... but without the laws the  
sword is but a piece of iron.

(qu Calleo, 1966: 73)<sup>\*\*</sup>

This led to Coleridge's focus on education:

It is evident from everything that Coleridge  
wrote on politics that a belief in the ameliorating  
power of education, both on the individual and  
state, was a faith that underwent change and

---

\* This paragraph rests upon: Feiling, 1930; Beeley, 1934; Colmer, 1959, 1971; Calleo, 1966 and Stafford's 1973 D.Phil thesis.

\*\* This recalls to the sociological reader Durkheim's similar remark concerning the flag (Durkheim, 1912:220) as a piece of cloth endowed with power. Durkheim and Coleridge should be compared in terms of their relation to Kant and their focus on moral relations; Cf. Durkheim, 1898; 1904; 1906; 1907; 1912; 1918b.

modification but was never destroyed.

(Colmer, 1959: 111)\*

In 1808 and 1813 Coleridge delivered enthusiastic lectures on Bell's 'new system of education' and Southey's 1812 book on Bell is based, according to Coleridge, on the first of these. Importantly - and like the State Servants I have examined - Coleridge argued that real education was both technical instruction and moral training. He praised Bell in 1816 (and is critical of the Lancastrian alternative, Courier 25 July 1816), but with the following qualification:

take even Dr. Bell's original and unsophisticated plan, which I myself regard as an especial gift of Providence to the human race; and suppose this incomparable machine, this vast moral steam-engine, to have been adopted and in free motion throughout the Empire; it would yet appear to me a most dangerous delusion to rely on it as if this of itself formed an efficient national education.

(Coleridge, 1816: 41)

Education was far more than the 'acquirement of Reading and Writing'.

Central to Coleridge's idealism is a material content - a particular understanding of Property, above all land-holding.

From my earliest manhood it was an axiom in politics with me, that in every country where property prevailed, property must be the grand basis of the government; and that government was the best, in which

---

\* Cf. Beeley, 1934:169f; Calleo, 1966:21f; Stafford, D.Phil., Ch.5.

the power of political influence of the individual was in proportion to his property, provided that the free circulation of property was not impeded by any positive law or custom, nor the tendency of wealth to accumulate in masses unduly encouraged.

(Friend, 1809; qu Beeley, 1934: 163).

The last qualification is important. In his Table Talk of 31st March 1833, Coleridge recorded that 'one of the chief sources of bad economy of the country now is the enormous aggregation of capitals' (qu Beeley, 1934: 166). The Spirit of Trade must be dominated by the Spirit of Agriculture; just as the Spirit of Commerce must be subordinated to that of the State. In his Lay Sermon, Coleridge praises the Earl of Winchelsea's allotment scheme as a good example of the Spirit of Agriculture (1817a:219f) and he concludes

the Spirit of Commerce is itself capable of being at once enlightened by the Spirit of the State to the advantage of both.

(1817a: 223).

To mention Spirit or 'Idea' is to emphasise how bound together are Coleridge's philosophical and political comments. Coleridge's Idealism is methodological. His 'critique' (and the word itself is justified) of Hobbes and Locke is significant because he is able to recognise what we would call sociological factors. Following Kant, Coleridge argues for a distinction between immediate appearances, perceived by the senses, and the world of essences and relations which we can only grasp through our Understanding, informed by certain key Ideas. In the 1818 edition of the Friend,

Coleridge argues that what confronts us in the world is not things only ... but ... chiefly the relationship of things ... To enumerate and analyse these relations, with the conditions under which alone they are discoverable, is to teach the science of method.

(qu Calleo, 1966: 29)

That is to say, our ideas and understanding are the means 'by which we generalise and arrange the phenomena of perception' (qu Calleo, 1966: 35) \*.

As Stafford has shown (D. Phil thesis, Ch.2) Coleridge attenuated his Kantianism via Schelling and Fichte, taking - particularly from the latter - the notion of moral responsibility. This forms the basis for Coleridge's commitment to idealist constructionism: since what we make of the world owes much to our own action and thought, we are therefore responsible. It also informs his crucial distinction between People and Things. His constant attention to the meaning of words \*\* -and to the moral evasions he makes visible - is frequently employed to show the

---

\* See also Coleridge's '10 theses of his Logosophia' 1817b:149f; his Philosophical Lectures XI-XIII, 1819; and Mill, 1840: 109f. The sociological reference is clear when Coleridge argues '... no man can rightly apprehend an abuse till he has first mastered the idea of the use of an institution ... Table Talk, 11 May 1830 qu Beeley, 1934: 157.

\*\* This is clear in Coleridge's articles in the Courier in 1817 on Francis Horner's Bullion Select Committee (David Ricardo supported Horner in the Morning Chronicle). Attention to language use is a feature of his lectures and Biographia Literaria (1817b). On these matters, Cf. Kennedy (1957) who related Coleridge to Marshall (Ch.9) and Keynes (Ch.10); making good use of Parsons' essays on economics of the 1930s.

dereliction of moral duty by the governing classes. By this neglect, they endanger their rights.

Coleridge was amongst the first to see clearly that 'In Trade ... no distinction is or can be acknowledged between Things and Persons.' (1817a: 219-220).

On the distinction: between Things and Persons, all law, human and divine, is grounded ... that the former may be used, as mere means; but the latter dare [later editions have 'must' PC] not be employed as the means to an end without directly or indirectly sharing in that end.

(1817a: 218n; Cf. his, 1830: 7f)

Looking back on the 1816/17 period in 1832, Coleridge considered that he had been overharsh in his judgements on the nascent working-class movements:

in truth it should be said that the working classes did not substitute Rights for Duties, and take the former into their Guardianship, till the higher classes, their legitimate protectors, had subordinate [sic ] Persons to Things, and systematically perverted the former into the latter.

(qu Colmer, 1971: 253-4)

It is in this sense that it is accurate to see Coleridge in terms of the usual approaches to T.H. Green. First, like Green, he saw Will not force as the basis for the just State. Second, working from his concept of 'Idea' he established a programme for a 'positive state' (Beeley, 1934: 166f; Cf. Kennedy, 1957: Ch.4)

through using some ideas of Rousseau to criticise Hobbes and Locke. It is a tribute to the complexity of Coleridge that he can be a legitimate 'ancestor' for two groups of critic: literary: M. Arnold, T.S. Eliot, F.R. Leavis, and Raymond Williams (Stafford, D.Phil Ch.5) and, metaphysical: F.H. Bradley and B. Bosanquet (Ibid., Ch.3) Like both groups he detested political economy's view of the individual and society (Calleo, 1966: 83f) <sup>\*</sup>.

. . . . .

Coleridge saw true revolutions as moral-philosophical transformations in the key values of the ruling class. Colmer argues that 'his main purpose in all his later political writing was to bring about a complete moral and philosophical revolution in the governing class of England' (Colmer, 1959: 131). Coleridge used his Lay Sermons to do this and retrospectively applied the generic title 'lay sermon' to his earlier work including his 1795 Lectures (Coleridge, 1817a: 125n). The first of the Lay Sermons was 'addressed to the higher classes of society' but Coleridge records in a letter that 'The Title ought to have been, and I had so directed it - addressed to the Learned and Reflective of all Ranks and Professions, especially among the Higher Class' (1816:3 fn.1). It was part of his general approach to appeal for, and not to, the oppressed. This is in marked contrast to what James Hamburger

---

\* For Coleridge's reading of Malthus and others see the list in Colmer (1959: 219). According to Beeley (1934: 166 fn1) a study of Coleridge's annotations to Malthus' Essay shows that Southey's review of 1803 is part-authored by Coleridge. Kennedy (1957:Chs.5-6) brings out Coleridge's general debt to Steuart, a political economist whom Marx also studied and employed in his Capital, e.g. in the fourth volume (Theories of Surplus Value, Part One).

has suggested were the manipulative politics of the Bentham-Mill Radicals which entailed a cynical employment of the threat of mass action as a 'bludgeon' against recalcitrant fractions of the ruling bloc.

The editor of the Collected works edition of the Sermons, R.J. White, has provided a good historical introduction to their context, in his From Waterloo to Peterloo (1957). White, in his editorial introduction, and Colmer (1959: Ch.5) both stress the intentional differences between the style of the two Sermons, The first esoteric and typically Coleridge. The main theme here involves the betrayal, by the 'clerisy' (although the word is not yet used), of its moral duty to the State. The phenomenal evidence used is the spread of 'mere' accomplishment, particularly in the case of reading (1816: 36f). By contrast the 1817 Lay Sermon, addressed to the 'higher and middle classes', shows a wide engagement with the events and political information of Coleridge's time. His readers are urged to contemplate certain 'particulars in their universal laws': these include: taxation, the cycle of boom and slump related to the Wars against Napoleon<sup>\*</sup>; and pensions and sinecures. At the basis of his commentary is the 'universal law' of Balance:

the OVERBALANCE OF THE COMMERCIAL SPIRIT IN  
CONSEQUENCE OF THE ABSENCE OR WEAKNESS OF THE  
COUNTER-WEIGHTS (1817a: 169, his capitals).

But one should not think this 'Balance' self-regulating. It is precisely against this abstraction of political economy that Coleridge is most scathing; speaking of a 'fiscal crash' he writes,

---

\* Coleridge identifies 'periodical Revolutions-of-Credit' in a cycle of about '12 or 13 years' (1817a: 202f).



we shall perhaps be told too, that the very Evils of this system, even the periodical crash itself, are to be regarded but as so much superfluous steam ejected by the Escape Pipes and safety valves of a self-regulating Machine: and lastly, that in a free and trading country all things find their level ... But Persons are not Things - but Man does not find his level.

(1817a: 205, 206)

These remarks are, moreover, followed by a sketch which shows the differential impact of such a crash - particularly - and it is worth stressing the attention to words again - on those 'we are now accustomed to call the Laboring [sic.] Poor' (1817a: 207). Coleridge seeks to show that the phenomena of 'Improvement' are related to suffering - for example in the Highlands (1817a: 209f; Cf. Marx, 1867: Part VIII; Weber, 1922: Part IV).

Crucially, the Lay Sermon turns on a contrast between Spirits:

Agriculture requires principles essentially different from those of Trade - that a gentleman ought not to regard his Estate as a merchant his cargo, or a shopkeeper his stock ... the purposes of Agriculture ... ultimately are the same as those of the State of which it is the offspring ... If the continuance and independence of the State must be its object, the final causes of the State must be its final causes. We suppose the negative ends of a State already attained, viz., its own safety by means of its own strength, and the protection of

person and property for all its members, there will then remain its positive ends:- 1. To make the means of subsistence more easy to each individual. 2. To secure to each of its members THE HOPE of bettering his own condition or that of his children. 3. The development of those faculties which are essential to his Humanity, i.e. to his rational and moral Being.

(1817a: 215-217; his typography).

What matters is good Stewardship; by landlords in local communities; by the Government of the State. Only a morally worthy class of stewards can balance the spirit of Trade.

It is in the framework of the above that Coleridge makes his criticisms of both the Poor Law and those 'poor visionaries called SPENCEANS' (1817a: 226f, his capitals). Gradual reform must restore 'ancient prudence'

our manufacturers must consent to regulation; our gentry must concern themselves with the education as well as the instruction of their natural clients ...

(1817a: 229)

As Kennedy (1957) has shown, Coleridge founds his 'Theory of State Intervention' (Ch.4) on applying his notion of 'Reason' (Ch.3) to an analysis of Distress (Ch.6) as opposed to a redescription of 'immediate appearances' (Ch.5). The point being, irrespective of the values entailed or the result of the exercise, that this is a coherently recognisable piece of sociological work.

Coleridge's commitment to 'a Spirit of Land' was not restricted to his idea of the moral relations of Good Stewardship; he also saw

agriculture as productively central to national well-being. In his Table Talk for 31st March 1833, he noted 'No State can be such properly which is not self-subsistent at least; for no State that is not, is essentially independent' (qu Beeley, 1934: 166). The same kind of understanding underpins a comment he recorded a month before his death in 1834

You talk about making this article cheaper by reducing its price in the market from 8d to 6d. But suppose, in so doing, you have rendered your country weaker against a foreign foe; suppose you have demoralized thousands of your fellow-countrymen, and have sown discontent between one class of society and another, your article is tolerably dear, I take it, after all.

(Table Talk 20 June 1834, qu Beeley, 1934: 166)

Although Coleridge opposed any general State regulation-by-legislation, he actively pamphleteered on behalf of Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850, the Peel's father) when he presented a Factory Bill. Peel had been active since 1800<sup>\*</sup> in this field, not least because he was a large employer of factory children. In the event the Lords defeated the Bill on April 30th 1818; Coleridge's two pamphlets had circulated in the Commons during the preceding fortnight (1818a, on the 18th; 1818b, on the 24th). We know that Coleridge intended the pamphlets to have Parliamentary influence<sup>\*\*</sup>; the first one,

---

\* I have variously mentioned these early Factory Acts in Chapters 1 and 3 above; Cf. Montmorency, 1902: 210f; Mantoux, 1928: 468f; Djang, 1942 and Blelloch, 1938.

\*\* Coleridge's other attempt at Parliamentary influence were the letters to Lord Liverpool of 19th March and 28th June 1817; for Liverpool's laconic comments see Colmer (1959: 138; on Liverpool's Administration Cf. White, 1957; Cookson, 1975). Coleridge may have expected some patronage from Liverpool, (see Coleridge, 1830:vi,n.4 and Colmer, 1959:153 n.2).

which I have examined in the original, is printed to appear as a Parliamentary paper. These 1818 pamphlets are still little known; significantly they were not known to A.V. Dicey (Colmer, 1959: 151 n2)

Coleridge attempts to answer the four major objections raised to Peel's Bill by the manufacturing interest. These concern: the impropriety of any legislative interference with free labour; the dangers of any kind of State action; the inadequacies of Peel's proposals and, as a final instance of special pleading, the argument that what needs doing can best be done by 'the master manufacturers themselves as individuals'. Coleridge's response is direct. He first stresses that the State in England has always intervened in the 'free' labour market, this is one of the 'principles' and part of the 'spirit of the British Constitution'. Moreover

Every Canal Bill proves, that there is no species of property which the legislature does not possess and exercise the right of controlling and limiting, as soon as the right of the individuals is shown to be disproportionately injurious to the community.

(1818a: 2)

But, anyway, in what sense is the labour of these children 'free'? Coleridge knew from his liaison with Crabb Robinson (Colmer, 1959: 151) and his intensive reading of the 1816 Select Committee report (Ibid., 149, n.3) that factory labour led to premature death. He saw his work in 1818 as 'Efforts ... on behalf of the little white slaves of the Cotton Factories' (qu Colmer, 1959: 150; Cf. Coleridge's 1808 review). In the pamphlets he makes this analogy explicit (1818a: 3f; 1818b: 364f). So influenced was he by the evidence that the same phrases about length of working time - 'from thirteen to fifteen

hours in the day' - and the factory conditions - 'in a heated stifling impure atmosphere' - occur in both pamphlets and in his Philosophical Lecture of 22nd February 1819. In the latter text he blames them on the Spirit of Commerce which makes us 'consider men, our fellow creatures, mere parts of a machine ...'

is it not a contradiction ... they are free labourers, poor little darlings! And consider the revenue consider the money got by them.

(1819: 287-288)

Finally it is time to consider Coleridge's On the Constitution of the Church and State according to the idea of each (hereafter C&S)\*, the only publication of his that 'achieved anything like a popular success' (Colmer, 1959: 165). Much of J.S. Mill's 1840 Essay is on C&S, which Colmer argues also influenced M. Arnold, W. Gladstone, F.D. Maurice and T.S. Eliot\*\*. It has been much studied\*\*\*. Although C&S responds to a number of Catholic Emancipation Bills - and, in fact, appeared after the successful Act of 1829 - it employs a general scheme of interpretation. C&S connects directly with the Bosanquetian notion that institutions are ethical ideas. Like Bosanquet, Coleridge's work is ahistorical philosophizing; despite his depiction of all history since 1688 as 'misgrowth'.

---

\* A full scholarly edition of C&S is now available as volume 10 of the Bollingen edition of the Collected Works (edited by J. Colmer, Routledge, 1975) but this was unavailable when the work was done for this Appendix.. Contemporary editions - e.g. the 3rd by H.N. Coleridge of 1839 - of C&S, also included the Lay Sermons. I have used the Everyman ed. which reprints the 2nd ed.

\*\* It is by no means a dead issue; as the editorial "The Power of Church and State" (Times, 9th June 1976) and subsequent correspondence make clear.

\*\*\* Willey, 1949:52-8; Colmer, 1959:153-166; Calleo, 1966:Chs.5-7; and Stafford's D. Phil thesis passim.

C&S brings together three strands of Coleridge's thought into a theory of citizenship and Nation: German Idealism, the power of patriotism and the significance of nationality, and, thirdly, the moral importance of Christianity. After an early discussion of the State, narrowly defined, as the organic confluence of two tendencies - the lex equilibri - Permanence, of land, versus Progress, of commerce; Coleridge extends the discussion by introducing a third estate or interest, the National Church, co-ordinate with the other two (Land and Commerce), but concerned with cultural or moral well-being. Such a Church (not to be confused with an empirical form of it, like the Church of England) is staffed by a 'clerisy' the minority of whom are intellectuals, concerned with cultivation and enlargement; the majority are teachers, instructors in civilisation. Coleridge then introduces the idea of a National Commonwealth which has two kinds of landed property: the Nationality 'a reserve ... for the Nation itself', and the Propriety, in the stewardship of particular landowners. In this scheme, the King, as Coleridge later clarified, is 'the lawful Representative, the consecrated Symbol of the Unity and Majesty of the Nation' rather than of 'the People' (Letter, 3rd June 1831 qu Colmer, 1959: 162. Cf. Coleridge, 1830: Chs. 10-12). Finally, the two Houses of Parliament represent the Major Barons, who are the House of Lords, and the Franklins or Minor Barons, who are represented in the Commons. The 'Novi Homines' - those with 'personal interest', the manufacturing, mercantile, distributive and professional classes - are 'admitted' as Minor Barons.

What is being explored here is the Idea of the British Constitution - this notion of Idea is much better than that of 'social contract' since there can never be found that original 'first contract'.

Coleridge is trying to elucidate the supporting conditions which make such contracts (as interpretive paradigms) possible; he finds notions of moral obligation entail 'duties anterior to the formation of the contract ... of the very constitution of our humanity ... moral freedom [is] the Ground of our proper responsibility ...' (1830:6f; Cf. Ibid.,97-111). It is on these grounds that Coleridge objects to specific pieces of legislation; here his rejection of the 1795 Bills and his comments on the 1832 Reform Bills are related - both reflect pragmatic expediency and do not correspond to the moral realities of the Idea of the State.

. . . . .

A final word or two is required to show the relevance of this brief summary to the themes of my thesis. First, the 'structural similarity' of much of Coleridge's work and that of the later Idealist Philosophers should need no emphasis. The conundrum that Coleridge is completely ignored, whereas Green is given causal significance remains. Second, we have no a priori reason for rejecting this kind of philosophy - or 'structure of feeling' to embrace the wider literary and religious ideas and to use Raymond Williams' conception - in trying to detect the aetiology of Erastian philosophies and practices in Britain in the early and mid-nineteenth century. Society was perceptually changing - the images used by Burke or Carlyle are very accurate - from that of 'a Tree' to that of 'a Machine'. The ways in which a Tree is regulated and tended differ dramatically from the same relations regarding machines. This is not simply an empirical matter - I am not suggesting that historical sleuths need to be sent out to trace

a hint of Coleridge there, or a trace of Burke here, in the way that some of the pro- and anti-Bentham writers have done - but is ultimately related to the very project of history as such. Although Kay or Tremenheere may never acknowledge a resource upon which they draw, one cannot deny the possibility of it influencing their theories and practices as State Servants. In turn, this is not to encourage agnosticism, but to suggest that we need to attend to the supporting conditions of a social-structural character that (i) make some ideas practicable; (ii) help us to understand what it means to think or say certain words<sup>\*</sup> in particular contexts.

Here a return to Mill's 1840 Essay on Coleridge is useful. Mill justifies my claims here, and elsewhere, about the sociological relevance of such philosophizing when he depicts the 'Germano-Coleridgian school' as the first 'who inquired with any comprehension or depth, into the inductive laws of the existence and growth of human society'. They were the first

to bring prominently forward the three requisites...  
as essential principles of all permanent forms of  
social existence ... They thus produced ... a  
philosophy of society ... and afforded the only means  
of predicting and guiding the future, by unfolding the  
agencies which have produced and still maintain the  
Present.

(1840: 129-131)

Mill identifies the 'three requisites' as: 'a system of education'; 'the feeling of allegiance, or loyalty'; and 'a strong and active

---

\* I mean here that it is not the meanings of 'raw' words (symbols) that matter but social understanding. Cf. Durkheim, 1912 and my preface above.



principle of cohesion among the members of the same community or state' (1840: 121-126). Mill also mentions Dugald Stewart as a 'Philosopher of society'; I would wish to go further and stress the equal significance (and structurally similar nature) of the work of the Scottish Moralists.

Mill, as with others, sees Coleridge as making a major contribution to the critique of the 'let us alone' view of Government (1840: 137) by specifying certain positive duties for the State (e.g. 1817a: 215f, quoted above). Although it is right to stress that what Mill offers us is an interpretation of Coleridge - for example, Mill completely negates Coleridge's own views on landholding in order to further Mill's Radical case regarding landowners - it is relevant to see how Coleridge leads Mill to question laissez faire. Agreeing that people must be free to make the 'most advantageous bargains', Mill asks

But does it follow from this that government cannot exercise a free agency of its own? - that it cannot beneficially employ its pecuniary resources ... in promoting the public welfare by a thousand means which individuals would never think of, would have no sufficient motives, or no sufficient powers to accomplish?

(1840: 156-7)

Mill argues here that 'a State ought to be considered as a great benefit society, or mutual insurance company ...' (1840: 157). In his Reform of the Poor Law (1890: 104)\*, Sidney Webb argued

---

\* I am most grateful to Tony Novak for this reference.

that

it seems desirable to promote in every way  
the feeling that 'the Government' is no  
entity outside of ourselves, but merely  
ourselves organised for collective purposes ...  
Regarding the State as a vast benefit society,  
of which the whole body of citizens are  
necessarily members ...

Coleridge would clearly not agree with specific terms, and  
the Erastian tendency, of these formulae; but he would applaud  
what they reveal - the superiority of the category Nation to any  
particular Interest. Above all he would welcome the ways in  
which such an approach makes a class analysis almost impossible.  
Finally, it is Coleridge's attempts to provide a semisecular  
equivalent for Divine justifications of the way society is  
arranged that mark out his prose works on political philosophy as  
worthy texts for investigation.

. . . . .

.

## B I B L I O G R A P H I E S

<u>A Unpublished materials</u>		2 - 5
1. Private Papers	2	
2. State Papers in the Public Record Office		3
3. Theses	4-5	
<u>B Published materials</u>		6 -
1. State Papers	6-12	
2. All others		
(a) Materials by Horner; Kay; Tremenheere; and Chadwick		13- 20
(b) All others.	21 -	

.....

A Note on Arrangement

I use the P.R.O. coding for their Papers.

Theses are in alphabetical order by author.

Published State papers are given in the categories used in the bound series of the State Paper Room, British Library: Session Date, House of Commons or Command Paper Number, Volume Number (in Roman Numerals) of the series for that session.

For the other categories (B.2(a) and (b) ) arrangement is alphabetical by author (or first author), subdivision of the works of the same author is by date; subdivision within the same author and the same year is by subscript letters (e.g. 1838a) added to the year.

Standard abbreviations are indicated prior to the sequence within which they are employed.

.....

A.1 Private Papers

Brougham Papers

Both in D.M.Watson Library

Chadwick Papers

University College, London

The first contains 45 letters from Leonard Horner and 2 letters from Kay.

The second contains 5 letters from Leonard Horner to Chadwick; 5 letters from Kay to Chadwick (one from Chadwick to Kay); and 35 letters from Tremenheere to Chadwick (and one from Chadwick to Tremenheere). Two important bodies of material not examined are 104 letters from Ashley to Chadwick, 1833-1885; and 78 letters from Chadwick to Lord John Russell, 1836 to 1872 (although the first two on Poor Law policy were perused).

There is an extremely valuable typescript held in the D.M.Watson Library: Janet Percival Papers of Sir Edwin Chadwick, 1800-1890 (1975). My thanks to the staff at University College for their help during several visits.

Note

Although I have made use of other private papers I have done so indirectly citing them in their published version (as with Graham and Peel, for example) or quoting them as used by other historians.

I had thought of investigating the unpublished materials of the major State Servants directly. I did not do so for two reasons. Much material is available- e.g. Kay's Autobiography; Smith's biography and Johnson's or Hurt's writings. Chadwick has been well-studied by Finer. Horner's papers were available in three Memoir volumes. I had thought- since Tremenheere has long been a major interest (and despite I was there and the theses of Holmes or Cassell)- of studying his papers. I asked Professor R.K.Webb if he thought this useful. In his reply (30 April 1975) he said 'I doubt, though, that if you did have a look at them [i.e. HST's papers] you would find much that is not indicated in either my article or the Edmonds material'. As it was I think the Tremenheere/Chadwick letters were a major find.

---

A.2 State Papers in the Public Record Office\*(i) General

H.O. 1841-1855  
 45 1856- 1871 Home Office 'Disturbances' files  
 Indexes: RR 2/78 and 2/79

(ii) Factories and Mines

## (a) Inspectors of Factories and Mines. Letter Books.

H.O. I: 23 August 1836 to 3 April 1846  
 87 II: 8 April 1846 to 19 August 1853  
 III: 23 August 1853 to 29 November 1864  
 IV: 3 December 1864 to 24 March 1869

## (b) Factory Inspectors. Meetings. Minute Books.

LAB I: September 1836 to January 1844  
 15 II: July 1844 to February 1849  
 III: May 1849 to June 1855  
 IV: May 1855 to June 1867

## (c) Mines Inspectors. Letter Books.

H.O. I - V 1855 to 1871  
 95

## (d) Mines Inspectors. Manuscript Reports.

H.O. 1852 only  
 87/53

(iii) Poor Law

MH 48 to 50 Correspondence with Dr Kay (Shuttleworth)  
 32/ 1835 to 1845. Index: MH 33/4

.....

\* I did not investigate any P.R.O. Educational materials given the studies of Ball, Hurt, Bishop and Johnson.

---

A.3 Theses

R.G.BARKER

Houghton-le-Spring Poor Law Union.  
M.Litt.(Newcastle Upon Tyne)1974.

A.J.CASSELL

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Mines,  
1843-1862.  
M.Sc.(Econ)(Southampton) 1962.

A.C.CHITNIS

The Edinburgh professariate,1790-1826,  
and the University's contribution to  
nineteenth-century British Society.  
Ph.D.(Edinburgh) 1968.

PAUL CORRIGAN

Secondary education and juvenile delinquency.  
Ph.D.(Durham) 1974.

J.DITTON

'The Fiddler': A sociological analysis of  
blue collar employee theft amongst bread  
salesmen.  
Ph.D. (Durham) 1976.

M.S.FREEDEN

English Liberal thought: problems of social  
reform, 1886-1914.  
D.Phil.(Oxford) 1972.

J.M.GOLDSTROM

The changing social content of elementary  
education as reflected in school books in  
use in England, 1800-1870.  
Ph.D. (Birmingham) 1968.

C.HOLMES

The Life and work of H.S. Tremenheere.  
M.A. (Nottingham) 1964.

J.R.B.JOHNSON

The Education Department,1839-1864:a study in  
social policy and the growth of government.  
Ph.D.(Cambridge) 1968.

G.J.JONES

Darwinism and social thought: a study in the  
relationship between science and the development  
of sociological theory in Britain,1860-1914.  
Ph.D. (London) 1974.

- P.LINEBAUGH Tyburn. A study of crime and the Labouring poor in London during the first half of the eighteenth century.  
Ph.D. (Warwick) 1968.
- T.J.Nossiter Elections and political behaviour in County Durham and Newcastle, 1832-1874.  
D.Phil.(Oxford) 1968.
- N.PEARSON The social construction of Art. 2 vols.  
Ph.D. (Durham) submitted 1976
- H.RAMSAY Participation for whom?  
Ph.D. (Durham) in progress
- P. RICHARDS The State and the working class, 1833-141: MPs and the making of social policy.  
Ph.D.(Birmingham) 1975.
- D.SAYER Some issues in historical materialism.  
Ph.D. (Durham) 1975.
- H.SMITH The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 1826-1846.  
M.A. (London) 1972.
- W.A. STAFFORD Man and Society in the thought of Coleridge and Disraeli.  
D.Phil (Oxford) 1973.
- D.N.THOMAS Marriage patterns in the British Peerage.  
M.Phil.(London) 1969

B.1 State Papers

Key: ( ) round figure after Session Year = Parliamentary Paper usually Commons; [ ] = Command Paper.

LH = Leonard Horner; HST = H.S.Tremenheere; JPK(S) = J.P. Kay (- Shuttleworth); ECT = E.C.Tufnell; FI = Factory Inspectors; Rep = Report(s); Comm = Commissioner(s); MD = Mining Districts

Note: This does not pretend to a full listing of Kay (Cf. Ball, Hurt, Johnson) or Chadwick (Cf. Finer).

Each citation should be preceded by P.P. to show its inclusion in the officially bound set of Parliamentary Publications. I have generally used the set in the British Library's State Paper Room in London.

1828

(552) XVII

Return... Public Offices or Departments  
...1797,1805,1810,1815,1819,1827.

1830

(386) XVII

Return...Public Departments and Offices  
in 1821 and 1829.

1831-32

(343) XXVI

An account of every increase and dimunition  
... Public Offices and Departments. 1831.

1833

XX

Central Board of His Majesty's Comm appointed  
to collect information in the Manufacturing  
Districts as to the Employment of Children  
in Factories...First and Supplementary  
Reports. LH & others.

(514) XXIII

Return... Establishments...Public Departments  
and Offices. 1821,1832.

1834

(596) XLIII

Report...FI. LH & others.

1835

(342) XL

Report... FI. LH & others.

(609) XXXVII

Account... Civil Departments, 1815-1835.



- 1836  
 (78) XLV Report...FI. LH & others.  
 (483) XLV Rules and Regulations made by LH.
- 1837  
 (67) L Returns... LH to his Superintendents.  
 (72) XXIV Part 1 Report on Fees and gratuities.  
 (73) XXXV Report...FI. LH & others.  
 (74) XXXI Directions to FI.  
 (162) XLIV Treasury Committee on Fees etc. 1st Report.  
 (277) XLIV Ibid. 2nd Report.  
 (376) LI Report of Dr. Kay... on Distress in Spitalfields.
- 1837-8  
 [119,131] XXVIII Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 (612) XLV Report...FI. LH & others.
- 1839  
 (42) XLII Report on the effects of the educational provisions. LH.
- [159,201] Reports... FI. LH & others.
- 1840  
 XL Minutes of the Committee on Education and Appendices. HST on S.Wales. JPK, Secretary.
- [218,261] XXIII Reports...FI. LH & others.
- (385) XXXIX Return on Poor Law Commission.  
 (394) XXXIX Report on the relief of Lunatics in Metropolitan Districts by Dr. Kay.
- 1841  
 [294] X Report....FI. LH & others.  
 [317] XX Minutes of the Committee...and Appendices. HST on Cornwall, Greenwich. JPK, Secretary
- 1841 Sess. 2  
 [342] VI Report...FI. LH& Others

- 1842  
 XXXIII Minutes of the Committee...and Appendices.  
 HST, ECT, JPK.
- (31) [410] XXII Reports... FI. LH & Others.
- [380] XV Children's Employment Commission. First Rep.  
 Mines. LH, Saunders, Tooke, Southwood Smith.
- 1843  
 XL Minutes of the Committee... and Appendices.  
 HST on British & Foreign Schools. JPKS, Secretary.
- [429,523] XXVII Reports...FI. LH & others.
- [430] XIII Children's Employment Commission. 2nd Rep.  
 Trades and Manufactures. LH & others.
- [500] XXVII Report on the educational clauses of the  
 Factory Acts by R.J.Saunders.
- 1844  
 [524,583] XXVIII Reports... FI. LH & others.
- [592] XVI Report...Comm MD. HST.
- 1845  
 [639] XXV Report...FI. LH & others.
- [670] XXVII Report...Comm MD. HST.
- 1846  
 (572) XXXVI Return on Assistant Poor Law Commissioners.  
 [681,721] XX Reports...FI. LH & others.
- [737] XXIV Report... Comm MD. HST.
- 1847  
 [779,828] XXV Reports... FI. LH & others.
- [844] XVI Report...Comm MD. HST
- 1847-48  
 [900,957] XXVI Reports...FI. LH & others.
- [993] XXVI Report...Comm MD. HST.

1849  
 [1017,1084] XXII Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [1109] XXII Report...Comm. MD. HST.

1850  
 (260) XXXIV Return on Poor Law Expenditure.  
 (611) XV Select Committee on Official Salaries. Rep.  
 [1141,1239] XXIII Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [1248] XXIII Report... Comm MD. HST.

1851  
 (103) XLIII Minutes of the Committee...Appandices.  
 Returns. Lists.  
 [1304, 1396] XXIII Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [1406] XXIII Report...Comm MD. HST.

1852  
 [1525] XXI Report...Comm MD. HST.  
 [1580, 1642] XL Reports...FI. LH & others.

1852-53  
 [1679] XL Report...Comm MD. HST

1854  
 [1712,1796] XIX Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [1713] XXVII Civil Service Reorganization. Trevelyan  
 and Northcote.  
 [1838] XIX Report...Comm MD. HST.

1854-55  
 (439) XXX Treasury Minute on 'Civil Service  
 Reorganization'.  
 [530- 1] XX Index to Reports and Papers on 'Civil  
 Service Reorganization'.  
 [1870] XX Papers of the Report 'Civil Service  
 Reorganization'.

[1943] XVII Report of the Comm on Bleaching Works. HST.  
 [1947] XV Report...FI. LH & others.  
 [1993] XV Report... Comm. MD. HST.

- 1856  
 (337) IX Select Committee on Civil Service Superannuation.  
 [2031,2090] XVIII Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [2125] XVIII Report...Comm MD. HST.
- 1857 Sess. 1  
 [2153] III Report...FI. LH & others.
- 1857 Sess. 2  
 [2247] XVI Report...FI. LH & others.  
 [2275] XVI Report... Comm MD. HST.
- 1857-58  
 [2314, 2391] XXXIV Reports...FI. LH & others.  
 [2424] XXXII Report...Comm MD. HST.
- 1859.Sess. 1  
 [2463] XII Report...FI. LH & others.
- 1859 Sess. 2  
 [2583] XIV Report...FI. LH & others.  
 [2566] XII Report...Comm MD. HST.
- 1860  
 IX Select Committee on Civil Service Appointments.  
 Reports. Evidence. Appendices.  
 [2594] Report...FI. LH & others.
- 1861  
 (231) XLVIII Education Commission. Letter to Earl Granville.  
 JPKS.  
 (354) XLVIII Education Commission. Paper by Mr. Tremeneere.  
 [2797] XXII Report of Comm on Lace Manufacture. HST.
- 1862  
 (120) XLIII Two Papers by Mr. Chadwick on Education and  
 Drill.  
 [3027] XLVII Report of Comm on Journeymen Bakers. 1st. HST.
- 1863  
 [3091] XXVII Report of Comm on Journeymen Bakers. 2nd. HST.

1863

[ 3170 ] XVIII Children's Employment Commission. 1st Rep.  
HST, ECT and R.D.Grainger.

1864

[ 3414 ] XXII Idem. 2nd Report.

[ 3414-I ] XXII Idem. 3rd Report. HST, ECT alone.

1865

(175) XLVII Report of Comm on the Bakehouses Regulation  
Act, 1863. 1st. HST.

[ 3548 ] XX Children's Employment Commission. 4th Rep.  
HST, ECT.

1866

(394) LXVI Report of Comm on the Bakehouses Regulation  
Act, 1863. 2nd. HST.

[ 3678 ] XXIV Children's Employment Commission. 5th Rep.  
HST, ECT.

1867

[ 3796 ] XVI Idem. 6th Report. HST, ECT.

1867-68

XXVIII 21 Volumes Schools Inquiry (Taunton Commission).

[ 4068 ] XVII Commission on the Employment of Children, Young  
Persons and women in Agriculture. 1st Report  
and Appendix Part 1. HST, ECT.

[ 4068-I ] XVII Idem., Appendix Part 2: Evidence.

1868

[ 4149 ] XIV Report of Comm on the Printworks, and the  
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts. HST, ECT.

[ 4202 ] XIII Commission on the Employment...in Agriculture.  
2nd Report and Appendix, Part I. HST, ECT.

[ 4202-I ] XIII Idem., Appendix Part 2: Evidence.

1870

[70\*] XIII

Commission on the Employment....in Agriculture.  
3rd Report, on Wales. HST, ECT.

[221] XIII

Idem., 4th Report, on Scotland. HST, ECT.

The following are not given in their P.P. format  
since I examined them in their separately, but  
original, published state.

1875

Civil Service Enquiry. Reports, 1876-677.  
C1113;C1227;C1317. The Playfair Commission.

1886

Royal Commission on Civil Establishments.  
Reports, 1887-1890.  
C5226;5545;5748;6172. The Ridley Commission.

1912

Royal Commission on the Civil Service.  
Reports, 1912-1914: Cd6209;Cd6534;Cd6739;Cd7338.  
Appendices: Cd6210;Cd6535;Cd6740;Cd7339;Cd7340.  
The MacDonnell Commission (included G.Wallas).

1928

Royal Commission on the Civil Service.  
Report, 1931. Cmd. 3909. The Tomlin Commission.

1953

Royal Commission on the Civil Service.  
Report, 1955. Cmd. 9613. The Priestley Commission.

1966

Committee on the Civil Service.  
Report, 1968. Cmnd 3638 .  
The Fulton Report.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

\* A new series of Command Papers started in 1870, adding, for the first time a prefatory C; a second series has Cd; a third, Cmd;and the current (1976) series has Cmnd. These have been omitted in my pre-1875 listing.

## B.2(a) Material by the State Servants

Place of Publication always London unless stated.

LEONARD HORNER

- Memoir,I Memoir of Leonard Horner, F.R.S., F.G.S., consisting of letters to his family, and some of his friends; edited by his daughter Katharine M. Lyell.  
Women's Printing Society Ltd., 1890. 2 vols.
- Memoir,II Francis Horner and Leonard Horner [Speeches and Letters ed. M. Lyell].  
Edinburgh, Morrison and Gibb, n.d.  
No Copy British Library; Xerox Copy, Heriot Watt.
- 1834 The factories Regulation act [explained].  
Glasgow, privately published.
- 1837 [Letter to Mr. Senior in the latter's] Letters on the Factory Act...  
London, printed R. Clay.
- 1838a "Preliminary observations on the necessity of legislative measures to extend and improve education among the working classes and the poor in Great Britain" [Prefaced to V. Cousin, 1838].
- 1838b Remarks on certain charges of misrepresentation of Lord Brougham's educational bill, in Mr. Horner's observations prefixed to his translation of M. Cousin's work... contained in number 134 of the Edinburgh Review, January 1838. [London?] printed G. Wood.
- 1840 On the employment of children in factories and other works in the United Kingdom and some foreign countries.  
Longmans; Manchester, Bancks; Leeds, Baines...; Glasgow, David Robertson.
- 1843 Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.; edited by his brother... Murray. 2 vols.  
Idem, Condensed ed [by Mr. Burton, advocate].  
Edinburgh, W & R Chambers, 1849 (Instructive and entertaining library).
- 1851 Address to Edinburgh Schhol of Arts.  
Edinburgh, for the School, Morrison and Gibb.

\*\*\*\*\*

J.P.KAY (SHUTTLEWORTH from 1843 publications on)

For a comprehensive bibliography see B.C.Bloomfield,1960.

- 1832 The moral and physical condition of the working classes employed in the cotton manufacture in Manchester. 2nd ed. Ridgway.
- 1835 "Report...on the migration of labourers from the Southern rural counties of England to the cotton district of Lancashire." Appendix B. Poor Law Commission Report. Clowes.
- 1836 "Report on the administration...Poor Law Amendment Act... Suffolk and Norfolk." Appendix B. P.L.C. Report. Clowes.
- 1837 "Report...Distress...Spitalfields Weavers." Appendix B. P.L.C. Report. Clowes.
- 1838a "Report on the training of Pauper children." Appendix B. P.L.C.Report. Clowes.
- 1838b " On the establishment of County or District Schools for the training of Pauper children maintained in Union workhouses." Journal of Statistical Society, I.
- 1838c "Earnings of agricultural labourers in Norfolk and Suffolk." Ibid., I
- 1838d "Notes illustrative of a previous paper on the training in Schools of Industry of Children..." Ibid., I
- 1838e "The system of compulsory apprenticeship pursued in the incorporated Hundreds of Suffolk and Norfolk." In P.L.C. 1841 composite Report; reprinted in 1839c.
- 1839a Recent measures for the promotion of education in England. 2nd ed. Ridgway.
- 1839b "The Training of Pauper Children. 2nd Report." Appendix C. B.L.C. Report. Clowes. Reprinted 1839c.
- 1839c The training of pauper children... Reprinted, Manchester, Morten, 1970.
- 1840a "On the training of pauper children. Supplementary Note." In P.L.C. 1841 composite Report,
- 1840b "An account of certain improvements in the training of Pauper children..." In P.L.C. 1841 composite Report.



KAY(-SHUTTLEWORTH) CONTINUED

- 1841a and E.C. Tufnell.  
" On the training school at Battersea."  
In the P.L.C. 1841 composite Report.
- 1841b On the punishment of Pauper Children [ Mss. submitted  
to P.L.C. with the latter's comments; transcribed  
and published by B.C.Bloomfield as an occasional  
paper ] College of St. Mark and St. John, 1961.
- 1846 The School in its relations to the State, the Church  
and the Congregation, being an explanation of the  
Minutes...August and December 1846.  
Murray, 1847.
- 1853 Public education as affected by the Minutes... from  
1846 to 1852, with suggestions as to future policy.  
Longman, Brown, Green & Longman.
- 1854 "Education essential to the success of trade and  
commerce" Manchester Guardian 14th and 18th  
January 1854.  
Also as pamphlet, Manchester, Cave & Sever, 1854  
(Only copy in Manchester Public Library).
- 1856 Medical and middle class education: an address...  
Manchester, Simms, Kelly & Slater.
- 1859 "Address...on the progress of civilization in England."  
Transactions of the National Association for the  
Promotion of Social Science, 1860. (Hereafter: NAPSS)
- 1860 "Address...on public education and the relations of  
moral and physical forces in civilization."  
Transactions NAPSS, 1861.
- 1861a "Letter to Earl Granville" 1st ed. P.P. 1861(231)XLVIII.
- 1861b "Popular education and its relation to the religious  
dominations." Address to the Educational Committee  
of the Wesleyan Conference. In his 1873.
- 1861c "Letter to Earl Granville". Reprinted in his 1862a.

KAY SHUTTLEWORTH CONTINUED

- 1862a Four periods of public education as reviewed in 1832-1839-1846-1862.  
Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts.  
(His 1832, 1839a, 1846; 1861c and part of 1861a).
- 1862b Words of comfort and counsel to distressed Lancashire workmen...by a country squire, their neighbour.  
Hatchard; Manchester, Abel Heywood.
- 1863a "Industrial and social development of South East Lancashire...". Address to the Annual Meeting of the East Lancashire Union of Institutions.  
Reprinted in his 1873.
- 1863b "Manual of suggestions for relief committees in the Cotton Districts, suggested by the experience of 1862-3." In his 1873.
- 1864a "The relations of manufactures to science and art." Address at the opening of Oldham School of Science and Art. In his 1873.
- 1864b "Co operative associations of workmen." Address at Bury. In his 1873.
- 1864c "The treatment of Idiots." Address to a meeting to establish a Northern Counties Asylum. In his 1873.
- 1865a "The social progress of the English manual labour class in its political bearing..." Address to Kendal Working Men's Club. In his 1873.
- 1865b "The defence of England and non-resistance." Address to the Volunteer Rifle Battalion in N.E. Lancashire. In his 1873.
- 1866a "Address... on economy and trade." Transactions NAPSS, 1867. Reprinted as 'Laws of social progress' 1873:Ch.1
- 1866b "A sketch of the history and results of popular education in England..." Address to the Annual Meeting of the East Lancashire Union of Institutions. In his 1873.
- 1866c "Middle class education..." Transactions, NAPSS, 1867.
- 1866d "The relation of elementary education to the franchise." Manchester Guardian, 26 January 1866.

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH CONCLUDED

H.S.TREMENHEERE BEGUN

- 1868 Memorandum on Popular Education.  
Ridgway, 1868.
- 1872 "Memorandum on Training Colleges." In his 1873.
- 1873 Thoughts and suggestions on certain social problems,  
contained chiefly in address to meetings of working  
men in Lancashire.  
Longmans, Green & Co.
- 1876 "Some of the results of the Education Act and Code of  
1870." Fortnightly Review, 25.
- 1877 The aut obiography...edited by B.C.Bloomfield.  
University of London, Institute of Education, 1964.  
('Education Libraries Bulletin', Supplement No.7).

\*\*\*\*\*

H.S.TREMENHEERE

- 1837 Review of Laing(1836). Edinburgh Review, 65.\*
- 1838 Review of Guizot(1837). Idem., 67. \*
- 1839 Review of Laing (1839). Idem., 69.\*
- 1842 "Educational Statistics, 1840-41."  
Journal of the Statistical Society,5.
- 1843 "Government expenditure on education in England,  
1841-42." Idem., 6.
- 1852 The political experience of the ancients in its bearing  
upon modern times.  
Murray.
- 1857 "On associations for offering annual prizes" and  
"On certificates of acquirement..." In Hill, 1857.
- 1861 Submission to Newcastle Commission PP 1861(354)XLVIII.

---

\*Authorship attributed to Tremenheere by (i) Wellesley Index;  
(ii) Edmonds' editorial remarks in I was there.

## H.S.TREMENHEERE CONTINUED

- 1865a I:Factory schools, and education under the Print-  
Works, Act; II: The Children's Employment Commission.  
(Papers originally to the NAPSS, Sheffield, October  
1865). Privately printed, 1865.
- 1865b The franchise:a privilege and not a right.Proved by  
the political experience of the ancients. New ed.  
Murray.
- 1880 "State aid and control in industrial insurance."  
Nineteenth Century, 8.
- 1881 "Thriftless thrift."  
Fortnightly Review, 36.
- 1882 A manual of the principles of government as set  
forth by the authorities of ancient and modern  
times...New and enlarged edition.  
Kegan Paul.
- 1889 Why have I a vote? and how should I use it? An  
answer to a working man's question...  
Liberal Unionist Association.
- 1890 What to avoid, and why. Addressed to working men.  
Liberal Unionist Association.
- 1891 Why have I the vote...2nd thousand, with supplement.  
Liberal Unionist Association.
- 1893 How good government grew up and how to preserve it.  
Liberal Unionist Association.
- 1965 I was there : the <sup>M</sup>emoirs...compiled and edited...  
by E.L. and O.P. Edmonds. Eton: Shakespeare Head Press.

\*\*\*\*\*

E. CHADWICK

For a full bibliography see Finer 1952a:517-521;530-540

- 1829 "Preventive Police". London Review, I.
- 1834 See POOR LAW REPORT (1834) ed. Checklands.
- 1841 "Evidence of employers of labourers on the influence of training and education on the value of workmen..." In the P.L.C. 1841 composite Report. Clowes.
- 1855 "Administrative Diaries" in his 1887:I:374
- 1857 "On the economical, social, educational and political influence of competitive examinations as tests of qualifications for admission to the junior appointments in the public service." Paper to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Dublin, August 1857. Journal of the Statistical Society, 21, 1858.
- 1859a The development of Statesmanship as a science... Charles Knight. Reprinted in his 1887:I:Chs.14-15.
- 1859b "Results of different principles of legislation and administration in Europe; of competition for the field, as compared with competition within the field, of service." Journal of the Statistical Society, 22.
- 1860 "Address... on Public Health." Transactions NAPSS, 1861
- 1862 "On the subject matters and methods of competitive examinations for the Public Service." Paper to B.A.A.S. Journal of the Statistical Society, 25.
- 1863a "Prevention of robberies and murder for money." Social Science Review, 16 May 1863; Reprinted 1887:II:Ch.3.
- 1863b "Poor Law Administration". Paper to the NAPSS. Journal of the Statistical Society, 27, 1864.

## E. CHADWICK CONCLUDED

- 1864 "Opening Address" [ Department of Economy and Trade,  
NAPSS ] Journal of the Statistical Society, 27.
- 1868 "On the Consolidation of police force, and the  
prevention of crime."  
Fraser's Magazine, 78.
- 1871 "Competitive examinations" [ Address to NAPSS, 1871 ]  
  
In his 1887:I:327-339.
- 1881 " On the best forces for the suppression of riots."  
In his 1887:II:406-417.
- 1884 [ Revision of his 1829 article on police ]/.  
In his 1887:II:390-397.
- 1887 The Health of Nations: a review [ i.e. Epitome ]  
of the works of Edwin Chadwick...by Benjamin W.  
Richardson.  
Longman, 2 vols.
-

B.2(b) All other published material

## Abbreviations and conventions:

- (i) Entry is under the surname of the first named author for all collective writings. That is a single sequence, with subarrangement by date of writing (which is the date of publication unless the latter is also given) or first publication, of all an author's work, whether alone or with others, will be given.
- (ii) This is a finding list rather than a standard bibliography. Some titles are foreshortened. Frequently full publication details have been omitted.
- (iii) Place of Publication is always London unless given. Publishers with two or more names have been foreshortened.
- (iv) Journal publication data is title(abbreviated as follows) and volume number: e.g. 21; where a number of enclosed in () it indicates a journal with issue numbering only as Past & Present, New Left Review, Radical Philosophy.

## (v) Abbreviations:

Am = American

Int = International

Assoc = Association

J = Journal

Br = British

Trans =

Bull = Bulletin

M = Magazine

Transaction(s)

C = Cambridge

NY = New York

U = University

Can = Canada

O = Oxford

Vol = Volume

Comp = Comparative

P = Press

comp = Compiled (by)

Pol = Political

Ec Economic/s

Qu = Quarterly

Ed = Editor, edited(b)

R = Review

ed =

Educ = Education/al

Repr = Reprinted

Eng = English

rev = revised(by)

Fr = French

Rdy = Royal

His = History/Historical

Soc = Society

Sociol = Sociology/ical

Stud = Study/ies

\*\*\*\*\*

- ABRAHAM: J.H.: 1973 The origins and growth of sociology.  
Penguin.
- ABRAMS: P.  
1964 'The sociology of political life'.  
In Fyvel, 1964.
- 1968 The origins of British sociology, 1834-1914. U of Chicago P.
- 1972a 'Sociology and History'.  
Past & Present, (52).
- 1972b 'The sense of the past and the origins of sociology'.  
Past & Present, (55).
- 1972c Being and becoming in sociology.  
Durham City, Durham U.
- ABRAMSON: P.  
1967 'The differential political socialization of English secondary school students'.  
Sociol Educ, 40.
- 1970 'The Development of systematic support in four Western democracies'.  
Comp Pol Stud, 2.
- ACLAND: A.H.D. 1886 'Working men's co-operative organisations in Great Britain'.  
<sup>Roy</sup>  
J Statistical Soc, 49.
- ADAMIAK: R. 1974 'Marx, Engels, and Dukring'.  
J His Ideas, 35.
- ADELMAN: P. 1972 The rise of the Labour Party, 1880-1945.  
Longmans.
- AITKEN: H.J. 1959 (ed). The State and economic growth.  
NY, SSRC.
- ALBERT, Prince Consort, 1860  
[ Presidential Address, International  
Statistical Congress, London ]  
J Statistical Soc, 23.
- ALBROW: M.  
1970 Bureaucracy. Macmillan.  
1975 'Legal positivism and bourgeois materialism'.  
Br J Law & Soc, 2.
- ALEXANDER: J.P. 1974 and D.G. Paz,  
'The Treasury Grants, 1833-1839'.  
Br J Educ Stud, 22.



- ALFORD: RR 1974 and R. Friedland.  
'Nations, Parties, and Participation: a critique of political sociology'.  
Theory & Soc , 1.
- ALLEN: P. 1975 'The Civil Service'.  
In Thornhill, 1975:Ch.5
- ALLSOP:P. 1976 (ed) Encyclopedia of factories...law and practice. Sweet & M. (Looseleaf).
- ALSTON:P. 1969 Education and the State in Tsarist Russia.  
Stanford U P .
- ALTHUSSER: L.  
1970a 'Marx's relation to Hegel'.  
In his Politics and History, NLBooks,1972.
- 1970b 'Ideology and ideological State apparatuses'.  
In his Lenin and Philosophy, NLBooks,1971.
- AMORY:M. 1976 'The cleverest young man in England?'  
Sunday Times M , 2 May
- ANDERSON:M.  
1971a 'Family household in the Industrial Revolution' in his:  
1971b (ed). Sociology of the family.Penguin  
1971c Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire. C.U.P. 1972  
1972 National sample from the 1851 Census...  
Edinburgh, Edinburgh U.  
1973 'Smelser revisited'  
Social His, 1, 1976
- ANDERSON:O.  
1965 'The Janus face of mid-nineteenth century English Radicalism'.  
Victorian Stud , 8.  
1967 'The political uses of history in mid-nineteenth century England'.  
Past & Present (36).  
1974a 'The Administrative Reform Association, 1855-1857'.  
In Hollis , 1974.

ANDERSON:O.

1974b Review of A.J.Taylor, 1972.  
Eng His R , 89.

ANDERSON:P.

1963 'Origins of the present crisis'.  
New Left Review (23); Repr: Towards  
Socialism, Fontana, 1965.

1968 'Components of a national culture'.  
New Left R , (50).

1974a Passages from Antinuity to Feudalism.  
NLBooks.

1974b Lineages of the Absolutist State.  
NLBooks.

1976 Considerations on Western Marxism.  
NLBooks.

ANNAN:N.

1952 Leslie Stephen. Harvard U.P.

1955 'Intellectual aristocracy...'.  
In: J.H.Plumb, ed. Studies in social  
history. 1955

ANSTRUTHER:I. 1973 Scandal of the Andover workhouse.  
Bles, 1973.

APPLEBY:A.B. 1975 'Agrarian capitalism or Seignourial reaction?'  
Am His Re , 80.

ARDANT:G. 1975 'Financial policy and economic infra-  
structure of modern states and nations'.  
In Tilly, 1975d.

ARMSTRONG:W.A. 1966 'The interpretation of the Census  
enumerators' books for Victorian Towns'.  
In Dyos, 1968.

ARNHEIM: R. 1968 'Order and complexity in landscape design'.  
In Kuntz, 1968.

ARNSTEIN: W.L. 1972 'The survival of the Victorian aristocracy'.  
In Jaher, 1972.

ASCHROTT: P.F. 1902 The English poor law system past and  
present...ed. with additions, H.Preston-  
Thomas...2nd ed. Knight.

ASHCROFT: R.1972 'Marx and Weber on Liberalism as  
bourgeois ideology'.  
Comp Stud Soc His, 14.

- ASHFORTH:D. 1976 'The Urban Poor Law'.  
In Fraser, 1976.
- ASHTON:T.S.  
1934 Economic and social investigations in Manchester, 1833-1933.  
Repr Brighton, Harvester P, 1976.
- 1949 'The standard of life of the workers in England 1790-1830'.  
J Ec His, Supplement 9; Repr In Taylor, 1975.
- ASKWITH: G. 1920 Industrial problems and disputes...  
Repr Brighton, Harvester P, 1974.
- AUBREY:H. 19  
1949 'Deliberate industrialization'.  
Social Research, 15.
- 1951 'The role of the State in economic development'. Am Ec R , 41.
- AVINERI:S. 1972 Hegel's theory of the modern State.  
C U P .
- AYDELOTTE: W.O.  
1962 'The Business interests of the gentry in the Parliament of 1841-1847.'  
Appendix to Kitson Clark, 1962.
- 1963 'Voting patterns in the British House of Commons in the 1840s'.  
Comp Stud Soc His, 5.
- 1965 'Parties and issues in Early Victorian England'. J Br Stud , 5 ; Repr Stansky, 1973.
- 1967a 'The conservative and Radical interpretations of early Victorian social legislation.' Victorian Stud , 11.
- 1967b 'The country gentlemen and the repeal of the corn laws'. Eng His R , 82.
- 1972 'The disintegration of the Conservative Party in the 1840s...'  
In his Dimensions of quantitative research in history. Princeton U P , 1972.
- AYLMER:G.E. 1973 The State's Servants: the civil service in the English republic, 1649-1660.  
Routledge.

- BACKSTROM: R.F. 1974 Christian socialism and co-operation in Victorian England. Croom Helm.
- BAERNREITHER:J.M. 1883 . English associations of working men...enlarged and rev by author...  
Swan S, 1889.
- BAGEHOT:W.  
1867 The English constitution. ed RHS Crossman.  
Fontana, 1965.  
1872 'Introduction' to 2nd ed of his 1867,  
20 June 1872. In Crossman ed.  
and A.J.Bagley.  
The State and education in England, 1833-  
1968. Macmillan.
- BAGWELL:P. 1974 The Transport revolution from 1770.  
Batsford.
- BALIBAR:E. 1972 'La rectification du Manifest communiste'.  
La Pensee, (164).
- BALL:N. 1963 Her Majesty's Inspectorate,1839-1849.  
Edinburgh, Oliver & B.
- BARAN:P.  
1957 The political economy of growth.  
NY, Monthly R P, 1968.  
1966 and P.Sweezy. Monopoly Capital.  
Penguin, 1968.
- BARKER:E.  
1915 Political thought in England,1848-1914.  
Repr O U P , 1959.  
1930 'A study of the modern State' (In E.  
Eyre(ed) European civilization, Vol.5)  
Repr as The development of public  
services in Western Europe...  
O U P , 1944. Repr NY Archon Books,1966.
- BARKER:T. 1975 (ed) The Long March of everyman.  
BBC/Deutsch.
- BARNES: H.E.  
1917 'Sociology before Comte'. Am J Sociol,22.  
1948 'L.T. Hobhouse' Ch.15 in his:  
1966 (ed). Introduction to the history of sociology.  
Abridged ed. Chicago U P .

- BARNETT: C. 1970 Britain and her army, 1509-1970.  
Penguin, 1974.
- BARNSLEY, J.H. 1973 The social reality of ethics.  
Routledge.
- BARRELL: J.  
1971 The idea of landscape and the sense of place, 1730-1840. C U P .  
1972 'Introduction' to his ed. of Coleridge, 1830.
- BATES: T.R. 1975 'Gramsci and the theory of hegemony'.  
J His Ideas, 36.
- BAUGH: D.A. 1975 'The cost of Poor Relief in South East England, 1790-1834'. Ec His R, 28.
- BAYLEY: D.H. 1975 'The politice and political development...'  
In Tilly, 1975d.
- BEALES: D.E.D.  
1967 'Parties and the "independent" member, 1810-1860'. In Robson, 1967.  
1971 The political parties of nineteenth-century Britain. Historical Assoc.  
1974 'Peel, Russell and Reform'. His J, 17.
- BEALES: H.L.  
1931 'The new poor law'. His, 15.  
1945 The making of social policy. OUP, 1946.  
1948 The passing of the poor law. Pol Qu, 9.
- BEALEY: F. 1970 (ed) The social and political thought of the British Labour Party. Macmillan.
- BEAN: R. 1973 'War and the birth of the nation-state'.  
J Ec His, 33.
- BEATTIE: J.M.  
1970 'Towards a study of crime in eighteenth century England'. In Fritz, 1970.  
1974 'The pattern of crime in England, 1600-1800'. Past and Present, (62).
- BECKERMAN: W. 1975 'Growth: economics or sociology?'  
New Statesman, 4 April.
- BEELEY: H. 1934 'The political thought of Coleridge'.  
In Blunden, 1934.

- BEER:S.H.  
1957 'The representation of interests in British government...'  
Am Pol Science R, 51.
- 1969 Modern British Politics: a study of parties and pressure groups.  
Rev ed Faber.
- BETHAM:D. 1974 Max Weber and the theory of modern politics. Allen & U.
- BEIRNE: P. 1975 'Marxism and the sociology of law'.  
Br J Law and Soc, 2.
- BENDIX:.R  
1957 'A study of managerial ideologies'.  
Ec Development and Cultural Change, 5.
- 1960 'Social stratification and political community'. Archives europeenes de sociologie, I.
- 1963 Work and authority in industry. Rev ed.  
NY, Harper.
- 1964 Nation-building and citizenship...  
NY, Wiley.
- 1968 (ed). State and society: a reader...  
Rev ed. U of California P.
- BEN-ISRAEL:H. 1958 'Carlisle and the French Revolution'.  
His J, 1.
- BENNETT:W.J.E. 1846 Crime and education: the duty of the State therein. Cleeve.
- BENNETT:W.L. 1974 The political mind and the political environment. Lexington, Lexington Bks.
- BENTHAM: J.  
1776 A fragment on government, and, An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation. ed W.Harrisson (1948). Repr Oxford, Blackwell, 1967.
- 1820 'Summary of basic principles'  
In his 1973:Ch.22.
- 1823 Introduction to the principles of morals and legislation. In 1948 ed of 1776.
- 1973 Political thought ed B Parekh.  
Croom Helm.

- BEST: G.F.A.  
1956 'The religious difficulties of national education in England 1800-1870'.  
Cambridge His J, 12.
- 1967 'Popular protestantism in Victorian Britain' In Robson, 1967: Ch.5.
- 1971 Mid-Victorian Britain. Weidenfeld.
- BESTOR: A.E. 1948 'The evolution of the socialist vocabulary'. J His Ideas, 9.
- BETTELHEIM:C.  
1970 Economic calculation and forms of property. Routledge, 1976.
- 1973 Cultural revolution and industrial organization in China. NY, Monthly R P, 1974.
- BEYNON:H. 1973 Working for Fords. Penguin
- BINFIELD:C. 1973 George Williams and the Y.M.C.A.  
Heinemann.
- BIRCH, A.H. 1964 Representative and responsible government.  
Allen & U.
- BIRCH: R.C. 1974 Shaping of the Welfare State. Longmans.
- BISHOP:A.S.  
1968 'Ralph Lingen, Secretary to the Education Department, 1849-1870'.  
Br J Educ Stud, 16.
- 1971 The rise of a central authority for English education. C U P .
- BLACKBURN: R.  
1972 (ed). Ideology in social science. Fontana
- 1976 'Marxism: theory of proletarian revolution'. New Left R, (97).
- BLACKLEY: W.L. 1878 'National insurance: a cheap, practical and popular means of abolishing poor rates'. Nineteenth Century, 4.

- BLAUG:M.  
1958 'The classical economists and the Factory Acts: a re examination'.  
Qu J Ec, 72.
- 1963 'The myth of the Old Poor Law and the making of the New'. J Ec His, 23;  
Repr Smout, 1974:Ch.6.
- 1964 'The Poor Law Report re examined'.  
J Ec His, 24.
- BLELLOCH: D.H. 1938 'A historical survey of factory inspection in Great Britain'.  
Int Labour R, 38.
- BLEWETT:N. 1965 'The Franchise in the United Kingdom.'  
Past and Present, (32).
- BLINCOE:R. 1832 Memoir.  
Extracted In Gaines, 1974.
- BLONDEL, J. 1973 Comparing political systems.  
N.Y., Praeger.
- BLOOMFIELD:B.C.  
1960 'Sir James Phillips Kay-Shuttleworth (1804-1877): a trial bibliography'.  
Br J Educ Stud, 9.  
Idem, 'Addenda'. Ibid., 10.
- 1961 A handlist of the papers in the deed box of Sir James Phillips Kay-Shuttleworth...  
College of St. Mark and St John.
- BLUNDEN: E 1934 and E.L.Griggs (eds).  
Coleridge... Constable.
- BOAS: F. 1965 (ed) Modern British biography.  
Truro, Netherton; Repr Cass. 6 vols.
- BOCK:K.E.  
1974 'Comparison of histories: the contribution of Henry Maine'.  
Comp Stud Soc His, 16.
- 1976 'The moral philosophy of Sir Henry S. Maine'. J His Ideas, 37.



- BOGGS: C. 1976 Gramsci's Marxism. Pluto P.
- BOND, B.  
1963 'Military power in modern British history.' Services Roy United Institute's J, 108.
- 1974 'The Army'.  
In Barker, 1975: Ch. 2i.
- BOOTH: C.  
1886 'Occupations of the people of the United Kingdom, 1801-1881.'  
J Roy Statistical Soc, 49.
- 1894 'Statistics of Pauperism in Old Age'.  
J Roy Statistical Soc, 57.
- BORKENAU: F. 1937 'State and Revolution in the Paris Commune, The Russian Revolution and the Spanish Civil War.'  
Sociol R, series i, 29.
- BOSANQUET: B.  
1890 'The antithesis between individualism and socialism philosophically considered.' (Paper to Fabian Society).  
Charity Organisation R, 69.
- 1909 'Introduction' to his 1920.  
Philosophy of the State. 3rd ed.  
Macmillan.
- 1920
- 1937 'Introduction' to his edition of T.H. Green, 1883.
- BOULEY, M. 1872 'Sanitary police...'. Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des seances de l'Academie des Sciences, 74; Trans: J Roy Soc Agriculture Eng, series ii, 8.
- BOURN: J.B. 1968 'The main reports on the British Civil Service since the Northcote-Trevelyan Report'. Memoranda 10 Fulton, vol.3.
- BOWLEY: A.L. 1898 'Statistics of wages in the United Kingdom during the last 100 years. I: Agricultural Wages'. J Roy Statistical Soc, 61.  
(The series continues to 1904).

- BOYD: D.P. 1974 'The educational background of a selected group of England's leaders'. Sociol, 8.
- BOYLE, J. 1838 'An account of strikes in the Potteries in the years 1834 and 1836'. J Statistical Soc, I.
- BOYLE: J.S. 1973 From Edinburgh School of Arts to Heriot-Watt University, 1821-1973... Edinburgh, The U., n.d.
- BOYSON: R.  
1960 'The New Poor Law in N.E. Lancashire'. Trans Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Soc, 70.
- 1972 'Industrialization and the life of the Lancashire Factory worker'. In R.Hartwell, 1972b: Ch.3.
- BRADLEY: I. 1976 The call to seriousness: the Evangelical impact on the Victorians. Cape.
- BRAITHWAITE: W.J. 1957 Lloyd George's ambulance wagon. ed H.N.Bunbury. Faber.
- BRAUN: R. 1975 'Taxation socio-political structure and State building: Great Britain and Brandenburg Prussia'. In: Tilly, 1975d: Ch.4.
- BRAVERMAN: H. 1974 Labor and monopoly capital: the degradation of work in the twentieth century. NY Monthly R P.
- BREADY: J.W. 1926 Lord Shaftesbury and Social-Industrial Progress... Allen & U., 1927.
- BREBNER: J.B. 1948 'Laissez-faire and State intervention in nineteenth century Britain'. J Ec His, Supplement 8.
- BRECH: R. 1974 'Business needs regulator of social responsibility'. Times Business News, 6 Nov.
- BRETT: R.L. 1971 (ed) S.T. Coleridge. Bell.

- BRIGGS:A.
- 1947 'Thomas Attwood and the economic background of the Birmingham Political Union.' Cambridge His J, 9.
- 1952 'The Background of the Parliamentary Reform Movement in three English cities'. Cambridge His J., 10.
- 1954 'Robert Lowe and the theory of democracy'. in his Victorian people... Rev ed. Penguin, 1965.
- 1956 'Middle-class consciousness in English politics, 1780-1846.' Past & Present, (9).
- 1959a The Age of Improvement. Longmans.
- 1959b (ed) Chartist studies. Macmillan.
- 1960 'The language of "class" in early nineteenth century England'.  
In A. Briggs and J. Saville (eds)  
Essays in Labour History. Macmillan.  
Repr Smout , 1974:Ch.7.
- 1961 'The Welfare State in historical perspective' Archives europeenes de sociologie, 2.
- 1963 Victorian Cities. Penguin, 1968.
- 1968 2 sections in: The origins of the social services. New Science Publications.
- BRISTOW:E. 1975 'The Liberty and Property Defence League and Individualism'. His J, 18.
- BRITISH Association for the Advancement of Science  
1839 'First report...Colleries upon the Tyne and Wear'. J Statistical Soc, 2.
- BROCK:M. 1973 The Great Reform Act. Hutchinson.
- BROCKMAN:H.A.N. 1973 The British architect in Industry. 1841-1940. Allen & U..

- BROUGHAM: H.  
1825 Practical observations upon the education of the people, addressed to the working classes and their employers. Longmans, for the London Mechanics Institute. Repr Manchester, Morten, 1971.
- 1860 'Presidential address'.  
Trans NAPSS.
- BROWN:L. 1958 The Board of Trade and the Free Trade Movement 1830-1842. Oxford, Clarendon P.
- BRUCE: M.  
1973a 'Introduction' to his  
1973b (ed). The rise of the Welfare State.  
Weidenfeld.
- BRUNDAGE:A.  
1972 'The Landed Interest and the New Poor Law: a reappraisal of the "revolution in government". Eng His R, 87.  
1974 'The English Poor Law of 1834 and the cohesion of agricultural society'.  
Agricultural History
- 1975 'The Landed Interest and the New Poor Law: a reply'. Eng His R, 90.
- BRYNN:E. 1972 'Politics and economic theory: Robert Wilmot Horton, 1820-1841'. Historian, 34.
- BUICK:A. 1975 'Joseph Dietzgen'. Radical Philosophy, (10).
- BURKE:E. 1790 Reflections on the Revolution in France. Repr Penguin, 1969.
- [BURN:J] 1855 Language of the Walls. Manchester, privately printed.
- BURN:W.L.  
1956 'Newcastle upon Tyne in the early nineteenth century'. Archaeologia Aeliana, series iv, 34.

- BURN:W.L.  
1963 Review of MacDonagh 1961  
His J, 6.
- 1964 Age of Equipoise. Allen & u.
- BURNETT:J. 1966 Plenty and want...Penguin, 1968.
- BURNS:J.H. 1973 'Bentham on sovereignty'  
Northern Ireland Legal Qu, 24.
- BURROW:J.W.  
1967 'The uses of philology in Victorian  
England'. In Robson, 1967:Ch.7.
- 1969 'Introduction' to Von Humboldt, 1791.
- 1970 Evolution and Society: a study in  
Victorian social theory. C U P .
- 1971 '"The Village Community" and the uses  
of History in late nineteenth century  
England'. In McKendrick, 1974:Ch.9.
- 1976 'A radical in Cheyne Row' (Review of  
Rosenberg, 1975). Times Literary  
Supplement, 23rd January.
- BUTLER:D. 1975 and A.Sloman (eds).  
British political facts. 4th ed. Macmillan
- BUTT:R. 1974 'Dangerous doctrines that keep the class  
war alive'. Times, 7th February.
- BYTHELL:D. 1974 'A history of the poor' Eng His R, 89.
- 
- CAIRNES:J.E.  
1870 'Political economy and Laissez faire'  
Inaugural lecture, University College,  
London, in his 1873: Ch.7.
- 1873 Essays in political economy, theoretical  
and applied. Macmillan
- CALDWELL: J.A.M. 1959 'The genesis of the Ministry of  
Labour'. Public Administration, 37.
- CALLEO: D.P. 1966 Coleridge and the idea of the Modern  
State. Yale U P .

- CAMMETT:J.M. 1967 Antonio Gramsci and the origins of Italian Communism. Stanford U P .
- CAPLAN:M. 1970 'The Poor Law in Nottingham shire, 1836-1871.' Trans Thoroton Soc, 74.
- CARLYLE:T.  
CARLISLE:T.  
1829 'Signs of the Times'. In his 1971.  
1839 'Chartism'. In his 1971.  
1851 'Coleridge'. In his 1971.  
1932 Reminiscences; ed. C.E.Norton, & Walter Murdoch. Dent-Everyman, 1972.  
1971 Selected writings. Penguin.
- CARPENTER:E. 1888 Chants of Labour: The Song Book of the People. Allen & U., 1922.
- CARR:E.H.  
1951 The New Society. Macmillan.  
1953 The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923. Vol.3. Penguin, 1966.
- CARR: W.  
1971 'James Mill's Politics reconsidered: Parliamentary Reform and the triumph of truth'. His J, 14.  
1972 'James Mill's politics:a final word'. His J, 15.
- CARSON:W.G.  
1970a 'White-collar crime and the enforcement of Factory Legislation'. Br J Criminology, 10.  
1970b 'Some sociological aspects of strict liability and the enforcement of Factory legislation'. Modern Law R, 33.
- CARTER:I. 1972 'The Highlands of Scotland...'  
In De Kadt, 1974.
- CASSIRER:E.  
1945 Rousseau, Kant, Goethe. Princeton UP, 1963.  
1946 The myth of the State. Yale UP, 1973.
- CAVANAGH:F.H. 1940 'State intervention in English education'. History, 25.

CENTRAL Society of Education. 1837-1839

Papers. I - III. Taylor Walton.

CHADWICK:W.E. 1905 Poverty: a social disease; suggestions for workers among the poor.  
S.P.C.K.

CHALONER: W.H.

1958

'Writings on British urban history  
[1700 to the present], 1934-1957'.  
Vierteljahrschrift für sozial- und  
wirtschaftsfeschichte, 45.

1969

The skilled artisan during the Industrial  
Revolution, 1750-1850. Historical Assoc.

1972

'F.Engels and the England of the "Hungry  
Forties"'. In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.7.

CHAMBERLAIN:C. 1973 'The growth of support for the Labour  
Party in Britain.' Br J Sociol, 24.

CHAMBERLAIN:M.E. 1970 The "New Imperialism". Historical Assoc.

CHAMBLISS:W.J.

1974

'The State, the Law and the definition of  
behaviour as criminal or delinquent'.  
In Glaser, 1974.

1975

'Toward a political economy of crime'.  
Theory & Soc., 2.

CHANG:S.H.M. 1931

The Marxian theory of the State.  
Repr NY Russell, 1965.

CHAPMAN:.R.A. 1970

The Higher Civil Service in Great Britain.  
Constable.

CHECKLAND: S.G.

1949

'The propagation of Ricardian economics  
in England'. Economica, 16.

1974

and E.O.A. Checkland  
'Introduction' to POOR LAW REPORT 1834.

CHESNEY:K. 1970

The Victorian Underworld. Newton Abbott,  
Victorian Book Club, 1971.

CHITNIS:A.C. 1973

'Medical education in Edinburgh, 1790-  
1826...' Medical His, 17.

- CHURCH:.R.A. 1971 'Profit sharing and labour relations in England in the 19th century'.  
Int R Social His, 16.
- CIPOLLA:C.M.  
1973a (ed) The Industrial Revolution. Fontana.  
1973b (ed) The Emergence of Industrial Societies.  
Vol. I. Fontana.
- CLARE: J. 1972 [Machinery of government].  
Times, 8,9,10 May.
- CLARK, G.Kitson  
1951 'The Electorate and the Repeal of the Corn Laws'. Trans Roy His Soc, series vi, I.  
1959 '"Statesmen in disguise": reflexions on the history of the neutrality of the Civil Service'. His J., 2.  
Repr Stansky, 1973.  
1962 The Making of Victorian England: being the Ford Lectures... Methuen.  
1967 An expanding society: Britain 1830-1900. C U P .
- CLARK: T. 1968 'Emile Durkheim...' Archives europeenes de sociologie, 9.
- CLARKE:J.C. 1927 Marxism and History. National Council of Labour Colleges (Shilling series,1).
- CLARKE:M. 1975 'Social problem ideologies'.  
Br J Sociol, 26.
- CLARKE: P.F. 1974 'The Progressive movement in England'.  
Trans Roy His Soc., 24.
- CLARKE: R. 1975 'The Machinery of Government'  
In Thornhill, 1975: Ch.4.
- CLEMENTS: R.V.  
1955 'Trade Unions and emigration, 1840-1880'.  
Population Stud, 9.  
1961 'British Trade Unions and popular political economy, 1850-1875'.  
Ec His R, 14.



- COATES: D. 1975 The Labour Party and the struggle for socialism. C U P .
- COATES: W.H. 1950 'Benthamism, Laissez-faire and Collectivism'. J His Ideas, 11.
- COATS: A.W.  
1958 'Changing attitudes to Labour in the mid eighteenth century.' Ec His Rev, 11. Repr Smout, 1974:Ch.4.
- 1960 'Economic thought and Poor Law Policy in the eighteenth century'. Ec His R, 13.
- 1967 'The Classical Economists and the Labourer'. In Jones, E.L. 1967.
- 1972a 'The Classical Economists, Industrialization and poverty'. In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.6.
- 1972b 'Contrary moralities: Plebs, Paternalists, and Political Economists.' Past & Present, (54).
- COBURN:A. 1950 (ed). The Debate on the French Revolution 1789-1800. Kay (British Political Tradition, Book 2).
- COBURB:K. 1960 'Poet into Public Servant'. Trans Roy Soc Can, Section II, 14.
- COHEN:E.W. 1941 The growth of the British Civil Service 1780-1939. Allen & U. Repr Cass, 1965.
- COLEMAN:B.I. 1973 (ed) The Idea of the City in nineteenth century Britain. Routledge.
- COLERIDGE: S.T.  
CW = Collected works (Bollingen ed.) Routledge, 1971 -
- 1795 'Lecture on the Two Bills, 26th November 1795'. CW, I:261-276.
- 1800 The Character of Pitt. Morning Post 19 March; Repr: Essays on his own Times; ed Sara Coleridge. Pickering, 1850: Vol II: 319-329.

COLERIDGE:S.T.

- 1808 Review of Clarkson, History of the Slave-Trade. Edinburgh Review.  
Repr In his 1951: 368-374.
- 1816 The Statesman's Manual, or The Bible the best guide to political skill and foresight:a Lay Sermon... Gale & Fenner.  
Repr CW,6; ed R.J.White: 3-114.
- 1817a A Lay Sermon addressed to the Higher and Middle Classes... Gale & Fenner.  
Repr CW,6; ed R.J. White: 119-230.
- 1917b Biographia Literaria...ed G.Watson.  
Dent, 1965.
- 1818a Remarks on the Objections which have been urged against the principle of Sir Robert Peel's Bill. Printed, Clowes.
- 1818b The Grounds of Sir Robert Peel's Bill Vindicated. Repr In his 1951:359-365.
- 1819 Philosophical Lectures [1818-1819]  
ed. K Coburn. Routledge, 1949.
- 1830 On the Constitution of the Church and State, according to the Idea of each.  
2nd ed Repr ed J. Barrell. Dent,1972.
- 1839 Idem., 3rd ed [and Lay Sermons]  
Rev ed H.N. Coleridge. Pickering.
- 1951 Inquiring Spirit: a new presentation of Coleridge...ed K.Coburn. Routledge.
- 1974 Notebooks...ed K.Coburn. Vol III:  
1808-1819. Routledge.

---

COLLETTI:L.

- 1968 'Bernstein and the Marxism of the Second International' In his 1972.
- 1969 Marxism and Hegel. NLBooks,1973.
- 1972 From Rousseau to Lenin. NLBooks, 1972.
- 1974 'Introduction' to K.Marx Early writings.  
Penguin, 1975.

- COLLIER:F. 1964 The family economy of the working classes in the Cotton Industry, 1784-1833. Manchester U P.
- COLLINI:S.  
1972 Review of Wiener, 1971. His J, 15.  
1974 Review of A.J.Taylor, 1972. History, 59.  
1976 'Hobhouse, Bosanquet and the State: philosophical Idealism and political argument in England 1880-1918.' Past & Present, (72).
- COLLINS: F.H. 1897 (ed) Epitome of the Synthetic Philosophy of Herbert Spencer. 4th ed Williams & N.
- COLLINS:W. 1913 'The Chadwick School of Thought: an appeal from the new sanitarians to the old'. J Roy Sanitary Institute, 24.
- COLMER:J.  
1959 Coleridge: Critic of Society. Oxford, Clarendon P.  
1971 'Coleridge and Politics'. In Brett, 1971:Ch.9.
- COMMON:J. 1938 Freedom of the Streets:Essays. Secker.  
COMMONS:J.R. 1924 Legal foundations of capitalism. Madison:Wiscon U P, 1957.
- CONQUEST:R. 1975 'The Black Hole of St Pancras: the Workhouse and its Inmates'. Camden His R, 3.
- COOK:P.J. 1971 'Robert Michels " Political Parties" in perspective'. J Pol, 33.
- COOKSON:J.E. 1975 Lord Liverpool's Administration: the Crucial years, 1815-1822. Edinburgh, Chatto.
- COOPER:L. 1959 Radical Jack... Cresset P.
- CORINA:M. 1976 'The Department of Industry comes under new management'. Times Business News 9 Mar

- CORNFORD:J.  
1962 'Review of the "Age of Churchill"'.  
Victorian Stud, 6.
- 1963 'Transformation of Conservatism in the  
late nineteenth century'.  
Victorian Stud,7;Repr Stansky,1973.
- CORRIGAN:Paul 1975 'Community work and political struggle!  
In Leonard, 1976.
- CORRIGAN, P.R.D.  
1974 'On the historical experience of the  
People's Republic of China...'  
J Contemporary Asia, 4.
- 1974b and H.Ramsay, D.Sayer.  
Socialist Construction and Marxist Theory:  
Essays. 1st version 1974-5. Revised  
version, forthcoming, Macmillan, 1977.
- 1975a 'On the politics of production'.  
J Peasant Studies, 2.
- 1975b and D Sayer  
'Moral Relations, political economy and  
class struggle'. Radical Philosophy,(12)
- 1975c 'Dichotomy is Contradiction...'  
Sociol Rev, 23.
- 1976 'Feudal relics or capitalist monuments?  
Notes on the sociology of unfree labour'.  
Sociol, 11,1977.
- COULTER, J. 1971 'Marxism and the Engels paradox'.  
Socialist Register.
- COUSIN, V. 1838 On the State of education in Holland  
as regards schools for the working  
classes and for the poor...trans...  
by Leonard Horner. Murray.
- CRANSTON:M. 1974 'Efforts to enforce the Western tradition  
of human rights'. Times, 21st May.

CRITCHLEY:T.A.

1967

A history of police in England and Wales 900-1966. Constable.

1973

'The idea of policing in Britain: success of failure?' New Community, 3.

CROMWELL:V.

1966

'Interpretations of nineteenth century administration: an analysis'.  
Victorian Stud 9.

1969

and Z.S. Steiner.

'The Foreign Office before 1914...'  
In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.7.

1973

The Great Reform Bill, 1832...

for the National Portrait Gallery, HMSO.

CROSSICK\*

CROSSMAN:R.H.S. 1976

[Diaries, II] Extracts. Sunday Times, 31 October.

CROUGH:R.L. 1967

'Laissez faire in nineteenth century Britain myth or reality?'.  
Manchester School, 35.

CROWTHER:M.A. 1970

Church Embattled: Religious controversy in mid-Victorian England. Newton Abbot, David & C.

CULLEN: A.J. 1975

The Statistical movement in early Victorian Britain... Brighton, Harvester P.

CURTIS, S. 1976

'Ahead of her time: [H.Martineau]'  
New Society, 1 July.

CURTIS:S.J. 1965

History of Education in Great Britain.  
6th ed. Universities Tutorial P.

CURTIS: T.C. 1976

and W.A. Speck.

'Societies for the Reformation of Manners: a case study in the theory and practice of moral reform'. Literature & His, (3).

---

\*CROSSICK:G. 1976 'The Labour aristocracy and its values: a study of mid-Victorian Kentish London'.  
Victorian Stud, 19.

- DE KADT:E 1974 and G.Williams (eds).  
Sociology and development. Tavistock.
- DELLA VOLPE:F. 1962 'Marxist critiques of Rousseau'.  
New Left R, (59).
- DENNIS,J 1971 et al. 'Support for nation and  
government amongst English children'.  
Br J Pol Science, 1.
- D'ENTREVES:A.P. 1962 The notion of the State. Rev ed.  
Oxford, Clarendon, 1969.
- DESMARAIS:R.  
1971 'The British Government's strike-  
breaking organization'. J Contemporary  
His, 6.
- 1973 'Strike-breaking and the Labour government  
of 1924'. J Contemporary His, 8.
- 1974 'The Internationalization of the  
British strike-breaking system'.  
Bulletin of the Soc Labour His, (29).
- 1975 'Lloyd George and the development of  
the British Government's strike-breaking  
organization'. Int R Social His, 20.
- DESSAUER:M. 1940 'Unemployment records, 1848-1855'  
Ec His R, series i, 10.
- DEUTSCHER:I. 1954 The Prophet Armed: Trotsky 1879-1921.  
Oxford U P.
- DIBBLE:V.K.  
1968 'Social science and political commitments  
in the young Max Weber'. Archives europeenes  
de sociologie, 9.
- 1972 'Political judgements and the perception  
of social relationships...' Am J Sociol, 78.
- DICEY:A.V. 1867 'The Balance of classes'.  
Ch.4 in Essays in Reform.
- DICKENS:C. 1855 'The Administrative Reform Association'.  
In his Speeches; ed K.Feiling.Oxford,  
Clarendon P. 1960.

## DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY. O U P

DIGBY:A.

1975

'The Labour Market and the continuity of social policy after 1834: the case of the Eastern Counties'. Ec His R, 28.

1976

'The Rural Poor Law' In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.7.

DINWIDDY:J.R. 1975

'Bentham's transition to political Radicalism, 1809-1810'. J His Ideas, 36.

DITTON:J.

1976

'Moral Horror vs. Folk Terror: Output restriction, class and social organization of exploitation.' Sociol Rev, 24.

1976b

'Perks, Pilferage and the Fiddle: the Historical Structure of Invisible Wages'. Theory & Soc, 3.

DJANG:T.K. 1942

Factory Inspection in Great Britain.  
Allen & U.

DOBB:M. 1973

Theories of value and distribution since Adam Smith... C U P

DODD:.J.T. 1890

'Casual paupers and how we treat them'  
Charity.

DOMHOFF:G.W.

1967

Who rules America? Prentice-Hall.

1968

and H.T.Bullard (eds).

C.Wright Mills and the Power Elite.  
Boston, Beacon P.

1974

'State and Ruling Class in Corporate America'. Insurgent Sociologist, 4.

DONAJGRODZKI:A.P. 1969 'New roles for old: the Northcote-Trevelyan Report and the Clerks of the Home Office, 1823-1848'. In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.4

DONNELLY:F.K. 1976

'Ideology and early English working-class history'. Social His, I.

- DORE:R.P.  
1969 'Making sense of history'. Archives europeenes de sociologie, 10.
- 1972 'The late development effect'. IDS Communications, (113).
- DOWSE:R.E. 1971 'The family, school and the political socialization process'. Sociol, 5.
- DRAPER:H.  
1962a 'Marx and the dictatorship of the proletariat'. Etudes de marxologie, (6).
- 1962b 'Marx and the dictatorship of the proletariat'. New Politics, 1.
- 1970 'The Death of the State in Marx and Engels'. Socialist Register.
- 1971 'The principle of self-emancipation in Marx and Engels'. Socialist Register.
- 1974 'Marx and democratic forms of government'. Socialist Register.
- forthcoming Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution.  
NY Monthly R P, 2 volumes.
- DUKE:F. 1976 'Pauper Education'. In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.3
- DUNCAN:D. 1908 (ed) Life and letters of Herbert Spencer.  
Methuen, 2 Vols.
- DUNKLEY:P.  
1973 'The Landed Interest and the New Poor Law: a critical note'. Eng His R, 88.
- 1974 'The "Hungry Forties" and the New Poor Law: a case study [County Durham]'. His J, 17.
- DUNNING:E.G. 1975 'Power and authority in the Public Schools 1700 - 1850'. Working Papers in Historical Sociology, 2.
- DUNRABIN:J.P. 1963 'The politics of the establishment of County Councils'. His J, 7.



DUPPA:B.F.

1837

'The Central Society of Education'.  
C.S.E. PAPERS, I.

1839

'The education of pauper children  
in workhouses'. CSE Papers, III.

DUREY:M. 1974

The first spasmodic cholera epidemic in  
York, 1832. York, St. Anthony's Press.

DURKHEIM:E.

1893

Montesquieu's contribution to the  
rise of social science. With 1918b.

1895

Rules of sociological method.  
NY, Free Press, 1938.

1896

Socialism; ed. A. Gouldner.  
N.Y., Collier Books, 1962.

1897

Suicide...  
Routledge, 1952.

1898

'Individual and collective representations'.  
In his 1924.

1900

'Sociology and its scientific field'.  
In Wolff, 1960.

1902

The Division of Labour in Society.  
Rev ed. NY, Free Press, 1947.

1903

and M. Mauss. Primitive Classification.  
Cohen & W., 1963.

1904

Professional ethics and civic morals.  
Routledge, 1957.

1906

'The determination of moral facts'.  
In his 1924.

1907

Moral education...  
NY, Free Press, 1973.

1911

'Value judgements and judgements of  
reality'. In his 1924.

1912

The elementary forms of religious life.  
Allen & U., 1915.

DURKHEIM, E.

- 1914 'The dualism of human nature and its social conditions'. In Wolff, 1960.
- 1915 'Sociology'. In Wolff, 1960.
- 1918a 'Rousseau's "Social Contract"'. In his
- 1918b Montesquieu and Rousseau.  
Ann Arbor, U of Michigan P, 1960.
- 1924 Sociology and philosophy. New ed.  
Cohen & W., 1965.
- 1972 Selected writings; ed. A. Giddens.  
C U P .

## DYOS: H.J.

- 1968 (ed) The study of Urban History...  
Leeds, ED. Arnold.
- 1973 and M. Wolff (eds).  
The Victorian City. Routledge, 2 vols.

---

ECLECTIC REVIEW 1842 [On Inspection] 12 November

## EDELMAN: M.

- 1975a 'The patronage State'.  
New Statesman, 11 April.
- 1975b 'The Patronage explosion'.  
New Statesman, 11 July
- 1975c 'How the new system of patronage in government scatters the confetti of privilege'. Times, 14 October.
- 1975d 'Time to stop the public appointments merry-go-round'. Times 15 October.

EDGWELL: E.W. 1838 'Moral statistics of the Parishes of St James, St George and St Anne, Soho...'. J Statistical Soc, 1.

EDINBURGH. School of Arts. See SCHOOL OF ARTS, Edinburgh.  
Boyle, J.

EDINBURGH REVIEW 1842 [On Education] .

EDMONDS:E.L.

1958 'Education and early factory inspectors'. Vocational Aspect, 10.

1960 'Some Inspectoral synonyms'.  
Vocational Aspect, 12.

1962 The School Inspector.  
Routledge.

1963 and O.P.Edmonds  
Hugh Seymour Tremenheere, Pioneer  
Inspector of Schools.  
Br J Educ Stud, 12.

EDMONDS:M 1975 'The role of the armed forces in the  
maintenance of law and order in Britain'.  
In Enloe, 1976:Ch.4

EDMONDS:O.P. 1963 and E.L.Edmonds  
An account of the founding of H.M.  
Inspectorate of Mines and the work of  
the first Inspector, Hugh Seymour  
Tremenheere. Br J Industrial Medicine, 20.

EDSALL: N.C.

1971 The Anti-Poor Law movement, 1834-1844.  
Manchester U P .

1973 'Varieties of Radicalism:Attwood, Cobden  
& the local politics of municipal  
incorporation'. His J, 16.

EDWARDS:W.W.

1879a 'The Poor In France'.  
Nineteenth Century, 5.

1879b 'Compulsory providence: a reply to Mr.  
Blackley'. Nineteenth Century, 5.

EISEN:S. 1967 'Herbert Spencer and the spectre of  
Comte'. J Br Stud, 7.

EISENSTADT:S. 1973 and S. Rokkan (eds).  
Building States and Nations. 2 vols.  
NY:Sgge.

- ELDER:G.H. 1965 'Life opportunity and personality...'.  
Sociol of Educ, 38.
- ELISH:D. 1972 'The Manchester Statistical Society:  
a case study of a discontinuity in the  
history of empirical social research'.  
J His Behavioral Sciences.
- ELLIS:A.  
1971 Books in Victorian elementary schools  
Library Association.
- 1976 'Influences on the availability of  
recreational reading for Victorian working  
class children'. J Librarianship, 8.
- ELTON:G.R.  
1953 Tudor revolution in government.  
C U P.
- 1972 Policy and police: the enforcement of  
the Reformation in the Age of Thomas  
Cromwell. C U P.
- 1973 Reform and renewal: Thomas Cromwell and  
the Commonweal. C U P.
- EMMET:D. 1971 'Coleridge and philosophy'.  
In Brett, 1971:Ch.7
- EMY: H.V. 1973 Liberals, Radicals and social politics  
1892-1914. C U P.
- ENGELS:F.  
See also many works with K.Marx, where the  
details of their joint Collected Works is given.
- 1844a 'The Condition of England [1]  
"Past and Present" by Carlyle'.  
CW, 3:444-468.
- 1844b 'The Condition of England [2]  
The Eighteenth Century'.  
CW, 3:469-488.
- 1844c 'The Condition of England [3]  
The English Constitution.'  
CW, 3:489-513.

ENGELS:F.

- 1845 The Condition of the working-class in England: from personal observation and authentic sources. Panther, 1969.
- 1874 'The English Elections'.  
In Marx, 1962.
- 1881a 'Trades Unions [1,2]'.  
In Marx, 1962.
- 1881b 'A working men's party'.  
In Marx 1962.
- 1888 The Role of Force in History.  
Lawrence & W., 1968.
- 1890 'May 4 in London'.  
In Marx, 1962.
- 1891 The origin of the family, private property and the State. 4th ed.  
In Marx, 1968.
- 1892 Socialism: utopian and scientific.  
In Marx, 1968.
- 1892b 'On certain peculiarities of the economic and political development of England'.  
In Marx, 1962.
- 1894 Anti-Duhring... 3rd ed.  
Lawrence & W., 1947.
- ENLOE: C.H. 1976 and U.Semin-Panzer (eds).  
The military, the police and domestic order...a symposium Mar 21 1975.  
Richardson Institute.
- ERICKSON:C. 1972 Invisible immigrants: the adaptation of English and Svottish immigrants in nineteenth century America.  
Coral Gates(Fla), U of Miami P.
- ESCOTT:T.H. 1885 England... Rev ed.  
O U P .
- ESSAYS 1867 Essays on Reform.  
Macmillan.
- EVANS-PRITCHARD,E.E. 1968 The sociology of Comte: an appreciation.  
Manchester U P, 1970.
-

- EVERETT: C.W. 1966 Jeremy Bentham.  
N.Y. Dell; Weidenfeld & N.
- FABER:R. 1971 Proper stations: class in Victorian fiction. Faber.
- FAIRBROTHER:W.H. 1900 The philosophy of T.H.Green. 2nd ed.  
Methuen.
- FARR:W. 1848 'Statistics of the Civil Service in England...' J Statistical Soc, 11,1849.
- FAWCETT:T. 1881 Aids to thrift now offered by the Post Office. The Post Office.
- FEDOSEYEV:P.N. 1973 et al.  
Karl Marx: a biography.  
Moscow, Progress.
- DEILING:K. 1930 'Coleridge'  
In his Sketches in 19th century biography. Longmans.
- FEMIA:J.V. 1972 'Barrington Moore and the pre-conditions for democracy'. Br J Pol Science, 2.
- FETTER:A.  
1953 'The authorship of economic articles in the Edinburgh Review, 1802-1847.'  
J Pol Ec, 56.
- 1965 'Economic controversy in the British Reviews, 1802-1850'. Economica, 38.
- FINE:B. 1976 and L.Harris.  
Critique [of Gough, 1975].  
New Left R, (98).
- FINER:S.E.  
1952a Life and times of Sir Edwin Chadwick.  
Methuen.
- 1952b Patronage and the public service:  
Jeffersonian bureaucracy & the British tradition. Public Administration, 30.
- 1959 'The transmission of Benthamite ideas, 1820-1850'. In Sutherland, 1972:Ch.1
- 1975 'State & Nation-building in Europe: the role of the military'. In Tilly, 1975d.

- FINLAYSON:G.B.A.M.  
1966 'The politics of municipal reform,1835'.  
Eng His R, 81.
- 1969 England in the eighteen-thirties: decade  
of Reform. Leeds, Ed.Arnold.
- 1974 'Shaftesbury'.  
In Hollis,1974.
- FIORE:F. 1965 Antonio Gramsci.  
NLBooks, 1970.
- FISCHER, W.1975 and P.Lundgen.  
'The Recruitment and training of  
administrative and technical personnel'.  
In Tilly,1975d:Ch.7.
- FLEISCHER:H. 1969 Marxism and history.  
Aklen Lane, 1973.
- FLETCHER,J. 1951 Education: national, voluntary, and free.  
Ridgway,
- FLINN:M.W.  
1957 (ed) Law Book of the Crowley Iron Works.  
Durham, for the Surtees Soc, Andrews.
- 1961 'The Poor Employment Act,1817'.  
Ec His R, 14.
- 1971 'Policy of Public Works'.  
New Society, 18 November.
- 1974 'Trends in real wages, 1750-1850'.  
Ec His R, 27.
- 1976 'Medical services under the New Poor  
Law'. In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.2.
- FOLLETT:M.T. 1918 The new state: group organization the  
solution of popular government. Longmans.
- FORBES:D. 1975 'Sceptical Whiggism, commerce and Liberty'.  
In Skinner, 1975.
- FOORD, A.S. 1964 His Majesty's Opposition,1714-1830.  
O U P .
- FOOT:M.R.D. 1973 ed.War and Society: Historical essays...  
Elek.

- FORDER:A. 1970 Penelope Hall's Social Services of England and Wales...Routledge, 1971.
- FORSYTH:M. 1971 Property and property distribution policy. Political & Economic Planning.
- FOSTER:D. 1974 'Class and county government in early-nineteenth-century Lancashire'. Northern His,9.
- FOSTER:J.  
1966 'Nineteenth-century towns:a class dimension'. In Dyos,1968:Ch.6i.  
Repr Smout,1974:Ch.8.
- 1969 'The making of the first Six Factory Acts'. Bulletin Society for the Study of Labour History, (18).
- 1970 'South Shields Labour Movement in the 1830s and 1840s'. Bulletin of the North East Group for the Study of Labour His,(4).
- 1974 Class struggle and the industrial revolution. Weidenfeld & N.
- FOUCAULT:M.  
1961 Madness and civilisation...Abridged ed. Tavistock, 1967.
- 1963 The Birth of the Clinic. Tavostock, 1973.
- 1966 The Order of things (Les mos et les choses). Tavistock, 1970.
- 1968 'Reply to questions from "Cercle Epistemologique' of the ENS'. Cahiers pour l'analyse,(9); Trans: Theoretical Practice, (3/4), 1971.
- 1969 The archeology of knowledge. Tavistock, 1969.
- 1972 'Discussion with Gilles Deleuze'. L'Arc, (49).Trans: Telos (16),1973.
- 1974 'Interview with Foucault'. Cahiers du Cinema,(251/2).  
Trans:Radical Philosophy, (11), 1975.



- FOX:J. 1973 'The Brains behind the throne'.  
[C.P.R.S.] Sunday Times M, 25 March.
- FRASER:D.  
 1970 'The agitation for Parliamentary Reform'.  
In J.T.Ward, 1970b:Ch.1.
- 1971a 'The Leeds Churchwardens, 1828-1850.'  
Thoresby Society Publications:Miscellany,  
 15.
- 1971b 'Poor Law Politics in Leeds, 1833-1855.'  
Idem.
- 1971c 'The Politics of Leeds Water'.  
Idem.
- 1971d 'Improvement in early Victorian Leeds'.  
Idem.
- 1972 'The fruits of Reform :Leeds politics  
 in the 1830s'. Northern His, 7.
- 1973 Evolution of the British Welfare State.  
 Macmillan.
- 1974 'Edward Baines'.  
In Hollis, 1974.
- 1976a 'The Poor Law as a political institution'.  
In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.5.
- 1976b ed. The New Poor Law in the nineteenth century.  
 Macmillan.
- FRASER:P. 1960 'The growth of ministerial control in  
 the nineteenth century House of Commons'.  
Eng His R, 75.
- FREITAG:P.J. 1975 'The Cabinet and big business: a study of  
 interlocks'. Social problems, 23.
- FRIEDMANN:W. 1950 'The function of property in Modern  
 English law.' Br J Sociol, 1.  
 and D.Wills (eds).  
The Triumph of Culture.  
 Toronto, Hakkert.
- FRY:G.K. 1969 Statesman in disguise: the changing role  
 of the Administrative class of the British  
 Civil Service 1853-1966. Macmillan.

- FRYDE:E.B. 1970 and E.Miller (eds).  
Historical studies of the English Parliament. C U P . 2 vols.
- FYNES:R. 1873 History of the Miners of Northumberland and Durham. Repr E.P., 1973.
- FYVEL:T.R. 1964 (ed). The frontiers of sociology.  
Cohen & West.
- 
- GAINES:D.I. 1974 'Story of an English Cotton Mill lad'.  
His of Childhood Qu, 2.
- GALLAGHER: J.A. 1953 and R.Robinson.  
'Imperialism of Free Trade'  
Ec His R, Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.7.
- GAMBLE:A.  
1974 The Conservative nation.  
Routledge.  
1976 and P.Walton.  
Capitalism in Crisis: Inflation and the State. Macmillan.
- GARRETT:J. 1972 The management of government.  
Penguin.
- GASH:N.  
1974 'Wellington and Peel, 1832-1846'.  
In Southgate, 1974:Ch.1.  
1976 Peel.  
Longmans.
- GAZLEY:J.G. 1973 The life of Arthur Young, 1741-1820.  
Philadelphia, American Philosophical Soc.
- GENOVESE:E.  
1967 Review of Cammett. Repr his 1972:Ch.19.  
1972 In red and black:Essays.  
N.Y. Vintage.
- GENOVESE:E.F  
1973 'The many faces of moral economy: a  
contribution to a debate'. Past  
and Present,(58).

GEORGE:V.

and Paul Wilding

1972

'Social values, social class and social policy'. Social & Ec Administration, 6.

1976

Ideology and social welfare.

Routledge.

GERAS:N. 1971

'Essence and appearance...'

New Left R, (65). Repr Blackburn, 1972.

GERTH:H 1953

and C.Wright Mills.

Character and social structure.

Routledge.

GHOSH:R.N. 1964

'The colonization controversy:R.J.

Wilmot-Horton...'Economica

Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.5.

GIDDENS:A.

1971

'Durkheim's political sociology'.

Sociological R, 19.

1972

Politics and sociology in the thought of Max Weber. Macmillan.

1972b

'Elites in the British class structure'.

Sociological R, 20.

GILBOY:E.W. 1936

'The cost of living and real wages in eighteenth century England'.

R Ec Statistics, 18; Repr Taylor, 1975.

GILLIE:O. 1976

'The low cost of risking factory workers' health'. Sunday Times, 23 May.

GILMOUR:R. 1967

'The Gradgrind school: political economy in the classroom'. Victorian Stud, 11.GINSBERG:M 1959 (ed). Law and opinion in the twentieth century. Stevens.GIRARDIN, J-C. 1972 'Sur la theorie marxiste de l'Etat'. Tempes modernes, 29.GLADDEN: E.N. 1967 Civil service of the United Kingdom, 1853-1966. Cass.GLASER:D. 1974 ed. Handbook of criminology. Chicagom, Rand McNally.

- GLENNERSTER:H. 1976 In praise of public expenditure.  
New Statesman, 27 February.
- GLYN:A.  
1971 and B.Sutcliffe.  
'The critical condition of British capital'. New Left R, (66).
- 1972 British capitalism, workers and the profits squeeze. Penguin.
- GOLBY:J. 1974 'Chartism and Public Order'.  
In Open University 1974d.
- GOLD:D.A. 1975 et al.  
'Recent developments in Marxist theories of the capitalist State'.  
Monthly Review, 27 (5) and (6).
- GOLDMANN:L.  
1945 Immanuel Kant. 2nd ed.  
NLBooks, 1971.
- 1970 'Reflections on "History and Class Consciousness"'.  
In Meszaros, 1971:Ch.5.
- GOLDSTROM:J.M.  
1966 'Richard Whately and political economy in school books, 1833-1880'. Irish His Stud, (15).
- 1972a Social content of education, 1808-1870.  
Newton Abbott, David & C.
- 1972b ed. Education: elementary education, 1780-1900.  
Newton Abbot, David & C.
- GOLDTHORPE:J.  
1962 'The development of social policy in England 1800-1914'.  
Trans of V World Congress of Sociol,  
Washington, DC, 1964, Vol.IV.
- 1969 'Social inequality and social integration in modern Britain'.  
Advancement of Science; Repr  
Wedderburn, 1974.
- 1971 'Theories of industrial society...'  
Archives europeenes de sociologie, 12.

- GORDON:P.  
1973 'Some sources for the history of the school manager, 1800-1902'.  
Br J Educ Stud, 21.
- 1974 The Victorian School Manager: a study in the management of education...  
Woburn P.
- GORDON:S. 1966 'The London "Economist" and the high-tide of laissez faire'.  
J Pol Ec, 63.
- GORZ:A.  
1972a 'The Tyranny of the factory'.  
Temps modernes. Trans:Telos, (16)  
1973 and Gorz, 1973b.
- 1972b 'Technical intelligence and the capitalist division of labour'.  
Telos, (12) 1972.
- 1973a Socialism and revolution. Rev ed.  
Allen Lane, 1975.
- 1973b *ed.* The Division of labour: the labour process and class-struggle in modern capitalism. Harvester, 1976.
- GOSDEN:P.H.J.H.  
1961 The Friendly Societies in England.  
Manchester U P .
- 1973 Self-Help: voluntary associations in the nineteenth century. Batsford.
- GOUGH:I. 1975 'State Expenditure in advanced capitalism'. New Left R, (92).
- GOULDNER:A. 1970 The coming crisis in Western sociology...  
Heinemann.
- GOURVISH:T.R. 1976 'Flinn and real wages trends... a comment'.  
Ec His R, 29.
- GRADA, C. Ó. 1975 'A note on nineteenth century Irish emigration statistics'. Population Stud, 29.
- GRAHAM:J. 1907 Life and letters of Sir James Graham...  
ed C.S.Parker. Murray. 2 vols.

- GRAMSCI:A.  
1934 Prison Notebooks; e.d. Nowell-Smith & Hoare. Lawrence & W., 1971.
- 1948 Il Materialismo Storica.  
Turin. Extracted, 1971 ed his 1934.
- GRAY:R.Q.  
1973a 'The labour aristocracy in the Victorian Class Structure'. Paper to 1973 BSA Conf.
- 1973b Social classification and the study of Victorian class structure. Discussion paper. Cambridge, Group for the study of social structure.
- GREEN:.T.H. 1881 Lectures on the principles of political obligation. Ed and introduced B.Bosanquet. Longman, 1937.
- GREENSTEIN: F.I. 1969 Children and politics.  
Rev ed. Yale U P .
- GRETTON R.H. 1913 The King's Government: a study of the growth of central administration.  
Bell.
- GRIFFIN: C.M. 1974 'L.T.Hobhouse and the idea of harmony'.  
J His Ideas, 35.
- GRIFFIN: C.P. 1974 'Chartism and opposition to the New Poor Law in Nottinghamshire'.  
Midland His, 2.
- GRIFFITH:J. 1975 'Judges and a Bill of Rights'.  
New Statesman, 10 January.
- GUIZOT:F. 1837 Lectures on European civilization.  
Condensed ed as 'General history of civilisation in Europe...'.  
Edinburgh, Chambers, 1848  
(Instructive & Entertaining Library).
- GUTCHEN:R.M. 1961 'Local improvements and centralization in nineteenth-century England'. His J, 4.
- GUTMAN:H. 1973 'Work, culture and society in industrializing America'. Am His R, 78.

GUTTSMAN:W.L.

1968 The British political elite.  
MacGibbon & K..

1969 ed. The English ruling class.  
Weidenfeld & N.

GUY:W. 1870 'On the claims of science to public  
recognition and support...'.  
J Roy Statistical Soc, 33.

---

HABERMAS:J.

1968 Knowledge and human interests.  
Heinemann, 1972.

1969 Toward a rational society.  
Heinemann, 1971.

1970 'Toward a theory of communicative  
competence'. Recent Sociology, (2) 1972.

1971 Theory and practice.  
Heinemann, 1974.

1973 Legitimation crisis.  
Boston, Beacon P.

1975 Reply to Muller and Newsuss.  
Telos, (25).

HADDON:R. 1973

'Foreword'  
In his ed of Kerr, 1960.

HAILSHAM:Q.M.H. 1976 'Elective dictatorship' The Dimbleby  
Lecture. Listener, 21 October.

HAIR:P.E.H. 1968 'Mortality from violence in British  
coal mines, 1800-1850'. Ec.His R, 21.

HALDANE:A.R.B. 1962 New ways through the Glens.  
Newton Abbot, David & C.

HALDAR:H. 1927 'Neo-Hegelians'.  
Bombay:Heath.

HALEVY:E.

1906 The birth of methodism in England; ed.  
B.Semmel. U of Chicago P, 1971.

1912 England in 1815.  
Benn, 1949.

HALEVY:E.

- 1919 'The Policy of social peace in England'.  
In His 1965.
- 1921 'The problem of worker control'.  
Idem.
- 1922 'The present state of the social  
question in England'.  
Idem.
- 1923a The Liberal awakening, 1815-1830.  
Benn, 1949.
- 1923b The triumph of Reform, 1830-1841.  
Benn, 1950.
- 1932 The rule of democracy, 1905-1914.  
Benn, 1961.
- 1934 The growth of philosophic radicalism.  
Rev ed. Faber, 1972.
- 1946 'The Age of Peel and Cobden' in his  
Victorian years, 1841-1895 ed. R.B.  
McCallum. Benn, 1951.
- 1965 The Era of Tyrannies ed R.K.Webb.  
Allen Lane, 1967.

HALLIDAY:R.J. 1968 'The sociological movement, the sociological  
Society and the genesis of academic  
sociology in Britain'. Sociol Rev, 19.  
HALSEY:A.H. 1972 (ed). Trends in British society since  
1900. Macmillan.

HALSTEAD:J. 1973 'Ideology in history'. Bulletin of the  
Soc for the Stud Labour His, (26).

HAMBURGER:J.

- 1963 James Mill and the Art of Revolution.  
Yale U.P.
- 1965 Intellectuals in politics:J.S.Mill and  
the Philosophic Radicals. Yale U P .

HAMOWY:R. 1968 'Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson and the  
Division of Labour'. Economica, 35.

HAMPSON:N. 1976 'Marking time behind the lines'.  
Times Literary Supplement, 25 June.



- HANDLIN:J. 1963 and J.Burchard. eds.  
The historian and the city.  
M.I.T. P and Harvard U P .
- HANHAM:H.J.  
1963 'Liberal organizations for working  
men, 1860-1914'.  
Bulletin Soc Stud Labour His, (7).
- 1973 'Religion and nationality in the mid-  
Victorian army'. In Foot, 1973:Ch.10.
- HANSON:C.G.  
1972 'Welfare before the Welfare State'.  
In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.5.
- 1975 'Craft Unions, welfare benefits and  
the case for trade union law reform, 1867-  
1875'. Ec His R, 25.
- HARDING:N 1975 'Lenin's early writings- the problem of  
context'. Political Studies, 23.
- HARE: R.M. 1967 'The lawful government'.  
In P.Laslett, 1967:Ch.7.
- HARRIES-JENKINS, G. 1973 'The Victorian military and the political  
order'. J Pol and Military Sociol, 1.
- HARRIS:J. 1972 Unemployment and politics, 1896-1914.  
Oxford U P .
- HARRIS:J.S. 1955 British Government Inspection...  
Stevens.
- HARRIS:N. 1972 Competition and the corporate society:  
British conservatives, the State, and  
industry 1945-1964. Methuen.
- HARRIS:R. 1974 'Like it or not, our society is based on  
the theory of capitalism'.  
Times, 4 December.
- HARRISON:B.  
1965a 'The Sunday Trading riots of 1855'.  
His J, 8.
- 1965b 'Philanthropy and the Victorians'.  
Victorian Stud, 9.
- 1967a 'Religion and recreation in nineteenth-  
century England'. Past and Present, (38).

## HARRISON:B.

- 1967b 'Underneath the Victorians'.  
Victorian Stud, 10.
- 1968 'Two roads to social reform: Francis Place and the "Drunken Committee" of 1834'. His J, 11.
- 1971 Drink and the Victorians: the temperance question in England 1815-1872. Faber.
- 1973a 'For Church, Queen and Family: The Girls' Friendly Society, 1874-1920'.  
Past and Present, (61).
- 1973b 'Animals and the State in nineteenth century England'. Eng His R, 88.
- 1973c 'Teetotal Chartism'. History, 58.
- 1974 'State Intervention and moral reform'.  
In Hollis, 1974:Ch.12

## HARRISON:F.

- 1865 'The limits of political economy'.  
Fortnightly R, 1.
- 1867 'Our Venetian Constitution'.  
Fortnightly R, 3.

## HARRISON:J.F.C.

- 1954 Social reform in Victorian Leeds: the work of James Hole, 1820-1895.  
Leeds, Thoresby Society (Monographs,100).
- 1971 The early Victorians.  
Weidenfeld & N.

HARRISON:R. 1968 'Afterword' to Smiles, 1859 (Sphere ed).

HARRISON:S. 1962 Alex Gossip. Lawrence & W.

HARRISON:W. 1948 'Introduction' to his ed of Bentham, 1776.

HARRISON:W. 1974 'The British Press and the Russian Revolution of 1905-1907.'  
Oxford Slavonic Papers, 7.

HART:H.L.A. 1963 Law, liberty and morality.

HART:J.

- 1955 'Reform of the Borough Police, 1835-1856'.  
Eng His R, 70.
- 1956 'The County and Borough Police Act, 1856'.  
Public administration, 34.
- 1960 'Sir Charles Trevelyan and the Treasury'.  
Eng His R, 75.
- 1965 'Nineteenth century social reform: a  
Tory interpretation of history'.  
Past and Present, (31); Repr Snout, 1974:Ch.9.
- 1969 'The genesis of the Northcote-Trevelyan  
Report'. In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.3
- HARTER:L.G. 1962 John R. Commons: his assault on  
laissez-faire. Cornvallis(O.), Oregon  
State U P.
- HARTSTHORNE:R. 1956 'The role of the State in economic  
growth'. In Aitken, 1959:Ch.11.
- HARTWELL:R.M.
- 1959 'Interpretations of the Industrial  
Revolution in England'. J Ec His, 19;  
Repr his 1971:Ch.5.
- 1961 'The rising Standard of Living in England  
1800-1850'. Ec His R, 13.  
Repr his 1971:Ch 13; Taylor, 1975:Ch.5.
- 1963 'The Standard of Living during the  
Industrial Revolution: a discussion'.  
Ec His R, 16; Repr his 1971:Ch.14.
- 1965a The Industrial Revolution in England.  
The Historical Assoc, 1965.
- 1965b 'The Making of the English working class?'.  
Ec His Rev, 18; Repr his 1971:Ch.15.
- 1970 'Introduction' to his ed Ricardo, 1821.
- 1971 The industrial revolution and economic  
growth: essays and papers. Methuen.
- 1972a 'The consequences of the Industrial  
Revolution in England for the Poor'  
in his 1972b:Ch.1

- HARTWELL:R.  
 1972b (ed) The Long debate on poverty.  
 Institute of Economic Affairs.  
 1974 with S.Engerman.  
 'Models of immiseration: the theoretical  
 basis of pessimism'. In Taylor, 1975:Ch.8ii.
- HARVEY:D. 1973 Social justice and the city.  
 Leeds: Ed.Arnold.
- HARVEY:J. 1958 and K.Hood.  
The British State. Lawrence & W.
- HARVIE:C.  
 1974a 'The administrative state'.  
In Open University, 1974a.
- 1974b 'Patterns of industrial control'.  
In Open University, 1974b.
- HAY:D.  
 1975a 'Property, authority and the criminal  
 law'. Ch 1 in his  
 1975b (ed) et al.  
Albion's fatal tree:crime and society  
 in eighteenth century England.  
 Allen Lane.
- HAY:J.R. 1975 The origin of the Liberal Welfare  
 Reforms, 1906-1914. Macmillan.
- HEARDER:H. 1974 and H.R.Loyn (eds).  
British government and administration...  
 Cardiff, U of Wales P.
- HEASMAN:D.J. 1970 'The emergence and evolution of the  
 Office of Parliamentary Secretary'.  
Parliamentary Affairs, 23.
- HECHTER:M.  
 1973 'Industrialization and national  
 development in the British Isles'.  
J Development Stud, 8.
- 1975 Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe  
 in British National Development,1536-1966.

Routledge

HEESOM:A.J.

1974a 'The Sunderland bye-election, September 1841'. Northern His, 9.

1974b 'Entrepreneurial paternalism: the Third London Londonderry(1778-1854) and the Coal Trade'. Durham U J, 66.

HEGY: P. 1974 'Words of power: the power of words'. Theory & Soc, 1.

HENDERSON: W.O. 1958 The State and the industrial revolution in Prussia. Liverpool U P .

HENNESSY:P. 1976 'The Cabinet Office'. Times, 8 March,

HENNOCK:E.P.

1958 'Urban sanitary reform a generation before Chadwick?'. Ec His R, 10.

1963 'Finance and politics in urban local government in England 1835-1900'. His J, 6.

1966 'The social composition of Borough Councils in two large cities, 1835-1914'. In Dyos, 1968:Ch.6iii.

1968 Two sections on the Poor Law IN: The Origins of the Social Services. New Science Publications.

1971 'The sociological premises of the first Reform Act: a critical note'. Victorian Stud, 14.

1973 Fit and proper persons...Leeds, Ed.Arhold.

1976 'Poverty and social theory in England: the experience of the 1880s'. Social His, 1.

HENRIQUES:U.

1967 'Bas tardy and the new Poor Law'. Past and Present, (37).

1968 'How cruel was the Victorian poor law?'. His J, 11.

1970 'An early factory inspector:James Stuart...'. Scottish His R, 50, 1971.

1971 The early Factory Acts and their enforcement. Historical Association.

- HENRIQUES:U. 1974 'Jeremy Bentham and the machinery of social reform'. In Hearder, 1974.
- HERIOT WATT UNIVERSITY, 1973: See BOYLE, J.S.
- HERRICK:F.A. 1948 'The Second Reform Movement in Britain, 1850-1865'. J His Ideas, 9.
- D.G.HEY 1973 'The pattern of nonconformity in South Yorkshire, 1660-1851'. Northern His, 8.
- HEYWOOD:A. 1876 'Newspapers and periodicals: their circulation in Manchester'. Papers of the Manchester Literary Club, 1.
- HILL:A 1857 ed. Essays upon educational subjects...  
Longman, Brown.
- HILL:C. 1940 The English revolution, 1640. 3rd ed.  
Lawrence & W., 1955.
- HILL:M.J. 1972 The sociology of public administration.  
Weidenfeld, & N.
- HIMMELFARB:G.  
1969a 'Bentham Scholarship and the Bentham "problem"'. J Modern His, 41.
- 1969b 'Commitment and ideology...'  
J Br Stud, 9.
- 1971 'Mayhew's Poor...'  
Victorian Stud, 14.
- 1976 'Process, purpose and Ego'.  
Times Literary Supplement, 25 June.
- HIMMELWEIT:H.T. 1952 et al.  
'The views of adolescents on some aspects of the social structure'. Br J Sociol, 3.
- HINTZE:O.  
1897 'The State in historical perspective'.  
In Bendix, 1968.
- 1902 'The formation of States...'  
In his 1975:Ch.4.
- 1906 'Military organisation and the organisation of the State'. In his 1975:Ch.5.
- 1908 'The origins of the modern ministerial system...'. In his 1975.
- 1975 Historical essays... ed F.Gilbert.  
NY, O U P .

- HIRSCH:H. 1971 Poverty and politicization.  
NY, Free P.
- HOBHOUSE:L.T.  
1918 The Metaphysical theory of the State.  
Allen & U.
- 1924 Social development: its nature and conditions. Allen & U, Repr 1966.
- HOBBSBAWM:E.J.  
1948 ed Labour's turning point, 1880-1900.  
Lawrence & W. Repr Harvester, 1974.
- 1957a 'The British Standard of Living, 1790-1850'. Ec His R, 10. Revised Repr his 1968:Ch.5; Taylor, 1975:Ch.4.
- 1957b 'Methodism and the threat of Revolution in Britain'. Ec His R; Repr his 1968:Ch.3.
- 1957c 'Friendly Societies'.  
Amateur Historian, 3.
- 1959 Primitive Rebels...  
Manchester U P.
- 1963 'The Standard of living...a discussion'.  
Ec His R, 16. Repr with his 1957a to be Ch5 of his 1968.
- 1964a 'The Standard of Living debate: a postscript'. In his 1968:Ch.7
- 1964b 'The Labour Aristocracy in nineteenth century Britain' In his 1968:Ch.15.
- 1964c 'The Fabians reconsidered'.  
In his 1968: Ch.14.
- 1968 Labouring Men: studies in the history of Labour. Rev ed. Weidenfeld & N.
- 1974 'The Standard of Living Debate...'  
In Taylor, 1975:Ch 8i.
- HOBSON: J.A. 1931 'The State as an organ of rationalisation'.  
Pol Qu, 2.
- HODGES: D.C. 1965 'Engel's contribution to Marxism'.  
Socialist Register.
- HOLE:J. 1860 Light, More Light!...  
Longman, Brown.

- HOLLAND:S. 1976 'The case against the cuts'.  
New Statesman, 16 July.
- HOLLANDER:S.  
1968 'The role of the State in vocational training...' Southern Ec J, 34.  
1971 'Adam Smith's approach to economic development'. IN Hughes, 1971:269-296.
- HOLLINGSWORTH:T.H. 1964 'Demography of the peerage'. Population Studies, Supplement, 18.
- HOLLIS:P.  
1970 The Pauper Press:a study in working class radicalism of the 1830s.  
O U P.
- 1973 ed. Class and conflict in nineteenth century England, 1815-1850. Routledge.
- 1974a 'Introduction' to her 1974b  
1974b ed. Pressure from without in early Victorian England. Leeds, Ed.Arnold.
- HOLYOAKE:G.J. 1906 The history of co-operation.  
T.Fisher Unwin, 1908.
- HOOKER:R.H. 1894 'On the relation between wages and the numbers employed in the coal mining industry'. J Roy Statistical Soc, 57.
- HOPKINS:E. 1975 'Small town aristocrats of labour and their standard of living, 1840-1914'.  
Ec His R, 27.
- HORNE P. 1976 'The bleak houses of colleges past'.  
Times Higher Educational Supplement, 2 Jul.
- HORNER:F. Memoir,I. Memoirs...ed.L.Horner.Murray, 1843.  
Memoir,II. Francis Horner and Leonard Horner [ed. M.Lyell] Edinburgh,  
Morrison and Gibb, n.d.
- HOROWITZ:D. 1975 'Textbook models of American economic growth, 1837-1911'. His of Pol Ec, 7.



- HUGHES:E.  
1942 'Civil Service Reform, 1853-1855.'  
History. Rev ed Public Administration,  
32, 1954.
- 1949 'Sir Charles Trevelyan and Civil Service  
Reform, 1853-1855.' Eng His R, 64.
- HUGHES:P. 1971 and D.Williams (eds)  
The varied pattern...Toronto, Hakkert.
- HUGHES: R.E. 1974 'The Boys and Girls Welfare Society, 1870-  
1974'. Manchester R, series ii, 1.
- HUME:L.J. 1967 'Jeremy Bentham and the "nineteenth  
century revolution in Government"'.  
His J, 10.
- HUNT:A. 1976 'Lenin and sociology'.  
Sociol R, 24.
- HUNT:C.J. 1970 Lead miners of the Northern Pennines.  
Manchester U P.
- HUNT:E.H.  
1972 'How mobile was labour in nineteenth  
century Britain?' Exeter Papers in  
Economic History, (6).
- 1973 Regional wage variations in Britain, 1850-  
1914. Oxford, Clarendon P.
- HUNT:R.N. 1974- The political ideas of Marx & Engels.  
Macmillan. Vol. 1, 1975.
- HUNTER:R. 1974 and I MacAlpine.  
Psychology for the poor: 1851 Colney  
Hatch Asylum/Friern Hospital 1973.  
Dawson,
- HURT:J. 1971 Education in evolution: Church, State,  
Society and popular education, 1800-1970.  
Paladin, 1972.
- HUTBER:P. 1976 The Decline and fall of the middle class  
and how it can fight back. Assoc Business  
Programmes.
- HUZEL:J.P. 1969 'Malthus, the Poor Law, and Population  
in early nineteenth century England'.  
Ec His R, 22.

- HYNDMAN:H.M. 1881 England for all.  
Repr Harvester P, 1973.
- HYPPOLITE:J. 1955 Studies on Marx and Hegel.  
Heinemann, 1969.
- 
- INGLIS:B. 1971 Poverty and the Industrial Revolution.  
Rev ed. Panther.
- INGLIS:F. 1976 'Nation and community: a landscape and its  
morality'. Universities Qu, 30.
- INGLIS:K.S.  
1960 'Patterns of religious worship in 1851'.  
J Ecclesiastical His, 11.  
1964 Churches and the working class... Rev ed.  
Routledge.
- INGRAM:J.K. 1878 'The need for sociology'. Presidential  
address, Section F, B.A.A.S.  
Repr Abrams, 1968:Document 2.
- JACOB:H. 1963 German administration since Bismarck.  
Yale U P.
- JAHER:F.C. ed 1972  
The rich, the well-born and the powerful.  
Urbana: U of Illinois P.
- JAMES:M 1973 ed Bentham and Legal Theory . Belfast,  
Supplement to Northern Ireland Legal Qu.
- JAMESON:F. 1971 Marxism and form.  
Princeton U P .
- JEFFERSON:J.M. 1972 'Industrialization and poverty in fact  
and fiction'. In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.8.
- JEVONS: S. 1882 The State in relation to Labour.  
Murray.
- JOHNSON:D.A. 1973 'Between Evangelicalism and a social  
Gosppl: the case of John Rayner Stephens'.  
Church His, 42.
- JOHNSON:R.  
1969 'Administrators in education before 1870...'.  
In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.5.  
1970 'Educational policy and social control in  
early Victorian England'.  
Past & Present (49)Repr Stansky,1973.  
1973 The Blue Books and Education,1816-1896...  
Birmingham, C.C.C.S. Occasional Papers.

- JOHNSON:R.  
1976 'Barrington Moore, Perry Anderson and English social development'. Working Papers in Cultural Stud, (9).
- JOHNSON:R.W. 1973 'The British political elite, 1955-1972'. Archives europeenes de sociologie, 14.
- JOHNSON:S.C. 1913 History of emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912. Repr Cass, 1966.
- JOHNSTON:H.J.M. 1972 British emigration policy, 1815-1830: "shovelling out paupers". Oxford, Clarendon P.
- JONES:C. 1975 The reserve army of labour: the search for solutions, 1885-1914. Paper to Political Economy Group, Durham.
- JONDES:D.J.V.  
1974 'Crime, protest and community in nineteenth century Wales'. Llafur, 1.  
1976 'Thomas Campbell Foster and the Rural Labourer: Incendriam in East Anglia in the 1840s'. Social His, 1.  
1976b 'The Second Rebecca Riots: a study of poaching on the River Wye'. Llafur, 2.
- JONES:E.L. 1967 and G.E.Mingay (eds). Land, labour and population in the Industrial Revolution... Methuen.
- JONES:G.S.  
1967 'The pathology of English history'. New Left R, (46).  
1971 Outcast London: a study in the relationship between classes in Victorian society. Oxford, Clarendon P.  
1973 'Engels and the end of classical German philosophy'. New Left R, (79).  
1974 'Working-class culture and working-class politics in London, 1870-1900: notes on the remaking of a working class'. J Social His, 7.
- JONES:R. 1971 The Nineteenth century Foreign Office: an administrative history. Weidenfeld/LSE.

- JONES:W.P. 1972 The trade in lunacy.  
Routledge.
- JOSEPH:K.  
1975 'Is Beckerman amongst the sociologists?'.  
New Statesman, 18 April.
- 1976 Reversing the trend: a critical re-appraisal  
of Conservative economic and social  
policies. Rose.
- 
- KAMENKA:E.  
1975a and A. Erh-Soon Tay.  
'Beyond bourgeois individualism...'  
In Kamenka, 1975b.
- 1975b and R.S.Neale (eds).  
Feudalism, capitalism and beyond.  
Leeds, Ed.Arnold.
- KANT:I. 1889 Metaphysic of morals.  
O U P .
- KARL:B.D. 1974 Charles E.Merriam and the study of politics.  
U of Chicago P.
- KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Ughtred J, Lord Shuttleworth, 1923.  
'A son's reminiscences'.  
In Smith, 1923:Ch.12.
- KEATING:P.J. 1971 The working classes in Victorian fiction.  
Routledge.
- KEITH-LUCAS? B. 1953 'Some influences affecting the  
development of sanitary legislation in  
England'. Ec His R, 6.
- KELSALL:R.K. 1966 Higher Civil Servants in Britain...  
Routledge.
- KEMP:T. 1969 Industrialization in nineteenth-century  
Europe. Longmans.
- KENNEDY:W.F. 1957 Humanist versus economist:the economic  
thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.  
U of California Publications in Ec, 17.  
et al.
- KERR:C.  
1960 Industrialism and industrial man...New  
ed, with postscript. Penguin, 1973.
- 1971 'Postscript' Int Labour R, 103  
Repr Penguin ed of their 1960.

- KIERNAN:V.  
1965 'State and Nation in Western Europe'  
Past and Present, (31).
- 1972 'Gramsci and Marxism'.  
Socialist Register.
- KITTRELL:.E.R. 1965 'The Development of the theory of  
colonization in English classical  
political economy'.Southern Ec J;  
Repr Shaw,1970:Ch.2
- KNIGHT:G. 1843 London.  
Knight. 5 vols.
- KNIGHT :.R.J.B. 1975 'Pilfering and theft from the  
Dockyards at the time of the American  
War of Independence'. Mariners Mirror,61.
- KNIGHT:R.P. 1796 The Progress of Civil Society:  
a didactic poem in six books. Johnson.  
and M.Broszat.  
Anatomy of the S.S.State. Paladin, 1970.
- KUCZYNSKI:J. 1945 A short history of labour conditions  
under industrial capitalism...  
2nd ed. Muller, Repr 1972.
- KUNTZ:P.G. 1968 ed The concept of Order.  
U Washington P.
- 
- LACLAU:E. 1975 'The specificity of the political:  
the Poulantzas-Miliband debate'.  
Ec & Soc, 4.
- LAFITTE:F. 1974 'The relief function'  
In M.J.Brown (ed) Social issues and  
the social services...Knight.
- LAING:S.  
1836 Journal of a residence in Norway during  
the years 1834,1835, and 1836; made with  
a view to enquire into the moral and  
political economy of that Country and  
the condition of its inhabitants.Longman...  
1839 A tour in Sweden:comprising observations  
on the moral, political and economical  
state of the Swedish nation. Longman...

LAMBERT:R.

1962a

'A Victorian National Health Service: State Vaccination, 1855-1871'.

His J, 5.

1962b

'Central and local relations in mid-Victorian England: the Local Government Act Office, 1858-1871'. Victorian Stud, 6.

1963

Sir John Simon, 1816-1904; and English social administration. Macfibbon & K.

LARGE:D. 1974

'William Lovett'.

In Hollis, 1974b.

LASKI:H.J.

1928

'The Personnel of the English Cabinet, 1801-1924'. Am Pol Science R, 22.

1935

The State in theory and practice.

Allen & U.

LASLETT:P. 1967

and W.G.Runciman (eds).

Politics, philosophy and society, III.  
Oxford, Blackwell.

LAWSON:W.

1971

'The Newcastle to Carter Bar Road...'  
Archeologia Aeliana, series iv, 49.

1973

'The Construction of <sup>the</sup> military road in Northumberland, 1751-1757'.

Archeologia Aeliana, series v, 1.

LEAVIS:F.R.

1948

'Hard Times: the world of Bentham'.

Repr in his 1972:Ch.4.

1950

'Introduction' with his ed Mill, 1950.

1972

and Q.D.Leavis.

Dickens the Novelist. Penguin.

LEFEBVRE:H.

1966

Sociology of Marx. Allen Lane, 1969.

1968

Everyday life in the modern world.

Allen Lane, 1971.

1973

The Survival of capitalism.

Allison & B, 1976.

LEHMANN:W.C.

- 1930 Adam Ferguson and the beginnings of modern sociology... NY, Columbia U P; London, P.S.King.
- 1952 'John Millar, historical sociologist'.  
Br J Sociol, 3.
- 1960 John Millar of Glasgow...  
C U P .
- 1971 Henry Home, Lord Kames, and the Scottish Enlightenment. Hague, M.Nijhoff.

LENIN, V.I.

- 1895 'What the "Friends of the People" are'.  
In his, 1947; Vol.1
- 1899 The development of capitalism in Russia.  
Collected works, vol.3.
- 1917a Marxism on the State [Notebooks for:]  
Moscow, Progress, 1972.
- 1917b State and Revolution.  
Lawrence & W., 1933.
- 1919 The State:a lecture.  
Peking, F.L.P., 1965.
- 1947 The essential Lenin. 2 vols.  
Lawrence & W.

LEONARD:P. 1976 (ed). The Sociology of community action.  
Keele, Sociological Review Monographs (21).

LETWIN:S.R. 1965 Pursuit of certainty...  
C U P .

LEVI:L. 1885 Wages and earnings of the working classes.  
Murray.

LEVY:S.L. 1943 Nassau W.Senior, 1790-1864.  
Repr Newton Abbot, David & C, 1970.

LEWIS:R.A.

- 1950 'Edwin Chadwick and the administrative reform movement, 1854-1856'.  
Birmingham U His J, 2.
- 1952 Edwin Chadwick and the public health movement, 1832-1854. Longmans.
- 1964 'William Day and the Poor Law Commissioners'.  
Birmingham U His J, 9.
- 1971 Review of Parris, 1969 and Wright, 1969.  
History, 56.
- 1974 Review of Sutherland 1972b.  
History, 59.

- LEWIS:R. 1976 'When are the middle classes going to fight back?' Times, 21 June.
- LINEBAUGH:P. 1972 [Crime and Labour] Bulletin Soc Stud Labour His, (25).
- LISTENER, 1975 'Which way for the Tories? a study of Keith Joseph'. Listener, 26 June.
- LIPSON:E. 1946 Planned economy of free enterprise? The lessons of history. Black.
- LITTLE:K. 1973 et al. The Development of State education. Milton Keynes, Open University P, E352.ii.
- LLEWELLYN:E. 1972 The decade of reform. The 1830s. Newton Abbot, David & C.
- LLOYD:C.1974 'The Navy'. In Barker, 1975:Ch.2ii.
- LOADES:D.M. 1974 Politics and the nation,1450-1660: obedience, resistance and public order. Fontana.
- LOCH:C.S. 1898 'Poor Relief in Scotland...1791-1891'. J Roy Statistical Soc, 61.
- LOCKE:R.R. 1974 French legitimists and the politics of moral order in the early Third Republic. Princeton U P .
- LOCKWOOD:D. 1958 The Black coated worker... Allen & U.
- LOCKWOOD:N. 1970 The State in economic theory: a note. Paper to Socialist Economists' Conference, Cambridge.
- LONGFORD:E. 1971 Wellington: Pillar of the State. Panther, 1975.
- LONGMATE:N. 1974 The Workhouse. Temple Smith.
- LORD, G de F. 1974 (ed) Anthology of poems on affairs of State...1660-1714. Yale U P .
- LOVETT:W. 1876 The life and struggles of William Lovett in his pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom. Trubner.



- LOWE:R.A. 1878 'Recent attacks on political economy'.  
Nineteenth Century, 4.
- LOWENTHAL:E. 1911 'The Ricardian socialists'.  
Studies in history, economics and public law, 56.
- LUBENOW:W.C. 1971 The politics of government growth: early Victorian attitudes toward State intervention, 1833-1848.  
Newton Abbott, David & C.
- LUCRETIUS 1951 Nature of the Universe. Penguin.
- LUKACS:G.  
1967 History and class consciousness: studies ... [1918-1930]. 2nd ed, Merlin, 1971.
- 1968 Political writings, 1919-1939.  
NLBooks, 1972.
- LUKES:S. 1975 'Political ritual...'.  
Sociol, 9.
- LYELL:K.M. 1890 ed. Memoir of Leonard Horner.  
Women's Printing Society Ltd.
- LYELL, M. n.d. ed. Francis Horner and Leonard Horner...  
Edinburgh, Morrison & G., n.d.
- 
- NOTE: Mc and Mac are interfiled, i.e. sequence is by letter following the 'c'.
- MACBRIAR, A. 1962 Fabian socialism and English politics, 1884-1918. Cambridge U P.
- MCCALLUM:R.B. 1951 'From 1852 to 1895'. Part II of E.Halevy Victorian Years...Benn, 1962.
- MCCLOSKEY: D. 1973 'New Perspective on the Old Poor Law'.  
Explorations in Ec His, 10.
- MACCOBY, S. 1934 'Newspaper politics'.  
Politica, 1.
- MCCORD:N.  
1967a 'Some difficulties of Parliamentary Reform'. His J, 10.
- 1967b 'Tyneside discontents and Peterloo'.  
Northern His, 2.
- 1969a 'The government of Tyneside, 1800-1850'.  
Trans Roy His Soc, 20.

## MCCORD:N.

- 1969b 'The Implementation of the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act on Tyneside'.  
Int R Social His, 14.
- 1969c 'Gateshead politics in the Age of Reform'. Northern His, 4.
- 1970 ed Free Trade: theory and practice from Adam Smith to Keynes. Newton Abbot, David & C., 1970.
- 1972a 'Aspects of the relief of poverty in early 19th century Britain'.  
In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.4.
- 1972b 'Some aspects of North East England in the 19th century'. Northern His, 7.
- 1974 'Some limitations of the Age of Reform'.  
In Hearder, 1974.
- 1976 'The Poor Law and Philanthropy'.  
In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.4

## MACDONAGH:O.

- 1953 'The regulation of the emigrant traffic from the United Kingdom 1842-1855'.  
Irish His Stud, 9, 1954-55.
- 1955 'Emigration and the State, 1833-1855: an essay in administrative history'.  
Trans Roy His Soc, series v, 5.
- 1968a 'The nineteenth-century revolution in government: a reappraisal'. His J, 1; Repr Stansky, 1973.
- 1958b 'Delegated legislation and administrative discretion in the 1850s: a particular study'. Victorian Stud, 2.
- 1961 A pattern of government growth, 1800-1860: the Passenger Acts and their enforcement. MacGibbon & K.
- 1962a 'The Anti-Imperialism of Free Trade'.  
Ec His R, Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.8.
- 1962b 'The Poor Law, emigration and the Irish Question, 1830-1855'. Christus Rex, 12.
- 1967 'Coal Mines regulation: the first decade: 1842-1852'. In Robson, 1967:Ch.3.

- MCDONALD:L. 1976 The sociology of Law and Order.  
Faber.
- MACFIE:A.L. 1955 'The Scottish tradition in economic  
thought'. Scottish J Pol Ec, 2.
- MCGILL:B 1962 'Francis Schnadhorst and Liberal Party  
Organisation'. J Modern His, 34;  
Repr Stansky, 1973.
- MCGRAW:T.K. 1975 'Regulation in America: a review article'.  
Business His R, 49.
- MCGREGOR:O.R.  
1951 'Civil Servants and the Civil Service,  
1850-1950'. Pol Qu, 22.
- 1957 'Social research and social policy in  
the nineteenth century'. Br J Sociol, 8.
- MACINTYRE:S.1974 'Joseph Dietzgen and British working  
class education'. Bulletin Soc Stud  
Labour His, (29).
- MACK:M.P. 1955 'The Fabians and utilitarianism'.  
J His Ideas, 16.
- MCKENDRICK:N.  
1971 'Home demand and economic growth: a new  
view of women and children in the  
Industrial Revolution'. Ch 7 in his  
1974 ed Historical perspectives: studies in English  
thought and society in honour of J.H.  
Plumb. Europa.
- MCKENZIE:N. 1976 'The Once and Future Fabians'.  
New Statesman, 2 July.
- MCKIBBIN:R. 1974 The evolution of the Labour Party, 1910-  
1924. D U P.
- MCLELLAM:D. 1973 Karl Marx.  
Macmillan.
- MACLURE:J.S. 1969 ed. Educational documents... Rev ed.  
Methuen
- MACPHERSON:C.B. 1973 'Capitalism and the changing concept of  
property.' In Kamenka, 1975b.
- MCQUAIL:D. 1968 et al.  
'Elite education and political values'.  
Political stud, 16.

- MACRAE:D.G.  
1958 'The development of sociology in Britain'. Repr his 1961:Ch.2
- 1961 Ideology and society. Heinemann
- 1963 'Adam Ferguson'.  
In Raison, 1969.
- 1969 'Introduction' to his ed Spencer, 1884.
- MADGE:C. 1964 Society in the mind: elements of a social eidos. Faber.
- MAEHL:W.H.  
1967 ed The Reform Bill of 1832. Why not Revolution? NY Holt, R & W.
- 1975 'The Northeastern miners' struggles for the franchise, 1872-1874'.  
Int R Social His, 20.
- MAIN:J.M. 1955 'Working class politics in Manchester from Peterloo to the Reform Bill, 1819-1832'. His Stud (Australia and New Zealand), (6).
- MALCHOW:H.L. 1976 'Trade Unions and emigration in late Victorian England: a national lobby for State aid'. J Br Stud, 15.
- MALCOLMSON, R.W. 1973 Popular recreations in English Society, 1700-1850. C U P .
- MALTHUS:T. 1798 An essay on the principle of population...  
Repr Penguin, 1970.
- MANDERS:F.  
1973a 'Housing and public health in Gateshead...'  
Bull North East Group Stud Labour His, (7).
- 1973b A history of Gateshead.  
Gateshead Corporation.
- MANN:H. 1854 'On the statistical position of religious bodies in England and Wales'.  
J Statistical Soc, 18.
- MANN:J.S. 1890 'The distinction between Society and the State'. Proceedings Aristotelian Soc, 1.
- MANNHEIM:K. 1936 Ideology and Utopia.  
Routledge, 1960.

- MANTOUX:P. 1928 The Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century... Rev ed. Methuen, 1964.
- MARCET:J.  
1816 Conversations on political economy in which the elements of that science are familiarly explained by the author of "conversations on chemistry". Longman  
2nd ed 1817; 3rd ed 1819; 4th ed 1821; 5th ed 1824; 6th ed 1827.
- 1833 John Hopkins's notions of political economy by the author of "conversations on chemistry"... Longman
- MARCUSE:H. 1955 Reason and revolution... 2nd ed. Routledge, 1967.
- MARSHALL:D.  
1966 'Colonisation as a factor in the planting of towns in NorthWest England'. In Dyos, 1968:Ch. 5i.  
1974 'The role of the Justice of the Peace in Social Adminsitartion'. In Hearder, 1974.
- MARSHALL:T. 1972 'Value problems of welfare-capitalism'. J Social Policy, 1.
- MARTIN:B. 1969 'Leonard Horner: a portrait of an Inspector of factories'. Int R Social His, 14.
- MARTIN:D. 1974 'Land Reform'  
In Hollis, 1974b.
- MARTIN:I. 1971 From workhouses to welfare. Penguin.
- MARTINEAU:H.  
1829 The turn out, or Patience the best Policy... Wellington, Salop, for Houlston...  
1832-1834 Illustrations of political economy. Fox. 9 vols.  
1833 Poor laws and paupers illustrated... under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Fox, 1833-34.

MARTINEAU:H.

1834

The tendency of strikes and sticks to produce low wages and of union between masters and men to ensure good wages...  
Durham, J.H.Weitch...

MARTINELLI:A 1968

'In defence of the dialectic:Antonio Gramsci's theory of revolution'.  
Berkeley J Sociol, (13).

1967

MARWICK:A. 1967

'The Labour Party and the Welfare State in Britain,1900-1948'.  
Am His R, 73.

MARX:K.

and F.Engels

Collected works. Lawrence & W, 1975-

1844a

'Comments on James Mill' CW,3.

1844b

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts  
CW, 3.

1845

and F.Engels.

German Ideology...Full ed.

Moscow, Progress (now also CW,6).

1847

Poverty of philosophy.

NY, International, 1963.

1848

and F.Engels

The Manifesto of the Communist Party.

In Marx, 1968.

1850

and F.Engels

'Address of the CC to the Communist League' IN Marx-Engels Selected Works  
Vol. 1, Moscow, Progress, 1969.

1850b

'Review of Guizot's Book "Why has the English Revolution been Successful"'.  
In Marx,1962.

1852

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.  
In Marx 1968.

MARX, K

- 1852b 'The Elections in England [1] Tories and Whigs'. In his 1962.
- 1852c '[The Elections, 2: Free Traders and The Chartists'. In his 1962.
- 1852d 'Corruption at elections'. In his 1962.
- 1853 'Parliamentary debates...'. In his 1962.
- 1853b 'Capital Punishment'. New York Daily Tribune, 18 February; Extracts: Selected writings; ed. Bottomore and Rubel, Penguin, 1963.
- 1854 'Letter to the Labour Parliament'. In his 1962.
- 1855a 'Parties and Cliques'. In his 1973.
- 1855b 'Palmerston and the English Oligarchy'. In his 1962.
- 1855ca '[The British Constitution] The Crisis in England'. New York Daily Tribune version in his 1962.
- 1855cb 'The British Constitution'. Neue Oder-Zeitung version in his 1973.
- 1855d 'The character of the Whigs and Tories'. In his 1973.
- 1855e 'On the Reform movement'. In his 1973.
- 1855f 'The Association for Administrative Reform'. In his 1962.
- 1855g 'Anti-Church movement- demonstration in Hyde Park'. 2 articles in his 1962 (Different versions in his 1973).
- 1855h 'Lord John Russell'. Neue Oder-Zeitung version In his 1962.
- 1855j 'Lord John Russell'. New York Daily Tribune version in his 1962.
- 1856 'Speech at the anniversary of the "Peoples Paper". In his 1962

MARX:K.

- 1858 Grundrisse...ed.M.Nicolaus.  
Penguin, 1973.
- 1859b Contribution to the critique of  
political economy...Lawrence & W., 1971.
- 1862 'A London Workers' Meeting'.  
in his 1962.
- 1863 Capital,IV: Theories of Surplus Value,  
Part I. Moscow, Progress, 1963.
- 1864 Capital,III.  
Moscow, Progress, 1971.
- 1864b 'Inaugural address of the International  
Working Man's Association'  
In Marx-Engels Selected Works, vol 2,  
Moscow, Progress, 1969.
- 1866 'Results of the immediate process of  
production'(Extra Chapter for his 1867 )  
Appendix to Mandel ed of Capital, I,  
Penguin, 1976.
- 1867 Capital, I.  
Moscow, Progress, 1967.
- 1871 CivilWar in France. Drafts and Texts.  
Peking, F.L.P., 1970.
- 1871b 'Interview with Karl Marx'.  
World, 18 July; Repr Labour Monthly,54,  
1972.
- 1872 and F.Engels.  
'Preface' to German edition of Manifesto  
In his 1968.
- 1875 and F.Engels  
'Critique of the Gotha Programme'.  
In his 1968.
- .....
- 1962 and F.Engels  
On Britain 2nd ed. Moscow, F.L.P.H.
- 1965 and F.Engels.  
Selected correspondence. Moscow, Progress.
- 1968 and F.Engels.  
Selcted works in one volume. Moscow, Progress.
- 1973 Surveys from Exile. Penguin.
-



- MATHER:F.C.  
1953 'The Railways, the Electric Telegraph and Public Order during the Chartist Period, 1837-1848'. History, 38.
- 1958 'The Government and the Chartists'. Ch. 12 in Briggs, 1959b.
- 1959 Public order in the Age of the Chartists. Manchester U P .
- 1965 Chartism. Rev ed. Historical Assoc. 1968
- 1970 'The General Strike of 1842...' In Quinault, 1974b:Ch.3.
- MATOSSIAN:M. 1958 Ideologies of delayed industrialization: some tensions and ambiguities. Ec Development & Cultural Change, 6.
- MATTHEW:H.G. 1973 The Liberal Imperialists. O U P .
- MATTHEW:R. 1974 'Defining what is meant by decent business behaviour'. Times, 20 October.
- MATTICK:P. 1969 Marx and Keynes. Merlin.
- MAUDLING:R.  
1973 'Local forces a safeguard against oppression'. Times, 6 October.
- 1974 'Self-discipline essential to a free society'. Times, 20 February.
- MAUS:H. 1956 A short history of sociology. Routledge, 1962.
- MAWSON:P. 1970 'Poor Law administration in South Shields...' Bull North East Group for the Stud of Labour His, (4).
- MAYHEW:H. 1849-50 The Unknown Mayhew: Selections from the "Morning Chronicle" and two essays by eds E.P.Thompson and E Yeo. Merlin, 1971.
- MAZLISH:B. 1975 James and John Stuart Mill: father and son in the nineteenth century. NY Basic Books.

- MEACHAM:S. 1972 'The sense of an impending clash: English working class unrest before the first World War'. Am His R, 77.
- MEACHER:M.  
1974a 'The coming class struggle'. New Statesman, 4 January.
- 1974b 'The widening wages gap...'. Times Business News, 21 January.
- MEEK:R.L.  
1954 'The Scottish contribution to Marxist sociology'. In Saville, 1954.
- 1973 ed Precursors of Adam Smith: Readings... Dent.
- 1975 Social science and the ignoble savage. C U P .
- MEPHAM :J. 1972 'The theory of ideology in "Capital"'. Radical Philosophy, (2).
- MERRIAM: C.E.1931 The making of citizens: a comparative study of methods of civic education. Chicago U P.
- MERRINGTON:J.  
1968 'Theory and practice in Gramsci's Marxism'. Socialist Register
- 1975 'Town and County in the transition to Capitalism'. New Left R, (93).
- MESZAROS:I. 1971 ed. Aspects of History and Class Consciousness. Routledge.
- 197
- MIDDLETON:C.R. 1974 'John Backhouse and the origins of the Permanent Undersecretaryship for Foreign Affairs, 1828-1842'. J Br Stud,13.
- MIDWINTER:E.C.  
1966 'A Tory interpretation...some comments'. Past & Present, (34).
- 1967 'State Intervention at the local level: the New Poor Law in Lancashire'. His J,10.

## MIDWINTER:E.C.

- 1968a 'Central and local government in mid-nineteenth-century Lancashire'. Northern His, 3.
- 1968b Victorian social reform. Longmans.
- 1968c Law & Order in early Victorian Lancashire. York, St Anthony's P.
- 1969 'The Administration of public education in Late Victorian Lancashire'. Northern His, 4.

## MILIBAND:R.

- 1960 Parliamentary socialism: a study in the politics of Labour. Reprint of Monthly R ed. of 1964 plus 1972 'Postscript'. Merlin, 1972.
- 1965 'Marx and the State'. Socialist Register.
- 1969 The State in Capitalist Society. Weidenfeld, & N.
- 1970 'The Capitalist State: a reply to N. Poulantzas'. New Left R, (59); Repr Blackburn, 1972; Urry, 1973.
- 1973 'Poulantzas and the Capitalist State'. New Left R, (82).

## MILL:J.

- 1826 'State of the Nation'. Westminster R, 6.

## MILL:J.S.

- 1838 'Bentham'. Westminster R. Repr in his 1950, 39-98.
- 1840 'Coleridge'. Westminster R. Repr in his 1950, 99-168.
- 1848 The Principles of Political Economy. Books IV and V. Penguin, 1970.
- 1862 'Centralization'. Edinburgh R, 115 (Attribution from Wolfe, 1975).
- 1950 Mill on Bentham and Coleridge... ed F.R. Leavis. Chatto & W.
- 1973 A logical critique of sociology; ed. R. Fletcher. Nelson.

- MILLER:.R.W. 1974 'Rawls and Marxism'. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 3; Repr Daniels, 1975:Ch.9.
- MILLS:C.W. 1956 The Power Elite.  
Oxford U P .
- MILNE:A.J.M. 1973 'Bentham's principles of utility and legal philosophy'. In James, 1973.
- MILNES:R.M. 1867 Lord Houghton  
'On the admission of the working classes as part of our social system; and on their recognition for all purposes as part of the Nation'. Essays...1867:Ch.3
- MIGAY:G.E.  
1972 'The transformation of agriculture'.  
In Hartwell, 1972b:Ch.2
- 1975 Arthur Young and his times.  
Macmillan.
- MISHRAE:R. 1976 'Convergence theory and social change'.  
Comp Stud in Soc and His, 18.
- MISRA: B.B. 1959 The central administration of the East India Company, 1773-1834. Manchester U P.
- MITCHELL:A. 1971 Bismarck and the French Nation.  
NY:Bobbs-Merrill.
- MITCHELL:G.D.  
1964 'Education, ideology and social change in England'. In Zollschan, 1964:Ch.30.
- 1968 A hundred years of sociology.  
Duckworth.
- 1970 'Sociology: a historical phenomenon'.  
Sociological Review Monographs, (16)
- MITCHELL:M. 1931 'Emile Durlheim and the philosophy of nationalism'. Pol Science Qu, 46.
- MITCHISON:R.  
1962 Agricultural Sir John: the life and times of Sir John Sinclair... Bles.
- 1974 'The making of the old Scottish Poor Law'. Past & Present, (63).

MOMMSEN:W.J.

1965 'Max Weber's political sociology...'  
Int Social Science J, 17.

1972 The Age of Buteaucracy...  
Oxford, Blackwell, 1974.

MONTMORENCY:J.E.G.de 1902

State intervention in English education: a short history from the earliest times to 1833. Cambridge, U.P.

MOONEY:B. 1974 'A letter from the Squire'.  
New Statesman, 20 December.

MOORE:Barrington.1966

Social origins of dictatorship and democracy...Penguin, 1969.

MOORE:D.C.

1961 'The other face of Reform...'  
Victorian Stud, 5; Repr Maehl,1967.

1965 'The Corn Laws and High Farming'.  
Ec His R, 18; Repr Stansky, 1973.

1966 'Concession or cure? The sociological premises of the First Reform Act'.  
His J, 9.

1967 'Social structure, political structure, public opinion in mid Victorian England'.  
In Robson, 1967:Ch.2.

1969 'Political morality in mid-nineteenth century England: concepts, norms, violations'  
Victorian Stud, 13.

1971 'Reply' / To Hennock,1971 /  
Idem, 14.

1976 Politics of deference...  
Brighton, Harvester P.

MOORE:S. 1966 'Ricardo and the State of Nature'.  
Scottish J of Pol Ec, 13.

MOOREHEAD:C. 1976 [Five articles on Patronage]  
Times, 4,5,6,7 October.

MOOREHOUSE:H.F. 1973 'The political incorporation of the British working class'.Sociol, 7.

- MORRIS:R.J. 1970 'The history of Self-Help'.  
New Society, 3 December.
- MORRIS:W. 1893 Communism: a lecture.  
Fabian Society, 1903.
- MOSS:G.L. 1975 ed. Police forces in history.  
NY, Sage.
- MOWAT:C.L.  
1952 'The Approach to the Welfare State in  
Great Britain' Am His Rev, 58.
- 1969 'Social legislation in Britain and the  
United States in the early 20th century'.  
Historical Stud, 7.
- MULLER:W. 1970 and C. Neususs.  
'The Illusion of State socialism...'  
Telos, (25), 1975.
- MURRAY:R. 1971 'The Internationalization of capital  
and the Nation-State'. New Left R, (67).
- MUSGRAVE:P.W.  
1968 Society and education in England  
since 1800. Methuen.
- 1970 ed Sociology, history, education.  
Methuen.
- 1971 'Functionalism and socialization'.  
Australian and New Zealand J of Sociol, 15.
- MUSGROVE:F.  
1959a 'Middle class families and schools'.  
Sociol R, 7; Repr Musgrave, 1970.
- 1959b 'Middle class education and employment  
in the nineteenth century'.  
Ec His R, 12.
- 
- NAIRN:T.  
1963 'The English working class'.  
New Left R, (24); Repr Blackburn, 1972.
- 1964 'Anatomy of the Labour Party'.  
New Left R, (27,28).
- 1965 'Nature of the Labour Party'.  
Towards Socialism, Fontana, 1965.
- 1970 'The fateful meridian'. New Left R. (60).

NAIRN:T.

1972 'The European problem'(Whole issue).  
New Left R, (75).

1975 'The Modern Janus'.  
New Left R, (94).

NEALE:R.S.

1966a 'Class and ideology in a provincial city:  
Bath 1800-1850'. Our History, (42);  
Repr his 1972d:Ch.2

1866b 'The Standard of living, 1780-1844:  
a regional and class study'. Ec His R,19;  
Repr in Taylor, 1975.

1967a 'H.S.Chapman, class consciousness  
and the "Victorian Ballot"'.  
Historical Stud (Australia and New  
Zealand), 12.

1967b 'Working class women and womens suffrage'  
Labor History, (12); Repr his 1972d:Ch.7.

1968 'Class and class consciousness in early  
nineteenth century England: three classes  
of five?' Victorian Stud, 12.

1972a '"Middle-class morality" and the  
systematic colonizers'. 1972d:Ch.6.

1972b 'Class conflict and poll-books in Victorian  
England'. 1972d:Ch.3.

1972c 'The colonies and social mobility...'  
In his 1972d:Ch.5.

1972d Class and ideology in the nineteenth  
century. Routledge.

1975a 'Property, law and the transition from  
feudalism to capitalism'. In Kamenka,1975b.

1975b '"The Bourgeois, historically, has played  
a most revolutionary part..."'.  
In Kamenka, 1975b.

NEALE:A.R. 1967

The St Marylebone Workhouse and  
Institution 1730-1965.  
St Marylebone Society.

NETTL:J.P.

- 1965a 'Consensus or elite domination: the case of business'. Political Stud, 13.
- 1965b 'The German S.D.P. 1890-1914 as a political model'. Past & Present, (30).
- 1968 'The State as a conceptual variable'. World Pol, 20.

NEWBY:H.

- 1975a 'Deference and the agricultural worker'. Sociol R, 23.
- 1975b 'The Deferential dialectic'. Comp Stud Soc His, 17.

NEWMAN:G. 1975

'Anti-French propoganda and British Liberal nationalism in the early nineteenth century...'Victorian Stud,18.

NEWTON:R. 1966

'Society and politics in Exeter,1837-1914 '. In Dyos, 1968:Ch. 6 ii.

NICOLAYEVSKII:B. 1956 'Toward a history of the Communist League'. Int Rev Social His, 1.

NICHOLLS:D.

- 1962 'Positive Liberty, 1880-1914'. Am Pol Science R, 56.
- 1975 The pluralist State.  
Macmillan.

NICHOLLS:G.

- 1846 'On the condition of the agricultural labourer: with suggestions for its improvement'. J Roy Agricultural Soc of England, series i, 7.
- 1898 A history of the English Poor Law in connection with the State of the Country and the condition of the People...2 vols, revised with 3rd vol by T.Mackay. New ed by H.G.Willinck. King, 1898. 3 vols.
- NICOLAUS:M 1970 'The theory of the labour aristocracy'. Monthly R, April.
- NICHOLS:T. 1975 'The "socialism" of management'. Sociol R, 23.



## NORTHERN IRELAND LEGAL QUARTERLY, 1973

'Bentham and legal theory'.

NOSSITER:T.J.

1969

'Dock politics and unholy alliances, 1832-1852'. IN H.G. Dowling(ed) Some Chapters in the history of Sunderland. Sunderland, privately printed, 1969.

1970a

'Aspects of electoral behavior in English constituencies 1832-1868'.

In: Allardt & Rokkan (eds) Mass politics, NY, Free Press, 1970.

1970b

'Voting behaviour, 1832-1872'.

Political Stud, 18.

1970c

'Recent work on English elections, 1832-1935'. Idem.

1972

'Shopkeeper radicalism in the 19th century'.

In his et al (eds) Imagination and precision in the social sciences...

Faber, 1972.

1976

Influence, opinions and party idiom.

Harvester.

NOVAK:T.

1975

Social policy, poverty and the working class: the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act.

Paper to Durham Political Economy Group.

1976

and C.Jones.

The Welfare State.Idem.

O'CONNOR:J. 1973

The Fiscal crisis of the State,

St James' P, 1976.

OFFE:C.

1972a

'Political authority and class structure'.

Int J Sociol, 2.

1972b

'Further comments...' Telos, (25), 1975.

1972c

'The abolition of market control...'

KapitaliState (1) and (2) 1973.

1975

'Theses on the theory of the State'.

New German Critique, (6).

OLLMAN:B.

1971

Alienation...

Cambridge U P.

1976

'In defence of internal relations'.

Radical Philosophy, (13).

OPEN UNIVERSITY

1974a

Poverty and social policy.

Milton Keynes, Open U P, A401:iv:12-16.

1974b

British Elites, 1750-1870.

Milton Keynes, Open U P, A401, iii, 7-11.

1974c

British Elites, 1870-1950.

Milton Keynes, Open U P, A401, vii, 25-28.

1974d

Popular politics, 1750-1870.

Milton Keynes, Open U P, A 401, ii, 3-6.

1974e

Popular politics, 1870-1950.

Milton Keynes, Open U P, A401, vi, 21-24.

ORWELL:G.

1939

: 'Charles Dickens'

In his 1970:I:Text 162.

1970

Collected essays...

Penguin, 4 vols.

OSSOWSKA:M. 1967

Social determinants of moral ideas.

Routledge, 1971.

OTLEY:C.B.

1968

'Militarism and the social affiliations  
of the British army elite'.In Van Doorn, 1968.

1970

'The social origins of British Army  
Officers'. Sociol R, 18.

1973

'The educational background of British  
Army Officers'. Sociol, 7.

OWEN:J.T. 1975

L.T.Hobhouse...

Edinburgh:Nelson.

OWEN:R. 1814

A new view of society...

Repr Penguin, 1970.

OXLEY:G.W.

1974 Poor Relief in England and Wales  
1601-1834. Newton Abbot, David &C.

- PAHL:R.E. and J.T.Winkler  
1974 'The coming corporatism'.  
New Society, 11 October.
- 1976 'Corporatism in Britain'.  
Times, 26 March.
- PAINE:T 1792 Rights of Man...  
Repr Penguin, 1969.
- PAPPE:H.O. 1951 'Wakefield and Marx'.  
Ec His R; Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.10.
- PAREKH:B. 1973 'Introduction' to Bentham, 1973.
- PARKER C.S. see GRAHAM, Sir J; PEEL, Sir R.
- PARKIN:F. 1971 Class inequality and the political order. McGibbon & K.
- PARKIN:R. 1975 The Central Society of Education, 1836-1840.  
Leeds, Museum of History of Education.
- PARRIS:H.  
1960 'The nineteenth-century revolution in government:a reappraisal reappraised'.  
His J, 3; Repr Stansky, 1973.
- 1961 'The Home Office and the provincial police in England and Wales 1856-70'.  
Public Law.
- 1965 Government and the railways in nineteenth-century Britain. Routledge.
- 1968 'Origins of the permanent civil service, 1780-1830'. Public Administration, 46.
- 1969 Constitutional bureaucracy: the development of British Central Administration since the eighteenth century. Allen & U.
- PARSONS:T.  
1937 The structure of social action.  
NY Free Press, 1949, 2 vols.
- 1945 'The present position and prospects of systematic theory in sociology'.  
In his 1954:Ch.9.
- 1954 Essays... 2nd ed.  
NY Free P.
- 1967 Social theory and modern society.  
NY Free P.
- 1968 'Introduction' to re-issue of his 1937.  
NY Free Press Paperback ed.

- PARSSINEN:T.M. 1973 'Association, convention and anti Parliament in British radical politics, 1771-1848'. Eng His R, 88.
- PASCAL:R. 1938 'Property and society. The Scottish historical school of the XVIII century'. Modern Qu, 1.
- PASSMORE:J. 1966 100 years of philosophy. Penguin, 1968.
- PATERSON:A. 1976 'The Poor Law in nineteenth century Scotland'. In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.8.
- PAUL:W. 1917 The State: its origin and function. Glasgow, Socialist Labour P.
- PEARSALL:R. 1973 'The first metropolitan detectives'. Police R, 7 September.
- PEARSON:G. 1975 The deviant imagination... Macmillan.
- PEEL:J.D.Y. 1971 Herbert Spencer: the evolution of a sociologist. Heinemann.
- PEEL:R. 1891-99 Sir Robert Peel... from his private correspondence; ed C.S.Parker. Murray. 3 vols. 1891: Vol 1; 1899:Vol.2.
- PELLEW:J.H. 1974 'The Home Office and the Explosives Act of 1876'. Victorian Stud, 18.
- PELLING:.H. 1965 The Origins of the Labour Party. Rev ed. O U P.
- PERKIN: H.  
1961 'Middle class education and employment in the nineteenth century: a critical note'. Ec His R, 14.
- 1969 The origins of modern English society, 1780-1880. Routledge.
- PEVSNER:N. 1976 A history of building types. Thames & H.
- PHILIPS:C.H. 1940 The East India Company, 1784-1834. Manchester U P
- PHILIPS:P. 1974 'Riots and public order in the Black Counrty 1835-1860'. In Quinault, 1974b:Ch.4.
- PICKERING:W.S.F. 1967 'The 1851 religious census...'. Br J Sociol, 18.

- PIVEN:F. 1972 and R.A.Cloward.  
Regulating the Poor...  
 Rev ed. Tavistock, 1976.
- PLACE:F.  
 1970 London Radicalism, 1830-1843: a selection from the papers of Francis Place, ed D.J.Rowe. London Record Soc.  
 1972 Autobiography, ed M.Thale.  
 C U P .
- PLUMMER:A. 1929 'The Place of Bronterre O'Brien in the working class movement'.  
Ec His R, series i, 2.
- POLANYI:K. 1945 Origins of our time. The Great Transformation. Gollancz, 1946.
- POLK:K 1971 and W.Pink.  
 'Youth culture and the school...'.  
Br J Sociol, 22.
- POLLARD: S.  
 1963 'Factory discipline in the Industrial Revolution'. Ec His R, 16.  
 1965 The genesis of modern management...  
 Penguin, 1968.  
 1968 The idea of progress: history and society. Penguin, 1971.
- POOLE:J. 1813 The village school improved, or The New system of education practically explained and adapted to the case of country parishes...2nd ed. Oxford, for the Author, at the U P . 1813.  
Idem. 3rd ed... 1815.
- POOR LAW COMMISSION 1835-1839.  
Annual Reports, 1 - V.  
 Clowes.  
 1841 Report...on the training of pauper children. Clowes.
- POOR LAW REPORT 1834  
 Ed S.G. and E.O.A. Checkland. Penguin, 1974.

## POOR RATES

- 1844a Poor rates reduced by self-supporting reading, writing and agricultural schools...from "Farmers' Almanac" for 1844. Ridgway.
- 1844b Poor rates reduced by self-supporting reading, writing and agricultural schools, and by the allotment system under regulation. As revised by a Member of Parliament. printed by Hodson.
- PORTER:G.R. 1838 'Statistical inquiries into the social condition of the working classes...' Papers C.S.E., II.
- POST:J.D. 1976 'Famine, mortality and epidemic disease in the process of modernization'. Ec His R, 29.
- POTTER:D.C. 1974 Lords, peasants and politics.  
Milton Keynes, Open U P, D231 ii 5-8.
- POULANTZAS:N.  
1966 'Marxist political theory in Great Britain'. Temps Modernes New Left R, (43).
- 1968 Political power and social classes [de L'Etat capitaliste]. NLBooks, 1973.
- 1969 'The problem of the capitalist State'. New Left R, (58) Repr Blackburn, 1972; Urry, 1973.
- 1970 Fascism and dictatorship.  
NLBooks, 1974.
- 1973 'Internationalization of capitalist relations and the nation-State'. Temps Modernes; Economy & Soc, 3, 1974; Repr his 1974:Ch.1
- 1974 Classes in contemporary capitalism.  
NLBooks, 1975.
- 1976 'The capitalist State. A reply to Miliband and Laclau'. New Left R, (95).

- POUND:J. 1971 Poverty and vagrancy in Tudor England.  
Longmans.
- POZZOLINI:A. 1968 Antonio Gramsci. Pluto P.
- PRESTON:.R.A. 1956 Men in arms.  
NY
- PRESTON-THOMAS, H.  
1902 Ed, trans, reviser of Aschrott, 1902.  
1909 The work and play of a government  
inspector... Edinburgh, Blackwood.
- PRICE:.R.N. 1971 'The working men's club movement and  
Victorian social reform ideology'.  
Victorian Stud, 15.
- PRIMER:I. 1964 'Erasmus Darwin's "Temple of Nature"...'.  
J His Ideas, 25.
- PROUTY:R. 1957 The transformation of the Board of  
Trade 1830-1858... Heinemann.
- PUDNEY:J. 1975 London's docks.  
Thames & H.
- PURDY:F.  
1860 'The Statistics of the English Poor  
Rate...' J Statistical Soc, 23.  
1861 'On the earnings of agricultural  
labourers in England and Wales, 1860'.  
J Statistical Soc, 24.
- 
- QUETELET:A. 1842 A treatise on man...  
Edinburgh, Chambers.
- QUINAULT:R.  
1974a 'The Warwickshire county magistracy  
and public order c 1830- 1870'.  
Ch 5 in his  
and J.Stevenson (eds).  
1974b Popular protest and public order...  
Allen & U.
- QUINTON:A. 1973 'Living free'  
New Statesman, 7 December.
-

- RABAN:J. 1975 'What the doctor ordered'.  
New Statesman, 19 December.
- RAE:J. 1890 'State socialism and Social Reform'.  
Contemporary R, 58.
- RAEFF:M. 1975 'The well-ordered police State...'.  
Am His R, 80.
- RAISON:T. 1969 ed The founding fathers of social science.  
Penguin.
- RALEIGH:J.H. 1968 'Victorian morals and the modern novel'.  
In Watt, 1971.
- RALSTON:D.B. 1966 ed  
Soldiers and States: civil-military relations  
in modern Europe. Boston, D.C.Heath.
- RAMSAY:H. 1977 'Cycles of control: worker participation  
in sociological and historical  
perspective'. Sociol, forthcoming.
- RANCIERE:J. 1973 'On the theory of ideology.'  
Radical Philosophy, (7).
- RAPAPORT:A. 1967 'The Galilean Revolution'.  
Listener, 26 October.
- READ:D. 1964 The English provinces, c 1760-1960: a  
study in influence. Leeds, Ed.Arnold.
- READER:W.J. 1966 Professional man: the rise of the  
professional classes in nineteenth  
century England. Weidenfeld & N.
- REES-MOGG, W.  
1974 The reigning error: the crisis of world  
inflation. H.Hamilton.
- 1976 'Monetarism: established principles  
we cannot ignore.'  
Times, 23 August.
- REID-SMITH:E.R. 1973 'School libraries in 1833'.  
Educ Libraries Bull, 16.
- RENNER:K. 1928 The Institutions or private law and their  
social functions. Routledge, 1949  
Repr 1976.
- RICARDO:D. 1821 On the principles of political economy  
and taxation. 3rd ed Murray;  
Repr Penguin, 1971.



RICHARDS:E.S.

1973a

'Structural change in a regional economy: Sutherland...1780-1830'.

Ec His R, 26.

1973b

The Leviathan of Wealth: the Sutherland fortunes... Routledge.

RICHARDSON B.W.

1862

'Edwin Chadwick as a social reformer'. Social Science Review; Repr in Chadwick, 1887, I:xvi-xxi.

1887

'Edwin Chadwick, CB: a biographical dissertation'. Repr Idem.

RICHTER:M.

1956

'T.H.Green and his audience: Liberalism as a surrogate faith'. R of Pol, 18.

1960

'Durkheim's politics'.  
In Wolff, 1960.

1964

Politics of conscience: T.H.Green and his age. Weidenfeld & N.

RITCHIE:D.G.

1887

'The political philosophy of T.H.Green'. Contemporary R; Repr in his The principles of State interference. 4th ed. G.Allen.

1902

RIVLIN:J.B. 1947

Harriet Martineau: a bibliography of her separately printed works.  
NY, New York Public Library.

ROACH:J.

1957

'Liberalism and the Victorian intelligentsia'. Cambridge His J, 13; Repr Stansky, 1973.

1959

'Universities and national intelligentsia'. Victorian Stud, 3.

ROBBINS:L.

1952

The theory of economic policy in classical political economy. Macmillan.

1973

'The legacy of Adam Smith'.  
Financial Times, 5th June.

- ROBERTS:A. 1975 'The British Armed Forces and politics: a historical perspective'. In Emloe, 1976:Ch.3.
- ROBERTS:D.  
1957 'Tory Paternalism and social reform in early Victorian England'. Am His R, 63; Repr Stansky, 1973.
- 1959 'Jeremy Bentham and the Victorian Administrative State'. Victorian Stud, 2.
- 1960 Victorian origins of the British Welfare State. Yale U.P.
- 1963 'How cruel was the Victorian Poor Law?' His J, 6.
- ROBERTS:J. 1976 Revolution and Improvement: the Western World, 1775-1847. Weidenfeld & N.
- ROBINSON:S. 1854 Friendly letters on the recent strikes from a Manufacturer to his own Workpeople. Groombridge.
- ROBSON:A.H. 1931 The education of children engaged in industry in England 1835-1876. Devonshire P.
- ROBSON:R. 1967 ed Ideas and institutions in Victorian England. Bell.
- ROBSON:W.A. 1934 'The Factory Acts, 1833-1933: a centenary of pride and shame'. Pol Qu, 5.
- ROCK:P. 1974 'The sociology of deviancy and conceptions of moral order'. Br J Criminology, 14.
- RODGERS:B 1952 'The Social Science Association, 1857-1886'. Manchester School, 20.
- ROGERS:F.W.  
1971 'Gateshead and the Public Health Act of 1848'. Archeologia Aeliana, series iv, 49.
- 1974 Gateshead: an early Victorian boom town. Wallsend, Priory P.
- ROKKAN:S. 1973 'Building States and Nations: a selective bibliography'. In Eisenstadt, 1973:Vol.1.
- 1975 'Dimensions of State formation and Nation-building'. In Tilly, 1975d:Ch.8.

- ROLL:E. 1976 [Stamp Memorial Lecture, 11 Nov.1976] Extracts, Times, 12 November.
- ROSE:J.H. 1897 'The unstamped press, 1815-1836'. Eng His R, 12.
- ROSE:M.E.  
1966a 'Allowance system under the New Poor Law'. Ec His R, 19.
- 1966b 'Anti-Poor Law movement in the North of England'. Northern His, 1.
- 1970 'The anti-Poor Law agitation'. In Ward, 1970b:Ch.3
- 1971 ed The English Poor Law, 1780-1930. Newton Abbot, David & C.
- 1972 Relief of Poverty, 1834-1914. Macmillan.
- 1976 'Settlement, removal and the New Poor Law'. In Fraser, 1976b:Ch.1
- ROSE:R.B. 1965 'The origins of working-class radicalism in Birmingham'. Labour His, (9).
- ROSENBERG:D. 1976 [Review essay on Fascism] Sociol R, 24.
- ROSENBERG:N. 1960 'Some institutional aspects of the "Wealth of Nations"'. J Pol Ec, 68.
- ROSENBERG:P. 1975 The Seventh Hero:Thomas Carlyle... Harvard U P .
- ROSENBLUM:N.L. 1973 'Bentham's social psychology for legislators'. Political Theory, 1.
- ROSEWEARE:H. 1973 The Treasury, 1660-1870: the foundations of control.Allen &U.
- ROSKELL:J.S. 1964 'Perspectives in English Parliamentary History'. Bull John Rylands Lib,46; Repr Fryde, 1970:II:Ch.10.
- ROSS:I. 1972 Lord Kames... Oxford U P.
- ROTHBLATT:S.1975 Tradition and change in English liberal education. Faber.

- ROTHMAN:S. 1970 'Barrington Moore and the dialectics of Revolution'. Am Pol Science R, 64.
- ROUTH:G. 1976 'A straying philosopher'.  
Times Higher Educational Supplement, 16 June.
- ROVER:C. 1970 Love, morals and the feminists.  
Routledge.
- ROWBOTHAM:S. 1973 Hidden from history.  
Pluto P.
- ROWE:D.J.  
1973a 'Francis Place and the historian'.  
His J, 16.
- 1973b 'Occupations in Northumberland and Durham, 1851-1916'. Northern His, 8.
- ROYLE:E.  
1971 Radical politics, 1790-1900: religion and unbelief. Longmans.
- 1974 Victorian Infidels: the origins of the British secularist movement, 1791-1866.  
Manchester U P.
- RUDE:G.  
1964 The crowd in history...1730-1848.  
NY, Wiley.
- 1970 Paris and London in the eighteenth century. Fontana
- 1971 Hanoverian London, 1714-1808.  
Secker.
- RUSSELL:B. 1946 History of Western Philosophy.  
Allen & U.
- RUSSELL SMITH:E. 1974 Modern bureaucracy: the Home Civil Service. Longmans.
- RYAN:A.  
1969 'Utilitarianism and bureaucracy...'  
In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.2
- 1974 J.S.Mill. Routledge.
- 1975 'The Price of common sense'.  
Times Literary Supplement, 12 September.

SAINTY:J.C.

Office holders in modern Britain.

Athlone P.

1. Treasury Officials, 1660-1870. 1972.

2. Officials of the Secretaries of State, 1660-1782. 1973.

3. Officials of the Board of Trade, 1660-1870. 1974.

4. Admiralty Officials, 1660-1870. 1975

Note: Vol.5 Home Office Officials...

is now available but was not at the time of the major work on this thesis.

1976

'The evolution of the parliamentary and financial secretaryships at the treasury'. Eng His R, 91.

SLAVEMINI:G. 1936

Under the Axe of Fascism.

Gollanz(Left Book Club).

SAMBROOK:J. 1973

William Cobbett.

Routledge.

SANDERSON:M. 1967

'Education and the factory in Industrial Lancashire, 1780-1840'. Ec His R, 20.

SASSOON, S. 1975

Letters to a critic [Michael Thorpe]  
Nettleshed, Kent Publications.

SAVILLE:J. 1954

ed. Democracy and the Labour Movement...  
Lawrence & W.

SAYER:D. 1975

'Method and dogma in historical materialism'.  
Sociol R, 23.

SCAFF:L.A. 1973

'Max Weber's politics and political education'. Am Pol Science R, 67.

SCARMAN:L. 1974

[The Hamlyn Lectures] Stevens, 1975.

SCHAFFER:B.B. 1957

'The idea of the ministerial department: Bentham, Mill, and Bagehot'.  
Australian J of Pol and His, 3.

SCHIEDER:T. 1954

'The crisis of bourgeois Liberalism'.  
Ch 2 of his

1958

The State and society in our time.  
Edinburgh, Nelson, 1962.

SCHMIECHEN:J.A. 1975

'State reform and the local economy: an aspect of industrialization in late Victorian and Edwardian London.  
Ec His R, 27.

- SCHNEIDER:L. 1967 ed The Scottish moralists.  
U of Chicago P.
- SCHOENWALD:R.L. 1968 'Town guano and social statics...'  
Victorian Stud, 11.
- SCHOOL OF ARTS, Edinburgh.  
Reports [1- 6, May 1822-Aug 1827]  
Xerox set held Heriot-Watt Library D6119.
- SCOTT:P. 1976 'A Victorian Whig at Westminster  
Today: Dr Rhodes Boyson M.P.'  
Times, 19 January
- SCULL:A.M. 1975 'From madness to mental illness:  
medical men as moral entrepreneurs'.  
Archives europeenes de sociologie, 16.
- SEARLE:R.R. 1971 The quest for national efficiency.  
Oxford, Clarendon P.
- SEMIN-PANZER:U. 1975 'The Military and State formation...'.  
Enloe, 1976:Ch.12.
- SEMMEEL:B.  
1960 Imperialism and social reform.  
C U P .
- 1961 'The Philosophic Radicals and  
Colonialism' J Modern His  
Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.3
- 1970 The rise of Free Trade Imperialism...  
C U P .
- 1971 'Introduction' to his ed Halevy, 1906.
- 1973 The Methodist revolution.  
Heinemann, 1974.
- SENIOR:N. 1837 Letters on the Factory Act...  
printed R.Clay.
- SHANNON:R.  
1974 'David Urquhart and the Foreign Affairs  
Committees' In Hollis, 1974b.
- 1976 'A very superior bogeyman'.  
Times Literary Supplement, 16 July.
- SHAW:A.G.L. 1970 ed. Great Britain and the colonies, 1815-  
1865.
- SHAW:M. 1974 'The theory of the State and politics'.  
Ec & Soc, 3.

- SHELTON:W.J. 1973 English hunger and industrial disorders... Macmillan.
- SHEPPARD:F.J. 1971 London, 18-8-1870:the Infernal Wen. Secker.
- SHERIFF:P.A. 1974 'Unrepresentative bureaucracy'. Sociol, 8.
- SHIMAN:L.L. 1973 'The Band of Hope movement: respectable recreation for working-class children'. Victorian Stud, 17.
- SHIPLEY:S. 1971 Club life and socialism in midVictorian London. Ruskin College History Workshop Pamphlets.
- SHONFIELD:A. 1967 'The pragmatic illusion: on the British formulae for muffling public purpose'. Encounter, 28.
- SILLITOE:A.F. 1971 Britain in figures. Penguin.
- SILVER:A. 1967 'The demand for order in Civil Society...' In D.J.Bordua (ed). The Police... NY,Wiley.
- SILVER:P. 1974 and H.Silver. The Education of the Poor: the history of a National School, 1824-1974. Routledge.
- SIMMONS:P.L. 1841 'Statistics of newspapers in various countries'. J Statistical Soc, 4.
- SIMON:B.  
1960 The two nations and the educational structure, 1780-1870. Lawrence & W. (Originally published as:Studies in the history of education...).
- 1975 and I.Bradley(eds). The Victorian public school. Dublin, Gill & M.
- SIMON:D. 1954 'Master and Servant...'. In Saville, 1954.
- SINEL:A. 1973 The classroom and the Chancellery: State educational reform under Count Dmitri Tolstoi. Harvard U.P.

SKILLEN:T.

1972

'The Statist conception of politics'.  
Radical Philosophy, (2).

1974

Philosophical Statism.

Unpublished paper.

1974a

'Marxism and morality'.  
Radical Philosophy, (8).

SKINNER:A.

1967

'Natural history in the age of Adam  
Smith'. Political Stud, 15.

1970

'Introduction' to his ed Smith, 1776.

1975

and T.Wilson (eds).  
Essays on Adam Smith.  
Oxford, Clarendon P.

SKLAIR:L. 1970

Sociology of progress.

Routledge,

SMART: 1909

'Notes by Professor Smart on the growth  
of Poor Law Expenditure in England  
and Wales' Royal Commission on the  
Poor Laws, Statistical Appendix, Part XII.

SMELSER:N.J.

1959

Social change in the industrial  
revolution...Routledge.

1963

'Sociological history: the industrial  
revolution and the British working-  
class family'. J Social His, 1;

Repr in his 1968 and Smout, 1974:Ch.2.

1968

Essays in sociological explanation.  
Prentice-Hall.

SMILES:S.

1859

Self Help:the art of achievement  
illustrated by accounts of the lives of  
great men... Sphere, 1967.

1863

Industrial biography: Iron workers and  
Tool Makers. Repr Newton Abbot, David &C,  
1967.

SMITH:A. 1776

The Wealth of Nations.

Books 1 and 2. Repr Penguin, 1970.



- SMITH:F. 1923 The life and work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth...Murray.
- SMITH:F.B. 1969 'The "dependence of licence upon faith": Miss Gertrude Himmelfarb on the 2nd Reform Act'. J Br Stud, 9.
- SMITH:R. 'Relief and urban poverty outside the Poor Law, 1800-1850...' Midland His, 2.
- SMITH:R.B. 1967 'The Atheist Mission, 1840-1900'. In Robson, 1967:Ch.8.
- SMOUT:T.C.  
1964 'Scottish landowners and economic growth'. Scottish J Pol Ec, 11.  
1974 and M.W.Flinn (eds). Essays in social history. Oxford, Clarendon P.
- SNELLING:R.C. 1969 and T.J.Barran. 'The Colonial Office and the permanent officials 1801-1914'. In Sunderland, 1972b:Ch.6.
- SNOW:C 1843 Replies...to Lord Ashley...regarding the education and moral and physical condition of the labouring classes. Olliver.
- SOBOUL:A. 1974 'Some problems of the revolutionary State, 1789-1796'. Past & Present, (65).
- SOUTHEY:R. 1812 The origin, nature and object of the new system of education.
- SOUTHGATE:D. 1974 ed. The Conservative Leadership 1832-1932. Macmillan.
- SPENCER:H.  
1861 Education: intellectual, moral, physical. Watts, 1929 (Thinkers' Library, No.2).  
1864 Reasons for dissenting from the philosophy of M.Comte...Repr Berkeley, Glendessary P., 1968.

SPENCER:H.

- 1871 'Specialized administration'.  
Fornightly R; Repr in his 1884.
- 1876 'The Inductions of sociology'.  
Repr with his 1864, 1968 ed.
- 1884 The Man versus the State.  
Reprinted from "The Contemporary Review" ed D.G. MacRae. Penguin, 1969.
- 1897 Epitome of the synthetic philosophy...  
4th ed. Williams & N.
- 1899 'The Filiation of ideas' Appendix B to  
his 1908, Vol.2
- 1908 Life and letters...ed. D.Duncan.  
Methuen. 2 vols.

SPENGLER:J.J. 1956

- 'The State and economic growth'.  
In Aitken, 1959:Ch.13.

SPRING:D.

- 1953 'Earl Fitzwilliam and the Corn Laws'.  
Am His R, 59.
- 1960 'Some reflections on social history in  
the nineteenth century'. Victorian Stud, 4.
- 1963 'Aristocracy, social structure and  
religion in the early Victorian  
period'. Victorian Stud, 6.

SRINIVASAN:R. 1969

- 'T.H.Green and the British intellectual  
aristocracy'. J U of Bombay, 38.

STANSKY:P.

- 1962 'Lyttleton and Thring: a study in  
nineteenth century education'.  
Victorian Stud, 5; Repr his 1973.
- 1973 ed The Victorian revolution: Government and  
Society in Victoria's Britain.  
New York, Watts.

STANWORTH:P. 1974

- and A.Giddens(eds).  
Elites and power in British Society.  
C.U p.

STARR:S.F. 1972

- Decentralisation and self government  
in Russia:1830-1870. Princeton U P.

- STATISTICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON 1838  
'Queries ...relating to Strikes'.  
[Questionnaire]. J Statistical Soc, 1.
- STEINER:J.M. 1973 'Power, ideology and political crime'.  
Int J Criminology, 1.
- STEPHEN:L. 1867 'On the choice of representatives by  
popular constituencies'.  
Essays...1867:Ch.5.
- STERN:W.M. 1950 'United Kingdom Public Expenditure  
by votes of supply, 1793-1817'.  
Economica, 17.
- STEVENSON:J. 1974 'Food riots in England, 1792-1818'.  
In Quinault, 1974b:Ch.1.
- STEWART:D. 1854 Collected works...ed Hamilton.  
Edinburgh: Black.
- STEWART:J. 1976 'Safety on the cheap.'  
New Statesman, 14 June.
- STIGANT:P. 1971 'Wesleyan methodism and working-class  
radicalism in the North,1792-1821'.  
Northern His, 6.
- STIGLER:G.J. 1975 The citizen and the State:: essays on  
regulation. U of Chicago P.  
ed.
- STONE:L. 1975 The University in Society.  
I: Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to  
the early 19th century. Princeton U.P.
- STORCH:R.D. 1975 'The plague of blue locusts: police  
reform and popular resistance in Northern  
England, 1840-1857'. Int R Social His, 20.
- STRADLING:R.  
1971a 'Socialization of support for political  
authority in Britain...' Br J Pol Science,1.  
and E Zarick.  
1971b 'Political and nonpolitical ideals of  
English primary and secondary school  
children'. Sociol R, 19.

- STRASSER:H. 1976 'The case of the Scottish enlightenment'  
Ch 3 of his The normative structure  
of sociology. Routledge.
- STRATTON:J.Y.  
1868 Friendly Societies versus Beerhouse  
clubs. Ridgway.
- 1870 'Farm labourers, their friendly societies  
and the Poor Law'. J Roy Agricultural  
Soc of Eng, new series, 6.
- 1872 'Method of improving the labouring  
classes by altering the conditions of Poor  
Relief and providing them with a system  
of insurance through the Post Office'.  
J Roy Agricultural Soc Eng, new series, 8.
- SUBRAMANIAM:V. 1967 'Representative bureaucracy: a  
reassessment'. Am Pol Science R, 61.
- SUDNOW:D. 1965 'Normal crimes'.  
Social Problems, 12.
- SUPPLE:B.  
1971 'The State and the Industrial Revolution'.  
In Cipolla, 1973a:Ch.5.
- 1974 'Legislation and virtue: an essay on  
working class self-help and the State in the  
early nineteenth century'.  
In McKendrick, 1974:Ch.8.
- SUTHERLAND:G.  
1969a 'Reform of the English Civil Service  
1780-1914: a project for a colloquium'.  
Past and Present, (42).
- 1969b 'Administrators in education after 1870'.  
In her 1972b:Ch.10.
- 1970 'Recent trends in administrative history'.  
Victorian Stud, 13.
- 1971 Elementary education in the nineteenth  
century. Historical Assoc.
- 1972a 'Introduction' to her  
1972b ed Studies in the growth of nineteenth-  
century government. Routledge.

SWEEZY:P.

- 1949 'Fabian political economy'.  
J Pol Ec; Repr in his 1953:Ch.29.
- 1951 'The American ruling class'.  
Monthly R; Repr Ch 9 in his  
1953 The Present as history.  
Monthly R.

SWINGEWOOD:A.

- 1970a 'Origins of sociology: the case of  
the Scottish enlightenment'. Br J Sociol, 21.
- 1970b 'Comte, Marx and Political Economy'.  
Sociol Rev, 18.

TAYLOR:A.J.

- 1960 'Progress and poverty in Britain  
1780-1850: a reappraisal'. History, 45.
- 1972 Laissez faire and State intervention in  
nineteenth century Britain. Macmillan.
- 1974 'Introduction' to his  
1975 ed The Standard of living in Britain in  
the Industrial Revolution. Methuen.
- TAYLOR:G. 1969 The Problem of poverty, 1660-1834.  
Longmans.
- TAYLOR:H. 1832 'On the best mode of constituting public  
offices'. Political Stud, 9, 1961.
- TAYLOR:J. 1971 From self-help to glamour: the  
Working Man's Club, 1860-1972.  
Ruskin College History Workshop Pamphlets.
- TAYLOR:J.S. 1969 'The mythology of the Old Poor Law'.  
J Ec His, 29.
- TAYLOR:R. 1973 'The Marxist theory of Art'.  
Radical Philosophy, (5).
- TAYLOR:T. 1857 'On central and local action in relation  
to town improvement'.  
Trans N.A.P.S.S.  
and L.M. Penson (eds).  
Foundations of British Foreign Policy...  
Repr Cass, 1966.

- TEMPERLEY:H. 1974 'Anti-Slavery'.  
In Hollis, 1974b.
- THANE:p. 1974 'History of social welfare'.  
New Society, 29 August.
- THERBORN:G.  
1974 'The economic theorists of capitalism'.  
New Left R, (87/88).  
1976 Science, Class and Society.  
NLBooks.
- THOLFSEN:.T.R.  
1954 'The artisan and the culture of Early  
Victorian Birmingham'.  
U of Birmingham His J, 4.  
1961 'The transition to democracy in Victorian  
England'. Int R Social His, 6.  
1971 'The Intellectual origins of mid-Victorian  
stability'. Pol Science Qu, 86.
- THOMAS: D.N. 1972 'The social origins of marriage  
partners of the British peerage in the  
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries'.  
Population Stud, 26.
- THOMAS:M.W. 1948 The early factory legislation...  
Leigh-on-Sea, Thames Bank.
- THOMAS:W.  
1962 'Francis Place and working class history'.  
His J, 5.  
1969 'James Mill's politics: the "Essay  
on Government" and the movement for  
reform'. His J, 12.  
1971a 'James Stuart Mill and the uses of  
autobiography'. History, 56.  
1971b 'James Mill's politics: a rejoinder'.  
His J, 14.  
1974 'The philosophic radicals'.  
In Hollis, 1974b.
- THOMPSON:D.M.  
1972 ed Nonconformity in the nineteenth century.  
Routledge  
1974 'The Liberation Society...'  
In Hollis, 1974b.

- THOMPSON:D. 1974 'Testing class struggle'.  
Times Higher Educational Supplement, 8 March.
- THOMPSON:E.P.  
1963 The making of the English working class.  
Repr Penguin, 1968.
- 1964 'Working class culture- the transition  
to industrialism'. Bulletin of the  
Soc for the Stud of Labour His, (9).
- 1965 'The peculiarities of the English'.  
Socialist Register.
- 1967 'Time, work-discipline and industrial  
capitalism'. Past & Present (38);  
Repr Smout, 1974:Ch.3.
- 1968 'Postscript'. To Penguin ed of his 1963.
- 1971 'The moral economy of the English  
crowd in the eighteenth century'.  
Past & Present, (50).
- 1974 'Open Letter to Leszek Kolakowski'.  
Socialist Register.
- 1975 Whigs and hunters: the origin of the  
Black Act. Allen Lane.
- 1976 'On history, sociology and historical  
relevance'. Br J Sociol, 27.
- 1976b 'Romanticism, moralism and utopianism:  
the case of William Morris'.  
New Left R, (99).
- THOMPSON:F.M.L.  
1963 English landed society in the nineteenth  
century. Routledge.
- 1968 'The second Agricultural revolution, 1815-  
1880'. Ec His R, 21.
- THORNHILL:W. 1975 ed. The modernisation of British  
government. Pitman.
- THORPE:E. 1973 'The taken for granted reference: an  
empirical examination'. Sociol, 7.
- THRUPP:S.L. 1963 'The city as the idea of social order'.  
In Handlin, 1963:121-132.

- TILLY:C.  
 1975a 'Reflections on the history of European Statemaking'. In his 1975d.  
 1975b 'Food Supply and Public Order...'  
In his 1975d.  
 1975c 'Western State-making and theories of political transformation'. In his 1975d  
 1975d ed The foundations of national States in Europe. Princeton U.P.  
 TIMES 1973 Supplement on Crime Prevention.  
Times, 6 October.
- TOBIAS:J.J.  
 1967 Crime and industrial society in the nineteenth century. Penguin, 1972.  
 1972a 'Police and public in the United Kingdom'.  
J Contemporary His, 7.  
 1972b ed Nineteenth century crime: prevention and punishment. Newton Abbot, David & C.  
 1975 'Police and Public in the United Kingdom'.  
 In Mosse, 1975 (Reprint 1972a ),  
 TODD:N. 1974 'Ideological superstructure in Gramsci and Mao'. J His Ideas, 35.  
 TORRANCE:J.R. 1968 'Sir George Harrison and the growth of bureaucracy in the early nineteenth century'. Eng His R, 83.  
 TREBLE:J.H. 1970 'The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards Trade Unionism in the North, 1833-1842.' Northern His, 5.  
 TREMENHEER:S.G. 1925 The Tremenheeres.  
 Privately printed. (Copy in B.M.).  
 TROPP:A. 1957 The Schoolteachers: the growth of the teaching profession. Heinemann.  
 TSUZUKI:C. 1956 'The "Impossibilist Revolt" in Britain'.  
Int R Social His, 1.  
 1973 'Introduction' to his ed Hyndman, 1881.  
 TUCKER:G.L.S. 1975 'The Old Poor Law revisited'.  
Explorations in Ec His, 12.  
 TUCKER:R.S. 1936 'Real wages of artisans in London 1729-1935'. J Am Statistical Assoc, 31;  
 Repr Taylor, 1975.



- TURNER:G. 1971 Business in Britain. Rev ed.  
Penguin.
- TYRRELL:A.  
1969 'Political economy, Whiggism and  
the education of working-class adults in  
Scotland, 1817-1840'. Scottish His R,48.  
1970 'Class consciousness in Early Victorian  
Britain: Samuel Smiles, Leeds Politics  
and the self-help creed'.  
J Br Stud, 9.
- 
- URRY:J. 1973 and J.Wakeford (eds).  
Power in Britain,  
Heinemann.
- 
- VAIZEY:J.  
1973 'Phase Three'.  
Listener, 25 October.  
1976 'The Roulette of Public Spending'.  
New Statesman, 13 February.
- VAN DOORN:J. 1968 ed.  
Armed forces and society. NY,Sage.
- VEREKER:C. 1964 The development of political theory.  
2nd ed. Hutchinson.
- VERVERKA:J. 1963 'The growth of government expenditure in  
the United Kingdom...' Scottish J Pol Ec,10'.
- VINCENT:J.  
1966 The formation of the British Liberal  
Party, 1857-1868. Penguin, 1972.  
1967 Pollbooks: how Victorians voted.  
C U P.
- VON HUMBOLDT:W. 1791 The limits of State action.  
Repr C U P., 1969.
- 
- WALCOTT:F.G. 1970 The origins of "Culture & Anarchy".  
Heinemann.

- WALDMAN:T. 1967 'Rousseau on the general will and the legislator'. Pol Stud, 8.
- WALKER:D. 1976 'Fabians face financial crisis'. Times Higher Educational Supplement, 25 June.
- WALKER:N. 1972 'Crimes'.  
In Halsey, 1972:Ch.15.
- WALLAS:G.  
1908 Human nature in politics. 3rd ed.  
Repr Constable, 1948.
- 1925 'Bentham as a political inventor.'  
The Creighton Lecture, King's College, London, 1925.  
Contemporary R, 1926.
- WALPOLE:K.A. 1931 'The humanitarian movement of the early nineteenth century to remedy abuses on emigrant vessels to America'.  
Trans Roy His Soc, series iv, 14.
- WALSH:V.J. 1974 'Old and new Poor Laws in Shropshire'.  
Midland His, 2.
- WALSH:W.H. 1967 'T.H.Green'.  
Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 3.
- WARD:J.T.  
1958 'Revolutionary Tory: the life of John Rayner Stephens'. Trans Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Soc, 68.
- 1962 The Factory Movement, 1830-1855.  
Macmillan, 1962.
- 1966 'West Riding Landowners and the Corn Laws'. EngHis R, 81.
- 1970a 'The Factory Movement'.  
Ch 2 in his
- 1970b ed Popular movements, c.1830-1850.  
Macmillan.
- 1970c ed The Factory System.  
Newton Sbbot, David & C. 2 vols.
- 1974 'Derby and Disraeli'  
In Southgate, 1974:Ch.2.
- WARDLE:D. 1970 English popular education 1780-1970.

- WARREN:B.  
1971 Comment on Murray, 1971.  
New Left R, (68).
- 1972 'Capitalist planning and the State'.  
New Left R, (72).
- WATKIN:B. 1975 ed. Documents on Health and Social Services.  
Methuen.
- WATT:I. 1971 ed. The Victorian novel.  
Oxford U P.
- WEARMOUTH:R.F. 1948 Some working class movements of the  
nineteenth century. Epworth P.
- WEBB:B. 1926 My apprenticeship.  
Penguin, 1971.
- WEBB:R.K.  
1955a 'A Whig Inspector'.  
J Modern His, 27.
- 1955b The British working class reader  
1790-1848: Literacy and social tension.  
Allen & U.
- 1960 Harriet Martineau: a Radical Victorian.  
Heinemann.
- 1968 Modern England: from the eighteenth  
century to the present.  
Allen & U., 1969.
- WEBB:S.  
1890 Reform of the Poor Law.  
Longmans.
- 1910 and B. Webb  
English Poor Law Policy. Longman.
- 1922 and B. Webb.  
Statutory Authorities for special  
purposes: Chs 5 & 6 Repr as The development  
of English local government, 1689-1835.  
Oxford U P, 1963.
- 1929a with B. Webb.  
English Poor Law History, Part II. The  
Last 100 years. Vol.1 Longmans.
- 1929b with B. Webb.  
Idem. Vol. II. Longmans.

WEBER:M.

- 1906 'The protestant sects and the spirit of capitalism'. In his 1948.
- 1914a 'Structures of Power'.  
In his 1948.
- 1914b 'Bureaucracy'.  
In his 1948.
- 1915 'The economic ethics of the world religions'.  
In his 1948 under the wrong title of:  
the 'Social Psychology...'
- 1918a 'Politics as a vocation'  
In his 1948.
- 1918b 'Socialism' [ Lecture to Austrian Army  
Officers ]. In his 1971.
- 1920 Lectures on economic history.  
NY Collier Macmillan, 1961.
- 1920b 'Class, Status and Party'.  
In his 1948.
- 1920c 'The meaning of Discipline' [ Order? ]  
In his 1948.
- 1948 Essays; ed. H.H.Gerth and C.Wright  
Mills. Routledge.
- 1971 Interpretation of social reality;  
ed. Eldridge. Edinburgh, Nelson, 1972.
- WEDDERBURN:D. 1974 ed  
Poverty, inequality and class structure.  
C U P.
- WEEKS:J.
- 1974 'The women's movement'.  
Bull Soc Stud Labour His, (29).
- 1976 'The politics of pluralism'.  
Ibid., (32).
- WEILER:P. 1972 'The New Liberalism of L.T.Hobhouse'.  
Victorian Stud, 16.
- WEINSTEIN:J. 1968 The corporate ideal in the Liberal  
State . Boston, Beacon P.
- WELLS:A.F. 1970 Social institutions. Heinemann.

- WEST:E.G.  
1975a 'Educational slowdown and public intervention in 19th century England'. Explorations in Ec His, 12.
- 1975b Education and the Industrial Revolution. Batsford.
- WESTERGAARD, J.H. 1975 and H.Resler. Classes in a capitalist society. Heinemann.
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW 1833  
Review of Kay, 1832. Westminister R, 18.
- WEYDEMEYER:J. 1852 'The dictatorship of the proletariat'. Repr Labor His, 3, 1962.
- WHITE:R.J. 1957 Waterloo to Peterloo. Penguin, 1968.
- WHITE:S.  
1974 'Soviets in Britain: the Leeds Convention of 1917'. Int Rev Social His, 19.
- 1975 'Ideological hegemony and political control: the sociology of antiBolshevism in Britain, 1918-1920'. Scottish Labour His Soc J, (9).
- WHITLEY:W. 1971 ed Language use and social change. Oxford U.P.
- WIENER:J.M. 1975 'The Barrington Moor thesis and its critics'. Theory & Soc, 2.
- WIENER:M.J. 1971 Between two worlds: the political thought of Graham Wallas. Oxford, Clarendon P.
- WILDMAN:R. 1974 'Workhouse Architecture'. Appendix to Longmate, 1974.
- WILKINSON:R.H. 1963 'The gentleman ideal and the maintenance of a political elite'. Sociol of Educ, 37; Repr In Musgrave, 1970.
- WILLEY:B. 1949 Nineteenth century studies. Penguin, 1964.
- WILLIAMS:G.  
1960 'Gramsci's concept of "Egemonia"'. J His Ideas, 21.
- 1974 'Proletarian forms: Gramsci'. New Edinburgh R, (1) and (2).
- 1974b 'True Born Britons'. In Barker, 1975:Ch.3.

## WILLIAMS:R.

- 1956 'Class and classes'  
Highway, (47).
- 1958 Culture and Society.  
Rev ed. Penguin, 1963.
- 1972 'Social Darwinism'.  
Listener, 23 November.
- 1973 The Country and the City.  
Paladin, 1975.
- 1973b 'Base and superstructure in Marxist  
cultural theory'. New Left R, (82).
- 1974 Drama in a dramatised society.  
Cambridge, U.P, 1975.
- 1975 'Developments in the sociology of culture'.  
(Paper to B.S.A. Conference; Revised in)  
Sociology, 10, 1976.

## WILLIAMS:W.A.

- 1966 The contours of American history.  
N.Y., Watts, 1973.
- 1969 The roots of the modern American  
Empire. N.Y. Vintage.

## WILLIS:P. 1976

'Lads, Lobs and labour'.  
New Society, 20 May.

- WILLS:V. 1972 ed Reports of the annexed estates.  
Edinburgh, H.M.S.O.

## WILLSON:F.M.G.

- 1955 'Ministries and Boards: some aspects of  
administrative development since 1832'.  
Public Administration, 33.
- 1959 'The routes of entry of new members of  
the Cabinet, 1868-1958'. Political Stud, 7.

## WILSHER:P.

- 1974 'The wrongs of the right to strike'.  
Sunday Times, 10 February.
- 1976 'The return of the tax-eaters'.  
Sunday Times, 22 February.

- WILSON:.A. 1974 'The suffrage movement'.  
In Hollis, 1974b.
- WILSON:A. 1976 'Danger, men at work'.  
Guardian, 28 May.
- WILSON:.T. 1966 'The downfall of the Liberal Party, 1914-1935. Fontana, 1967.
- WINCH:D.N.  
1963 'Classical economists and the case for colonization'. Economica; Repr Shaw, 1970:Ch.4.
- 1971 'The emergence of economics as a science, 1750-1870'. In Cipolla, 1973a:Ch.9.
- WINKLER:J.M. 1976 'Corporatism'.  
Archives europeenes de sociologie, 17.
- WINTER:J.M. 1974 Socialism and the challenge of war...  
Routledge.
- WOHL:A.S. 1968 'The Bitter Cry of Outcast London'.  
Int Rev Social His, 13.
- WOLFE: W. 1975 From Radicalism to Socialism: men and ideas in the formation of Fabian socialist doctrines, 1881-1889. Yale U.P.
- WOLFF:K.H. 1960 Essays in sociology of E. Durkheim and others. N.Y. Harper & R, 1964.
- WOLIN:S.  
1974 'From Jamestown to San Clemente'.  
New York Review of Books, 19 September.
- 1974 Letter [ON Durkheim's Socialism Lectures]  
Ibid., 30 October.
- WOMEN'S GROUP ON PUBLIC WELFARE, 1943  
Our towns: a close up...  
Oxford U P , 1943.
- WOOD:A.W. 1972 'The Marxian critique of Justice'.  
Philosophy and public affairs, 1.
- WOODRING: C. 1970 Politics in English Romantic poetry.  
Harvard U.P.
- WOODWARD :.L. 1962 The Age of Reform.  
Oxford, Clarendon P.

- WOOTTON:G. 1975 Pressure groups in Britain, 1720-1790.  
Allen Lane.
- WORSLEY:P. 1956 'Emile Durkheim's theory of knowledge'.  
Sociol Rev, 4.
- WRIGHT:D.G.  
1969 'A Radical Borough: Parliamentary  
politics in Bradford, 1832-1841'.  
Northern His, 4.
- 1970 Democracy and reform, 1815-1885.  
Longmans.
- WRIGHT:E.O. 'To control or smash bureaucracy: Weber  
and Lenin on politics, the State and  
bureaucracy'. Berkeley J of Sociol, (19).
- WRIGHT:M.  
1969a Treasury control of the Civil Service  
1854-1874. Oxford U P.
- 1969b 'Treasury Control, 1854-1914'.  
In Sutherland, 1972b:Ch.8.
- WYSE:T. 1837 'Education in the United Kingdom'.  
Papers C.S.E, 1.
- YAFFE:D.  
1973a 'The Marxian theory of crises, capital  
and the State'. Ec & Soc, 2 .
- 1973b 'The crisis of profitability: critique  
of the Glyn-Sutcliffe thesis'. New Left R,  
(80).
- YANEY:G.L.  
1966 'Bureaucracy or freedom: N.M.Korkunov's  
theory of the State'. Am His R, 71.
- 1974 The systematization of Russian  
government, 1711-1905. U of Illinois P.
- YEO:S. 1974 'On the uses of "apathy"'.  
Archives europeenes de sociologie, 15.
- YOUNG:G. 1867 'The House of Commons in 1833'.  
Essays...1867 Ch.12.
- YOUNG:K. 1963 Arthur James Balfour: the happy life  
of the politician, Prime Minister,  
Statesman and Philosopher...Bell.



- YOUNG:N. 1967 'Prometheans of Troglodytes? The English working class and the dialectics of incorporation. Berkeley J of Sociol,(12).
- YOUNG:R.  
1970 'Malthus and the evolutionists: the common context of biological and social theory 'Past & Present,(43).  
1972 'Darwinism and the division of Labour'. The Listener, 23 November.
- YOUNG:W. 1975 'Black, brown and khaki: the New Commonwealth immigrant and the British Armed forces'. In Enloe, 1975.
- YOUNGSON:A.J. 1973 After the Forty-five.  
Edinburgh U.P.
- 
- ZANGERL:C. 1971 'The social composition of the County Magistracy in England and Wales 1831-1887'. J Br Stud, 11.
- ZOLLSCHAN:G.K. 1964 and W.Hirsch. (eds).  
Explorations in social change.  
Routledge.
-