

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-15,334

SCHAFER, Delbert Frank, 1942-  
YOUNG ENGLAND AND CONSERVATIVE SOCIAL POLICY.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1972  
History, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973

Delbert Frank Schafer

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

YOUNG ENGLAND AND CONSERVATIVE SOCIAL POLICY

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
DELBERT FRANK SCHAFER  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1972

YOUNG ENGLAND AND CONSERVATIVE SOCIAL POLICY

APPROVED BY

William H. Moell, Jr.  
Richard J. Hall  
David J. M. M. M.  
Jonathan W. Spurgeon  
Robert C. Nye

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges his appreciation for the encouragement, guidance, and understanding of Professor William H. Maehl, Jr., who directed this study. The improvements made by the other members of the doctoral committee, Professor Rufus G. Hall, Associate Professor Gordon D. Drummond, Associate Professor Johnathan W. Spurgeon, and Assistant Professor Robert A. Nye, are gratefully acknowledged. The British National Trust for allowing utilization of the Hughenden Papers, the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Cambridge for making available portions of the Houghton Papers, and the British Museum deserve special commendations. My wife, Karen, typed the dissertation and provided inspiration and advice which will always be remembered.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE CONDITIONS OF ENGLAND: ATTITUDES, RESPONSES, AND SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS OF EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY INDUSTRIALIZATION .....	1
II. THE FOUNDATIONS OF YOUNG ENGLAND .....	41
III. YOUNG ENGLAND AND PARLIAMENTARY SOCIAL LEGISLATION, 1841-1846 .....	88
IV. YOUNG ENGLAND'S SOCIAL AND LITERARY RESPONSES TO THE CONDITION OF ENGLAND .....	147
V. DISSOLUTION, IMPACT, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE YOUNG ENGLAND MOVEMENT .....	209
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	248

## CHAPTER I

### THE CONDITIONS OF ENGLAND: ATTITUDES, RESPONSES, AND SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS OF EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY INDUSTRIALIZATION

Vast economic, political, and social alterations transformed England during the first half of the nineteenth century. Industrialization, with its origins in the previous century, began to erode the traditional basis of society, eventually dictating a new conception of life. The problems of these changes first became apparent, on a wide scale, in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The increased application of steam powered machinery not only increased the number of laborers engaged in factory employment but added to the difficulty through the large concentration of people in urban slums. Such momentous changes brought the social and political dominance of an agricultural aristocracy under attack; an attack which they failed to repel.

Faced with novel problems of industrialization, the English people did not know where to turn. No one had established himself as an unshakable social authority. For many, especially those of the rising middle class, materialism offered the best hope. To them it became a creed that the



way to self betterment and comfort came through the attainment of wealth. Yet, this drive for wealth had its critics among the working classes, the aristocracy, the humanitarians, and the churchmen. Wealth increased, but the distribution of income was monumentally unfair to the working classes. Therefore, the need for a social theory calling for the reformation, the explanation, or the rationalization of the new domestic conditions became imperative.

The movement known as Young England arose in the 1840's to provide an answer to the problems besetting society. Inspired by the ideals of humanitarianism, Romanticism, and Tory Radicalism, it attempted to restore an idealized picture of a pre-industrial, medieval society where the aristocrats took their responsibilities seriously. Early Victorian society felt unsure of its direction and purpose; therefore it had left the old hierarchical society intact as a symbol of authority.<sup>1</sup> Young England misread this to mean that the aristocracy still possessed the vitality, energy, and will necessary to provide the nation with paternalistic, benevolent, and moralistic leadership. Actually the age of aristocratic dominance had passed, and the middle class had assumed the initiative in the formation of social values and attitudes. The aristocracy was already a sham and had given up its control of the nation in return for the economic

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 102-06.

benefits of industrialization.<sup>2</sup> Young England, however, made a sincere and honest attempt to reinvigorate the aristocracy.

It is the purpose of this study to determine whether Young England offered a viable policy of social reform. The movement is considered by some as dead end, by others as the precursor of Tory Democracy. Within limits, this paper presents Young England as instrumental to the development of Tory Democracy and a Conservative Party social consciousness. The effect of Young England on the social reforms of the first half of the century is placed in perspective. Political, social, and literary endeavors are investigated to provide information for analysis.

The primary fame of Young England rests with its political activity. It served as a ginger group within the Conservative Party during the Parliament of 1841-1847. It never reached the dimensions of a major insurrection, because despite attracting others, only four politicians provided consistency--Benjamin Disraeli, John Manners, George Smythe, and Alexander Baillie-Cochrane. In this study their promotion of social legislation in Parliament during Young England's political zenith of 1843-1845 is emphasized. Also,

---

<sup>2</sup>Harold Perkin, The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 176-92, 237-52, 262-64. Also see John W. Osborne, The Silent Revolution; the Industrial Revolution in England as a Source of Cultural Change (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970), pp. 125-45, 214-15, for a discussion of the changing social scene. A. P. Thornton, The Habit of Authority (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966), pp. 173-75, provides a glimpse in the desertion of social responsibility by the landholding aristocracy.

the political actions of 1846-1853 are used as a check to see whether Young England enforced a discipline in voting upon social questions during its political zenith. Further, an analysis is provided of Young England's social impact upon its participants, the Conservative Party, politicians, and the public at large during the nineteenth century.

Young England must not be ignored as a literary manifestation. Not only was it inspired by literature, but the leaders sought to further its cause through the production of articles, poems, pamphlets, and novels. Disraeli's trilogy, Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred are well known, but the works of the other leaders have been unduly ignored. Hence, this paper studies the literary production of all four leaders during 1841-1847. The literary response by contemporaries and their significance to the development of social themes in literature are also discussed.

The activities by the leaders of Young England outside the walls of Parliament and the realm of literature during the 1840's are investigated. Participation in humanitarian, religious, and social endeavors is studied to show their interest in social problems. Speeches before various groups concerned with social betterment are studied to provide additional insight into their aspirations and to check the consistency of their social principles as expressed in the House of Commons.

It is fully recognized that the Young England conception of society did not meet with great immediate, tangible

success. Its view of the proper construction of society was anachronistic and too idealistic. Young England failed in the promotion of pragmatic social reforms, for it concentrated more on a religious revival than on the eradication of secular evils. Society refused to accept the pleading of Young England, and eventually forced the leaders from active politics or into accommodation to the political realities of the times. Yet, Young England provided a sentiment and mode of thought, softening the lines between the rich and the poor, which entered and never left the English attitude towards social theory and policy.<sup>3</sup> England benefited by the Young England attempt to reform society.

The interpretation of social, political, and economic conditions provided a considerable problem for all interested persons. Statistical data had not yet assumed the precision and accuracy necessary to the formulation of sound decisions.<sup>4</sup> Knowledgeable, contemporary impressions varied from a complete acceptance and encouragement of the further

---

<sup>3</sup>Percy Ford, Social Theory and Social Practice (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968), pp. 13-40, has delineated four groupings of social responses during this period: Economists, Benthamites, Marxists, and Christian Socialists. In this division, Young England should be placed as a precursor of Christian Socialism.

<sup>4</sup>Phyllis Deane, "Contemporary Estimates of National Income in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," Economic History Review, 2d series, VIII (April, 1956), 339-54, provides an adequate introduction into this problem. Also see G. R. Porter, The Progress of the Nation in its Various Social and Economic Relations from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century (London: John Murray, 1847), for a contemporary analysis.

development of the industrial system to demands that the entire system be remolded to eradicate poverty, overwork, and poor living conditions. The known data did not present a clear course of action; it was too incomplete to provide a total picture of the status of society.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the causes of social problems, their effects, and their solutions received analysis and explanation from numerous directions. In the end, all, including Young England, failed to develop an adequate, comprehensive social theory.

One major concern centered on the well-being of the working classes. Among the most influential of the works on the economic status of the nation appeared in 1814, A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire by Patrick Colquhoun. In his assessment of the income and the classes of society he presented seven divisions. Within these divisions he placed one-third of all families and one-half of all the population in the sixth, or next to bottom, level of society. The existence of poverty among such a considerable part of the population was not, in his opinion, an undesirable state of affairs.<sup>6</sup> He repeated the argument used in his 1806 publication, Treatise on Indigence, that

"poverty is therefore a most necessary and indispensable ingredient in society, without which nations and communities could not exist in a state of civilization. It is the lot of man. It is the source of wealth, since without poverty

---

<sup>5</sup>Ford, Social Theory and Social Practice, pp. 10-13, discusses this lack of data.

<sup>6</sup>(2d. ed.; London: Joseph Mawman, 1815), pp. 102-23.

there could be no labour; there could be no riches, no refinement, no comfort, and no benefit to those who may be possessed of wealth; inasmuch as without a large proportion of poverty, surplus labour could never be rendered productive in procuring either the conveniences or luxuries of life."<sup>7</sup>

Poverty became a virtue, necessary to the continued well-being of the nation. The only fear was poverty becoming indigence.

During the first half of the century a debate raged whether the factory system alleviated or contributed to the distress of the working classes. The varying opinions can be traced in books, newspapers, pamphlets, and government reports. In 1832, C. Turner Thackrah published, The Effects of Arts, Trades and Professions, and of Civic States and Habits of Living, on Health and Longevity. It became almost a bible for the factory reformers. He contended that the conditions in the factories were atrocious, observing that

"I stood in Oxford-row, Manchester, and observed the streams of operatives as they left the mills, at 12 o'clock. . . . Here I saw, or thought I saw, a degenerate race,--human beings stunted, enfeebled, and depraved,--men and women that were not to be aged,--children that were never to be healthy adults. It was a mournful spectacle. . . . independently of moral and domestic vices, the long confinement in mills, the want of rest, and shameful reduction of the intervals for meals, and especially the premature working of children, greatly reduce health and vigour, and account for the wretched appearance of the operatives. . . ."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 110.

<sup>8</sup>pp. 145-46, quoted in John Trevor Ward, The Factory System (2 vols.; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970), II, 29.

Only three years later a diametrically opposing viewpoint in favor of the factories reached print.

"In my recent tour, continued during several months, through the manufacturing districts, I have seen tens of thousands of old, young, and middle-aged of both sexes, many of them too feeble to get their daily bread by any of the former modes of industry, earning abundant food, raiment, and domestic accommodation, without perspiring at a single pore, screened meanwhile from the summer's sun and the winter's frost, in apartments more airy and salubrious than those of the metropolis in which our legislative and fashionable aristocracies assemble. . . . Such is the factory system, replete with prodigies in mechanics and political economy, which promises in its future growth to become the great minister of civilization to the terraqueous globe, enabling this country, as its heart, to diffuse along with its commerce the lifeblood of science and religion to myriads of people still lying 'in the region and shadow of death.'"<sup>9</sup>

With such polarity, making decisions became difficult.

Information provided to the legislature proved only slightly more helpful. Without sufficient information from independent sources, legislators began using committees and commissions to study matters of concern. The result of this, of course, manifested itself in the Blue Books. The amount of information increased; yet it often appeared undigested, verbose, and uncritical. The information was sometimes too biased. For example, in 1832, a Select Committee of the House of Commons, chaired by Michael Sadler, took testimony concerning the factory conditions; then in 1833 a Royal Commission repeated the investigation. The millowners disliked

---

<sup>9</sup>Andrew Ure, The Philosophy of Manufacturers, pp. 7, 19, quoted in Ward, The Factory System, I, 143.

the 1832 report; the factory reformers rejected parts of the 1833 investigation.

Although disagreeing on the extent of the factory problems, there did emerge a feeling that real problems existed. Ever since 1802 the legislature had shown that it would act to protect portions of the factory workers. Yet, it had not been resolved as to what extent the government should act in regulating the factories, or whether the government should enter into the social problems arising as an adjunct of the factory system. In an age marked by the removal of governmental restrictions in the mood of laissez-faire, many felt that the government should not involve itself, except in extreme circumstances, in social problems.

Charity, emanating from the sense of Christian duty, offered a means of solving some of the difficulties. The problem proved too large for private voluntary contributions; however the people of the early nineteenth century were not so sure of this.<sup>10</sup> The political leaders felt that the extension of benevolence could not only assist the poor but also better the relations between the classes. Paternalism carried no obnoxious connotations among the higher order of society.

As governmental leaders, politicians tried to use this charitable principle in awarding governmental grants and

---

<sup>10</sup>An abstract in 1846 showed 1053 registered memorials for charities and donations, Great Britain, Parliament, Sessional Papers (House of Commons), 1846 (716), XXXVI, 87.



loans during periods of acute distress. A list of loans and grants from 1825-1842 from the Treasury Department, Ordinance Department, Coast Guard, and Board of Works for Ireland demonstrates the sporadic quality of central governmental social assistance. The contributions of the most active department, Treasury, came only in the years of 1826, 1831, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1839, and 1842.<sup>11</sup> Apparently, income from the local poor rates were to care for the normal year to year difficulties. The national government provided assistance in specific cases in only particularly severe times of economic dislocation.

Voluntary associations also seemed to offer the means of solving some of the difficulties. Fay in Life and Labour in the Nineteenth Century argues that the voluntary associations existed as a minor, counter trend in the predominance of an age of laissez-faire. These associations were of two basic types: one formed to gain the abolition of some abuse, then disbanded upon the success of its object; the other concerned itself with the economic betterment of the worker, such as the Friendly Societies.<sup>12</sup> The Friendly Societies appeared, especially during the 1820's, to offer a mode of diminishing the poor rate and to inculcate the lower classes

---

<sup>11</sup>Great Britain, Parliament, Sessional Papers (House of Commons), 1842 (577), XXVI, 441-48.

<sup>12</sup>Charles Ryle Fay, Life and Labour in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947), pp. 49-53. Also see P. H. J. Gosden, The Friendly Societies in England, 1815-75 (Manchester: University Press, 1968).

with a lofty moral purpose. The government, though, declined to encourage them. Apparently, the greater accomplishment of these societies was the softening of short run economic difficulties. When a long term distress appeared, they proved unable to carry the burden of mass unemployment.

No segment of society offered a comprehensive program of social reform in the early nineteenth century. Many of the middle class, the manufacturers, and the political economists felt that no social alteration was needed. The Benthamites approved reform which removed abuses but were fearful of erecting unnecessary restrictions. The Benthamites had not yet developed their techniques of investigation and administration of social concerns. The factory commission of 1833 provided their first big opportunity; the administration of the New Poor Law gave them the needed experience. The working classes organized and protested, but they lacked the legislative pressure to gain their aims. The aristocracy had abdicated its social responsibilities, and despite the promptings of humanitarians, clergymen, and Young England, it displayed no great inclination to reassert itself. Nineteenth century English social reform came in piecemeal lots, not as a comprehensive package from any one group.

Social reform received legislative enactment during the first half of the century. The reforms, however, were limited and for factories concentrated in the textile industry. The English people were not heartless; they desired to

remove the worst abuses of industrialization. The upper and middle classes did not blatantly strive to suppress the lower classes. Their object was attaining and securing their own economic, social, and political fortunes, not the destruction of others. Unfortunately, such an aggressive system created gross inequalities and injustices.

The opening of the struggle for the improvement of factory conditions came in 1802. Sir Robert Peel, the father of the later Prime Minister of the same name and a prosperous manufacturer, successfully advocated the passage of a bill to regulate the health and morals of apprentices.<sup>13</sup> The bill, which concerned itself with the general welfare, education, and health of apprentices, proved ineffective and unenforceable. Nevertheless, the right of the state to intervene in industry was firmly established.<sup>14</sup>

In 1815, Peel the elder returned to the factory question with the presentation of a bill to extend the provisions of the earlier act.<sup>15</sup> The motion soon became untenable. In the next session, however, a committee of inquiry was appointed. Peel chaired this investigation, which met from April 25 through June 18, 1816, calling eight medical men and

---

<sup>13</sup>Referred to hereafter as Peel the elder.

<sup>14</sup>Maurice Walton Thomas, The Early Factory Legislation (London: Thames Bank Publishing Co., Ltd., 1948), pp. 8-13, provides a short discussion of this act.

<sup>15</sup>Alfred, [Samuel H. G. Kydd], The History of the Factory Movement (2 vols.; London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1857), I, 37-87, credits Robert Owen as providing the impetus to Peel the elder.

twenty-nine manufacturers to testify. The expressed opinions displayed a wide range of differences; the committee made no recommendation, merely reporting their findings. Hence, no immediate action occurred.

Persistently, Peel the elder presented another factory bill in 1818. This time the House of Commons acquiesced. The House of Lords, however, stymied the move by calling its own committee of inquiry. The legislation, which finally passed in 1819, prohibited the employment in cotton spinning of all children under nine years of age and limited all persons under sixteen years of age to a maximum of twelve hours a day. The aims were laudatory; yet as with the 1802 act, it proved ineffective because of lax enforcement.

The struggle for this bill during 1818 and 1819 set the terms under which the main lines of factory legislation followed throughout the first half of the century. The two major aims were protection of child laborers and shorter working hours. Some members of Parliament displayed concern in 1818 that the regulation of the hours of labor of any person might be an infringement upon the right of free labor.<sup>16</sup> In the end they came to accept the view as expressed by Peel the elder.

He was still an advocate of free labour, and he wished that that principle should not be infringed on. He could not think that little children, who had not a will of their own, could be called free labourers. They were

---

<sup>16</sup>Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1st ser., Vol. 37 (1818), pp. 559-66.

either under the control of a master or a parent. He hoped the House would take these children under their protection.<sup>17</sup>

The house refused to accept the limitation of hours of adult labor, even after receiving petitions from the Manchester cotton spinners requesting a limitation of ten and one-half hours labor a day. The petitioners declared that they were aware that the attainment of the object of the petition must be attended with a reduction of their wages, but anxious for health, and in order to enjoy some of the comforts of life, they were willing to submit to that sacrifice.<sup>18</sup> Public opinion accepted the protection of children, but not that of adult male factory workers.

The difficulties in implementing the legislation and concern for the child laborers prompted new factory bills. In 1825, John Cam Hobhouse unsuccessfully attempted to shorten the daily hours of child labor to eleven. Hobhouse's bill retained twelve hours, but it gained the removal of three hours of labor on Saturdays. The government did not oppose the bill, but members of Parliament, including Sir Robert Peel and William Huskisson, did not react very enthusiastically.<sup>19</sup> Peel's reluctance in this case illustrates his fear of moving too rapidly or too far in the regulation of working conditions.

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 581-82.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 264-65.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., new ser., Vol. 13 (1825), pp. 643-49, 1008-1011.

He had no objection to the hon. member's bringing in his bill: but he entreated the House to pause before it entered too extensively into this field of legislation. . . .the House must take care and not carry this sort of legislation too far. If they made the regulations too severe, the masters might refuse to employ any children.<sup>20</sup>

The plight of the factory laborers did not ignite the Parliamentary leaders with a passionate desire for regulation. In 1829 and 1831, Hobhouse succeeded in securing the passage of legislation aiding the implementation of the 1825 act, but the gains remained modest.

In 1831, a new spirit of factory legislation manifested itself in Parliament. This came with Michael Sadler's notice of his intention to present a bill limiting child labor in mills and factories to ten hours. He desired to expand the scope of factory legislation, optimistically declaring that

he was sure that what he proposed would be found unobjectionable, and not requiring an exception on account of any one trade. He embraced every branch of manufactures in it, because he was sure that the operatives, with their children, now gave up as much of their labour as the human constitution could afford.<sup>21</sup>

Sadler was incorrect; the members of Parliament did object.

Sadler's bill did not receive the assent of Parliament. Instead the House of Commons decided to create a Select Committee to study the problem. This committee, chaired by Sadler, received reports favorable to the factory reformers. Upon the publication of the findings of the investigation,

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 422.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 3d ser., Vol. 9 (1831), p. 256.

the manufacturers clamored for a new study presenting their side of the story.

Members of Parliament were skeptical of the veracity of the information stemming from the Sadler committee. One declared that "since the year 1819 the system pursued at the mills had been entirely altered and improved; they were now airy and commodious; . . ."<sup>22</sup> By a narrow vote of seventy-four to seventy-three Commons decided to call for a Royal Commission to reinvestigate the factory conditions. As a result, the factory bill passed in 1833 did not originate with the factory reformers.

The 1833 act remained unaltered until 1844.<sup>23</sup> Both proponents and opponents, however, attempted to alter its provisions. In 1836, the manufacturers failed in an attempt to prevent the enforcement of a maximum of eight hours of labor for children ages twelve to thirteen. Peel supported the manufacturers.<sup>24</sup> In 1838, the factory reformers failed by a vote of 111 to 119 in moving a new bill. Again Peel, although expressing concern for the situation, declared that "I never took the popular view of the subject. I saw it with other eyes than those who support the ten hours

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., Vol. 17 (1833), p. 79.

<sup>23</sup>See Chapter III, pp. 105-10, for a discussion of this action.

<sup>24</sup>Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. 33 (1836), pp. 782-86.

bill. . ."<sup>25</sup> Lord Ashley chaired a committee study on conditions in mills and factories during the middle of 1840, but no legislative enactment appeared immediately. Finally, in 1844, a new factory act was passed.<sup>26</sup>

Slowly but surely, working class social concerns came under legislative regulation. Humanitarian factory reformers urged that working class pleas for protection be honored.<sup>27</sup> It is evident that the base for factory reform expanded in two directions--the conditions which came to be considered capable of reform or regulation and the number and type of people who came to advocate the necessity for such actions. The limits of the factory acts expanded from the cotton factories to other textile manufacturers and eventually to a broad range of factories. The 1833 act placed education within the scope of social concern. The New Poor Law of 1834, despite its harshness, provided a new way of dealing with problem of pauperism. Mines and collieries came under governmental control in 1842. Problems of sanitation and housing received considerable attention and discussion during the 1840's. Advocates for improved factory

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., Vol. 43 (1838), pp. 974-77.

<sup>26</sup>Refer to Chapter III for information on other factory legislation passed during Peel's ministry. For later legislation see Chapter V.

<sup>27</sup>Raymond G. Cowherd, The Humanitarians and the Ten Hours Movement in England (Boston: Baker Library, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, /1956/), provides an informative, but not toally convincing, argument as to the importance of the role of the humanitarians.



conditions increased as evidenced by the success of the ten hours movement in 1847. The governmental bureaucracy, which became the vital cog in the initiation of much legislation, began to take effect. Members of both political parties undertook the creation of necessary enactments for the preservation and betterment of society.

This broadening of legislation and support did not come easily. During the early decades of the century, opinions on the necessity of reform offered little common ground. Even the proposals for reforms showed a wide diversity. No one single group, including Young England, came to possess an adequate social philosophy. Yet, this groping for solutions is an essential part of the erection of a public social conscience.

A brief presentation of some of the mainstreams of social criticism during these decades illustrates the increased concern. Despite individual differences, it is possible to discern certain attitudes toward the condition of England. The middle class, factory owners, the political economists, and utilitarians shared the assumption that the working classes should help themselves without the intervention of the state. The aristocracy, marked mainly by disinterest, included some individuals who felt that the workers needed help from outside in remedying the ill effects of the social alterations. The working classes felt incapable of solving their own problems without outside assistance.

Doubtless, the predominant view of society in the early years of the century emanated from the classical political economists. Their views, however, had no single all inclusive solution to prevailing social problems. They began with a basic laissez-faire attitude, then tempered it with individual tests of utility as regards the intervention of the state in concerns of social welfare. Therefore, they often served as a deterrent not a propellent for social amelioration.

The classical political economists, or laissez-faire school, argued against state interference on three counts: first, that on the principle of "liberty" already noted [the right to hold property] it was philosophically wrong; second, that it was unnecessary, since Divine Providence--"the invisible hand," as Adam Smith, greatest of the British classical economists, put it--would ensure that if each individual pursued his own economic interests, the end product would best serve the interests of the community as a whole; and, third, that it was inexpedient, since, so the classical school believed, scientific evidence could be presented showing the harmfulness of State interference and the salutary effect of economic freedom.<sup>28</sup>

This assessment illustrates the popular view of the classical economists, yet they never exhibited unanimity, nor did any individual long remain an adherent of the three expressed principles.

It has become increasingly clear that the depiction of the economists as strict advocates of laissez-faire is inadequate, if not altogether incorrect. Apparently, a sense

---

<sup>28</sup>Arthur Marwick, Britain in the Century of Total War: War, Peace and Social Change, 1900-1967 (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. 27.

of laissez-faire developed concurrently with the idea of state intervention. This development, stemming from the foundations set by Jeremy Bentham, should not appear startling. The doctrine of utility never called for the removal of all legislative interference for the common public welfare. In fact, one scholar has argued that "Jeremy Bentham was the archetype of British collectivism."<sup>29</sup> During the trying decades of the early nineteenth century the economists began to advocate the need for state intervention.

Evidently the economists, along with the general public, the politicians, the manufacturers, and the aristocracy altered their opinion from a rejection to an acceptance of essential social legislation. The exact role of the economists, in relation to the factory acts, has been an almost undeterminable factor. After an investigation of such economists as Robert Torrens, George Poulett Scrope, James Ramsay McCulloch, Nassau Senior, and William Thornton an analyst concluded that, although they hindered the ten hours movement, they did not offer any fundamental theory of opposition to the factory acts.<sup>30</sup> Another author noted this divergence from laissez-faire through a study of the economic theories of Torrens, McCulloch, and Senior in regards

---

<sup>29</sup>J. B. Brebner, "Laissez Faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth-Century Britain," The Journal of Economic History, VIII, Supplement (1948), 61.

<sup>30</sup>Mark Blaug, "The Classical Economists and the Factory Acts--a Re-Examination," Quarterly Journal of Economics, LXXII (May, 1958), 211-26.

to the factory acts.<sup>31</sup> They were not consistent, dedicated opponents of factory legislation.

Of all the economists, Nassau Senior has most often received undeserved approbation for his callous attitude toward the factory workers. His 1837 publication, Letters on the Factory Act, served as an inspiration to those who opposed the further shortening of the hours of labor during the 1840's. Yet, he did not oppose all factory legislation. He rejected only the control of the government over adult laborers and the further shortening of the hours of labor. Senior's thoughts on social reform did not end, however, with 1837. Eventually, he became an advocate of certain governmental regulations, including the shortening of factory hours.<sup>32</sup> Senior later declared, "it is the duty of a government to do whatever is conducive to the welfare of the governed."<sup>33</sup>

Many of the factory owners were too immersed in

---

<sup>31</sup>L. R. Sorenson, "Some Classical Economists, Laissez-Faire, and the Factory Acts," The Journal of Economic History, XII (Summer, 1952), 247-62. Also see K. O. Walker, "The Classical Economists and the Factory Acts," The Journal of Economic History, I (November, 1941), 168-77, for a discussion of views up to 1833.

<sup>32</sup>Marian Bowley, Nassau Senior and Classical Economics (New York: A. M. Kelley, 1949), pp. 237-52, 272-77, discusses Senior's changing views on social reforms. Nassau Senior, Industrial Efficiency and Social Economy, arranged and edited by S. Leon Levy (2 vols.; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1928), II, 285, 293, 303-54, provides statements by Senior on his changing social attitudes.

<sup>33</sup>Senior, Industrial Efficiency and Social Economy, II, 302.

economic materialism to see the advantages of social reforms. They worried that Thomas Malthus' dire predictions of a population explosion would come true if they provided easier existence for the workers. The proper course, as dictated by the utilitarians, was to act in their own best interests. Factory owners and other wealthy citizens hoped that the future disaster could be avoided; postponed; or, at least, the effects mitigated on themselves and their families. Vernon Royle, a cotton manufacturer from Manchester, in 1833, expressed a social philosophy for the factory owner.

We contend that the man of property, the Capitalist, who devotes all his time, who applies all his energies to increase his wealth, by building mills and factories, as to employing the poor, is the greatest benefactor the poor man can have. . .<sup>34</sup>

Hence, the duty of the wealthy was to become more wealthy thereby performing the greatest social good for the lower classes. What an expedient social philosophy and theory of action this provided.

Many of the working classes and contemporary observers advocated a more direct social policy. Workers, especially in times of economic distress, clamored for an amelioration of their pathetic plight. They sought assistance from trade unions, cooperative societies, Friendly Societies, Chartism, city governments, Parliament, political leaders, and

---

<sup>34</sup>The Factory System defended (Manchester, 1833), quoted in Ward, The Factory System, II, 142.

humanitarians. The workers deserve partial credit for their own improvement. Favorable legislation came after periods of working class agitation or at low points in the fluctuations of the economy.<sup>35</sup> The workers, however, always had difficulty maintaining agitation and effecting legislation since they lacked a consistent voice in politics.

Chartism demonstrated the attitudes and problems of working class movements in gaining social betterment. The Chartist, animated by the social evils, disliked the political alternatives. The middle class factory owners appeared as a major adversary. Yet, the landed aristocracy had done nothing to win their confidence.<sup>36</sup> Both refused to accept the Chartist program. It did, however, convince many to begin work on the problems with methods at their disposal.<sup>37</sup>

Chartist leaders formulated their own views of how best to assist the social improvement of the workers. Of course, the primary aim remained the gaining of the aims of the People's Charter. Some, such as William Lovett, James

---

<sup>35</sup>Blaug, "The Classical Economists and the Factory Acts--a Re-Examination," p. 225. Also see J. M. Ludlow and Lloyd Jones, Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867 (London: Alexander Strahan, 1867), and A. F. Young and E. T. Ashton, British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956), pp. 23-24, for assessments of working class activities.

<sup>36</sup>Northern Star, January 1, 1845.

<sup>37</sup>F. C. Mather, "The Government and the Chartists," in Chartist Studies, edited by Asa Briggs (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1960), pp. 372-405. Also see Maurice Bruce, The Coming of the Welfare State (London: B. T. Batsford, 1961), pp. 67-68.

Bronterre O'Brien, and Ernest Jones, emphasized the need of educating the working classes.<sup>38</sup> Feargus O'Connor expressed the dislike, shared by many of the workers, of the growing industrialization of the nation by proposing a plan of allotting plots of land to subscribers. His scheme met with no great success, but it demonstrated that many workers shared with the landed aristocracy an uneasiness about the society evolving around the factory system of production.<sup>39</sup> Young England did not see fit to support the Chartist land plan, but they approved of the promotion of allotments to the poor.

The problems of the workers elicited a response from those outside the mainstream of governmental power. Humanitarians offered aid to the workers in the struggle to better social and working conditions.<sup>40</sup> The humanitarians were not confined to one political party. A number, however, such as Richard Oastler; John Fielden; Lord Ashley, Anthony Ashley Cooper; and John Manners may be found within the Tory party. Robert Owen was not a Tory; nevertheless many of his ideas, such as the development of spade cultivation, accorded with

---

<sup>38</sup>Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1960), pp. 258-76.

<sup>39</sup>Joy MacAskill, "The Chartist Land Plan," in Chartist Studies, pp. 304-41, discusses O'Connor's land scheme. Also see Northern Star, January 1, 1845. See Chapters III and IV for discussion of the land allotment scheme supported by Young England.

<sup>40</sup>Cowherd, The Humanitarians and the Ten Hours Movement in England.

them.<sup>41</sup> While the Tories often feared the workers, some of them came close to answering the radical call for an inclusive, not a piecemeal social solution.

There is wanted, not a mere governmental or particular remedy, but a general remedy--one which will apply to all social wrongs and evils, great and small. The productive classes want a remedy for their incessant toil--they want a remedy for their compulsive idleness--they want a remedy for their poverty--they want a remedy for the misery, and ignorance, and vice which such toil, such idleness, and such poverty produce.<sup>42</sup>

These Tories, out of a strong sense of humanitarian paternalism rejected John Francis Bray's assertion that "THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS OF SOCIETY MUST BE TOTALLY SUBVERTED."<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, they felt uncomfortable with the industrial society and sought to return to a more peaceful agricultural age when all classes lived in harmony. The age of such peace and harmony had probably never existed, but it provided the Tories with a conception of an ideal society.

During the struggle for the improvement of factory conditions in the early decades of the century there surfaced

<sup>41</sup>Robert Owen, "An Address to the Working Classes," March 29, 1819 in A New View of Society and Other Writings, introduction by G. D. H. Cole (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1949), p. 149, asserts to the workers that the upper classes are concerned with their problems; also see in the same volume his "Report to the County of Lanark," May 1, 1820, pp. 253-61, for his advocacy of spade cultivation.

<sup>42</sup>John Francis Bray, Labour's Wrongs and Labour's Remedy; or the Age of Might and the Age of Right (Leeds: David Green, 1839 reprinted New York: A. M. Kelley, 1968), p. 8.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 17.



what has been labeled Tory Radicalism.

The remnant which vainly struggled against the intruding flood of new ideas was both Tory and Radical: Tory, because it saw danger in the dissolution of the ancient ties which, for good or for evil, had formerly bound English society together, Radical, because it sought to obliterate the very changes by removing their cause.<sup>44</sup>

This group found themselves outside the major development of Conservatism in the post 1832 reform bill era, which was being led by Peel to accept middle class, industrial values. The Tory Radicals failed to establish their social program in the newly founded Conservative Party, but literature provided them a ready avenue of expression. The political culmination of this literary production came with Young England.

Conservatism possessed diverse views of society. One group of the Tories drifted with the current and discretely accepted the industrial changes. Another group maintained a reactionary philosophy seeking relief in the attacks on the industrial system, but they refused to do anything active to alter society. This second group, with all their shortcomings, had to be influenced by the Tory Radicals to eventually reassert themselves with the full force of responsible, paternalistic, chivalric feudalism. The attempt was made; Young England tried to organize a political union capable of guiding society. In the end, the task proved impossible.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge must rank high among those who

---

<sup>44</sup>Richard Leslie Hill, Toryism and the People, 1832-1846 (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1929), p. 164.

sought to reinvigorate the aristocrats with their responsibilities. Coleridge fervently resisted the industrialization of England. He feared the rapid changes contributed to the destruction of the balanced constitution which had preserved the nation for so long. Cognizant of the attacks on the landed aristocracy, he realized that many of the complaints were justified. He knew that the aristocrats had become corrupted by the manufacturing and commercial interests of the realm.

When shall we return to a sound conception of the right to property--namely, as being official, implying and demanding the performance of commensurate duties! Nothing but the most horrible perversion of humanity and moral justice, under the specious name of political economy, could have blinded men to this truth as to the possession of land--the law of God having connected indissolubly the cultivation of every rood of earth with the maintenance and watchful labour of man. But money, stock, riches by credit, transferable and convertible at will, are under no such obligations; and, unhappily, it is from the selfish, autocratic possession of such property, that our land-owners have learnt their present theory of trading with that which was never meant to be an object of commerce.<sup>45</sup>

Coleridge asserted that the country had taken a wrong turn, ignoring the welfare of the public, all in the over-riding interest of the acquisition of immense wealth.

Our manufacturers must consent to regulations: our gentry must concern themselves in the education as well as in the instruction of their natural clients and dependents, must regard

---

<sup>45</sup>Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Table Talk, March 31, 1833, in The Political Thoughts of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, edited, selected, and introduced by R. J. White (London: J. Cape, 1938), pp. 163-64.

their estates as secured indeed from all human interference by every principle of law and policy; but yet as offices of trust, with duties to be performed in the sight of God and their country. Let us become a better people, and the reform of all the public (real or supposed) grievances which we use as pegs whereon to hang our own errors and defects, will follow of itself. In short, let every man measure his efforts by his power and his sphere of action, and do all he can do. Let him contribute money where he cannot act personally; but let him act personally and in detail wherever it is practicable. Let us palliate where we cannot cure, comfort where we cannot relieve: and for the rest rely upon the promise of the King of Kings by the mouth of his prophet: Blessed are ye that sow beside all waters.<sup>46</sup>

The sentiment is commendable; unfortunately it was ignored by all except a few.

Robert Southey's view of the social conditions also exerted a profound influence upon the development of Tory Radicalism. He held a deep concern for the social problems of his day. Southey contended that the separation of the rich and poor was the portent of a future social upheaval. In his estimation the moral, economic, and social position of the workers had deteriorated.

"They are worse fed than when they were hunters, fishers, and herdsmen; their clothing and habitations are little better, and, in comparison with those of the higher classes, immeasurably worse. Except in the immediate vicinity of the collieries, they suffer more cold than when the woods and turbaries were open. They are less religious than in the days of the Romish faith; and if we consider them in relation to their immediate superiors, we shall find reason to confess that the independence which has been gained since the total decay of the feudal

---

<sup>46</sup>Coleridge, 2nd Lay Sermon, in The Political Thoughts of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, p. 209.

system, has been dearly purchased by the loss of kindly feelings and ennobling attachments. They are less contented, and in no respect more happy."<sup>47</sup>

Young England concurred whole-heartedly with these ideas.

Southey did not end with a critique of society. He also proposed ameliorations. He realized the importance of a comprehensive scheme for

"there can be no health, no soundness in the state, till Government shall regard the moral improvement of the people as its first great duty. The same remedy is required for the rich and the poor. Religion ought to be blended with the whole course of instruction. . . . We are in a great degree, what our institutions make us."<sup>48</sup>

On a more practical basis he called for public works, a system of national education directed by the Anglican church, saving banks for the poor, the regulation of the hours of child labor, the prohibition of boys being hired as chimney sweeps, the abolition of game laws, and imperial expansion to drain off any excess population.<sup>49</sup> Many of these proposals became the stock and trade of the Tory Radicals.

The conservative journals provided a platform for those who sympathized with Tory Radicalism. The Quarterly Review and Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine printed articles

<sup>47</sup>Robert Southey, Coloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society (1829), I, 60, quoted in R. W. Harris, Romanticism and the Social Order, 1780-1830 (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969), p. 273.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 281.

<sup>49</sup>Harris, Romanticism and the Social Order, 1780-1830, pp. 263-74.

which promoted the sentiments, convictions, and activities of these Tories. In 1829, the plea was issued that

as Tories, we maintain that it is the duty of the people to pay obedience to those set in authority over them: but it is also the duty of those in authority to protect the people who are placed below them. They are not to sit in stately grandeur, and see the people perish, nor, indeed, are they ever to forget that they hold their power and possessions upon the understanding that they administer both more for the good of the people at large, than the people would do, if they had the administration of both themselves.<sup>50</sup>

Somehow, the aristocrats had to be convinced to reassume their leadership of the nation.

Journal articles also substantiated the dire predictions of the adverse effects of industrialization by printing assessments of the factory system and the conditions of the working classes. In January 1830, the distressful condition of the workers provided the substance of an article calling for the imposition of a direct tax on manufactured goods and the establishment of garden allotments for the use of the poor. The author contended that those in poverty who desired to make a living had to be given every opportunity to do so.

Now the business of Parliament is, to consider how the resources of the country may best be made available for the people's support, for that the people have a right to such application of the country's resources, we hold to be equally agreeable to reason, and to the spirit of the British Constitution. The means of obtaining subsistence in a country, where

---

<sup>50</sup>J. William Johnstone, "Our Domestic Policy," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXVI (November, 1829), 768.

subsistence can be obtained, if the means were granted, is obviously the very first and most important part of that protection which Blackstone uniformly teaches to be the "right of the people." Allegiance and protection are, he says, reciprocally the rights, as well as the duties of the magistrate and the people. "Allegiance is the right of the magistrate, and protection the right of the people."<sup>51</sup>

It appeared imperative that the aristocracy protect the poor.

Three years later, according to another analyst, the imperative still existed. Considerable controversy had arisen from Sadler's attempt to secure a factory bill limiting the hours of labor. Legislation was not presented as a panacea; yet it appeared a worthy aim to assist the laborers by removing excessive toil for "they are yet human; they feel, though you treat them as such, that they are neither machines nor brutes."<sup>52</sup> Major alterations were needed.

We denounce the /factory/ system itself, as it now works; and we call down blessings on the heads of all men who are striving to reform it. Some of "the modes in which legislation can weaken the tendency of such evils to increase" have been shewn; /sic/ and though the regulations it may enact will leave many evils to be bewailed, some--much--nay, great diminution of them may before very long be effected;--enough to justify still better and brighter hopes of the distant future.<sup>53</sup>

In 1834, Blackwood's provided information and analysis of the "progress of social disorganization." In the first of the series, the promulgation of education without the

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., XXVII (January, 1830), 94.

<sup>52</sup>John Wilson, "The Factory System," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXXIII (April, 1833), 450.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 445.

guidance of religion was portrayed as a primary cause of the deteriorating morality of the working classes. It was alleged that only religion could provide the proper education and guidance for man.

By the aid of national schools, and Mechanics' Reading-rooms; of Labourers' Institutes, and scientific lectures, of Penny Magazines, and laboured informations, the people have been generally and fatally withdrawn from the only species of knowledge which can be universally useful--the study of their moral and religious duties.<sup>54</sup>

In this view, education had worsened, not bettered, the conditions of the working classes.

The author in the next month returned to the topic, expressing "that the true friends of the working classes are the Conservatives."<sup>55</sup> The impetus for this article was a growing apprehension of the trade unions. The author noted a tendency for the Tories and the workers to unite. Rejecting Whig attacks, he argued that "the real interests of the Conservative Party, and of the working-classes, both agricultural and manufacturing, are, and ever must be, the same."<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, the essence of this unity would not herald a new age of revolution.

But let us not be misunderstood; it is by constitutional means, and constitutional means alone, that the battle must be fought; the

---

<sup>54</sup>Archibald Alison, "Progress of Social Disorganization," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXXV (February, 1834), 244.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., (March, 1834), 332.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., 339-40.

Conservatives never can, and never will, become Radicals; the Operatives must become Conservatives.<sup>57</sup>

If the conservatives could have seized the initiative, a joining of the upper and lower classes could have occurred.

An article, in 1837, indicated that this alliance had not come to fruition. The author argued for a plan to render the 1833 factory act more acceptable to the workers by assuring them that no system would be used that condemned the adult laborers to overly long hours of labor. While recounting the long conservative interest in factory reforms, the idea that such measures were prompted by the desire to improve the fortunes of party was rejected.

The Conservatives as a party were divided in sentiment upon the infant factory question, not certainly as to the principle, but the measure of its application. Upon the Ten Hours' Bill. . .they are still more divided, and that individuals /including the author/ among them of unquestionable philanthropy, whose character and station would lend authority to any cause, entertain opinions the most opposite respecting it.<sup>58</sup>

Tories never reached a single line of action towards social problems.

In 1836, an interesting account of the factory conditions by Lord Ashley, Anthony Ashley Cooper, appeared in the Quarterly Review. He did not provide much new original information but reported on the findings of some nine

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 352.

<sup>58</sup>Alfred Mallalieu, "The Ministry and the People, the Workhouse System, the Factory System, and the Ten Hours' Bill," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XLI (June, 1837), 840.



different studies of the factory conditions. Through this method the baneful conditions of the factories were presented, and the need for reform promoted. A plea was issued to legislators to undertake the limitation of child labor to ten hours a day. On a higher plane an appeal was made to Christians to improve their methods of providing the workers with the means of bettering their morals and knowledge of religion.<sup>59</sup>

To Tory Radicals the advent and increase of the factory system appeared directly connected with the decrease of public morality. Religion gave signs of losing its influence on the people. The Anglican church found itself under severe attack. The Tories sought to protect religion by expressing the importance of its ultimate object and its function as a stabilizing institution. They stimulated the church to take an active part in saving society from growing secularism. In turn, the organized churches expressed their concern with the decay of society.

Religion experienced difficulty in establishing programs of social reform. Religious leaders often lacked any understanding of the practical social evils afflicting the parishioners. Theological concern for other-worldly affairs led churchmen away from the formulation of an active policy of social amelioration. The church did not turn its

---

<sup>59</sup>Lord Ashley, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 7th Earl Shaftesbury, "The Factory System," Quarterly Review, LVII (December, 1836), 396-443.

attention to the worldly problems of society until after the theologians had failed to convince society of the pre-eminence of heavenly concerns. The Anglican church was especially hesitant to undertake any action which harmed its position as the established church. In general, the hierarchies of organized religions ignored social problems.<sup>60</sup>

Humanitarian, romantic Tory Radicals felt religion needed to play a fundamental role in the improvement of society. Coleridge's 1830 publication, Constitution of Church and State, inspired considerable thought. Coleridge's influence may be traced to William Ewart Gladstone (he published The State in its Relations with the Church in 1838). His ideas also affected the Oxford Movement and through it Young England.<sup>61</sup> Other Tories, such as Lord Ashley, from an Evangelical background, shared the ideal of the reinvigoration of religion in molding the lives of the citizens of the nation.

Yet, the move never proceeded far. Sectarian rivalry, jealousy of the privileged status of the Anglican church, and the constant inclination to forego mortal concerns for theology meant that the impetus was dissipated without

---

<sup>60</sup>For information on the activities of the organized churches towards social problems see Young and Ashton, British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century, pp. 28-42, 81-91, 162-71, and Kenneth Stanley Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, [1963/]).

<sup>61</sup>John Morley, The Life of William Ewart Gladstone, (3 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1903), I, 163-83. Young England, January 18, 1845.

creating a course of effective social action. Some, however, unconsciously tried to follow a plan enunciated by Robert Owen.

For the first grand step towards effecting any substantial improvement in these realms, without injury to any part of the community, is to make it the clear and decided interest of the Church to co-operate cordially in all the projected ameliorations. Once found a National Church on the true, unlimited, and genuine principles of mental charity, and all the members of the State will soon improve in every truly valuable quality. . . .It will therefore prove true political wisdom to anticipate and guide these feelings.<sup>62</sup>

The most serious attempt to implement these aims politically came with Young England.<sup>63</sup>

It is apparent that numerous factors contributed to the formation of a group of humanitarian, paternalistic, romantic, and idealistic Tories who felt radical alterations were needed in society. They agreed that the factory system was too harsh. Bewildered, they felt society was moving on an uncharted course. Hence, they set out to preserve the institutions which they felt had made England great. One

---

<sup>62</sup>Owen, A New View of Society and Other Writings, pp. 79-80.

<sup>63</sup>A different view of the proper role of religious social policy came from Thomas Chalmers of Scotland; for this see Robert H. Murray, Studies in the Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century (2 vols.; Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1929), I, 277-94; Karl de Schweinitz, England's Road to Social Security, 1349-1947 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947), pp. 100-13; Harold J. Laski, Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), pp. 27-68; H. W. C. Davis, The Age of Grey and Peel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), pp. 152-54.

of the foremost of the Tory Radicals, Richard Oastler, in 1832, had issued a call:

Now Tories, what say you? Will you go back? You cannot. 'Stand still?' Impossible. Will you join the Whigs against the people? If so, you are a set of unprincipled knaves, and deserve to meet with the first reward of roguery. Will you go forward, then, hand in hand with 'the people' and thus save the nation from anarchy and blood--thus secure the rights of the nobles by giving comfort, peace, and contentment to the cottage? If you follow this plan, every patriot will join you, I care not whether he be Tory, Whig, or Radical, every man who loves his country will be on your side.<sup>64</sup>

In the 1830's and 1840's a number of Tories tried to act on these principles.

Economic hard times stimulated those who disapproved of the industrialization of the nation to become more politically active. Many workers were discontented, as the turn to Chartism demonstrated. The middle class even evidenced some qualms. The conservatives tried to ignore the problems, accepted the moves undertaken by Peel's government, or advocated the Tory Radical program of reviving society. Young England fits into the last category.

Social tension permeated the 1840's. The distress of 1837-1842 created demands for alterations, which only the return of better times answered.<sup>65</sup> A recent analysis has

---

<sup>64</sup>Cecil Driver, Tory Radical: the Life of Richard Oastler (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 204, prints this material. See pp. 424-37 for a discussion of Oastler's social philosophy.

<sup>65</sup>The Annual Register; or a View of the History and Politics of the Year (London: J. G. F. Rivington, 1843-1846), LXXXIV (1842), 1-3; LXXXV (1843), 1-2; LXXXVI (1844),

correctly assessed the situation as one where the economy, not the social conditions improved, but this recovery took away the urgency of social reformation.<sup>66</sup> Not a completely accurate, but certainly one of the most famous contemporary views of England was published by Friedrich Engels in 1844. In his view England was headed for a violent social revolution within the next few years.<sup>67</sup> The reviving economy prevented the class conflict from occurring. The new industrial attitudes suffered some upsets in the 1840's, but with slight modifications in favor of limited factory regulations, the return of good times assured their dominance.<sup>68</sup>

The Tory attempt to reassert a feudalistic philosophy of society failed. The age of aristocratic dominance had passed and this last fling only confirmed its anachronism. The aristocrats never seized the initiative as urged by Tory Radicalism and Young England. The middle class continued to

---

1-2; LXXXVII (1845), 1-2. Also see G. S. R. Kitson Clark, "Hunger and Politics in 1842," Journal of Modern History, XXV (December, 1953), 355-74.

<sup>66</sup>M. A. Fitzsimons, "Britain in the 1840's: Reflections in Relevance," Review of Politics, XXXI (October, 1969), 521.

<sup>67</sup>Friedrich Engels, The Condition of the Working Class in England, translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 332-36.

<sup>68</sup>Illustrations of this continued faith may be found in Thomas Spring-Rice, "Distress of the Manufacturing Districts--Causes and Remedies," Edinburgh Review, LXXVII (February, 1843), 190-227; George Cornwall Lewis, "Legislation for the Working Classes," Edinburgh Review, LXXXIII (January, 1846), 64-99; W. R. Greg, "Unsound Social Philosophy," Edinburgh Review, XC (October, 1849), 496-524.

mount attacks upon the deleterious social effect of the aristocrats.

The Duke of Buckingham, and those of the same politics, do not, it is true, stop and pillage the merchant by the road-side, as their feudal ancestors are accused of having done; but a course of legislation which interferes with the power of selling and interchanging commodities, has precisely the same result.<sup>69</sup>

To the middle class, the Corn Laws seemed to confirm the validity of this indictment. Its repeal appeared as a panacea to many.

The seeds of a growing social consciousness had been planted during the trying years of the 1830's and 1840's. This concern had two sources: the development of a governmental bureaucracy and the promptings of the Tory Radicals.

Thus, halfway through the century the well-meaning delusions, by which laissez faire had allowed a nation of helpless slaves to come into being in the sacred name of freedom, was finally abandoned; and the State, prodded and adjured by a handful of individuals speaking for the nation, had at last, acting for the nation, accepted the responsibility for the well-being of its members. An enormous amount of work remained to be done, but the main battle was fought and won by the end of the 'Hungry Forties'.<sup>70</sup>

The statement is slightly exaggerated, but it does correctly present the direction of development.

Young England, a movement of Tory Radical social reform, deserves to have its role in this process better

---

<sup>69</sup>Spring-Rice, "Distress of the Manufacturing Districts--Causes and Remedies," p. 199.

<sup>70</sup>R. J. Evans, The Victorian Age, 1815-1914 (2d ed.; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), p. 74.

delineated. True, its schemes failed and deserve criticism for impracticability. Yet, its concern showed a breadth, a desire to make fundamental alterations, which in the end must undergird any social program. That the movement failed in this formulation is not surprising, all other efforts at this time also failed.

Young England furthered the development of British social thought. The individual members participated in political, social, and literary endeavors in the hope of furthering its cause. Parliamentary speeches as well as poems, novels, and pamphlets furnished information, criticism, and analysis to the English public about the status of society. The anticipated heyday, however, never came. Even Peel's Conservative Party of the 1840's, under the guidance of Sir James Graham in social matters, refused to accept its ideal. Nevertheless, Young England created an important legacy, which the present day Conservative Party proudly claims. Its impact on the development of social attitudes has yet to end.

## CHAPTER II

### THE FOUNDATIONS OF YOUNG ENGLAND

Young England originated from the idealistic spirit of nineteenth century English Tory Romanticism. Its social philosophy developed outside and counter to the major direction of contemporary English thought--utilitarianism. Young England, therefore, as a minor movement, had only meager immediate practical results. Politically, it could have never been otherwise. Yet, Young England, too often regarded as a dead-end movement, profoundly affected the attitude of society. The problem is to determine the intent, direction, need, and success of their proposed alterations. This assessment necessitates the use of some vague and difficult to assess sources and channels of information.

Young England, openly critical of contemporary society, pleaded for a new direction and reorganization of the patterns of life. Employing medieval England as its visionary guide, it embarked upon an adventure to restore the bliss of Merrie England. Any change in the life style of a people is a most difficult task. On the surface, Young England appears to have failed, for society did not restore feudalism.

The Young England attitude towards life never became



the dominant theme of nineteenth century English Romanticism or Conservatism. It would be absurd, therefore, to consider the ideals of Young England as capturing exclusive control of the public mind. It must be acknowledged though that English Romanticism did shape individuals and institutions which in turn initiated, supported, or at least, accepted significant social reforms. Young England played a role in the formation of public opinion by providing evidence to even the most stalwart opponents of social reform of the essential need for social betterment. Young England served as a positive force in the restructuring of English society to meet the stresses of industrialization.

The beginning of Young England sentiment predated its famous Parliamentary activity of 1841-1846.<sup>1</sup> The friendship between Lord John Manners, later the seventh Duke of Rutland, and George Smythe, later the seventh Viscount Strangford, foreshadowed the future formation of Young England. Manners and Smythe knew each other while schoolmates at Eton and Cambridge. Both exhibited early interest in the romantic study of medieval England. At Cambridge a circle of like-minded students quickly formed around Manners and Smythe which included Alexander James Beresford Hope and Augustus Stafford O'Brien. Even at this early stage they planned

---

<sup>1</sup>The exact derivation of the term Young England is unknown. Disraeli in a speech of 1844 asserted that it had been given in derision, Young England Addresses. . . (London: Hayward and Adam, 1845), pp. 43-44. See Chapter I for a discussion of Tory Radicalism.

future political activity.<sup>2</sup>

No specific, formal program provided the unity of this Cambridge group. Instead, a feeling and sentiment that the ideals of the Middle Ages offered solutions to the problems of nineteenth century England bound them together. They held a stronger respect for the romanticized past than for their own times. They endeavored to revive the past, employing it as a vanguard for effecting a reformation of the existing social structure of the nation. Romanticism, especially the High Church ideals of the Oxford Movement, provided a major stimulant to their thoughts.<sup>3</sup> Cochrane, much later in life, expressed the importance of the romantic impact upon this group of young aristocrats.

What Ruskin calls "the two essential instincts of humanity, the love of order and the love of kindness," in their relations to the people were the first principle of the Young England party. Radicals proposed to console the suffering by votes and speeches; the Philosophic School gave them tracts and essays. Young England desired to lighten their servitude and to add to their

---

<sup>2</sup>John Trevor Ward, "Young England," History Today, XVI (February, 1966), 120-27. Amy Cruse, The Victorians and Their Books (London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962), pp. 30, 140-41. Hereinafter referred to as Victorians.

<sup>3</sup>Richard Allan Levine, "Disraeli and the Middle Ages: the Influence of Medievalism in the Nineteenth Century" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Language and Literature, Indiana University, 1961), provides an overview of the impact and effect of Romanticism in England. Francis Hitchman, The Public Life of the Right Honourable Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vols.; London: Chapman & Hall, 1879), I, 127-28. Richard Leslie Hill, Toryism and the People, 1832-46 (London: Constable & Co., 1929), pp. 16-17. Also see Chapter I, pp. for role of literature in Tory Radicalism.

enjoyments--in fact, to restore "Merrie England."<sup>4</sup> To gain this objective it appeared imperative to restore the proper attitude of noblesse oblige among the aristocracy of the nation. Through the recreation of the powers of the Church, Crown, and aristocracy the social decay of England would be halted.

Literature provided the major source for their ideas. The compilation of a reading list of the individual members would be impossible. Nevertheless, it is plain that they read and were deeply touched by the romantic literature of their day. Cochrane felt the atmosphere in the early days of association to be Byronic.<sup>5</sup> It has been indicated that they read, among others, the Tracts for the Times; John Henry Newman's sermons; Thomas Carlyle's Past and Present; Bishop Richard Hurd's Letters of Chivalry and Romance; Henry St. John, first Viscount Bolingbroke's, On the Spirit of Patriotism and The Idea of a Patriot King. They were also receptive to the ideals as demonstrated and espoused by Sir Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon; Edmund Burke; William Pitt the Younger; George Canning. The youthful attitudes of Manners and Smythe approximate those expressed in the four volume publication, The Broad Stone of Honour: or, the True

---

<sup>4</sup>Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, In the Days of the Dandies (Edinburgh: Blackwood's, 1890), p. 89. Hereinafter referred to as Dandies.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 86-89. Charles Whibley, Lord John Manners and His Friends (2 vols.; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925), I, 81-84, reports Manners' study of Byron. Hereinafter referred to as Manners.

Sense and Practice of Chivalry, written by Kenelm Henry Digby.<sup>6</sup>

The central theme of Digby's work is the timelessness of the spirit of medieval chivalry. Chivalry, he argued, could be stymied or neglected, but it could never be eradicated. This same great faith in the strength and persistence of the spirit of chivalry appeared in Young England. On the other hand, it did not share his vociferous enthusiasm for the predominance of the Roman Catholic Church. Youthful High Church, anti-Reformation sentiments did not lead its members to Roman Catholic conversion, despite a self-professed love of the medieval church oriented society.

Young England envisioned an important contemporary role for religion. It fervently desired to increase the goodness of man and to better the spirit of all mankind. The movement contended it more beneficial to spread the Christian faith than to spread secular, utilitarian knowledge. Clearly, Young England embraced the view that the spread of literacy could not be directly associated with the acquisition of wisdom and goodness. It is quite possible that this idea was derived from The Broad Stone of Honour. Society was to be open and free; all persons were to be

---

<sup>6</sup>Cruse, Victorians, pp. 30, 141. Paul Smith, "The Young England Movement," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Literature, Columbia University, 1951), pp. 3-15, 39-45. William Flavelle Monypenny and George Earle Buckle, Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1929), I, 562-65. Hereinafter referred to as Disraeli.

treated as fellow human beings, not as servants or masters.<sup>7</sup> Courtesy, respect, humility, charity, and above all else, the friendship of one person to another was promoted and cherished.

In essence, mankind had to be moved through the spirit of chivalry to understand what is truly beautiful and sublime in the world. Once achieved, this general spirit and comprehension would compel people to undertake generous and heroic actions. These actions would then make the world a better place for everyone to live--utopia.<sup>8</sup> To formulate and implement a program effecting these amorphous ideals, thoughts, and sentiments into reality became one of their greatest problems. Yet, to them, any attempt provided more of value than the then current, materialistic schemes.

It would not become chivalry any more than youth to boast of having a system of philosophy which would exempt it from all danger of going astray; and yet its apparently undefined wanderings, like the playful walks of childhood, will be found more true to the simple harmony of nature, than the cunningly calculated progress of the worldly wise.<sup>9</sup>

In rectifying the social problems of the day, Young England's credo became, trust your heart over your head. In 1841, still infused with the spirit of Romanticism heightened

---

<sup>7</sup>Kenelm Henry Digby, The Broad Stone of Honour: or, the True Sense and Practice of Chivalry (4 vols.; London: Vol. III was sold by Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green; the rest were sold by Joseph Booker, 1826-1829), II, 310-40; IV, 174-227, 478-545.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., I, 89.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., 50-51.

at Cambridge, Manners expressed the importance of intuition and emotion in guiding humanity.

A voice on evening's zephyr-wing sweeps by  
 Bidding the heart in every mood be true,  
 To shun th'expedient, and the good pursue.  
 No! let each earnest-minded man prepare  
 To make some duty his peculiar care,  
 Work out with humbleness of head and heart  
 His own unnoticed, yet important part,  
 And leave the rest to Faith, content to say,  
 "My conscience prompts I have not lost to-day."<sup>10</sup>

This chivalric concern for the best interests of humanity inspired Young England to action.

The Young England advocates united upon this common basis of sentimentality. A number of similarities are discernible among the early adherents: youth, aristocratic parentage, conservative childhood upbringings, high educational attainment, romantic view of society, disenchantment with the prevailing trends of English life, and a desire to solve the problems of English society.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, a strong bond based upon sentiment, study, and intellectual repose existed. When the move from reflection to action was attempted, however, Young England encountered difficulties of cohesion.

These romantic, youthful, conservative individuals, desirous of social change, surveyed the principal modes of action open to them. They could simply have been content

---

<sup>10</sup>John Manners, England's Trust and Other Poems (London: Rivington, 1841), pp. 27-28.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 66, Manners discusses his pleasurable moments with Smythe at Cambridge.

to use their prestige, social status, and position to stimulate the aristocracy from the doldrums of reliance upon the status quo. This passive approach, rarely appealing to youth, appeared unattractive to them. The raising of the public's social conscience seemed a worthy goal. Hence, they employed their literary abilities to gain this objective.

Above all other modes, political service proved the most tempting. A Parliamentary career could provide fame, the chance for political success, and the possible addition of sympathizers. They dreamed of transforming British society through the creation of a political party to provide a viable alternative to the growing powers of utilitarianism.

In the general election of July 1841, Manners, Smythe, Cochrane, and O'Brien achieved election as Tory members of the House of Commons. Running for the borough of Newark, Manners expressed his principles to the electors.

"I need hardly assure you that the principles I profess are those which have for ages distinguished my family; . . . They are, devotion to the Church and loyalty to the sovereign; for I am well persuaded that the more a man acts upon these two principles, the more he will be promoting the best interests of the country, and the more zealous will he be for the welfare and prosperity of the poor, as well as the other classes of the Community."<sup>12</sup>

At first they anticipated that Sir Robert Peel, the leader of the Conservative majority, would share their

---

<sup>12</sup>Non-electors, Lord John Manners. A Political and Literary Sketch Comprising Some Account of the Young England Party and the Passing of the Factory Acts (London: n.p., 1872), pp. 14, 13-16.

sentiments. They were soon disappointed, for he did not. Peel's inability to communicate with his followers further alienated them from the government. Soon these youthful members began a search for others who shared their aspirations, ideals, sensibilities, and disenchantments.

During the next session of Parliament, they discovered Benjamin Disraeli.<sup>13</sup> Of course, he became the most famous of the members of Young England. As early as March 9, 1842, Disraeli wrote his wife that "all young England, the new members, &c, were deeply interested." He expressed special pleasure with the favorable reception by Peel, Manners, Smythe, Henry Baillie, Dicky Hodgson, and Sidney Herbert of his previous night's speech.<sup>14</sup> Two days later Disraeli again wrote his wife that

I already find myself without effort the leader of a party, chiefly of the youth and new members. Lord John Manners came to me about a motion which he wanted me to bring forward, and he would "second it like Claud Hamilton." Henry Baillie the same about Afghanistan. I find my position changed.<sup>15</sup>

A group began to form with Disraeli at the nucleus. He also brought the goodwill of more established politicians, such

---

<sup>13</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 84-85, reports that upon their first meeting on February 17, 1841, Manners was unimpressed by Disraeli.

<sup>14</sup>Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 525-27.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., I, 528. For a reprint of some of Disraeli's correspondence see Benjamin Disraeli, Home Letters Written by Lord Beaconsfield, 1830-1852, introduced by Augustine Birrell (London: Cassell & Co., 1928).



as John Singleton Copley, Lord Lyndhurst.<sup>16</sup>

In October, 1842, the parliamentary organization of Young England was solidified. Smythe, Cochrane, and Disraeli--all vacationing in Paris--met to discuss their common political aspirations. On the twentieth, Smythe commented about their meeting in a letter to Disraeli.

Dear Diz,

I have fulfilled your instructions and written to John Manners and H. Baillie. The first I have told that we are to sit together and vote as a majority shall decide and that any overture involving office ought to be communicated to the esoteric council of ourselves. To the Celt I have been more guarded and reserved, having only proposed that we should sit together in the hope that association might engender party. Have you attended to my suggestion and seen much of Cochrane? It cost me three hours' walking over the Place Vendôme after your dinner to reconcile him anew to our plan. He was all abroad--angry jealous because you had talked to me more than to him, that you had known me longer, but that him you did not understand. . . .

Yours affectionately,  
G. Sydney Smythe<sup>17</sup>

On November 14, Smythe again wrote Disraeli urging him to take the lead in any action that would "give nerve to disaffection with Peel."<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup>Ward, "Young England," pp. 123-24. Cochrane, Dandies, pp. 97-99, claims that they also possessed the goodwill of Lord Henry Brougham.

<sup>17</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/S/648, in the margin is the notation "I write to Cochrane at the same time." The Box Number has been omitted since it is of no assistance in finding material in Disraeli's papers as microfilmed for the Syracuse University Library, Syracuse, New York. Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 565, reprint this letter minus the marginal notation.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., B/XXI/S/649, he also reported that Henry

In a memorandum to Louis Philippe, King of the French, Disraeli discussed the formation and role of a new Conservative coterie in the British Parliament.

Previous to the meeting of the English Parliament a party should be organised which in respect to the external policy of England should be systematically opposed to the Russian system. The Government of Sir Robert Peel is at this moment upheld by an apparent majority in the Commons of 90 members. It is known that among these 90 are between 40 and 50 agricultural malcontents who, though not prepared to commence an active opposition, will often be absent on questions which, though not of vital, may yet be of great importance to the Minister. It is so obvious, therefore, that another section of Conservative members, full of youth and energy and constant in their seats, must exercise an irresistible control over the tone of the Ministers.<sup>19</sup>

There need be no doubt that Disraeli had Young England in mind.

Nevertheless, Disraeli and Smythe were sorely misdirected if they planned on forming an influential, parliamentary party. Young England never succeeded in becoming an important political party. Only Disraeli, Smythe, and Manners were ever able to work closely together in Parliament. Cochrane usually gave support, but he maintained an independence of action for he felt excluded from their innermost intimacies.<sup>20</sup> Others gave intermittent support, but only

---

Baillie had rejected their invitation because their numbers were too small.

<sup>19</sup>Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 807-11, reprint this memorandum in full.

<sup>20</sup>Cochrane, Dandies, p. 86.

these four can be confidently counted as playing a continual and effective role in matters of direct concern to Young England.

The failure of Young England as a political party becomes more understandable through an investigation of the personalities involved. This examination raises intriguing questions. Why did some individuals flit near for tantalizing periods of time, but then refuse to adhere to the quartet? In truth, what furnished the bonds of union between Disraeli, Manners, Smythe, and Cochrane? Since a fundamental appeal of Young England was basically romantic, with its inherent individualistic tendencies, unity was always difficult to achieve. Therefore, to understand better the lack of organization, it is necessary to glimpse at least briefly into the lives, thoughts, ideals, motivations, sentiments, and aspirations of those who came within the orbit of the movement.

Disraeli offered the romantic, youthful founders of Young England political experience, leadership, and notoriety. He had long envisioned the formation of a new political party, and Young England offered fulfillment of this ambition. He had entered Parliament in 1837 at the age of thirty-two; consequently he had already adequately demonstrated his parliamentary skills. Recognition, however, had not come as rapidly as he desired.<sup>21</sup> In addition, Disraeli

---

<sup>21</sup>C. L. Cline, "Disraeli and Peel's 1841 Cabinet," Journal of Modern History, XI (December, 1939), 509-12,

had attained fame outside of Parliament as a novelist and political pamphleteer.<sup>22</sup> He had also succeeded in making a splash in high society, establishing a reputation as a dandy.<sup>23</sup> Highly ambitious, his continued political subservience to Peel's leadership conflicted with his desire for glory and power. Ambition led Disraeli to treasure the promptings from youthful, Tory members of the House of Commons.

Yet, a group ambition is not enough to account for the attraction of the other members of Young England to Disraeli. The youthful members found Disraeli's philosophy of society attractive. They shared ideals, thoughts, sentiments, and objectives.

English Romanticism had a strong hold on Disraeli. An idealized view of the society of the English Middle Ages gave him a policy for the reconstruction of nineteenth century society. He rejected the political views of the utilitarians and looked askance at the growing power of a materialistic middle class. It appeared to Disraeli that the

---

discusses Disraeli's exclusion from a governmental post.

<sup>22</sup>Disraeli had published numerous works by this time. A full listing of his works may be found compiled by R. W. Stewart, "Writings of Benjamin Disraeli," in Robert Blake, Disraeli (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), Appendix ii, pp. 772-78.

<sup>23</sup>Richard Aldington, Four English Portraits, 1801-1851 (London: Evans Brothers, 1948), pp. 51-100, contains an interesting sketch of the early life of Disraeli. Also see Blake, Disraeli, pp. 3-166, and B. R. Jerman, The Young Disraeli (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960).

present political parties failed to offer adequate solutions to the problems confronting English life. He upheld the conception of Toryism as asserted by Bolingbroke, Shelburne, and William Pitt the Younger.

An especially firm belief in the superiority of the natural aristocracy of the landed interests provided one of Disraeli's basic tenets. Nevertheless, he decried the prevailing political and social organization of the aristocracy. Basically, he felt that the Whigs and Conservatives held a common political goal--the perpetuation of the power of the middle classes. Therefore, he desired Young England to rejuvenate ancient Toryism as a viable alternative to the policies that were rapidly turning the countryside into industrial centers.

Disraeli outlined his political hopes for Young England. In 1870, he wrote of his earlier anticipations.

To change back the oligarchy into a generous aristocracy round a real throne; to infuse life and vigour into the Church, as the trainer of the nation; . . .to establish a commercial code on the principles successfully negotiated by Lord Bolingbroke at Utrecht, and which, though baffled by a Whig Parliament, were subsequently and triumphantly vindicated by his political pupil and heir, Mr. Pitt; to govern Ireland according to the policy of Charles I. and not of Oliver Cromwell; to emancipate the political constituency of 1832 from its sectarian bondage and contracted sympathies; to elevate the physical as well as the moral condition of the people; by establishing that labour required regulation as much as property; and all this rather by the use of ancient forms and the restoration of the past than by political revolutions founded on abstract ideas, appeared to be the course which the circumstances of this country required.

and which, practically speaking, with all their faults and backslidings, be undertaken and accomplished by a reconstructed Tory Party.<sup>24</sup>

The sincerity of Disraeli's Tory Democracy has been questioned, yet he formulated and enunciated its ideals early in his political career. The 1835 publication, Vindication of the English Constitution, contains the seeds of his later announced Tory principles. He took a broad view of society by proclaiming the unity of interests of the merchants, manufacturers, and agriculturists of Britain. His specific pledge to the electors of Shrewsbury during the 1841 election called for the maintenance of the constitution, the protection of the interests of the poor, and the inviolability of the liberties of the people.<sup>25</sup> By 1841, Disraeli's political and social ideals had advanced towards maturity.

Disraeli looked to a revival of Toryism to combat the public decay of spirit and morals. To him, the ancient aristocracy manifested itself as the least corrupted segment of the nation. He hoped that they could be reinvigorated with the desire and energy capable of aiding and assisting the people.<sup>26</sup> He expressed dismay over the decline of Toryism, but optimistically predicted that "Toryism will yet

---

<sup>24</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, "General Preface," in Lothair, Vol. XVII, The Works of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, embracing Novels, Romances, Plays, Poems, Biography, Short Stories and Great Speeches (20 vols.; London and New York: M. Walter Dunne, 1904), pp. xx-xxi. All references to his novels come from this edition.

<sup>25</sup>Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 511.

<sup>26</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/II/113b, Disraeli to Charles Attwood, June 7, 1840.

rise from the tomb over which Bolingbroke shed his last tear, to bring back strength to the Crown, liberty to the subject, and to announce that power has only one liberty: to secure the social welfare of the people."<sup>27</sup>

The growing strength of the Oxford Movement he perceived to be a positive indication of a return to the ancient values and traditions. He maintained that the masses still respected the church and were loyal to the aristocracy. Therefore, he contended an alliance of Church-Crown-Aristocracy-People to be not only conceivable but also capable of effecting great social alterations.<sup>28</sup>

Politics attracted Disraeli as the best means of accomplishing the desired social changes. He felt, however, that the entire structure of politics had taken a wrong turn. He asserted that the Reform Bill of 1832 had destroyed the old aristocratic basis of governing but had failed to replace it with anything else. He never completely rejected the 1832 reform; he just felt that once accepted, further social and political modifications had to occur in order to return English society to an equilibrium.

In the pamphlet, What is He?, he argued that true reform, in the best interests of the nation, would come from

---

<sup>27</sup>Disraeli, Sybil, I, 395.

<sup>28</sup>J. A. Froude, Life of Lord Beaconsfield (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890), pp. 84, 94-95. J. T. Lawless, "Benjamin Disraeli's Concepts of Social Class" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of History, St. Louis University, 1967), pp. 55-57, 253-55.

a political alliance of Tories and Radicals. Such a union was attempted through his early Parliamentary activities. He stated in a reply of June 7, 1840, to Charles Attwood of Newcastle:

. . .I am honored by your approbation of my public conduct. I entirely agree with you, that an union between the Conservative Party and the Radical masses offers the only means by which we can preserve the Empire. Their interests are identical; united they form the nation; and their division has only permitted a miserable minority, under the specious name of the People, to assail all rights of property and person.

Since I first entered public life, now eight years ago, I have worked for no other object and no other end than to aid the formation of a national party. And when I recollect the difficulties with which this proposition struggles, and the contests and misrepresentations which I have personally experienced in advocating its adoption, you may understand the extreme satisfaction with which I have witnessed the recent progress of events, and now learn, on your unquestionable authority, that in Northumberland, long the sacred refuge of Saxon liberty, a considerable party, founded on the union in question, is at present in process of formation and of rapid growth.

None but those devoid of the sense and spirit of Englishmen can be blind to the perils that are impending over our country. Our Empire is assailed in every quarter; while a domestic oligarchy, under the guise of Liberalism, is denationalising England. Hitherto we have been preserved from the effects of the folly of modern legislation by the wisdom of our ancient manners. The national character may yet save the Empire. The national character is more important than the Great Charter or trial by jury. Notwithstanding the efforts of the Whigs to sap its power, I still have confidence in its energy.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/II/113b. Also Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 486-87, reprint this letter.



Young England sought this Tory Radical alliance to preserve the ancient English tradition.

Disraeli's first major biographers correctly issued a note of caution concerning the effect of this episode upon his career. Disraeli held a romantic, idealistic view of society, however, he was also a serious and astute politician who clearly understood that politics is the art of the possible. He relished the association, companionship, ideals, and dreams provided by this coterie of Parliamentary friends. He took pride in being the recognized leader of this political union. He refused, nevertheless, to let it ruin his drive for political power. It pushed him to the foreground; Disraeli after his association with the Young England movement had to be reckoned with by political leaders.<sup>30</sup>

John James Robert Manners, later seventh Duke of Rutland, provided the most enthusiastic and consistent support for the ideals of Young England. His early education, social position, environment, and associations propelled him towards Tory paternalism. Born to a wealthy, land owning family on December 13, 1818, his father early planned a political career for him. His father, the fifth Duke of Rutland, inculcated his sons with strong Tory views. He hoped that Manners, with the proper education and preparation, could serve in important governmental positions thereby helping to preserve the aristocratic society of England.

---

<sup>30</sup> Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 701.

It is not clear when Manners first began to profess an interest in Romanticism. Living in the feudal setting of Belvoir Castle, as a member of one of the oldest families in England, he was surrounded with manifestations of the ancient days, a time when the aristocracy reigned supreme and the English countryside exhibited beauty and happiness. His father provided a ready example of a well-meaning paternalistic aristocrat. It appears, therefore, that from the earliest age a romantic, feudalistic, aristocratic view of society affected him.

Manners' romantic view of society was also fostered by his education and early friendships. His formal education began at Brighton under the tutelage of Mr. Everard of Wick House. In 1831 he enrolled in Eton. There he associated with boys of his own class and distinction. One individual, however, seemed to have greater influence than the others--George Smythe. These two spent much time together discussing and studying current problems. As youthful aristocrats, they decided that the aristocracy was not leading enough. The manufacturers had assumed too much power. Therefore, the primary necessity appeared to be a return to the customs of the feudal past when the aristocracy acted in a paternalistic, heroic manner. It is not astounding to report that they found almost everyone at Eton agreed with them.

As Manners proceeded with his education, nothing arose to destroy his conceptions. In 1835, he began attendance at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he found a circle of

individuals to sustain, reinforce, and expand his ideas. Smythe was still around, although at a different Cambridge college. As a scholar Manners proved to be sufficiently skilled. He graduated in March, 1839, with a rank of fifty-first out of a class of one-hundred eighty. He enjoyed his stay at Cambridge, and it fulfilled the necessary preparation for his future political career. In 1840, he began studying law at Lincoln's Inn, and in the next year he entered actively into the political fray.

Everything went smoothly for Manners during his youth. Idealism, faith, and his romantic espousal of a desire to make England a better place to live met with applause. Only after his entry into the House of Commons did his ideas suffer the test of fire, unless of course, one considers the debates at the Union at Cambridge an adequate test.<sup>31</sup>

It is imperative that the influence of religion upon Manners' life be discussed. Romanticism carried within it a great trust in emotion and faith. The study of the Middle Ages fostered within him a respect for the traditions and benevolence of the Church. While at Cambridge, he and a number of his friends came under the influence of the Oxford Movement. The Reverend J. W. Blakesley, a tutor at Trinity College, commented:

"It is extremely curious, by the way, . . .to observe what a very great influence the Oxford school is beginning to exert in Cambridge. It

---

<sup>31</sup>Whibley, Manners, is the best and most complete study of the life of Manners.

is quite obvious, however, in all cases that are most conspicuous (viz., Smythe, John Manners, and Hope, the two former of whom were bitten by one Faber at the Lakes during the rainy weather last summer), that the religious views have grown out of the political, and that if we strip off the hide of Newman we shall find Filmer underneath."<sup>32</sup>

The ideals of the Oxford Movement, therefore, provided considerable discussion among the students at Cambridge. Manners and Smythe were in the vanguard of supporters, having as their tutor commented, met Frederick William Faber in the Lake District in the summer of 1838. Faber took an interest in propogating Tractarianism in Cambridge, and he thought Manners and Smythe prime candidates for conversion.<sup>33</sup>

Cambridge, however, did not rally to the cause of the Oxford Movement. Newman, in late 1838, assessed the influence much differently than Blakesley.

Faber, has returned from Cambridge with doleful accounts, as he gives them, though I have not confidence in his representation. However, I doubt not he has done good by going. He says that two parties are formed, Hookites, which in fact includes us, and a sort of Latitudinarians, who consider they maintain "Oxford views"; and they quote the Preface to the "Remains" to show that they are not members of the "Establishment," that is, the local Church (which they say is heretical, &c.), but the "Catholic Church," an idea or shadow.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., I, 75.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 63-75, for a discussion of their early meetings with Frederick Faber. Also see the letter from Faber to Reverend J. B. Morris, July 24, 1838, printed in John Edward Bowden, The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1869), p. 91.

<sup>34</sup>John Henry Newman to F. Rogers, Esq. printed in John Henry Newman, Letters and Correspondence of John Henry

Cambridge sensibility for the Oxford Movement affected only a minority, of which the future adherents of Young England formed a part.

Lord John Manners proved to be one of the most smitten individuals. He formed a friendship with Faber which lasted until Faber's conversion to Catholicism. This religious episode resulted in his meeting and attendance at the sermons of the most influential propagator of the Oxford ideals, Reverend John Henry Newman. Manners visited Oxford during Epiphany 1839, when Newman preached two sermons analyzing the ideas of faith and reason.

I have preached two sermons which have greatly enlightened me in my subject, and, I believe, perplexed all my hearers. I really do think I have defined Reason; a very large subject opens --I wish I could treat it. Lord John Manners has been here, and in manner and appearance is perfectly unaffected and prepossessing; but perhaps you have seen him. I am told he says that Faith and Reason are orient questions in Cambridge.<sup>35</sup>

The Oxford Movement had a lifelong influence on Manners. This influence is discernible in his actions, thoughts, speeches, and writings during the heyday of Young England.

Manners sought to further religious feelings through poetry and expository writing. His literary production gained him notoriety, much of it invited ridicule for his ideas.<sup>36</sup>

---

Newman. . ., edited by Anne Mozley (2 vols.; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897), II, 245-46.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 248-49.

<sup>36</sup>See Chapter IV for a discussion of Manners' literary production.

In 1841, in England's Trust and Other Poems he pleaded for a restoration of the role of the Church in society. It was his hope that a higher sense of morality could be achieved through a cooperation of the church and state. The morals could be constructed in the ideals of feudal chivalry; the aristocracy would care for the people.

Professing sympathy with the working classes, he toured the northern manufacturing districts of England to gain a better understanding of the problems of industrial distress. He realized the necessity of a greater economic allocation of the profits of industrialization to the laborers. He was not, however, overcome with the scenes of the poverty of the masses. Distress existed, but he professed that

there never was so complete a feudal system as that of the mills; soul and body are, or might be, at the absolute disposal of one man, and that to my notion is not at all a bad state of society; the worst of this manufacturing feudalism is its uncertainty, and the moment the cotton lord is done, there's an end also to his dependants' very subsistence: in legislating this great difference between an agricultural and a trading aristocracy ought not to be lost sight of.<sup>37</sup>

Neither anti-manufacturing nor anti-machinery ideas interested him. He accommodated the new commercial and industrial aristocracy within his feudal view of society.

Such an accommodation was necessary if Manners hoped to effect the betterment of the working classes of society

---

<sup>37</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 106, reprints a portion of this letter from Manners to his brother, the Marquess of Granby.

through a healthy dose of noblesse oblige. In a letter to his brother on September 10, 1842, he advocated these ideals.

Let us show the people, i.e., the lower orders, by adding to their comforts and pleasures in the only legitimate way a legislature can do so,--viz., by voting money to build public baths, to keep us, or rather to restore public games, to form public walks, that we are their real friends. Let us give them back the Church holy-days, open the Churches and Cathedrals to them, and let our men of power in their individual capacities assume a more personal and consequently a more kind intercourse with those below them. In a word let society take a more feudal appearance than it presents now. That's my vision; it may be a wrong one; but if, as I believe, the Whig one of giving the people political power and rating to them of the rights of man, the glories of science, and the merits of political economy, is wrong, I can see no other way save the old and worn-out one of "laissez-faire, laissez-aller," which I should fancy these summer troubles have effectually destroyed.<sup>38</sup>

The recreation of a feudal society provided his primary objective at the start of his political career.

Manners had long felt his talents could be best employed in Parliament. His education, association, planning, and aspirations had been designed to the uncovering of a new social credo to guide his political future. As a political Tory he desired to retain or reassert the ancient traditions, especially the moral sway of the Anglican Church.

Upon entry into politics, Manners sought like-minded men. At first, along with Smythe, he thought William Ewart Gladstone provided leadership of the interests of religion in politics; hence they styled themselves his followers.

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 137-38.

Not only did they possess a common interest in the spreading of the influence of the Church, but Manners also served as Gladstone's colleague for Newark.<sup>39</sup> This association did not last, for while they shared Gladstone's view of church and state, they did not share his support and enthusiasm for Sir Robert Peel. As Gladstone moved toward greater involvement with Peel, they moved diametrically away from Peel.

Another active leader of Young England, George Augustus Frederick Percy Sidney Smythe, later seventh Viscount Strangford and second Baron Penshurst, fervently desired to climb rapidly up the political ranks.<sup>40</sup> A major stimulus of his ambition stemmed from his father, who had served a number of years in the diplomatic service, but had not achieved the distinction which he felt that he fully deserved.<sup>41</sup> George's father gave regular advice and support in all

---

<sup>39</sup>John Morley, The Life of William Ewart Gladstone (3 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1903), I, 303-26, discusses Gladstone's relation to Tractarianism.

<sup>40</sup>An adequate tracing of the life and career of George Smythe is rendered difficult by the apparent destruction of his personal papers. The Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (63 vols.; London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885-1901), XVIII, 601-03, contains a short notice. The Times (London), November 26, 1857, printed his obituary. "Mr. Smythe," Fraser's Magazine, XXXV (May, 1847), 529-38, provides an assessment of his skills as a writer and politician. Edward Barrington de Fonblanque, Lives of the Lords Strangford with their Ancestors and Contemporaries through Ten Generations (London: Cassell Petter & Galpin, [1877/]), pp. 204-46, provides a few insights but is primarily valuable for the lengthy excerpts of letters from Smythe to his father. Hereinafter referred to as Strangford.

<sup>41</sup>de Fonblanque, Strangford, pp. 107-203, discusses the career of Smythe's father.



ventures which appeared productive of achieving a higher social status for the family. Unfortunately, George proved to be a disappointment to his father. The promise of a brilliant political career never came to fruition.

Politics attracted and intrigued Smythe. He began his career in the House of Commons in January, 1841, having stood successfully at a by-election in Canterbury. A few months later in the general election he successfully defended his seat. After this election he was joined in the House of Commons by his Cambridge friends, Manners and Cochrane. Possessed with the enthusiasm and ambition of youth, Smythe soon engaged in a social whirl designed to better his political connections. It appeared imperative that he make an immediate impression on English society. Smythe's financial problems and the incessant proddings of his father pushed him into the clamor for a position in Peel's government. When Peel overlooked him for a post, he turned to another avenue--Young England.

In preparation for his political career, Smythe had acquired a traditional, classical education. His father attempted to teach him certain fundamentals, but he did a rather poor job, only attending to the task with sporadic enthusiasm. At Eton, Smythe compiled only an average academic record, but he did make a number of influential friends. The most important of these was a boy only a few months his junior, Lord John Manners. This association continued throughout his lifetime. Smythe, like Manners,

attended Cambridge, although for financial reasons he attended the less expensive St. John's College.

The friendship of Manners and Smythe, formed at an early age, ripened during their college careers. Together they studied, discussed, and planned their futures. They professed agreement on almost all subjects, especially an admiration for the romantic view of medieval England.<sup>42</sup> They came to the forefront of those Cambridge students who argued for a reverence of historical traditions and institutions. It appears that each stimulated the other. Smythe led the way with his enthusiasm and intense (usually short-lived) interest in new discoveries. Manners sustained and directed their thoughts with his more studious, serious, and consistent approach to life.

Their academic reflections led them to a critique of British society. They did not approve of the existing social conditions. It failed to measure up to the romantic standards which they perceived in those idyllic days of Merrie England. The answers to their ambitions and concern for the betterment of the social condition of England appeared to be politics.

Smythe and Manners carefully plotted their political plans. Young England served as the culmination of this youthful vision. Smythe, however, also had other visions, for he abandoned Young England in January, 1846, accepting

---

<sup>42</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 62.

the post of under secretary of Foreign Affairs in the Peel government. Nevertheless, from 1843-1845, he was sincere in his Young England ambitions. It proved to be his single greatest political episode.<sup>43</sup>

Alexander Dundas Ross Wishart Baillie-Cochrane, later first Baron Lamington, found Young England tantalizing. Born in November, 1816, he attended Eton and Cambridge, taking his degree from Trinity College in 1837.<sup>44</sup> During his residency at Cambridge he became attracted to Smythe and Manners. Although later in life Cochrane disclaimed participation; he actively supported Manners and Smythe in their Cambridge activities.

Also interested in politics, Cochrane entered Parliament along with Manners in the general election of 1841. Tory in sentiment, he shared many of Smythe and Manners' romantic views of the ideal construction of society. Therefore, it was only natural that he be included in the formative plans of Young England in the autumn of 1842. Yet, from the beginning of the organization, he expressed a hesitancy to cast his political lot behind the leadership of Disraeli. Young England, however, never demanded strict discipline from its adherents, so Cochrane agreed to co-operate.

---

<sup>43</sup>The Times (London), November 26, 1857.

<sup>44</sup>Dictionary of National Biography, XXII, 462-63. Cochrane also presents a biographical problem for he apparently ordered the destruction of his private papers.

These four, Disraeli, Manners, Smythe, and Cochrane provided the consistent base of Young England. All displayed strong romantic temperaments in their political endeavors. They were active as writers, and it is in their writings that their social philosophy is best elucidated. Political action within Parliament, however, occasioned their unification and made them famous as formulators and propagators of the ideals of Young England. Manners, in the summer of 1842, noted that

at Paris he [Smythe] Cochrane, and D'Israeli agreed that they and myself should form an esoteric party, to decide a course to be taken on all important political questions, to sit together and vote together in the House. I note this down for if we succeed, and Smythe seems sanguine, or if we fail, which I think very likely, it will be equally amusing: this, then, is the germ of our party--no particular principles, but a hotch-potch, each surrendering his own to the majority.<sup>45</sup>

Unified, open expressions of displeasure in the House of Commons with the political framework gained them interest from others.

Richard Monckton Milnes, later first Baron Houghton, hovered on the fringes of Young England. Milnes is remembered more as a poet than as a politician or social reformer. He shared, however, Young England's desire to improve the conditions of the working classes. He deplored the baneful effects of the industrial revolution. Due to differences of opinion with the leaders of the movement, he stopped short

---

<sup>45</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 144-45.

of complete union. He did not share their hopes and trusts that the English landed aristocracy would undertake the rejuvenation of society. His political ideal was not a reconstruction of ancient Toryism. He disliked Peel, but Milnes and Smythe also disliked each other.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, Milnes felt unsure of Disraeli. He was friendly with Manners, and in late 1844 he came close to casting his lot with Young England.<sup>47</sup> He shared Young England's move away from Peel, but he moved towards liberalism, not Toryism.

Augustus Stafford O'Brien gave support. A contemporary and friend of Milnes, he enjoyed his association with Young England in and out of the House of Commons. He provided them with original views on agriculture and Ireland. His greatest contribution went to Disraeli, after the demise of Young England, when he provided him a direct connection with the Agricultural Protection Society during the fight over Corn Law repeal in 1846.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Hughenden Papers, A/I/A/180, Disraeli to Mary Anne Disraeli, March 10, 1842, hints at this antagonism between Milnes and Smythe by reporting that Milnes was floored when upon inquiry of Smythe why he did not prevent Alexander Hope from making foolish speeches, and Smythe replied to the effect, "why I don't stop you from speaking."

<sup>47</sup>James Pope-Hennessy, Monckton Milnes (2 vols.; New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1955-), I, 145-47, 185-96, 208-09, 245-59. Thomas Wemyss Reid, Life, Letters and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton (2 vols.; London: Cassell & Co., 1890), I, 1-366, covers these years of his life. Richard Henry Horne (ed.), A New Spirit of the Age (London: Oxford University Press, 1907), pp. 187-96, provides a sketch of the literary view of Milnes in the 1840's.

<sup>48</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 204-06. Blake, Disraeli, p.

Two brothers, Henry Thomas Hope (1808-1862) and Alexander James Beresford Hope (1820-1887), exhibited interest in Young England. By the 1840's the Hope family was socially prominent. Furthermore, they possessed more than a moderate amount of wealth, which they employed to fulfill their aspirations.<sup>49</sup> Young England could have profitted from their association. The two siblings, however, did not share a common view of the value of Young England.

Henry Hope provided assistance for he had been friendly with Disraeli since the early 1830's. Deepdene, Hope's country home, provided a congenial atmosphere for Young England discussions. Reportedly, it was here, at the suggestion of Henry Hope, that Disraeli began writing Coningsby. Henry gave Young England the wisdom of his political experience, having sat in the House of Commons from 1829-1832. After the Reform Bill he refused to run for the House of Commons, but he continued to maintain an active interest in the machinations of the political world. He professed an open fondness for the Young England movement, and he lent his home, support, talent, and prestige in the furtherance of its cause.

Alexander appeared to be a prime candidate for

---

225. See Chapter III, pp. 135-39, for a discussion of his role in the Corn Law Repeal squabble.

<sup>49</sup>Henry William Law and Irene Law, The Book of the Beresford Hopes (London: Heath Cranton Ltd., 1925), p. 107, reports a meeting of Disraeli and Henry Hope as early as 1834. This is the best work, although it provides only a glimpse into the lives of the Hope family.

membership. He attended Trinity College, Cambridge with Mann-  
 ners. Along with Manners and Smythe, he came under the in-  
 fluence of the Oxford Movement, and he retained High Church  
 ideals throughout his life. Also interested in politics, he  
 entered the House of Commons in the general election of 1841.

Yet, the leap to opposition to Peel proved impossible  
 for Alexander. Disraeli may have discouraged any close co-  
 operation, for in early 1842 he wrote that he "never knew  
 such an imbecile."<sup>50</sup> Always very independent minded, he  
 severed party connections in 1846, then returned, even serv-  
 ing a short stint as party whip. The rest of his political  
 career he spent as an independent Conservative often expres-  
 sing displeasure with the proposals and ideals of Benjamin  
 Disraeli.<sup>51</sup> Young England never won the sympathies of  
 Alexander Hope.

John Walter (1776-1847), major owner of The Times, pro-  
 vided invaluable assistance to the movement. Friendly with  
 the members of Young England, especially Disraeli, he occa-  
 sionally invited them to visit his country home, Bearwood.  
 Walter understood political intrigue, having sat in the  
 House of Commons from 1832-1837. He resigned in 1837 in  
 protest of the extension of the provisions of the New Poor

---

<sup>50</sup>Hughenden Papers, A/I/A/169, Disraeli to Mary Anne  
 Disraeli, February 22, 1842.

<sup>51</sup>Law and Law, The Book of the Beresford Hopes, p.  
 213, prints a letter from Alexander Hope to Reverend B. Webb  
 in which he summarized his political career. Apparently the  
 papers of Alexander were destroyed after his death.

Law to Ireland. In April, 1841, terminating his self-imposed boycott, he won re-election to the House of Commons. Although for a time he was considered for leadership of Young England, it never materialized. In the next year he lost his seat. His election was disallowed when charges of bribing the voters were brought forth. Therefore, Young England failed to profit from his parliamentary expertise. He did, however, throughout 1843 and 1844 allow the columns of The Times to be used to air the views of Young England.<sup>52</sup> Simply, this meant that Young England was not ignored in the major newspapers.

William Busfeild Ferrand (1809-1889), arising from northern Tory Radicalism, supported Young England. Ferrand, a squire from the West Riding of Yorkshire, had earlier demonstrated his interest in social conditions through active cooperation with Richard Oastler. Ferrand especially disliked the New Poor Law, the truck system, and the prospect of the implementation of commercial free trade. In 1841, Ferrand won a seat at Knaresborough for Parliament. Immediately he began to agitate for social reforms.

---

<sup>52</sup>Dictionary of National Biography, XX, 709-13. Cochrane, Dandies, pp. 128-30. Alfred [Samuel H. G. Kydd], The History of the Factory Movement (2 vols.; London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1857), II, 164-67. The Times (London), The History of the Times (4 vols.; London: Office of The Times, 1935-1952), II, 1-37. Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/S/649, Smythe to Disraeli, November 14, 1842, intimates that Disraeli had the option of including or deleting Walter from their organization. Also see B/XXI/W/109, John Walter to Disraeli, 1844, where he declared a lack of desire to fight a new election contest at Windsor.



One of Ferrand's guiding principles was a sincere desire to aid the factory workers. In fact, he so opposed the increase of manufacturing that he refused to allow the erection of factories on his land, although this meant a personal financial loss. The deteriorating conditions among the hand-loom weavers and the wool combers appalled him. Later, Ferrand provided a stirring emotional account of how these conditions had led to his entry into the factory reform movement.

"It was soon after Sadler and Oastler unfurled the banner of protection that I became a public man. At the hour of five on a winter's morning, I left my home to shoot wild fowl. On my road, I had to pass along a deep and narrow lane which led from a rural village to a distant factory. The wind howled furiously--the snow fell heavily, and drifted before the bitter blast. I indistinctly traced three children's footsteps. Soon, I heard a piteous cry of distress. Hurrying on, again I listened, but all was silent except the distant tolling of the factory bell. Again I tracked their footmarks, and saw that one had lagged behind; I returned, and found the little factory slave half-buried in a snow-drift fast asleep. I dragged it from its winding sheet; the icy hand of death had congealed its blood and paralysed its limbs. In a few minutes it would have been 'where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest'. I aroused it from its stupor and saved its life. From that hour I became a 'Ten Hours' Bill Man and the unflinching advocate of 'protection to native industry.'"<sup>53</sup>

In Parliament, Ferrand represented the weight of the northern factory reformers. Once within the walls, he searched

---

<sup>53</sup>"Letters to the Duke of Newcastle," The Home, March 27, 1852, printed in John Trevor Ward, The Factory System (2 vols.; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970), II, 82.

for and found sympathizers--Young England.<sup>54</sup>

Peter Borthwick (1804-1852) supported Young England activities. Cochrane, late in life, inaccurately claimed that the group sometimes met in the offices of the Morning Post, which was directed by Borthwick.<sup>55</sup> They may have met in the offices, but Borthwick did not become editor of the paper until 1849. Borthwick, a member of Parliament, from 1835-1838 and again from 1841-1847, in debates for social reform of interest to Young England, usually spoke and voted for its position.<sup>56</sup>

John Singleton Copley (1772-1863), first Baron Lyndhurst, was drawn towards the movement by his friendship with Disraeli. Lyndhurst and Disraeli had been close friends since the 1830's, and Disraeli's entry into Parliament had been aided by Lyndhurst. He stopped short of open, active support for he served as the Lord Chancellor under Peel. Yet, he opened his home to the members of Young England, gave them encouragement, and lent them his social

---

<sup>54</sup>John Trevor Ward, The Factory Movement, 1830-1866 (London: Macmillan, 1962), pp. 238-40. Ward, "Young England," pp. 122-25. Whibley, Manners, I, 121-22. Alfred, The History of the Factory Movement, II, 158-64. John Morley, The Life of Richard Cobden (13th ed.; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906), pp. 222-27. Cecil Driver, Tory Radical: the Life of Richard Oastler (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 240-41, 438-39.

<sup>55</sup>Cochrane, Dandies, pp. 128-29.

<sup>56</sup>Dictionary of National Biography, III, 871. Reginald Jaffray Lucas, Lord Glenesk and "The Morning Post" (New York: Lane, 1910), pp. 32-47. Wilfrid Hindle, The Morning Post, 1772-1937: Portrait of Newspaper (London: G. Routledge & Sons, [1937/], pp. 179-87.

prestige.<sup>57</sup> Lyndhurst's role in the cabinet consultations of the Peelite government is difficult to ascertain, but he did not share Peel's aversion to Young England. Therefore, he provided a measure of goodwill in the House of Lords and in the Cabinet for Young England.

The support given to the four stalwart members of Young England, both within and without the House of Commons, proved important. Apparently, conscious choice limited the active leaders to four. The supporters of Young England had common interests, but each also had their own perspectives on problems. This individual diversity of opinion was a major factor in preventing the formation of a large and significant political party; it also underscored its impossibility.

Furthermore, the structure of politics during the Parliament of 1841-1847 inhibited the successful formation of a Tory, Young England political party. The Conservative Party, under the recognized leadership of Sir Robert Peel, held a strong position as the government of the day. It is always a touchy business to oppose ones own party, especially while it is enjoying the fruits of office. Peel resented and resisted its attempts to reduce his authority. He felt that his position as leader of the party and first minister of the Crown had to be maintained in the best interests of

---

<sup>57</sup>Cochrane, Dandies, pp. 94-96. Dictionary of National Biography, IV, 1107-14. Theodore Martin, A Life of Lord Lyndhurst (London: John Murray, 1883), provides a complete study of his career.

the nation.

Sir Robert Peel, an experienced politician, served as Prime Minister and First Lord Treasurer from September 1841 to July 1846. Peel's long and distinguished record of governmental service dated from his entry into politics in 1809. A lifelong study of administration and governance had convinced Peel of the paramount importance of the nation being controlled by a conservative government. Catholic Emancipation in 1828 had demonstrated that if Peel had to choose between stated principles and the continuance of government; he would choose the latter. Governmental, not party considerations, took the foremost position with Peel.

During his earlier terms as Home Secretary, Peel had built a reputation as a reformer. Primarily his reforms concerned legal alterations, governmental regulation changes, and the efficient enforcement of all laws. He understood that the underlying basis of many problems were economic and social, but he never felt compelled to overstep the boundaries of his office to effect such changes. His investigation and solution to social problems were never conducted on a broad basis which might call for a drastic alteration of the prevailing moods or conditions of the people. He felt that the government should not over interfere in any matter; hence narrow, specific, pragmatic legislation took precedence. The search, assertion, and improvement of difficulties on the basis of first principles never appealed to him. Peel maintained the law; he did not try to

remedy the basic causes of the disturbance.<sup>58</sup> It has been charged, somewhat unjustly, that Peel made governmental reforms only in the interests of efficiency, totally uninterested in proposing measures effecting beneficial reforms in the factories.<sup>59</sup>

Comprehensive social reforms did not fit into Peel's plans; however he found his government faced with numerous problems. Advice was cheap, but as a dedicated minister of the crown he had to formulate the proper course or suffer the consequences. Predictably, he fell back on his tried and true method of solving problems. A recent biographer explained his system.

By 1817 he had perfected his technique of administration: the collection of factual information by means of carefully prepared series of specific questions to the men most likely to have access to the knowledge he wanted; the testing of generalities, opinions, and advice by reference to the facts; the prudent choice of agents; caution and scepticism in coming to a decision; and energetic action once the decision was reached.<sup>60</sup>

In retrospect, such thoroughness of investigation appears commendable; however to many of his contemporaries it appeared as an overcautious policy of do nothing.

Peel desired amelioration of distress but not at the

---

<sup>58</sup>Norman Gash, Mr. Secretary Peel (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), is the best study of Peel's early career.

<sup>59</sup>John L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond, Life of Lord Shaftesbury (London: Longmans, 1923), pp. 63-64.

<sup>60</sup>Gash, Mr. Secretary Peel, p. 226.

expense of over reaction or moving in the wrong direction. In the summer of 1842, Peel stated concern for the distressing conditions of the country.

Something effectual must be done to revive the languishing commerce and manufacturing industry of this country.

Look at the congregation of manufacturing masses, the amount of our debt, the rapid increase of rates within the last four years, which will soon, by means of rates in aid, extend from the ruined manufacturing districts to the rural ones, and then judge whether we can with safety retrograde in manufactures.

If you had to constitute new societies, you might on moral and social grounds prefer cornfields to cotton factories, an agricultural to a Manufacturing population. But our lot is cast, and we cannot recede. . .

The long depression of trade, the diminished consumption of articles of first necessity, the state of the manufacturing population, the instant supply by means of machinery of any occasional increased demand for manufactured goods, the tendency of reduced prices to sharpen the wits of the master manufacturer, and to urge him on in the improvement of his machinery; the doubled effect on manual labour and the wages of manual labour, first of this reduction in price, and secondly of the attempt to countervail it by improvement in machinery; the addition that each day makes of two thousand to the unemployed hands of the day before--these are the things about which I am more anxious than about the cattle from Vigo, or the price of pork.<sup>61</sup>

Peel found it difficult to act, even though he realized the severity of the conditions.

In attempting solutions to distress, Peel, early in his ministry, found that he could not satisfy everyone. He

---

<sup>61</sup>Peel to J. W. Croker, July 27 and October 30, 1842, printed in Charles S. Parker (ed.), Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers (3 vols.; 2d ed.; London: John Murray, 1899), II, 529, 531. Hereinafter referred to as Sir Robert Peel.

wrote Lord Ashley concerning the discovery of mining atrocities and the reason for his failure to propose remedies.

I have been compelled to neglect many things which nothing but absolute necessity would have induced me to neglect. Some of the measures mentioned in the Queen's Speech have been postponed; but when there is a constant unvarying demand upon sixteen or seventeen hours of the twenty-four for months together, delays which under other circumstances would be unjustifiable become unavoidable.<sup>62</sup>

Evidently, the press of business prevented him from moving as rapidly as he desired. On the other hand, the action undertaken evoked criticism. Peel wrote, "I can readily believe that 'many of our Ultra friends are dissatisfied with the measures of last Session.'"<sup>63</sup> His social policy received criticism for doing both too little and too much.

The prevailing distress was viewed by Peel as predominantly an economic issue. August 3, 1842, he advocated to Croker, "we must make this country a cheap country for living, . . . lower the price of wheat; not only poor rates, but the cost of everything else is lowered."<sup>64</sup> The lowering of the tariff on agricultural products appeared to Peel as the best way to restore equilibrium in the nation. He asserted that

the danger is not low price from the tariff,  
but low price from inability to consume, from

---

<sup>62</sup>Peel to Lord Ashley, July 22, 1842, printed in Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 534.

<sup>63</sup>Peel to Mr. Arbuthnot, October 30, 1842, printed in Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 532.

<sup>64</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 530.

the poor man giving up his pint of beer, and the man in middling station giving up his joint of meat.

Rest assured of this that landed property would not be safe during this next winter with the prices of the last four years, and even if it were safe it would not be profitable very long. Poor rate, rates in aid, diminished consumption would soon reduce the temporary gain of a nominal high price.<sup>65</sup>

His plan called for economic reform with the idea that social improvement would follow naturally in its wake. This priority did not appeal to Young England.

During the Conservative ministry of 1841-1846, Sir James Graham, Home Secretary, buttressed Peel's social views. Graham expressed pessimism about the fate of the factory workers. He maintained that the government should hesitate before interfering in industrial relations. He feared that governmental reforms would only diminish capital investments, thereby rendering the plight of the workers worse, not better. The riots of 1842 convinced him of the need for minimal reforms, but still he sought to deal only in technical questions, circumventing those dealing with broader social reforms.<sup>66</sup>

Graham opposed exciting expectations of great social measures from the government. This even went so far as discouraging investigation of social and economic inequities.

---

<sup>65</sup>Peel to J. W. Croker, October 30, 1842, printed in Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 530-31.

<sup>66</sup>Hammond and Hammond, Life of Lord Shaftesbury, pp. 68-69. John Trevor Ward, Sir James Graham (London: Macmillan, 1967), p. 193.



His skepticism fit with Peel's reluctance to legislate social improvement. An illustration of Graham's policy appeared in a letter of September 17, 1842, addressed to Peel.

I own to you that I am afraid of an inquiry by a 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 exact to the utmost the hopes and fears of rival factions; the truth will be exposed in a light probably 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. . . .if we appoint a Commission of Inquiry, if reports of striking effect be produced, if relying on these reports we attempt any large measure, general alarm will be excited, a spirit of resistance will be generated, failure will ensue, and the good which might otherwise be effected will be rendered impossible.<sup>67</sup>

This recommendation, with an air of disregard for the suffering masses, however politically sound, could never appeal to those who urged heroic social action.

Young England exhibited disenchantment with governmental social reforms. This opposition, of course, made

---

<sup>67</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 548-49.

them unpopular with the government. Graham expressed his displeasure in a letter to John Wilson Croker on August 22, 1843.

With respect to Young England, the puppets are moved by D'Israeli, who is the ablest man among them: I consider him unprincipled and disappointed; and in despair he has tried the effect of bullying. I think with you, that they will return to the crib after prancing, capering, and snorting; but a crack or two of the whip well applied may hasten and ensure their return. D'Israeli alone is mischievous; and with him I have no desire to keep terms. It would be better for the party, if he were driven into the ranks of our open enemies.<sup>68</sup>

Young England created discipline problems within the party. Peel needed the support of the Conservative Party to continue in office; therefore he could not allow them freedom of operation.

In the preceeding decade of the 1830's, English politics had begun to take on a new form and character. Party organization became increasingly important with the increased number of voters. The old idea of ministers being primarily responsible to the Crown had changed with the ouster of Arthur Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington, as Prime Minister in 1830. Peel failed to comprehend this change fully. Furthermore, the reform bill of 1832 had altered the constituencies, and in the ensuing years party organization became more and more important as a prelude to successful election.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup>J. W. Croker, The Croker Papers, 1808-1857, edited by Bernard Pool (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1884 [1967]), p. 188.

<sup>69</sup>Norman Gash, "Peel and the Party System, 1830-50,"

Peel, as Conservative leader, took command of shaping the party to the new demands.

The reciprocal relations of Peel and party were never ideal. Croker, an old and close friend of Peel's, analyzed the results of the general election of 1841.

The elections are wonderful, and the curiosity is that all turns on the name of Sir Robert Peel. 'Tis the first time that I remember in our history that the people have chosen the first minister for the Sovereign. Mr. Pitt's case in '84 is the nearest analogy; but then the people only confirmed the Sovereign's choice; here every Conservative candidate professed himself in plain words to be Sir Robert Peel's man, and on that ground was elected.<sup>70</sup>

Hence, the victory, forcing the resignation of the Whig government in August, 1841, was a personal triumph for Peel. Peel accepted the victory in this spirit; he refused to bind himself to support the ideals of the Conservative Party.

Peel did not intend to use his office in the exclusive interests of any private groups. As Prime Minister he expected his rewards to be "but the means of rendering service to his country, and the hope of honourable fame."<sup>71</sup> Conservatism did not constitute a practical political program for Peel. It merely served as the tool which allowed for his uninterrupted operation of government. This

---

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, I (1951), 47-69.

<sup>70</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 475.

<sup>71</sup>Croker, The Croker Papers, 1808-1857, pp. 184-85, prints this letter from Peel.

disinterested attitude, coupled with Peel's natural reserve in dealing with people, created considerable dissension. Of course, if Peel had not demanded personal political allegiance no notable problem would have arisen. Yet, on two occasions Peel threatened resignation unless his party supporters reversed their votes to accord with his own views. This presented a most unusual situation; Peel insisted on the unquestioned allegiance of the Conservative followers, but they could not expect the same return from their party leader.<sup>72</sup> This dichotomy created the prospects for a Conservative, parliamentary ginger group.

Other factors indicate the possible seriousness of an intraparty rebellion. In the view of a contemporary critic, Parliament displayed disgust with Peel's failure to consult his party supporters.<sup>73</sup> The members were still primarily aristocrats (71%), youth was well represented (56% were under age 45), and a significant minority (31%) had no previous Parliamentary experience.<sup>74</sup> Consequently, few members

---

<sup>72</sup>J. W. Croker, "Close of Sir Robert Peel's Administration," Quarterly Review, LXXVIII (September, 1846), 565-80. "Reflections Suggested by the Career of the Late Premier [Peel]," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LXI (January, 1847), 104. Thomas Spring-Rice, "The Late Session," Edinburgh Review, LXXVI (October, 1842), 249.

<sup>73</sup>Charles Cavendish Fulke Greville, The Greville Memoirs, a Journal of the Reigns of King George IV, King William IV, and Queen Victoria, edited by Henry Reeve (7 vols.; 2d ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1844-1911), II, 17-19.

<sup>74</sup>William O. Aydelotte, "The House of Commons in the 1840's," History, XXXIX (October, 1954), 249-62.

of this Parliament had prior opportunities to work with their party leaders. Peel worsened his position by making only minimal attempts to gain the support and good feelings of his party members.

It is beyond dispute, that, in point of tact and business talent, he Peel had no superior; but he either does not possess, or will not exhibit, that frankness which is necessary to make a leader not only respected but beloved; and hence it is that he has again alienated from himself the confidence of a large proportion of his followers.<sup>75</sup>

Young England, a product of this situation, found sympathizers among the rank and file of the conservatives. Yet, Peel's insistence upon allegiance, and the conservative fear of a Whig return to office meant that Young England could become no more than a political ginger group.

The leaders of Young England left an imprint upon the parliamentary sessions. They became an irritating problem to the government by not only asking provocative questions but also often taking a variant view in debate. They refused to be intimidated by Peel. Their forays enlivened the discussions, giving delight to those who opposed, felt ignored, or mistreated by the Prime Minister. The sentiments of Young England, expounded in the House of Commons, received wide publicity.

Young England's Parliamentary maneuvers were not predicated simply on the acquisition of popularity or the badgering

---

<sup>75</sup>"The Late and Present Ministry," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LX (August, 1846), 252.

of Sir Robert Peel. Young England dreamed of employing politics to restore the benevolent, paternalistic, feudalistic customs of Merrie England. Furthermore, they sought to prevent the furtherance of legislation which destroyed remaining traditional institutions or modes of action. A major question, of course, was how to implement its goals.

### CHAPTER III

#### YOUNG ENGLAND AND PARLIAMENTARY SOCIAL LEGISLATION, 1841-1846

Young England sought to use politics as a means of effecting benevolent social reforms. Its leading supporters hoped to influence legislation through constant and active participation in the House of Commons. Therefore, an examination of the members' attendance, questions, debates, maneuverings, and other activities in Parliament should add to an understanding of the movement's concern for the condition of the nation. An investigation of the remedial legislation initiated, encouraged, or supported by Young England should provide invaluable insights. Likewise, a study of those reform proposals which met its opposition should further assist in the determination of the character and substance of the movement. Its accomplishments could be measured by the successful blockage or passage of specific bills and policies.

A concern for society exhibited itself through the Young England movement. Some have asserted that this desire to better society provided the cohesiveness of the movement. Others have argued the passage of social legislation

to be unimportant; that in fact, a petty, spiteful desire to harass Sir Robert Peel, the Prime Minister, provided the basic motivation. Therefore, the extent to which the support for social reform provided its unification and basis for action has remained a matter of controversy. It has never been demonstrated how the participants attempted to translate their sentiments into legislative programs, or if they even really attempted this at all. Young England's influence, role, and significance in promoting social legislation during Peel's ministry of 1841-1846 (special emphasis will, of course, be placed on the sessions of 1843-1845 when Young England enjoyed its political heyday) deserve to be studied. This investigation should also aid in determining whether its legislative accomplishments presaged or undergirded the development of a conservative social conscience--Tory Democracy.

It is unfair to calculate the success and failure of Young England solely in terms of the successful blockage or passage of specific social reforms. While today, Parliament has become the primary instrument for social improvement; it was not so accepted during the 1840's. The achievements of a parliamentary session were not measured by the volume of legislation enacted. A conservative political journalist, in 1843, argued that

the pruriency for legislation has become of late years the subject of universal and, we think, just complaint. Sometimes attacked by ridicule, sometimes by argument, it seems, as a general thesis, admitted to have grown up into a serious



mischief; but, so inconsistent are the opinions and practices even of legislators themselves, that while all agree that law-making, like other manufactures, has exhibited sad proofs of over-production, there are few individuals who have not some special topic of their own on which they would willingly 'bring in a bill,' and still fewer who do not write and talk as if--for every ill or accident that can disturb or distress any class or society--there must needs be in the unexplored depths of legislation some occult specific: and parliaments are disparaged, and governments censured, for not finding remedies for diseases which are no more within the immediate control of governments, or even of parliaments, than climate and seasons.

This unwholesome appetite for 'doing something'--as if doing 'something'--though no one specifies what--were a magical remedy for every possible complaint--. . . deludes the people into false and dangerous estimates of what they have a right to expect from the legitimate powers and duties of a government.<sup>1</sup>

Bemoaning this state of affairs, the journalist took solace that "Sir Robert Peel has shown no disposition to purchase dishonest popularity, either in parliament or the country, by professing to cure diseases which he knows to be beyond the reach of ministerial remedies."<sup>2</sup>

Numerous factors bore down on the government to undertake social reforms. At the opening of his ministry, Peel found that generally difficult economic conditions were affecting all segments of the nation. The results were poverty, starvation, ill-health, poor working and living conditions, and increased political agitation. Interested individuals, philanthropic societies, magazines, novels,

---

<sup>1</sup>J. W. Croker, "Policy of Ministers," Quarterly Review, LXXII (September, 1843), 553.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

journals, and pamphlets created a public opinion in favor of amelioration. The public outcry made reform imperative.<sup>3</sup>

Sir James Graham, who as Home Secretary played a major role in ministerial social policy decisions, declared

we must not neglect any appliance which can improve the moral feeling and disposition of the people. We must augment the means of Education; we must keep down the price of articles of first necessity; we must endeavour to redress the wrongs of the labourer; we must mark an honest sympathy with his wants; and while we uphold the authority of the law with firmness, we must temper it with mercy. All this is in the exact spirit of your Government, and with the Divine blessing, I pray and hope that it may succeed.<sup>4</sup>

With the assistance of the factory inspectors, Graham began the preparation of a social policy for the Peel ministry.<sup>5</sup> Clearly, ministries needed to undertake the creation of social reforms.<sup>6</sup>

As a result, Peel's government provided opportunities for the discussion of social questions. Various aspects of

<sup>3</sup>Alfred [Samuel H. G. Kydd], The History of the Factory Movement (2 vols.; London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1857), I, v-viii, 157-58. G. S. R. Kitson Clark, An Expanding Society, Britain, 1830-1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 39-40, 134-37. W. H. Chaloner, The Hungry Forties: a Re-Examination (Aids for Teachers Series; London: Published for the Historical Association by Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957), argues that times were not as hard as usually considered.

<sup>4</sup>Charles S. Parker (ed.), Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers (3 vols.; 2d ed.; London: John Murray, 1899), II, 547, prints the letter of September 1, 1842, from Graham to Peel. Hereinafter referred to as Sir Robert Peel.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., II, 549-50, Graham to Peel, December 21, 1842.

<sup>6</sup>George Cornwall Lewis, "Legislation for the Working Classes," Edinburgh Review, LXXXIII (January, 1846), 64-99.

the New Poor Law were discussed in 1841, 1842, 1843, and 1845. Conditions in the mines were discussed in 1842 and 1843. Factory conditions were debated in 1843, 1844, and 1846. Numerous other bills added to the time spent in the discussion of social concerns, but the ministry found a general lack of enthusiasm for social legislation among the members of Parliament.<sup>7</sup> Young England failed to take full opportunity of the discussions. Only during the 1844 session did it present an aggressive legislative concern for social problems.

Young England opened its political mutiny in the middle of 1843. The specific occasion, a motion by Augustus Stafford O'Brien, called for an inquiry into the fundamental causes of Irish distress. From the start the members of the ministry expressed apprehension about Young England. William Ewart Gladstone, a rising member of Peel's cabinet, stated this attitude.

I certainly am one of those who think that in point of significance those whom you term "an energetic and enterprising portion" of the party have gained nothing by their late erratic movements. By "significance," however, I mean, not the notoriety of the moment, but permanent weight and the promise of power to be useful. And in this sentence I do not include Lord John Manners' philanthropic efforts: these appear to me quite distinct from the political errors of himself and his friends.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>William O. Aydelotte, "Voting Patterns in the British House of Commons in the 1840's," Comparative Studies in Society and History, V (1962-63), 155-63, discusses the passage of social legislation.

<sup>8</sup>William Ewart Gladstone to Richard Monckton Milnes,

Perceiving no benefits from cooperating with Young England, Peel neglected to send Benjamin Disraeli the party circular calling for attendance in the 1844 session. The breach was healed temporarily, but the amicability could not continue even through a single session.<sup>9</sup>

Doubtless, the members of Young England were upset over the plight of the working classes of the nation. Along with many other Tories during the general election of 1841, the future Young England members talked of the social conditions. Yet, the Tory victories did not translate into the enactment of comprehensive social remedies.<sup>10</sup> In fact, Disraeli, in 1842, had given evidence that foreign, not social, concerns were to provide the major purpose of the Young England movement.<sup>11</sup> Cochrane declared "the Young Englanders were not supposed to adopt a factious line: they simply expressed in bright and vigorous language fresh political views, which they hoped to see adopted by the government. . ."<sup>12</sup>

---

Oct. 23, 1843, quoted in Thomas Wemyss Reid, Life, Letters and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton (2 vols.; 2d ed.; London: Cassell & Co., 1890), I, 313. Hereinafter referred to as Houghton.

<sup>9</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 144-47, contains letters of Disraeli and Peel on the matter. Robert Blake, Disraeli (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), pp. 178-79.

<sup>10</sup>Thomas Spring-Rice, "The Late Session," Edinburgh Review, LXXVI (October, 1842), 241-74.

<sup>11</sup>Refer to Chapter II, p. 51, for this statement by Disraeli.

<sup>12</sup>Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, In the Days of the Dandies (Edinburgh: Blackwood's, 1890), p. 108.

The interest, intent, and purpose of Young England does not appear to have been greatly concerned with the passage of ameliorative legislation.

The leaders of Young England did display concern for society. On a number of occasions, they called for investigations of the causes of distress. Disraeli had established a reputation in support of the workers and had spoken favorably on the problems of the Chartists. Manners established a reputation as a philanthropist, and he gained first-hand impressions of the conditions in the northern manufacturing districts which enabled him to act knowledgeably upon the problems.<sup>13</sup> Cochrane, who also studied social problems, maintained that a major error came from the overemployment of machinery.<sup>14</sup> Of the quartet, Smythe possessed the least interest in social concerns, but he studied the problems with Manners and supported ameliorative social measures.

Nevertheless, concern and opportunity did not result in Young England promoting practical, comprehensive, legislative programs of social reform. Disraeli on February 14, 1843, expressed the idea that the complexity of the problem prevented any simple solution.

He would not, on the present occasion, attempt to investigate the origin of the distress, the

---

<sup>13</sup>Charles Whibley, Lord John Manners and His Friends (2 vols.; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925), I, 106. Hereinafter referred to as Manners.

<sup>14</sup>Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. 68 (1843), pp. 928-33. Hereinafter referred to as Hansard's.

prevalence of which was now universally recognised. But he would observe, that that origin must be sought in no single cause, but in a complication of causes; some vast, some comparatively minute, but all with a simultaneous action, even though unconnected together, pressing on our industry in a manner perhaps unprecedented in the history of our commerce.<sup>15</sup>

In early 1842, Manners, when provided a golden opportunity to propose a means of ending the distress, refused to make any specific recommendations.<sup>16</sup> Smythe had nothing of value to add to the question; Cochrane had little better. In 1843, Cochrane did call for the end of all governmental centralization plans, a declaration of the governments' plan for the corn laws, and a stimulation of religious and moral ideals.<sup>17</sup>

Only three social issues provided much unity for the group. The one positive proposal called for the allotments of wastelands to the poor. The two negative proposals called for the repeal of the law of mortmain and the destruction of the New Poor Law. Apparently, the achievement of pragmatic social legislation did not furnish the cohesiveness for Young England. The following chart (see p. 96) visually demonstrates the leaders' disunity on selected social questions as they arose in Parliament.

To the leaders of Young England religion appeared as significant as politics in solving the social ills of the day. This advocacy of the importance of religion resulted

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., Vol. 66 (1843), pp. 615-16.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., Vol. 60 (1842), p. 262.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., Vol. 66 (1843), pp. 715-21.

PARLIAMENTARY RESPONSES BY YOUNG ENGLAND LEADERS  
TO SELECTED SOCIAL ISSUES

	New Poor Law:	Mortmain Repeal:	Allot- ments:	Ten Hours:	Health of Towns:	Maynooth Supply:
	1841	1843	1843	1844	1847	1841
	1842	1846	1845	1846		1842
	1844	1847		1847		1843
	1847					1845
Disraeli	d n	i	i	a	i	d n
Manners	d n	d a	d a	d a	d n	d a
Smythe	n	a	a	n	i	d a
Cochrane	d n	i	i	d a	i	d n

Key:

d--spoke in debate

n--negative vote against policy or legislation

a--affirmative vote for policy or legislation

i--inactive on the question

in many of their contemporaries connecting the aims of Young England with the Oxford inspired Tractarian Movement.<sup>18</sup> In 1841, prior to the formation of Young England, a contemporary noted the sympathy for the Oxford Movement.

I wish I could give in the short compass of a letter all the many proofs I daily receive from various correspondents of the rapidly encreasing [sic] influence of the Oxford Divines and of their party generally. . . . already practical men like Gladstone, Milnes, and others, Lord John Manners, for instance, Mr. Bailly [sic] Cochrane, etc., are taking it up. Milnes wrote me a most flattering letter about the part I had taken in the matter.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup>Lewis, "Legislation for the Working Classes," pp. 64-99. Also see discussions of this point in Chapter II, pp. 56, 60-65, and Chapter IV, pp. 200-04.

<sup>19</sup>Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Lord Shrewsbury, printed in Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (2 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1900), II, 308.

During the early 1840's both groups called for an extension of the power of the Anglican church. Both felt that the church should reassert the importance of other-worldly concerns in caring for society's secular well-being. Frederick Faber provided the connection between the Oxford Movement and Young England. Manners and Smythe were enthused by Faber in their search for ways to better the social conditions of England.<sup>20</sup>

Once restored, the Anglican church, in Young England's opinion, had to improve the overall spirit of man through the implementation of comprehensive social programs. The church was not to be confined within the normal limits of practical, limited, remedial legislation, but it was to provide a tower of social and spiritual inspiration. Manners advocated an end to all restrictions hampering the church from playing its proper role in the restoration of the romantic medieval unity of church and state.<sup>21</sup> While the church would aim at ethereal objectives, it needed to come to grips with the problems of poverty, distress of the masses, and the proper education of the youth of the nation. Cochrane, on one occasion, argued if "the House strenuously endeavoured to promote religion and morality through the

---

<sup>20</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 66-67, prints Manners' Journal entries of August 4 and 9, 1838.

<sup>21</sup>Manners, Smythe, and Disraeli favored Anglicanism, but they could accommodate all Christian religions within their schemes. Cochrane, more staunchly Protestant, could not accept the idea of state endowment of Catholicism.



country, by upholding the authority of the church, . . . he believed that the cloud on the horizon would not overshadow us; . . ."<sup>22</sup> Clearly, religion provided a basic factor in any social alteration contemplated by Young England.

Manners was upset that portions of the law of mortmain hampered voluntary contributions in the amelioration of social evils. Hence, he sought to remove the eighteenth century restrictions on the granting of land to institutions (primarily religious) for benevolent, charitable purposes. In 1843, he proposed a resolution "'that it is inexpedient, in the present condition of the country, to continue the existing restrictions on the exercise of private charity and munificence.'"<sup>23</sup> Manners tried to answer all possible objections to ending the restrictions. He argued that commerce would not suffer; anyway "he was sure, that even if it were so, the country was suffering more from the excess of commercial competition and enterprise than it would from any such slight check that might be given to it by the repeal of the Mortmain Act."<sup>24</sup>

The end of the law would have immensely aided benevolent institutions. Manners asserted that an earnest appeal to "the nobler impulses of our nature; . . . faith and charity" could bring about the establishment of much needed

---

<sup>22</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 66 (1843), p. 721.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., Vol. 71 (1843), p. 109.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 103-04.

schools, cathedrals, churches, hospitals, and religious houses. Mortmain inhibited these impulses. He felt that with the end of mortmain the poorer classes would discover their situation much improved through the expansion of individual charity.<sup>25</sup> His intent was benevolent and laudatory.

The government, from the beginning, opposed the measure for the repeal of the mortmain law. First, Graham objected to such an important matter being handled as a resolution. Next, he expressed the fear that the end of restrictions might lead to the re-establishment of monastic institutions throughout England.<sup>26</sup> Many other members of Parliament agreed with Graham. In face of this opposition, Manners regretfully withdrew the resolution.<sup>27</sup> Nonetheless, he refused to drop the issue. Later, he returned to it--unsuccessfully.

Young England professed support for church directed education. A major aspect of the problem of the relation of the church and state existed in the determination of the role of religion in the education of the youth. In 1843, the government introduced a factory bill which, due to the strong opposition to the educational clauses, had to be

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 106-09.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 109-11.

<sup>27</sup>Smythe, Disraeli, and Cochrane failed to speak on this measure. See Chapter V, pp. 211-14, for a continuation of his attempts.

withdrawn.<sup>28</sup> For some unknown reason, the leaders of Young England did not take the opportunity to state their position or to play a role in this donnybrook.

Young England was particularly intrigued with the condition of the Irish Maynooth College for the education of Roman Catholic clergy. Yet, when the issue rose to major prominence in the 1845 session, the members could not agree on a united stand. All wished for the religious direction of educational activities; they could not agree, however, whether this should include the Roman Catholic Church, or the extent the state should enter into this process.

The leaders of Young England, prior to the major debate in 1845, had expressed their feelings on Maynooth. Disraeli, as early as 1839, had stated a general objection to the interference of the state into education.<sup>29</sup> In 1841, on the question of supply to Maynooth, Smythe supported the grant. On the other hand, in both 1841 and 1842, Cochrane strongly objected to granting of the supply.<sup>30</sup> In 1843,

---

<sup>28</sup>Edward Baines, Jr., The Social, Educational, and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., & T. Ward & Co., 1843), shows opposition on two counts, (1) the state of education in manufacturing districts as not lower than in the rural districts, (2) the bill placed the Anglican church in areas held by Dissenting Churches.

<sup>29</sup>Francis Hitchman, The Public Life of the Right Honourable Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vols.; London: Chapman & Hall, 1879), I, 79, comments on Disraeli's parliamentary speech of June 30, 1839.

<sup>30</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 59 (1841), pp. 668-71, Vol. 65 (1842), p. 385. The grant of £4,464 in 1841 passed by the vote of 99-23. The grant in 1842 was for £8,928.

Cochrane spoke against the supply motion and served as the teller of the opposition votes. Manners and Smythe, in contrast, voted for the victorious (120-40) grant of supply.<sup>31</sup>

In 1844, Peel gave notice of his intention to increase the grant to Maynooth College. True to this promise, in 1845, he moved to raise the grant to £26,300 annually, plus an additional £30,000 for rebuilding purposes. This move, eventually successful, fragmented most of the traditional political groupings.<sup>32</sup> As to be expected, Young England split. Smythe and Manners favored the increased grant. Cochrane, who had displayed vehement opposition in the past, did not attend the debate. Therefore, Disraeli filled Cochrane's role by not only opposing the increase but also launching a scathing attack on Peel's intentions and motives.

Disraeli resisted the grant on the grounds of maintaining the separation of church and state. He preferred that religious concerns remain free from control of the House of Commons. He feared that the principle of state intervention once allowed could not be stopped. "Will you apply this principle of endowment to sectarians and schismatics of every class? Where will you stop? Why should you stop?"<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., Vol. 68 (1843), pp. 727-28. The grant was again for £8,928.

<sup>32</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 175-76, prints a letter from Peel to Croker, April 22, 1845, in which he states that the major opposition came from Dissenters and Members of Parliament yielding to them.

<sup>33</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 79 (1845), p. 555.

Disraeli's position was completely logical and consistent with his past statements on such questions.

The notoriety of his speech stems from the remaining statements in which Disraeli openly declared rebellion against Peel.

I oppose this Bill on account of the manner in which it has been introduced, and I oppose it also on account of the men by whom it has been brought forward. . . .I do not think-- . . .that the Gentlemen who are now seated on the Treasury Bench are morally entitled to bring such a measure forward.<sup>34</sup>

Furthermore, he attacked the grant as insufficient thereby incapable of solving the problems of education of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland. He decried the disastrous effect of the bill in destroying the operation of the political parties within the House of Commons. Clearly, for Disraeli, the Maynooth grant had pitfalls and dire implications far beyond just a simple increase of money.<sup>35</sup>

On April 16, 1845, only five days after Disraeli's speech, Manners spoke in favor of the grant. He argued, "as a Churchman, I am free in conscience either to support or oppose this grant; and it is as a statesman, therefore, that I must come to a decision upon it."<sup>36</sup> In his thinking it

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 561. Spring-Rice, "The Late Session," pp. 263-66, as early as October, 1842, had commented that Peel was implementing Whig views on education in both England and Ireland.

<sup>35</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 555-69, for his entire speech.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 826.

had already become established policy that the state supported the training of Roman Catholic clergy at Maynooth College. Hence, this grant merely provided the required financial backing to assure a quality education for the students. He even hoped that the grant might lead to better relations with the Vatican, culminating in a mutual venture to the credit of Christendom. In contrast to Disraeli, Manners rejoiced that "we may augur from this magnanimity to Maynooth, a return to a more generous and confiding bearing on the part of the State towards the Church of England: . . ."<sup>37</sup> Therefore, without hesitation, he pledged full support of the bill.

On this same evening, Smythe also spoke in favor of the increased grant. He declared it "a liberal, a wise, and a conciliatory course, . . ."; one that he had urged the government to undertake two years previously.<sup>38</sup> He leveled a barrage against those opponents who raised the cry of religious fear--No-Popery. Quite pointedly, in contradiction of Disraeli's earlier speech, he praised Peel and his policy concerning Maynooth.

Among the many contrasts which the right hon. Gentleman's long career affords, there is none which history will record more favourably than the contrast between Mr. Secretary Peel and Sir Robert Peel the Prime Minister of England. The young and proscribing partisan has become the clement and beneficent ruler--the young Octavius of intolerance is merged in the

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 830.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 833-34.

Augustus of conciliation and of grace. The right hon. Gentleman may in this matter rely on the sincerity of my congratulations because I know full well how much they will cost me.<sup>39</sup>

Smythe hoped that increased assistance to Maynooth would reconcile the Irish Roman Catholics to the government. The result, unity binding the nation against all outsiders, would assure that "'our Queen reigns over a united people.'"<sup>40</sup>

The Maynooth grant raised a problem for Young England over the position to be taken in regard to the ministry. Smythe had drawn closer to Peel. Cochrane, uncommitted, played only a nominal part during the 1845 session. Manners continued to exhibit an independence of thought regarding governmental proposals. For example, Manners tried to alter some of the proposals contained within the Maynooth grant, even though he supported the overall attempt. Soon afterward he opposed the Irish Academical Institutions Bill because he considered it too secular in intent.<sup>41</sup> In any case, the other members of Young England refused to follow Disraeli into open warfare.

It appears then, that Young England produced no victories, or even unity of purpose, in promoting the educational claims of religion. While interested, it could not agree on a common policy or objective. Obviously, it did

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 835. Smythe also argued that Gladstone's stand was unfortunate and unrealistic.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 840.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 118-19, 123, 1137-41.

not possess harmony based upon a practical legislative program for the betterment of church-state-education relations. The source of its cohesion, if parliamentary and political, must be sought elsewhere.

The factory legislation proposed during the 1844 session provides the best illustration of the attitude of Young England toward practical social reform. A squabble erupted in the House of Commons when the attempt was made to limit the daily hours of labor of women and children to a maximum of ten hours.<sup>42</sup> Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley and later the 7th Earl of Shaftesbury, the major proponent of the ten hours clause, realized that Peel's government resisted his alteration.<sup>43</sup> True to form, when Ashley on March 15, 1844, amended the bill in favor of ten hours, the government immediately asked for reconsideration of the vote.

Therefore, the 1844 factory bill became a test between the proponents and opponents of the limitation of ten hours labor for women and children.<sup>44</sup> Young England with its origins in Tory Radicalism came to the support of the ten

---

<sup>42</sup>John Trevor Ward, The Factory Movement, 1830-1855 (London: Macmillan, 1962), has an informative discussion on the Ten Hours Movement. William O. Aydelotte, "The House of Commons in the 1840's," History, XXXIX (October, 1954), 249-62, also has an interesting analysis.

<sup>43</sup>Norman Gash, "Ashley and the Conservative Party in 1842," English Historical Review, LIII (October, 1938), 679-81.

<sup>44</sup>Refer to Chapter I, pp. 15-17 for a discussion of background of this movement.



hours movement--that is, all except Smythe.<sup>45</sup> While the quartet did not present an unanimous front, its general assent concurred with their Tory humanitarian friends, such as William Busfeild Ferrand, a long time advocate, and Richard Monckton Milnes who declared himself "an aide-de-camp of Ashley's. . ."<sup>46</sup> In the end the advocates for the ten hour day were defeated, but Peel experienced some trying times.

Manners spoke in favor of Ashley's ten hours amendment. He did not speak in anger but professed a sympathy for the manufacturing interests of the realm. He believed that the employees of the larger manufacturing establishments were not overworked. He openly acknowledged that many workers had profitted by moving from the rural agricultural districts to the urban manufacturing and commercial districts. Manners, fully cognizant of the problems, concluded "that the same county may easily at the same time, 'bloom a garden and a grave.'"<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, he agreed with Ashley in rejecting the argument that the commerce of the nation depended totally upon the two extra hours of labor over the ten hours daily. Further, he denied that the reduction

---

<sup>45</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 160-65, claims the struggle temporarily united Manners and Ashley. Blake, Disraeli, p. 179, claims Disraeli was furious over the vote recision, but he did not speak often.

<sup>46</sup>Milnes to François Guizot, April 5, 1844, quoted in Reid, Houghton, I, 325.

<sup>47</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 73 (1844), p. 1418.

would automatically result in a twenty-five percent decrease in wages; "he had too high an opinion of the humanity of our great English manufacturers to believe that such would be the case."<sup>48</sup>

In summation, Manners argued that it would disastrous to reverse the earlier vote which had approved the ten hours amendment. Having earlier voted for the clause, he asserted that some exceedingly strong reasons, not yet given, had to be put forth before he would alter his opinion. He voiced a private fear that a reversal might result in an English jacquerie.

Sir, said the noble Lord, in conclusion, there may have been, in the opinion of some, a doubt as to the prudence of the decision of a former night. Can there now be any doubt as to the madness of reversing it? By that decision you told the toiling people of England that party difference or indifference to this question was at an end, and that the Legislature was prepared to interfere in behalf of Labour--to interfere for the shirt maker of London--for the poor workman of the metropolis, and in behalf of want and poverty wherever they are to be found throughout the broad Kingdom of England, as well as in favour of the operative spinners of cotton and of flax. By that decision, you caused joy and smiles to prevail where, before, was nothing but despair--and yet that decision you now propose to reverse. You then held out to the parched lips of toil and neglect the cup of hope--will you now dash it to the ground untasted? I would entreat this House, I would implore this Committee, to reflect for a moment on what has occurred during the last three years. Have you learnt nothing from the agrarian rebellion in Wales--Cambridgeshire and elsewhere regard your flaming homesteads and fired corn-ricks? Do all these things teach you nothing? Methinks, when the storm does

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 1420.

arise, and the waves of anarchy begin to break upon the barriers of the Constitution, and when all you hold dear and value shall be swept away in the general desolation a poor consolation it will be to you to reflect that such a melancholy result has arisen from your refusal to interfere in behalf of the over-worked labourer who toils beyond human endurance at the manufactures of England, albeit that refusal may be in accordance with the strictest canons of political economy.<sup>49</sup>

Despite eloquent pleas the vote was reconsidered, and the second vote defeated the amendment. Then in an even more extraordinary maneuver, the House defeated the government's twelve hour measure as well. Votes had thus been recorded for and against both ten hours and twelve hours provisions.

At an impasse, the government withdrew the entire factory bill. Cochrane utilized this occasion to speak. He commended the government for withdrawing the bill, since it claimed to be compromising its principles if it abandoned the twelve hours clause. Nevertheless, he pledged continued support for ten hours. He believed that, despite the ten hours limit, production and wages would remain stable. The extra energy of the workers freed from excessive hours of work would more than make up for the two hours of toil.<sup>50</sup>

After the Easter recess, the government introduced a

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 1420-21.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., pp. 1617-20. Cochrane also criticized Ashley for failing to press the ten hours issue to a conclusion prior to the Easter recess.

revised factory bill which included the provision for a twelve-hour day. To facilitate passage, the House of Commons received the governmental directive that the bill had to be passed without a ten hours amendment--or the ministry would resign.<sup>51</sup> Undaunted, Ashley on the third reading on May 13 introduced a ten hours clause. Peel carried the vote against Ashley but not without creating hard feelings. Cochrane criticized the government for obstinance on the issue. He was angered that it had been made a party question after allowing the early discussions and voting to be conducted along non-party lines.<sup>52</sup>

The ten hours question and factory bill of 1844 did not provide political unanimity among the leaders of Young England. Manners provided the most fervent support for the ten hours enactment, and he continued to favor its implementation in 1846, 1847, and 1850. Disraeli did not provide any vocal support in the 1844, 1846, or 1847 debates; however he later claimed to have been a supporter of ten hours throughout the legislative conflict.<sup>53</sup> Cochrane participated

---

<sup>51</sup>Charles Cavendish Fulke Greville, The Greville Memoirs, a Journal of the Reigns of King George IV, King William IV, and Queen Victoria, edited by Henry Reeve (7 vols.; 2d ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1844-1911), I, 546-48, recorded on March 31, 1844, that Peel could carry the bill; so the threat might have been unnecessary. Hereinafter referred to as The Greville Memoirs.

<sup>52</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 74 (1843), pp. 1077-78.

<sup>53</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, Addresses on Education, Finances and Politics (rev. ed.; London: Charles Hawksley, 1873), pp. 17-18. Disraeli voted for passage in 1846 and 1847.

only in 1844. Smythe remained mute, although in 1846 he voted against ten hours. Young England was neither callous nor oblivious to unsatisfactory conditions, but the concern was individual, not of the group.

Ever since its passage in 1835, the New Poor Law had met with opposition. While there was not any serious attempt to create a national organization, many factory reformers, especially those from the north, added this to their lists of causes to advocate. At least until the advent of Chartism, it offered a unity of Tory factory reformers and radical workingmen.<sup>54</sup> In the early 1840's, with the widespread existence of distress in manufacturing districts, attempts to extend relief without destroying the workhouse system brought severe problems. Young England assumed a personal concern with this question. One of its close sympathizers, Ferrand, while serving as Chairman of the Keighley Union in 1842, had hotly contested the actions of the Central Poor Law Commissioners.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, Young England came to the forefront of parliamentary opposition to the continuance of the New Poor Law. This opposition produced its greatest unanimity on any social legislation.

---

<sup>54</sup>Nicholas C. Edsall, The Anti-Poor Law Movement, 1834-44 (Manchester: University Press, 1971), pp. 25-58, 167-86. Anthony Brundage, "The Landed Interest and the New Poor Law: a reappraisal of the Revolution in Government," English Historical Review, LXXXVII (January, 1972), 27-48, argues that New Poor Law increased, not decreased, the powers of the landed gentry.

<sup>55</sup>Edsall, The Anti-Poor Law Movement, 1834-44, pp. 232-42.

Cochrane, Manners, and Disraeli spoke against the New Poor Law. Smythe, though silent, voted with them. Young Englanders opposed the New Poor Law out of the fear of governmental centralization of power. Disraeli adamantly opposed any measure which reduced local political power. During the general election of 1841, he had openly attacked the centralized system of poor relief.<sup>56</sup> Disraeli's established opposition to the New Poor Law must have been considered by Smythe, Manners, and Cochrane as they drew near to him.

In 1842, Young England did not possess sufficient unity to demonstrate coordinated dislike for the five year extension of the New Poor Law. Cochrane, however, spoke against it. He stated,

that it appeared to him that every law bearing upon the poor should have two objects in view; the first, that the relief should be speedy and effectual, and the other (and by no means the least important) object was, that the relief should be given in such a manner as should be acceptable to the people and call forth their gratitude--that it should be of that kind which blesseth both the giver and the receiver.<sup>57</sup>

The present law, in his opinion, fulfilled only the first purpose; therefore the system should be altered to approximate a voluntary contribution. He derided the argument in favor of the cheapness of the operation of the New Poor Law.

---

<sup>56</sup>The Shropshire Conservative, July 3, 1841. The Northern Star, July 3, 1841, also wrote favorably of Disraeli's attacks on the New Poor Law.

<sup>57</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 64 (1842), p. 585.

"It was not what they paid, but what was sufficient to provide for the destitution of the poor, to which they should look as the principal object of a Poor-law."<sup>58</sup>

While the government succeeded in extending the law for another five years, opposition continued. Early in the 1843 session an attack, supported by Young England, on the New Poor Law occurred. John Walter, a long time opponent to the poor relief system, moved for its total reconstruction. Ferrand seconded the motion. Manners supported the motion arguing, in the same vein opened by Cochrane in the previous year, for a more humane poor relief system. "Some members had referred to the statute of Elizabeth, but he would go further back, and say that the administration of the funds for the maintenance of the poor ought to be in the hands of the Church."<sup>59</sup> This vexatious attempt for alteration failed.

In the next session the government brought in an amendment thereby furnishing a fresh opportunity for debate. Manners and Cochrane led the Young England opposition to the government's proposal. Young England, at its peak of unity, took full advantage of the dislike (generated by the ten hours vote recision) for Peel. Young England expressed hostility to, and defiance of, the government. The major attempt at disruption came on July 4, 1844, with Cochrane and

---

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 586.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., Vol. 66 (1843), pp. 1217; 1159, for the beginning of the debate.

Manners debating; Disraeli and Smythe voting.<sup>60</sup> At the first opportunity, Young England intended to scuttle the New Poor Law.

At the very start of the discussion, Cochrane proposed "'that the new Poor Law, though improved by the proposed amendments, is still opposed to the ancient Constitution of this realm, and inadequate to the necessities of the people.'" <sup>61</sup> At the completion of his speech he moved to put off the bill for six months (this would have killed the measure up for consideration). The move to put off the bill failed, so the debate continued.

Cochrane reiterated many of his points from the previous year. For instance poverty was not to be considered a crime, relief was to make both the receiver and the donor feel better, the incorrectness of centralized administration of the system, and the consideration of the cheapness of operation as a major factor in the question of poor relief. He attacked the greed and shortsightedness of the commercial and manufacturing interests of the state. In his estimation the laborers were willing to work but not enough jobs existed. He argued that this state of affairs had been accentuated in

that every measure affecting the commercial and financial interests of the country that had been passed since the year 1819 had tended

---

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., Vol. 74 (1844), pp. 981-82; Vol. 76 (1844), p. 105.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., Vol. 76 (1844), p. 319.



directly to the benefit of the capitalist and to the injury and deprivation of the labouring classes; and amongst these measures not the least influential had been the Currency Bill, the Poor Law Amendment Act and the New Tariff.<sup>62</sup>

The baneful conditions--the gulf between the rich and the poor--seemed to be worsening. Cochrane asserted that while commerce and manufacturing had made England a great international power; they had also destroyed domestic tranquility. He reminded the members of Parliament that similar situations had occurred in sixteenth century Spain and seventeenth century France, with ruin as the outcome. Hence, to prevent a parallel decline and to restore the domestic bliss of England, Cochrane asked the House of Commons to reject the poor relief system.<sup>63</sup>

Peter Borthwick, a Young England sympathizer, followed Cochrane with the next major speech. He lambasted the harshness of the workhouse system and lamented the unjust treatment of the workers of the kingdom. Distrusting the entire composition of the system, he presented two resolutions.

- "1. That the Act 4 and 5 William IV. c. 76, commonly called the New Poor Law, is unconstitutional in principle, and oppressive in operation.
2. That it is therefore expedient that the said Act should be taken into consideration, with a view, not to its partial amendment, but to its entire reconstruction."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., pp. 319-35.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 343, 335-43, for the entire speech.

The ministry, upset by these attacks, could not let Young England succeed.

Graham presented the government's case in rebuttal to the arguments, objections, and resolutions of Cochrane and Borthwick. He decried their gross misunderstandings of the operation and objectives of the New Poor Law. Especially objectionable, in his opinion, were the unfounded charges against commercial and manufacturing concerns. He argued that the only remedies to the prevailing adverse conditions existed in the stimulation of commerce and manufacturing, plus the legislative amelioration of problems and inequities of the New Poor Law.<sup>65</sup> Even Lord John Russell, the leader of the Whig, parliamentary opposition, expressed strong support for the governmental policy.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, Young England decided to fight to the end.

After allowing the expression of varied viewpoints, the dissidents made their move. Abruptly, Ferrand moved for the adjournment of the debate. Immediately, Peel arose, lashing at the opponents of the amendment, claiming that the government had only brought in the amendment to meet their objections. Peel, incensed by Young England tactics, threatened to abandon the bill if the furor continued. Cochrane, Borthwick, and Manners retorted by accusing the government of not allowing sufficient time for a thorough discussion

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 343-57.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. 357-64.

of the act. They criticized Peel for threatening to abandon the bill, which remedied problems acknowledged by the government, only because the debate in the House of Commons took on a form not anticipated by the ministry.

In rapid order, divisions took place on the two questions before the House. On the question of adjournment, 18 voted in favor and 219 against. The small minority included Cochrane, Manners, Disraeli, Smythe, Ferrand, Brothwick, and Richard Monckton Milnes. The Young England sympathizers, strongly evident in this vote, were in a great minority in the House of Commons. On the question that the resolutions proposed by Borthwick be defeated, 199 voted in favor and only 19 against. Young England sentiment, again in the minority, inexplicably did not include the votes of either Disraeli or Milnes.<sup>67</sup> These two divisions assured passage for the governmental amendment act. Only sniping at specific clauses remained for the opponents.

Throughout the rest of the discussion of the act, Young England attacked a number of the proposed provisions. Nonetheless, this opposition was neither blind nor total; each clause was weighed against the desired effect. Young England did not oppose relief for the poor, only the then current mode of administering the relief. On two occasions during this debate Young England pointedly spoke and voted

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., pp. 377-88. On the second vote the ayes are not listed; thus it is impossible to say whether Disraeli and Milnes voted aye or just failed to vote.

in favor of the governmental alterations.<sup>68</sup> It desired to create a workable system, not just to anger Peel. Even on clauses opposed by most of the sympathizers of Young England, not all participated in or agreed with the opposition. Complete unanimity proved to be lacking; there existed no serious conspiracy. The Young England leaders and supporters spoke their convictions and principles on these issues. Social sentiment, not political chicanery, activated their movements.

On July 12, with the House in committee on the Poor Law Amendment Bill, two clauses came under their siege. Borthwick opened the salvo with an attempt to gain the acceptance of parish clergymen as *ex officio* guardians of all local or parish unions for the poor. Cochrane, Ferrand, and Manners sustained the idea by stressing the propriety of the clergy serving as the dispensers of charity. Graham effectively refuted their proposal. An evident lack of support convinced Borthwick to withdraw the proposal without further ado.

Next, Cochrane expressed doubts about a clause authorizing the placing of lunatics in workhouses. He contended that there had been numerous infractions of the rule that lunatics be kept no longer than fourteen days in any workhouse. He made no attempt, however, to bring a division on the question.<sup>69</sup> So, on this day, Young England displayed

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., pp. 442, 821.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., pp. 740-44.

opposition but stopped short of an open breach.

On the following day, with the House back in committee, divisions were pressed. Manners voiced disapproval of the government's proposal of placing schools for the poor under the control of the Poor Law Commissioners. As always, he demanded that the education of the people be supervised by the clergy. He objected to the creation of district schools, which destroyed the home environment, in order to provide for the proper education of the youth. Yet, when the division was taken, Manners, Borthwick, Ferrand, and O'Brien voted for the governmental provision. Seemingly, this novel pattern of voting constituted a parliamentary maneuver to introduce as many objectionable elements into the bill as possible. Apparently, they hoped for the eventual defeat of the entire clause for Borthwick, immediately after the division, denounced the over-centralization of education. In the ensuing vote Manners cast the sole negative vote with Ferrand and Borthwick serving as the negative tellers.<sup>70</sup> Graham had led the government to another victory.

Undismayed by its failures, Young England returned to the offensive on July 24, when Borthwick introduced an alteration concerning the separation of families upon entry into workhouses. Speaking against the operation of the poor relief system, he moved

"and be it Enacted, That when any two persons,  
being husband and wife, both of whom shall be

---

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., pp. 768-72. The vote was 107 ayes and 1 nay.

above the age of sixty years, shall be received into any workhouse in pursuance of the provisions of the said recited Act, or of this Act, such two persons shall not be compelled to live separate and apart from each other in such workhouse; and that to this end suitable and decent accommodation shall be provided in every workhouse for each man and his wife so of the age aforesaid, any thing in the said recited Act, or in the rules and regulations for the government of any workhouse, to the contrary notwithstanding."<sup>71</sup>

Manners rose in defense of this motion. Again Graham resisted their moves. Subsequently, the clause suffered defeat by a vote of thirty-two to ninety-five. In the minority, Milnes and O'Brien voted aye, while Borthwick and Manners served as the affirmative tellers. Evidently, neither the House nor the government was favorable to the movement's machinations.

Still undaunted, O'Brien followed the defeat with another sally. He moved

"and be it Enacted, that the Commissioners do and shall take order for the due performance of religious services in each of such workhouses, and for that purpose do and shall appoint fit persons, being Clergymen of the Church of England to act as Chaplains in such workhouses, and fix the amount to be paid to such Chaplains respectively by way of salary or allowance for their services (which amount when so paid shall be paid out of the rates accordingly); Provided always, that no person shall be so appointed to be a Chaplain for any workhouse shall act as such Chaplain unless he be approved for that purpose by the Bishop of the diocese within which such workhouse is situated."<sup>72</sup>

This motion was intended to encourage the frequency of

---

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., pp. 1346-47.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 1361.

worship services in the workhouses. Unfortunately for O'Brien, Graham rebutted the case quite adequately by stating that parish clergymen could and did already visit the workhouses. Furthermore, the guardians of the workhouses had the right to allow inhabitants to attend parochial Sunday worship services. A division taken on the second reading found Manners, O'Brien, Milnes, Borthwick, and seventeen others supporting the motion, but eighty-two members of the House opposed the move. Decisive defeat was once again administered to their aspirations.<sup>73</sup>

The government had easily withstood the jabs of Young England. Acknowledging the government victory, Cochrane, on July 26, expressed joy over the passage of the Poor Law Amendment Bill. He reasoned that there had existed a definite need for the changes enacted; he trusted the future to bring further desirable alterations. Then in a display of defiance, he reiterated opposition to the poor relief system, contending that the changes to be wrought in the next session should be in the direction of abolition.<sup>74</sup> Young England was beaten but not cowed.

Young England exhibited its greatest cohesion, spirit, and inclination to disrupt the proceeding of Parliament in its opposition to the New Poor Law. As a ramification of this struggle the leaders of the movement had to defend

---

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., pp. 1340-70, contains the entire episode.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., pp. 1492-95.

Ferrand. Even though they disagreed with Ferrand's position in this case, they defended his deportment. The Young Englanders felt that the government acted in a repressive manner in attempting the censure of Ferrand. On this issue, more than any other, Young England acted as a ginger group in antagonism to the ministry. At no other juncture of their parliamentary heyday did Young England take such a united stand upon such spurious principles.

The clamor arose over a newspaper account of an anti-New Poor Law speech given by Ferrand at Leeds. The speech received wide circulation and The Times account of it was read to the members of the House of Commons and dutifully reported in the columns of Hansard's for April 24, 1844.

"Mr. Ferrand: I know a little about Sir J. Graham. I have had to battle against him when fighting the cause of the working classes in this county; and a man who took steps to procure a report which was false, merely for the purpose of crushing a Member of the House of Commons, who raised his voice in defence of the suffering poor, would not hesitate to keep the working classes in the manufacturing districts in a state of degrading slavery [Cheers]. What was his conduct in my own case? I stuck to the man like a leech. [Cheers]. I told him the report on Mr. Mott, his assistant Poor-law Commissioner, was false. I was determined to bring it before the House until justice was done; but he feared to meet me, and dismissed the poor tool who had been his degraded and ignominious instrument in fabricating the injurious report [Cheers]. That is not all Sir J. Graham has done of late for the purpose of putting down the advocates of the poor in the House of Commons. You will remember that Mr. Walter was returned for Nottingham, and I have had the honour of battling by that Gentleman's side the enemies of the poor [Loud Cheers]. No man has resisted the New Poor-Law more vigorously or at a greater sacrifice of time and



money than Mr. Walter [Cheers]. It was, therefore, felt necessary for Sir J. Graham to get him out of the House of Commons, for Sir James was a man who could not bear to hear the truth spoken, especially on that subject. A Petition was presented against Mr. Walter's return. The Committee sat several days, and entered into an enquiry as to the alleged bribery and corruption which Mr. Walter had committed in obtaining his seat. They could not prove that he had spent one farthing, nor had he; they could only prove that his friends in the town of Nottingham, not his agents, had spent between 30*l.* and 40*l.* in money and what they called treating. The Committee was divided--there were three Whigs for throwing him out, and three Tories for keeping Mr. Walter in. Mr. Hogg, the Member for Beverley, one of the most pure Boroughs in the Kingdom forsooth [Loud Laughter], whether he got his seat for 40*l.* I do not know--but this Tory Chairman aided Sir James Graham and the Government in unseating Mr. Walter. Mr. Hogg tried to explain away his conduct on that occasion; the whole of the Government side of the House, on which I sat listened with feelings of disgust while he higgled and haggled through his explanation; but there was one man who vociferously cheered, and that one man was Sir James Graham!"<sup>75</sup>

On the day prior to the reading of the above account, Ferrand stated that he had read The Times report, affirmed that he had made the charges, and that he did not intend to retract any of the statements. Then he stunned the House into momentary silence by dramatically leaving his seat, walking down the center of the room, and exiting without further elaboration or defense.

Ferrand, therefore, had to be protected by his friends. Disraeli, Smythe, and Manners defended him even though they agreed with the rest of the members of Parliament that the charges of Ferrand were not just. In his defense, they

---

<sup>75</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 74 (1844), pp. 235-36.

reacted strongly against any punishment being inflicted by Parliament. Disraeli, who had served as a member of the election committee which had investigated John Walter's election at Nottingham, publicly stated that the charge against Hogg had no basis in fact. Nevertheless, he declared that the matter should have been handled by Hogg with either a direct appeal for satisfaction to Ferrand or a direct appeal to the House to protect him in his capacity as the chairman of the committee. Disraeli charged that Ferrand had been mistreated by both sides of the House since the printed speech did not constitute a virulent attack. He recommended that Parliament let the matter drop without taking any official action. The House disagreed and refused to let it drop.

Manners and Smythe, however, staunchly opposed the intention of the House to adjudicate this case. After two nights of discussion, Manners tried to end debate by moving the previous question on Peel's motion that the question be taken up on the next Friday. Smythe seconded Manners move. Although he disagreed with Ferrand's views, Smythe felt that Ferrand should be allowed to maintain his beliefs. Smythe charged that the issue had been blown out of proportion by John Roebuck's mischievous plan of taking time away from the discussion of the poor law. Belligerently, Roebuck rose in self-defense and in attack on Smythe. In contrast, Graham and Hogg made conciliatory speeches. Hence, Young England decided against forcing a division of the House.

On the Friday designated, the House returned to the problem. Before the main question could be dealt with, a related dispute between Roebuck and Smythe had to be resolved. Roebuck alleged that Smythe intended to force him into a duel. He insisted that Smythe's letter about the debate of the 24th be printed for the information of the House of Commons.

"Travellers' Club, April 25.

"Sir,--I cannot determine from the newspaper reports of your speech, nor from what I understood of it myself last night, whether it was to me personally that you meant to apply dishonourable motives.

"If it is, I beg to refer you to a letter to my Constituents, dated the 19th of July, 1843, which contains this passage--that as I had never asked a favour of Sir R. Peel's Government, so I could not be actuated by any motive of disappointment, should I be induced by my convictions to vote against it.

"I repeat this assertion.

"I must now call upon you to state that you did not apply your remarks to me; or if you did so, either to retract them, or to refer this matter to some friend to whom my friend, Captain Darnell, can address himself.

"I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

"G. Smythe."<sup>76</sup>

Roebuck claimed that upon Captain Darnell's delivery of the letter; he (Roebuck) had asserted that Smythe would receive his answer in the House of Commons.

Smythe appeared caught off-balance by Roebuck's move, although he had been forewarned by Manners. In vain, he tried to redeem the situation by pointing out previous attacks leveled by Roebuck against him, plus disputing

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 287.

Roebuck's version of the handling of the letter. Consequently, he felt that his intentions were being viewed from the wrong perspective. Upon the urging of the speaker of the House of Commons, he made a full apology and pledged that the matter would proceed no further.

With this episode out of the way, the case against Ferrand resumed. Ferrand, who had been ordered to attend, apologized to the House and to the working classes of England for becoming involved in a quarrel which had taken up precious time--time that would have been better spent dealing with questions of the poverty of the people. Nevertheless, he still refused to retract his reported statements. In addition, he denied the right of the House of Commons to try him on any criminal charge.

Immediately after Ferrand sat down, members clamored to comment. Graham denied the charges levied against himself and Hogg. After the withdrawal of Ferrand, Graham, and Hogg from the chambers, Peel proposed a resolution, which read in part

that the said Sir James Graham and James Weir Hogg, esquire, having, in their places, denied the imputations cast upon them, and William Busfeild Ferrand, esquire, having avowed that he had used the said expressions, and having declined to substantiate the truth of them this House is of the opinion that the imputations conveyed in the said expressions are wholly unfounded and calumnious; and that they do not affect, in the slightest degree the honour and character of the Members to whom they were applied.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 308.

This resolution, repudiating Ferrand while defending Graham and Hogg, passed without a single dissenting vote. The only open objection came from Manners who claimed that he had misunderstood which issue was being voted upon. He protested to sections of the resolution. The speaker, however, ruled him out of order, and Manners had to sit down.

Young England had disrupted the business of the House with its protective maneuvers, but it stopped short of casting a vote which was unprincipled. Therefore, the members of the coterie refused to rebel without sound justification. Once again the movement failed to stymie the intentions of the Peel government.<sup>78</sup> Social actions by Young England were based on principles other than negativism, disruptiveness, and opportunism.

Ferrand and Manners played instrumental roles in proposing a bill allocating wastelands to the poor. The idea probably originated with Ferrand for on March 30, 1843, he introduced the bill. In presenting it he decried the widespread existence of poverty and the dearth of constructive remedial efforts. Ferrand asserted that this measure could solve many social problems through the stimulation of agriculture by placing approximately 16,000,000 additional acres of wastelands into profitable cultivation. He cited a corroborative statement from the 1834 Poor Law Commissioners report. This report stated that an agricultural family

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 215-28, 234-69, 285-308, for the debates on the Ferrand-Graham-Hogg squabble.

could successfully till one-half an acre. The anticipated expense and revenue from just one-fourth an acre would be:

"Rent for a quarter of an acre--	0	12	6
Digging--	0	8	0
Manure--	0	10	0
Seed--	0	3	0
Planting--	0	4	0
Hoeing, &c.--	0	8	0
Digging and hawling--	0	10	0
<hr/>			
Supposing the man to hire and pay for everything--	£	2	15 6

## PRODUCE

Twenty sacks of potatoes--	4	10	0
Other vegetables--	1	0	0
	£	5	10 0
<hr/>			
Less labour, &c., as above--	2	15	6
<hr/>			
Clear profit, supposing the man to hire and pay for everything--	£	2	14 6
<hr/>			
If all done by the man--	£	4	4 6" <sup>79</sup>

On the basis of these figures, Ferrand maintained that much misery could be alleviated by appropriating garden plots to the impoverished.

Ferrand's allocation plan applied only to those sections of the nation where unappropriated wastelands existed. This land within each parish was to be used to provide five acres of every one hundred for the poor. An additional ten acres in each parish was to be set aside as a drying ground for wet clothing and for recreation. Parish trustees consisting of the rector of the parish, the lord of the manor,

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., Vol. 68 (1843), pp. 189-90. See Chapter I, pp. 23-24, for reference to Chartist land plan.

the church-wardens, and the overseers, under the constant surveillance of magistrates, who received annual reports of the allotments, were to serve as administrators. The government was to assist the poor in purchasing the needed initial machinery. After six years the purchasers would bear the total expenses of the allotments. Hopefully, by the third year of allotment, full rent price could be exacted thereby returning a profit to the poor-rate fund. The cumulative effect, in Ferrand's opinion, would be the restoration of the economic position of the working classes.<sup>80</sup>

Manners rose to support Ferrand's proposals as well as to meet intervening objections raised by Graham. The Home Secretary had expressed sympathy with the venture, but he doubted its workability since large amounts of uncultivated land were found only in areas with sparse population. In areas of crowded population, the amount of uncultivated lands was minimal. Manners, in rebuttal, expressed belief that additional acres of land could be placed into profitable use. Probably because there existed no adequate argument, Manners ignored the question of the unavailability of lands near heavily populated centers. The House, although skeptical of the broad effects of such a scheme, felt it might benefit the poor; therefore it gave permission to bring in the bill. Nevertheless, no further action occurred on the bill in this session.

---

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., pp. 183-97.

In 1845, the question of allotment of wastelands arose again. Vocal Young England supporters this time included Manners, Smythe, Ferrand, Borthwick, and O'Brien. W. F. Cowper, a liberal, presented the proposal. This bill provided for the creation of parish institutions to administer allotments to the poor where landlords had failed to make such allotments. The creation was voluntary. Manners advocated the bill as a practical measure--one that helped the poor help themselves. On the second reading, the decisive division took place and by a majority of seventy-four (92-18) the bill was victorious.<sup>81</sup>

Therefore, Young England exhibited a vital interest in the allotment plans. Ferrand wrote to Disraeli in 1858 reporting that the Bingley allotment plan, inaugurated by Disraeli, was doing well, providing for a minimum of 400-500 tenants. He asserted that as a result "Chartism is dead, and as John Manners said, 'they have a stake in the hedge,' and instead of studying the points of the Charter, they watch the points of the weathercock.'"<sup>82</sup> Young England supported the allotments, for the principles of parochial organization, voluntary contributions, and the creation of working class agricultural pride were dear to it. As Ferrand's letter suggests, granting the poorer classes a

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., Vol. 78 (1845), pp. 308-20; Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 380-86.

<sup>82</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/F/131. See Chapter IV, pp. 153-56, for further discussion of allotment support by Young England outside of Parliament.



share in the land provided economic betterment of the participants, a decline of interest in radical politics, and an increased feeling of goodwill towards the governing institutions of the nation. Young England enthusiastically favored such a turn of events.

During the struggle over the question of protection, Young England demonstrated more of its basic attitudes toward society. Concern over agriculture protection stemmed from the movement's conception of its role and effect upon the entire structure of British society. The Anti-Corn Law League blamed economic distress upon the existence of agricultural protection; Young England sought to show that the distress had other than agricultural causes and origins. In a real sense, to Young England, the corn law repeal debates, the existence of social problems, and the woeful state of society were bound together. The Young England members had shown in debate, however, a range of opinion as to the proper course of action on the question of agriculture protection. A major conflict appeared in 1846 with Smythe and Cochrane siding with Peel; Manners and Disraeli opposing Peel. Yet, Manners and Disraeli, in earlier statements, had inclined towards approval of the eventual abolition of agricultural protection. After all, the repeal of the corn laws provided annual parliamentary debates throughout the early 1840's.

In 1842, a full opportunity to debate the corn laws arose when Peel moved for the erection of a new system of

import duties. Manners, Smythe, and Disraeli spoke in favor of Peel's sliding tariff scale for the entry of corn. They either believed in Peel's course or failed to perceive any viable alternative to trusting him to maintain agricultural protection. Disraeli and Manners, however, expressed dismay that many citizens blamed corn laws as the sole cause of economic distress. Smythe asserted that the repeal of the corn laws would benefit the consumer, but it would also destroy the agricultural interests of the country. Therefore, he insisted that Peel's course of reducing but not abolishing the tariff to be both proper and judicious.<sup>83</sup> They did not attack Peel on the question of protection--at least, not at this juncture. Young England pointedly resisted involvement in the unsuccessful protectionist revolt led in Parliament by Sir Richard Vyvyan.<sup>84</sup>

Of course, the clamor over the corn laws did not subside with Peel's 1842 budget incorporating the sliding tariff. The agricultural interests, mainly within the Conservative Party, grudgingly accepted the 1842 policy, in the fervent hope that Peel would move no further reductions of the agricultural grains tariff.<sup>85</sup> Evidently, Whig

---

<sup>83</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 60 (1842), pp. 711-14, 743-46; Vol. 65 (1842), pp. 419-27. Cochrane, in 1843, also came out in support of Peel's tariff policy.

<sup>84</sup>Hughenden Papers, A/I/A/187, 188.

<sup>85</sup>J. W. Croker, "Policy of Sir Robert Peel," Quarterly Review, LXX (September, 1842), 485-531, put forth the view that Peel was confirming agricultural protection; thus there was no valid reason for Vyvyan's attacks, in his opinion.

observers understood the situation, position, and feelings of Peel better than the Tories.<sup>86</sup> Sir James Graham, Peel's close political confidant, wrote to him on December 30, 1842.

It is a question of time. The next change in the Corn Laws must be to an open trade; and if our population increase for two or three years at the rate of 300,000 per annum, you may throw open the ports, and British agriculture will not suffer. But the next change must be the last; it is not prudent to hurry it; next Session is too soon; and as you cannot make a decisive alteration, it is far wiser to make none.<sup>87</sup>

Consequently, Peel's government preferred to leave the corn laws alone for as long as possible.

Nevertheless, in the 1843 session the question of repeal reappeared before the House of Commons. Young England has coalesced and had begun to jab at governmental policy. Disraeli, at least early in the session, supported Peel urging that the fiscal and commercial policies enacted in the previous year be given a fair trial. At the same time, Disraeli refused to bind himself to the continuance of the corn laws and insinuated that he would adopt any program insuring national prosperity if it balanced agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce.<sup>88</sup> Cochrane, on three occasions,

---

<sup>86</sup>Greville, The Greville Memoirs, I, 413-14, noted on February 11, 1842, that Peel was not convinced of the feasibility of his corn law arrangement. Nassau W. Senior, "The Budget of 1842," Edinburgh Review, LXXV (April, 1842), 187-209, argued against Peel's corn law bill and predicted that free trade would eventually be effected.

<sup>87</sup>Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 551.

<sup>88</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 66 (1843), pp. 615-28.

exhibited sympathy for the general principle of protection and a dislike for the Anti-Corn Law League. He asserted that

in his opinion, the good of the country would be better consulted by a decided declaration either way--either for or against any further change in the Corn-law; and he considered that the many interests involved in it would be less affected even by the certainty of loss than by the apprehensions which they endured daily of some great impending danger. A broad, bold line of policy should be laid down by the Government, and it should be strictly adhered to. . . .The only way to arrest the march of revolution in this country was to decide at once against all concession.<sup>89</sup>

The leaders of Young England favored the concept of agricultural protection, but they did not feel bound by any particular system or policy.

Young England's activities displayed marked disenchantment with Peel's contemptuous attitude toward the protectionist members of the Conservative Party.<sup>90</sup> Young England believed in the protection of the landed interests as the single greatest bulwark supporting the ancient,

---

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., Vol. 69 (1843), p. 137. Also see Vol. 66 (1843), pp. 715-21; Vol. 67 (1843), pp. 928-33; Vol. 69 (1843), pp. 931-38.

<sup>90</sup>Opinion divided on the question of the effect of Peel's 1842 sliding scale. Croker, "Policy of Ministers," pp. 555-57, tried to convince the agricultural interests to continue full support of Peel. Thomas De Quincey, "The Last Session of Parliament," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LIV (October, 1843), 539-44, argued that the Canadian Corn Bill of that Session proved the failure of the 1842 proposal and the first step towards free trade. Thomas Spring-Rice, "The Ministry and the Late Session," Edinburgh Review, LXXVIII (October, 1843), 536-38, fully realized the existence of discontent among the agriculturists and was overjoyed with the prospects for free trade.

territorial constitution of the nation. Despite the reluctance of many, including Young England, to believe so, Peel did not share these convictions. Disraeli, on May 9, 1843, while visiting his constituents, sought to allay their fears.

You should not part with him [Peel] for what he has done; neither should you part with him because you think he will do a certain act which I believe that he will not. If I find the government seceding really from their pledges and opinions--if I find them, for instance, throwing over that landed interest that brought them into power--my vote will be recorded against them. . . .what I wish to secure, and what, as far as my energies go, I will secure is the preponderance of the landed interest.<sup>91</sup>

Unfortunately, Disraeli's assessment proved incorrect; the fears of abandonment were well founded. Hence, when the question of the reduction of the import duties on corn from Canada arose, Disraeli felt compelled to vote against the government's proposed reduction. Displeasure with Peel's tariff reductions on agricultural products partially explains the revolt of Young England.

In the 1844 session the general question of the maintenance of the corn laws did not receive much attention in Parliament. The determination of the tariff level on the importation of sugar, however, did reach the explosion level. Antagonism within the Conservative Party still

---

<sup>91</sup>The Shropshire Conservative, May 13, 1843, printed in William Flavelle Monypenny and George Earle Buckle, Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1929), I, 538-39. Hereinafter referred to as Disraeli.

existed over the recent ten hours squabble. When Peel, for the second time in one session, came to the members of the House of Commons and threatened resignation if a vote was not reversed; it proved to be too much for the members to swallow. Dramatically, Disraeli altered his previous, official support of Peel's tariff system. Disraeli charged Peel with forsaking his followers--abandoning the landed interests. Not only did Disraeli refuse to reverse his vote but with Cochrane and Ferrand vehemently expressed dislike of the governmental pressure tactics. As a result of the hard feeling generated over this question, a full scale rebellion among the Tories appeared imminent.<sup>92</sup>

The continuing distress of the agricultural districts into 1845 necessitated parliamentary investigation and discussion. Of course, the corn laws could not have been avoided. The stage for a confrontation between Peel and Young England appeared set. Disraeli, however, wrote his sister, Sarah, that despite weaknesses in Peel's government "this is not the age of Non Confidence--& I don't see much trouble before him--"<sup>93</sup> Disraeli hesitated in the face of battle against Peel; he refrained from casting his lot with the protectionists, although he exhibited animosity towards

---

<sup>92</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 75 (1844), pp. 1027, 1021-22. Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/2, B/XXI/F/114. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 150-54. Robert Stewart, "The Ten Hours and Sugar Crises of 1844: Government and the House of Commons in the Age of Reform," Historical Journal, XII (1969), 35-57.

<sup>93</sup>Hughenden Papers, A/I/B/287, February 8, 1845.

Peel's treatment of the landed interests.<sup>94</sup>

The discussion over whether to create a committee to study the distress of agriculture took place early in the 1845 session. Disraeli, Smythe, and Cochrane (ill with a fever) did not speak at this time. Hence, one is forced to use only comments by Manners and O'Brien as expressive of Young England sentiment. O'Brien concurred with the creation of a committee of inquiry and lamented the silence from the government on the problem. He, however, retreated from too direct a criticism and stated, "but, of course, feeling a general confidence in the Administration, and not having acquired very extensive experience in that House, it was not for him to leap up and give utterance on every occasion to his feelings of disappointment at the course they might pursue."<sup>95</sup> Apparently, O'Brien agreed with Disraeli's assessment on the strength of the government.

On this same evening, February 6, 1845, Manners presented his views on the distress. He claimed to be speaking for no special interest but from a deep concern for those suffering from distress. He professed, "I am not a Member of the League or of the Anti-League, nor am I a Member of the Administration who have held the scales so evenly between the contending parties during this discussion; . . ."<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 78 (1845), pp. 1022-29, Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 568-69.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., Vol. 77 (1845), pp. 199-200.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 205.

He rejected the idea that tariffs on the importation of grain caused the distress. Personal poverty, in his opinion, would not end with the repeal of the corn laws. Mannors argued that the division of political interests along agricultural and manufacturing lines hampered the more important business of narrowing the wide gap between the rich and the poor of England.<sup>97</sup>

In 1846, support by Smythe and Cochrane of repeal was consistent with their earlier parliamentary positions. Smythe took what might be construed a traitorous course, but if so, he tempered it with tact and diplomacy, remaining silent throughout the repeal debates. Cochrane had repeatedly refused to hold firm to protection as a general principle of commerce or politics. He had always maintained that the greatest political need was a strong government. With so much conflicting evidence in late 1845 concerning the seriousness of the famine in Ireland and the purported dearth of a good harvest elsewhere, Cochrane bowed to the authority, knowledge, and sensibilities of the government.

I vote for this measure, because I prefer legislation to agitation; moreover, because I am a sincere advocate for protection. . . .the protection of a strong and vigorous Administration; but, above all, I vote for this measure because in the beautiful language of the prayer which we hear each day, I would set aside all private interests, prejudices, and partial affections, and lend my humble but most sincere endeavours to any settlement which those whose peculiar province it is to rule the destinies of this great country may judge

---

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., pp. 205-07.



conducive to the comfort and welfare of the poorer but not less loyal classes of my fellow subjects.<sup>98</sup>

Cochrane's support of the government, hence, was determined by his social consciousness--what he felt to be in the best interests of the people of the kingdom--not a sense of political or economic expediency.

Disraeli and Manners in opposing the 1846 repeal legislation expressed just as sincere a concern for the welfare of the kingdom. In Paris, Disraeli wrote to Manners on December 17, 1845, that he did not trust Peel's statistics about the existence of a famine. He felt that Peel no longer enjoyed the prestige or the support of the majority of the members of the Conservative Party in Parliament.

I am told that a month ago Thiers said: "If it be a real famine, Sir Robert will be a great man, and will command his party; but if it be a false famine, and he tries to play tricks, he is lost." Now I think it is a false famine; and the question is not ripe enough for his fantastic pranks. He is so vain that he wants to figure in history as the settler of all the great questions; but a Parliamentary constitution is not favourable to such ambitions: things must be done by parties, not by persons using parties as tools--especially men without imagination or any inspiring qualities, or who, rather, offer you duplicity instead of inspiration. . . .<sup>99</sup>

Manners obviously concurred, for during the session he

---

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., Vol. 78 (1846), p. 574; pp. 568-74, for his entire speech.

<sup>99</sup>Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli, I, 735-36, print this letter. Also, most of this letter may be found in Whibley, Manners, I, 195-96.

played an active role in the defense of protection.<sup>100</sup>

O'Brien, a Young England sympathizer, provided invaluable assistance to the protectionists during the early months of 1846. An active member of the Anti-League, he provided the link between the protectionists and Disraeli. O'Brien acted instrumentally in urging Disraeli to assume an active and leading role in the opposition to repeal. On January 28, he invited Disraeli to a protectionist meeting to plan the campaign against the government. On February 23, he urged Disraeli to attend a gathering at the Carlton Club to explain the conduct of the voting to the country squires. Although Disraeli failed to credit either the Anti-League or O'Brien in his account of the repeal crisis in Lord George Bentinck; they both provided an indispensable element of support.<sup>101</sup>

The 1846 repeal of the corn laws, therefore, displayed a deep rift among the political actions of the leaders of Young England. Yet, they had disagreed on other issues and, in fact, the movement had lost its political impetus prior to the opening of the 1846 session. Nevertheless, the divided feelings on this issue among those who had supported

---

<sup>100</sup>Mary Lawson-Tancred, "The Anti-League and the Corn Law Crisis of 1846," Historical Journal, III (1960), 162-83, argues that Manners had personally switched his views on the Corn Laws, but felt he had to continue to follow his constituents' wishes.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., provides an assessment of the role of O'Brien's activities in the Anti-League. For the appropriate letters from O'Brien to Disraeli concerning repeal see the Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/S/448-52.

the aspirations and activities of Young England prevented the possibility of future political cohesion. Each individual had to chart his political career within the possible limits, and these did not include the prospects of their unification in an idealistic, visionary movement--Young England. While the participants might maintain personal attachment, Young England as a political clique was dead.

The contemporary assessments of Young England's role in Parliament ranged from fervent enthusiasm to intense opposition. One of the severest criticisms came in an article in the Quarterly Review of September, 1843, written by J. W. Croker. At this time, Croker still professed compelling support for Sir Robert Peel. Croker sympathized with some of Young England's ideas, but he opposed many of its measures. He stated

regret that they should not see, even with their own peculiar views, the extreme inconsistency and impolicy of endeavouring to create distrust of the only statesman in whom the great Conservative body has any confidence, or can have any hope. . . .we beg leave, in all kindness, to warn them against being deceived as to the quality of the notice which their singularity had obtained; it has in it more of wonder than of respect, and will certainly confer on them no permanent consideration with any party or any constituency: a few stray and unexpected shots, fired in the rear of any army, attract more notice than a cannonade in front; but it is an evanescent surprise, soon forgotten, or remembered only to the disadvantage of those whose indiscretion created it.<sup>102</sup>

This expressed the majority sentiment of conservatives.

---

<sup>102</sup>Croker, "Policy of Ministers," p. 554.

Young England, however, found support from an influential conservative publication. In an article on September 12, 1843, The Times took umbrage to Croker's evaluation.

It is true that "Young England" musters little more than half a dozen members in the House of Commons. It is true that they rank higher as amiable, elegant, and accomplished private gentlemen, than as statesman; but "Young England," though thus immediately of little consequence, is a type, an indicator of something that is working in the public mind.<sup>103</sup>

Early in the next year a letter appeared expressing dismay with some of the activities of the group, but it opened with a strong eulogy.

Sir,--I am one of those who have been watching with some degree of interest, and not without favourable expectations, the senatorial proceedings of "Young England." The members who compose this party are few in number, but are destitute neither of zeal nor of talent. Professing the warmest attachment to the Church of their forefathers, and to the ancient constitutional principles of the realm, and advocating to a certain extent the revival of monastic institutions, they might be expected to take a lively interest in all matters affecting the welfare of the poor, to whose happiness and comfort both the civil and spiritual institutions of this country had, as they themselves admit, an especial regard.<sup>104</sup>

Support and notoriety came to Young England from these articles.

Whig publications took notice of the political maneuverings of Young England. In 1844, the Edinburgh Review printed an article which explained, assessed, and found

---

<sup>103</sup>The Times (London), September 12, 1843.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., March 15, 1844.

Young England lacking. The author complimented its interest in the problems of the lower classes of society, but argued that the proposed remedies--alliance of the Crown and Chartists, increase of the power of the Crown, and a democratization of the Church--were "harebrained." To the author, Young England, unimportant in itself, only exemplified the loss of faith on the part of many conservatives with Peel. He felt that as a political faction Young England was doomed to failure because the adherents were too presumptuous, too opportunistic, and too destructive of the institutions of society. A second major fault, the maintenance of political independence, meant the movement's supporters became exaggerated and vulgar in their antics to focus attention upon themselves. He deplored its disdain for common sense, its proclivity for emotion, its support of historical feudalism and Jacobitism, and its denunciation of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Yet, he hoped that the spirit of generosity and humanitariansim would eventually lead the participants to support the best interests of the workers of the country.<sup>105</sup>

Politically, Young England aided the Whigs by opposing the policies of Sir Robert Peel. Hence, the Whigs could afford to be generous. After Peel's ouster and Lord John Russell's formation of a Whig government, the situation

---

<sup>105</sup>Abraham Hayward, "Young England," Edinburgh Review, LXXX (October, 1844), 517-25. Hayward argued that the freeing of industry from all restraints was the best way to assist the working classes.

altered. The Whigs then became much less lenient towards Young England sentiments. In 1849, a Whig article criticized Young England as a social force.

If our ancestors were really happier, wiser, more successful than we,--if the condition of the people were really more satisfactory in those days than in these,--there would be a powerful argument for attempting to retrace our steps, and striving to replace society in the position it occupied in generations past. A double blunder, this: for not only would the operation prove an impossible one--but, if achieved, would be only an aggravation of our difficulties. As long as these ideas are confined to secluded and speculative thinkers, they produce merely feeble poetry and faulty philosophy. When however, as in our days, they penetrate the arena of actual statesmanship, and endeavour to force their way into life and action, they not only divert attention from a sounder channel, but lead to practical mistakes of the worst kind. The crude and boyish theories, the vague and declamatory language, of the Young England section of our legislators, have given us the measure at once of the wild impracticability and unsoundness of their views, and of the mischievous confusion which might be anticipated if they were to take strong hold of the national mind. The error of these men is, that they carry the conception of poetry into the unsuitable atmosphere of public life. Policy, with them, is not a matter of science, but of taste; and their opinions are selected according as they harmonise with fancy, not as they square with fact. They dream of a beautiful past which had no existence--and would compel the actual present into conformity with that unreal and shadowy vision.<sup>106</sup>

Young England sentiments proved fundamentally unpalatable to both established political parties. Still, the article in 1849 illustrates that the social effects of the group did not end with its parliamentary demise.

---

<sup>106</sup>W. R. Greg, "Unsound Social Philosophy," Edinburgh Review, XC (October, 1849), 500-01.

The active political life span of Young England was short. The immediate results of its brand of Tory Radicalism were meager. Politically, it gained fame, only a few supporters, and very little substantive social legislation. Within the House of Commons its attacks stung the Prime Minister, but this may be attributed as much to the sensitivity of Peel than to the potency of its charges. Young England did indicate the existence of displeasure within the Conservative Party of Peel's policies. Certainly, Young England cannot be credited with bringing about the downfall of the ministry, but many sympathized with its barbs which created qualms for Peel. Actually, it did not, in comparison with later ginger groups, much delay the work of the government with diversionary tactics.

The promotion of social legislation in this period did not receive much of a boost from Young England. As has been presented, the members often played a minimal or disunited role in the debates over social legislation. Manners had an original idea in the need to remove the mortmain restrictions, but his friends failed to give him strong support. The encouragement of the allotment of wastelands was admirable, but one of the four leaders, Cochrane, played no part in it. Smythe refused to support the ten hours fight, and Disraeli took no active part until 1850. Of all the social issues, the opposition to the New Poor Law most ignited the movement's interest, activity, and unanimity. The weight of Young England, however, did not succeed in making the New

Poor Law opposition a success. Therefore, it failed in blocking or promoting social legislation during its political heyday.

The leaders of Young England did not spend all their time in Parliament from 1841-1846 dealing with social questions. In fact, the majority of their questions, statements, and debates were concerned with other problems. All members of the quartet shared an avid interest in foreign policy. Disraeli was involved in a wide range of foreign questions, Manners and Smythe held a special interest in Spain, and Cochrane frequently referred to the problems in Greece. Irish problems provided a powerful attraction, and they spoke often on the topic. The normal problems of governing such as election petitions, public works, annual supply grants, and domestic concerns assumed considerable time, and they often took positions independent of the government on these questions.

At times, Peel and other contemporaries became quite upset over Young England's actions. During the 1844 debate over the colonial sugar tariff, Queen Victoria even feared Young England might topple the government. She wrote, "We were really in the greatest possible danger of having a resignation of the Government without knowing to whom to turn, and this from the recklessness of a handful of foolish half 'Puseyite' half 'Young England' people!"<sup>107</sup> Actually,

---

<sup>107</sup>Queen Victoria to King of the Belgians, June 18, 1844, quoted in The Letters of Queen Victoria: A Selection



few of the members of Parliament viewed the movement in a very serious light. If nothing else, the avid support of the Spanish Carlists made it an impossible choice. Young England could gain the interest of politicians, but it was never considered a viable alternative to Peel's government.

Although the leaders of Young England gained little besides notoriety through the political machinations, they did possess thoughts, ideals, and aspirations worthy of serious consideration. Their prominence in the House of Commons directly related to their activities outside Parliament. Social and literary fame came to Young England sympathizers more rapidly and easily than political prominence. Therefore, to assess properly the significance, substance, and lasting effect of Young England upon society it is necessary to investigate the members' activities and contributions outside the realm of parliamentary politics.

---

from Her Majesty's Correspondence between the Years, 1837 and 1861, edited by Arthur Christopher Benson and Viscount Esher (3 vols.; London: John Murray, 1908), II, 16.

## CHAPTER IV

### YOUNG ENGLAND'S SOCIAL AND LITERARY RESPONSES TO THE CONDITION OF ENGLAND

The condition of England question animated numerous attempts to ease the social problems of the 1840's. Undesirable effects of rapid industrialization and population growth had to be ameliorated. Free traders felt that they could ease the problem by reducing the cost of food for the masses through tariff removals. Chartists felt the first step to solving the economic ills was the acquisition of working class political representation. Political economists felt the manufacturers should be allowed to operate unchecked so that the law of supply and demand could correct all imbalances. Factory reformers sought to better working conditions and shorten the hours of labor thereby making the people happier. Humanitarians urged a wide range of improvements in factories, housing, education, and an increased philanthropic spirit among the more fortunate members of society. The government, in a quandry, proposed legislation, but felt it would be best if the problems were solved without state intervention. Young England, a part of this broad spectrum of society searching for answers to the difficulties

of the day, offered its plan to make the best of England's peculiar situation.

Many concerned citizens asserted that philanthropy could be used as a major tool in eradicating economic problems. The government tried to increase the volume of private charitable contributions. There existed no widespread desire among politicians to replace private donations with public assistance--except as a last resort.

One of the most interesting uses by the government of the spirit of private donation occurred in 1842, a year of considerable distress. In May, 1842, Peel, Graham, and the Archbishop of Canterbury resolved to ask Queen Victoria to solicit private contributions. Peel wrote to her that "'Independently of the actual relief which would be afforded by such contributions--the moral effect of a demonstration of a general sympathy with the distress--and of approval of their peaceable [sic] conduct and submission to the laws might be advantageous.'"<sup>1</sup> The Queen concurred. She wrote a letter, which Graham sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury on May 11, 1842, calling for such donations.

"Most Reverend Father in God, Our right trusty and right entirely beloved Councillor, We greet you well: Whereas in some districts in England and Scotland many of the Working Classes have suffered, and continue to suffer, severe distress; and whereas many of Our Subjects have entered into voluntary Subscriptions

---

<sup>1</sup>William C. Lubenow, The Politics of Government Growth: Early Victorian Attitudes toward State Intervention, 1833-1848 (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971), p. 20, prints this portion of the letter.

for their relief, and have at the same time humbly prayed Us to issue Our Royal Letters, directed to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Archbishop of York, authorizing them to promote Contributions within the several Provinces for the same benevolent purpose:

We, taking the premises into Our Royal consideration, and being always ready to give the best encouragement and countenance to such humane and charitable undertakings, are graciously pleased to condescend to their request; and We do hereby direct, that these Our Letters be communicated by you to the several Suffragan Bishops within your Province, expressly requiring them to take care that publication be made hereof, on such Sunday in the present or in the ensuing month, and in such places within their respective Dioceses, as the said Bishops shall appoint; and that upon this occasion the Ministers in each Parish do effectually excite their Parishioners to a liberal contribution, which shall be collected the week following at their respective dwellings by the Churchwardens or Overseers of the Poor in each Parish; and the Ministers of the several Parishes are to cause the sums so collected to be paid immediately into the hands of the Bank of England, to be accounted for by them, and applied to the carrying on and promoting the above-mentioned good designs. And so We bid you very heartily farewell."<sup>2</sup>

In light of the governmental activity, private appeals to the spirit of human benevolence, charity, and empathy for the condition of fellow citizens does not appear uncharacteristic of the age. A recent author has portrayed humanitarianism as a fundamental aspect of Romanticism.

There are fundamental traits which most of the English Romantics shared: a revolt against the 'age of reason,' an increasing reliance upon emotion and imagination, and a new attitude toward nature, a longing for the past and for the remote, a keen interest in humanitarian concerns, and a re-awakened belief in idealism and

---

<sup>2</sup>Great Britain, Sessional Papers, House of Commons, 1842 (383), XXXVII, 57.

transcendentalism along with neo-Platonic and Kantian lines.<sup>3</sup>

Young England, filled with Romanticism, professed enthusiastic support for private donations. Manners in the notes to his poem England's Trust pleaded for the regular Sunday collection of alms for the poor by the Church.<sup>4</sup> Disraeli in Coningsby supported charity by asserting the beneficial results of the custom of alms-giving.<sup>5</sup> In 1845, Disraeli addressed the Printer's Pension Society in London appealing for increased public contribution.<sup>6</sup> The caring for the poorer classes through philanthropy emanating from the aristocratic sense of noblesse oblige appeared to be part of the spirit which Young England hoped to further. A sympathetic contemporary observer felt they were succeeding in this

---

<sup>3</sup>Richard A. Levine, "Disraeli and the Middle Ages: the Influence of Medievalism in the Nineteenth Century," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Language and Literature, Indiana University, 1961), p. 37. Hereinafter referred to as "Disraeli." G. S. R. Kitson Clark, "The Romantic Element - 1830 to 1850," in Studies in Social History, edited by J. H. Plumb (London: Longmans, Green, 1955), for a discussion of ideas of the times.

<sup>4</sup>John Manners, England's Trust and Other Poems (London: Rivington, 1841), p. 43.

<sup>5</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, Coningsby, I, 193-94. The references to Disraeli's novels are taken from The Works of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, embracing Novels, Romances, Plays, Poems, Biography, Short Stories and Great Speeches (20 vols.; London and New York: M. Walter Dunne, 1904). The volume numbers used are of the individual titles not of the collected works.

<sup>6</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, The Speech Delivered by Benjamin Disraeli, Esq., M.P., at the Anniversary Dinner of the Printer's Pension Society (London: James S. Hodson, n.d.). Hughenden Papers, A/I/A/203, Disraeli to Mrs. Disraeli, April 21, 1845, in which he states satisfaction with the meeting.

direction.

They must be Gracchi at heart--self-denying, laborious--patient, yet zealous--sanguine--full of faith, hope, and charity. But am I wrong in fancying that I do see all these qualities in the real leaders of YOUNG ENGLAND? And if the present political representatives of her principles fall short of their high calling yet I will not despair. Great exigences /sic/, make great men.<sup>7</sup>

Young England hoped that by increasing the charitable feelings of the English people a move could begin towards solving the existing social wrongs.

Young England exhibited concern over the assistance which private contributors and public institutions could provide for the working classes. As noted earlier, it possessed parliamentary cohesion on the basis of sympathy to social legislation. The movement held an avid interest in the conditions of the working classes, even though it failed to meet the demands from some supporters for practical legislation.<sup>8</sup> The leading participants approached the problems of society with the eyes of romantic poets not that of analytical sociologists. The ultimate aim was to alter the inner spirit and essence of humanity. Parliamentary maneuvers could gain Young England much, but it was inadequate to fulfill such an ambitious objective.

Young Englanders had to serve as leading examples of

---

<sup>7</sup>Young England, January 18, 1845, p. 43. They also advocated private aid for the improvement of working class housing.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., January 25, 1845, pp. 56-57; February 1, 1845, pp. 72-73.

how the new generation should best act. To convince the aristocrats to take their social responsibilities more seriously, the leaders of the movement had to be socially active. They had to demonstrate concern for the people through speeches and attendance at mass meetings. They needed to encourage paternalistic programs which embodied their aims. Above all, they needed to educate society as to the real need for a reinvigoration of the English spirit. Literary production, in an increasingly literate society, offered an avenue of expression which they were quick to grasp. Through the use of the written and spoken word they hoped to insure that the next generation would do a better job than the present one of handling social problems.

Social activity provided Young England with the opportunity to reinforce and spread its social gospel. Disraeli, Smythe, and Manners were frequent companions in social, political, and literary endeavors. Cochrane was not as regularly included; in truth, Richard Monckton Milnes for awhile was a more constant social associate of Disraeli, Smythe, and Manners. Excursions to the country homes of Henry Hope, Deepdene, and of John Walters, Bearwood, furnished the Young Englanders relaxation, friendship, and time for reflection. The most famous public ventures by Young England came in the autumn of 1844 when Disraeli, Smythe, and Manners visited the northern parts of England. Great interest as to the meaning and intent of Young England arose from their speeches.

The members of Young England sought to further its

cause through private activities. In the House of Commons' debates they had become associated with the allotment system and they supported it outside of Parliament. The allotment system was picked up by aristocrats. The fifth Duke of Rutland, Manners' father, gave allotments, and one may conjecture that the stimulus emanated from his son.<sup>9</sup> The idea was promoted through the newspaper, Young England, even to the extent of printing a set of regulations to be used in erecting and maintaining allotments for the benefit of the poor in the manufacturing districts.<sup>10</sup> The allotment system was viewed as an effective tool closing the gap between the classes, increasing the sense of responsibility of the landowners, and easing the economic burdens of the workers.

On October 11, 1844, Manners and Disraeli gave a boost to the allotment scheme at Bingley by attending the inaugural of the program. Their close supporter, Ferrand, who invited them, wrote prior to the meeting, "I am convinced that one party at Bingley will be important in its results. The masses want practical measures of improvement, they are weary of constantly swallowing the six points."<sup>11</sup> Ferrand,

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., February 1, 1845, pp. 74-75; also see January 25, 1845, p. 58, for discussion of reluctance by gentry to grant allotments. Non-Elector, Lord John Manners. A Political and Literary Sketch Comprising Some Account of the Young England Party and the Passing of the Factory Acts (London: n.p., 1872), pp. 20-23, discusses Manners' influence on his father in this endeavor. Hereinafter referred to as Manners.

<sup>10</sup>Young England, February 1, 1845, p. 77.

<sup>11</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/F/117, Ferrand to Disraeli, October 6, 1844.



who had vigorously advanced the allotments in Parliament, had evidently convinced his aunt, Mrs. Walker Ferrand, to give fifteen acres, divided into fifty-nine plots.<sup>12</sup> The festive event featured cricket matches and a banquet, highlighted by after-dinner speeches. Ferrand, enjoying his role, stated

"for if there be one position more than another in which an English country gentleman may stand proud and happy in his own parish, it is when he is surrounded by every grade of society within it, cheering him when his health is proposed at a vast meeting like the present. . . .The working classes of this parish have not hesitated to tell me what was my duty. I listened to their counsel; I followed their advice; and it is the working classes who have placed me where I am. Behold, my friends, the dawn of the sunshine of ancient days on our native land!"<sup>13</sup>

The Bingley episode expressed the spirit of Young England.

The speeches of Manners and Disraeli, which followed, were later disseminated in a full written form. The event received wide publicity and raised Young England to new heights. Public interest proved so great that speeches of Disraeli, Manners, and Smythe were collected and printed in 1845 under the partial title of Young England.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Young England, February 1, 1845, p. 76, provides information on the fifty-nine allotments. A discussion of the visit to Bingley is found in John Trevor Ward, "'Young England' at Bingley," Journal of the Bradford Textile Society (1965-66), pp. 49-59.

<sup>13</sup>Ward, "'Young England' at Bingley," p. 56.

<sup>14</sup>Young England Addresses. . . (London: Hayward and Adam, 1845), hereinafter referred to as Young England Addresses. Unexplainably, Ferrand's speech was omitted. Manners was upset by lack of reporting and later omission of Milnes' speech at Birmingham on August 26, 1844, Manners

Manners spoke about the benefits of the allotment plan. He stressed that large farms should not be allowed to swallow small farms since "I confess that I know not why we should not anticipate at least a million more of people easily supported from the soil of England and Ireland by the introduction of spade-labour and science applied to the cultivation of waste lands than now we can support."<sup>15</sup> Manners asserted that not only would the allotments support a larger population but also at a more congenial level than at present.

I will go further, and state my sincere and strong opinion, that the time is not far distant when, throughout the whole of England, the great truth will be felt, acknowledged, and acted upon, that the peasant who has a stake in the hedge is more likely to be a better man, a better citizen, and a better member of society, than he who merely works for another. (Loud Cheers.) I believe, gentlemen, that this allotment system, to celebrate which we are here this evening, will go far to rectify what I cannot help looking upon as a serious and growing evil--I mean the extinction of every agricultural class between that of the rich tenant-farmer and that of the day-labourer.<sup>16</sup>

Disraeli shared the enthusiasm for the allotments, and he depicted the benefits in even more grandiose terms. He lauded the inauguration of the Bingley allotments "for we are now the infant in its cradle; and, though I believe it is an infant Hercules, we do it with almost as much of

---

to Milnes, Houghton Papers, 15:317, 323, 324, Trinity College Library, Cambridge University.

<sup>15</sup>Young England Addresses, pp. 37-38.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

anxiety as affection."<sup>17</sup> Disraeli proclaimed the beginning of a new spirit of the English mind. Increased public interest in the importance of duty, the end of social exclusiveness, and diminution of political factiousness--all the desires of Young England--seemed to be occurring. Heartened by the meeting, he declared straightforwardly the objective of Young England.

Gentlemen, what we desire is this--that England should be once more a nation, and not a mere collection of classes who seem to think they have nothing in common--no interest which it becomes all of them to unite together to support, and no pursuit which it is the delight of them at the same time to cultivate.<sup>18</sup>

A grand and glorious future seemed to be in the offing. Disraeli, Manners, and Ferrand acted in high and optimistic spirits.<sup>19</sup>

Young England sentiment favored the creation of more leisure time for the working classes, plus the availability of opportunities to employ this time in beneficial ways. As noted earlier, the allotment scheme presented to the House of Commons in 1843 had carried a provision for a plot of land to be used for recreational purposes. A portion of the Bingley meeting had been spent with cricket matches. The teams were formed by Ferrand under the inspiration and active

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>19</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/F/131, Ferrand to Disraeli, August 10, 1858, reports the Bingley allotment system to be flourishing with 400-500 tenants.

participation of Manners. Manners, an advocate of recreational pursuits for all persons, declared

I may say that cricket, the game to which you have devoted your attention, is manly, bracing, and brings together in harmonious contact the various classes of society; and therefore I say you do right well to establish conjointly with the allotment system a cricket club. May the two ever flourish and go together, and may their united efforts be productive of that good which, in my conscience, I believe will be derived from them to the parish of Bingley. The same system which had decreed the peasant should never rise out of the rank he was born in, also denied him any amusement but the alehouse--any rest but on a Sunday; what wonder, then, that the old landmarks were beginning to disappear, and a new and strange antipathy to be seen between the employer and the employed? That estrangement, then, which unfortunately has undoubtedly taken place between the various classes of society, where your good example is followed will give place to cordial sympathy, to the performance of duties and responsibilities on the part of the rich, and to contentment and loyalty on the part of their less fortunate fellow-countrymen.<sup>20</sup>

Manners held the conviction that the reinvigoration of sporting activities would better social conditions. In 1843, he had published A Plea for National Holy-Days, which contained a strong appeal for the development of recreational activities. He blamed the dearth of physical activities on the over-emphasis placed on the accumulation of wealth. In his opinion, the problem stemmed originally from puritanism, then developed into bigotry and hypocrisy with the amusements of the upper classes increased, those of the lower classes decreased. He contended the insufficiency of education of the mind for the working classes. The restoration

---

<sup>20</sup>Young England Addresses, pp. 38-39.

of ancient physical recreations would be more beneficial. Although he became an ardent supporter of the ten hours bill limiting factory labor for women and children; he stated in this work a slightly different view.

It is also worthy of consideration whether, in a pecuniary point of view, such an observance of holy-days would not better suit the manufacturing artizan, than the curtailment of his labour to ten hours a day; while it is at least doubtful, as far as recreation is concerned, whether a man who has worked that number of hours a day would experience any benefit from that change.<sup>21</sup>

Manners, critical of the social stratification and widespread acceptance of the social evils of the day as unsolvable, expressed the core of his thoughts in the question, "Utilitarian selfishness has well nigh banished all such unproductive amusements from the land: has it not also banished contentment, and good humour, and loyalty from thousands of English cottage homes?"<sup>22</sup> The restoration of recreation, therefore, would remove some of the harshness of life imposed by utilitarianism.

The call for the restoration of sporting activities did not fall on deaf ears. The governmental Treasury Department, in 1841, recommended a grant of £10,000 to aid local subscribers in the opening of public walks, and by April,

---

<sup>21</sup>John Manners, A Plea for National Holy-Days (London: Painter, 1843), p. 10.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 5. Also see Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. 71 (1843), pp. 761-62, for Manners' jab of August 14, 1843, on the status of working class recreation.

1843, £500 had been expended.<sup>23</sup> Disraeli noted the derision for many of Manners proposals, but positive affirmations such as the raising of £21,000 in Manchester for the building of public parks had occurred by late 1844. Lord Francis Egerton and other nobles responded with the creation of sporting clubs.<sup>24</sup> The Birmingham Athenic Institution invited Manners to address their meeting on August 26, 1844, because they supported his cry for the encouragement of sports. He accepted their invitation for

it was in his opinion necessary for the hard-working men of Birmingham to enter in an intelligible manner their protest against the modern political dogma which would assume that no recreation was necessary for the working population of England, which seemed to have adopted for its motto that which he fancied would have been held in universal execration, namely--"All work and no play."<sup>25</sup>

The newspaper, Young England, during its short existence, gave the advocacy for sports and recreation grounds a prominent place in its writings.<sup>26</sup> Manners took great pride in this project to provide beneficial activities for the English populace. Hence, Young England helped in making the leisure time of the workers more amenable and humane.

The improvement of workers' living conditions received

<sup>23</sup>Great Britain, Sessional Papers, House of Commons, 1841 (357-I), XIV, 475; 1843 (187), XXX, 727.

<sup>24</sup>Young England Addresses, pp. 41-43.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5.

<sup>26</sup>Young England, February 1, 1845, p. 76; February 22, 1845, p. 122; March 1, 1845, p. 138; March 29, 1845, p. 205.

only minimal attention. Young England led a plea for the erection of bath and wash houses for the use of the poorer classes.<sup>27</sup> Manners, Disraeli, and Cochrane responded by participating in organizations promoting better health, sanitation, and living conditions.<sup>28</sup> A charge about the poor housing conditions of the peasantry on the estates of Manners' father also created an interest by Disraeli and Manners. Manners, investigating the charge, concluded that the report of atrocious conditions in the village of Cheveley were incorrect. He argued that no old English village provided adequate housing for their inhabitants, but that Cheveley had more satisfactory houses relative to other parishes.<sup>29</sup> Disraeli's descriptions of working class housing conditions in Sybil illustrates that he was well informed of the problems. Young England did not, however, push strenuously for reforms, and its record in this area is tarnished by missed opportunities.

During the later months of 1844, the Young England leaders displayed an awareness for social reform by making an investigative and speaking tour of the north. As noted earlier these speeches were printed in a volume entitled, Young England. It includes the speeches of Disraeli and

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., March 1, 1845, p. 138; April 5, 1845, p. 222.

<sup>28</sup>S. E. Finer, The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick (London: Methuen & Co., 1952), pp. 239, 409.

<sup>29</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/6,7,8, Manners to Disraeli, November 4, 14, 26, 1844.

Manners at the Bingley allotment inaugural; Manners at the Birmingham Athenic Institution; and those of Disraeli, Manners, and Smythe at the Manchester Athenaeum Soirée. Their speeches were not vitrolitic but sought to explain the general principles and objectives of their budding movement. Optimistic about a changed attitude of the people, they encouraged any activity which would bring the classes closer together in pursuits beneficial to their physical or mental well-being.

The first annual dinner of the Birmingham Athenic Institution provided the occasion for Manners to address the members. He wrote Disraeli, "I shall go like a knight-errant-alone: they seem fine straightforward fellows."<sup>30</sup> The group had been formed to encourage recreational and intellectual stimulation to the young men of that city. Manners became a patron of the organization, for he felt that it should be fostered, even though no leading citizen of Birmingham had yet stepped forward to guide the organization. He soundly approved of their emphases on physical recreation, mental education, and the unification of the social classes.

Manners desired to better the relations between all social classes. The immediate necessity was to raise the level of existence of the working classes.

It was his firm conviction, founded upon something like a careful examination of history, that in days long gone by, when the unhappy

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., B/XX/M/3, Manners to Disraeli, August 5, 1844.



separation of classes which now existed in this country was not known in the land, there was far more peace, more real happiness, and more complete security for all classes, than had existed or could ever exist under such a class system as now prevailed in society. . . .He knew very well that it was deemed unphilosophical to revert to those days and times, and the ancient customs of their forefathers; but believing as he did that in those ancient days the poor lost nothing by his condescension, and that the poor were great gainers by it, he saw no reason why they should not dwell with pleasure on those days, and why he should not, if he could, encourage and support any legal, just, and prudent associations which would have the effect of restoring at least some portion of that fine feeling which existed amongst the people in bygone days, and which would elevate the character of those who ought to be considered the pride and glory of their country.<sup>31</sup>

Faith that assistance given to the working classes would eventually aid all segments of society undergirded Manners' thoughts.

On this occasion Manners analyzed the status of education for the working classes. His statements expose the feelings of Young England towards the subject. The movement opposed institutions which emphasized the acquisition of rational education as capable of single-handedly solving the ills of the realm. Manners did not oppose education; he even used this event as an opportunity to present the Birmingham Athenic Institution with a set of works, "'The Englishman's Library.'"

He did not think, with some, that education was not suited to the working classes--that they ought not to enjoy the blessings of it; on the contrary, all experience told them that, when a

---

<sup>31</sup>Young England Addresses, pp. 6-7.

proper foundation in something higher and deeper than science has been laid, then a population, though never so hardworking, could most beneficially relax their minds by reading, as well as their bodies by manly exercises. Neither did he agree with those who considered a mere smattering of knowledge, without something better would make a country great or good. It was no mean praise of their Institute to say that it had fallen into neither extreme, and that, while it provided intellectual instruction and amusement, it did not elevate reason above its own province.<sup>32</sup>

A proper balance of recreation, education, and mingling of the classes would have gone far towards the eradication of social ills.<sup>33</sup>

The popularity of the Young England movement reached its peak at the Manchester Athenaeum Grand Soirée of October 3, 1844. It was through Disraeli, who had been connected with the organization since at least the previous year, that the invitations for Manners and Smythe were extended. Young England was eager for a platform. Manners even accepted the invitation before conferring with Disraeli, although he expressed concern over exactly what the institution stood for, having heard a revolutionary political dinner was to be given there.<sup>34</sup> A contemporary, laudatory report stated that "the speeches delivered on the occasion were uniformly good; but

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>33</sup>The Times (London), September 4, 1844, p. 4, commented favorably. Houghton Papers, 15:317, Manners to Milnes, December 26, 1844, provides a glimpse into the roles of Milnes and John Hanmer at Birmingham.

<sup>34</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/3,4, Manners to Disraeli, August 5, September 25, 1844; A/IV/M/48,50, Manchester Athenaeum to Disraeli, October 4, 1843, July 1, 1844.

that of Mr. Smythe, as one of the most influential and clever of the party called 'Young England,' deserves special attention."<sup>35</sup> Richard Cobden, present at the meeting, is reported to have remarked, "'Young England had come to shake hands with Young Manchester.'"<sup>36</sup> On the basis of these speeches many felt that Young England had embarked upon a glorious future.

Disraeli chaired the session with some three thousand persons in attendance. As chairman, he spoke first, opening the proceedings. His main topics included the recounting of the organization and activities of the institution over the past few years, the need to end factionalism of all sorts, the importance of education, and the future responsibilities of the youth of the nation. He asserted the organization was a social necessity not a luxury, for "as civilization has gradually progressed it has equalised the physical qualities of man. Instead of the strong arm it is the strong head that is now the moving principle of society."<sup>37</sup> He applauded their desire for the acquisition of knowledge for "it is knowledge that equalizes the social condition of man--that gives to all, however different their political position, passions which are in common, and enjoyments which are universal."<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>The Times (London), October 4, 1844, p. 6.

<sup>36</sup>Non-Elector, Manners, p. 65.

<sup>37</sup>Young England Addresses, p. 18.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

Disraeli encouraged the youthful members. He urged them to strive for the heights, to be active, and to test their ideas through association and discussion with others. The youth were charged with the responsibility of improving the existing social structure. In the manufacturing districts their position was novel, for a whole new civilization was rising. The next generation would have to maintain the public virtues and spirit requisite to leading British civilization to new accomplishments.<sup>39</sup>

Manners made a short speech. He complimented the organization for providing recreation and amusement for the populace of Manchester. In turn, he attacked the Mechanics' Institutes for overstepping their bounds; "they arrogated, or at least their advocates arrogated for them, the education of the country, and seemed to fancy it supplied by a smattering of science and philosophy."<sup>40</sup> He urged the erection of parks and museums. He asserted that the improvement of social relations in Manchester could serve as an example for the rest of England, if only the proper effort occurred.

The speech of Smythe, which gained so much fame, primarily related the unity of commerce and literature. In his view, Manchester had succeeded in covering the world with material goods. Yet, the great task of spreading the spiritual and literary aspects of mankind still lay ahead. He

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 22-24.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

felt that commercial leaders actively engaged in such ventures could benefit all mankind. He expressed encouragement by the interest of the Manchester middle class in social betterment.

In the discussions Smythe mentioned politics. In this respect, he made the oft-repeated comment, which must be interpreted as an attack on Sir Robert Peel, "'Oh, for one hour of George Canning!'" Yet, this was but a small portion of the entire speech. More indicative of his thoughts, which later proved incompatible with his Young England colleagues sharing the platform, were the declarations in sympathy with free trade.<sup>41</sup>

These Young England speeches caught the attention of the public. The Manchester organization, thankful for their assistance, felt the effects of the meeting to be beneficial and profound.<sup>42</sup> The publication of the speeches stemmed from public curiosity more than the speakers' desires to achieve popularity. Manners informed Milnes of the proposal.

Some London Publishers--Haywood and Adams, have written to me informing me that in a professional tour they have been making in the North of England they found a great curiosity prevailing as to the late sayings of 'Young England,' whereupon to gratify that curiosity they have bethought themselves of publishing in a volume that young gents' speeches during the past autumn.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 29-34.

<sup>42</sup>Hughenden Papers, A/IV/M/55, 56, Manchester Athenaeum to Disraeli, October 10, 14, 1844.

<sup>43</sup>Houghton Papers, 15:317, Manners to Milnes, December 26, 1844.

Disraeli, Manners, and Smythe had no objection to this upsurge of interest. Cochrane did not approve.<sup>44</sup>

Nevertheless, second thoughts made Manners hesitant to accept further public invitations. He wrote to Disraeli, October 24, 1844, that he had received a request from the Oddfellows of Birmingham to attend a meeting; in addition, they planned to invite Disraeli, Smythe, Milnes, and Sir John Hanmer. Manners intended to reject the invitation. After sending his rejection he wrote Disraeli that he had experienced a "foretaste of mob tyranny" for they had refused his rejection. The Oddfellows decided to wait until it was convenient for Manners to attend. Left without a tactful method of withdrawal, Manners hesitantly accepted their invitation for the following Easter season.<sup>45</sup> Quite likely Manners was relieved when he wrote the next spring that "the Birmingham meeting has fallen through, they failed to secure the great Hall."<sup>46</sup>

At almost the same time another problem over an invitation plagued the members of Young England. Apparently, Manners prevented participation when on November 14, 1844, he wrote to Disraeli stating his objections to attendance at

---

<sup>44</sup>Cochrane refused to participate fully in their activities; Manners wrote Disraeli that he saw growing signs of displeasure from Cochrane, Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/7, 8, November 14 and 26, 1844.

<sup>45</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/5, 6, 7, Manners to Disraeli, October 24, November 4, 14, 1844.

<sup>46</sup>Houghton Papers, 15:319, Manners to Milnes, Easter day, 1845.

a proposed political dinner.

You have I believe received an invitation from Wakefield to a 'Young England' dinner. I have not answered the one I received, rather expecting I might hear from you or Smythe on the subject: as it might be well to act in concert about it. There are several reasons which make me wish such a thing had never entered into our good friends' heads, and dispose me to beg off from it--In the first place my father has a very strong objection to anyones' taking part at political meetings out of ones own district & sphere, and I am sure so marked an affair as this would displease him. Secondly William Lascelles is a word illegible kinsman of my own, and it looks as if this was if not against him, at least without his being party to it; he being to not disinclined to marry of our views: anyhow I would not take part in it without communication with him. Thirdly such a step savors too much of popularity hunting; the meeting has no object but to laud us, and we by sanctioning it would at once separate ourselves as a distinct political party, which I for one am not prepared to do. Fourthly as it is I shall have to attend a political dinner at Newark with Gladstone, and that will give me enough trouble & disquiet for some time to come.

Ferrand it seems has wisked headlong into it; but it is in his own neighbourhood, and there can be nothing to prevent him going if he likes--the rock against which Maidstone split was political dinner going. . . .<sup>47</sup>

A few days later he again wrote Disraeli about the affair.<sup>48</sup>

With this letter, mention of the affair closes; evidently

---

<sup>47</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/7. Houghton Papers, 15:317, December 26, 1844, Manners wrote Milnes that Gladstone at the Newark meeting "spoke very well and said nothing in a most convincing way: so that no controversy arose during the evening."

<sup>48</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/8, Manners to Disraeli, November 26, 1844. Houghton Papers, 15:317, Manners to Milnes, December 26, 1844, refers in all probability to this meeting as being instigated by Hanmer and his bad feelings in declining the invitation.

they stayed away from the function.

The speeches at Birmingham, Manchester, and Bingley provided Young England sentiment a great boost. Yet, while the leaders were willing to attend and address social functions and literary fetes; they stopped short of a direct political rebellion. They sought mainly to explain the principles, purposes, and objectives of the movement. They expressed optimism about the changing conditions of the state of society, urging their listeners to make greater efforts to provide for the unity of all classes of society. In the autumn of 1844, they expressed strong beliefs that a return to Tory principles had begun.

Ostensibly, the Young England leaders sought to mold public opinion but were wary of stepping too far in the front with direct action. Early in the next year, Manners displayed a continued reluctance to participate in public meetings. On March 11, 1845, he declined an invitation from James English, Secretary of the Manchester Operatives Association.

"Sir,--In answer to your flattering invitation for the 25th inst., I beg leave to inform you that my engagements during the Easter recess would prevent me having the honour to accept it, did I fully and heartily concur in the objects of your proposed meeting; but I will frankly own to you that I feel no affection or regard for that abstract something or nothing called 'Conservatism,' and could not, therefore, even were I otherwise able to take part in the festival. In these days more distinctive principles and more decided acts are, in my poor opinion, required than Conservatism affords, or is likely to afford. I would rather hear a body of right-principled Englishmen, such as will be



assembled on the 25th inst., assert, for instance, their determination to maintain the integrity of the Welsh episcopate than 'the institutions of the country,' which may mean institutions of any sort. I know that frank and honest character of the Manchester men too well to fear that you or they will resent this brief expression of my convictions on this subject, however they may dissent from them.

With a hearty wish that old Tory principles and sympathies may once more strike a deep root into the English soil."<sup>49</sup>

This type of publicity could hardly have aided the leaders of Young England, nor did it aid in explaining what they meant to achieve or how to achieve it.

Much of the thought of the members of Young England, as well as public response to them, may be traced through their literary productions. Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred by Disraeli are often referred to as the Young England trilogy.<sup>50</sup> These three works provided Disraeli the best avenue to reach a wide audience interested in the sentiment of Young England. It is clear that literature served an important role in the spread of its ideals. Unfortunately, the other members' productions, although popular at the time, have been unduly ignored.<sup>51</sup> Some of Disraeli's ideas

---

<sup>49</sup>Young England, March 29, 1845, p. 201, prints this letter. At this time, Manners was still committed to the Birmingham meeting.

<sup>50</sup>Paul Smith, "The Young England Movement," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Literature, Columbia University, 1951), pp. 78, 79.

<sup>51</sup>Muriel Masefield, Peacocks and Primroses, a Survey of Disraeli's Novels (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953), pp. 164-67, discusses them briefly. For background on novels of the period see Kathleen Tillotson, Novels of the Eighteen-Forties (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954).

emanated from earlier publications by his compatriots.

Disraeli performed an invaluable service to Young England as well as to the development of social consciousness through the publication of this set of novels. In May, 1849, Disraeli, in the preface of the fifth edition of Coningsby, provided his reasoning for resorting to the use of novels to express his ideas.

Coningsby was published in the year 1844. The main purpose of its writer was to vindicate the just claims of the Tory party to be the popular political confederation of the country; a purpose which he had, more or less, pursued from a very early period of life. The occasion was favourable to the attempt. The youthful mind of England has just recovered from the inebriation of the great Conservative triumph of 1841, and was beginning to inquire what, after all, they had conquered to preserve. It was opportune, therefore, to show that Toryism was not a phrase, but a fact; and that our political institutions were the embodiment of our popular necessities. This the writer endeavoured to do without prejudice, and to treat of events and characters of which he had some personal experience, not altogether without the impartiality of the future.

It was not originally the intention of the writer to adopt the form of fiction as the instrument to scatter his suggestions, but, after reflection, he resolved to avail himself of a method which, in the temper of the times, offered the best chance of influencing opinion.<sup>52</sup>

Doubtless, a primary purpose existed in expounding the theories and sentiments of Young England. In the first edition, dedicated to Henry Hope, he commented that he hoped "to scatter some suggestions that may tend to elevate the tone of public life, ascertain the true character of

---

<sup>52</sup>Disraeli, Coningsby, I, xv-xvi.

political parties, and induce us for the future more carefully to distinguish between facts and phrases, realities and phantoms."<sup>53</sup> An important and serious educative task was assigned to the literary works.

The novels, Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred must not be ignored in any attempt to understand Young England.<sup>54</sup> In addition to social, parliamentary, and rhetorical endeavors, literature offered Disraeli a means of formulating and effecting a rejuvenation of Toryism. Politics, albeit exceedingly important, never made up the whole of his influence. To achieve his ideal of altering human thought he viewed ". . . politics as an art."<sup>55</sup> Consequently, other art forms were just as acceptable, if they contributed to the achievements of the objectives.

A great problem for the leaders of Young England arose when they attempted to explain their social program. Disraeli in his novels provided an interesting, readable, political philosophy. According to one assessment, Disraeli

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., xiii.

<sup>54</sup>Considerable past research renders a new detailed analysis of the novels unnecessary. For such information see Paul Smith, The Young England Movement, Muriel Masefield, Peacocks and Primroses, a Survey of Disraeli's Novels, Richard A. Levine, Benjamin Disraeli (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968), Louis Cazamian, Le Roman Social en Angleterre, 1830-1850 (new ed.; 2 vols.; Paris: H. Didier, [1934/]), Eric Forbes-Boyd, "Disraeli the Novelist," Essays and Studies, 1950, Vol. III of the New Series of Essays and Studies collected for the English Association by G. Rostrevor Hamilton (London: John Murray, 1950), 100-17.

<sup>55</sup>Robert Hamilton, "Disraeli and the Two Nations," Quarterly Review, CCLXXXIII (January, 1950), 115.

expounded support for gradual legislative change as public opinion shifted; strong opposition to any sudden, revolutionary alterations; the removal of all barriers creating class division; the restoration of the prerogatives of the monarchy; the enlargement of religious freedoms and sentiment.<sup>56</sup> Disraeli demonstrated belief in these principles and writing provided him an avenue of propagation.

These three works of fiction provide clues to the adaptiveness of Disraeli and Young England. In other words, Young England failed politically, but its objectives transcended purely political achievements. Seen in the view of one recent writer, Disraeli aimed for the (1) realignment of the aristocracy by admitting the commercial and manufacturing leaders, (2) exhibition by the aristocracy of a concern for the poor while realizing it would be politically frustrated, (3) transcendence of politics into spirit, emotion, religion.<sup>57</sup> The Young England spirit avoided extinction with political failure by remaining accessible to all who read Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred.

These works by Disraeli have been labeled political novels. In fact, he has been credited with the creation of this form of literary expression.<sup>58</sup> This in itself renders

---

<sup>56</sup>Morris Edmund Speare, The Political Novel: its Development in England and America (New York: Russell and Russell, 1966), pp. 56-57.

<sup>57</sup>Levine, "Disraeli," pp. 244-45.

<sup>58</sup>Speare, The Political Novel: its Development in England and America, pp. 1-5.

Disraeli a significant literary figure. Despite his own avowed reasons, the question still remains why he chose to resort to this form of expression. As a politician he had ample opportunity to express himself in the House of Commons, in political clubs, and in outdoor meetings. He had written articles for journals or newspapers. He had written a political treatise. The answer lies in that he desired the freedom to express himself without being held strictly accountable for every word put to the paper and presented to the public.

In effect, he was caught in a dilemma, a desire to influence public opinion but not to sacrifice his position as a practicing politician. Disraeli had a keen awareness of the importance of the written word on the literate public. He wanted to reach this group; nevertheless he also wanted a way to back down if his ideas met with too much derision. Crane Brinton has depicted the situation in which Disraeli found himself.

In any progressive and democratic society--and modern societies are all, apparently, progressive and democratic--public opinion must have a certain margin of advance over actual political measures. The practical politician, like any other professional man, is usually in these days a bit behind the times. He is a result and not a cause; one suspects a servant, not a master. Perhaps the real changes are economic; but at any rate these changes spread through society with a thoroughness made possible only by the rule of what is vaguely called public opinion. Obviously, we now use the words public opinion loosely but significantly to describe the sovereignty of the people; and that is a product of the Revolution. The sovereign people expresses itself, not merely through the

vote, not merely by the inarticulate role of custom, but vocally through its Press.<sup>59</sup>

Disraeli tried to operate in two worlds, ahead of the times in literature and behind the times in politics.

In Coningsby the social problems of England are expressed. Disraeli portrays the period of the 1830's, and the lack of any political responses capable of curing the existing social ills provides the main theme. The Reform Bill of 1832 had not solved social problems. The author in long discussions, outright digressions, and caricatures criticizes the politicians then in, or contending for, power. In his view a Whig Venetian oligarchy had been established in the seventeenth century, setting the nation on a disastrous course. In other than material terms, he noted the failure of the nineteenth century beginning when the second Earl of Liverpool's ministry failed to act in the best tradition of the Tory principles. The culmination, "the Tamworth Manifesto of 1834 was an attempt to construct a party without principles; its basis therefore was necessarily Latitudinarianism; and its inevitable consequence has been Political Infidelity."<sup>60</sup>

As a politician, Disraeli expected much from politics. Feeling disappointment, he concluded that the problem stemmed from misuse or non-use of the traditional

---

<sup>59</sup>Crane Brinton, The Political Ideas of the English Romanticists (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), p. 199.

<sup>60</sup>Disraeli, Coningsby, I, 132.

institutions of the nation. "In the hurry-skurry of money-making, men-making, and machine-making we had altogether outgrown, not the spirit, but the organisation, of our institutions."<sup>61</sup> England, hence, was committed to the wrong principles. He scathingly presented this situation in a conversation of a couple of political hangers-on.

"Hush," said Mr. Tadpole. "The time has gone by for Tory governments; what the country requires is a sound Conservative government." "A sound Conservative government," said Taper, musingly. "I understand: Tory men and Whig measures."<sup>62</sup>

Perceiving an abundance of problems, Young England needed to offer suggested remedies. In essence, it desired to restore the strengths of the national spirit, re-uniting the interests of all classes. The movement issued a call for heroic leadership. Coningsby expressed the desires of the rising generation to Lord Monmouth.

"What we want, sir, is not to fashion new dukes and furbish up old baronies, but to establish great principles which may maintain the realm and secure the happiness of the people. Let me see authority once more honoured; a solemn reverence again the habit of our lives; let me see property acknowledging, as in the old days of faith, that labour is his twin brother, and that the essence of all tenure is the performance of duty; let results such as these be brought about, and let me participate, however feebly, in the great fulfillment, and public life then indeed becomes a noble career, and a seat in Parliament an enviable distinction."<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 94.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., 139; 134-35, 349-50. On page 197, conservatism is called "the mule of politics that engenders nothing."

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., II, 139.

In 1844, Disraeli, in an expression of concern over whether the youth would succeed or fail, ended Coningsby with a declaration of unsureness.

They stand now on the threshold of public life. They are in the leash, but in a moment they will be slipped. What will be their fate? Will they maintain in august assemblies and high places the great truths which, in study and in solitude, they have embraced? Or will their courage exhaust itself in the struggle, their enthusiasm evaporate before hollow-hearted ridicule, their generous impulses yield with a vulgar catastrophe to the tawdry temptations of a low ambition? Will their skilled intelligence subside into the adroit tool of a corrupt party? Will vanity confound their fortunes, or jealousy wither their sympathies? Or will they remain brave, single, and true; refuse to bow before shadows and worship phrases; sensible of the greatness of their position, recognise the greatness of their duties; denounce to a perplexed and disheartened world the frigid theories of a generalising age that have destroyed the individuality of man, and restore the happiness of their country by believing in their own energies, and daring to be great?<sup>64</sup>

The challenge to the upper class to act with a renewed sense of responsibility and compassion for their fellow men had been stated in an entertaining style. Unfortunately, the message failed to revive the aristocracy.

In his next novel, Sybil, published in 1845, Disraeli illustrated the severity of social dislocation. Many persons still remained ignorant of the poor social conditions, although the study of the conditions of the working classes was increasing. The government published the Blue Books, which Disraeli used in this work. Nevertheless, they meant little for as Manners once complained, ". . . hundreds of

---

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., II, 225-26.



thousands of pounds for printing blue-covered books, which one man in every hundred thousand looks at,. . ."65 The social novelists of the 1840's had an important educative function to fill. Disraeli's overdrawn picture must rank in the first degree of impact and popularity. The presentation of the two nations within England received wide acclaim.

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

"You speak of--". . .

"The Rich and the Poor."66

The vivid portraits of the agricultural tenants, the factory workers, the miners, the handloom weavers, the nail makers, and the Chartists must have given the upper and middle class readers shudders of apprehension.

Disraeli criticized the political structure which allowed such gross mistreatment of the working classes. While he deplored the violence of the Chartists, Disraeli declared that many of their demands were not only just but capable of being met without a loss of privilege by the upper classes. He did not desire the loss of position and privilege but an

---

<sup>65</sup>Manners, A Plea for National Holy-Days, pp. 6-7. Also see Sheila M. Smith, "Willenhall and Wodgate: Disraeli's Use of Blue Book Evidence," Review of English Studies, new ser., XIII (November, 1962), 368-84.

<sup>66</sup>Disraeli, Sybil, I, 93.

extension of them to the lower levels of society. To gain this expansion a revival of ancient Tory principles as asserted by Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke; 2nd Earl of Shelburne; and William Pitt the Younger was imperative. His plan called for a return to the past when the English people were "the truest, the freest, and the bravest, the best-natured and the best looking, the happiest and most religious race upon the surface of this globe; . . ."<sup>67</sup>

As in Coningsby, the aristocracy was called upon to lead the restoration of the good old days. True, the aristocrats had failed in their duties; yet with help, especially from the church, everything might be regained. Unfortunately, the established church had not only failed to care properly for the poor, but the working classes displayed immense ignorance about religion.<sup>68</sup> A working class girl in the squatter town of Wodgate asserted:

"I be a reg'lar born Christian and my mother afore me, and that's what few gals in the Yard can say. Thomas will take to it himself when work is slack; and he believes now in our Lord and Savior Pontius Pilate, who was crucified to save our sins; and in Moses, Goliath, and the rest of the Apostles."<sup>69</sup>

A formidable task lay ahead for the aristocracy and the church.

Conditions were bleak; yet Disraeli was optimistic.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 177. Also see Richard Faber, Beaconsfield and Bolingbroke (London: Faber & Faber /1961/).

<sup>68</sup>Disraeli, Sybil, I, 159, 253.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 238.

"I will believe that moral power is irresistible, or where are we to look for hope?"<sup>70</sup> If the youth of the nation, aware of the problems, would act, the conditions could be remedied. Disraeli maintained "it is not individual influence that can renovate society; it is some new principle that must reconstruct it. . . .What we want is community."<sup>71</sup> An alliance of Church-Crown-Aristocracy-People was called upon to make great social improvements.

Tancred, published in 1847, came after the enthusiasm for Young England had waned. The desired quadruple alliance had not come. So, some other solution for the problems of society had to be found. In effect, Tancred provided a place for the disillusioned new generation to turn. Society had not been converted; Tadpole still talked of "the nonsense of Young England."<sup>72</sup>

In the novel the national scene presented a despairing picture to the hero, Tancred. He lamented, "nobody now thinks about heaven. They never dream of angels. All their existence is concentrated in steamboats and railways."<sup>73</sup> Obviously, Disraeli still considered English society to be developing along inappropriate lines. Tancred in turn discussed the decline of importance of the power of the crown,

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., 242.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., 276-77. Also see II, 192.

<sup>72</sup>Disraeli, Tancred, I, 179.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., 170.

the lack of faith in British institutions, moral decay of the working classes, troubles within the Anglican church, the unreliableness of public opinion, and the decline in the ideals of friendship.<sup>74</sup> Tancred, an English aristocrat, found nothing deserving of his trust and confidence within the British system.

Therefore, Disraeli depicted Tancred searching for basic answers in religion not politics. Tancred is sent off for a visit to the Holy Lands. Once there, he is soon involved with a plot to form a new crusade emerging from the Arabian desert--to erect a Young Syria.<sup>75</sup> Employing the powers of description gained from his own youthful visit to the Near East, Disraeli painted a vivid scene involving Tancred in fanciful, gallant, and heroic escapades. Yet, the reader is left in suspense for the book closes, without really ending, with the announcement of Tancred's parents entering Jerusalem. Are they entering to indicate their interest and desire to learn of the mysteries of the faith which religion offers, or are they coming to take Tancred back to England, to end his Grand Tour? Unfortunately, no clue comes from Disraeli. Nevertheless, despite its faults, Disraeli considered Tancred to be his best work.

The aspirations, problems, and hopes of Young England are contained within Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred. Disraeli

---

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 57-67, 91-96, 190; II, 223-24.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., II, 126, 226-43, 256-59.

considered Young England as a portent of better times. In Coningsby the members of the movement are setting out to operate within the political institutions of the nation. In Sybil a clear sympathy and understanding of the special problems of the working classes is evident. In Tancred the Young Englanders are depicted as still at work, but the struggle has not met with any great success in political or social terms; hence the hero turns to religion. In all three works the conclusions are actually statements of a hope for something new and better. The social problems are discussed, but the solutions are not provided. Evidently, during 1844-1847, Disraeli retained his aspirations for social regeneration, but he had not, despite Young England, seen any decisive political victories in this direction. Could literature succeed where political activity had failed?

Lord John Manners employed his literary abilities to further the social alteration of England. In 1841, he published a volume, England's Trust and Other Poems, dedicated to George Smythe. Evident in this work are many of the same social problems and sentiments expressed later in Disraeli's trilogy. These poems give a clear indication why Disraeli and Manners came to a meeting of the minds. Both men felt society to be awry. They looked for solutions in the same historical institutions--the church and the aristocracy. In one of the poems, "Signs of the Times," Manners expressed the fearful consequences if England failed to undergo a humane transformation.

Methinks an earnest-minded man may see,  
 In these our days of restlessness and strife,  
 Portents with which our English air was rife  
 What time religion and philosophy  
 Cut off a sainted monarch's blameless life.  
 The sick and fierce affection to be free  
 From all restraints of Church and monarchy;  
 The haughty confidence of power, that springs  
 From out dull years of cold indifference,  
 And weighs and counts the cost of holiest things,  
 Asking the use of prelates and of kings,  
 And views high mysteries with eye of sense,--  
 Warn us that England once again may hear  
 The shouts of Roundhead and of Cavalier.<sup>76</sup>

Chaos was imminent; change was imperative.

The change was to be guided by the romantic, historical traditions of medieval feudalism. To Young England the feudal structure had bound the social classes together with each person realizing his dependence on the other. In contrast, the nineteenth century manufacturing society had subjected the working classes to virtual slavery, without hope for the future.

Oh! would some noble dare again to raise  
 The feudal banner of forgotten days,  
 And live despising slander's harmless hate,  
 The potent ruler of his petty state!  
 Then would the different classes once again  
 Feel the kind pressure of the social chain,  
 And in their mutual wants and hopes confess  
 How close allied the little to the less.<sup>77</sup>

This appeal for the return of feudal inspired, aristocratic sentiment did not increase Manners' popularity. In the poem, "England's Trust," he wrote the lines which were often derisively used against him.

---

<sup>76</sup>Manners, England's Trust and Other Poems, p. 89.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., pp. 17, 16.

Let wealth and commerce, laws and learning die,  
But leave us still our old Nobility!<sup>78</sup>

To manufacturers, commercial traders, et al. of the nineteenth century, imbued with a sense of change, progress, and utility, these feudal pronouncements sounded harebrained.

Manners realized that the nineteenth century aristocrats did not exhibit the purported social sympathies of their feudal ancestors. Yet, he was talking of an older nobility, one which relied on the church. Manners insisted on the importance of spiritual strength to revive the aristocrats to their social responsibilities.

The church had to undertake a major commitment in effecting the return to better social conduct. Manners decried the existence of a weakened church, which failed to care for the poor. Above all, he felt the church should stand firm against the employment of physical violence to solve social problems. The nobles had to act, under the direction of religious sentiments, if violence were to be avoided. The priests had to divest themselves of the political games of religion, confining themselves to caring for the people. Heroic action, not political maneuvering, was demanded by Manners.

Oh! would her priests but dare to raise on high  
Her glorious banner to the storm-rent sky,  
Be bold to plead their Mother's holy cause  
Nor shrink from one least tittle of her laws,  
Then might our England justly hope to be  
What she was once--the faithful and the free:  
Then might she, with her meteor-flag unfurled,

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

Despise the threatenings of a banded world!<sup>79</sup>

Manners had been affected by the Oxford Movement through his meetings with Frederick William Faber and John Henry Newman. The effects, however, of this religious movement did not come in immediate social improvement but in the long range theological position of Anglicanism. In 1843, Newman wrote, "George Denison has been very urgent with us here to get up a protest against the unecclesiastical clauses of the Factory Bill, . . . .I told him nothing would be done. . . ."<sup>80</sup> For the most part, Anglicanism ignored the problems of the workers during the 1840's. The church, on the defensive, proved incapable and undesirous of launching an offensive sortie against the established social conventions, of which they were a part.

Social conditions did not moderate as Manners anticipated; yet he remained optimistic. This sense of optimism and hope provided the basis of his Young England aspirations. He willingly undertook heroic actions in an attempt to make his dreams come true. In 1841, Manners expressed himself upon the subject in a poem, "Hope."

Surely, it is no idle hope that cheers  
My else desponding soul to soar  
Into the dim futurity of years,  
Exulting, though no longer as of yore  
Old England's heart is healthy at its core.  
Yes! mid the thickening gloom, and doubtful fears,

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., pp. 5, 1-6, 14-41.

<sup>80</sup>Newman to Keble, May 29, 1843, in John Henry Newman, Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman. . . ., edited by Anne Mozley (2 vols.; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897), II, 370.



When each fresh morn perplexing portents bears,  
 Mid earthquake murmurs and the tempest's roar,  
 England shall see a nobler spirit rise  
 To change for smiles her children's craven tears,  
 And kindle in their now lack-luster eyes  
 The fires that gleamed when Coeur de Lion bore  
 The banner of the Cross from England's shore,<sup>81</sup>  
 And saw it flaunt its own, its Eastern skies.

Attaining maturity after a childhood of study and contemplation, Manners declared the intention to contribute to the improvement of the social problems of the nation.<sup>82</sup>

In 1843, the consistency of Manners' thought continued with the publication of A Plea for National Holy-Days. His concern, still essentially the same as in 1841, had acquired greater depth with further information provided by first-hand observations, witnesses before governmental committees, and various governmental reports.<sup>83</sup> He attacked overemphasis on wealth, reliance on the doctrine of utility, overly long hours of labor for the workers, lack of recreational facilities for the poor, and decline of importance of the church in the daily lives of the populace. He strove to solve some of these difficulties. He pleaded that a restoration of the holy days would be especially beneficial to the physical well-being of the lower classes.<sup>84</sup>

Of course, the restoration of the holy days carried

<sup>81</sup>Manners, England's Trust and Other Poems, p. 64.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., "Childhood's Spring," pp. 75-77.

<sup>83</sup>Manners, A Plea for National Holy-Days, pp. 20-22, discusses the primary sources of his information.

<sup>84</sup>See this chapter, pp. 156-58, for his argument of value of Holy-Days in contrast to 10 hour day limit.

with it a religious significance. Supposedly, leisure, sports, and improved social contact would all lead to the restoration of the Merrie England which had existed prior to the seventeenth century. Manners, heartened by the parishes which had reinstituted a number of saints' days, claimed this meant the church was still capable of uniting the people. The traditional institution of the established church could solve social problems; hence

there is no need for striking out a new path; the old one, that leads over the village green to the church door, is patent: our forefathers, that are at rest in the churchyard, used, in merrier or sterner days than ours, to frequent it--we have but to do the same.<sup>85</sup>

It was Manners' contention that a nation which humbly and faithfully followed God would receive a special reward. In order to escape an impending disaster, society had to be turned to religion.

Through these works, some additional poetry, and correspondence printed in the press, the thoughts of Lord John Manners were opened to public perusal. Most of the upper and middle class citizens found his ideas unpalatable. The aristocracy neither stirred itself to aid the workers or to return to the established church. The middle class, with no desire to return to the feudal past, felt insulted by his attacks on manufacturing, commerce, utilitarianism, and wealth. His appeals contained considerable romantic appeal, but the dominant trend was an increasing aversion to

---

<sup>85</sup>Manners, A Plea for National Holy-Days, pp. 25, 26, 18-19.

Romanticism, not a reliance upon it to lead England out of the problems of a new industrial age.

George Smythe also made a literary contribution to the furtherance of the sentiments supported by Young England. In 1844, he dedicated a group of poems, Historic Fancies, to Manners. The poems possess no sustained topic; yet they furnish an indication of historical thinking among the members of Young England. The conflicts of the ancient monarchy, republicanism, and desire for empire are depicted. In addition, a reverence for the English era of the Stuarts, for the church, and for the aristocracy of Europe are evident. He shared many of the heroes of Disraeli and Manners, for example, Viscount Bolingbroke is presented in a favorable light. A sympathy for the working classes and an appreciation of youth rounds out the volume.<sup>86</sup>

Historic Fancies must have perplexed most of the readers of that day. On the one hand, he received their derision for advocating touching for the evil by the monarch. He argued that it provided not only an immediate contact of the crown and the people, but through the distribution of money to the participants an immeasurable amount of benefit occurred.<sup>87</sup> On the other hand, he received their approbation for advocating the importance of "The Merchants of Old

---

<sup>86</sup>George Smythe, Historic Fancies (2d ed.; London: Henry Colburn, 1844). His numerous comments on various personalities of the French Revolution are interesting but not of great value for this paper.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., pp. 88-92.

England."<sup>88</sup> The merchants from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century were depicted as the most important element in society, as the providers of England capable of solving the economic problems of the day.

The land it boasts its titled hosts--they cannot vie  
     with these,  
 The Merchants of old England--the Seigneurs of the Seas,  
 In the days of Queen Victoria, for they have borne  
     her sway  
 From the far Atlantic islands, to the island of Cathay,  
 And, o'er one-sixth of all the earth, and over all  
     the main,  
 Like some good Fairy, Freedom marks and blesses her  
     domain.  
 And of the mighty empires, that arose, and ruled, and  
     died,  
 . . . . .  
 Not one among the conquerors that are or ever were,  
 In wealth, or fame, or grandeur with England may  
     compare.  
 But not of this our Sovereign thought, when from her  
     solemn throne,  
 She spoke of the Poor, and what they endure, in her  
     low and thrilling tone,  
 And offered a prayer that Trade might bear relief  
     through the starving land,  
 To the strong man's weakened arm, and his wan and work-  
     less hand.  
 And by the power, that was her dower, might commerce  
     once more be  
 The Helper of the Helpless, and the Savior of the Free.  
 Then Glory to the Merchants, who shall do such deeds  
     as these,  
 The Merchants of Old England, the Seigneurs of the  
     Seas.<sup>89</sup>

Evidently, Smythe held a higher esteem for the middle class merchants and manufacturers than for the landed aristocracy.

Alexander Baillie-Cochrane published nothing of

---

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., pp. 381-86. The Annual Register of 1844 felt it popular enough to include part of the poem in the back of its publication.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., pp. 385-86.

The conditions of the poor constituted an important segment of his writings. In 1838, at the age of twenty-one, he distributed twenty copies of Poems; due to the limited numbers its public impact must have been slight. Yet, it provided him a means of expressing his feelings openly and honestly. In discussing the working classes, he had the rural poor uppermost in mind.

Because the poor man knows not History's page,  
Think you he wants the spirit of his age?  
Proud fool! I tell you in the poor man's breast  
The truest, noblest feelings often rest.  
He has not drunk from Education's well,

. . . . .

But yet he bears within a flow of soul,  
Which, if occasion calls, will burst control.  
Born in a hut, and pillow'd on a sod,

<sup>90</sup>Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, Exeter Hall; or Church  
Polemics (London: W. E. Painter, 1841), p. 11.

That man would die for Country, King, and God.<sup>91</sup>

In 1841, he praised the poor for their loyalty to the nation and its leaders. He commended them for teaching their children "to honour those above him as he ought."<sup>92</sup> Cochrane's announced views were compatible with those of his friends, Manners, Smythe, and Disraeli.

The publications, speeches, and social activities of the members of Young England raised support among the English public. Manners noted, in late 1844, that "there are at least half a dozen 'Young England' newspapers & magazines bursting the shell."<sup>93</sup> A young Englishman wrote, after the enthusiasm of the 1844 Manchester meeting, his expectations and hopes that Disraeli would take the leadership in an organization promoting the aspirations of the new generation.<sup>94</sup> Manners' father read and found satisfaction in Coningsby. The accolades of Disraeli's sister, Sarah, can be partially attributed to family pride, but she also praised Smythe's work and proudly noted the spread of Young England influence.<sup>95</sup> Disraeli's old friend, Lord Lyndhurst, a member

---

<sup>91</sup>Cochrane, Poems (London: W. Clowes & Sons, 1838), p. 12.

<sup>92</sup>Cochrane, "Meditations of Other Days," in The Morea, To Which is Added, Meditations of Other Days (London: Saunders & Otley, 1841), pp. 137-38.

<sup>93</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/6, Manners to Disraeli, November 4, 1844.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., A/IV/M/54.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., D/III/A/30, 31, 33, 42, 50, Sarah to Mrs. Disraeli, May 3, 1844, June 9, 1844 ?, August 4, 1844, 1844, March, 1845.

of Peel's government, considered Coningsby to be full of wit and talent, a "spicy" and "malignant" work.<sup>96</sup>

Some literary reviewers, however, were not enthralled with the propagation of Young England sentiment. Coningsby, Historic Fancies, and England's Trust were reviewed as a unit in the October, 1844, number of the Edinburgh Review. As expected, the Whig journal found little to its taste in Young England, although it was not found to be totally unacceptable. The members were deemed too extravagant, too presumptuous, too contemptuous of the middle class, too metaphysical and theological, too contemptuous of experience gained by age, and too ignorant of the tenets of political economy. Disraeli's promotion of feudalism, Manners' support of the Stuart cause, and Smythe's advocacy of the touching for the evil were singled out for special reprehension. Yet, the movement was considered understandable for it had arisen from legitimate grievances.

It is from the want of a solid Temple and a true Faith, that men betake themselves to Idols; and we are not without hopes that among the disciples of this errant school, which is not without redeeming characteristics, Truth may yet find some of her most rational worshippers.<sup>97</sup>

The objectives of Young England were anathema, but the desire for the discovery and spread of basic social principles

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., B/XXI/L/466, Lord Lyndhurst to Disraeli, May 22, 1844.

<sup>97</sup>Abraham Hayward, "Young England," Edinburgh Review, LXXX (October, 1844), 525, see 517-25 for the entire article.

struck a responsive chord.

The fame of the Young England literature did not remain confined to England. In 1844, Eugene Forcade published an article on Young England, based primarily on Coningsby, for the Revue des Deux Mondes to satisfy French curiosity. The article, highly explanatory, was uncomplimentary of the movement. The reviewer appreciated Disraeli's posing the question of the proper basis of Toryism but criticized him for failing to offer any answers. While noting the humanitarian concern for the poor stemming from its philanthropy and interest in furthering the tendencies of the Oxford Movement, the author considered the policies and theories of Young England as inadequate to the erection and carrying on of the government of Great Britain.<sup>98</sup>

In England a literary attack was launched upon Young England with the publication of Anti-Coningsby. The work satirized Young England by presenting the disastrous consequences of the movement coming to political power. The work is verbose, undigested, and poorly written; yet it is symptomatic of the feeling that something needed to be written to deflate Young England. The movement was not treated correctly or fairly, depicting them destroying the House of Lords, replacing the monarchy with a new ruler from their own sect (clearly Disraeli), and destroying the institutions

---

<sup>98</sup>Eugene Forcade, "De la Jeune Angleterre," Revue des Deux Mondes, new ser., VIII (October, 1844), 385-417.



of the nation.<sup>99</sup> Nevertheless, despite all the misinterpretations, this assessment might be right. Young England probably would have ended in defeat if it had been swept into office behind a ground swell of public clamor. The leaders of the movement did not have clear, practical reforms capable of solving the problems brought on by industrialization and the rapid growth of population. The closing of the wide gap between those in luxury and those in poverty required more than Young England visions of utopia.

Young England also inspired enthusiastic support from the press. Strong support came with the formation of a quasi-official newspaper, Young England, published from January through April, 1845, by Henry George. It appears that the paper purposely did not seek a direct connection with the leaders of Young England. It is clear, however, that it was made available to Disraeli, and Manners spoke favorably of its items.<sup>100</sup>

The paper should not be considered completely accurate in the presentation of the views of the leaders of Young England. As well as interpreting Young England, the editor provided his own views of the needs of society. It did demonstrate, however, the direction and impact of Young England's

---

<sup>99</sup>Christopher North [John Wilson], Anti-Coningsby; or, the New Generation Grown Old (2 vols.; London: T. C. Newby, 1844). Young England, January 11, 1845, p. 23, reviews Coningsby and Anti-Coningsby together.

<sup>100</sup>Young England, January 4, 1845, pp. 9-10. Hughenden Papers, D/III/A/76, Sarah to Mrs. Disraeli, 1845. Houghton Papers, 15:319, Manners to Milnes, Easter day, 1845.

activities. The paper pushed for more practical measures of social reform, empirical investigation of social difficulties, and less interest in the revival of feudal customs than did the active members of Young England. The paper, willing to overlook some differences of opinion, gave full support to the movement.

The paper, at its inception, attempted to outline the principles of the movement. The editor declared "to forward and aid the noble work of reform of our social condition, is the especial object of this Journal."<sup>101</sup> Furthermore, an enumeration of the principles of the Young England sentiment was printed for the benefit of all interested readers.

- First--The system of a limited and hereditary monarchy, as best promoting the liberty, prosperity, and contentment of a nation.
- Secondly--The Reformed Church of England, as primitive in institution, large and tolerant in doctrine and practice.
- Thirdly--Care and encouragement of the moral and affectionate sympathies of the people, and hence opposition to the harsh and unnatural enactments of the Poor Law Act.
- Fourthly--Protection for the plough and the home market, consistent with a favourable extension of commerce.
- Fifthly--Education for the people that shall tend to ennoble, elevate, and sanctify the heart.
- Sixthly--Improvements in the multitudinous dwellings of the poor.
- Seventhly--Allotments of land for the humbler classes.
- Eighthly--Rational and moral recreation, in which all classes may unite, combined with a restoration of the holydays of the church.
- Ninthly--Lawful resistance to all encroachments in any shape on the rights and privileges of

---

<sup>101</sup>Young England, January 4, 1845, pp. 10, 9.

the poorer and humbler orders of men.<sup>102</sup>

All of these measures were in accord with the desires of the members of Young England. The members had made or were to make public statements in support of all of the items mentioned.

The existence and promptings of Young England aided the furtherance of the movement. The journal declared that a large portion of the nation approved of Young England; therefore it urged a decisive movement in Parliament to enact legislation beneficial to the working classes.<sup>103</sup> This support emanated from the same spirit of respect for the past historical traditions.

This seems to be one of the first principles of YOUNG ENGLAND'S philosophy--"stare super antiquas vias"--to reanimate the body politic with the spirit of the past; not to try new-fangled schemes and theories, but to recur to the practices and constitution of primitive antiquity.<sup>104</sup>

The existence of a literary ally added enthusiasm to the leaders of the movement.

The journal provided political support for Disraeli's attacks on Peel in the House of Commons. Young England clamored for the ending of all political factionalism; the split from Peel was considered as a defense of principles not factionalism. The journal shared Disraeli's view that

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., January 25, 1845, pp. 56-57; February 1, 1845, p. 76; p. 75, is a reprint of "Young England, a National Ballad," from Parker's London Magazine, February, 1845.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., January 18, 1845, p. 43.

Peel had deserted the principles of Toryism; therefore it was only fitting that the government be called into question.<sup>105</sup> Hence, Disraeli in his mutiny against Peel, for a short time, had the constant support of a newspaper. The demise of the journal damaged the position and prospects of Young England. Both the journal and the political hopes of Young England failed in 1845.

Politicians did not immediately accept the tenets of Young England. The political development of Britain moved in a direction much different from the one Disraeli propounded in Coningsby.

"Nevertheless, if we are forced to revolutions, let us propose to our consideration the idea of a free monarchy, established on fundamental laws, itself the apex of a vast pile of municipal and local government, ruling an educated people, represented by a free and intellectual press. Before such royal authority, supported by such a national opinion, the sectional anomalies of our country would disappear. Under such a system, where qualifications would not be Parliamentary, but personal, even statesmen would be educated; we should have no more diplomatists who could not speak French, no more bishops ignorant of theology, no more generals-in-chief who never saw a field.

Now there is a polity adapted to our laws, our institutions, our feelings, our manners, our traditions; a polity capable of great ends and appealing to high sentiments; a polity which, in my opinion, would render government an object of national affection, which would terminate sectional anomalies, assuage religious heats, and extinguish Chartism."<sup>106</sup>

These ideas had been long standing with Disraeli. Since the

---

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., March 18, 1845, pp. 152, 155; March 15, 1845, p. 170; March 22, 1845; March 29, 1845, pp. 200-01.

<sup>106</sup>Disraeli, Coningsby, II, 67.

1830's he had attacked the centralization of governmental authority, the decline in the aristocratic principles of government, the weakness of the constitution, the weakened church, the unprincipled political parties, and concern for the lost feudal traditions of English society. Disraeli realized that the nation had two choices--advance to democracy, or revert to aristocracy.<sup>107</sup>

Young England represented an attempt to revert to the aristocratic principle. The political failure of the movement opened Disraeli's mind to the acceptance of the idea of the advance to democracy. His conception of democracy, however, was that of Tory Democracy, balancing the acquisition of suffrage with the acquisition of duties. Disraeli advocated political responsibility not enfranchisement.<sup>108</sup> The writings of Young England succeeded better than its Parliamentary maneuvers in forming a public impression of Tory concern for the people.

Public opinion as to the proper structure of society received ideas from Young England. The leaders existed in the vanguard of literature which was beginning to deal, in

---

<sup>107</sup>Disraeli, Whigs and Whiggism, Political Writings, edited and introduced by William Hutcheon (London: John Murray, 1913), pp. 16-22. Also see "Old England" in the same volume in which he criticized the loss of efficiency and moral power of the government.

<sup>108</sup>J. T. Lawless, "Benjamin Disraeli's Concepts of Social Class," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of History, St. Louis University, 1967), pp. 39-57, discusses Disraeli's Tory Democracy; pp. 118-26, for Disraeli's view of middle class conservatism.

a major way, with the problems brought to England by rapid industrialization.<sup>109</sup> Young England literature fits in the tradition of writers who were concerned with the deteriorating and baneful conditions of society, opposed to the major spirit of the age, and who struggled for the maintenance of human dignity. In conjunction with such authors as Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Robert Southey, Charles Kingsley, Matthew Arnold, and William Morris, the leaders of Young England possessed a humanitarian concern for the condition of England.<sup>110</sup> The greatest effect of these authors and Young England is similarly measured in sensitivity and poetry, rather than in the passage of practical social legislation. A provocative view of society appeared with Young England, and it did not remain exclusive with them.

Disraeli's Young England trilogy provided a perceptive and penetrating, if not completely accurate, picture of English society. He realized the potential social disaster if the gap between the classes persisted. He blasted the aristocratic inertia and disinterest in the problems of the working classes of England. The middle class was also singled out for reproof; yet he praised the virtue of some individuals

---

<sup>109</sup>William O. Aydelotte, "The England of Marx and Mill as Reflected in Fiction," The Journal of Economic History, VIII, Supplement (1948), 42-58, explains this idea and considers Disraeli as exemplary.

<sup>110</sup>Bernard N. Schilling, Human Dignity and the Great Victorians (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946), pp. 204-19, discusses this concept, although he does not mention Young England.

for their vitality, wealth, and concern for the factory workers. The working classes gained his support for the improvement of their conditions; yet he disfavored their employment of violence. Anyone, regardless of his social standing, upon the reading of Coningsby, Sybil, and Tancred found that his awareness of the necessity of social amelioration was stimulated.

In the final analysis, religion appeared to Young England to provide the most promise for altering the prevailing current of social opinion. In 1870, Disraeli, reflecting upon this episode in his career, wrote "the writer and those who acted with him looked, then, upon the Anglican Church as a main machinery by which these results might be realised."<sup>111</sup> This statement raises the question of the depth and involvement of Young England with the spirit of Christianity, specifically those ideals propounded by the Oxford Movement. Although the connection was not shared by all members, and the influence was not constant, they did support, encourage, and propound Tractarianism through their literary works.

The Oxford Movement served as a partial stimulus of Young England. The leaders of Young England borrowed from and were stimulated by Tractarianism. A desire to understand and follow traditions of the medieval Church are evident in both, but the movements did not reach the same conclusions. The climax of the aspirations of the Oxford Movement came

---

<sup>111</sup>Disraeli, Lothair, p. xxiv.

when Newman found that his conception of the true church extended to Roman Catholicism--further than he had originally envisioned. In this setting of individualistic groping, the four leaders of Young England each created their own historical, religious utopia.

Disraeli, an active communicant of the Anglican church and at this time a supporter of the High Church, illustrated in Tancred that the basis of Christianity should be carried back to the ancient Judaic traditions.<sup>112</sup> By the time of the writing of Lothair he was attacking Roman Catholicism.

Manners held the longest-standing interest in the plans of the Oxfordites; however he refused to follow the conversion to Roman Catholicism. He understood the need for a unity among all Christian faiths. Nevertheless, by 1846, he had concluded that union was impossible.<sup>113</sup> Manners continued to desire the connection of the Anglican church with Toryism. He maintained a faith in the power of religion and argued the benefit of religious freedom. "I quarrel with no man for advocating to the best of his power any question in

---

<sup>112</sup>For helpful discussions on Disraeli's views on religion see Clyde J. Lewis, "Disraeli's Conception of Divine Order," Jewish Social Studies, XXIV (July, 1962), 144-61; Arthur H. Frietzsche, Disraeli's Religion; the Treatment of Religion in Disraeli's Novels (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1961); Joseph Ellis Baker, The Novel and the Oxford Movement (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965); Lawless, "Benjamin Disraeli's Concepts of Social Class," pp. 270-80.

<sup>113</sup>Charles Whibley, Lord John Manners and His Friends (2 vols.; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925), I, 251-55. Hereinafter referred to as Manners.



which he feels religion to be connected, . . ."<sup>114</sup> To Manners, if humanity followed its free religious spirit, all problems could be solved.

Cochrane displayed an interest in the fortunes of the Oxford Movement. In Exeter Hall, he pointedly refused to be cast as a stalwart of Oxfordites. He asserted, however, that the Tractarians were being unduly and unfairly criticized. He envisioned the objectives of all groups within the church to be the same; only the methods differed. In his opinion, the fears of Roman Catholicism had been grossly exaggerated in England. Simultaneously, he characterized the attraction of Roman Catholicism to those perplexed by religious controversy.

History proves to us--if it has, indeed, been written for our learning--that, in times of religious controversies between different parties in the Church, very many of its members have slid back into Romanism, seeking, in its fixed and unalterable decrees, some relief from the pangs of uncertainty and religious strife.<sup>115</sup>

Cochrane never took pride in the accuracy of his prediction as it pertained to the Oxfordites. Of the leaders of Young England he showed less enchantment with Catholicism than the others. His vote against the 1845 Maynooth Grant demonstrated his strong Protestant sympathies. Later in Young Italy

---

<sup>114</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/25, Manners to Disraeli, February 21, 1848; also see B/XX/M/20, 37, Manners to Disraeli, January 19, 1848, and January 28, 1849.

<sup>115</sup>Cochrane, Exeter Hall; or Church Polemics, pp. 14-15.

he criticized the entire system of the Roman Catholic Church as anti-liberal, hypocritical, uncharitable, and corrupt.<sup>116</sup>

The religious attitude of Smythe must remain open to conjecture. Inadequate evidence exists to gauge his thoughts after the publication of Historic Fancies. As he lost political enthusiasm for Young England, he also lost enthusiasm for the Oxford Movement. Among the four leaders of Young England, religion made the least impact on Smythe.

Other areas exist in which it is possible to view a common ground of the Oxford and Young England movements. Both emphasized emotion over reason in religious concerns. Both disliked the idea of state control over all aspects of society. If the monarchy had gained strength, the movement might have parted company over the proper relation of the Church and the Crown, but there was no disagreement over the independence of the Church from Parliament. The Oxfordites were only mildly interested with the improvement of social conditions, being preoccupied with moral regeneration. Young England shared this moral concern but placed greater interest in social betterment. Neither possessed a comprehensive program of pragmatic social legislation.

The order and authority of a revived Church provided a major ideal for both. In the end, both groups decided that the existing structure of the Anglican church was incapable of effecting their wishes. The leaders of the Oxford

---

<sup>116</sup>Cochrane, Young Italy (London: John W. Parker, 1850), pp. 195-204, 214-15.

Movement either moved toward Catholicism or struggled within the Anglican framework. The leaders of the Young England movement either deserted politics or struggled within the political framework.<sup>117</sup> With a basis of common sensibilities, they shared a common end.

The strongest attempt by any of the leaders of Young England to emulate the desires of the ancient church occurred with Manners' role in the establishment of a benevolent sisterhood. The plan originated as a memorial to Southey, who died in 1843. Apparently, Manners initiated the scheme, propounding it among his friends and through the columns of the Morning Post and the English Churchman.<sup>118</sup> He planned to erect the house in London. If the Bishop of London had disapproved, he considered locating it in one of the manufacturing dioceses.

By December 30, 1843, Manners had devised tentative regulations and organized a committee to take subscriptions

---

<sup>117</sup>For views of Oxford Movement see Harold J. Laski, Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), pp. 69-119; L. E. Elliott-Binns, Religion in the Victorian Era (2d ed.; Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1946), pp. 92-113; Robert H. Murray, Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century (2 vols.; Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1929), I, 244-77; S. C. Carpenter, Church and People, 1789-1889 (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), pp. 110-74, 201-15; Owen Chadwick, The Mind of the Oxford Movement (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960).

<sup>118</sup>Houghton Papers, 15:313, Manners to Milnes, December 8, 1843, Manners commented, "as to the Times I have a great horror of asking them to do anything, but I have half a mind to write a private letter to young Walter on the subject."

for the creation of the sisterhood in London.

I propose to invest the six following regulations /that is if they meet with the Bishop's approval, to whom I have forwarded them/ elaborated from the various letter written on the subject.

1. The members of the House of Mercy to be members of the Church of England.
2. Their labours of love not to be confined to members of that Church.
3. Their residence in the establishment to be voluntary, they, during their residence, to conform to its orders and regulations.
4. The Superior to be appointed by the Bishop.
5. The Establishment to be subject to the supervision of the Rector or Vicar of the Parish in which it is situate. /sic/
6. The Visitor to be the Bishop of the Diocese.  
 . . .if I have my way the committee shall stand with an addition or two as circumstances may require.

Lord Lyttelton

Sir John Hanmer. M.P.

Richard M. Milnes Esq. M.P.

J. D. Walts Russell Esq. M.P.

& myself, or not, or as secretary, or treasurer, as may be thought most likely to do good.<sup>119</sup>

Manners wished to press the plan, but at the same time he did not want to carry the entire burden.

Finally, in 1845, the house of the Sister of Mercy was opened. The beginning was quite modest, with only five sisters, of whom two were laywomen.<sup>120</sup> Although the establishment had the support of some influential Churchmen, it ended in failure. Eventually, the Bishop of London withdrew his sanction because of the leanings of the inhabitants for Roman Catholicism. The Reverend W. Dodsworth, governor of the house, and the Superior, infused with the spirit

---

<sup>119</sup>Ibid., 15:315, Manners to Milnes, December 30, 1843.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., 15:319, Manners to Milnes, Easter day, 1845.

originating from the questions of the Oxford Reformers, converted to Catholicism. With so many problems plaguing the establishment, the benefactors, in 1856, disbanded the sisterhood.<sup>121</sup>

The members of Young England, therefore, asserted little of immediate, practical significance. Yet, it was not insignificant. John Stuart Mill, a contemporary, without reference to Young England, accurately stressed its dilemma.

This, at least, seems to me undeniable, that long before the superior classes could be sufficiently improved to govern in the tutelary manner supposed, the inferior classes would be too much improved to be so governed.<sup>122</sup>

In this aspect, Mill came closer to assessing the current of political development than did Young England.

On the other hand, interpretations from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have lauded Young England. In 1959, a reviewer in the Times Literary Supplement assessed Coningsby a seminal work, exerting a great impact upon the social developments of England.<sup>123</sup> Another recent critic considers Young England as important for raising the question of formulating and passing legislation without a sound ideology or philosophy of politics lying underneath

<sup>121</sup>Whibley, Manners, I, 259-62.

<sup>122</sup>John Stuart Mill, Principles of Political Economy with some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy (5th ed.; 2 vols.; New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1920), II, 343; 341-81, 414-15, 563-73.

<sup>123</sup>Maurice Edelman, "A Political Novel: Disraeli sets a Lively Pace," Times Literary Supplement (August 7, 1959), pp. x-xi.

the surface.<sup>124</sup> Perhaps the best interpretation of the position, role, importance, and partial failure of Young England comes from an anonymous nineteenth century author.

Young England, in the days of its irresponsibility, had created for itself an imaginary paradise, which Fate now sternly forbade it to realize. It had performed its allotted task,--no mean one,--encouraged the praiseworthy aspirations of youth, created new bonds of sympathy between class and class, awakened the aristocracy to the consciousness of their responsibilities, taught the poor to regard them no longer as enemies but as friends, and imparted to English politics a gentler spirit and a loftier tone. Gifted with the sagacity to perceive that this self-styled "Age of Progress" is, in reality, only an age of reaction, the leaders of Young England had wisely made no attempt to alter the direction of its current; but had devoted their efforts, like their co-workers in the Church, to promoting a reactionary movement, which, whilst real and substantial, would at the same time, be safe in its extent and beneficial in its operation. Thus, they had avoided on the one hand, the imprudence of endeavouring to stifle the democratic tendency, and, on the other, the impropriety of yielding to it entirely. Calling to their aid the venerable influences of religion and tradition, they had struggled for a time with great gallantry, to hold a middle ground between the "Party of progress," and the Party of resistance. This, to their minds, was true Toryism. Unfortunately, however, the political "via media" had proved itself as unreliable as the ecclesiastical one.<sup>125</sup>

While the estimate of Young England's actions is exaggerated, the analysis of its political position is accurate.

Young England through its literature and social activities continued to live in the minds of humanity. The political accomplishments were meager, and as a political

---

<sup>124</sup>Levine, "Disraeli," pp. 61-86.

<sup>125</sup>Non-Elector, Manners, pp. 73-74.

party it never really existed. Yet, as a gallant, heroic, humane effort the Young England spirit served as a foundation of that ephemeral concept--Tory Democracy. Young England employed political and literary propaganda, and in the end it became a source of social Tory propaganda for the British Conservative Party.

## CHAPTER V

### DISSOLUTION, IMPACT, AND SIGNIFICANCE

#### OF THE YOUNG ENGLAND MOVEMENT

The Tory Radicalism of Young England positively affected the development of a social consciousness in Britain. Intellectually, the basis of Young England was Romanticism--hence the greater concern shown for sentiment, emotion, and attitude than with the attainment of a pragmatic social program. Politically, Young England advocated no comprehensive social policy. Disraeli's leadership of 1874-1880 displays this--concern for society but an inability to lead in the practical formulation of the specific pieces of legislation. The Tory ideals of the movement, while not becoming supreme, were not forgotten. A combination of political, social, and literary factors assured that mankind would be reminded of the social ideals of the movement.

The importance of Young England as a catalyst for the improvement of society may be measured in various categories. The promotion or resistance to the enactment of social legislation by the leading members during their later political careers may be examined and assessed. To prevent the inclusion of too many new variables, only the remainder of the



first phase of social legislation, closing in 1853-1854, will receive a concentrated investigation. A survey of their lives should show whether they continued to exhibit the sentiments of Young England in their political, social, and literary undertakings. Their significance may also be evaluated by the degree to which the Conservative Party adopted their philosophy of society. Furthermore, a measurement may be made of its impact on the formation of public opinion. If Young England shaped developments in these areas, it becomes impossible to label it a dead end movement.

Social sentiment, not social legislation, provided the political cohesiveness of Young England.<sup>1</sup> The members expressed themselves better in literature than in the authorship of social bills. It would be unreasonable to expect a greater agreement after their parliamentary demise, than before. Nevertheless, this split must not be construed to indicate a permanent break of relations or ideals among the members. Manners and Disraeli remained in close contact until the latter died. Cochrane soon reasserted his support and friendship. Smythe maintained sympathy for his former colleagues, although he did nothing to further the aspirations of Young England. Other individuals, who had sympathized with the activities of the movement, also maintained personal contact. The split of Young England was not fostered

---

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter III for discussions of the disunity of Young England on social questions during their political zenith of 1843-45.

by any basic disagreement over the proper structure of society. The Young England supporters still held similar social sentiments, but they continued to disagree on specific issues.

An investigation of the supporters' reactions to the social reforms proposed soon after the political disintegration of Young England shows little change. Among the four, Manners still took the leading role in social matters.<sup>2</sup> Disraeli increased his activity in matters of social concern. Cochrane's responses were infrequent but friendly. Smythe, who had been the most inactive, showed a slight tendency to oppose his former friends.<sup>3</sup> Ferrand, Borthwick, and O'Brien still acted in consort; occasionally Milnes joined them. Their attitudes toward social questions were not greatly affected as they continued to act upon many of the same issues.

Manners renewed his struggle against portions of the law of mortmain. As a result of Manners' proposal in 1843, a Select Committee, chaired by him, had been created to hear evidence on mortmain. In 1846, Manners used the findings of this committee to propose a Pious and Charitable Bequests Bill. In moving for the second reading of the bill, Manners indicated that his object was not the repeal of all laws of mortmain, but specifically a restriction passed during the

---

<sup>2</sup>Manners was defeated during the general election of 1847 at Liverpool, and he did not return to the House of Commons until his election at Colchester in 1850.

<sup>3</sup>See the chart of votes on social issues in Chapter III, p. 96.

reign of George II designed to hamper the granting of land to religious institutions. He maintained that the benefits would be immense--enabling "all British subjects who were legally entitled to do so, to demise their property, real or personal, to any public purpose not in opposition to the policy of the country, or condemned by its laws."<sup>4</sup>

Parliament proved to be no more receptive to Manners' proposal, than it had been in 1843. Sir James Graham, as before, led the government's opposition to the alteration. Support came from Borthwick and Milnes, but the debate indicated little hope for successful passage. Manners persisted by calling for a division. On the vote, the bill suffered defeat by a count of sixty to twenty-four. For that session, the issue was dead.<sup>5</sup>

Manners refused to let the issue alone and, in 1847, proposed a new bill. He discerned the major objections to be fears of dying persons being tricked into giving up their property and of huge amounts of land becoming bound to charitable and religious organizations.

He had endeavoured to meet these two objections in the present Bill. He proposed to require that all wills or deeds containing bequests or grants of landed property for charitable purposes, should be signed three months before the death of the testator; also, that when such

---

<sup>4</sup>Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. 84 (1846), p. 580. Hereinafter referred to as Hansard's. See Chapter III, pp. 98-99, for Manners' attack on mortmain in 1843.

<sup>5</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 84 (1846), pp. 578-619. Disraeli, Smythe, and Cochrane failed to vote.

bequests or grants had been made, the property should not go as land to the charity, but that it should be sold, and the proceeds devoted to the purposes of the charity. . . .he further proposed that small portions of land, intended as sites for churches, chapels, and schools, should be exempt from the necessity of being sold.<sup>6</sup>

He anticipated that this delineation of the scope and purpose of the repeal would result in additional support.

The second reading provided the crucial debate and vote on the proposal. Manners again sought to clarify that his intent was not to remove all laws of mortmain--only the act of ninth George II passed in 1736. He charged that this particular law had been maliciously enacted to injure the Church of England. Therefore, he stated, "I ask this present Legislature of England, to undo the great wrong which a spiteful and irreligious majority committed more than one hundred years ago, and to reassert the generous and faithful principles of ancient law and practice."<sup>7</sup>

Although there had been a change of ministry with Lord John Russell replacing Sir Robert Peel, the bill met with no greater support. Manners pleaded that, at least, the bill be placed in committee for further study. Nevertheless, by a large majority of 146 (20-166), the bill was again put off for six months.<sup>8</sup> After three defeats, Manners dropped the issue.

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., Vol. 90 (1847), p. 440.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., Vol. 92 (1847), p. 701.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 695-719.

The repeal of sections of the mortmain law, therefore, met with failure. Never during these three presentations had Manners enjoyed the strong support of his fellow Young England leaders. Disraeli and Cochrane failed to express themselves in Parliament. Smythe took no vocal role, although he voted with Manners in 1847. It was not until 1888 that tentative repeal legislation was passed, and Young England can take little credit for that.

As individuals, the members of Young England retained their interests in the status of education. There did not occur any argument to compare with the 1845 Maynooth Grant; however the issues remained much the same. In 1846, Borthwick and Manners vocalized their feelings during the debates of the Committee of Supply for education in England and Ireland.<sup>9</sup> Manners argued that the system of education in Ireland discriminated against the Church of Ireland. Borthwick asserted the undesirability of a purely secular education. He declared that "the true object of education was not to make men learned, but to make good men and good subjects."<sup>10</sup> Education still concerned individuals who had been active in Young England, but the concern had dimmed.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., Vol. 87 (1846), pp. 1232-62, for the debates participated in by Manners and Borthwick.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 1254.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., Vol. 109 (1850), pp. 838-52; Vol. 110 (1850), pp. 154-62; Vol. 113 (1850), pp. 480-82, for discussions of a successful Libraries and Museums Bill. Manners opposed the bill since churches, schools, and hospitals did not enjoy the same benefits.

Factory legislation continued to concern the Tory Radical members of Parliament. The ten hours movement had been temporarily delayed by defeat in 1844, but the advocates were soon again on the offensive. Of the sympathizers of Young England only Cochrane and Smythe did not actively support the cause. Although guilty of overstatement, Manners later credited Young England with a major role in the carrying of ten hours.

That the Ten Hours Bill was violently opposed by the Manchester School and the political economists, headed by Sir Robert Peel, is well known. It is, I think, doubtful whether Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Fielden would have carried it had not it been for the help of Lord Beaconsfield and Young England.<sup>12</sup>

The passage of the ten hours limitation constituted the single, greatest, immediate, and practical political achievement of Tory Radicalism.<sup>13</sup>

The fruition of the struggle for the ten hours bill came in 1847. Victory had been narrowly lost in 1846, and the support of the new Prime Minister made passage possible.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Letter by Lord John Manners printed in Talbot Baines, "The Citizenship of British Nobility," Quarterly Review, CLXXXIV (July, 1896), 274.

<sup>13</sup>William O. Aydelotte, "The Conservative and Radical Interpretations of Early Victorian Social Legislation," Victorian Studies, XI (December, 1967), 225-36, presents a conclusive case that they should not be given sole credit. The votes show that the vote, in 1847, gained a cross section of support in Parliament, not just Tories and Radicals.

<sup>14</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 86 (1846), pp. 1080-83, for the unsuccessful vote to gain the enactment of ten hours (193-203). Disraeli, Manners, Ferrand, Borthwick, Milnes, and O'Brien voted yes. Smythe voted no. Cochrane did not vote. Also see pp. 914-52 for the ill fated second reading of the Lace

Lord Ashley was not in the House of Commons in 1847, so the bill was proposed by John Fielden early in the session.<sup>15</sup> Opposition to the proposal arose during its second and third readings. Ferrand spoke on both the first and second readings. Disraeli, Milnes, and O'Brien failed to speak, but they did cast affirmative votes.<sup>16</sup> Manners' speech of February 10 displayed knowledge and understanding of the factory conditions. He alleged that the fight for the ten hours bill proved the aristocrats still took their social responsibilities seriously.

They, the Tory Gentlemen of England, had maintained their just and historical position; that, consistently with the character they had ever aspired to, they had fought the fight of the poor against the rich, and had been fellow-soldiers with the weak and defenceless against the mighty and the strong, and to the best of their ability, had wielded the power which the Constitution reposed in them, to protect and defend the working people of this country.<sup>17</sup>

On the basis of their long standing advocacy, Tory Radicals took credit for the 1847 passage of the ten hours bill for

---

Factories Bill (vote of 66-151) supported by Manners, Borthwick, Ferrand, and O'Brien. Smythe voted no. Disraeli and Cochrane did not vote.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., Vol. 89 (1847), pp. 487-98, for the first reading.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., Vol. 90 (1847), pp. 175-77, for the vote on the second reading and Vol. 92 (1847), pp. 311-13, for the vote on the third reading.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., Vol. 89 (1847), p. 1118.

the factories.<sup>18</sup>

Three years later, the ten hours legislation came under reconsideration. Manufacturers had found a loophole in the enactment. Through the use of relays of children they forced the adult males to long hours of labor. Consequently, Lord Ashley, back in the House of Commons, initiated a move to stop these relays. The manufacturers responded by exerting pressure for an alteration of the ten hours limitation--if they were forced to give up the relay system.<sup>19</sup> The ensuing struggle provided Manners, recently returned to Parliament and a tri-sponsor of the bill, his greatest opportunity to assume the parliamentary leadership of Tory Radicalism.<sup>20</sup>

The dispute revolved around the distribution and the maximum weekly hours of labor. Manners contended the original proposal provided that the total number of hours per week could not exceed fifty-eight.<sup>21</sup> Opponents to Manners' view united behind a plan that

none of the persons whose labour is now

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., Vol. 90 (1847), p. 140, for Ferrand's statement that he had fought for the ten hours limitation for seventeen years.

<sup>19</sup>Maurice Walton Thomas, The Early Factory Legislation (London: Thames Bank Publishing Co., Ltd., 1948), pp. 294-313, argues that the 1847 limitation had received a big boost from an existing economic recession which made for shorter working hours anyway.

<sup>20</sup>Cecil Driver, Tory Radical: the Life of Richard Oastler (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 509-12.

<sup>21</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 109 (1850), pp. 883-933, for the first reading of the proposal.



regulated by the Factory Acts shall be employed before 6 o'clock in the morning, nor after 6 o'clock in the evening; and that, between those limits, an hour and a-half shall be allowed for the meals of young persons and women: and, further, that they shall not be employed after 2 o'clock on Saturdays, with half an hour for breakfast on that day. This makes 60 hours per week, or an average of 10 hours per day, --thus giving, in truth, all that was originally contended for, but in a better way.<sup>22</sup>

The government decided to accept the alternative suggestion as their own.<sup>23</sup> Without hesitation, Manners declared his rejection. A few evenings later, he announced that "he would move that 'half-past five' be substituted for 'six o'clock' in the evening--an alteration which, in point of fact, would make the proposal of the Government an effective Ten Hours Bill."<sup>24</sup>

A major controversy arose over whether the relay system could be ended without lengthening the weekly hours of labor. Lord Ashley decided to accept the additional two hours--not all working men agreed with his stand.<sup>25</sup> Working class meetings were held to support Manners' position.

The Central Ten Hours Committee of the West Riding of Yorkshire beg most gratefully to acknowledge your Lordship's patriotic and consistent conduct at this crisis in undertaking the cause of young persons and women employed in factories, and in so promptly attempting to secure to them their undisputed

<sup>22</sup>The Times (London), April 25, 1850.

<sup>23</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 110 (1850), pp. 1132-34.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 1284, 1135.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., Vol. 111 (1850), pp. 832-34. The Times (London), May 9, 1850.

and indisputable right to a continued limitation of their labour to 58 hours per week.<sup>26</sup>

Manners had reached his peak of leadership of working class interests in the House of Commons.

The debate and vote on Manners' amendment came on June 14, 1850. Manners provided a strong, well researched case for the amendment by asserting that the original intention of the framers of the factory act had been the prevention of relays, that the government proposal did not better the conditions of work, and that the ten hours limitation had worked well.<sup>27</sup> Disraeli, in his first speech ever given on the ten hours issue, rose to Manners' defense. He reiterated the argument that the ten hours limitation had not harmed the economy of the nation. In addition, he asserted that a reversal of the 1847 act might alienate the working classes. Significantly, he argued the question upon moral--not economic grounds.

We have always acknowledged that the most important elements of Government were its moral influence. The reason that the Government of this country is more powerful than other Governments is, because the moral influences are those which predominate. What you have to decide to-night is, whether you will taint this fountain of security, whether you can govern millions of freemen, except upon the principles of justice, benevolence, and truth.<sup>28</sup>

Immediately after Disraeli's speech, the vote was taken.

---

<sup>26</sup>The Times (London), May 14, 1850.

<sup>27</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 111 (1850), pp. 1243-54.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 1283, 1278-83, for the entire speech.

Manners, Disraeli, and Cochrane registered their votes for the amendment, but it was narrowly lost by thirty-nine votes (181-142).<sup>29</sup> Young England sentiment had been reasserted and had been found, once again, unacceptable to the majority of the members of the House of Commons.

Nevertheless, the ten hours question remained of interest to members of Young England. In 1853, Manners helped prod Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, who was serving as Home Secretary at that time, to stiffen enforcement against the relay system and to provide uniform work limitations for all protected persons.<sup>30</sup> Boastfully, Manners claimed that

Lord Beaconsfield's Government, with Lord Cross as Home Secretary, took the whole subject in hand; many other manufacturers and trades were brought under the Factory legislation, and the original ten hours' limit was restored.

I had the satisfaction of being the Chairman of the Select Committee to which that Bill was referred; and so great was the change of feeling in the quarter of a century which had elapsed since 1847, that one of the leading political economists of the day, the late Professor Fawcett, took an active and leading part in inducing the Committee to sanction that sweeping extension of Factory legislation.<sup>31</sup>

During this first epoch of factory legislation, members of Young England had played an important part in the ten

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 1283-86.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., Vol. 124 (1853), pp. 738-40; Vol. 128 (1853), pp. 1253-90.

<sup>31</sup>Letter by Lord John Manners printed in Baines, "The Citizenship of British Nobility," p. 274.

hours struggle. Although the object was not fully gained, they had helped in laying the principles of state intervention, control, and regulation. They had come to rely upon the administrative machinery to implement the laws. In other words, they had willfully participated in laying the foundation of future industrial legislation.<sup>32</sup> They stood in the vanguard of those who first realized that the reduction of hours of work did not destroy the financial base of the manufacturing industry. They recognized that social betterment of the working classes did not result in a decrease of productivity. The nation gained, not lost, by removing social inequities and injustices.

The Young England members continued their concern for the treatment of the poor. During its political heyday, an opposition to the New Poor Law had provided a united stand for the movement. In 1847, the New Poor Law debate gave everyone an opportunity to express his views--changed or unchanged.<sup>33</sup> Disraeli, Manners, Ferrand, and Borthwick showed consistency by registering their displeasure. They continued to oppose the law, since they failed to see how a change of the administration at the top could meet their objections. Manners felt the system to be not only unresponsive to the wishes of the people, but "for the life of him,

---

<sup>32</sup>Thomas, The Early Factory Legislation, pp. 327-28, assesses the fundamental gains made during this first phase.

<sup>33</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 87 (1846), p. 95, contains a statement by Manners in opposition to the New Poor Law.

he could not conceive how the addition of three or four high Government officers, whose time was already taken up so that they did not know which way to turn, could add to the practical efficiency of the present system."<sup>34</sup>

On May 20, 1847, Disraeli directly attacked the poor law system. It was the first time he had spoken on the topic, although he had long opposed increases in the size of the governmental bureaucracy. He charged, "but is not this in truth, a Bill intended to perpetuate that system of metropolitan control, which I believe to be so fatal--which has been characterized by such maladministration--which has created so much discontent throughout the country?"<sup>35</sup> He continued to resist the idea that national, parliamentary, London based control was necessary.

There is to be a central control, but central is a relative term--it may be answered by an authority in the centre of each county; and, as the administration of the law must be local, I cannot understand why the control should not be placed in each county.<sup>36</sup>

Despite its best efforts, Young England had not created a widespread public rejection of the New Poor Law. On the important vote on the second reading they were decisively beaten by a majority of one hundred seventy-six (218-42).<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., Vol. 92 (1847), p. 1222, see pp. 1216-33 for the entire speech.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 1162.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 1154.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., Vol. 92 (1847), pp. 1235-37.

Borthwick, however, did succeed in gaining an alteration in the system. He had long sought to require workhouses to provide mutual habitation by husband and wife above sixty years of age. Lord John Russell led the opposition to this amendment, but on a small vote of fifty-five to seventy the House of Commons decided to add Borthwick's clause.<sup>38</sup> They could modify and soften the system, but they could not destroy it.

Gradually, the efficient administration of the New Poor Law system made it acceptable. Disraeli, who had been vehement in attacking centralized operations, changed his attitude. In early 1850, while speaking on the economic problems in the rural areas, he praised the poor law administration.

For so many years the central management of the poor-laws has excited in this House so much controversy, and indeed, I may say, so much odium, that I think it must be a satisfaction to the House, to the Government, and to the country, to contrast the position which that branch of the Administration now occupies with reference to public opinion, with what it did three years ago. . . .the Government must be repaid for the concession to opinion which they wisely made, and which they wisely carried into effect, with respect to that department, when they observe that a branch of the Administration so intimately connected with the condition of the great body of the people, should be conducted, as I believe it now to be, in a manner which entitles it to public confidence.<sup>39</sup>

Young England principles of social legislation were not so

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., Vol. 93 (1847), pp. 894-900. See Chapter III, pp. 118-19, for Borthwick's earlier unsuccessful attempts to gain this concession.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., Vol. 108 (1850), pp. 1027-28.

closed minded or so cohesive that a leading participant could not change his opinion.

One of the most decisive shifts still had to come, at least for Disraeli and Manners, in accepting the repeal of the corn laws. Young England held in high esteem the landed aristocracy of the nation. To make this transformation Disraeli and Manners must have decided either to abandon, at least partially, the aristocracy or that the repeal had not made any fundamental changes in the territorial constitution.

Disraeli and Manners came to view the repeal of the corn laws as unalterable. As with the New Poor Law, the decisive change came in 1850. In fact, Disraeli stated these new positions in the same speech. Disraeli still claimed a general belief in agricultural protection, but he realized "it was the opinion of a large majority in both Houses of Parliament not to disturb at present the settlement which this country has recently arrived at in that respect."<sup>40</sup> Since the reinstitution of the corn laws was impossible, he called for an equalization of taxation by removing special burdens upon the land. This would, in his opinion, allow for the continued preponderance of the landed interests.

Disraeli and Manners did not plan to desert the aristocracy. The most, however, that they could achieve, in 1850, was a grant of money for the immediate relief of the

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 1029.

rural poor.<sup>41</sup> The landed aristocracy were rapidly losing political ground; hence Disraeli and Manners had at last arrived at the same conclusion as Smythe and Cochrane in 1846--agricultural protection had no political future. Therefore, they gradually shifted towards a greater reliance upon the masses. Simultaneously, they continued to extol the virtues of the aristocracy; even though they had refused to heed the call for a Young England.

In concern for public health problems, Young England continued to furnish a poor example. In view of the sanitation oriented legislation of Disraeli's ministry of 1874-1880, this is somewhat startling. Furthermore, Disraeli, Manners, and Cochrane had earlier shown interest through memberships in voluntary organizations which worked to improve the sanitation and housing conditions in the towns.<sup>42</sup>

As the public health movement gained momentum, fear grew about the implications of centralization and bureaucratic growth exemplified by the three member General Board of Health.<sup>43</sup> Manners was not in Parliament during the creation of the General Board of Health in 1848, but in the abortive

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 1026-45, 1093-95, 1272-75; Vol. 110 (1850), pp. 876-80, 885-89.

<sup>42</sup>S. E. Finer, The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick (London: Methuen & Co., 1952), pp. 237-39.

<sup>43</sup>David Roberts, Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), pp. 67-104, presents Disraeli as the leading figure in opposing the centralization of the General Board of Health.



bill of the previous year he had attacked the scheme. His opposition was based upon the bill excluding London from its provisions and for creating too many jobs for government patronage.<sup>44</sup> In 1848, Manners' brother, the Marquess of Granby, attacked the bill on almost the exact same issues.<sup>45</sup> Disraeli and Manners were critical of the conduct of the General Board of Health, although they did not actively oppose the pieces of enacting legislation emanating from its needs.

In the 1852 Conservative government headed by Edward Stanley, Earl of Derby, Manners became directly involved with the General Board of Health. His appointment as First Commissioner of Works carried with it the Presidency of the General Board of Health. Manners, unprepared for the position, had not formulated a program on sanitation problems. In truth, his inclusion in the cabinet came as a surprise--it was a payoff for the good services of the Marquess of Granby--not as a result of his demonstrated ability in handling social legislation. While his short tenure accomplished little of significance, he does not deserve to be called "dim and spineless."<sup>46</sup>

In his new position, Manners promoted interments and

---

<sup>44</sup>Hansard's, Vol. 93 (1847), p. 1113.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., Vol. 98 (1848), pp. 797-98.

<sup>46</sup>Geoffrey Francis Andrew Best, Shaftesbury (New York: Arco Publishing [1964]), p. 122.

water bills. He did not initiate new legislation but continued with the previous proposals. The interments bill called for the creation of cemeteries away from populated districts; it was, however, to be a slow process. Further, it contained no safeguards that the new cemeteries would not soon be surrounded by densely populated areas. The water bill sought to improve the supply and quality of water to districts in London, but it allowed the private companies to control the distribution. As long as rates were not exorbitant, the water companies were to be left to make their own improvements. Manners' Young England sentiment did not provide a suitable guide in the enactment of specific social legislation.<sup>47</sup>

Sentiments inspired by Young England did not propel its sympathizers into the support or encouragement of a comprehensive social program from 1845 to 1854. Individually, however, they still acted with interest on social questions. Opposition to the New Poor Law and advocacy for the limitation of ten hours of labor for women and children continued to animate them. Manners had not lost interest in the question of mortmain, but he never fared well. Perhaps the most significant change came with Disraeli becoming more vocal. Yet, Disraeli spent little time on such issues, probably no

---

<sup>47</sup>Roberts, Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State, pp. 249-51. Finer, The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick, pp. 407-29. Charles Whibley, Lord John Manners and His Friends (2 vols.; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925), II, 45-46. Hereinafter referred to as Manners.

more than expected of him in his new role of leadership of the Conservative Party. Overall, they did little to push the members of Parliament, of this period, toward a recognition of their social responsibilities.

Young England lingered strongest in the minds of those who had actively participated in the 1843-1845 political maneuverings of the movement. It must be remembered that the aim had never been practical social legislation but the implementation of a spirit, a mood, a sentiment in favor of the moral betterment of society. Disraeli and Manners retained the sentiment of Tory Radicalism which had inspired them during the 1840's. Smythe lost interest in politics, but he never forgot the enthusiasms inspired by the movement. Cochrane never held the ideal as fully as the others, but he maintained personal contacts with his friends of the 1840's. Of the other major parliamentary supporters, Ferrand and O'Brien remained devoted, while Milnes and Borthwick moved on to other concerns. The Young England venture provided an unforgettable episode in the lives of all participants.

Disraeli's retention of those Tory Radical political sentiments expressed during his Young England days resulted in his being labeled a Tory Democrat.<sup>48</sup> He was neither a Radical nor a Democrat, but he had every intention of turning both into his version of a Tory. Perhaps he did not

---

<sup>48</sup>Robert Blake, Disraeli (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), pp. 476-77, argues against considering Disraeli a Tory Democrat.

educate the members of his party, but he certainly prevented them from becoming reactionary. Conservatism has to adapt to the times, and he forced it to adapt. This accomplishment, although politically essential, had not been his ideal. Disraeli operated in two areas: the one of political reality and the one of philosophical utopianism. Both contributed to the continued existence of British Toryism.

A controversy revolves around Disraeli's role in promoting the Reform Bill of 1867. A recent biographer of Disraeli concedes that the carrying of the reform was an adroit political maneuver, but that he never planned for it to come out as it did.<sup>49</sup> It cannot be denied that the bill took more democratic directions than desired by Disraeli; however cannot the same thing be said about Gladstone, his liberal opponent? In another recent view it is asserted that Disraeli should be given major credit for the reform. The author argues that it was a decisive act which allowed the Tory party to perpetuate its myth of best serving the national interests, this time by appearing as the natural allies of the working classes. This move allowed British political parties to retain the initiative in the formulation of political decisions.<sup>50</sup>

Disraeli had read the political current correctly, gaining the votes of a portion of the working classes, had

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 456-77.

<sup>50</sup>Gertrude Himmelfarb, Victorian Minds (New York: Knopf, 1968), pp. 333-92.

prevented the isolation and extinction of the aristocracy. In 1867, he declared, "I have always looked on the interests of the labouring classes as essentially the most conservative interests of the country."<sup>51</sup> Increasingly, Disraeli came to view the workers as a dependable element of the party. Late in his career, Disraeli wrote to Manners that "the only portion of the Constituencies, in my opinion, who may be depended on when affairs are riper, are the English working-classes, . . ."<sup>52</sup> Disraeli did not implement the Young England dream of creating an aristocratic-working class alliance opening a new social era, but he had postponed the estrangement.

Another controversy revolves around the passage of social legislation during Disraeli's ministry of 1874-1880. Robert Blake refuses to acknowledge the social legislation as an attempt to effectuate the ideas of Young England, or that it provided any new Tory Democratic theory of social reform.<sup>53</sup> In direct contrast, a slightly earlier account claims these social reforms to be the culmination, fulfillment, and execution of the ideals of Young England.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Answer to the Address presented by the Working Men of Edinburgh in the Music Hall, October 30, 1867 (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1867), p. 8.

<sup>52</sup>Disraeli to Manners, December 24, 1880, printed in Whibley, Manners, II, 203-04.

<sup>53</sup>Blake, Disraeli, pp. 211, 549-58.

<sup>54</sup>Paul Smith, "The Young England Movement," (unpublished

Paul Smith in Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform allows for a somewhat middle position. He does not view Disraeli as forceful in social legislation, and he does not believe that the Conservative Party was even attempting to formulate a social policy. From his viewpoint it would be ridiculous to assert that Disraeli had educated the party to social reform based on the principles of either Young England or Tory Democracy. "He could not marry the party of the people, or fuse the 'two nations', but he did much to ensure that between them there should be no complete and fatal divide."<sup>55</sup>

Disraeli took little interest in the details of the bills, but he did perceive the need for enactment of essential social reforms.<sup>56</sup> This piecemeal approach is not to be sneered at; it was also the approach of every other social reformer of that time. The basic situation had altered little since the 1840's; a comprehensive social policy was still absent.

---

Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Literature, Columbia University, 1951), pp. 59, 219-25. Also see Jeanne Frances Manley, "Disraeli's Tory Democracy: a Parliamentary Study," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, St. Louis University, 1968).

<sup>55</sup>Paul Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967), pp. 325, 131, 181, 198-200, 257-67, 310-21.

<sup>56</sup>Benjamin Disraeli, Speech of the Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P. at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, April 3, 1872 (/London/: W. Tweedie for the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, /1872/), pp. 16-19, contains Disraeli's discussion of the need for health and sanitation reforms.

Therefore, while neither Young England nor Tory Democracy provided this broadly based program, they served as a step in the process. Tory Democracy affected the development of later reformers. Neither was accepted by the majority of the Conservatives, but their existence meant that a portion of the party would not ignore the working classes.

Manners, the most enthusiastic member of Young England, enjoyed a long political career in which ample opportunities arose to initiate social reforms. He retained a lifelong fondness for his Young England days, but this did not lead to an active role in social reform. He provided constant friendship to Disraeli through his attendance in the House of Commons and his service in the various Conservative governments. He spent almost seventeen and one-half years in governmental posts as First Commissioner of Works in the governments formed in 1852, 1858, 1866, and 1868. During Disraeli's last ministry he served as Postmaster General. He corresponded frequently with Disraeli, but the letters devote little space to social questions.<sup>57</sup>

Manners did little to further the expansion of social legislation during the remainder of his career. Occasionally, he would ask questions in Parliament or indicate sympathy, but he took no leading role in the formulation of social reform policies. He contentedly followed Disraeli's lead.

---

<sup>57</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/138, Manners to Disraeli, October 24, 1866, does contain a plea for social legislation. Also see B/XX/M/161, 202, Manners to Disraeli, November 10, 1870, and October 27, 1876, concerning working class meetings.

He wanted to increase the knowledge and happiness of the populace, but he did little of a practical nature to further these aims.

Manners never lost the feudalistic, romantic, moralistic views of society formed during his youth. Late in life, one of his greatest enjoyments was reminiscing about his Young England days. He fulfilled a transitionary, communicative function by passing on many of his views in correspondence with Robert Cecil, Lord Salisbury, although they disagreed as to the needs of society. Manners remained active in the House of Commons until 1886, succeeded to the peerage in 1888, and finally left public service in 1895. He lived into the twentieth century, dying in August 1906.<sup>58</sup> His desired reconstruction of society never occurred. Young England remained a memory, not a political program.

The career of Cochrane presents an equally dismal picture in the encouragement of social ameliorations. Although he sat almost constantly in Parliament until 1880, he did not play an active role. His interests tended more towards literature and the maintenance of his estate. His primary contact with the other Young England sympathizers came through Manners.<sup>59</sup> He did not advocate social policy based upon his

---

<sup>58</sup>Whibley, Manners, II, 197-99, 231-77, 286-90.

<sup>59</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/65, 147, Manners to Disraeli, September 10, 1850, and September 12, 1867. Cochrane had shown a return to allegiance as early as his 1852 publication, Who Are the Liberals? (London: John Ollivier, 1852).



Young England experience; he had not even been very active during its period of greatest strength. Young England, however, brought him the friendships of important politicians, and Disraeli granted him a peerage in 1880. From the tone of many of his letters to Disraeli, the attainment of a peerage became more important to him than the support of social reforms.<sup>60</sup>

George Smythe contributed nothing of value in the promotion of social reforms. After the parliamentary demise of Young England, the remainder of his short life to 1857 presents a pathetic picture. Smythe realized that his 1846 desertion to the Peelites ended his political relations with his Young England friends, but he continued to have fond feelings for them.<sup>61</sup> Although re-elected to the House of Commons in 1847, he failed to play an active role. In 1852, he lost his bid for re-election and never again entered into active politics. In 1855, he succeeded to the peerage, but he did not participate in the House of Lords.

Smythe lost interest in the political world. He turned his talents to literature and a life of pleasure. In 1852, he wrote *Manners* lamenting the impossibility of reviving the halcyon days of Young England. He commented that

---

<sup>60</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/L/32a, C/I/A/45, 55a, 59a, 59b, C/I/B/119, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161a, and 161b, recount the various requests and disposition of the granting of a peerage to Cochrane.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, B/XXI/S/650, 651, 652, Smythe to Disraeli, December 16, 1846, February 24, 1852, and July 2, 1852.

"I see now how vain an ass I was in my Young England days, . . ."<sup>62</sup> Smythe came to feel that "my watch is always five minutes fast."<sup>63</sup> By 1854, the link with the Young England past was his continuing friendship with his old school comrade, Manners.<sup>64</sup> Smythe "came almost to be forgotten as a public man."<sup>65</sup>

The other politicians who had supported Young England in the 1840's did not distinguish themselves in the promotion of social reforms. Ferrand, who had been drawn to Young England because of a prior interest in social problems, continued to provide information to Disraeli about the working classes.<sup>66</sup> Richard Monckton Milnes maintained his personal contact, but he moved towards a more liberal political position. Milnes did distinguish himself with the establishment of reformatories for juveniles.<sup>67</sup> O'Brien experienced political difficulties in the 1852 government and never

<sup>62</sup>Smythe to Manners, October 18, 1852, printed in Whibley, Manners, II, 57-58.

<sup>63</sup>George Smythe, Speech at Canterbury, July 6, 1847 (London: n.p., 1847), p. 17.

<sup>64</sup>Whibley, Manners, II, 99.

<sup>65</sup>The Times (London), November 26, 1857.

<sup>66</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XXI/F/134, 140, Ferrand to Disraeli, April 5, 1860, February 14, 1863, provides a sampling of his letters.

<sup>67</sup>Correspondence between Disraeli and Monckton Milnes may be found in the papers of both individuals. Thomas Wemyss Reid, Life, Letters and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton (2d ed.; 2 vols.; London: Cassell & Co., 1890), I, 366-77.

reached his potential. From 1849 until his death in December 1852, Borthwick spent his energy serving as the editor of the Morning Post. Borthwick refused to be too closely bound to any political party and spent much of his time studying and discussing foreign affairs.

Young England sentiment did not stimulate any of its active political sympathizers to undertake a full-time career in social research, reform, or service. As a group they possessed little unity on social issues. Concern for society did not result in the creation of a Young England social theory. It contributed to Disraeli's decision to undertake social legislation in 1874-1880, but this came a long time after the Young England episode after numerous other factors had entered the scene. No list of specific credits for social legislation may be compiled for the movement. Its greatest significance lies in the shaping of public opinion, attitude, and sentiment in its conception of the proper organization of society.

Much of the credit for the Conservative Party acceptance of state intervention in society must go to Disraeli. He prevented the loss of working class support by making the party more responsive to the voices of the masses by introducing the plank of social reform. He walked a political tightrope, maintaining the support of the agricultural, landed interests, and the aristocracy, while keeping the party open for support from moderately liberal middle class elements and from the working classes. Disraeli, therefore,

prevented the aristocrats from assuming a posture of reaction to the changing social conditions. At the same time, he realized that he could not push them very far, nor very fast. Also, by 1874, he lacked the energy and interest in detail to make sweeping reforms.<sup>68</sup> Without destroying the unity of the party, which he had worked diligently to create since the 1867 Reform Bill, he went as far as politically expedient.

The Conservative Party never completely accepted the ideals of Young England. Nevertheless, their tradition was continued within the party by small groups and interested individuals. Disraeli carried on a consistent development of his Young England thoughts into the creation of the concept of Tory Democracy. Tory Democracy never became the official stance of the party, but the Fourth Party and the Primrose League carried on the traditions. Because of this, the party never presented a united front in opposition to

---

<sup>68</sup>E. J. Feuchtwanger, Disraeli, Democracy and the Tory Party (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. ix-xiv, 3-24. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform, pp. 181-200, 257-65, sees little reason to credit Disraeli with much advancement in social legislation. Disraeli had become a political asset, for he was leading the way in making short run accommodations to bring the party in line with public opinion, an essential political task for any politician, according to W. L. Burn, "English Conservatism," Twentieth Century, CXLV (February, 1949), 1-11. Stanley B. James, "The Tragedy of Disraeli," Catholic World, CLII (1941), 414-19, argues that the Conservatives refused to accept Disraeli's ideals, but they accepted his practical political maneuvering. For informative but overstated studies of Tory Democracy see Henry Bentinck, Tory Democracy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1925), and Manley, "Disraeli's Tory Democracy; a Parliamentary Study."

the concerns of the working classes.

The Fourth Party of 1880-1884 sought to continue the social ideals of Disraeli. All four members, Lord Randolph Churchill, John Gorst, Henry Drummond Wolff, and Arthur James Balfour, claimed to have received encouragement from Disraeli in their parliamentary undertaking.<sup>69</sup> Manners, still in the House of Commons, viewed the group in light of his earlier Young England days. He wrote to Disraeli that "I look upon the 4th party with less of disfavour than some of our friends do, and do not distress myself about their independent action."<sup>70</sup> Disraeli shared Manners' feelings and did not desire to repress the faction. Nevertheless, he was concerned with the unity of the party and could not let the situation get out of hand. Disraeli reassured Queen Victoria that "Lord Randolph, Mr. Gorst, and their companions, do no harm. They are a safety valve and tend to disorganise the ministerial ranks."<sup>71</sup> He refused to make a clear stand in favor of either the political practicality or the political ideal.

Tory Democracy, as enunciated by the Fourth Party, vocalized the ideals and traditions of the Young England

---

<sup>69</sup>William Flavelle Monypenny and George Earle Buckle, Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1929), II, 1460-61. Feuchtwanger, Disraeli, Democracy and the Tory Party, p. 24.

<sup>70</sup>Hughenden Papers, B/XX/M/280, Manners to Disraeli, November 24, 1880.

<sup>71</sup>Disraeli to Queen Victoria printed in Blake, Disraeli, p. 731.

movement. Lord Randolph Churchill presented a definition of Tory Democracy which re-echoed much that had been venerated by Young England.

The Tory Democracy is a democracy which has embraced the principles of the Tory party. It is a democracy which believes that an hereditary monarchy and hereditary House of Lords are the strongest fortifications which the wisdom of man, illuminated by the experience of centuries, can possibly devise for the protection, not of Whig principles, but of democratic freedom. The Tory democracy is a democracy which adheres to and will defend the Established Church, because it believes that that Establishment is a guarantee of State morality, and that the connection of Church and State imparts to the ordinary functions of executive and law something of a divine sanction. The Tory democracy is a democracy which, under the shadow and under the protection of those great and ancient institutions, will resolutely follow the path of administrative reform.<sup>72</sup>

Toryism was to guide the development of the nation towards democracy.

While sharing similarities with Young England, the Fourth Party also had its own peculiar outlook and methods. Young England, in its political heyday, attacked an almost impregnable stronghold held by Sir Robert Peel; the Fourth Party attacked a weak Conservative Party headed in the House of Commons by an ineffectual leader, Sir Stafford Northcote. Both provided their views of society in generalities, not in the pronouncement of specific social reforms, but their tactics differed markedly. Young England gained fame in the

---

<sup>72</sup>Lord Randolph Churchill, Speeches of the Right Honourable Lord Randolph Churchill, M.P., 1880-1888, collected with notes and introduction by Louis J. Jennings, M.P. (2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1889), I, 331-32.

House of Commons and sought to use literature to further their aims. The Fourth Party gained fame in the House of Commons and sought to gain control of the party to further their aims.<sup>73</sup> Both groups failed in the immediate political maneuvering, but it was more serious for the Fourth Party than it had been for the Young England movement.

The romantic, feudalistic, and aristocratic aspects of Young England passed onto the Primrose League. Young England had failed in their desired revival of an effective Tory paternalistic organization of society. The Primrose League, inspired by the Fourth Party, existed as a sham feudal organization. There was no hope of reviving the aristocratic ideals at this date, but it, at least, offered a connection between the upper and lower levels of the nation. An article, in 1883, took high hopes at the formation of the organization, declaring that "'the alliance between the noble and the worker foreshadowed forty years ago in Coningsby and Sybil has become an established fact. Of this the Primrose League is the evidence. . .'"<sup>74</sup>

The Primrose League did not fundamentally alter the development of society. It became a social institution where glamorous sounding medieval titles could be acquired,

---

<sup>73</sup>Harold Gorst, The Fourth Party (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1906), pp. 299-305, discusses their activities designed to seize control of the party organization.

<sup>74</sup>Morning Post, December 17, 1883, printed in Reginald Jaffray Lucas, Lord Glenesk and "The Morning Post" (New York: Lane, 1910), pp. 298-99.

but where pressing social issues were discussed only infrequently. The league softened the social lines somewhat, and a high percentage of the members came from the working classes. It assisted the Conservative Party by issuing pamphlets and holding meetings designed to retain the loyalty of the agricultural laborers and to gain that of the urban workers. For some of the working classes the Primrose League proved appealing, but by the start of the twentieth century the great majority turned to more exclusive working class organizations.<sup>75</sup> The two nations of the rich and the poor were not united by the exertions of the Primrose League.

Overall, the practical effects of the Young England ideals on the development of Conservatism in the nineteenth century were negligible. Conservatives accepted the ideals of utilitarianism, becoming almost indistinguishable from their fellow liberals. The party organization did not strive for the revival of a feudal, paternalistic society but struggled to adapt to the growing democratization. Tory Radicalism did not formulate a new theory of social reform. Instead, Conservatives proceeded cautiously, promoting only those reforms which were absolutely essential.

Nevertheless, Young England did affect the development of personal attitudes towards the need for social

---

<sup>75</sup> Janet Henderson Robb, The Primrose League, 1883-1906 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 9-29, 49-68, 144-74. Crane Brinton, English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 146-47.



ameliorations. This effect came from two sources: (1) the stimulation of the idea of their concern for society, especially by Disraeli, in propounding Tory Democracy, and (2) the continued literary popularity of works which advocated the Young England ideals. In 1896, Manners made the following assertion.

That Lord Beaconsfield's speeches and writings, and--in a far less degree--those of his friends and followers, did produce a certain effect on the influential classes is, I think, undoubted . . . .The number of large domains, picture galleries, &c., which are now open, not once a year, but habitually, is too large to be enumerated; and although some of them were open before the days of Young England, a great many were not . . . .In the country districts not only is the extension of allotments remarkable, but the improvement in the number and condition of the cottages. In this, too, the influence of Lord Beaconsfield's writings may be detected.<sup>76</sup>

In one view, "Young England promoted a quiet social revolution."<sup>77</sup>

The precise measurement of the impact of Young England on the formation of the social consciousness of the Victorian mind is an impossible task. After all, Manners had no convincing proof that the opening of museums or the creation of additional allotments were directly stimulated by the growth of Young England ideals. When the assessment of literary works on forming the aesthetic sensibilities of millions of people begins, so begins conjecture. The continued popularity

---

<sup>76</sup>Letter by Manners in Baines, "The Citizenship of British Nobility," p. 274.

<sup>77</sup>George Saintsbury, "The Young England Movement," in The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury, 1875-

of Disraeli's Young England trilogy, provides assurance that the ideas were far from forgotten. As Disraeli ascended the political ladder, he frequently reminded the nation that the Tories were not opposed to political and social reforms.

The perpetuation of the spirit of social concern helped the aristocracy to accept social change, even if it did so reluctantly and unenergetically. The Young England inspired concern for society may have fostered the establishment of university settlements "to give the poorest and most densely populated working class districts the benefit of a resident gentry such as, in the clergyman or the squire, is generally commanded in rural parishes."<sup>78</sup> In this social endeavor, the aristocracy assumed a leading role. Neither the aristocrat, nor any Victorian could have read and discussed the ideas of the Young England trilogy without arriving at a more humane or, at least, a more concerned attitude about the conditions of the nation.<sup>79</sup>

In any case, the Conservative record in nineteenth century social reform is not to be denigrated. The Conservative Party failed to make sweeping reforms, but the

---

1920 (4 vols.; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1923), III, 265.

<sup>78</sup>T. H. S. Escott, Social Transformation of the Victorian Age, a Survey of Court and Country (London: Seeley & Co., Ltd., 1897), pp. 120-21. At this point only a conjecture may be made; the topic of the university settlements deserves further study.

<sup>79</sup>Jenifer Hart, "Nineteenth Century Social Reform: a Tory Interpretation of History," Past and Present, No. 31 (July, 1965), 39-61, disagrees with the idea that humanitarianism was increasing in the nineteenth century.

Liberal Party record is certainly no better in this account. It took the economic difficulties beginning after 1870; the development of new techniques of social investigation, such as statistical compilations; and the development of a greater social and political responsibility before drastic changes could be made. There was a reappraisal of society going on by 1880, but the result of this re-evaluation did not culminate in a social transformation until 1906.<sup>80</sup> It is, therefore, unfair to criticize them for not formulating a comprehensive social program--a feat which no nineteenth century group achieved.

Especially within the Conservative Party, Young England has continued to exert an impact. As Britain moved into the provision of extensive social services, the Conservative Party found that it possessed adequate material to propagandize the party as one with a historical concern for the working classes.<sup>81</sup> Without the Tory Radicals, humanitarians,

---

<sup>80</sup>Percy Ford, Social Theory and Social Practice (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968), pp. 98-102. Also see H. L. Beales, The Making of Social Policy (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 9-22, and K. B. Smellie, A Hundred Years of English Government (London: Duckworth, 1937), pp. 134-82, for discussions of the gropings of Victorian society towards the formulation of a social policy.

<sup>81</sup>C. E. Bellairs, Conservative Social and Industrial Reform, 1800-1945 (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947), David Clarke, The Conservative Faith in a Modern Age (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947), Robert Blake et al., Conservatism Today; four Personal Points of View (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1966), J. Enoch Powell, "Conservatives and the Social Services," Political Quarterly, XXIV (April-June, 1953), 153-66.

Young England, and Tory Democracy their case would be much harder to make. Whether the facts be true or not, the idea is firmly implanted.

The persistence of this idea among the working classes has remained of fundamental significance for the Conservative Party. It is a matter of importance that approximately one-third of the working classes vote for the Conservative Party thereby providing one-half of its total electoral strength. The Conservative Party, appearing as the preserver of the national heritage, has gained the deference vote of many of the working classes. They have done this while maintaining a sense of class differentials and excluding the workers from playing any major role in the decision making process of the party. These voters believe that the Conservative Party is most capable of guiding and governing in the best interest of the nation.<sup>82</sup>

Young England, Disraeli, and Tory Democracy deserve the gratitude of the Conservative Party. The nineteenth century Tory refused to accept the ideals of Young England as their political philosophy, but the twentieth century Tory finds himself the recipient of their legacy. This

---

<sup>82</sup>Robert Trelford McKenzie and Allan Silver, Angels in Marble: Working Class Conservatives in Urban England (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), and Eric Nordlinger, The Working Class Tories (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), provide two adequate studies of this phenomenon. Arthur J. Penty, Protection and the Social Problem (London: Methuen & Co., 1926), provides an interesting call for the return of protection and a more feudal organization of society.

situation provides an interesting statement in the debate whether Peel or Disraeli most affected the development of the party.<sup>83</sup> For the twentieth century Tory it appears that Disraeli, not Peel, had the more profitable idea. The Conservatives ended up attracting the middle class anyway, due to dissensions within the Liberal Party. With the addition of portions of the working classes, as desired by Disraeli, the Conservatives have remained a viable political entity. If they had exclusively followed Peel towards middle class liberalism, the current party would have found itself unable to attract the working classes.

Young England played a major role in the maintenance of the Tory tradition. Harvey Glickman presents Young England as one of the Conservative ginger groups which arise from time to time to push for the betterment of the lower classes while advocating retention of political power in the hands of the upper classes.<sup>84</sup> The Conservatives, therefore, are constantly reminded by such groups as Young England that they cannot stop social change. Conservatives seldom undertake the initiative, but they must not become reactionary.

The Tories suffered a loss of power from reactionary stances taken in 1906-1914 and in the immediate post World War II period. In 1943, an article appeared in the American

---

<sup>83</sup>R. E. Riggs, "Peel and Disraeli: Architects of a New Conservative Party," Western Humanities Review, XI (Spring, 1957), 183-87.

<sup>84</sup>Harvey Glickman, "The Toryness of English Conservatism," Journal of British Studies, I (1961-62), 116-17.

Historical Review which warned the Tories against becoming reactionary in the formulation of domestic reforms.<sup>85</sup> They refused to heed this warning, and only a desire for stability and efficient leadership resulted in their resurgence to political power. Toryism has remained a factor in the British political life, due to a long standing desire for effective leadership, but to be truly effective they need to formulate a new faith for society. The current need, according to one author, is not a higher standard of living but a higher moral standard of society--a new Jerusalem.<sup>86</sup>

Young England as a political, literary, and social movement will not be forgotten. It served as a critic of society when overemphasis was placed on the material development of the nation. Young England was concerned with human costs. The members fervently desired to provide for order and stability through the recognition that social problems must not be confronted solely on economic terms. The leaders of Young England were engaged in a search for truth, and they felt that truth must be sought in the development of ones overall conception of society.

---

<sup>85</sup>William B. Willcox, "The Tory Tradition," American Historical Review, XLVIII (July, 1943), 707-21. Also see Ford, Social Theory and Social Practice, pp. 103-317, for an overview of twentieth century developments. Fossey John C. Hearnshaw, Conservatism in England (New York: H. Fertig, 1967), provides a sweeping view of the development of social policy up to the early 1930's. Maurice Bruce, The Coming of the Welfare State (London: B. T. Batsford, 1961), pp. 291-93, takes a brief look at post World War II developments.

<sup>86</sup>A. P. Thornton, The Habit of Authority (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966), pp. 348-87.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

#### Archives

Houghton Papers.

Hughenden Papers.

#### Governmental Publications

Great Britain. Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1st ser., Vol. 37 (1818).

\_\_\_\_\_. Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, new ser., Vol. 13 (1825).

\_\_\_\_\_. Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vols. 9, 17, 33, 59-94, 108-111, 124, 128, (1831, 1833, 1836, 1838, 1841-1847, 1850, 1853).

\_\_\_\_\_. Parliament, Sessional Papers (House of Commons), 1842 (577), XXVI, 441-48.

\_\_\_\_\_. Parliament, Sessional Papers (House of Commons), 1842 (383), XXXVII, 57.

\_\_\_\_\_. Parliament, Sessional Papers (House of Commons), 1846 (716), XXXVI, 87.

#### Publications by the Leaders of Young England

Cochrane, Alexander Baillie, 1st Baron Lamington. Exeter Hall; or Church Polemics. London: W. E. Painter, 1841.

\_\_\_\_\_. In the Days of the Dandies. Edinburgh: Blackwood's, 1890.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Morea, To Which is Added, Meditations of Other Days. London: Saunders & Otley, 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Poems. London: W. Clowes & Sons, 1838.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Who are the Liberals? London: John Ollivier, 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Young Italy. London: John W. Parker, 1850.
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 1st Earl Beaconsfield. Addresses on Education, Finances and Politics. Rev. ed., London: Charles Hawksley, 1873.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Home Letters Written by Lord Beaconsfield, 1830-1852. Introduced by Augustine Birrell. London: Cassell & Co., 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lord George Bentinck: a Political Biography. New ed. London: G. Routledge, 1858.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Speech Delivered by Benjamin Disraeli, Esq., M.P., at the Anniversary Dinner of the Printer's Pension Society. London: James S. Hodson, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in answer to the Address Presented by the Working Men of Edinburgh in the Music Hall, October 30, 1867. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1867.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Speech of the Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P. at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, April 3, 1872. [London]: W. Tweedie for the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, [1872].
- \_\_\_\_\_. Whigs and Whiggism, Political Writings. Edited and introduced by William Hutcheon. London: John Murray, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Works of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, embracing Novels, Romances, Plays, Poems, Biography, Short Stories and Great Speeches. 20 vols. London and New York: M. Walter Dunne, 1904.
- Manners, John, 7th Duke of Rutland. England's Trust and Other Poems. London: Rivington, 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter printed in Baines, Talbot. "The Citizenship of the British Nobility." Quarterly Review, CLXXXIV (July, 1896), 270-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Notes of an Irish Tour. London: John Ollivier, 1849.



- \_\_\_\_\_. A Plea for National Holy-Days. London: Painter, 1843.
- Smythe, George, 7th Viscount Strangford. Historic Fancies. 2d ed. London: Henry Colburn, 1844.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Speech at Canterbury, July 6, 1847. London: n.p., 1847.
- Young England Addresses. . . London: Hayward and Adam, 1845.

#### Publications by Forerunners and Contemporaries

##### Books and Pamphlets

- Alfred [Samuel H. G. Kydd]. The History of the Factory Movement. 2 vols. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1857.
- Baines, Edward, Jr. The Social, Educational, and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. & T. Ward & Co., 1843.
- Bray, John Francis. Labour's Wrong and Labour's Remedy; or the Age of Might and the Age of Right. Leeds: David Green, 1839. Reprinted New York: A. M. Kelley, 1968.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. The Political Thought of S. T. Coleridge. Edited, selected and introduced by R. J. White. London: J. Cape, 1938.
- Colquhoun, Patrick. A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire. 2d ed. London: Joseph Mawman, 1815.
- Digby, Kenelm Henry. The Broad Stone of Honour: or the True Sense and Practice of Chivalry. 4 vols. London: Vol. III was sold by Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green; the rest were sold by Joseph Booker, 1826-1829.
- Engels, Friedrich. The Condition of the Working Class in England. Translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner. New York: Macmillan, 1958.
- Fielden, John. The Curse of the Factory System. New introduction by J. T. Ward. 2d ed. New York: A. M. Kelley, 1969.
- Mill, John Stuart. Principles of Political Economy with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy. 2 vols. 5th ed. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1920.

North, Christopher /John Wilson/. Anti-Coningsby; or the New Generation Grown Old. 2 vols. London: T. C. Newby, 1844.

Owen, Robert. A New View of Society and Other Writings. Introduction by G. D. H. Cole. New York: E. P. Dutton, /1949/.

Porter, G. R. The Progress of the Nation in its Various Social and Economic Relations from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. London: John Murray, 1847.

Senior, Nassau. Industrial Efficiency and Social Economy. Arranged and edited by S. Leon Levy. 2 vols. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1928.

### Articles

Alison, Archibald. "Progress of Social Disorganization." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXXV (February, March, April, May, 1834), 228-48, 331-53, 526-46, 675-90.

Ashley, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord, 7th Earl Shaftesbury. "The Factory System." Quarterly Review, LVII (December, 1836), 397-443.

Crocker, J. W. "Close of Sir Robert Peel's Administration." Quarterly Review, LXXVIII (September, 1846), 535-80.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Policy of Ministers." Quarterly Review, LXXII (September, 1843), 553-93.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Policy of Sir Robert Peel." Quarterly Review, LXX (September, 1842), 485-531.

De Quincey, Thomas. "The Last Session of Parliament." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LIV (October, 1843), 538-550.

Forcade, Eugene. "De la Jeune Angleterre." Revue des Deux Mondes, new ser., VIII (October, 1844), 385-415.

Greg, W. R. "Unsound Social Philosophy." Edinburgh Review, XC (October, 1849), 496-524.

Hayward, Abraham. "Young England." Edinburgh Review, LXXX (October, 1844), 517-25.

Johnstone, J. William. "Our Domestic Policy." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXVI, XXVII (November, December, 1829, January, 1830), 768-74, 940-47, 90-96.

"The Late and the Present Ministry." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LX (August, 1846), 249-60.

Lewis, George Cornwall. "Legislation for the Working Classes." Edinburgh Review, LXXXIII (January, 1846), 64-99.

"Literary Legislators." Fraser's Magazine, XXXV (January, February, March, May, June, 1847), 79-95, 193-208, 321-39, 529-38, 722-26.

Mallalieu, Alfred. "The Ministry and the People, the Work-house System, the Factory System, and the Ten Hours' Bill." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XLI (June, 1837), 836-54.

"Reflections Suggested by the Career of the Late Premier /Peel/." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LXI (January, 1847), 93-128.

Senior, Nassau. "The Budget of 1842." Edinburgh Review, LXXV (April, 1842), 187-218.

Spring-Rice, Thomas. "Distress of the Manufacturing Districts--Causes and Remedies." Edinburgh Review, LXXVII (February, 1843), 190-227.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Late Session." Edinburgh Review, LXXVI (October, 1842), 241-74.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Ministry and the Late Session." Edinburgh Review, LXXVIII (October, 1843), 517-49.

Wilson, John. "The Factory System." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, XXXIII (April, 1833), 419-50.

#### Memoirs, Collected Papers and Speeches

Churchill, Lord Randolph. Speeches of the Right Honourable Lord Randolph Churchill, M.P., 1880-1888. Collected, with notes and introduction by Louis J. Jennings, M.P. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1889.

Crocker, J. W. The Crocker Papers, 1808-1857. Edited by Bernard Pool. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1884 /1967/.

Greville, Charles Cavendish Fulke. The Greville Memoirs; a Journal of the Reigns of King George IV, King William IV, and Queen Victoria. Edited by Henry Reeve. 7 vols. 2d ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1844-1911.

- Newman, John Henry. Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman. . . . Edited by Anne Mozley. 2 vols. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897.
- Parker, Charles S. Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers. 3 vols. 2d ed. London: John Murray, 1899.
- Queen Victoria. The Letters of Queen Victoria: a Selection from Her Majesty's Correspondence between the Years 1837 and 1861. Edited by Arthur Christopher Benson and Viscount Esher. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1908.

#### Journals and Newspapers

- The Annual Register; or a View of the History and Politics of the Year.
- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.
- Edinburgh Review.
- Fraser's Magazine.
- Northern Star.
- Quarterly Review.
- The Shropshire Conservative.
- The Times (London).
- Young England.

#### Secondary Sources

##### General

- Bentinck, Henry. Tory Democracy. London: Methuen & Co., 1918.
- Blake, Robert et al. Conservatism Today; Four Personal Points of View. London: Conservative Political Centre, 1966.
- Briggs, Asa. ed. Chartist Studies. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1960.
- Brinton, Crane. English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century. 2d ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Political Ideas of the English Romanticists. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.
- Carpenter, S. C. Church and People, 1789-1889. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Chadwick, Owen. The Mind of the Oxford Movement. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960.
- Chaloner, W. H. The Hungry Forties: a Re-Examination. Aids for Teachers Series. London: Published for the Historical Association by Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957.
- Clark, G. S. R. Kitson. An Expanding Society, Britain, 1830-1900. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Christie, Octavus F. The Transition from Aristocracy, 1832-1867. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.
- Davis, H. W. C. The Age of Grey and Peel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Elliott-Binns, L. E. Religion in the Victorian Era. 2d ed. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1946.
- Evans, R. J. The Victorian Age, 1815-1914. 2d ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968.
- Fay, Charles Ryle. Life and Labour in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- Feuchtwanger, E. J. Disraeli, Democracy and the Tory Party. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Gash, Norman. Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics, 1832-1852. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Gorst, Harold. The Fourth Party. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1906.
- Harrison, J. F. C. The Early Victorians, 1832-1851. New York: Praeger, 1971.
- Hearnshaw, Fossey John C. Conservatism in England: an Analytical, Historical, and Political Survey. New York: H. Fertig, 1967.
- Hill, Richard Leslie. Toryism and the People, 1832-1846. Foreword by Keith Feiling. London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1929.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. Victorian Minds. New York: Knopf, 1968.

- Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Inglis, Kenneth Stanley. Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, /1963/.
- Laski, Harold J. Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.
- Manley, Jeanne Frances. "Disraeli's Tory Democracy: a Parliamentary Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of History, St. Louis University, 1968.
- Marwick, Arthur. Britain in the Century of Total War: War, Peace, and Social Change. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968.
- McKenzie, Robert Trelford, and Silver, Allan. Angels in Marble: Working Class Conservatives in Urban England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Murray, Robert H. Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1929.
- Nordlinger, Eric. The Working Class Tories. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Robb, Janet Henderson. The Primrose League, 1883-1906. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Simon, Brian. Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1960.
- Smellie, K. B. A Hundred Years of English Government. London: Duckworth, 1937.
- Thornton, A. P. The Habit of Authority. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966.
- The Times (London). The History of the Times. 4 vols. London: Office of The Times, 1935-1952.
- White, R. J. ed. The Conservative Tradition. London: Nicholas Kaye, 1950.
- Wilkinson, William John. Tory Democracy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925.

## Biographical

- Aldington, Richard. Four English Portraits, 1801-1851. London: Evans Bros., 1948.
- Best, Geoffrey Francis Andrew. Shaftesbury. New York: Arco Publishing, /1964/.
- Blake, Robert. Disraeli. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Bowden, John Edward. The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1869.
- Bowley, Marian. Nassau Senior and Classical Economics. New York: A. M. Kelley, 1949.
- de Fonblanque, Edward Barrington. Lives of the Lords Strangford with their Ancestors and Contemporaries through Ten Centuries. London: Cassell Petter & Galpin, /1877/.
- Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 63 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885-1901.
- Driver, Cecil. Tory Radical: the Life of Richard Oastler. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Faber, Richard. Beaconsfield and Bolingbroke. London: Faber & Faber, /1961/.
- Finer, S. E. The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick. London: Methuen & Co., 1952.
- Gash, Norman. Mr. Secretary Peel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Hammond, John L. and Hammond, Barbara. Life of Lord Shaftesbury. London: Longmans, 1923.
- Hindle, Wilfrid. The Morning Post, 1772-1937: Portrait of a Newspaper. London: G. Routledge & Sons, /1937/.
- Hitchman, Francis. The Public Life of the Right Honourable Earl of Beaconsfield. 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, 1879.
- Jerman, B. R. The Young Disraeli. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Law, Henry William, and Law, Irene. The Book of the Beresford Hopes. London: Heath Cranton, 1925.

- Lucas, Reginald Jaffray. Lord Glenesk and "The Morning Post". New York: Lane, 1910.
- Martin, Theodore. A Life of Lord Lyndhurst. London: John Murray, 1883.
- Monypenny, William Flavelle, and Buckle, George Earle. Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Morley, John. The Life of Richard Cobden. 13th ed. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. 3 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1903.
- Non-Elector. Lord John Manners. A Political and Literary Sketch Comprising some Account of the Young England Party and the Passing of the Factory Acts. London: n.p., 1872.
- Pope-Hennessy, James. Monckton Milnes. 2 vols. New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, /1955-/.
- Purcell, Edmund Sheridan. Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- Reid, Thomas Wemyss. Life, Letters and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton. 2 vols. 2d ed. London: Cassell & Co., 1890.
- Saintsbury, George. The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury, 1875-1920. 4 vols. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1923.
- Taylor, G. R. S. English Political Portraits of the Nineteenth Century. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1967.
- Ward, John Trevor. Sir James Graham. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Whibley, Charles. Lord John Manners and His Friends. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925.

#### Social Reform

- Beales, H. L. The Making of Social Policy. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1946.



- Bellairs, C. E. Conservative Social and Industrial Reform, 1800-1945. London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947.
- Bruce, Maurice. The Coming of the Welfare State. London: B. T. Batsford, 1961.
- Clarke, David. The Conservative Faith in a Modern Age. London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947.
- Cowherd, Raymond G. The Humanitarians and the Ten Hours Movement in England. Boston: Baker Library, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, [1956].
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Politics of English Dissent, the Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
- Edsall, Nicholas C. The Anti-Poor Law Movement, 1834-44. Manchester: University Press, 1971.
- Escott, T. H. S. Social Transformation of the Victorian Age, a survey of Court and Country. London: Seeley & Co., Ltd., 1897.
- Ford, Percy. Social Theory and Social Practice. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968.
- Gillespie, F. E. Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1927.
- Gosden, P. H. J. The Friendly Societies in England, 1815-75. Manchester: University Press, 1961.
- Harris, R. W. Romanticism and the Social Order, 1780-1830. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.
- Lawless, J. T. "Benjamin Disraeli's Concepts of Social Class." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of History, St. Louis University, 1967.
- Lubenow, William C. The Politics of Government Growth: Early Victorian Attitudes toward State Intervention, 1833-1848. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971.
- Ludlow, John Malcolm, and Jones, Lloyd. Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867. London: Alexander Strahan, 1867.

- Osborne, John W. The Silent Revolution: the Industrial Revolution in England as a Source of Cultural Change. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- Owen, David. English Philanthropy, 1660-1960. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Penty, Arthur J. Protection and the Social Problem. London: Methuen & Co., 1926.
- Perkin, Harold. The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Plumb, J. H. ed. Studies in Social History. London: Longmans, Green, 1955.
- Poynter, John Riddoch. Society and Pauperism; English Ideas on Poor Relief, 1795-1834. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Roberts, David. Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Schweintz, Karl de. England's Road to Social Security, 1349-1947. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947.
- Smith, Paul. Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Thomas, Maurice Walton. The Early Factory Legislation. London: Thames Bank Publishing Co., Ltd., 1948.
- Ward, John Trevor. The Factory Movement, 1830-1855. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Factory System. 2 vols. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970.
- Young, A. F., and Ashton, E. T. British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956.

#### Literature

- Baker, Joseph Ellis. The Novel and the Oxford Movement. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965.
- Cazamian, Louis. Le Roman Social en Angleterre, 1830-1850. 2 vols. New ed. Paris: H. Didier, [1934/].

- Cruse, Amy. The Victorians and their Books. London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962.
- Frietzsche, Arthur H. Disraeli's Religion; the Treatment of Religion in Disraeli's Novels. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1961.
- Levine, Richard Allan. "Disraeli and the Middle Ages: the Influence of Medievalism in the Nineteenth Century." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Language and Literature, Indiana University, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Benjamin Disraeli. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1968.
- Horne, Richard Henry ed. A New Spirit of the Age. London: Oxford University Press, [1907/].
- Masefield, Muriel. Peacocks and Primroses, a Survey of Disraeli's Novels. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953.
- Schilling, Bernard N. Human Dignity and the Great Victorians. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.
- Smith, Paul. "The Young England Movement." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Literature, Columbia University, 1951.
- Speare, Morris Edmund. The Political Novel: its Development in England and America. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.
- Tillotson, Kathleen. Novels of the Eighteen-Forties. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society, 1780-1950. London: Chatto & Windus, 1960.

#### Articles

- Aydelotte, William O. "The Conservative and Radical Interpretations of Early Victorian Social Legislation." Victorian Studies, XI (December, 1967), 225-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The England of Marx and Mill as Reflected in Fiction." The Journal of Economic History, VIII, Supplement (1948), 42-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The House of Commons in the 1840's." History, XXXIX (October, 1954), 249-62.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parties and Issues in Early Victorian England." Journal of British Studies, V (May, 1962), 95-114.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Voting Patterns in the British House of Commons in the 1840's." Comparative Studies in Society and History, V (1962-63), 134-63.
- Blaug, Mark. "The Classical Economists and the Factory Acts--a Re-Examination." Quarterly Journal of Economics, LXXII (May, 1958), 211-26.
- Brebner, J. B. "Laissez Faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth Century Britain." The Journal of Economic History, VIII, Supplement (1948), 59-73.
- Brundage, Anthony. "The Landed Interest and the New Poor Law: a reappraisal of the Revolution in Government." English Historical Review, LXXXVII (January, 1972), 27-48.
- Burn, W. L. "English Conservatism." Nineteenth Century and After, CXLV (February, 1949), 67-76.
- Clark, G. S. R. Kitson. "Hunger and Politics in 1842." Journal of Modern History, XXV (December, 1953), 355-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Repeal of the Corn Laws and the Politics of the Forties." Economic History Review, 2d ser., IV (1951), 1-13.
- Cline, C. L. "Disraeli and Peel's 1841 Cabinet." Journal of Modern History, XI (December, 1939), 509-12.
- Deane, Phyllis. "Contemporary Estimates of National Income in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." Economic History Review, 2d ser., VIII (April, 1956), 339-54.
- Edelman, Maurice. "A Political Novel: Disraeli Sets a Lively Pace." Times Literary Supplement, August 7, 1959, pp. x-xi.
- Fitzsimons, M. A. "Britain in the 1840's: Reflections in Relevance." Review of Politics, XXI (October, 1969), 509-23.
- Forbes-Boyd, Eric. "Disraeli the Novelist." Essays and Studies, 1950. Vol. III of the New Series of Essays and Studies collected for the English Association by G. Rostrevor Hamilton. London: John Murray, 1950.

- Gash, Norman. "Ashley and the Conservative Party in 1842." English Historical Review, LII (October, 1938), 679-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Peel and the Party System, 1830-50." Transactions of the Royal Historical Association, 5th ser., I (1951), 47-69.
- Glickman, Harvey. "The Toryness of English Conservatism." Journal of British Studies, I (1961-62), 111-43.
- Hamilton, Robert. "Disraeli and the Two Nations." Quarterly Review, CCLXXXIII (January, 1950), 102-15.
- Hart, Jenifer. "Nineteenth-Century Social Reform: A Tory Interpretation of History." Past and Present, No. 31 (1965), pp. 39-61.
- James, Stanley B. "The Tragedy of Disraeli." Catholic World, CLII (1941), 414-19.
- Kemp, Betty. "The General Election of 1841." History, new ser., XXXVII (June, 1952), 146-57.
- Lawson-Tancred, Mary. "The Anti-League and the Corn Law Crisis of 1846." Historical Journal, III (1960), 162-83.
- Lewis, Clyde J. "Disraeli's Conception of Divine Order." Jewish Social Studies, XXIV (July, 1962), 144-61.
- Powell, J. Enoch. "Conservatives and the Social Services." Political Quarterly, XXIV (April-June, 1953), 156-66.
- Riggs, R. E. "Peel and Disraeli: Architects of a New Conservative Party." Western Humanities Review, XI (Spring, 1957), 183-87.
- Roberts, David. "Tory Paternalism and Social Reform in Early Victorian England." American Historical Review, LXIII (January, 1958), 323-37.
- Smith, Shelia M. "Willenhall and Wodgate: Disraeli's Use of Blue Book Evidence." Review of English Studies, new ser., XIII (November, 1962), 368-84.
- Sorenson, L. R. "Some Classical Economists, Laissez Faire, and the Factory Acts." The Journal of Economic History, XII (Summer, 1952), 247-62.
- Stewart, Robert. "The Ten Hours and Sugar Crises of 1844: Government and the House of Commons in the Age of Reform." Historical Journal, XII (1969), 35-57.

Walker, K. O. "The Classical Economists and the Factory Acts." The Journal of Economic History, I (November, 1941), 168-77.

Ward, John Trevor. "Young England." History Today, XVI (February, 1966), 120-27.

\_\_\_\_\_. "'Young England' at Bingley." Journal of the Bradford Textile Society (1965-66), pp. 49-59.

Willcox, William B. "The Tory Tradition." American Historical Review, XLVIII (July, 1943), 707-21.