UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

RHETORICAL TRANSFORMATIONS: THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

JENNIFER BOOTS-MARSHALL
Norman, Oklahoma
2005

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/941

UMI Number: 3203301

UMI

UMI Microform 3203301

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

RHETORICAL TRANSFORMATIONS:
THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

_____
Dr. Daniel Cottom

_____
Dr. Richard Barney

_____
Dr. Eve Tavor Bannet

_____
Dr. Ronald Schleifer

_____
Dr. Judith Lewis

© Copyright by JENNIFER BOOTS-MARSHALL 2005
All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my PhD support group in Gallup, NM, whose questions, humor, and support kept me energized and focused.

Thank you to my committee, whose timely and insightful comments, questions, and criticisms helped me transform my initial thoughts on the Industrial Revolution and figurative language into a polished and focused dissertation.

Thank you to my family, John and Justine Boots and Mary-Catherine and Damon Boots-Sacra, for being my constant cheerleaders.

Thank you to John Marshall, for telling me that I am smart and for believing it.

Finally, thank you to Joel Morgan Francis Boots-Marshall, who had not taken up residence in either my mind or my life when I began this project, but who is, nevertheless, the reason I finished it.

Table of Contents

Abstract
……vi

Introduction
……..1

Chapter One:
……14
Reducing, Regulating, Replacing:
Turning Workers into Hands

Chapter Two:
……47
Transforming Machines into Gods:
The Religion of Science and Industry

Chapter Three:
…….…….....……86
The Mythology of Modernity:
The Myth of the Self-Made Man

Chapter Four:
……..147
Writing Rioting:
The Industrial Sublime

Conclusion
……..……206

Works Cited
……..230

Abstract

This dissertation is an examination of the rhetoric and images used in the British industrial rhetoric of the mid-nineteenth century. This body of work encompasses the industrial novel as well as non-fiction works. This study discusses the implications bound up with rhetorically transforming laborers into hands, machines into gods from the Greco-Roman and Christian traditions, and the industrialist into the mythic figure of the self-made man. The final chapter examines the assumptions and contradictions in the rhetoric of the riot, which often involves sublime imagery. My basic thesis is that in the novels of this era rhetoric, through metaphors and imagery, imaginatively serves to erase social history and the scope of human responsibility and power. The more original aspect of my thesis arises from my attention to the tensions and contradictions in the writers' attitudes and how these are imagistically regenerated.

Introduction

I: Introduction

In Culture and Society (1958), Raymond Williams was the first literary critic to dub the group of novels written during the turbulent middle of the nineteenth century as "the industrial novels," a group which includes Benjamin Disraeli's Sybil; or The Two Nations (1845), Elizabeth Gaskell's Mary Barton (1848) and North and South (1854-5), Charles Dickens Hard Times (1854), Charles Kingsley's Alton Locke (1850) and George Eliot'sFelix Holt (1866). Before Williams's labeling, literary critics, like Louis Casamian (The Social Novel in England [1903]), Kathleen Tillotson (Novels of the Eighteen Forties [1954]), and Arnold Kettle ("The Early Victorian Social-Problem Novel"[1958]), called this particular sub-genre of the Victorian novel "the social-problem novels." Essentially, these critics viewed the social-problem novel as industrial portraits designed to give the new middle classes a picture of industrial life. As Kettle explains, "It was to the conscience – not to mention the downright factual ignorance – of the middle classes that [these authors] addressed themselves" (171). Louis Casamian even finds that by the end of the 1850's "the novelists brought sensitivity to bear upon the ills of society, and by the emotions they evoked, revived all the mental activities that had been sacrificed to industrial discipline and economic arguments. Man became a sensitive being once more, responsive to all sorts of outside influences, instead of a plain, rational follower of enlightened self-interest" (297). By and large, before Williams's analysis of these

novels, the critical consensus was that these novels not only presented social problems but also offered workable solutions for those problems. Casamian explains, "The social 'novel with a purpose' appeared with the early-Victorian period in 1830, and until about 1850 exhibited characteristics analogous with it. Impassioned, challenging novels took as their subject the grave problems which concerned the whole of society, discussed them in their entirety, and proposed precise formulas or vague aspirations for the total reform of human relations" (4).

It is now a commonplace to note that this particular sub-genre of novels comprises the middle-class literary answer to the Condition of England Debate, a discussion whose main anxiety concerned the physical and moral condition of the laboring classes. Many critics who study this same period of literature look to Thomas Carlyle as the most important and prominent voice for initiating an inquiry into the social problems of industrial Britain. It was Carlyle, after all, who coined the phrase "The Condition-of-England Question" in the opening chapter of Chartism (1839), in which he exclaimed, "The sum of [the laboring classes'] wretchedness merited and unmerited welters, huge, dark, and baleful, like a Dantean Hell" (176). However, middle-class novelists were not only concerned with the plight of the laboring classes on the basis of social compassion, Christian duty or even imaginative opportunity. They were also fearful of laboring-class uprising and revolution, especially in light of the French Revolution, which still occupied a prominent place in the popular imagination. The British laboring-class movements, Luddism and

Chartism, also helped to fuel the middle-class perception of laboring-class violence and unrest.

By calling them "the industrial novels" rather than "social-problem novels", Williams isolated the real factor that separated this sub-genre from the Victorian Novel in general: industrialism, the process of technical change which dramatically changed the physical, economic, social, political, and imaginative landscapes of England. He was also one of the first critics to explain that the one feature these novels share is their inability to truly identify with the experience of the new, industrial laboring classes, even though their subject matter was intimately and often sympathetically concerned with this new experience: "These novels, when read together, seem to illustrate clearly enough not only the common criticism of industrialism, which the tradition was establishing, but also the general structure of feeling which was equally determining. Recognition of evil was balanced by fear of becoming involved. Sympathy was transformed, not into action, but into withdrawal" (109). Writing about Mary Barton, but speaking generically about the industrial novel, Williams notes that this novel

> is a dramatization of the fear of violence which was widespread among the upper and middle classes at the time, and which penetrated, as an arresting and controlling factor, even into the deep imaginative sympathy of a Mrs. Gaskell. This fear that the working people might take matters into their own hands was widespread and characteristic, and the murder of Harry Carson is an imaginative working-out of this

> fear, and of reactions to it, rather than any kind of observed and considered experience. (90)

The industrial novel, then, is not so much about the industrial experience as it is about the ways by which the potential violence and unrest of the laboring classes could be imaginatively contained and defused.

This dissertation is a study of the rhetorical effects of the Industrial Revolution as they are manifested in literary works from, roughly, the 1840's to the 1950's. Of course this is a topic so familiar that David Lodge made it the subject of his heroine's dissertation in his comic novel Nice Work (1988). For that very reason, though, I think it is due for reconsideration. This dissertation presents an argument about the Industrial Revolution that accounts for change beyond the economic and industrial. As Williams notes, 'Industry,' is a world that has both technological and characterological valences; and in this study I develop an argument about the relation between the Industrial Revolution and the figurative language used to describe the changes it produced in both the laboring and middle classes. My basic thesis is that in the novels of this era rhetoric, through metaphors and imagery, imaginatively serves to erase social history and the scope of human responsibility and power. I study the creation and development of this figurative language as it is manifested in nineteenth-century texts, both fictional and non-fictional. This dissertation does discuss the traditional nineteenth-century industrial novels, including Benjamin Disraeli's Sybil; or, The Two Nations (1845), Elizabeth Gaskell'sNorth and South (1847), Charlotte Brontë's Shirley (1849), Charles Dickens'sHard Times (1854) and

Dinah Mulock Craik's John Halifax, Gentleman (1856). Because novels only give us a part of the industrial picture, however, I also draw on many non-fiction texts, such as James Kay Shuttleworth's The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester (1832), Peter Gaskell's The Manufacturing Population of England, Its Moral, Social, and Physical Conditions, and the Changes Which Have Arisen From the Use of Steam Machinery (1833) and Artisans and Machinery: The Moral and Physical Condition of the Manufacturing Population Considered with Reference to Mechanical Substitutes for Human Labour (1836), Andrew Ure's Philosophy of Manufacturers (1835), Charles Babbage's On the Economy of Machines and Manufactures (1835), W. Cooke Taylor's Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire (1842), and Leon Faucher's Manchester in 1844 (1844).

My basic thesis, that middle-class rhetoric allows for the erasure of laboring-class identity, is a fairly standard one. Even though most of these authors appear sympathetic to the plight of the laboring classes, they are, finally, more interested in protecting the sanctity of the middle classes. The more original aspect of my thesis arises from my attention to the tensions and contradictions in the writers' attitudes and how these are imagistically regenerated.

II. Recent Scholarship in this Area

In The Captain of Industry in English Fiction 1821-1871 (1970), Ivan Melada takes as subject for his study on the Industrial Revolution the evolving representation of the industrialist in the industrial novel. This study traces the shifting image of the

industrialist, as a representative of the new middle classes, as he incorporates himself into a society traditionally governed by the social, economic, and political interests of the upper classes. I am interested in this book because Melada is one of the first writers to approach the literature of the Industrial Revolution by isolating an image in the novel and tracing its historical development over the course of fifty years. Melada explains that his study also examines the relationship between the industrialist, the laborer, and the aristocrat. He concludes that by the late nineteenth century, the industrialist finally "learns to accept the social responsibilities of power and to be worthy of the rank to which he has aspired" (x).

In Fact into Fiction (1975), Ivanka Kovačević traces the industrial theme in English fiction from the middle of the eighteenth-century to the middle of the nineteenth. In essence, her study is a survey of the process of industrialism and how the social novel developed as a literary tradition. She relates "the fictional representation of social problems to political and intellectual trends" (14). So she places the works as developing, in part, from a cultural background. What is of particular interest to the study of the industrial novel is that she sees the ambivalence of the early Victorian writers' social philosophy. This ambivalence is due to the overwhelming problems to which the Industrial Revolution gave rise – essentially, laissez-faire individualism versus social responsibility.

Igor Webb's From Custom to Capital (1981) argues that "any novel written between roughly 1780 and the 1850's is necessarily an expression of and a response to" the Industrial Revolution (9). He focuses specifically on Jane Austen, Charlotte

Brontë, and Charles Dickens, and he examines how these novels reflect aspects of early to mid- nineteenth-century social consciousness. He also argues that the novels he has chosen for this study "register the fundamental transformation of England from an agrarian to an industrial nation" (25). While many of the studies that have come before Webb's explore the standard body of novels that we have come to call the industrial novels (as defined by Williams), Webb deviates from the standard list to include Pride and Prejudice, Mansfield Park, and Jane Eyre, novels that we do not normally associate with the Industrial Revolution. Webb sees connections between the changing political economy of England and the development of the novel, and he shows how the way characters develop and .grow in these novels connects with changing views of economic value spurred by the Industrial Revolution. He chooses to focus on the novel of manners because it most clearly shows the difficulty of incorporating into fiction the social, political, and economic conditions wrought by the Industrial Revolution. His study is important because it goes outside of the traditional industrial canon, as defined by Williams, to study how the Industrial Revolution is represented not only in traditional industrial fiction but also in novels not normally thought of as industrial.

Catherine Gallagher's The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction (1985) examines the formal properties of the standard nineteenth-century industrial novels. By looking at their formal properties, Gallagher defines the development of the novel during the first and second Reform Acts. She uses the same body of novels that Raymond Williams defined as the "industrial novels." She examines how these

novels established tensions between freedom and determinism, between the public world and the private world, and between the representation of facts and the representation of values. These were not only the same issues bound up in the Debate but also the issues that formed the frame of the novel itself: "[F]iction concerned with the Condition of England Debate turned these implicit tensions into explicit contradictions because the debate was composed of controversies over the same issues that were delicately suspended to form the framework of the novel" (xii). In this way, the Condition of England Debate helped to reform the novel as a genre, while simultaneously the industrial novel helped shape the Debate.

Robert Werlin's study The English Novel and the Industrial Revolution (1990) focuses primarily on the novels of the 1840's. Like Gallagher, he examines the traditional industrial canon as defined by Williams. His argument looks to answer how people make sense of their world during periods of mass social change and cope with the problems that emerge with such change. This study seeks to understand the social sources of conflict between the novels' representations of society and the actual society to which the representations refer. Essentially, Werlin examines the assumptions bound up with the ideological frameworks of the novelists and how those assumptions can be used to explain how and why the conflict between representation and reality occurs.

Susan Zlotnick's study, Women, Writing, and the Industrial Revolution (1998), departs from the traditional industrial canon and looks at the conflict between the Industrial Revolution as it was imagined and reimagined by men (Carlyle,

Dickens, Disraeli) and by women (Gaskell, Brontë, Trollope, Tonna). She argues that while male writers tended to condemn the social changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution and to seek solutions to industrial problems by turning to an idealized past, women writers tended to be more optimistic about the improvements promised by industry and technology. These women writers, Zlotnick argues, connected women's social, political, and economic liberation to industrial capitalism. Also, she finds that women writers were more interested in finding real solutions to the problems caused by the Industrial Revolution.

III. Chapter Outline

Chapter One, "Reducing, Regulating, Replacing: Turning Workers into Hands**,**" examines the industrial metaphor of transforming factory laborers to hands, and it explores the ideologies bound up with such a comparison. This chapter begins with a brief survey of the changes in the laboring classes and economy as a result of the process of industrialization. It then examines the implications of those changes on the depictions of the laboring classes as they are reduced to Hands, then regulated like machines, and finally replaced by machines, and it relies on a traditional Marxist approach to do so. Such implications include the fragmentation and amputation of the laborer's body as well as the gothic dehumanization of the laborer – imagine the horror of a laboring body made entirely of hands. These kinds of amputations and dehumanizations imagistically serve to reinforce the upper classes' sense of social superiority and to separate them further from the laboring classes while they simultaneously serve to show the dependence of one class on another.

Chapter Two, “Transforming Machines into Gods: The Religion of Science and Industry," examines the mechanical transformations that turn machines into gods from both the Greco-Roman and Christian traditions. For example, several writers use the Roman god Minerva to explain the advent of the steam-powered machine. Andrew Ure compares Richard Arkwright to the Greek god Prometheus. Peter Gaskell and Ure both use the Roman figure of Hercules to discuss the origin of manufactures. Thomas Carlyle uses the Titans to critique nineteenth-century industrial progress. Charles Babbage uses myths of Jesus to discuss the power of the machine. Leon Faucher even refigures the Genesis story to discuss the transformation of cotton into cloth. I am concerned in this chapter to trace how and why these ancient mythological figures are essentially lumped together without any sense of cultural or religious differentiation, as if they were all part of one image bank. This discourse consecrates a religion of science and industry – one that serves to ordain a new order of creation in which workers become hands and industrialists and machines become gods; in which history vanishes in the face of innovation and progress; and in which laborers serve, even worship, machines. This discourse on industrialism removes machines from the realm of the human and, hence, draws attention away from a class system and a political economy of industry by treating industry as supernatural.

Chapter Three, “The Mythology of Modernity: The Myth of the Self-Made Man**,**" studies the rhetoric of the Industrial Revolution that deals with the social transformations that turn poor, homeless men into industrious and successful

capitalists. This kind of transformation draws attention away from a hierarchical class system and a political economy of industry by representing the process of becoming a successful industrialist as a natural and inevitable result of hard work, as Samuel Smiles suggested in his famous and popular Self Help (1859). As laborers are transformed into hands, hands into grotesque bodies, bodies into machines, and machines into gods, the next step in the rhetorical transformation of the laboring classes is to transform the laborer into the mythical figure of the self-made man. The complexities bound up in this idealized figure are many: he is simultaneously a solitary individual, an idealized representative of the middle-class, an agent for potential change, and a selfless duty-bound Christian.

Chapter Four, "Writing Rioting: The Industrial Sublime," examines how and why riots and mobs are constructed in terms of natural disaster imagery, like volcanoes, tempestuous seas, and hurricanes. This chapter follows logically from the previous one in that Chapter Three focused partly on how men can become self-made, a transformation that implies some kind of superhuman agency. It is important to note, though, that the men who can become self-made are middle-class individuals not laborers, even though the rhetoric seems to suggest that any man, regardless of class, can become self-made as long as he as the necessary character. In this chapter, I examine how laborers, through riots and mobs, become storms, in another kind of superhuman transformation. One consequence of this elision of human agency is that it becomes impossible to understand the laboring classes in human terms. We are left to see the laboring classes not in human form but as forces of nature in conflict with

the needs or will of the gods (i.e. self-made men) who employ or control their labor. Furthermore, the image of the storm symbolizes the laboring classes' attempts at controlling their own labor. Finally, it is also an image of the sublime, which connects to a consciousness of divinity: an implicit religious aspect that hovers on the edge of terror and the supernatural. Certainly, it comes as no surprise that the riot as a crowd action is historically bound up with issues of class, politics, and economics; but when, in the industrial novel, it is written in the discourse of the sublime, the riot scene takes on an added layer of complexity. The riot scenes in industrial texts are not merely about the right to work, a fair wage for a day's labor, or the elimination of hand labor in the wake of automated factories. These riots also speak to the tie between aesthetics and politics as well as to the tie between economics and domesticity. For Edmund Burke, one of the founders of the British sublime, the aesthetic phenomenon of the sublime is naturally evoked by politico-economic problems of civic disorder.

Finally, in the Conclusion, I turn to a novella written at the turn of the nineteenth-century, H.G. Wells's The Time Machine (1894-5), in order to trace how these industrial metaphors have been refocused or reformulated. The Time Machine belongs to a group of stories that Wells dubbed "scientific romances," the purpose of which, Wells explains, is to "reflect upon contemporary political and social discussions" (Scientific Romances ix). Wells's purpose with The Time Machine was to criticize the contemporary state of the divisive class system in place at the close of the nineteenth century. To that end, The Time Machine critiques the notion of social

and technological progress that the myth of the self-made man and the machine-turned-god seem to embody. This novel also criticizes the social divide that is bound up in the rhetorical transformations of laborers-turned-hands and riots-turned-storms. Therefore, my purpose in this conclusion will be to trace this dissertation's themes in Wells's own critique of the late nineteenth-century technological society.

Chapter One:

Reducing, Regulating, Replacing: Turning Workers into Hands

The nineteenth-century British industrial novel takes as its general subject the regulating, ordering, and mechanizing of the natural world. With the advent of the machine, in all its manifestations, control of the natural world developed at a quicker pace than ever before and over a large geographical area. With such large-scale change also developed a sense of concern as well as a sense of excitement for the possibilities that the machine could bring. The foci of much nineteenth-century writing about industrialization ranged from the economic to the social impact of the machine on the laboring classes. Some writers examined the machine as the basis of technical progress, while others questioned the machine and the subsequent regulatory effects of industrialization.

In Industry and Empire (1968), Eric Hobsbawm explains that this regulation, as a by-product of industry, changed the nature of work, in the shift from a pre-industrial society to an industrial one. He states:

> [I]ndustrial labour – and especially mechanized factory labour – imposes a regularity, routine and monotony quite unlike pre-industrial rhythms of work, which depend on . . . the vagaries of other human beings, or even a man's own desire to play instead of working . . . Industry brings the tyranny of the clock, the pace-setting machine, and the complex and carefully-timed interaction of processes: the measurement of life not in seasons . . . or even in weeks and days, but

> in minutes, and above all a mechanized *regularity* of work which conflicts not only with tradition, but with all the inclinations of a humanity as yet unconditioned into it. (85-6)

While speaking directly to the regulatory effects of the Industrial Revolution, Hobsbawm's insight into the changing nature of work implies that the final site for that regulation is the body. Words such as "rhythms," "vagaries," and "desire to play" characterize pre-industrial work patterns over which the laborer had bodily control. However, with the advent of the machine, factory system, and consequent division of labor, the laborers' bodies as well as the body of laborers were subjected to the regulatory effects of mechanized factory labor, "the tyranny of the clock" and "the pace-setting machine." David Landes explains in The Unbound Prometheus (1969) that the Industrial Revolution "required machines which not only replaced hand labour but compelled the concentration of production in factories – in other words, machines whose appetite for energy was too large for domestic sources of power and whose mechanical superiority was sufficient to break down the resistance of the older forms of hand production" (81).

Many nineteenth-century writers, like Andrew Ure[1] and Charles Babbage, sought to portray this change as beneficial not only for the production of goods and

[1] Joseph Bizup, in Manufacturing Culture (2003), does a nice job of gathering contemporary and modern opinions of Ure's Philosophy of Manufacturers: "E. P. Thompson objects to Ure's 'Santanic Advocacy' of the factory system (*Making* 359). Maxine Berg, commenting on both the style and the content of Ure's argument, characterizes his treatise as an 'extraordinary and blatant panegyric in apology for the factory system' (181). These impressions are consistent with those of Ure's contemporaries. Marx calls Ure 'the Pindar of the automatic factory' (*Capital* 544). Engles, somewhat less archly, derides him as the 'mouthpiece' and 'chosen lackey of the bourgeoisie' and decries his 'song of praise' over the 'slavery of operatives' (189, 211). . . . Peter Gaskell note his

the accumulation of capital but also for the disciplinary power such regulation has in keeping unruly bodies in check. Others, like Charles Dickens, Peter Gaskell, and Thomas Carlyle, expressed concern for the negative effects of industrial regulation on the working-class body and on society as a whole. Andrew Zimmerman (1997) explains that for supporters of industrial capitalism, like Ure and Babbage, the human element in the factory was most in need of careful discipline if machines and technological knowledge were to function: "The human as self-interested calculating agent disappears from political economy and reappears as the more or less recalcitrant laborer who must be disciplined and integrated into an assemblage of machines" (19). Zimmerman's phrase "more or less recalcitrant laborer" also carries a suggestion that the laborer actively resisted the systems of industrial regulation imposed upon him by being unruly. It is this unruliness, then, that needed discipline. This discipline took several forms, including the more overt factory rules and time clock as well as the more subtle rhetorical use of words like "body" and "hand" as synonyms for "laborer." Of course, the synecdoche "hands" can be traced back to eighteenth-century political economy and, thus, to a pre-industrial moment. So while these terms originated in the eighteenth century, they took on a new meaning at this time. The reference was to agricultural hands or artisanal hands, usages that also imply fragmentation of the laborer and disassociation from work. Nevertheless, in the nineteenth century discussions of factory work, the synecdoche changed reference, valency and force. Hobsbawm's above observation on the regulation caused by the

---

propensity to exhibit 'that mingling of truth, exaggeration, and poetical description, usually forming a romance' (*Artisans* 319)" (23).

Industrial Revolution has three significant implications that are directly responsible for the transformation of men into hands: the invention of machines to increase productivity, the housing of those machines in a factory, and the technical and social division of labor to organize the factory.

This transformation of laborers into hands is no less fantastic than the transformations Marx discerned in Capital (1887) during his discussion of the fetishism of commodities. Marx explains that commodities abound in "metaphysical subtleties" (71). Man can take a natural material, such as wood, Marx explains, and turn it into a table. In much the same way, an employer can take a laborer and turn him into a hand. However, once that table or hand becomes a commodity, something to be produced, bought, or sold, "it is changed into something transcendent" (71). The process of becoming a commodity assumes both a location to house production and a division of labor to organize that production based on the division of classes. The capitalist controls production and buys labor. Once the division of labor is in place in the production process, the value of the commodity appears to be an inherent characteristic of the commodity itself within the system of economic exchange, rather than a characteristic of the social relationship between the capitalist and the laborer, characterized by the surplus value that the commodity gains through the capitalist's exploitation of labor. Value is economically displaced from labor and rhetorically or metaphysically assigned to the commodity produced by that labor. Marx states:

> A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective

> character stamped upon the product of that labour: because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour . . . In the same way the light from an object is perceived by us not as the subjective excitation of our optic nerve, but as the objective form of something outside the eye itself. (72).

This transformation of the value of labor into the value of things is similar to the rhetorical transformations that both workers and machines undergo in the various genres of industrial writings. This chapter will explore three topics and their implications as they are bound up with the transformation of laborers into hands: the invention of machines, the factory, and the division of labor.

Transforming laborers into hands is an amputation, which fragments the laborer's body to achieve one cohesive factory body made entirely of hands that simply tend machines. Essentially, people are turned into machines, and the opposite is simultaneously true as well: whole machines are turned into people – they are anthropomorphized. Furthermore, by the anthropomorphizing of the machine, the human hand is replaced by a mechanical hand. Reducing laborers to hands in a factory removes the capacity for independent thought, and the laborer becomes only a productive organ. Finally, transforming men into thoughtless hands is a form of gothic dehumanization; imagine the grotesqueness of a body made entirely of hands. Furthermore, this dehumanization is made possible by the division of labor, which

turns laborers into freaks of nature while maintaining that transformation as natural and normal. This kind of dehumanization also reinforces the bourgeois class's sense of social superiority and rhetorically serves to separate them further from the laboring class. It is interesting to note that the pale, delicate or elegant hands of men or women signify gentility. One only needs to remember the famous tea-serving scene that occurs between Mr. Thornton and Margaret Hale in Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South (1854-5) to see this signifier in action.

The invention of machines to increase productivity, profit, and competition had several effects. First, fewer laborers were needed to produce a greater amount of goods. Second, larger amounts of goods signaled larger profits, which could then be reinvested in more machines. Third, only men with large amounts of ready capital could buy several machines, which implies that the laborer was now severed from the origin of production: he did not own his own machine. Rather, he sold his labor to the capitalist. One way to rhetorically figure this new relationship was to call laborers "hands" to underscore that the only aspect of production for which the laborer was now responsible was the manual tending of a machine that produced the commodity. David Landes explains that "the introduction of machinery implied for the first time a complete separation from the means for production; the worker became a 'hand'" (43). Because the laborer is no longer connected to the origin of production, his hands are rhetorically severed from his body and used as a synecdoche for it. Friedrich Engels and Charles Dickens are two nineteenth-century writers who criticize the machine for this transformation as well as for its social

effects. Amputation, though, was only the first step in separating the laborer from the production process. Apologists, like Andrew Ure and Charles Babbage, actually wrote the human laborer out of the industrial equation by anthropomorphizing the machine and turning it into a human hand.

Friedrich Engels begins his 1845 study of the formation of the English working class by explaining that "the history of the proletariat in England begins with the second half of the last century, with the invention of the steam-engine and of machinery for working cotton." Engels continues, "These inventions gave rise, as is well known, to an industrial revolution, a revolution which altered the whole civil society" (37). Engels begins his study, then, by pairing the development of the laboring class with the advent of machines powered by steam. Engels locates the rise of the Proletariat and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution with two important eighteenth-century textile inventions, James Hargreaves's spinning jenny and James Watt's steam engine, both invented in 1764. The jenny changed the nature of spinning fiber into thread because unlike the traditional spinning wheel that had just one spindle, the jenny had at least eight. The greatest implication for the spinner was that one jenny operated by one laborer could now do the work of a room full of spinners. Added to Engels's list should be Richard Arkwright, aBritish inventor and cotton manufacturer who is credited for designing both a water-frame by which cotton fiber was spun into thread as well as the modern factory system.[2] He first put

[2] It should be noted that Arkwright was decidedly not the inventor of the water-frame. As Karl Marx explains in a footnote in Capital, "Whoever knows the life history of Arkwright, will never dub this barber-genius 'noble.' Of all the great inventors of the 18th century, he was incontestably the greatest thiever of other people's inventions and the meansest fellow" (425).

the machine to practical use in 1768. In 1769, he patented a spinning frame that produced cotton yarn hard and firm enough for the warp of woven fabric. In the early 1780's Samuel Crompton produced a machine that had features of both the water-frame and the jenny: as a cross between two kinds of machines, it was called the mule. In 1785, Edmund Cartwright combined the power of Watt's steam engine with Arkwright's spinning frames and invented the power loom, which wove thread into fabric. It is these inventions that not only comprise the beginning of the Industrial Revolution but also begin the laborer's transformation from laborer to hand. In The Making of the English Working Class (1963), E .P. Thompson explains, "The physical instruments of production were seen as giving rise in a direct and more-or-less compulsive way to new social relationships, institutions, and cultural modes" (191). The economic possibilities that the machine held were the first step in transforming the laborer into a hand because the change in the economic structure of society changed the kind of relationship the laborer and employer shared.

While pairing the rise of the working class with the invention of machines geared toward mass production sounds like a fairly simple idea, Engels illustrates the huge social alterations that stemmed from this social and economic transformation. Machines changed the nature of human relationships, and the laboring class was subject to the will of those who controlled the machines. Engels states:

> We have already seen how the proletariat was called into existence by the introduction of machinery. The rapid extension of manufacture demanded hands, wages rose, and troops of workmen migrated from

> the agricultural districts to the towns. . . . In the place of the former masters and apprentices, came great capitalists and working-men who had no prospect of rising above their class. Handiwork was carried on after the fashion of factory work, the division of labour was strictly applied, and small employers who could not compete with great establishments were forced down into the proletariat (50-1).

Engels here touches upon one of the greatest social transformations that the Industrial Revolution affected, the treatment of the working class at the hand of the capitalists. Capitalists and workmen replaced the older pairing of masters and apprentices. The latter pairing carries connotations, whether nostalgic or not, of a young novice learning a trade from a sometimes tyrannical, sometimes paternal experienced tradesman.[3] Within this social paradigm, there was room, according to Engels, for upward movement: after years of training, the apprentice could become the master. However, with the invention of the steam-powered machine, this older relationship was rendered null and void. Since the relationship between employer and worker was primarily characterized by an exchange of labor for money, the Industrial Revolution substituted the servant and man – or in Engels's word "apprentice" -- for the "operative" and "hand" (Hobsbawm 85). The human connotations bound up in

[3] Arnold Toynbee explains, "The old life [of domestic industry] . . . is at first sight the most attractive . . . . The relations between masters and workmen were then extremely close, but this close relationship had its bad side. There was often great brutality and gross vice. The workman was at his employer's mercy: in Norfolk the farmer used to horsewhip his labouring men, and his wife the women. There existed a state of feudal dependence, which, like all feudalism, had its dark and light sides. The close relationship was distinctly the result of the small system of industry, and hence it was shattered by the power-loom and the steam-engine. When huge factories were established there could no longer be a close tie between the master and his men; the workman hated his employers, and the employer looked on his workmen simply as hands." (121-2).

"servant" and "man" are replaced by the more mechanic "operative" and disembodied "hand." In the place of the old relationship between servant and master, Engels reminds us, are capitalists and laborers. Describing this new relationship, David Landes draws attention to its dichotomous nature: "On the one side was the employer, who not only hired the labour and marketed the finished product, but supplied the capital equipment and oversaw its use. On the other side there stood the worker, no longer capable of owning and furnishing the means of production and reduced to the status of a hand" (2).

In the three chapters of Hard Times (1854) that introduce Stephen Blackpool, Dickens's working-class hero whose name is symbolic of his social place, Dickens uses the words "hand" and "hands" twenty-five times; thirteen of those times he uses the word to signal factory workers. The sheer number of times that "hands" appears in these three chapters indicates that Dickens is playing with the meaning of the word. Rarely, over the course of these pages, does he ever use the word in its simplest meaning: the fingers and palm attached to the end of the arm via the wrist. Instead, he capitalizes the "H" and defines the word as meaning "a race who would have found more favour with some people, if Providence had seen fit to make them only hands" (103). Dickens use of race as a synonym for class alerts us to the great divide that existed between social classes; of course, Dickens does not use it innocently; it carries connotations of both extreme difference and savageness, representing a rhetorical move that is bound up in the division of labor, which is discussed in the final section of this chapter. The "some people" referred to are factory owners like

Mr. Bounderby, Stephen's employer. The success of Bounderby's factory depends on how well he controls the means of production, which is his work force comprised of laboring hands. As the laboring force is turned into mere hands by its employers, any capacity for individual thought is effectively removed -- there is no thinking organ here, a point to which I will return in my discussion of the effects of the factory system.

For Dickens, hands are, in their most fundamental sense, signifiers. In the third chapter of Stephen's introduction, Stephen returns to work after visiting Bounderby at home. Bounderby's mother, who admires her son only from a distance, stops Stephen at the factory door to inquire about Bounderby's health and overall well-being. Once she learns that Stephen works in her son's factory, she exclaims, "I must kiss the hand that has worked in this fine factory for a dozen year" (117). Through Stephen Dickens is mourning the loss of the laborer's body and his transformation into hands.

Nevertheless, there were writers who saw this amputation as offering a fabulous economic opportunity. They argued that machines were more reliable than humans and that paying unreliable humans is a waste of capital. In order to underscore that machines represent capital reinvested well, they anthropomorphized the machine to demonstrate that the mechanical hand was more regular, more consistent, and more productive than its human counterpart. In his book Industrial Biography (1863), Samuel Smiles – best known for his self-help ideology – lists the once-human tasks that the steam-engine is now capable of doing: "Yoked to

machinery of almost infinite variety . . . the Steam-engine pumps water, drives spindles, thrashes corn, prints books, hammers iron, ploughs land, saws timber, drives piles, impels ships, works railways, excavates docks" (333). Smiles's choice of verbs is human in action and in history. With the advent of the machine, though, Smiles envisions a society in which machines do the work of humans. Smiles implies that these tasks will make all areas of life easier, from home to travel to defense to education. What Smiles does not choose to recognize, however, is that as machines replace human workers, an entire group of laborers is left redundant.

Supporters of industrial capitalism saw the economic benefits of machine labor. In The Machinery Question and the Making of Political Economy (1980) Maxine Berg explains that Andrew Ure was the "writer who was to describe the immense possibilities for capitalist power in the machine and factory production . . . [and who] envisaged the fully automated factory that would bring complete control of production into the hands of the capitalist" (197). He endorsed the machine by first endowing the human laborer with bad personal and moral habits, then extending these habits to encompass work. In the beginning of The Philosophy of Manufactures (1835), Ure argues against the human element in manufacture because laborers are prone to passionate, violent outbursts "if addicted to liquor." Moreover, the drunken laborer, "after a visit to the beer-shop," will resume "his task with violence" and drive "his machine at a speed beyond the power" of the other laborers to follow (8-9). Once he demonstrated the inconsistent work habits of the human worker, he argued not only that machine labor was regularized but also that the machine existed outside the

realm of human morality. The machine would not succumb to human temptations, like alcohol, and to support his position, he points to the automatons of Vaucanson, who constructed a mechanical flute player and drummer that looked human as well as a duck that, once wound, "went through all its vital evolutions without needing to be touched" (11).[4] For Ure, a fully automated factory, uncorrupted by the disorderly human element, could increase production and, of course, profits. Furthermore, Smiles argued that "machines with millions of fingers work for millions of purchasers – for the poor as well as the rich; and while the machinery thus used enriches its owners, it no less enriches the public with its products" (332). What is glaringly absent from Samuel Smiles's endorsement of machines is any mention of how they fail to enrich those hands that tend the mechanical fingers. Of course, Smiles is implying that machines are some kind of social equalizer, granting access to a variety of mass-produced products for all classes, but in fact the rise of the machines and the factory system gave way to both a technical and social division of labor, which widened the gulf between classes.

By turning hands into machines and praising this new process of production as beneficial to all of society, industrial capitalists removed the human hand from the production of goods and thereby justified the effects of industrial capitalism. Furthermore, as Zimmerman explains, "The automaton presents itself as a machine with agency, and thus is a reified representation of a reified world in which relations

[4] Bizup note that Ure's "fascination with automated machinery arises as much from its uncanny appropriation of the qualities of organic life as from its technical efficiency," and Bizup points to Ure's mention of Vaucanson's automatons to illustrate this point (22).

of production appear to exist independently of socially related producers" (17). By giving the machine human hands, the industrialists both remove the laborer from his social and historical context and replace him with the machine. The use of the word "hand" to signal the body of labor used in the factory was already in place. Hands are, in Bruce Robbins's words, "the signs of work accomplished, productive value signified," even if they are essentially non-human (20). The industrial capitalists shifted "hand" from the human laborer to the nonhuman machine, thereby endowing the machine with human power. "Machinelike workers and the machines which control them by simulating (automating) them" are, according to Zimmerman, "ideological mystifications of a system of social relations" (24). Through this mystification, the laborer is removed from production as an active subject. His only job is to tend the machine's production or, in Ure's words, to guide "the work of mechanical fingers and arms, regularly impelled with great velocity by some indefatigable physical power" (14).

Charles Babbage, a mathematics professor at Cambridge University and the inventor of one of the first proto-computers, also lauded the benefits of the machine. He argues in On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures (1835) that machines are better able to regulate their work than are human laborers. Not only is it too difficult to organize many laborers into one laboring force, but also it is too difficult to have one worker perform a delicate task. Babbage explains that "it would be exceedingly difficult to discover whether each exerted his whole force, and consequently, to be assured that each man did the duty for which he was paid" (47).

Babbage implies that a human work force is both lazy and untrustworthy. Therefore, he argues, factories should employ machines as the labor force because "it is the same 'giant arm' which twists 'the largest cable,' that spins from the cotton plant an 'almost gossamer thread.' . . . It is the same engine that, in its more regulated action, weaves the canvass it may one day supersede; or, with almost fairy fingers, entwines the meshes of the most delicate fabric that adorns the female form" (49-50).[5] Unlike the laborer's hands, which Babbage has implicitly characterized as being both weak and clumsy, the machine's hands can accomplish a large variety of tasks. His use of "gossamer thread" to describe one of the delicate products of the machine implies an organic action. By first suggesting that machines have arms and then comparing the machine's arms to a spider's anatomy, Babbage doubly transforms the machine into a living thing. Furthermore, his use of "fairy fingers" implies that machines can manufacture fabric more delicate and, hence, more desirable (i.e. more expensive) than that made by a human weaver. The term "fairy fingers," moreover, takes the machine out of the realm of the human and into the realm of the supernatural, thus again removing machines and their products from human agency. Generally speaking, fairy lore presents fairies as beneficial to humans, completing tasks left undone at night and solving problems that humans cannot.[6]

The bottom line that Babbage endorses is that machines can do a better job much more cheaply than the human laborer, so the factory owner no longer needs to

[5] Tamara Ketabgian also makes use of the passage from Babbage ("The Human Prosthesis" 20).
[6] Babbage's "fairy" agency resembles Adam Smith's famous image of "the invisible hand" which regulates the economic marketplace.

worry about paying the laborer what his job is worth. When the laborer is only responsible for tending the machine, rather than producing the expensive fabric, the value of his labor is significantly reduced, thus warranting low wages and long hours. In Babbage's writing, as in Ure's, the machine has become fetishized, and Thomas Carlyle's great fears in "Signs of the Times" (1829) are realized in their writings. Carlyle states, "It is the Age of Machinery, in every outward and inward sense of that word. . . . The shuttle drops from the fingers of the weaver, and falls into iron fingers that ply it faster" (64). The iron fingers belong to the self-acting mule, which Ure calls the "Iron Man." Not only has the weaver become a hand, but also an anthropomorphized machine that works faster and more consistently has replaced him.

In order to ensure fast and consistent work, these machines were housed in factories, which gave rise to the factory system; large numbers of laborers were now congregated in an enclosed space, working as a production unit. Dickens characterizes factories in Coketown as "fairy palaces [that] burst into illumination, before pale morning showed the monstrous serpents of smoke trailing themselves over Coketown. A clattering of clogs upon the pavement; a rapid ringing of bells, and all the melancholy-mad elephants, polished and oiled up for the day's monotony, were at their heavy exercise again" (107). The use of "fairy palaces" directly conflicts with the monstrous smoke serpents and the monotony of the machines, grotesquely characterized as elephants; Dickens's description of the factory emphasizes its horrible routine and regularity that now characterize industrial labor.

In contrast to Babbage's image of "fairy fingers" and Dickens's "fairy palaces," factory owners used words like "body" and "hands" to create a whole production unit from the productive parts. In order to increase efficiency and productivity of the machines, employers believed that laborers needed discipline and organization. Seemingly innocent words such as "body" and "hands" rhetorically demand these ends. For example, the factory owner called the group of laborers a "body" of workers, to signify a cohesive whole. However, since these workers sold their labor to the capitalist, they were, essentially, his body of laborers, and he profited from the production of his hands. The success of the factory depended, in part, on the capitalist's control of production: how well he managed his work force. By transforming his individual laborers into a cohesive body, by owning the labor produced by that body, and by reducing that body to hands which performed only specialized functions, the factory owner could better control his work force. The implication of reducing a body of laborers to a body of hands is that what is left is a body that has no capacity for individual thought. The factory system, through the division of labor, amputated laborers from their complete knowledge of the production system and, in effect, turned them into factory hands that had no capacity for thought beyond completing the repetitive task at hand. Furthermore, the implication of a body made entirely of hands is both grotesque and dehumanizing.

David Landes explains that the rise of the factory system meant more than just machines and new technologies. With the Industrial Revolution also came a "transformation of the organization as well as the means of production." Specifically,

Landes points to "the assemblage of large bodies of workers in one place, there to accomplish their tasks under supervision and discipline" (114). In The Age of Manufactures (1980), Maxine Berg notes the vagueness of the word "factory." She explains that "while the rise of the factory system remains a vital pillar of our ideal of an industrial revolution, there is still no agreement about what a 'factory' was" (189). She cites Andrew Ure's definition of a factory as centralized technology as juxtaposed to another definition that focuses on centralized management rather than machines. Centralized management, according to Berg, implies a disciplined, unskilled working class and the division of labor (190). In exploring this second definition, control over the working class becomes more important than control over the natural world. But both definitions – centralized technology and centralized management – require a labor force that will not think for itself. What makes centralized technology work, for Ure at least, is the removal of the wayward laborer. Similarly, what makes centralized management work is a work force that understands uniform rules and regulations to be a natural and normal part of the work environment. The descriptions of riots in industrial novels and the fear of combinations in industrial writings underscore that the factory system was as much about controlling the labor force as it was about organizing production under one roof (Berg 197). The rules for conduct, the late penalties, the fear of termination, and the low wages, which meant that laborers had to work harder for less, served as insurance that the laboring class would not become unruly.[7] The word "hands" signifies this

[7]The Industrial Revolution increased production of goods, and so the price of goods decreased. With

demand for control. If an industrialist has a body of workers and calls that body his hands, then he suggests his control over that symbolic body as if they were his own hands. To call workers "hands" was one way of gaining discipline and control over a body that was feared to be unruly.

In order to remove the idiosyncratic nature of the laborer from the regularity of the factory, Andrew Ure, in Philosophy of Manufactures, defines the word "factory" to designate "the combined operation of many orders of work-people, adult and young, in tending with assiduous skill a system of productive machines continuously impelled by a central power" (13).[8] The human element of the factory, the workpeople, Ure buries as the object of a preposition that is the object of a preposition. These laborers then tend the machines that produce the goods. No longer are the laborers responsible for the production; rather, they are to act as shepherds of the machines, as the gerund "tending" suggests. However, the pre-industrial, pastoral connotations of "tending" are removed because the worker does not occupy a position of power over the machine. Instead, the laborer is at the mercy of the machine that is powered by a "central power," which is literally a steam engine and figuratively a thinking organ. For Ure, the real trouble with fulfilling this vision of the factory inhabited by machines with automatons would not be inventing a

---

the increase in production coupled with the decrease in cost of buying, the working classes producing cheap goods pays the price in the form of lower wages. The capitalist motto is buy cheap sell high. The capitalist then reinvests the profits in his factory, buying more machines or production supplies to increase his production base. Increasing his base means employing more labor – but since profit drives production, he pays them low wages. Ironically, low wages were also one way to keep factory workers working, or so capitalist employers believed. Poor wages keep production costs down.

[8] For additional commentary on Ure's definition of "factory," see Zimmerman, who notes that "Ure does not advocate this system on the basis of its greater productivity, but rather because it deskills workers" (11-12).

machine that could twist cotton into one continuous thread; rather, the problem would lie in "training human beings to renounce their desultory habits of work, and to identify themselves with the unvarying regularity of the complex automaton" (15). For Ure, the most troublesome aspect of the factory system, which organized and disciplined the labor force, was the labor force. Without the human element, the machines could mass-produce goods without a hitch.

According to Keith Tribe, in Genealogies of Capitalism (1981), Ure, in his definition of "factory," is firm in his exclusion of all "enterprises not based on machine technology and centralized power" (109). Furthermore, this exclusion "takes the problem of machinery and labour further . . . and locates the conflict as between labourers on the one hand, and the owners, not simply of a new technology, but of a new system of economic organisation and social domination" (109). In Hard Times, Dickens comments on this new organization that removes the thinking capabilities from the laboring force. He states that the laborer belonged to "a race who would have found more favour with some people, if Providence had seen fit to make them only hands or like the lower creatures of the sea-shore, only hands and stomachs" (103). The "some people" that Dickens refers to here are those members of the middle and upper classes, like Mr. Bounderby, Stephen's boss and owner of the factory, who manufacture the working class in their own image. Mr. Bounderby thinks that all Hands in his factory think they deserve venison and gold spoons – when Stephen interrupts his lunch, Bounderby is eating chops and drinking sherry. The sea creatures, like sea cucumbers, anemones, and corals, are comprised of two

main parts: tentacles with which to grab food and a stomach in which to digest it. By suggesting that the upper classes would like the working classes to be simply hands with stomachs, in the likeness of sea creatures, Dickens draws attention to the industrial demand that the laborer lack an individual intelligence.

In Capital, Karl Marx states that within the factory system, the division of labor

> converts the labourer into a crippled monstrosity, by forcing his detail dexterity at the expense of a world of productive capabilities and instincts; just as in the States of La Plata they butcher a whole beast for the sake of his hide or his tallow. Not only is the detail work distributed to the different individuals, but the individual himself is made the automatic motor of a fractional operation, and the absurd fable of Menenius [sic.] Agrippa, which makes man a mere fragment of his own body, becomes realized. (360).

Here, Marx's "crippled monstrosity" has connotations of a gothic dehumanization; the new economic system, characterized by machines, factories, and the division of labor, turns men into monsters not unlike bodies made entirely of hands or hands joined to stomachs. Marx even footnotes this passage, stating, "In corals, each individual is, in fact, the stomach of the whole group; but it supplies the group with nourishment, instead of, like the Roman patrician, withdrawing it" (360). Coral is the common name for members of a large class of marine invertebrates, which are colonial in nature. Individual corals secrete calcium carbonate, forming skeletal cups

that anchor and protect the polyps. At night the polyps' tentacles extend from the cup, seize plankton that wash against them, and carry them to the mouth. Both Dickens's and Marx's metaphors – comparing the laboring hand with coral – deserve some attention.

In Dickens's comparison, it is the employers, like Bounderby, who see laborers as corals, "the lower creatures of the seashore." This comparison implies that the two functions of the laboring hand are producing labor and fueling it, much as the coral produce the calcium carbonate protective skeleton. However, whereas the coral's skeleton serves not only as protection from predators but also as a home, the laboring hand has no such luck. Nightly, Stephen returns to his lodging above a shop that sells "wretched little toys, mixed up with cheap newspapers and pork" (106). Marx's metaphor, which is a sympathetic comparison, suggests that even though the laborer has been fragmented, there exists a sense of community – each coral supplies the colony with plankton.

One reason for why the factory system by means of the division of labor "converts the labourer into a crippled monstrosity" stems from one fear of the employer: the fear of failure. According to Ure, the knowledgeable laborer has the potential power to disrupt the entire production process simply because he has production skills. Certainly, phrases that pepper this literature (like "desultory habits", the "self-willed and intractable" worker, "the more or less recalcitrant laborer", the "lazy and untrustworthy" workforce, and "the wayward labourer") all suggest that labours may have subverted or resisted the systems of regulation imposed

upon them. Indeed, James Scott in Domination and the Arts of Resistance (1990) has studied the ways in which marginalized groups have engaged in the "politics of resistance" (17). Moreover, the fear of riots, combinations, and machine smashing that characterize much of this literature suggests that the laboring class engaged in expressions of worker intractability and self-will. Ure reasoned that "by the infirmity of human nature, it happens that the more skilful the workman, the more self-willed and intractable he is apt to become" (20). What Ure is implying is that workmen, when using their own power, will not allow themselves to be controlled by the regularity of the machine. The effects of this self-willed behavior for the industrialist had the potential of being a dire crisis: without a controlled, reliable, and efficient production force, industrialization could fail, and the industrialist could become bankrupt. Therefore, in order that production be regulated, the laborer must not be seen as responsible for the production of goods, so the rhetoric transforms the laborer into unthinking hand that is only responsible for its small production task.

Ure explains, "Manufacture is a word, which, in the vicissitude of language, has come to signify the reverse of its intrinsic meaning, for it now denotes every extensive product of art which is made by machinery, with little or no aid of the human hand, so that the most perfect manufacture is that which dispenses entirely with manual labor" (1).[9] The inherent meaning to which Ure alludes is that man used

[9] About Ure's tendency to flagrantly promote industry and industrialization, Joseph Bizup states, "Among nineteenth-century critics of the factory system . . . Ure was regarded not as a reliable authority but as a flagrantly preindustrial propagandist who demanded vigorous refutation. His notoriety derived not merely from his advocacy of the systematic substitution of self-acting machinery for human "hands" but also from the elevated language in which he expresses his utopian vision of total automaton" (21). And Bizup points to this quotation as an apt example of Ure's tendency.

to be responsible for production in the process of *man*ufacture. In fact, the "man" in "manufacture" comes from the Latin for "hand," so it literally meant made by hand. In the above passage, Ure notes the reversal the original meaning: machines, not hands nor men, now signal production. Andrew Zimmerman uses the word "machinofacture" to signal this phenomenon (6). Not only must the machine become the productive hand, but also Ure describes the products created by it as "products of art." However, "art" here unintentionally carries ironic connotations. Art in this era was associated with either imaginative or highly skilled work. Writing during this period, Peter Gaskell, in Artisans and Machinery (1836), explains that "the term artisan will shortly be a misnomer as applied to the operative; he will no longer be a man proud of his skill and ingenuity, and conscious that he is a valuable member of society; he will have lost all free agency, and will be as much a part of the machines around him as the wheels on cranks which communicate motion" (358). The machine brought, according to Maxine Berg's analysis of Adam Smith, a "*breakdow*n of craft" (33). This breakdown in turn led to "the material basis for a separation between mental and manual labour" (33). Due to the factory system and its organizing principle, the division of labor, the laboring hand no longer has the capacity to understand the entire production process – rhetorically he has no brain and literally he does not possess the skill.

In addition to stripping the laborer of his capacity for independent thought, one of the effects of the breakdown of handicraft due to the division of labor was the mass production of identical things. Some critics, like Thomas Carlyle and John

Ruskin, protested the sameness and sterility of mass produced goods, while others, like Charles Babbage, lauded mass production because everything that came off the line was the same. Babbage commented on the accuracy of machinofacture: "Nothing is more remarkable, and yet less unexpected, than the perfect identity of things manufactured by the same tool" (66). While this seems like a fairly commonplace observation on the part of Babbage, the economic implications are quite large. Babbage continues to comment that if a highly skilled workman were to try and produce a steel cylinder, "the time which this would require would be so considerable, and the number of failures would probably be so great, that for all practical purposes such a mode of producing a steel cylinder might be said to be impossible" (67). Babbage saw the division of labour as a significant feature of the factory. The importance of this passage is not so much that such a production method would be impossible as much as such a method would cost more, in terms of labor used to produce one product, than it is worth.

The Gothic Revival, spear-headed in the literary world by Carlyle and later Ruskin, was a movement formed in reaction to the mass production of ugly and non-imaginative goods. In "Signs of the Times" Carlyle worries that "the same habit regulates not our modes of action alone, but our modes of thought and feeling. Men are grown mechanical in head and heart, as well as in hand" (67). Here, Carlyle is alluding to the social effects of the factory system and the technical division of labor – the regulation of hours, the process of production, and the laborer's physical movements. Unlike Ure, who welcomes the automaton, Carlyle's mechanical hand is

a symbol not only for the exploitation of the laborer but also of the dehumanization of society, resulting from industrialization. Igor Webb, in his study of the Industrial Revolution and the novel, explains that as the classes diverged, "one class increasingly became invisible to the other, or at best put out of mind. The laborers, once intimate with their employers, now suffered a kind of exile into their narrowed community; familiarity gave way to distance" (39-40).

The title of Benjamin Disraeli's industrial novel, Sybil, or The Two Nations (1845), illustrates this great social divide. Bound up in Howsbawm's notion of "pre-industrial rhythms of work" is the complexity of the social relationship between the landowner and the laborer. In exchange for land, protection, and a dwelling from the landowner, the laborer worked the land. Hobsbawm explains that this relationship implied "duties on both sides, though very unequal ones" (85). With the shift from an agriculturally-based economy to an industrial one, the relationship between the laborer and the landowner was transformed from one that was at least supposed to be socially reciprocal to one based on an exchange of services for wages determined by time spent producing goods.

In "The Nature of Gothic" (1852) John Ruskin criticizes the materialistic tendency of the consumer, which stems from buying cheap, mass-produced goods. Ruskin isolates the six characteristics of the gothic: savageness, changefulness, naturalism, grotesqueness, rigidity, and redundance (216). For Ruskin, savageness is the most important characteristic that makes an object truly gothic because it indicates that the object has obviously been made by hand; it has some rough-hewn

quality, which, for Ruskin, is indicative of a thoughtful, creative process. In his explanation of savageness, Ruskin argues that man can be taught to perform technical skills, like drawing and cutting lines or forms. However, once the man is asked to think about those forms, "he stops; his execution becomes hesitating; he thinks, and ten to one he thinks wrong; ten to one he makes a mistake in the first touch he gives to his work as a thinking being. But you have made a man of him for all that. He was only a machine before, an animated tool" (222). The most important aspect of production for Ruskin is the thought process of the laborer, which is erased by the factory system and replaced by a thoughtless repetition in the form of the division of labor:

> We have much studied and much perfected, of late, the great civilized invention of the division of labor; only we give it a false name. It is not, truly speaking, the labor that is divided; but the men: -- Divided into mere segments of men – broken into small fragments and crumbs of life, so that all the little piece of intelligence that is left in a man is not enough to make a pin, or a nail, but exhausts itself in making the point of a pin or the head of a nail. (226)[10]

The technical division implies a deskilling of labor: his general knowledge of the production process is erased and replaced with the specialized knowledge of one part

[10] In the above quotation, Ruskin uses as his example the manufacturing of a pin, which echoes Adam Smith's example of the pin factory, his model for the technical division of labor. In The Wealth of Nations, Smith breaks down the production of a pin into eighteen distinct tasks: "one man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head require two or three distinct operations, to put it on, is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper" (4).

of the process. Rather than having an intimate knowledge of the entire spinning process, from shearing the sheep to spinning the fibers into yarn, the worker now only knows one step in the process. The technical division of labor also ensures that commodities are mass produced and, hence, identical. In the rhetoric of the Industrial Revolution, the synecdoche "hand' replaces the laborer and resembles the replacement of general knowledge for one specific task. The implication of "hands" in this context is that a body made of hands does not have a thinking organ: it does not control itself. So the word "hand" is a symbol for the technical division of labor: as the laborer's knowledge of the production process is fragmented, so his hands are figuratively amputated from his body. As these hands form a single productive unit, they are also figuratively transformed into a freakish whole, as Dickens's figure of a laborer made only of a hand and a stomach implies.

While the technical division of labor divides the production process into small tasks, social division of labor divides men into employers and laborers—those who have access to capital and those who do not. Those who possess capital control the production of goods; those who have none sell their labor. This marked division of labor led to a more marked class division. One of the implications of reducing laborers to hands is that it is one rhetorical way for the upper classes to legitimize their social superiority. Richard Dennis explains this legitimation in English Industrial Cities of the Nineteenth Century (1984):

> As the rich lost their influence, so it was assumed that an undifferentiated poor would be led astray by the least desirable

> elements in its own ranks . . . this model, or elements of it, underlay the writing of many middle-class commentators. What they wrote reflected what they looked for, and what they looked for was evidence of the segregation of their own (upper-middle) class from the rest of society, and of the mixing of different elements within the labouring classes. (49)

Any of the middle-class writings about the Industrial Revolution, whether they laud industry or demonstrate concern for the effects of industrialization on the working classes, use this rhetoric to demonstrate their separation from the working classes. This kind of rhetoric is bound up in the nineteenth-century idiom "hands."

Elizabeth Gaskell, in her industrial novel North and South, explores the contemporary rhetoric used by capitalists in defending their superior position while also dehumanizing their laborers. Gaskell's industrialist is Mr. Thornton, a self-made capitalist who owns his own cotton mill. Margaret Hale and her father both occupy the position of industrial critic. In a series of conversations about industry and the position of workers as juxtaposed to that of employers, Thornton and the Hales both use and comment on the popular idioms used when discussing the working classes. For example, in an early conversation in the novel, Margaret states, "But he [Higgins] – that is my informant – spoke as if the masters would like their hands to be merely

tall, large children – living in the present moment with a blind unreasoning kind of obedience" (166).[11]

Thornton responds to Higgins's indirect quotation by saying, "My theory is, that my interests are identical with those of my workpeople, and vice-versa. Miss Hale, I know, does not like to hear men called 'hands,' so I won't use that word, though it comes most readily to my lips as the technical term, whose origin, whatever it was, dates before my time" (167). Thornton simply dismisses "hands" as a "technical term" as he uses it. Ironically, as he utters "hands," he claims that he will refrain from using it. Furthermore, Thornton refuses to take responsibility for the implications of the term when he explains that it predates him. Thornton's interests are decidedly not identical with those of his workers. As a capitalist, Thornton needs to produce his product at a cost that will allow him to compete with other markets. Thornton notes, "[T]he Americans are getting their yarns so into the general market . . . our only chance is producing them at a lower rate" (195). Thornton's workers, conversely, are concerned with earning a wage that can sustain their families.

In his introduction of Stephen Blackpool and the neighborhood in which he lives, Dickens draws attention to the effects of the social division of labor. The "hardest working part of Coketown" is characterized in such a way as to suggest the chaos apparent there:

---

[11] Children turned into fact-spewing numbers is a situation analogous to workers turned into hands. In fact, Dickens satirizes the former by likening the training of a teacher to the factory system when he details Mr. M'Choakumchild's training: "He had some one hundred and forty other schoolmasters, had been lately turned at the same time, in the same factory, on the same principles, like so many pianoforte legs" (52-3).

> In the hardest working part of Coketown; in the innermost fortifications of that ugly citadel, where Nature was as strongly bricked out as killing airs and gases were bricked in; at the heart of the labyrinth of narrow courts upon courts, and close streets upon streets, which had come into existence piecemeal, every piece in a violent hurry for some one man's purpose, and the whole an unnatural family, shouldering, and trampling, and pressing one another to death; in the last close nook of this great exhausted receiver, where the chimneys, for want of air to make a draught, were build in an immense variety of stunted and crooked shapes as though every house put out a sign of the kind of people who might be expected to be born in it, among the multitude of Coketown, generically called 'the Hands', -- a race who would have found more favour with some people, if Providence had seen fit to make them only hands, or, like the lower creatures of the seashore, only hands and stomachs – like a certain Stephen Blackpool, forty years of age. (102-3)

The length and structure of this periodic sentence, with its tangled prepositional phrases, labyrinthine dependent clauses, and delayed resolution, represent the slum itself – an urban effect of the social division of labor. Dickens's extremely long introductory sentence is thrown together with stops and starts, semi-colons, prepositional phrases, gerunds, dependent clauses. The fact that this part of Coketown is thrown together "for some one man's purpose" underscores the greed

and self-servedness that characterizes Dickens's portrayal of the industrial capitalist, who is interested only in what his Hands can produce for him. While the form also represents the social division of labor, the content illustrates the effects of that division – Stephen's neighborhood is unnatural and, Dickens implies, unfit for human habitation.

Conversely, Mr. Bounderby lives in "a red house with black outside shutters, green inside blinds, a black street door, up two white steps, BOUNDERBY (in letters very like himself) upon a brazen plate, and a round brazed door-handle underneath it like a brazen full-stop" (108). When juxtaposed together, the structure of two descriptions signal what it is that they are describing. On one hand, the laboring-class part of Coketown – the place the Hands occupy – is chaotic, with no perceivable form; it is thrown together. On the other hand, Mr. Bounderby's house is all orderly and organized. What Dickens is trying to show is the vast separation, and even segregation, of classes within the same urban area. What his description does not reveal, though, is that Hands and masters really occupy the same physical, urban space. It is not a long walk from Bounderby's factory to his house; nor is it a long walk from the factory to Stephen's home. Richard Dennis argues that, with the exception of Manchester, employers and employees were not significantly segregated, as Dickens portrait would suggest. In fact, Dennis suggests that these two classes actually lived in the same urban space. "Yet despite the proximity of rich and poor homes, and despite the use of the same areas by rich and poor, their experience was of minimal social interaction. The rich employed a variety of strategies,

consciously or unconsciously, to ensure that contact with the poor remained minimal" (Dennis 77).

As with his description of the various class areas of Coketown, Dickens also uses the word "Hands" to signal such a dehumanization. It not only signifies the amputation and fragmentation of the worker's body but also signals the dehumanization of the laborer. In these three chapters, this is best illustrated when Stephen visits Bounderby looking for advice on his alcoholic wife. Of the thirteen times "Hands" is used to mean workers, Mr. Bounderby uses it six times. He believes that some Hands "expect to be set up in a coach and six, and to be fed on turtle soup and venison, with a gold spoon" (109). Of course, Mr. Bounderby is making his Hands in his own image: those are the signifiers of class that Mr. Bounderby expects for himself. Ironically, the word "Hand," as it signals the dehumanization and the social division of labor, also underscores the need that the upper class has for the lower class, even though they cannot stand that need. Without the work produced by their Hands, the factory owners would not have the lifestyle they have. Ironically, then, as the word "Hands" serves to fragment the worker's body, erase his knowledge of his skill, and turn him into a freak of nature, so it simultaneously serves to show the dependence of one class on another.

Chapter Two:

Transforming Machines into Gods: The Religion of Science and Industry

In the Philosophy of Manufactures (1835) Andrew Ure fulfills his vision of the unruly laborer transformed into a regularized and efficient machine. Ure argues that laborers will become "useful hands" when they are trained "to renounce their desultory habits of work, and to identify themselves with the unvarying regularity of the complex automaton" (15). For Ure, the effects of the machine and of the factory system have an organizing benefit for the hands that tend the machines. Ure's choice of words, such as "renounce," "desultory," "identify," and "regularity," works not only to explain how the technology of industrialism can regularize the otherwise unruly hand but also to establish a discourse of industrialism.

In the previous chapter, I examined the implications bound up with the transformation of laborers into hands. What I am interested in examining in this chapter is the creation of a discourse of industrialism by which the hand is transformed into a machine that is then transformed into a god through its associations with a variety of mythological images. For example, several writers use the Roman god Minerva to explain the advent of the steam-powered machine. Andrew Ure compares Richard Arkwright to the Greek god Prometheus. Peter Gaskell and Ure both use the Roman figure of Hercules to discuss the origin of manufactures. Thomas Carlyle uses the Titans to critique nineteenth-century industrial progress. Charles Babbage uses myths of Jesus to discuss the power of the machine. Leon Faucher even refigures the Genesis story to discuss the

transformation of cotton into cloth. Charlotte Brontë, in Shirley (1848), uses both Greco-Roman and Christian images to criticize her industrial hero, for whom industry has become a religion; this novel is an examination of the sacrifice of the laborer for the promise of industrial progress. My task in this chapter is to consider how these ancient mythological figures and Christian images are being refigured in the nineteenth-century industrial context.[12]

In addition, I am concerned in this chapter to trace how this plethora of ancient mythological figures are essentially lumped together without any sense of cultural or religious differentiation, as if they are all part of one image bank. I will also discuss the significance of the loose, syncretic way of treating all mythological figures as part of this image bank, the purpose of which is to create a discourse of industrialism. This discourse consecrates a religion of science and industry – one that serves to ordain a new order of creation in which workers become hands and industrialists and machines become gods; in which history vanishes in the face of innovation and progress; and in which laborers serve, even worship, machines. This discourse on industrialism removes machines from the realm of the human and,

[12] These kinds of transformations – hands into machines into gods – were quite useful in the nineteenth century to discussions and debates about industrialization because most educated men shared a classical education. So the allusions to Greco-Roman mythology served as a device to mark the separation of the classes, even as they were used to discuss the effects of industrialization. Frank Turner explains that the fascination with and embracing of Greek language and culture in nineteenth-century schools was based on the "new and powerful role that Hellenism offered in the ideological maintenance of the ruling class" ("Why the Greeks" 62). Turner explains that this kind of knowledge provided "a frame of cultural reference for discussion and debate . . . [in] a relatively safe forum wherein the educated elite could in a more or less exclusive manner explore potentially disruptive modern public topics that were carefully concealed in the garb of the ancients" ("Why the Greeks" 63-4). The Greco-Roman tradition offered itself as a safe forum for the upper classes to explore topics like the effects of the machine and of industrialization because this rhetoric defused hot-button issues so that the educated elite could politely discuss them.

hence, draws attention away from a class system and a political economy of industry by treating industry as supernatural.

Ure's use of this industrial discourse mythologizes the machine and the factory system. Moreover, it not only gives the machine and the factory system a new fantastic, fabulous history, but it also endows them with god-like, supernatural capabilities. For example, Ure states:

> In those spacious halls the benignant power of steam summons around him his myriads of willing menials, and assigns to each the regulated task, substituting for painful muscular effort on their part, the energies of his own gigantic arm, and demanding in return only attention and dexterity to correct such little aberrations as casually occur in his workmanship. The gentle docility of this moving force qualifies it for impelling the tiny bobbins of the lace-machine with a precision and speed inimitable by the most dexterous hands, directed by the sharpest eyes. (18)

Here, the process – by which a laborer becomes a hand, which becomes a machine, which becomes supernatural – reaches fruition. In this particular retelling, or myth, it is steam that has the supernatural power to animate machines. The "willing menials" are servants of that power. Steam, as it is personified here, takes on the characteristics of a benevolent god: it is all-powerful; it has the power to heal; it demands attention; yet it is gentle and concerned with the minutiae of its world. In this passage, and in others to come in this chapter, there is an underlying sense that,

because laborers serve as part of the machine's ultimately supernatural operation, they themselves are subject to the process of deification. However they are incorporated into the magical whole though, this description still marginalizes the laborer's role by referring to them as "menials" and "hands." As it is used here, "hands" carries a double connotation: a physical body part and a metonymy for the laborer himself. While laborers are integral to the entire picture, which deifies the machine, and this text also locates strategies for making them contingent, as though they are afterthoughts or dangling elements in the entire process.

In another passage, Ure writes, "It is in the cotton mill, however, that the perfection of automatic industry is to be seen; it is there that the elemental powers have been made to animate millions of complex organs, infusing into forms of wood, iron, and brass an intelligent agency" (2). Ure's argument is teleological in nature because he is explaining the cotton mill in terms of its final end, the perfection of automatic industry. Teleology is based on the proposition that the universe has design and purpose. In Christian theology, teleology argues that if the world's design is intelligent, then an ultimate Designer must exist. What Ure is inventing here is a religion of science and industry that functions on the same basic teleological principles as the Christian religion – not unlike Auguste Comte's attempt to create a Religion of Humanity, which had been called "Catholicism minus Christianity" (Reardon 234). Presumably, the "elemental powers" are fire and water, which produce the steam necessary to power the machine. But by calling them "elemental powers" Ure complicates the fact that they are, simply, fire and water because he

endows them with a god-like capability to turn machines into intelligent beings. For Ure, these powers have supernatural abilities. Ure's machine has become an intelligent and active producer of material goods. So even behind the all-powerful image of Steam in the previous quotation is an even greater supernatural force at work engaged in the power of creation.

In the beginning of his chapter of Capital entitled "The Fetishism of Commodities," Karl Marx takes Ure's transformatory rhetoric to its logical conclusion. Marx states:

> It is as clear as noon-day, that man, by his industry, changes the forms of the materials furnished by Nature, in such a way as to make them useful to him. The form of wood, for instance, is altered, by making a table out of it. Yet, for all that, the table continues to be that common, every-day thing, wood. But, so soon as it steps forth as a commodity, it is changed into something transcendent. It not only stands with its feet on the ground, but in relation to all other commodities, it stands on its head, and evolves out of its wooden brain grotesque ideas, far more wonderful than "table-turning" ever was. (71)

As Marx uses it here, fetishism applies to a form of religious belief and practice in which supernatural attributes are placed on material, inanimate objects. The fetish is usually a figure modeled or carved from clay, stone, wood, glass, or other material in imitation of a deified object. Ure's discourse is an example of Marx's fetishism (Marx even characterizes the "character of commodities" as "mystical") in that Ure

transposes mythological properties onto material things, therefore by-passing both their social history and their social effects. For Marx, commodities, as things in and of themselves, make it difficult to see the human relationships – like that which exists between capitalist and laborer – that produce them. The commodity does not reveal the labor that produced it – and rightly so, according to Ure. For him, a machine produces the commodity; the laborer has no active, or important, part in the process. The only way for human industry to become active, productive, and important is, ironically, by embracing a passive role in production. Ure explains that human industry would become vastly productive "when no longer proportioned in its results to muscular effort, which by its nature is fitful and capricious, but when made to consist in the task of guiding the work of mechanical fingers and arms, regularly impelled with great velocity by some indefatigable physical power" (14). The commodity produced is fetishized as the product of fire and water – the indefatigable physical power – not of human beings or even human hands but of mechanical fingers and arms.

Igor Webb, in From Custom to Capital (1981), refers to Ure's tendency, demonstrated in the passages above, to turn machines into mystical beings. Webb states, "For Ure the nature of progress became suddenly mystical. . . . That this mystification is integral to Ure's role as an apologist for a new ascendant system becomes immediately clear when we follow him from his dismissal of labor to his dismissal of laborers," a dismissal which happens when Ure transforms human laborers into mechanical fingers and arms (32). Webb explains that studying the

history of economic thought through writers like Ure is especially useful when we see their writings "as critical efforts to interpret and define a developing social transformation" (29).[13] Moreover, this discourse on industrialism also demonstrates ideological efforts to maintain and control that social transformation by a variety of means.

We know that the Industrial Revolution changed the face of the English physical landscape and its social body. With the development of industry came a new way to figure the traditional social structure, as the above passages from Ure make clear. In Technics and Civilization (1934), Lewis Mumford analyzes this social transformation from a feudal society to an industrial one. He states:

> Before the machine pervaded life, order was the boast of the gods and absolute monarchs. Both the deity and his representatives on earth had, however, the misfortune to be inscrutable in their judgment and frequently capricious and cruel in their assertion of mastery. On the human level, their order was represented by slavery: complete determination from above: complete subservience without question or understanding below. Behind the gods and the absolute monarchs stood brute nature itself, filled with demons, djinns, trolls, giants, contesting the reign of the gods. (326)

[13] In addition to Webb, Maxine Berg also uses the work "mystical" to refer to Ure's definition of the factory. She states that "in Andrew Ure's mind, the factory had taken on distinctly mystical qualities: 'the idea of a vast automaton, composed of various mechanical and intellectual organs, acting in uninterrupted concert for the production of a common object, all of them being subordinated to a self regulated moving force'" (199).

With his colorful language, Mumford comments on the historical belief in the divine right of kings, a belief which legitimized the social structure embodied in the Great Chain of Being. His references to the mythological creatures thought to have occupied Nature bear reference to the fear of the unknown, and his comment is quite mythological itself, even though he is a twentieth-century writer. One reason people tell stories and constructs mythologies is to explain the unexplainable. Mumford goes on to state that

> [w]ith the development of the sciences and with the articulation of the machine in practical life, the realm of order was transferred from the absolute rulers, exercising a personal control, to the universe of impersonal nature and to the particular group of artifacts and customs we call the machine. (326)

For Mumford, science here takes the place of traditional religion, much as it does in Comte's Religion of Humanity. Science is empirical, positive truth, in contrast to myth, which, Mumford implies, is not a reliable means of representation, especially as it is characterized by demons, djinns, trolls, and giants. Mumford comments here on the transference of power that occurred in the shift from the feudal society to the industrial one. As Mumford explains, the science and industry that gave rise to the machine put an end to the need for mythological explanations.

Nevertheless, that mythology does not give way to science in the discourse on industrialism. Instead, it is used as a resource for symbolically controlling workers and erasing history. Mumford argues that with the advent of the machine, the

preservation of social order was transferred from the absolute ruler to the machine itself. He seems to be noting an epistemic shift in the conception and maintenance of the social hierarchy. No longer were the Great Chain of Being and the Divine Right of Kings responsible for order. Nevertheless, the nineteenth-century discourse on industrialism, with its foundation in mythic images, suggests that the control determined by the Great Chain of Being and the Divine Right of Kings was simply reassigned to another god-like power, the machine – an image which discursively retains all the supernatural powers associated with the earlier sovereign powers**.**

In the Grundrisse (1857), Marx clarifies how mythology works to explain human's origins as well as his interaction with the natural world: "All mythology masters and dominates and shapes the forces of nature in and through the imagination: hence it disappears as soon as man gains mastery over the forces of nature" (394). The way that Marx characterizes the function of mythology here, as disappearing into the cultural imagination once it has been used, is akin to the way that he describes the transformation of natural material into a commodity. Once the wood has become a table, Marx argues, it ceases to be perceived as wood and becomes, instead, a commodity with near supernatural attributes: it becomes a fetish. In the above quotation, Marx means that a society's system of myths is used to explain how man interacts with the natural world. As soon as man has dominated the natural world, Marx argues, the mythological figures disappear or recede into the background of the collective cultural memory. Nevertheless, the way writers like Ure use myth and appropriate mythological figures in the creation of new mythologies

suggests that Marx's explanation is too simple. There are two different senses of the word "disappear" operative here. The first sense, which fits Marx's analysis of the commodity, is of becoming invisible while still being present. The second sense is to be left behind altogether, which is what Marx really seems to be suggesting about mythology. These figures have not disappeared as much as they have been refigured or even, in Marx's own words, fetishized. As Marx himself notes, wood continues to be wood even though it has been endowed with some kind of religious or supernatural significance through the process of manufacture. Even as he argues that myth disappears in the face of science, myth continues to function as myth: the mythic images now function in a religion of science and industry. While Marx means the second sense of the word "disappear," he ought to mean the first – essentially, applying his logic about commodities to the historical process of scientific secularization.

To illustrate how mythology seems to disappear in the face of science and technology, Marx questions, "Is the view of nature and of social relations which shaped Greek imagination and Greek art possible in the age of automatic machinery and railways and locomotives and electric telegraphs? Where does Vulcan come in as against Roberts & Co.? Jupiter, as against the lightning conductor? and Hermes, as against the *Crèdit Mobilier*?" (394). The rhetorical answer to Marx's first question is, of course, no; the ancient Greek views of nature and social relations shaped their own art and mythology. Nevertheless, nineteenth-century industrial writers actively refigured images from Greek imagination and art (as well as from

other myth systems) to explain what happens to nineteenth-century nature and social relations in the wake of automatic machinery, railways, locomotives, and electric telegraphs. Marx aligns Vulcan, the god of fire, with Roberts & Co., which is his generic name for a factory powered by steam; he associates Jupiter, whose sign is a lightning bolt, with the lightning rod; and he pairs Hermes, the god of commerce, invention, cunning, and theft, with a bank. The factory, the lightning rod, and the bank can all be ways to explain human's interaction with or domination of nature as well as his interaction with or domination of other men. As Marx's own writing shows, then, the ancient myths have not disappeared; they have just been transformed into more modern figures, and these modern mythical figures have fantastic powers as well. Through the division of labor, the factory can turn a laboring man into a hand and strip him of his creativity; by conducting electricity, the lightning rod has the power to prevent damage; and, perhaps most magical of all, with laissez-faire capitalism, the bank has the power to create, move, invest, and lose wealth. These nineteenth-century images – the factory, the lightning rod, and the bank – form a new holy trinity. They are symbols for industrial manufacture, industrial invention, and industrial capital.

In this era, one of the most popular refigured Greco-Roman images is the birth of the Minerva, goddess of wisdom, arts, trade, industry, and war. Typically, it is used to explain the advent of the industrial machine. For instance, William Cooke Taylor, in his Notes on a Tour of the Manufacturing District (1842), exclaims:

> The steam-engine had no precedent, the spinning-jenny is without ancestry, the mule and the power-loom entered on no prepared heritage: they sprang into sudden existence like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter, passing so rapidly through their stage of infancy that they had taken their position in the world and firmly established themselves before there was time to prepare a place for their reception. (4)

Of course, Cooke Taylor is aware that Thomas Newcomen in 1705 invented the first steam engine, on which James Watt made improvements in 1769. In 1801, Richard Trevithick made improvements on Watt's engine: Trevithick invented the first steam-propelled passenger car, and in 1804 he made the first use of steam in hauling loads of iron on the railway. Furthermore, Cooke Taylor must have been aware that James Hargreaves invented the spinning jenny in 1764 and patented it in 1770. He must have known that in 1779, Samuel Crompton invented the spinning mule, which was an improvement on Hargreaves's spinning jenny, and that Edmund Cartwright invented the power-loom in 1785. Despite their genealogies, however, Cooke Taylor insists that these machines "entered on no prepared heritage."

In a similar rhetorical turn, Leon Faucher, in his study of Manchester in the mid 1840's, likens "the birth of the manufacturing system" to "the birth of Minerva," explaining that it "was sudden and complete; and in less than a century, its colossal, if not harmonious, proportions were fully developed" (3). Significantly, the comparison between Minerva and the factory system implies that the factory system miraculously

came into being all at once as opposed to being wrought by the work of hands. Like the factories themselves, this kind of rhetoric is engaged in a system of production: a discursive system that produces a social history that seems to exist outside of the realm of society and, therefore, may seem to justify contemporary political, economic, and class structures.

Both Cooke Taylor and Faucher characterize the machine as a superhuman force that has no apparent connection to the human world, either in its invention or its development. In The Making of the English Working Class (1963), E. P. Thompson points out one problem with this sort of characterization: "[T]oo much emphasis upon the newness of the cotton-mills can lead to an underestimation of the continuity of political and cultural traditions" (193). While Thompson is discussing the use of the cotton industry as a model instance of industrial exploitation, his point also comments, more generally, on the rhetorical tendency to present the machine and the manufacturing system as not having a social history or development. In fact, the series of inventions covered, roughly, one hundred years. While the invention of machines spanned about fifty years, from the invention of the flying shuttle in the 1730s to Cartwright's invention of the power loom in 1785, the application of machines to full-fledged factories took another sixty. As Eric Hobsbawm explains in Industry and Empire (1968), after the power-loom was invented, "[T]his branch of manufacture was not mechanized on any scale until after the Napoleonic Wars" (59). Even then the factories were usually confined to certain geographical areas, specifically in Lancashire, Glasgow, and Manchester.

Still, the use of Minerva to comment on the advent of machines and the manufacturing system is a particularly appropriate one, considering the subtext of defensive war linked to her name. Although the term "Industrial Revolution" wasn't coined until 1881, the associations between industry and war were already being made in the early part of the century. In the Preface to The Philosophy of Manufactures, Ure states:

> The present is distinguished from every preceding age by an universal ardour of enterprise in arts and manufacturers. Nations convinced at length that war is always a losing game, have converted their swords and muskets into factory implements, and now contend with each other in the bloodless but still formidable strife of trade. They no longer send troops to fight on distant fields, but fabrics to drive before them those of their old adversaries in arms, and to take possession of a foreign mart. (vii)

Here, Ure makes the claim that industry is a more powerful way than war to assert national dominance. Nevertheless, this claim transforms the tools of war (swords and muskets) into the weapons of manufacture (factory implements) so that the sense of aggression is retained. It is as if the metal of the weapons has been molded into the metal of the machines, which are, in effect, a new kind of weapon. Furthermore, troops, whose status is guaranteed by the weapons they carry, are transformed into fabrics created by machines that once were weapons. Even as industry seems to

displace warfare, then, it is actually figured here as simply another kind of warfare – another way to national dominance.

This theme of national dominance through industry, rather than warfare, occupies Charlotte Brontë's industrial novel Shirley (1848). The novel is set against the historical backdrop of the Napoleonic wars and Luddism, both of which functioned in the popular imagination as threats to national dominance.[14] Images of red-coated soldiers haunt the novel as if to be a constant reminder of the importance of maintaining order, whether it like socio-political or international. These soldiers both fight with Wellington against Napoleon and squelch the Luddite rebellion in the novel, two British conflicts that inform the politico-historical background of the novel.

The Napoleonic wars challenged Britain's national strength, and Luddism threatened industrial progress. At the crux of these two threats, for British cloth manufacturers, lay the Orders in Council, passed by the British Parliament in 1807. The Orders in Council prohibited neutral nation ships from trading with France by using the British Royal Navy to block Napoleon's ports. As a result of the Orders, America put an embargo on trade with Britain. Since America was the largest importer of English fabric, the Orders in Council effectively halted the production

[14]Brontë goes back in actual history in this novel as if to remind the nineteenth century that it had a non-mythical past. Nevertheless, the way she imagistically renders this history seems to suggest that history is as mythic as mythology is. The Luddites in the novel lurk in darkness, and we never even are introduced first hand to Moses Barrclough; all we see of him are second-hand accounts. Furthermore, Brontë very self-consciously compares Napoleon to a Titan, which endows him with mythic proportions. Even though her opening chapter promises the reader "[s]omething real, cool, and solid" which is as "unromantic as Monday morning" the novel still examines the tropes and images that govern the politics of representation (39).

and sale of British fabric. As a result, manufacturers were forced either to give up manufacture altogether or to find new, cheaper ways to produce cloth. Some chose to mechanize their factories, thereby forcing some laborers into redundancy. As they fought to retain their traditional way of life and livelihoods in the wake of this new machinery geared to reducing the amount of labor needed to produce fabric, the Luddites ransacked and burned both mills and machinery. As Webb explains in his study of the industrial novel, the Luddite riots were characterized as a "general collapse of law and order" – not unlike the characterization of the Napoleonic Wars (127). It is against this backdrop that the events in Shirley unfold.

For example, in Chapter 17, titled "The School-Feat," the Sunday school children march to a picnic; during the procession, Shirley's imagination is awakened by the martial music that accompanies them. She thinks, "We are not soldiers – bloodshed is not my desire; or if we are, we are soldiers of the Cross. Time has rolled back some hundreds of years, and we are bound on a pilgrimage to Palestine" (298). This vision uses as its base the Crusades, whose purpose it was to drive non-believers out of the Christian Holy Land. This image brings together the themes of religion, economics, and national dominance. The Church promised land to knights who rode under the banner of the Christian god to drive the infidel from the Holy Land. In addition, the Crusades offered rich commercial incentives to merchants looking to become wealthy through trade. Another subtext of the mythic image of the Crusades here is its focus on national dominance through religion, and it is this subtext that gets played out during the march.

As the Sunday school procession turns into the very narrow "straits of Royd-lane," it is met by another procession, an "unholy alliance" made up of "Dissenting and Methodist schools, the Baptists, Independents, and Wesleyans," whose supposed intention is to obstruct the marchers and drive them back (300). Shirley deems that this is an example of "bad manners" so "they must have a lesson" (300). To the strains of "Rule Britannia," Shirley's procession marches down the Dissenters. "The enemy was sung and stormed down . . . amazed, then alarmed, then borne down and pressed back, and at last forced to turn tail and leave the outlet from Royd-lane free" (301). That Shirley's procession takes as its song James Thomson's anthem "Rule Britannia" (1740) is no accident. The first ten lines of the song establish Britain as created by the Christian god and, therefore, able to "flourish great and free, / the dread and envy of them all" (9-10). Next, the anthem argues that with each foreign war, Britain's national dominance gains more strength: "Sill more majestic shalt thou rise, / More dreadful, from each foreign stroke" (12-13). Finally, it confirms Britain's agricultural and commercial might: "To thee belongs the rural reign; / Thy cities shall with commerce shine" (24-25). This anthem, thus, lauds Britain's national dominance as it is ordained by God. Accordingly, Shirley's vision of the Crusade is fulfilled: the Sunday school procession dominates the scene. Interestingly enough, though, Shirley's vision is interrupted by "a line of red. They are soldiers – cavalry soldiers . . . they ride fast; there are six of them" (299). The soldiers here remind us that, while farcical, the battle that plays out in Royd-lane is thematically connected to

the novel's other battles, including the Luddite attack on Robert Moore's mill that occurs a few hours later. The soldiers will help restore order within Britain.

In a complicated and often quoted passage from The Philosophy of Manufactures, Ure comments on the ability of industrial technology to restore British order. He mixes Greek and Roman figures to comment on Arkwright's self-acting mule, an automatic spinning frame, invented in the 1760s, in which cotton fiber was spun into thread. It was a water-driven spinning machine that not only formed "the basis of British spinning" but also pioneered the basis of the factory system (Hobsbawm 59). Ure states:

> To devise and administer a successful code of factory discipline, suited to the necessities of factory diligence, was the Herculean enterprise, the noble achievement of Arkwright. Thus the *Iron Man,* as the operatives fitfully call it, sprung out of the hands of our modern Prometheus at the bidding of Minerva – a creation destined to restore order among the industrious classes, and to confirm to Great Britain the empire of art. The news of this Herculean prodigy spread dismay through the Union, and even long before it left its cradle, so to speak, it strangled the Hydra of misrule. (367)

This passage explains not only that the Iron Man will restore order within Britain, but that this kind of industrial technology will also secure Britain's place as the leader of the industrial world. Interestingly enough, though, Ure's explanation relies entirely on machines; even soldiers who fight on the side of order and progress have no place

here. Ure calls on a host of Greco-Roman images to explain the rise of factory discipline and the division of labor, both products of the manufacturing system and foundations of Britain's industrial empire.[15] One of the Greek myths that Ure is alluding to in this passage is the creation of man by Prometheus and his gift of fire; in fact, he states that the inventor produced "a machine apparently instinct with the thought, feeling, and tact of the experienced workman" (367). In Greek myth, Prometheus, along with his brother Epimetheus, was responsible for the creation of man as well as animals. After endowing animals with their gifts, the brothers had nothing left to give man to separate him from the animal world. So, aided by Minerva, who presided over domestic and industrial arts, Prometheus stole fire from the gods to give to man, a gift which gave man power over the natural and animal world. Ure is also alluding to the myth of Hercules, who, as an infant, strangled two serpents sent by Juno to kill him as he slept in his cradle. Slaughtering the Hydra, a nine-headed monster, was one of Hercules' twelve labors. In this passage, Arkwright

[15] James Kay Shuttleworth, in The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester (1832), cautions against the very same division and regularization of labor that Ure lauds. Shuttleworth argues:

> The dull routine of a ceaseless drudgery, in which the same mechanical process is incessantly repeated, resembles the torment of Sisyphus – the toil, like the rock, recoils perpetually on the wearied operative. The mind gathers neither stores nor strength from the constant extension and retraction of the same muscles. The intellect slumbers in supine inertness; but the grosser parts of our nature attain a rank development. To condemn a man to such severity of toil is, in some measure, to cultivate in him the habits of an animal. He becomes reckless. He disregards the distinguishing appetites and habits of his species. He neglects the comforts and delicacies of life. He lives in squalid wretchedness, on meager food, and expends his superfluous gains in debauchery. (22)

Shuttleworth uses the myth of Sisyphus to contextualize for his audience the negative effects of regularized labor. This myth explains that after enraging Zeus, Sisyphus, a legendary king of Corinth, was confined to Tartarus and made to perpetually roll a rock up a hill. This image equates the factory work of the laborer with the drudgery of Sisyphus in order to demonstrate the monotony of deskilled labor.

is compared to Hercules, and the invention of the Iron Man is compared to one of Hercules' twelve labors.

Ure's Iron Man passage uses mythology to explain the effects of the machine on the laborer's work. Since Ure characterizes the laborer as both fitful and capricious, it is appropriate that he personifies the Iron Man and gives him the ability to "restore order" among the factory labor force. In practice, this order involved a deskilling of the laborer, which reduced the complexity of his craft to a single task. Richard Brown, in his Society and Economy in Modern Britain, 1700-1850 (1991), explains that up to 1850, cotton production "operated not so much by directly subordinating large bodies of workers to employers, but by subcontracting exploitation and management" (119). The example that Brown uses to illustrate this point is the way that the self-acting mule – the Iron Man – was used in factories. This is what Ure referred to as "the successful code of factory discipline." Essentially, three laborers, one minder and two piecers, worked each pair of mules in a factory. "The 'minder' was in charge and was paid by the owner according to the output of his mules," and the piecers labored for the minder (Brown 119). Because the minder was in charge, he had "a vested interest in increasing the output of his mules" (119). Brown explains that one implication of the minder-piecer system was that the skill of the minder was rooted in his ability to oversee his piecers rather than in his proficiency as a spinner. Another implication of this system was that it showed that "skill and craft status could be socially constructed rather than technologically determined" (120). What Arkwright invented was a system of division of labor and a

management of that division. He invented a new way to envision the factory and introduce order and organization to the production of commodities. Of course, one of the tenets of neoclassical aesthetics was order and organization, so Ure's use of Greco-Roman figures is particularly apropos.

Part of the mythological confusion at the heart of Ure's passage assumes a connection between Arkwright and the Titans, when Ure compares him to Prometheus. The Titans were the race of gods who existed before those of the Greco-Roman pantheon. They were the race of giants who sought to rule heaven and were overthrown and supplanted by the family of Zeus. What is interesting about this loose imaging is that all of them are pulled from one image bank, which implies that there is no differentiation when it comes to religious figures. Religions are conflated and religious figures are used seemingly in an indiscriminate way, which seems to suggest that religion as it was formerly figured (as a way to provide meaning, to determine and control behavior, to explain the world and human's place in it) has little place in an industrialized society. With the development of the sciences, and specifically of the machine, this discourse of industrialism seems to suggest that there are other discursive ways (like the transformation of laborers into hands, the myth of the self-made man, and the characterization of industrial riot as sublime) to provide meaning, to determine and control behavior, to explain the world and human's place in it, and to give man a purposeful existence. What this syncretic plethora of images implies, then, is that the purpose of religion has not really changed, just the vehicle by which that purpose is explained.

In another creation myth, Ure cleverly tells the history of the art of spinning, producing for it a mythological past. In The Philosophy of Manufactures, he states:

> The art of spinning may be traced to the most remote antiquity, especially that by the distaff; and it is claimed as an honourable discovery by many nations. The Egyptians ascribe it to Isis, the Chinese to their emperor Yao, the Lydians to Arachne, the Greeks to Minerva, the Peruvians to Mamacella the wife of Manco Capac their first sovereign. . . . It was under the infatuation of love that Hercules degraded himself by spinning at the feet of Omphale. Modern opinions have undergone a complete revolution with regard to this species of industry. A man is no longer deemed to be deserving of contempt for exercising the functions of a spinner, but what a superior result does he produce to that produced by Hercules! The Grecian demi- god, with all his talent, spun but a single thread at a time, while a Manchester operative spins nearly 2000. (105)

Ure begins this passage by referencing the many different mythical origins of the craft of spinning. Then he explains that "[m]odern opinions have undergone a complete revolution" concerning the social status of the contemporary laborer. Like Marx's argument about mythology disappearing with the advent of science, Ure suggests here that with the advent of the industrial spinning machine, the laborer's lowly status disappears in the wake of industrialism to be replaced by something much greater. For instance, the comparison between Hercules and the laborer implies

that the spinning machine has been endowed, through its mythological development, with the power to turn men into gods, in terms of their ability to produce, so the laborer is more powerful then even Hercules, the most powerful mortal in Greek mythology. As they are used in this passage, these mythological figures bestow the mantle of culture and civilization on the otherwise unruly and lazy laborer. (Even though the operative may be more productive than the demi-god, however, Ure still describes the laborer's work ethic as "fitful and capricious" elsewhere in the Philosophy [14].[16]) And in the passage about the Iron Man cited above, Ure also endows the Iron Man and its inventor, Arkwright, with Herculean attributes. Figuratively speaking, then, in Ure's work, the laborer, the machine he tends, and the inventor of that machine are all Hercules: a secular trinity, as it were.

In addition to ancient religious figures, like Minerva or Hercules, industrial writers turned to figures and stories from the Christian tradition to explore the relationships among the laborer, the machine, and the capitalist. Allusions to Bible stories are used by industrial apologists in their studies of the effects of the machine and of industrialization. In fact, Leon Faucher in the beginning of his study of Manchester echoes the biblical creation story when describing the transformation of cotton into fabric:

[16] Peter Gaskell, a critic of industrialization, also compares manufactures to "a Hercules in the cradle" in The Manufacturing Population of England (1833) (6). He then goes on to explain, "It is indeed only since the introduction of steam as a power, that they have acquired their paramount importance: one generation even now is but passing away since this epoch, and what mighty alterations has it already wrought in the condition of society – changing in many respects the very frame-work of the social confederacy, and opening into view a long vista of rapid transitions, terminating in the subjection of human power, as an agent of labor, to its gigantic and untiring energies" (6).

> An order sent from Liverpool in the morning, is discussed by the merchants in the Manchester Exchange at noon, and in the evening is distributed amongst the manufacturers in the environs. In less than eight days, the cotton spun at Manchester, Bolton, Oldham, or Ashton, is woven in the sheds of Bolton, Stalybridge, or Stockport; dyed and printed at Blackburn, Chorley, or Preston, and finished, measured, and packed at Manchester. By this division of labour amongst the towns, and amongst the manufacturers in the towns, and amongst the operatives in the manufactories; the water, coal, and machinery work incessantly. Execution is almost as quick as thought. Man acquires, so to speak, the power of creation, and he has only to say, "Let the fabrics exist," and they exist. (16)

First, like the creation of the heavens and the earth, the creation of cotton takes seven days. Second, like the creator of the heavens and earth, the creator of cotton need only speak the fabric into being. It should come as no surprise that revision of Genesis serves the purpose of turning man into God. Faucher's use of passive verb constructions draws attention to the miraculous ability of machines to produce commodities – which can take on lives of their own once they have been turned into fetishes, as Marx suggests in the discussion of the fetishism of commodities. By couching this productive act in the rhetoric of the first biblical event, Faucher legitimizes the division of labor, the reduction of skill, and the long hours and poor wages that comprise the factory system. What is most interesting about Faucher's

revision of Genesis is that it is a decidedly British revision of Genesis – as the geographical markers in the quotation make clear – whose purpose seems to be to create and then christen British industrial dominance. By giving the British man the power to speak fabric into being, Faucher appears to turn Britons into gods. Faucher need not specify what kind of man does the speaking. Nevertheless, the magical creation of things in this way can only be imagined from a non-laborer's perspective. The laborer has no ability merely to assert things into existence, and it is precisely the laborer's work that allows Faucher to indulge in this fantasy. From this privileged position, human element simply does not matter, because water, coal, and machinery – Ure's elemental powers – are truly the active producers. Water, coal, and machinery are some of the very few grammatical subjects in this passage that do not have passive verbs. The trinity of this new religion of science and industry is the division of labor, manufacturers, and operatives – an industrial trinity not unlike Marx's, although viewed from a very different political perspective.

Other supporters of industrial development in this era, such as Charles Babbage, also use New Testament biblical rhetoric to extol the virtues of the machine. In Making a Social Body (1995), Mary Poovey discusses some of the purposes of this kind of transformatory rhetoric. She notes that "far from reducing human beings to 'hands', as some critics charged, machines could even transform individuals who were otherwise incomplete, who lacked hands, for example – into complete (that is, productive) members of society" (39). For example, in his book, Babbage describes this healing power of the machine:

> Another, though fortunately a less general substitution of tools for human hands, is used to assist the labour of those who are deprived by nature, or by accident, of some of their limbs. Those who have had an opportunity of examining the beautiful contrivances for the manufacture of shoes by machinery . . . must have noticed many instances in which the workmen were enabled to execute their task with precision, although labouring under the disadvantages of the loss of an arm or leg. A similar instance occurs at Liverpool, in the Institution for the Blind, where a machine is used by those afflicted with blindness, for weaving sash-lines. (13)[17]

For Babbage, the machine can make the incomplete body whole again, by endowing the crippled with new limbs and by restoring sight to the blind. These examples of extraordinary healing are Christ-like in nature, reminiscent of the miracles that Jesus preformed during his travels. As Poovey observes, this healing power takes a laborer who, due to his disability, is unable to produce as much as the normal laborer and turns him into a more industrious one, thereby increasing the amount of material goods he can produce. In Babbage's argument, however, laborers are implicitly being defined solely in terms of their labor – their productivity – as evidenced by their reduction to the word "hands." Another implication of this healing is that it is temporary at best and certainly not integral to the laborers in question. In essence,

[17] For an alternate reading of Babbage, see Tamara Ketabgian's article "The Human Prosthesis: Workers and Machines in the Victorian Industrial Scene." In this essay, Ketabgian explores the ways that several industrial texts, including Babbage's study, use the rhetoric of the prosthetic in order to explore the impact of the machine on the human and vice versa.

they are still being reduced to body parts even as they are being momentarily healed and made whole.

Babbage continues to explore the Christ-like abilities of the machine when he explains the three main advantages of the machine: "The addition which they make to human power. –The economy they produce of human time. –The conversion of substances apparently common and worthless into valuable products" (Babbage 6). While the first two are not religious in nature, the last of these advantages has obvious Christ-like implications. As Christ turned water into wine, made one fish into thousands, and found water in a rock, so machines can turn horse and cattle hooves into "that beautiful, yellow, crystallized salt, which is exhibited in the shops of some of our chemists" (Babbage 11). Machines can also turn worn-out saucepans into protection for the "edges and angles" of the trunk-maker's boxes. The bits of metal that are not used by the trunk-makers are "conveyed to the manufacturing chemists . . . who employ them in combination with pyroligneous acid, in making a black die for the use of calico printers" (11-12). The machine can turn the waste by-products of industry into figurative gold. The transformatory power of the machine is not unlike a secular transubstantiation, which is the doctrine holding that the bread and wine of the Eucharist are transformed into the body and blood of Jesus, although their appearances remain the same.

Near the end of On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures, Babbage reflects on the future of machine technology and science, and his reflection is framed in decidedly religious terms. Babbage knows that the supply of fossil fuels is limited

and that this limitation has implications for the future use of steam as a mode of power. But Babbage looks to the tides as well as the wind as possible modes of power with which to fuel machines. About the use of wind, Babbage states:

> Even now, the imprisoned winds which the earliest poet made the Grecian warrior bear for the protection of this fragile bark; or those which, in more modern times, the Lapland wizards sold to the deluded sailors; —these, the unreal creations of fancy or of fraud, called, at the command of science, from their shadowy existence, obey a holier spell: and the unruly masters of the poet and the seer become the obedient slaves of civilized man. (390)

As in Marx's passage concerning the disappearance of mythology with the advent of science and Mumford's passage about the triumph of science as dispelling myth as explanation for natural phenomena, mythology is not really disappearing here, either. These myths are appropriated by science, and their fundamental purpose still remains the same. In this passage, Babbage describes human's scientific progress, which has developed from constructing myths, like those in The Odyssey, that explain the relationship between man and nature, to harnessing actively the power of nature. Babbage's argument here echoes Mumford's claim that with science comes a new social order no longer determined by the divine right of kings or the Great Chain of Being. Even more pointedly than Mumford's rhetoric, Babbage's religious image – "a holier spell" – shows the teleological thrust of human's development. He has moved from the creation of myths to show his understanding of nature to the creation

of machines, which can physically harness the powers of nature. Rhetorically, Babbage is replacing traditional religion, with its belief system founded on myths, with a scientific religion that takes as its icon the miracles of science. He explains that science reveals to man "the living miracles which teem in rich exuberance around the minutest atom," which gives "evidence of immeasurable design" (390).

This scientific religion resembles Auguste Comte's Positivism, which was a system of philosophy based on experience and empirical knowledge of natural phenomena. In The Nature of the Positive Philosophy [18] Comte explains that the development of human intelligence is necessarily subject to the law that "each of our leading conceptions, -- each branch of our knowledge, -- passes successively through three different theoretical conditions: the Theological, or fictitious; the Metaphysical, or abstract; and the Scientific, or positive" (133). Comte regarded metaphysics and traditional Christian theology as inadequate and imperfect systems of knowledge. In fact, Comte attempted to create a Religion of Humanity. Andrew Wernick explains in Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity (2001) that for Comte

> the waning of theism in the dawn of positivity entailed, at the limit, not just the decay of belief in an external yet ineffable super-being, nor indeed just the delegitimising moral and political consequences of this. It entailed a shattering epistemic break. The rise of a scientific world-view spelt the end of all supernaturalist ontologies, however attenuated, and their displacement by an immanentist materialism,

[18] Comte wrote The Nature of Positive Philosophy between 1830 and 1842; it was translated by Harriet Martineau in 1853.

> grasped at the primacy of experienced actuality behind and beyond which we cannot go. (6)

Like Marx, Ure, and Babbage, Comte also sees science as totally separate and superior to any previous belief system. As T. R. Wright explains in The Religion of Humanity (1986), Comte's attempt to create a new humanist religion must be situated in "the context of the wide-ranging contemporary attack on Christianity from the point of view of science, ethics, and history" (3). Any literal belief in Christian tenets was challenged by discoveries in the scientific fields of zoology, geology, and evolution. "The history of the New Testament was undermined by higher criticism, which rejected the miraculous and reduced the content of the gospels to the moral and the mythical" (Wright 4). For Comte, positive science, then, revealed biblical teachings to be mythological in nature.

It is this belief in the power of science and technology – the transformation of science into a religion – that Thomas Carlyle critiques in his essay, "Signs of the Times" (1829). Carlyle turns to the mythological figure of the Titan to discuss the problems bound up with the religion of science and technology and to critique the nineteenth -century's technological developments: "Our true Deity is Mechanism. It has subdued external Nature for us. And we think it will do all other things. We are Giants in physical power: in a deeper than metaphorical sense, we are Titans, that strive, by heaping mountain on mountain, to conquer Heaven also" (77). For Carlyle, science and technology are responsible for the unraveling of the social fabric because they replace traditional social relationships – like reciprocity and paternalism

– with industrial ones. Carlyle uses the figure of the Titan to underscore what he understands to be the destruction not only of the natural world but also of the social world.

At the conclusion of Shirley, Brontë reiterates this standard comparison of the nineteenth century with a Titan. In the closing chapter, Brontë states, using similar language, "It is burning weather: the air is deep azure and red gold: it fits the time; it fits the age; it fits the present spirit of the nations. The nineteenth century wantons in its giant adolescence: the Titan-boy uproots mountains in his game, and hurls rocks in his wild sport" (590). This comparison, at first glance, seems to resonate with Carlyle's point, especially since this final chapter also envisions the destruction of natural places in the wake of industrial progress. Thus Robert Moore explains his vision for the "barren Hollow":

> The copse shall be firewood ere five years elapse: the beautiful wild ravine shall be a smooth descent; the green natural terrace shall be a paved street: there shall be cottages in the dark ravine, and cottages on the lonely slopes: the rough pebbled track shall be an even, firm, broad, black sooty road, bedded with the cinders from my mill: and my mill, Caroline, my mill shall fill its present yard. (597)

About his vision, Caroline exclaims, "Horrible, you will change our blue hill-country air into the Stilbro' smoke atmosphere," to which Robert counters, "I will pour the waters of Pactolus through the valley of Briarfield" (598). In Greek mythology, the Pactolus River was thought to be rich in gold. More specifically, though, King Midas

was granted his wish that everything he touched be turned to gold, but he soon regretted his choice because even his food and water were changed to gold. To break the spell, Midas bathed in the Pactolus River.

In tandem with his invocation of the Pactolus River, it is this image of his magnificent mill – which is characterized as his god, his lover, and himself –that has the power to turn the elements of the "barren Hollow" into gold. In at least four places in the novel, Robert Moore's mill, which will soon "fill its present yard," is rhetorically transformed into something greater than the sum of its parts. First, his mill is characterized as one of his three gods – the other two are his trade and his machinery. At one point, Shirley refers to his mill as a Moloch (499).[19] His mill is also called his "lady-love," and he even associates his own body with a mill: "The machinery of all my nature; the whole enginery of this human mill: the boiler, which I take to be the heart, it fit to burst" (496).[20] Nevertheless, because he invokes the Pactolus River, he is also implicitly comparing himself with Midas. While Moore

[19] In the Old Testament, Moloch was the god of the Ammonites and Phoenicians to whom children were sacrificed. About Brontë's use of this figure, Patricia Ingham explains, "[Shirley] rejects [Robert] in an appropriately biblical register for bringing the values of the marketplace into the sacred sphere of domesticity and morality. She recognised earlier that his mill was his 'lady love'; now she sees it as the heathen god, said (in Kings and Jeremiah) to have been worshipped with human sacrifice: '*you* want to make a speculation of me. You would immolate me to that mill – your Moloch!' She perceives him as a 'brigand who demanded my purse'. In retrospect Moore describes himself emerging from this encounter as the guilty figure of Cain. The image reveals the underlying equivocation in the text between the discourses of class and gender. He is guilty of the romantic crime of preferring money to love. In perpetrating it he has somehow symbolically murdered his brother in the workplace. This use of the biblical register is essential if the discussion is not to become a radical examination of society" (37).

[20] "For early Victorian thinkers, steam engines and living bodies followed similar, if not identical, principles. In the sciences, the machine popularly appeared as a vital body exhibiting forms of energy considered typical of animal life . . . Whereas engines ran on forms of energy that resembled living animal heat, animal bodies not only harbored mechanical instincts, but also were viewed as themselves organic machines. . . . No longer a metaphor for life, combustion was the actually form assumed by life, producing the energy necessary to maintain biological functions" (Ketabgian "'Melancholy Mad Elephants'" 652-3).

may be referring to his ability to make, manage, and keep huge amounts of money, the implication that his Midas touch may be his downfall still haunts his comparison.[21]

Moore's trade, mill and machinery are his "gods"; the Orders in Council are "another name for the seven deadly sins"; and Castlereagh is his "Antichrist" (57). As the connection in the novel between political elements like the Orders in Council, Luddism, and the Napoleonic Wars makes clear, it is the religion of science and industry that fundamentally ordains Britain's national dominance.[22] But Brontë encourages the reader to question the means by which this national dominance is gained. As Brontë's use of Moloch implies, the cost of this religion includes a certain amount of sacrifice. The novel itself is an examination of the sacrifice of the laborer for industrial progress. In addition, it examines the sacrifice of a feminist religion for industrial progress (the feminist visions keep getting interrupted by soldiers in the distance), a point to which I will return later.

As Igor Webb explains in his study of the industrial novel, the Luddite riots were characterized as a "general collapse of law and order" (127). As they fought to

---

[21] In Past and Present, Carlyle states: "Midas longed for gold, and insulted the Olympians. He got gold so that whatsoever he touched became gold, -- and he, with his long ears, was little better for it. Midas had misjudged the celestial music-tones; Midas had insulted Apollo and the gods: the gods gave him his wish, and a pair of long ears, which also were a good appendage to it. What a truth in these old Fables!" (254).

[22] The novel is set against the backdrop of the Napoleonic wars and Luddism, both which functioned in the popular imagination as threats to national dominance. The Napoleonic wars challenged Britain's national strength, and Luddism threatened industrial progress. At the crux of these two threats lay the Orders in Council, passed by the British Parliament in 1807. The Orders in Council prohibited neutral nation ships from trading with France by using the British Royal Navy to block Napoleon's ports. As a result of the Orders, America put an embargo on trade with Britain. America was the largest importer of English fabric, so the Orders in Council effectively halted the production and sale of British fabric.

retain their traditional way of life and livelihoods in the wake of new machinery geared to reducing the amount of labor needed to produce fabric, the Luddites ransacked and burned both mills and machinery. One of the opening episodes of Brontë's novel illustrates such activities. Moore tells his men: "The utmost you *can* do . . . is to burn down my mill, destroy its contents, and shoot me. What then? Suppose that building was a ruin and I was a corpse, what then? . . . would that stop invention or exhaust science? – Not for the fraction of a second of time! Another and better gig-mill would rise on the ruins of this, and perhaps a more enterprising owner come in my place" (155-156). Moore's imagery here compares the mill-owner with a phoenix, the mythical bird that consumes itself by fire every five hundred years and then springs anew from its own ashes. While originally Egyptian in its origins, the Christian tradition adopted the phoenix as a symbol of immortality and resurrection. Also, and more importantly, the image of the phoenix, already refigured by Christianity, is refigured again by Moore as a symbol for the religion of science and industry. Moore's language seems to advocate the sacrifice of man for the progress of the machine. Essentially, though, this phoenix allusion figures as an industrial crucifixion, and what is primarily being crucified here is a machine; Moore's significance is secondary as he is only the owner of the machine. Moore is a disciple of the religion of science and industry; he is one of the Titans that uproots mountains to conquer heaven, as his action of uprooting the Hollow symbolizes.

While in the final chapter Brontë is drawing on Carlyle's use of the Titan image, she is also refiguring it.[23] Brontë sets up this image carefully by first introducing the weather of June 1812 as "it fits the age" and then, more specifically, as it fits "the present spirit of the nations" (590). After introducing the Titan image, Brontë goes on to a lengthy, visionary explanation of Napoleon's Russian campaign, which begins: "This summer, Bonaparte is in the saddle: he and his host scour Russians deserts" (590). The way the whole paragraph is structured suggests that Bonaparte himself is the Titan-boy.[24] Brontë emphasizes the comparison of the historical Napoleon with a mythic Titan by exclaiming that Napoleon "puts his trust in a snow-cloud: the Wilderness, the Wind, and the Hail-Storm are his refuge: his allies are the elements – Air, Fire, Water" (590). These harsh, natural images support and further the image of the Titan-boy rooting up mountains and hurling rocks. Because Brontë takes the Titan image and associates it with Napoleon as a major figure of the nineteenth century, she draws attention to one of the sub-themes in the novel, the concern for and relationship between British social order and British

---

[23] In a study about how Brontë uses nineteenth-century mythic heroes, Pat Morris explains:

> The various classes were attached to myths of greatness founded upon images of heroic conflict that were becoming increasingly nostalgic. In Shirley, likewise, there is a sense in which the real heroes are largely absent and mythic. Helstone and Robert and Louis Moore form a series of substitutions for originary ideals of greatness – such as Wellington and Napoleon – who, in an imaginary space beyond narrative realism, are likened to "Titan-boy[s] uproot[ing] mountains" and "hurl[ing] rocks in . . . wild sport". The term 'Titan-boys' is revealing: this violence signals a return to the regressive childhood belief in "the world of gods," a world of heroic oppositions of good and evil for which, within the novel and perhaps also in the nation outside the novel, there is a "longing" – rather as the martial music awakes in Shirley a "longing" for what reality cannot offer her. (303-04)

[24] In its entirety, the paragraph reads: "It is burning weather: the air is deep azure and red gold: it fits the time; it fits the age; it fits the present spirit of the nations. The nineteenth century wanton in its giant adolescence: the Titan-boy uproots mountains in his game, and hurls rocks in his wild sport. This summer, Bonaparte is in the saddle: he and his host scour Russians deserts" (590).

national dominance. In the first two chapters, the novel presents this sub-theme through a vision of "bloodshed and civil conflict" (50); an explanation of the Orders in Council as "the seven deadly sins" (57); and a midnight Luddite attack on Moore's new, labor-saving machinery (63).

The vision that opens the novel comes from Michael Hartley, and his vision is complicated by the fact that he is characterized as an "Antinomian" and "a violent Jacobin and leveller" (48).

> [A]ll amongst the trees [Hartley] saw moving objects, red, like poppies, or white, like May-Blossom: the wood was full of them; they poured out and filled the park. He then perceived they were soldiers – thousands and tens of thousands; but they made no more noise than a swarm of midges on a summer evening. They formed in order . . . and marched, regiment after regiment, across the park. (49)

Michael Hartley explains that this vision signifies "bloodshed and civil conflict" (50). These very same soldiers appear in the novel as background to the main action three times. The first is in this opening vision, the second is after Shirley's visionary explanation of the Sunday School's procession as a Crusade -- a point discussed earlier -- and the third is after Shirley's visionary retelling of Genesis. Each of these visions further underscores Brontë's revision of the Titan image.

It should come as no surprise that Brontë clearly connects the fate of the redundant worker, symbolized by the Luddites, to the fate of the redundant woman, symbolized by Caroline Helstone who is one of the book's two heroines. In an oft

quoted passage from the novel, Caroline states, "Old maids, like the houseless and unemployed poor, should not ask for a place and an occupation in the world: the demand disturbs the happy and rich" (377).[25] And Caroline goes on to consider two important models of ideal womanhood. She states, "Lucretia, spinning at midnight in the midst of her maidens, and Solomon's virtuous woman, are often quoted as patterns of what 'the sex' (as they say) ought to be" (378).[26] Patricia Ingham suggests in The Language of Gender and Class: Transformation in the Victorian Novel (1996) that this use of myth allows Shirley and Caroline to construct a feminist revision of history and to give them a language in which to discuss subversive politico-domestic topics (45).

Shirley's revision of Genesis is a watershed moment in the novel because it uses this proto-feminist language to write women into history. Shirley exclaims:

> [T]he first men of the earth were Titans, and . . . Eve was their mother: from her sprang Saturn, Hyperion, Oceanus; she bore Prometheus -- . . . I say, there were giants on the earth in those days: giants that strove to scale heaven. The first woman's breast that heaved with life on this world yielded the daring which could contend with Omnipotence: the strength which could bear a thousand years of bondage, -- the vitality

[25] See Ingham 31-54; Boumelha 91-106; Belkin 50-66; Dolin 197-215.

[26] In her study of the novel, Patricia Ingham explains that Caroline "reconsiders critically the literary examples conventionally offered as 'patterns of what "the sex" ought to be . . . She dismisses the former [Lucrecia] as much like that martinet, Hortense Moore, with her capacity for disturbing people. She is able to make more of Solomon's account, historicizing the 'virtuous woman' to produce a heretical model for herself:'. . . she was a manufacturer – she made fine linen and sold it . . . This is the kind of 'clever woman' she longs to be, not the stitching automaton that her uncle described in that phrase" (48) .

> which could feed that vulture death through uncounted ages, -- the unexhausted life and uncorrupted excellence, sisters to immortality, which, after millenniums of crimes, struggles, and woes, could conceive and bring forth a Messiah. The first woman was heaven-born: vast was the heart whence gushed the well-spring of the blood of nations; and grand the undegenerate [sic] head where rested the consort-crown of creation. . . . I saw – I now see – a woman-Titan: her robe of blue air spreads to the outskirts of the heath, where yonder flock is grazing; . . . So kneeling, face to face she speaks with God. That Eve is Jehovah's daughter, as Adam was his son. (315-316).

Shirley's vision suggests that Eve is responsible for the strength and success of mankind, rather than for the Fall. Eve is equal to Adam, if not superior to him. It is she who is responsible for the birth of nations. It is in this figure of a paganized Eve, a Titan woman wearing the blue robes of Mary, that Shirley conflates Greek mythology and Christian mythology. Her purpose, of course, is to give women a place in history. This particular retelling works as a "disruption of and an alternative to that history whose terms and course have been set by the powerful" (Boumelha 98). Nevertheless, as Penny Boumelha argues, "The ideological value of the myth offers a strategy for consolation, not for change" (99). At the conclusion of the novel, the women's identities disappear behind that of their male counterparts: Shirley becomes Mrs. Louis and Caroline becomes Mrs. Robert.

Shirley's revision of Genesis is interrupted by "a noise on the road . . . They listened, and heard the tramp of horses: they looked, and saw a glitter through the trees: they caught through the foliage glimpses of martial scarlet; helm shone, plume waved. Silent and orderly, six soldiers rode softly by" (317). These are some of the same soldiers that Michael Hartley watched at the beginning of the novel; they are part of the same army that thwarts the Luddite attack on Robert Moore's mill, and they are part of the same army that fights with Wellington against Napoleon at the conclusion of the novel. Their appearance here is no mistake. Their movement through the backdrop of the novel is a constant reminder of the power structures that govern not only domestic, industrial, and national politics but also the tropologies through which politics is represented in literature and history.

Chapter Three:

The Mythology of Modernity:

The Myth of the Self-Made Man

In the first chapter, I explored three sources for the transformation of the laborer into a hand (the invention of machines, the factory, and the division of labor), as well as the implications that are bound up with that transformation. First, transforming laborers into hands is an amputation, which fragments the laborer's body to achieve one cohesive factory body made entirely of hands that simply tend machines. Second, by the anthropomorphizing of the machine, even the amputated human hand is replaced by a mechanical hand. Third, reducing laborers to hands in a factory removes the capacity for independent thought, and the laborer becomes only a productive organ. Finally, transforming men into thoughtless hands is a form of gothic dehumanization; imagine the grotesqueness of a body made entirely of hands. This dehumanization is made possible by the division of labor, which turns laborers into freaks of nature while maintaining that transformation as natural and normal. This kind of dehumanization also reinforces the upper classes' sense of social superiority and rhetorically serves to separate them further from the laboring classes. Since the alienation of class from class was part and parcel of the industrial experience, it should come as no surprise that the industrial novel is concerned with, as Deirdre David puts it, "one of man's most immediately felt modern alienations from his experience, namely his alienation from his work" (7).

One of the ways in which nineteenth-century novelists sought to remedy this problem was to replace the class conflict brought to light by the Industrial Revolution (although, of course, it had existed before) with what David calls "a myth of class cooperation" (7). The endings of the three novels David studies all resolve the alienation of man from labor and of capitalist from laborer by creating a sense of coherence and a "totality of life" (David 8). David notes that these kinds of endings are essentially fables that reconcile disturbing social realities, fulfilling the desire for resolution in the novel and the fantasy of a real resolution in society (12). My interest in David's analysis is two-fold. First she explains that the nineteenth-century writer's construction of myths and fables works to justify the alienation of the laboring classes not only from the upper classes but also from the labor that they produce. Second, the sense of social and literal coherence as a resolution of class conflict, that David notes, functions as a "strategy of containment," to borrow a term from Frederic Jameson's The Political Unconscious (1981).

It comes as no surprise that much of the contemporary writing of and on the Industrial Revolution deals with these kinds of justifications or transformations. One of the most popular transformations turns the poor, homeless man into an industrious and successful capitalist. Paradoxically, this kind of transformation hinges on the deliberate erasure or displacement of the actual origins of the industrialist. In other words, the description of the creation of the self-made man often tends to gloss over or ignore his working-class origins so that his success is portrayed as solely of his own making, rather than as the culmination of social, familial, and economic factors.

For example, in Hard Times (1854), Charles Dickens draws overt attention to such displacement in the character of Josiah Bounderby. In addition, Elizabeth Gaskell in North and South (1855), and Dinah Mulock Craik in John Halifax, Gentleman (1856) remove their heroes from their biological origins in order to establish them more persuasively as self-made industrialists. Furthermore, this kind of mythical transformation draws attention away from a hierarchical class system and a political economy of industry by representing the process of becoming a successful industrialist as a natural and inevitable result of hard work. As laborers are transformed into hands, hands into grotesque bodies, bodies into machines, and machines into gods, the next step in the rhetorical transformation of the laboring classes is to transform the laborer into the mythical figure of the self-made man.

The basic rhetorical pattern of development shows the hero fashioning himself out of his poor, laboring-class origins to become a successful entrepreneurial capitalist, complete with a good character. While appearing to advocate the possibility of social mobility, this myth is really used as an instrument of social control to limit mobility. James Catano explains how the myth works in different cultural areas: "In politics, the myth serves to enunciate ideals of democratic progress and individuality, while on a related economic level, the myth helps to mask the disturbing presence of corporate power. In the arena of individual needs, the myth provides identities that seem to fit naturally into the requirements of society" ("The Rhetoric of Masculinity" 421). While each of these novels examines the myth of the self-made man, each presents a different model. For example, for Dickens, the value

of the self-made man is a near stalemate, in which even a perfect version of him (Stephen Blackpool) dies rather than being able to sustain the model in life. This stalemate gets new ideological resolutions in later representations. For example, Gaskell offers a more positive model in John Thornton; North and South illustrates how the negative aspects of the self-made man can be ameliorated, modified, or fixed so that it can work more satisfactorily. And Craik, through John Halifax, gives an unabashed celebration of self-made ideology. What is interesting about the myth of the self-made man, then, is how and why these authors use it in their novels. Why do the very same works that criticize it still end up supporting it in crucial ways?

One way to get at the answer to this question is to examine the complexities and contradictions bound up with the representation of the self-made man as it is developed in these industrial novels. First, the self-made man is, above all, an individual and thus one taught and teaching others that all sorts of communal or collective identities have no importance. As the factory makes hands out of laborers, so capitalism makes individuals out of everyone. Second, the image of the self-made man represents an idealized image of the middle-classes as a whole: they stand opposed to the aristocratic classes, which inherit rather than earn or create their status, as well as to the laboring classes, whose status is presumed to represent the social consequence of weak character or morals. Third, the image of the self-made man represents a commitment to the potential for agency and the desire for change – a myth of opportunity – both in individuals and in society generally. Precisely because it is mythical, however, the image of the self-made man serves in important ways to

disable agency and deflect attempts at social change. Finally, the image of the self-made man is Christian. In his selflessness, humility, and frugality, the self-made man is ideologically opposed to the merely self-interested and uncharitable economic man. Thus, his economic ideology is cloaked within religious principles and ideals of duty.

Another way to answer the above question is to turn to Jameson, who studies how literature works out structured solutions to otherwise intractable socio-economic dilemmas, such as those bound up with the self-made man. The historical figure of the self-made man assumes that anyone, with a strong work ethic, good character, unbending faith in God combined with patience and perseverance, can become self-made. The rhetorical construction, however, is incongruent, as noted above. For example, the self-made man has fragmentary, anti- social, and elitist implications, characteristics that directly oppose those suggested by the historical figure. In this chapter, I want to examine not only the contradictions bound up in the self-made man but also the solutions by which these three authors contain the problem of the self-made man's negative social characteristics. For example, Dickens simultaneously criticizes and rehabilitates the self-made man, Gaskell domesticates him and endows him with Christian piety, and Craik shows that the self-made man is always already a gentleman. Jameson's term for this kind of solution is "strategy of containment." Jameson argues:

> [I]deology is not something which informs or invests symbolic production; rather the aesthetic act is itself ideological, and the production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as an ideological

> act in its own right, with the function of inventing imaginary or formal 'solutions' to unresolvable social contradictions. (79)

He continues to argue that novels as cultural artifacts "are to be read as symbolic resolutions of real political and social contradictions" and that literary critics "must necessarily grasp them as resolutions of determinate contradictions" (80).[27]

Finally, I need to explain some of the terminology that this chapter uses. The historical figure of the self-made man assumes that anyone, regardless of class status, can become self-made, and this assumption is true of the historical figure of the self-made man. Certainly, there were numbers of people in the lower ranks who did rise in trade and government and who, hence, became gentlemen and gentlewomen. Their social power came from their accumulation of capital not from their bloodlines and from their industrial holdings not from familial estates. However, the contradictions bound up in the rhetoric of the self-made man argue otherwise. My purpose in this chapter is to examine the contradictory nature of the rhetoric that, effectively, mythologizes the self-made man. A myth, by definition, is a cultural story that portrays a hero who stands as a fundamental type in the world-view of a people by

[27] At this point, I want to acknowledge that the critical framework that I'm borrowing from Jameson is more complicated than my analysis currently allows for. For example, his "strategies of containment" is more than a matter of plot arrangement or conscious intention on the part of the author. For Jameson, the key lies in the actual structure of the genre. Genres for Jameson articulate larger social approaches to storytelling and social contradiction, which provide a deep structure for the kinds of containment that I'm exploring in this chapter. Jameson is interested in how genres inherit social traditions, how they can be mixed together to create new formulations, and how authors can innovate genres. As part of a long-term revision of this chapter, I'm interested in exploring what sorts of specific generic structures these three novelists incorporate, mix, or revise in writing their particular version of the genre of novel. In addition, this generic mixing is something that I have explored in a previous essay on George Eliot's Middlemarch. In that essay, I argued that Eliot aligns her characters with specific genres with the intention of reforming the novel and making it respectable, rather than vulgar.

delineating the psychology, customs, or ideals of that society. I argue that the myth of the self-made man (as separate from the historical figure of the self-made man) as a representative of, for, and by the middle classes embodies their interests, which effectively limit who can become self-made through its rhetorical construction. For clarification purposes, when I refer to the self-made man in this chapter, I am referring to the rhetorical construction rather than the historical figure, unless otherwise noted. Another term that needs to be explained is "individual" because there are two meanings at play here. Being an individual is part of the ideology of the self-made man; in this sense, "individual" means self-sufficient or self-reliant, and John Thornton and John Halifax both represent this meaning. In addition, Dickens's Josiah Bounderby thinks he is this kind of individual, although Dickens disagrees. Another signification of "individual", though, means a single person, totally alone, with no ties to society; this is the meaning Dickens associates with Stephen Blackpool.

One of the greatest – and most grotesque – self-made men in the industrial novel is Josiah Bounderby of Dickens's Coketown in Hard Times. Dickens's portrait of Bounderby is a caricature of the myth the self-made man as a figure of self-improvement. But while the portrait of Bounderby seems to criticize the myth, Dickens nevertheless ends up supporting it in crucial ways. In other words, Dickens shows Bounderby to be a phony self-made man, and in showing him to be such, Dickens simultaneously upholds the essential qualities of the self-made man. He upholds the ideal even though he unmasks this particular example as a perversion of

the ideal. In this way, Dickens rehabilitates the self-made man. In Hard Times, this rehabilitation is a strategy of containment because it functions, in Jameson's words, as a way to "avoid the ultimate consequences of such insights as the relationship between labor and value" (53).

Like all self-made men, Bounderby sees himself as an individual and espouses the fact that he has fashioned himself out of his own hands.[28] He chooses not see himself as a part and parcel of a larger social network except, of course, as he relates to the economics of the factory and market.[29] As a self-made man, then, Bounderby has been taught and is teaching others that all sorts of communal or collective identities have no importance. The only collectivity that counts for the self-made man is the market or factory. As the factory makes hands out of workers, so capitalism makes individuals out of everyone, as the relationships between Bounderby and Bitzer and Bounderby and Stephen Blackpool make clear. Under Bounderby's laissez-faire tutelage, Bitzer becomes a staunch believer in the economic power of the individual, and Stephen becomes one of the novel's only true individuals.

As a self-made man, Bounderby sees himself as an individual and as a product of his own hands. As in nearly every depiction of the self-made man, there is a huge discrepancy between Bounderby's self-made rhetoric and his actual boyhood

[28] It should be noted that "hands" as it is used here carries a double meaning. First, it refers to Bounderby's own physical hands as being responsible for his creation, and second, it refers to the Hands in his employment who have literally produced his prosperity.
[29] For more on how the myth of the self-made man ignores the role of society and family in forming the individual, see Catano "The Rhetoric of Masculinity" 421-425.

upbringing.[30] Dickens describes him as "a rich man: banker, merchant, manufacturer . . . A man with a great puffed head and forehead . . . A man with a pervading appearance on him of being inflated like a balloon . . A man who could never sufficiently vaunt himself a self-made man. A man who was always proclaiming, through that brassy speaking-trumpet of a voice of his, his old ignorance and his old poverty" (58). Dickens's description insinuates that Bounderby is full of hot air, and he is. In his book on nineteenth-century fictional captains of industry, Ivan Melada explains that through the portrait of Bounderby "Dickens makes art out of the materials of polemic by permitting Bounderby to create a fictionalized version of himself as a self-made man. The Coketown's industrialist's fantasy is a mixture of current notions of self-help . . . and a romantic idealization of the self-made man in the early days of the Industrial Revolution" (111). Bounderby claims that he was born in a ditch, abandoned by his mother, raised by his wicked grandmother, and "so ragged and dirty, that you wouldn't have touched [him] with a pair of tongs" (59). In essence, Bounderby's self-portrait the perfect representation of the self-made man because it shows a man who has elevated himself from humble beginnings to become one of Coketown's most successful businessmen. In Bounderby, we see an illustration of Ivanka Kovačević's insight that the "ideal of self-help – that is, the belief that the fate of the individual is in his own hands . . . is the moral concomitant of the economic principle of *laissez-faire*" (35).

[30] Mr. Thornton, of Gaskell's North and South, John Halifax, of Craik's John Halifax, Gentleman, and Robert Moore, of Brontë's Shirley are three other examples of men who claim self-made status but are in reality indebted to a community or family for their success in business.

Nevertheless, as is the case with many self-made men, the reality of Bounderby's upbringing undermines his self-made status because it shows him as a product of a loving, supportive parents who "never thought it hardship on themselves to pinch a bit that he might write and cypher beautiful . . . to help him out in life, and put him 'prentice. And a steady lad he was, and a kind master he had to lend him a hand, and well he worked his own way forward to be rich and thriving" (280).[31] In his narrative of self, Bounderby chooses not to see that he is part of this larger community of family and friends. Rosemarie Bodenheimer comments that Bounderby's fictional autobiography "is a narrative equivalent of the ladder kicked over when the climber reaches the top; the story denies that there is a respectable working class or a chain of social interdependence that can nurture ambition. In this way Bounderby cleanses himself of the taint of his working-class origin" (197). Of course, this deliberate inability to see beyond the immediate self is one of the standard criteria of the self-made man.

What makes this particular portrait interesting is Dickens's simultaneous criticism and rehabilitation of the myth itself. Dickens allows Bounderby pompously to explode his own construction, but this action also seems to undercut three main tenets of the self-made man that Dickens wishes to promote: humility, sobriety, and frugality. For example, in his first interview with Bounderby, Stephen Blackpool –

[31] Catano reads Bounderby's erasure of his own origins as a stereotypical tale of masculinity by which the self-made man loudly rejects his "maternal origins" (427). Essentially, Catano reads the myth of the self-made man in terms of its masculine appeal and fundamentally opposed to the threat of the feminine. He reads the myth of the self-made man as hiding "an underlying fear that if a man is not correctly masculine then he is something else" (426). For more, see Catano "The Rhetoric of Masculinity."

one of the Hands in Bounderby's factory – comes to ask for advice on obtaining a divorce from his drunken wife. During his lunch break, Stephen makes his way to Bounderby's house in "the damp wind and cold wet streets," having lunched on "nothing but a little bread" (108). Once inside, he is ushered in while Bounderby is "at lunch on chop and sherry" in front of his fireplace in the parlor (109). During the interview, Bounderby, "the Bully of humility," continues to swallow mouthfuls of meat and to drink glasses of sherry, while lambasting Stephen on the impossibility of a Hand obtaining a divorce from his absent, alcoholic wife (58).[32] The discrepancy between Stephen's cold, hungry, and humble position and Bounderby's warm, full, and self-important one would seem to represent part of Dickens's criticism of the myth. However, this criticism also seems to suggest that the qualities of humility, sobriety, and frugality, which Bounderby so obviously lacks, are the very virtues that would be found in the true self-made man, as opposed to this sort of imposter. With his portrait of Bounderby, Dickens is not truly criticizing the myth of the self-made man as much as he is mocking a caricature of it so as to contain these essential components of the myth, which are the virtues to which the middles classes supposedly owe their success, and to protect them from the laboring classes.

One of the ways that Dickens mocks Bounderby is through Bounderby's own insistence on his status as an individual. As a self-made man, Bounderby sees himself above all else as a solitary figure, a fact which is confirmed by his blustery

[32] It should be noted that Stephen's absentee and drunken wife does more than just garner sympathy for Stephen's plight. The fact that she has no permanent place either in the novel or in Stephen's domestic sphere is a reminder of the viciousness of the laboring class that lurks in the middle-class imagination.

and inflated claim that he is "Josiah Bounderby of Coketown" who has "nobody to thank for [his] being here but [himself]" (60, 59). As such, he is a self-made man who is taught and teaching others that all sorts of communal identities – like a supportive community or a loving family – have no importance. The only collectivities on which Bounderby places any importance are his factory and his bank – the two that can generate economic wealth. As an advocate for this philosophy, Bounderby takes on two pupils, Bitzer who successfully embodies the philosophy, and Stephen Blackpool, who is a miserable failure at it.

Bounderby's educational philosophy is shared by his friend Thomas Gradgrind senior, who owns and operates a school that centers its curriculum on this philosophy. The lack of a sense of community in the school is evidenced by the fact that the students are, by and large, referred to by numbers. Even Mr. M'Choakumchild, the school's teacher along with "some one hundred and forty other schoolmasters, had been lately turned at the same time, in the same factory, on the same principles, like so many pianoforte legs" (52-3). Here, being turned into piano legs is a process that is complimentary to the transformation of laborers into hands. The fulfillment of the education students receive in the school is their participation in the market. The purpose of Gradgrind's school is to create a mindset that is conducive to this participation – one that won't question the implications of the market and one that allows them to become part of the capitalist machine. As students, they are "in all things regulated and governed . . . by fact," and they become market commodities with "composed faces" and "regulated actions" (52; 108).

One of the best examples of this philosophy to come out of Gradgrind's school is Bitzer, who begins in the novel as a student and becomes a protégé of Bounderby's and a ladder-climbing employee in his bank. While Bitzer believes neither in class solidarity nor family, he does believe in the economic power of the individual. In speaking of the economic status that he has gained through frugality, Bitzer states: "That gratuity which I receive at Christmas, ma'am: I never touch it. I don't even go the length of my wages, though they're not high, ma'am. Why can't [the Hands] do as I have done, ma'am? What one person can do, another can do" (151-152).[33] Bitzer even questions why Hands don't spy on each other in order to better their own economic condition: "[B]y watching and informing upon one another [they] could earn a trifle now and then" (152). Bitzer knows the economic benefits that come from stressing the importance of the individual over any form of community, whether it's simply a network of social relations or a mutually supportive group of family and friends.

This belief in the economic importance of the individual comes up against the importance of the family when Bitzer spies on Tom Gradgrind junior as Tom robs Bounderby's bank to pay off his gambling debts. Bitzer wants to turn Tom in so that he will be promoted to Tom's old position, a position that, in his words, "will be a rise to me, and will do me good" (303). In this scene, Bitzer's naked self-interest is

[33] Dickens calls this one of the "fictions of Coketown. "Any capitalist there, who had made sixty thousand pounds out of sixpence, always professed to wonder why the sixty thousand nearest Hands didn't each make sixty thousand pounds out of sixpence, and more or less reproached them every one for not accomplishing the little feat. What I did you can do. Why don't you go and do it?" (152)

juxtaposed with Gradgrind's familial love of his son.[34] When Gradgrind asks Bitzer if turning in Tom is solely a question of self-interest, he replies, "I am sure you know that the whole social system is a question of self-interest. What you must always appeal to, is a person's self-interest. It's your only hold. We are so constituted" (303). Bitzer's point illustrates his belief that the social system is comprised of a bunch of independent individuals all pursuing their own interests – he has reached the fulfillment of his education's philosophy. Manufactured in Gradgrind's school, Bitzer espouses the curriculum quite well:

> "I was brought up in that catechism when I was very young, sir, as you are aware . . . My schooling was paid for; it was a bargain; and when I came away, the bargain ended. . . . I don't deny . . . that my schooling was cheap. But that comes right, sir. I was made in the cheapest market, and have to dispose of myself in the dearest." (303-4)

As a product of Gradgrind's school, Bitzer sees education as a commodity. More importantly, though, as a product of that education, he sees himself as a commodity. Bound up in his philosophy here is the assumption that as part of the process of capitalism, Bitzer is an individual solely responsible for himself, with no obligations to anyone but himself .

As the portraits of Bitzer and Bounderby suggest, the middle-class self-made man tends to define himself "against the working class and its culture" (Young 10).

---

[34] It should be noted that the tone of the love that Gradgrind feels for his son here is new. Gradgrind begins the novel as a staunch believer in facts, in the individual, and in the market. However, when the solidarity of his family is threatened – Louisa by Harthouse and Tom by Bitzer – Gradgrind has a transformational change of heart, which is also aided by Sissy Jupe's presence in the Gradgrind house.

Bitzer wants desperately to become a member of the middle-classes and so tries to take Tom's place in the Bank. In essence, this is Bitzer's attempt to pull himself up by his proverbial bootstraps and climb the social ladder. Bounderby separates himself from the laboring classes by rejecting their collective associations, like the Union "in favor of the ideals of individualism and self-help" (Young 10). He is characteristically obtuse when he sees in Stephen the seeds of rebellion that challenge his position as a self-made man; he tells Stephen, "[Y]ou are one of those chaps who have always got a grievance. And you go about, sowing it and raising crops. That's the business of *your* life, my friend" (182). Bounderby assigns to Stephen the role of an inciter. Of course, Stephen is no Slackbridge; he has neither the desire nor the power to head up a union or power a strike. But because Stephen speaks critically of the tendency of factories, factory owners, and the laws that protect both, he becomes an individual, rather than a Hand. Stephen's individuality, though, does not suggest combination for Bounderby. Instead, Bounderby reacts against Stephen's individuality for the same reason that Slackbridge does. Both men despise the value of individualism even though they claim to represent it: Bounderby as a self-made man and Slackbridge as an organizer who seeks justice for each and every hand. Once again, then, Dickens is showing that Bounderby is a false prophet of individualism – and thus rehabilitating the image of the self-made man.

Of course, Dickens is careful to paint Bounderby, Bitzer and Slackbridge as unlikable characters. Bitzer becomes Bounderby's "rising young man, so devoted to [Bounderby's] great merits" that Bounderby makes "a show of Bitzer to strangers"

(311). Upon his death, Bounderby clones himself and creates a community made entirely out of individuals who are all exactly the same. Of course, this is no community at all, in the fraternal, fellowship sense of the word. Bounderby's will provides for "five-and-twenty Humbugs, past five and fifty years of age" to take "upon himself the name, Josiah Bounderby of Coketown . . . [and] for ever dine in Bounderby Hall, for ever lodge in Bounderby Buildings, for ever attend a Bounderby chapel, for ever go to sleep under a Bounderby chaplain, for ever be supported out of a Bounderby estate, and for ever nauseate all healthy stomachs with a vast amount of Bounderby balderdash and bluster" (312). Bounderby's legacy is not unlike a grotesque body of hands, and it undermines his insistence on the importance of his own individual self. Obviously, Dickens's portraits of Bounderby and Bitzer are unappealing and vile. And it is through these portraits that Dickens demonstrates his support of the essential qualities of the self-made man. This support is shown in the way he idealizes middle-class virtues and cloaks them in religion and morality, thus rehabilitating them – so that Bounderby and Bitzer appear as the corruption of these ideals, but the ideals themselves are not corrupted.

Through his sympathetic portrait of hard-working and thoughtful Stephen Blackpool, Dickens continues his support of the myth of the self-made man. Stephen is a laborer in Bounderby's factory, and as such, Bounderby sees Stephen as a Hand, part of his laboring-class body. As are all Hands in Bounderby's factory, Stephen is important only in his capacity to produce goods. However, when Bounderby's Hands form the United Agregate Tribunal and threaten combination, it is not only

Bounderby who feels bullied, Dickens does too. Even though his portrait of Bounderby is satirical, Dickens does not sympathize with the Union.[35] In fact, his portrait of Slackbridge, the union agitator, and the United Aggregate Tribunal is hostile to a laboring-class community characterized by solidarity and economic egalitarianism. One reason for Dickens' hostility is that this community could easily be a threat to middle-class stability – and to the essential qualities to which they owe their success – especially since the French Revolution was still part of popular memory. Josephine Guy, in her study of the role of the gentleman in Victorian fiction, explains that Stephen's isolation from his laboring-class community "is often read as evidence of Dickens's inability to conceive that working-class decency and working-class militancy could possibly coexist" (130). The Union, as a trope in industrial fiction, represents for the middle classes the threatening power inherent in laboring-class community. Arlene Young explains that the stability of the middle-classes' vision rests on the ability "to order and control society through the manipulation of images and representation of the working class" (52). Dickens undermines this class-consciousness by attributing it "to the manipulative activities of an unscrupulous individual" in the figure of Slackbridge (Guy 130). As a spokesman for the United Aggregate Tribunal, Slackbridge invokes "the holy and eternal privileges of Brotherhood" (170). But what these privileges are for each laborer Slackbridge never makes clear. Instead of explaining how he will seek justice

[35] It should be noted that the Union trope in industrial fiction rarely works to support laboring-class needs. The Union often figures as an image of laboring-class violence and agitation, rather than laboring-class community and solidarity.

for each and every hand through the collective power of the Union, Slackbridge draws attention to the fact that Stephen Blackpool is the only Hand in Bounderby's mill who does not join the Union. Slackbridge acknowledges Stephen to be he "who, at such a time, deserts his post, and sells his flag; who, at such a time, turns a traitor and a craven and a recreant; who, at such a time, is not ashamed to make to you the dastardly and humiliating avowal that he will hold himself aloof and will *not* be one of those associated in the gallant stand for Freedom and Right" (171).

The consequence of Stephen's action is to be shunned by his fellow laborers, which turns him into one of the novel's only true individuals because he is the only character who lives outside any community. He falls "into the loneliest of lives, the life of solitude among a familiar crowd" (175). Bounderby even fires him simply because he has become an individual: "You are such a waspish, raspish, ill-conditioned chap, you see . .. . that even your own Union, the men who know you best, will have nothing to do with you. I never thought those fellows could be right in anything; but I tell you what! I so far go along with them for a novelty, that I'll have nothing to do with you either" (183). What we have here is a self-made man, whose origins are obscured and whose success is believed to be entirely of his own making, supposedly butting heads with the demands of labor, which are "urged in the name of mutualism and brotherhood rather than ordered in the name of established institutional power" (Catano 425). The irony of Bounderby's words, of course, lies in the fact that he is agreeing with what he despises most: a laboring-class consciousness and sense of community at odds with his perceived individualism.

This is the final act that totally severs Stephen from the mutualism and brotherhood of the factory body. Dickens is, thus, rehabilitating the image of the individual as self-reliant just as he is rehabilitating the image of the self-made man.

Because Stephen is one of the few characters who understand the benefits of community, he feels very alone when he is forced to give up his associations in the wake of the Union: "He had never known before, the strength of the want in his heart for the frequent recognition of a nod, a look, a word" (175). Stephen is one of the novel's critics of the philosophy that communal identities have no importance. Even though he has been abandoned by his peers, during his second interview with Bounderby, "[h]e had not spoken out of his own will and desire." Rather, he was "faithful to the last to those who had repudiated him" (181). He believes in laboring-class solidarity but believes that it should not subsume the value of individualism.

If this is the case, then why is Stephen sacrificed in the abandoned mine, aptly named "Old Hell Shaft"? Mortally injured, Stephen is rescued days after his fall, and the gravity of his situation, as compared to that of men who had died in the same shaft, is not lost on him:

> "I ha' read on't in the public petition, as onny one may read, fro' the men that works in pits, in which they ha' <u>pray'n and pray'n</u> the lawmakers for Christ's sake not to let their work be murder to 'em but to spare 'em for th' wives and children that they loves as well as gentlefolk loves theirs." (290, my emphasis)

Stephen understands that these men had lost their lives because no labor laws existed to protect them. But more importantly, Stephen understands that these men died trying to keep their families "fro' want and hunger" (290). Stephen's thoughts of laboring-class political action – petitioning parliament to write laws governing labor conditions – are subsumed by quasi-religious appeals in the form of prayer. The value that Stephen places on laboring-class solidarity is complicated by his faith in personal and individual appeals (i.e. the men pray for their families) as opposed to political or collective action (i.e. union activism or the petitioning of Parliament), a value which is evidenced by Stephen's last appeal. Because Stephen knows that Tom was the one who stole money from Bounderby's bank, he petitions Gradgrind to clear his name: "Sir, yo will clear me an mak my name good wi'aw men" (291).

In his final words to Rachel, Stephen narrates his final spiritual appeal while in the Old Hell Shaft. "In my pain and trouble, looking up younder. – wi' [the star] shinin' on me – I ha' seen more clear, and ha' made it my dyin prayer that aw th' world may on'y coom together more, an get a better unnerstan'in o'one another, than when I were in't my own weak seln" (291). Stephen's final appeal is utopic in nature. In it, the realism of the novel gives way, for a moment, to religious sentimentalism, bordering on bathos. This star that Stephen prays to is the same one that he thinks is "the star as guided to Our Savior's home" (291). And it is this very star, Dickens tells us, that "had shown [Stephen] where to find the <u>God of the poor</u>; and through humility, and sorrow, and forgiveness, he had gone to his Redeemer's rest" (292, my emphasis). Humility and forgiveness, of course, are two of the essential qualities of

the self-made man. Stephen, though, because he is a laborer – even one who shuns combination and sets himself apart from laboring-class community, thus becoming an individual – is not allowed to use those qualities to become a self-made man, so he must be sacrificed in the Old Hell Shaft. Even in Stephen's death, Dickens still stresses Stephen's social status by implying that each social class has its own God. As through mocking the caricatures of Bounderby and Bitzer, it is also through the sacrifice of Stephen that Dickens finally upholds the essential qualities to which the middle classes owe their success: humbleness, frugality, forgiveness, faithfulness, sobriety, to name a few. Through Stephen's death, Dickens is rehabilitating the self-made man and preserving those qualities for the true self-made man, who must be, for Dickens, a member of the middle classes.

While Dickens uses rehabilitation as a strategy to contain the contradictions bound up with the self-made man and insists that no character in his novel deserves to become one, Gaskell tries to resolve this tension by creating a less extreme model in John Thornton. While Thornton does exemplify some of the self-made man's negative implications – his intractable independence, implicit elitism, and contradictory assumptions about character – North and South's strategy to contain them is to show how the self-made man can be reformed through domestication and the invocation of Christian piety.

Even more staunchly than Bounderby or Bitzer, John Thornton, the self-made man of Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South, insists on his status as an individual

above all else, bound to no one and totally self-reliant.[36] In fact, Thornton explains, "I value my own independence so highly that I can fancy no degradation greater than that of having another man perpetually directing and advising and lecturing me, or even planning too closely in any way about my actions" (168). While ostensibly speaking about his relationship – or lack thereof – with his workers, Thornton's comment underscores the importance he places on his perceived autonomy. Of course, as he distances himself from his laborers, citing his own value on independence, he also distances himself from his social responsibilities as an employer, a point to which I will return later in this chapter. And at the same time, as a self-made man and a member of the middle classes, Thornton sees himself and other manufacturers like him as creators of their class, just as he sees himself as "the architect of his own fortunes" (511). Thornton's use of the architect metaphor implies, by a back-projection, a highly trained, elite position, in which a form of mastery shaped his life before he could even have had such ability. Thornton even envisions the creation of his class as his obligation as an industrialist: "[T]he duties of a manufacturer are far larger and wider than those merely of an employer of labour: we have a wide commercial character to maintain, which makes us into the great pioneers of civilization" (171). In this passage, Thornton's use of pronouns

[36] Like Bounderby, Thornton has a mother who was, in part, responsible for his success. "Sixteen years ago, my father died under very miserable circumstances. I was taken from school, and had to become a man (as well as I could) in a few days. I had such a mother as few are blest with; a woman of strong power, and firm resolve. We went into a small country town, where living was cheaper than in Milton, and where I got employment in a draper's shop. . . Week by week, our income came to fifteen shillings, out of which three people had to be kept. My mother managed so that I put by three out of these fifteen shillings regularly. This made the beginning; this taught me self-denial. . . . Now when I feel that in my own case it is no good luck, nor merit, nor talent, -- but simply the habits of life which taught me to despise indulgences not thoroughly earned" (126).

"we" and "us" signals a collectivity – manufacturers as a group of people – and his use of "commercial character" suggests that this group has a collective character. For Thornton, as for Bounderby and Bitzer, the only collectivity that has value is one related to economics and the market. If a collectivity or other social relationship threatens the self-made man's tie to the market, as Thornton's quotation about the value of independence demonstrates, it is rendered worthless. Furthermore, his movement from the singular "manufacturer" to the plural "pioneers of civilization" mirrors the movement from the self-made man as the creator of his own individual self to self-made men as creators of the middle classes.[37] The assumption is that the middle classes create themselves, and they take as their representative the figure of the entrepreneurial, industrial, individualistic self-made man who has the character necessary to the task of creation and representation. David Kuchta explains that to describe the making of the self-made man means also to describe how those men became the middle class (136). In addition, term middle class "was given prominence and definition by the political and economic struggles that enfranchised and enriched the people who cam to be seen as middle-class men. Political culture and political economy defined 'class' in terms that legitimated the voices and interests of these very men" (Kuchta 136). So as Thornton documents and details

[37] "[T]he middle-class image of the self-made man – rational, frugal, and industrious – was not a self-made image, but rather a hand-me-down from an earlier generation, having its roots in an eighteenth-century aristocratic ideology of masculinity. . . . Aristocratic men had portrayed the middle class was vain, venal, and vicious; middle-class reformers reversed this by pitting 'prodigal luxurious landlords' against middle-class proponents of virtue and liberty. For reformers, luxury and effeminacy originated not from below, but in the 'hereditary honors and titles of nobility [that] produce a proud and tyrannical aristocracy' . . . Political reformers thus reversed eighteenth-century aristocratic claims to masculinity and political legitimacy by ascribing these virtues [simplicity of character, manliness of spirit, disdain of tinsel] to middle class men" (Kuchta 136-141).

how he became self-made, implicit in his explanation are the details of how the middle classes were formed.

The image of the self-made man, then, serves as an idealized, even elitist image of the middle classes as a whole because, as Kovačević explains in Fact into Fiction: English Literature and the Industrial Scene (1975), "the principle of improvement through self-help was transferred from the sphere of the individual to that of society as a whole" (37). Just as the self-made man stands alone, managing wayward laborers with one hand and distancing himself from worthless aristocrats with the other, so the self-made classes stand opposed both to the laborers who warrant their rank due to their vicious character and to the aristocrats who simply inherit (or buy) their status. "As a cultural and political construction, the middle class was precisely that: in the middle between two forms of corruption, and effeminate aristocracy and a vicious working class . . . While aristocrats were profligate, the working class was dissolute, and thus both were tempted by political venality" (Kuchta 140). As the representative for the middle classes, the self-made man's most important asset is his character, largely because it is something he can control. Industrial texts insist on the importance of character; more often than not, the self-made man's worthy character is juxtaposed to the profligate character of the laborer or to the idle character of the aristocrat. This discourse represents the importance of one's character, something he theoretically can control, over one's birth, something he theoretically cannot. In addition, the difference between the terms "man" and "gentleman" illustrates the importance of character in determining a man's value.

The difference also illustrates the way in which the self-made man stands as an idealized image of the middle classes because it centers him staunchly in middle-class values. As an image for the middle classes, the self-made man's character traits are transposed so that the middle classes become, for example, the industrious classes and so are separated from the idle and vicious classes.

These differences between the two terms are illustrated in North and South's chapter titled "Men and Gentlemen," which describes a dinner party given by the Thorntons for several of Milton's prominent self-made men. During the party, Margaret and Mr. Thornton discuss the definitions of "man" and "gentleman" and how each pertains to the notion of being self-made.[38] Thornton draws a distinction between the two terms:

> " A man is to me a higher and completer being than a gentleman. . . . I take it that 'gentleman' is a term that only describes a person in his relation to others; but when we speak of him as a 'man,' we consider him not merely with regard to his fellow-men, but in relation to himself, -- to life – to time – to eternity. A cast away, lonely as Robinson Crusoe – . . . I am rather weary of this word 'gentlemanly,' which seems to me to be often inappropriately used, and often, too,

[38] Arlene Young draws attention to the fact that Elizabeth Gaskell is not the only novelist to draw attention to the contested meaning of the term "gentleman." Thomas Hardy, in A Pair of Blue Eyes (1873) makes a similar move. Mrs. Swancourt educates her stepdaughter on the proper use of the word "gentleman," while simultaneously demonstrating its contested nature:

> "My dear, you mustn't say 'gentlemen' nowadays. . . . We have handed over 'gentlemen' to the lower middle class, where the word is still to be heard at tradesmen's balls and provincial tea-parties, I believe. It is done with here."
>
> "What must I say then?"
>
> "Ladies and *men* always." (156)

> with such exaggerated distortion of meaning, while the full simplicity of the noun 'man,' and the adjective 'manly' are unacknowledged – that I am induced to class it with the cant of the day." (218)[39]

The man sees himself as an individual who not only has the social skills of the gentleman but also has the power to create himself. Thornton further clarifies his definition by referring to Robinson Crusoe, an archetype of the self-made man.[40] For Thornton, Robinson Crusoe has those elements of character –what they are Thornton doesn't say, but independence is certainly implied – that can turn him into a successful, self-made man. Thornton's definition of "man" even takes on near godlike significance in that a self-made man can be eternal. On the other hand, Thornton's conception of "gentleman" stands for a man who knows his position in relation to those around him: how to act in particular social situations, how to treat the women in his presence, how to manage his laborers in a cost-effective way. Arlene Young notes that during the nineteenth century, the term gentleman "becomes an increasingly unstable symbol; 'gentleman' becomes a value-laden term that is paradoxically empty of meaning. Gentlemanly types proliferate; there is the gentleman of birth, of wealth, of breeding, of religion, or of education, to mention just

---

[39] For an alternate reading of this passage, see Barnes 13. She discusses this passage in terms of Victorian ideas of masculinity.

[40] Ivanka Kovačević explains that Defoe's hero is the eighteenth-century archetype of the self made man and John Halifax is the nineteenth-century archetype: "Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe (1719) epitomizes the spirit of self-help; seldom has the creative activity of man been presented with greater imaginative appeal than in this story of the isolated individual who, in the face of heavy odds, nevertheless masters a hostile environment so that it becomes subservient to his needs. But this is made possible because the hero turns his hear to God in his hour of dire need. . . . The Victorian parable of self-help [is] Dinah Craik's John Halifax, Gentleman (1856)" (36-7). Here, Kovačević brings to the surface the connection between self-help, laissez-faire, and Christian duty, a connection that I explore at the end of this chapter.

a few possibilities" (Young 6). This is one of the aspects of the term that Thornton criticizes when he notes its "exaggerated distortion of meaning." Another implication of "gentleman" in Thornton's quotation is that a gentleman is part of a society, and so his identity is bound up with a sense of the communal. In addition, for Thornton, the word "gentleman" is a term laden with aristocratic significance. By including it "with the cant of the day," Thornton implies that the word is simply upper-class jargon, synonymous with the more aristocratic South, while the term "man" is equivalent to the self-made man. Endowed with a godlike power, the self-made man becomes a creator of his own class, even as he insists on the absolute importance of his individualism.

In one sentence, Thornton explains his version of the creation of the self-made man and all that it implies. He states, "Raw, crude materials came together; men of the same level, as regarded education and station, took suddenly the different positions of masters and men, owing to the mother-wit, as regarded opportunities and probabilities, which distinguished some, and made them far-seeing as to what great future lay concealed in that rude model of Sir Richard Arkwright's" (124). In this passage, Thornton explains the creation of the self-made man, who through his in-born intelligence and character, or "mother-wit," is able to separate himself from those below him. This act of separation into "masters and men" signifies the formation of a class hierarchy. Notably, Thornton's separation also has implications for his earlier definition of "man." Are these "men" endowed with the same characteristics of Thornton's "man"? The answer, of course, is no because the

former is a class position, while the latter is an ideological construction. Thornton tries to explain that the division of men into masters and men is unbiased by suggesting that they all began on equal footing and "suddenly" found themselves divided into classes. Nevertheless, his reference to "mother-wit" suggests an in-born nature and, thus, a natural and justified class hierarchy in a middle-class society. The men who have become masters were able to recognize opportunity and make the most of it because they had a savvy business sense with which to raise themselves up.

Thornton's belief in the power of the individual to turn himself into a self-made man is theorized by Samuel Smiles in his famous nineteenth century self-help book titled, appropriately, Self-Help (1859). Smiles's self-help ideology rests on the maxim that "heaven helps those who help themselves," which appears on page one of Self-Help. Smiles explains that it is

> a well-tried maxim, embodying in a small compass the results of vast human experience. The spirit of self-help is the root of all genuine growth in the individual; and, exhibited in the lives of many, it constitutes the true source of national vigor and strength. Help from without is often enfeebling in its effect, but help from within invariably invigorates. Whatever is done *for* men or classes, to a certain extent takes away the stimulus and necessity of doing from themselves; and where men are subjected to over-guidance and over-government, the inevitable tendency is to render them comparatively helpless. (1)

Of course, the first line of this quotation, with its reference to "vast human experience," implies that the working-class laborer has the necessary skills to help himself, just as Thornton insists in the above quotation. This implication is both the key to and the breakdown of this maxim. It is the key because those men with the social wherewithal to develop skills (like an education, or business connections, or leisure time, or even mother-wit) see the skills not as learned, cultivated behaviors, which are really endemic only to a particular social class, but as a natural aspects of themselves as men. However, this implication also reveals the ideological nature of "Heaven helps those who help themselves" as a way of controlling social mobility. Of course, the working-class laborer does not have the opportunity, the social connections, or the education to develop the skills necessary to become self-made even though the maxim suggests that he does.

In addition, Smiles insists that when men are "done for" (as opposed to doing for themselves), they are rendered "comparatively helpless," a conviction that also appears in Thornton's argument concerning his own independence. This kind of belief allows the self-made industrialist to ignore the needs of those dependent on him, while ignoring, as well, all the ways in which he may himself have been or may still be dependent on others. Finally, Smiles implies that the middle classes create themselves when he states that "the spirit of self-help . . . constitutes the true source of national vigor and strength" when "exhibited in the lives of many." Smiles means that the middle classes help themselves, much in the same way that the self-made man helps himself. And as such, it is the middle classes, not the aristocracy, that are

the "true source[s] of national vigor and strength," an assumption that effectively debunks the power and importance associated with the upper classes and allows the self-made man and his middle classes to distance themselves from the aristocracy, a group that they have purposefully portrayed as idle and often corrupted by luxury and entropy. "'Class' was constructed in the terms of English political culture – a virtuous, sober class of producers was pitted against an idle, parasitical class of consumers," explains David Kuchta. As such, the term reflected the "biases of that political culture's attitudes toward production and consumption" (Kuchta 136).

The title of North and South, especially as those geographical markers are used in the novel, represents this dichotomy between the middle and upper classes. For example, Thornton sees the aristocratic south as opposed to the more industrious north: "I would rather be a man toiling, suffering – nay, falling and successless – here, than lead a dull prosperous life in the old worn grooves of what you call more aristocratic society down in the South, with their slow days of careless ease. One may be clogged with honey and unable to rise and fly" (122). What Thornton refers to is how the aristocratic classes are prosperous without having to work for it – in essence, they inherit their position and wealth, as opposed to the middle-class manufacturer who must work for and, hence, create his own, sometimes uncertain, success. Thornton's mother similarly scorns the idleness of the aristocracy. She separates her son's position as a self-made merchant from the more aristocratic occupations, like being a member of Parliament or of the peerage:

> "To hold and maintain a high, honourable place among the merchants of his country – the men of his town. Such a place my son has earned for himself. Go where you will – I don't say in England only, but in Europe – the name of John Thornton of Milton is known and respected amongst all men of business. Of course, it is unknown in the fashionable circles," she continued, scornfully. "Idle gentlemen and ladies are not likely to know much of a Milton manufacturer, unless he gets into parliament, or marries a lord's daughter." (160)

The question that Mrs. Thornton's scorn poses is, of course, what would happen to John Thornton's name and self-made status if he were to become a member of the aristocracy? She'd have us believe that he'd become an idle consumer. David Kuchta explains that it is the middle classes' tendency to construct class along the lines of production and consumption that establishes the laboring classes as "dissolute," the upper classes as "profligate," and the middle classes as industrious; as it juxtaposes its character to that of the other classes, the middle classes legitimate their claim to economic and social power (140-1). "In middle-class radical rhetoric, it was habits of consumption, rather than the relation to the means of production, that ultimately distinguished middle-class men from working class men. It was middle-class men's sober relation to the means of consumption – in contrast to the luxury and

indulgence of both aristocrats and workers – that defined the middle class" (Kuchta 141).[41]

In the Grundrisse (1841), Karl Marx criticizes the fiction of social mobility and the self-made man by explaining that the starting point of material production is the "socially determined production of individuals" (380). Marx criticizes the tendency of capitalist theorists who locate the starting point with "the individual and isolated hunter or fisher" (380). These figures "are Robinson Crusoe stories" which "are the fiction and only the aesthetic fiction of the small and great adventure stories" (380). Those economists, like Adam Smith and David Ricardo,[42] who use Robinson Crusoe as the figure of the self-made productive force, do not see Crusoe as a product of history because this kind of man conforms to their idea of human nature, which is "regarded not as developing historically, but as posited by nature" (376). This is the same argument that proponents of the self-made man, like Bounderby, Thornton, and Halifax, use to explain their own success. Marx states:

> Production by isolated individuals outside society – something which might happen as an exception to a civilized man who by accident got

[41] In light of Kuchta's point here, I am reminded of the scene in Hard Times when Stephen visits Bounderby at lunchtime to discuss the possibility of divorcing his wife. Bounderby tries very hard to distance himself from his laboring-class origins, as his self-made fiction illustrates. Nevertheless, in terms of his gross consumption of food and liquor, Dickens manages to make sure that Bounderby's luxurious and indulgent habits of consumption lay bare his origins, even if his rhetoric doesn't.

[42] It should be noted that Smiles's explanation of self-help also has a connection to Adams and Ricardo through laissez-faire capitalism and the problem with "over-guidance and over-government" where economic progress is concerned. His definition of self-help connects to the reigning economic model of the time, laissez-faire capitalism, which was the policy of non-involvement of the government in production affairs. It promotes self-interest and competition as forces that lead to success, affluence, and freedom. Of course, the doctrine of laissez-faire also promotes the division of labor, long hours, and poor working conditions, which are all regulated not by government standards but by the needs of the capitalist employer who measures fiscal success by his bottom line.

> into the wilderness and already potentially possessed within himself the forces of society – is as great an absurdity as the idea of the development of language without individuals living together and talking to one another. (381)

Marx explains that so-called self-made men are actually products of their social and historical circumstances – to believe otherwise is ignorant, even silly. By denying the anti-social implications of the self-made man, Marx lays bare one strategy of containment, "which allows what can be thought to seem internally coherent in its own terms, while repressing the unthinkable . . . which lies beyond its boundaries" (Jameson 53). What appears to be coherent is the self-madeness of the self-made man, which is, for Marx, an unrealistic, even unthinkable possibility.

One social and historical circumstance, appropriate to both Crusoe and Thornton, is the class hierarchy, which depends on the master-servant balance of power. The fact that Thornton compares his self-made status to Crusoe is no accident. If Thornton's laborers were to elevate themselves from their subservient position, Thornton's power would dissipate. It is in his best economic interest to maintain his position as master; as he argues, it is in his best interest "to make wise laws and come to just decisions in the conduct of my business – laws and decisions which work for my own good in the first instance – for [my laborers] in the second" (167). In her study of English literature and the Industrial Revolution, Ivanka Kovačević explains the connection between laissez-faire and self-help and its effect on the laboring classes:

> When combined with capitalist competition, this self-complaisant social philosophy resulted in a very crude application of the self-help principle from which the class that possessed no capital at all was bound to suffer most. If every man's duty is to be successful, and if he has no responsibility at all for his fellow men, it follows that he will crush the weak whose interests conflict with his own. The man of business had no conception of social responsibility that might compel him to consider the welfare of those whom he employed. (38)

Through her portrait of Thornton and his relationship with his laborers, Gaskell illustrates Kovačević's point quite well. Finally, to maintain order and limit the threat inherent in social mobility, the self-made man must be a member of the middle or upper classes. He cannot have laboring-class origins, as Dickens so staunchly implies in his portraits of Bounderby, Bitzer, and Stephen.

While the capitalist heroes of industrial novels insist that they are self-made men, the rhetoric that surrounds the laboring classes in novels simultaneously argues that lower-class laborers do not have and cannot develop the kind of character needed to become a great industrialist or a pioneer of civilization, to borrow Thornton's term, because the culture attributed to the lower classes prohibits such developments – men who drink or engage in licentious or rebellious acts are not men of good character. In Character (1883), a book that details the worldly rewards of certain moral values intrinsic to the self-made man, Smiles argues that self-control is "the chief distinction between man and the mere animal; and, indeed, there can be no true manhood without

it" (177). When a man succumbs to "his impulses and passions" he instantly "yields up his moral freedom" and "is carried along the current of life" (178). In order to avoid being a passive victim of his passions, the man of good character must exercise self-control: "Nine-tenths of the vicious desires that degrade society, and which, when indulged, swell into the crimes that disgrace it, would shrink into insignificance before the advance of valiant self-discipline, self-respect, and self control. By the watchful exercise of these virtues, purity of heart and mind become habitual, and the character is built up in chastity, virtue, and temperance" (178). While Smiles never names the "impulses and passions" that can drown a man's character, he does imply that acts of drunkenness, licentiousness, or rebelliousness lead to the degradation of character because they interfere with the "proper system and order in the regulation of life" (179). Smiles's implication is that in order to become a successful self-made man, one must be vigilant about maintaining order and regulation in his life, in terms of economics and of sexuality. In either set of terms, if a man spends too much, he ventures potentially dire consequences. The way that members of the laboring classes are portrayed in these novels, then, becomes an important point in the attainability of the self-made status. Because the laborer is most often represented as drunk, lewd, or rebellious, he automatically, by virtue of his character as well as his birth, is denied entrance to the club. The political significance of lower classes "in the bourgeois imagination is reflected in a cultural mythology that views . . . the working-class drunk as a threat to social stability" (Young 50).[43]

[43] Young prefaces this point with this one: "The creation of the illusion of class stability is a crucial

For example, Boucher, the laboring- class rioter in North and South, tries to advocate change by breaking laws and threatening Thornton's life and yet dies by his own hand: he drowns himself in a river and "his skin was stained by the water in the brook, which had been used for dyeing purposes" (368). He is symbolically marked as human waste by the very chemicals used by the factory in which he labored. Due to his riotous and violent nature, there would be no way for a man like Boucher to fulfill the myth of the self-made man; nor is it possible for Nicholas Higgins, one of Thornton's weavers, to rise above his social position, either. He is, in Mr. Hale's words, "a drunken infidel weaver" (286). While Mr. Hale is exaggerating, Higgins is unable to transcend his laborer status because he drinks too much alcohol and questions the tenets of established religion. Even though through the course of the novel Higgins becomes aware of the complexity of the master-laborer relationship, that awareness is not enough to transform him into a capitalist. Mr. Thornton generally comments on this kind of man: "I do not look on self-indulgent, sensual people as worthy of my hatred; I simply look upon them with contempt for their poorness of character" (126).

Not only are violence, agnosticism, and alcoholism addressed in North and South, but also overt shows of sexuality are shown to be detrimental to the character of the laboring classes. Arlene Young explains that the laboring classes were thought

---

component of the politics of literary representation in the English novel during the middle years of the nineteenth century. The specter of aristocratic dominance had been largely laid to rest over the course of the previous century, as the bourgeoisie wrested moral authority from the aristocracy by redefining the gentleman. The aristocracy retained its prestige and the aura of glamour, but bourgeois respectability had displaced gentility as the basis for social and moral leadership, and so the aristocracy no longer posed a serious threat to bourgeois cultural hegemony" (Young 49).

to be less civilized, especially in terms of their control over their sexual behaviors. This kind of behavior was often blamed on poverty, rather than seen as its result. "[I]n the most reductive formulations of middle-class social mythology, the lower classes figured as a collective of morally weak beings in need of control and guidance, who presented a more or less overt threat to social stability" (Young 51). When first adjusting to Milton life, the "unrestrained voices" and the "carelessness of all common rules of street politeness" of the laborers frighten Margaret (110). She "alternately dreaded and fired up against the workmen, who commented not on her dress, but on her looks, in . . . [an] open, fearless manner. She, who had hitherto felt that even the most refined remark on her personal appearance was an impertinence, had to endure undisguised admiration from these out-spoken men" (110). While the ogling that Margaret endures on the street remains fairly innocent within the context of the novel (at least until the riot scene), the fear of overt sexuality and licentiousness in the factory laborers was one very large source of concern for those writers looking to reform the factory system. James Kay asserted that licentiousness is "capable of corrupting the whole body of society" (62).[44] Peter Gaskell claimed, "The stimulus of a heated atmosphere, the contact of opposite sexes, the examples of license upon the animal passions – all have conspired to produce a very early development of sexual appetencies . . . Gross language, and allowance of word and deed are pregnant proofs of what the reality is when the outward from is so debased. The peculiar qualities of these passions . . . render the want of some sufficient visible check very

[44] For Kay, the great sexual evil is sex before marriage, which is caused by a "relaxation of social obligations" and gives rise to numbers of illegitimate births (62).

obvious" (103). Like the men on the Milton streets, factory laborers are portrayed as having no self-control in these tracts. Since self-control, whether it is over religious doubt, alcohol, or overt shows of sexuality, separates man from animal, when a man loses it, he ceases to be a true man.

In North and South, the show of overt laboring-class sexuality Margaret must endure while on Milton's streets is juxtaposed to Thornton's concealed, middle-class sexuality during the tea scene in Chapter 10. With passionate interest, seeming almost to burst, he watches Margaret serve tea:

> She looked as if she was not attending to the conversation, but solely busy with the tea-cups, among which her round ivory hands moved with pretty, noiseless daintiness. She had a bracelet on one taper arm, which would fall down over her round wrist. Mr. Thornton watched the re-placing of this troublesome ornament with far more attention than he listened to her father. It seemed as if it fascinated him to see her push it up impatiently, until it tightened her soft flesh; and then to mark the loosening – the fall. He could almost have exclaimed – "There is goes again!" There was so little left to be done after he arrived at the preparation for tea, that he was almost sorry the obligation of eating and drinking came so soon to prevent his watching Margaret. She handed him his cup of tea with the proud air of an unwilling slave; but her eye caught the moment when he was ready for another cup; and he almost longed to ask her to do for him what he

> saw her compelled to do for her father, who took her little finger and thumb in his masculine hand, and made them serve as sugar-tongs. (120).

The sensuousness that Thornton bestows upon Margaret's arm, wrist, and hand is unmistakable, and it is as sexual as the overt stares she is met with on the street. Nevertheless, comfortably couched in the decidedly middle-class ritual of taking tea in the parlor, Thornton's desire is contained, and his sexuality is not threatening. In contrast, the ogling that Margaret endures on the streets erupts in figurative sexual violence when she is wounded during the novel's riot scene. Gaskell's domestication Thornton's desire is a strategy that contains the contradictory assumptions about character. Character is not a universal term, as the rhetoric of the self-made man would have us believe; rather, it is class-specific. When juxtaposed, these two shows of sexuality speak to the way in which character is constructed in terms of class standing. The self-made man is given control, while the laboring-class man is not. This control is further implied and complicated by the sugar tongs image. In The Other Victorians (1964), Steven Marcus explains that the "imagery in which sexuality was represented in consciousness was largely drawn from the sphere of socio-economic activity and had to do with concerns and anxieties about problems of accumulation, production, and excessive expenditure" (xiii). Thornton's desire is an apt illustration of Marcus's point: Thornton desperately desires to control Margaret's hand and make it serve as sugar tongs for him just as he is desperate to control the hands in his factory. This image, while cloaked in middle-class domestic rituals, is an

industrial one in that conflates the control of sexuality with the control of laborers and machines.

This dichotomy of character is further emphasized by references to it not only as cultural capital but also as economic capital. For example, when referring to "self-indulgent, sensual people" like Higgins and other laborers, Gaskell does not have Thornton choose the word "poorness" to describe their lack of character by accident. "Poorness" not only refers to the quality of one's character but also to the quantity of capital intrinsic to developing good character. The presence of ready, surplus capital is one of the necessary components of the character of the self-made man, even though Smiles may say it's not. In fact, in On the Economy of Machines and Manufactures (1832), Charles Babbage explains the significance of capital to the character of the industrialist:

> The value of character, though great in all circumstances of life, can never be so fully experienced by persons possessed of small capital, as by those employing much larger sums: whilst these larger sums of money for which the merchant deals, render his character for punctuality more studied and known by others. Thus it happens that high character supplies the place of an additional portion of capital; and the merchant, in dealing with the great manufacturer, is saved from the expense of verification, by knowing that the loss, or even the impeachment, of the manufacturer's character, would be attended with

> greater injury to himself than any profit upon a single transaction could compensate. (219)

Here, Babbage relates character to capital: the greater the amount of capital, the greater the value of character. As character and capital are conflated, they both serve as a kind of insurance policy against loss during a transaction between seller and buyer. If the transaction fails, the seller will lose both capital and character. This association rests on the assumption that men without money are men to whom character is less valuable or treasured. In addition, it implies that money, rather than kindliness, gentlemanliness, or selflessness provides the foundation for success, which means that good character can be bought if the price is right. Good character is not simply developed through hard work.

In his chapter titled "On a New System of Manufacturing," Babbage further examines the connection between capital and character as he sets forth a model factory system. He explains that this system is "pregnant with the most important results," which will help improve the condition of the working classes and increase the size of the manufacturing system (253). By referring to the factory system as "pregnant," Babbage not only humanizes but also feminizes a system of exploitation, thereby endowing the factory system with a maternal nature, which may have the power to ameliorate the laboring classes. This image also indirectly aligns the factory

with the domestic sphere, implying that the production of the factory is not too far removed from the cottage industries of the past.[45]

His model rests on the idea that the "most intelligent and skillful workmen" should, with their small sums of capital, join with small manufacturers to create a factory in which to invest their capital. Profits of such a venture would be divided proportionally among the investors, based on what they initially invested (254). While the division of labor would determine which laborer was responsible for which task, the laborers would also be encouraged to invent improvements that would increase the productivity of the factory; the inventor, then, would be monetarily compensated for his invention.

For Babbage, this new system has several benefits. First, all laborers have a direct interest in the success of the factory, and therefore strive against mismanagement and for improvements. Babbage also claims that this new system would only admit "workmen of high character and qualifications" because a rigorous judgment in this regard "would be the common interest of all" (257). Finally, and most importantly, this system would remove all conflict between laborer and capitalist. In fact, the common interest shared between laborer and capitalist would transform them into one being. Babbage exclaims that laborer and capitalist would "shade into each other" (258).

There are two important points in Babbage's new system: first, that this system will eradicate all laborers of bad character, and second, that the system itself is

[45] One of the great evils of the factory system, for men like Gaskell and Kay, was that is corrupted the nuclear family by forcing women and children to work in factories.

endowed with the power to create new beings, which is further supported by his use of "pregnant" to describe the potential results of such a system. Of course, the premise on which this new system rests is that all of its founding members would actually have access to capital, which the vast majority of wage laborers do not have. Finally, those men with capital have the ability to become self-made because they are the ones for whom this new system is really a model. Babbage is sustaining the myth that all men can become successful while simultaneously imposing a foundation for success that only few men can mount.

Obviously, for men like Babbage, the image of the self-made man is, ostensibly, that of an economic man, endowed with the power to create that accompanies capital. Nevertheless, in many novels that depict the rise of the self-made man, the image simultaneously relies heavily on Christian duty, often portrayed as transcending economic individuality. The Christian man, in his selflessness, humility, and frugality, seems ideologically opposed to the self-interested and uncharitable economic man – a contradiction bound up in the image of the self-made man. Christian duty, as used in the industrial novel, insists on recognition of mutual dependence between the self-made man and the laborer; recognition of stewardship as a role of the self-made man; and recognition of the power of the self-made man to ameliorate the condition of the laborer.

As previously discussed, in North and South, Gaskell is very careful to establish a dichotomy between the geographical markers, in terms of industry and aristocracy, in order to critique middle-class identity, practices, and ideologies. In

addition, she juxtaposes economic individualism, associated with the North and Thornton, with Christian duty, represented by the South and the Hales. Thornton explains his position on economic individualism to the Hales, stating, "I will use my best discretion . . . to make wise laws and come to just decisions in the conduct of my business – laws and decisions which work for my own good in the first instance – for [the laborers] in the second; but I will neither be forced to give my reasons, nor flinch from what I have once declared to be my resolution" (167). Margaret criticizes Thornton's belief in his own independence because it forces every man "to stand in an unchristian and isolated position, apart from and jealous of his brother-man. . . . God has made us so that we must be mutually dependent. We may ignore our own dependence, or refuse to acknowledge that others depend upon us in more respects that the payment of weekly wages; but the thing must be nevertheless" (169). Speaking through Margaret, Gaskell reveals her belief that the class system has been ordained by God; mutual dependence does not contain the seeds of equality. The metaphors that she uses throughout this discussion on mutual dependence and economic individualism substantiate this point. She compares laborers to hands, children, and puppets, while equating masters with stewards, parents, and autocrats.[46] Of course, in this discussion, Gaskell criticizes the appropriateness of these metaphors, drawing attention to the lack of fellow feeling between the laborer and master. However, she does not criticize the lack of equal opportunity that these metaphors suggest.

[46] For a discussion on the metaphor that likens workers to children in North and South see Bodenheimer 57.

Gaskell's point in this juxtaposition is to show that if the mutual dependence that exists between classes were recognized as such, the recognition would work for the benefit of all classes instead of pitting one class against the other. Through Margaret, she criticizes the master's tendency to put his own economic needs above those of his laborers. Margaret states, "[T]here is no human law to prevent the employers from utterly wasting or throwing away all their money, if they choose; but … there are passages in the Bible which would rather imply – to me at least – that they neglected their duty as stewards if they did so. However, I know so little about strikes, and rate of wages, and capital, and labour, that I had better not talk to a political economist like you" (165). Bound up in Margaret's term "steward" is the belief that the middle-class industrialist is morally obligated to direct the economic and, perhaps, even social, affairs of the laboring classes, an assumption with which Thornton heartily disagrees.[47]

Deirdre David explains that Thornton's belief in the "fiction of mutual independence" between capitalist and laborer is "one of the principal litanies of the gospel which Carlyle attacks in Past and Present, that of Mammonism" (David 21). Mammonism is the personification of riches, avarice, and worldly gain as a false god in the New Testament. In Past and Present, Carlyle criticizes the tendency of capitalists to adhere to Mammonism: "True, it must be owned, we for the present,

[47] While the self-made man is often portrayed as a steward to his poor laborers (a position espoused by the benevolent patriarchy à la Thomas Carlyle and Benjamin Disraeli), he also strives to separate himself from them. Thornton does so through rhetoric; he continuously calls his laborers "hands" and "children." Halifax does so through clothing. In Hard Times, Bounderby is never seen in his factory, and is only rarely seen in his bank. Mostly, he can be found in his parlor, that sanctified middle-class space, often eating meat and drinking wine.

with our Mammon-Gospel, have come to strange conclusions. We call it a Society . . . We have profoundly forgotten everywhere that *Cash-payment* is not the sole relation of human beings; we think, nothing doubting, that it absolves and liquidates all engagements of man" (277-8). Throughout the novel, Gaskell insists that the one mistake that Thornton makes is thinking he and his workmen lead "parallel lives – very close, but never touching" (511). Thornton believes that once the day's work is done, his connection with his laborers ceases – each man goes his separate way.[48]

Through the course of the North and South, Thornton is gradually remade, through domestication and Christian piety, into the image of a kinder factory owner, who sees the inter-relatedness of his business interests and the interests of his employees.[49] And it is through these strategies that Gaskell contains his elitist, anti-social implications. The resolution of the novel even suggests that he has replaced his belief in economic individualism with Christian duty. As he fails in business, he is accused of "mismanaging his affairs" (524). This mismanagement stems from the fact that he chose not to gamble his creditor's money in a risky venture for his own "paltry aggrandizement" (516). While he is putting the financial needs of others before his own success, he also wants "to have the opportunity of cultivating some intercourse with the hands beyond the mere 'cash nexus'" (525). His conversations

[48] For a discussion on this fiction of mutual independence, see David's chapter on North and South (3-49).

[49] About this particular kind of conclusion to the industrial novel, James Catano states: "The various resolutions offered by the tales [of the self-made man] – from rejecting the role of the owner in favor of laborer to becoming the exemplary factory owner who maintains the correct relation to his labor force – demonstrate once more that the stories are more successful in their enunciation of the conflict over self and society than in their resolution of it. Resolving the tension between individual identity and union solidarity regularly leads to pseudo-heroic self-sacrifice or sentimental visions of individualism" (Catano "The Rhetoric of Masculinity" 425).

with Margaret have helped him realize the mutual dependence that exists between masters and laborers. Gaskell even comments on this realization: "Once brought face to face, man to man, with an individual of the masses around him . . . *out* of the character of master and workman . . .[Thornton] had begun to recognize that 'we have all of us one human heart'" (511). As a self-made man now aware of his Christian duty to others, he recognizes the mutual dependence of classes, his role as a steward, and his power to ease the condition of his laborers, which he realizes through creating a dining room in his factory.

Thornton's factory dinner table, which he establishes with the help of his laborers in Chapter 42, hearkens back to a more paternalistic and nostalgic era in which the great landowners would treat field laborers to a harvest dinner. He even sees his role as "something like that of steward to a club"; Thornton provides the provisions and hires the cook (445). Even though Thornton insists on "how careful [he is] to leave [the men] free, and not to intrude [his] own ideas upon them" concerning the operations of the dining hall, the hall is still governed by capitalist rules (445). Thornton explains that the laborers "pay rent for the oven and cooking-places at the back of the mill: and will have to pay more for the new dining-room" (446). His involvement in his factory dining hall is not unlike Adam Smith's invisible hand, guiding the ebb and flow of the capitalist market. The concept of power, as both an economic term and a Christian one, is important to understanding the complexities of the image of the self-made man. He is at once powerful in terms of his access to and use of capital and powerful in terms of his ability to ease the

condition of his laborers.[50] The use of capital – one of the self-made man's inalienable rights – is often portrayed as one cause for the plight of his laborers. But as Thornton's dining hall makes clear, Christian duty is part and parcel of economic individualism, as far as Gaskell is concerned. Nevertheless, this quasi-familial domestication of the work place and labor relations is a strategy that helps contain "real social contradictions [that are] insurmountable in their own terms" by giving them a "formal resolution in the aesthetic realm" (Jameson 79).

Just as Gaskell builds her model of the self-made man on Dickens's rehabilitation, so Dinah Mulock Craik constructs her model on Gaskell's. Craik resolves the negative implications of the self-made man by showing how he is always already a gentleman. In its time, John Halifax, Gentleman was a Victorian bestseller; by 1897 it had sold a quarter of a million copies. Moreover, the novel embodied the possibility of social mobility that the image of the self-made man represented for its contemporary audience. In fact, according to Louisa Parr, author of a late nineteenth-century survey of Victorian women's writing, it became for the "draughtsman, tradesman, and hard-handed toiler . . . a dear companion and a household name" (qtd. in Melada 172). For his audience, Halifax was a self-made hero who laid "his own claim to status" and, hence, represented "the ultimate victory of manners over lineage as the essential defining quality of gentlemanliness" (Young 37). Phineas

[50] Kovačević notes the conflation of economic and Christian principles: "With the greatest show of dignity and solemnity the profit-makers expended all their energy to carry on their business and to accumulate capital as if by so doing they were fulfilling their obligation to God and to society. To them the self-help principle was something of a gospel, but a gospel which made them close their ears to the grievances of the poor. Indeed, they would often use the Gospel as a weapon to be brandished against the socially dissatisfied, just as they rejected the complaints of the poor with the 'irrefutable' argument that poverty is the punishment for being lazy" (39).

Fletcher, the son of Halifax's first employer and his champion, describes the young Halifax as a dirty, starving boy. Nevertheless, Phineas detects in "every word [Halifax] said . . . a mind and breeding above his outward condition" (6). The novel's insistence on Halifax's status – even before he rises from the laboring classes to become a self-made gentleman – is mirrored in its title: John Halifax, Gentleman.

In The Ancien Regime and the French Revolution (1856) Alex de Tocqueville's claim that history of the word "gentleman" is the "history of democracy itself" is similar to the claim that John Halifax, Gentleman makes as a novel. De Tocqueville notes that when the word's origins and various meanings are studied, "we find its connotation being steadily widened in England as the classes draw nearer to each other and intermingle. In each successive century we find it being applied to men a little lower in the social scale" (qtd. in Gilmour 3). The way the term is used by the novel suggests that its application as a moral designator, as opposed to a designator of birth, seems to suggest that anyone with a worthy character can become a gentleman. From the very beginning of the novel, Halifax's humble position is juxtaposed to his worthy character. He is polite, deferential to his social betters, and determined to raise himself from his lowly place as honestly and doggedly as possible. While Dickens, in his attempt to deconstruct Bounderby's self-made status, is careful to lay bare the inconsistencies between the myth and the man, Dinah Craik, in her attempt to glorify Halifax's self-made status, totally removes John from his origins. She explains, "He was indebted to no forefathers for a family history: the chronicle commenced with himself, and was altogether his own making. No romantic

antecedents ever turned up: his lineage remained uninvestigated, and his pedigree began and ended with his own honest name – John Halifax" (11). In its most simple form, this is the myth of the self-made man. Freed from the baggage of hereditary lineage, Halifax is endowed with the power to make himself, and the novel chronicles the rise and success that Halifax makes of himself. In her portrait of Halifax, Craik's point is to suggest that true nobleness resides solely in a man's character and is not found in wealth, class, or birth, a point which Craik underscores in her juxtaposition of the aristocratic Lord Luxmore with the self-made Halifax.

John Halifax, Gentleman conflates the two terms "Christian" and "gentleman", as does North and South. For Craik, though, "gentleman" is synonymous with the self-made man, as the portrait of Halifax makes clear. In addition, for Craik, " a Christian can only be a true gentleman" regardless of rank or wealth (163). For example, Squire Brithwood – one of the novel's aristocrats who believes that "rank is rank," that a social connection to anyone in trade is "nonsense," and that upward mobility does not exist – strikes John Halifax in an attempt to force him to concede to his own perceived superior social rank (161). "They stood face to face. The one seemed uncomfortable, the other was his natural self – a little graver, perhaps, as if he felt what was coming, and prepared to meet it, knowing in whose presence he had to prove himself – what Richard Brithwood, with all his broad acres, could never be – a gentleman" (160). However, Halifax, as a Christian man, does not return the blow: instead, he imitates Christ, takes the moral high road, and turns the other cheek. What is interesting here is that Craik insists, through her description of

Brithwood, that rank and wealth do not a gentleman make. By this insistence, she seems to remove economics from the equation, as if to suggest that wealth does not determine the status of the self-made man. Gaskell makes a similar claim as well for her self-made man. At the end of the novel, Thornton becomes a kinder, gentler master through Margaret's preaching about the Christian's obligation to the welfare of the poor. Gaskell insists that Thornton's self-made status is legitimized not by marrying Margaret in the final pages and thus having control over her windfall inheritance but rather by becoming a better man and reforming his character. For Craik, as for Gaskell, the seeming reformation of laissez-faire economics by Christian morality actually serves to whitewash or further reinforce the principles of economic individualism and the negative implications of the self-made man. Heaven truly does help those who help themselves.

During the first riot scene of John Halifax, Gentleman, rioters attack Abel Fletcher's mill in search of food. Under normal circumstances, the law would protect the mill, but because Abel Fletcher is a Quaker, no law will come to his aid: "That was the truth – the hard, grinding truth – in those days. Liberty, justice, were idle names to Nonconformists of every kind" (75). So it falls to John Halifax, as the novel's laborer-turned-capitalist hero, to embody these principles. He single-handedly defuses the rioting crowd, protects his employer's house, calms "the roaring sea" of rioters, and abates their starving hunger. "John Halifax called out to Jael [the housekeeper]; bade her bring all the food of every kind that there was in the house, and give it to him out of the parlor window. . . . John divided the food as well as he

could among them; they fell to it like wild beasts" (80). Once the rioters' hunger is abated, John Halifax asks, "Well, my men, have you had enough to eat?" And they answer, "Oh, ay! Thank the Lord!" (104). Not only does Halifax embody law and order during the riot, but he also embodies Christ. His ability to feed the rioters alludes to one of the miracles of Christ, in which he transformed a few fishes and loaves into enough food for thousands.

In addition to ameliorating the condition of the laborers, however, Halifax also protects his employer's house. By doing so, he is protecting and legitimizing the social hierarchy. He asks the rioters why they would burn down their master's house: "What do you do it for? . . . All because he would not sell you, or give you, his wheat. Even so – it was *his* wheat, not yours. May not a man do what he likes with his own?" (79). Here, Halifax preaches the gospel of economic individualism and laissez-faire capitalism. But in the next breath, Halifax invokes Christian compassion and duty for those less fortunate: "I am sorry for you – sorry from the bottom of my heart . . . [s]uppose I gave you something to eat?" (80). Here, the economic implications associated with the self-made man are conflated with the idea of Christian duty as well as with the notion that the self-made man upholds the social hierarchy. What appears to be an image associated with social mobility actually limits it. In John Halifax, Gentleman and North and South, the riot scenes also juxtapose the labor of the self-made man (one who never stops laboring) with the laborer who stops working to riot and strike. Obviously, his lack of labor can't be rewarded, so he can't become a self-made man. The connection between economics

and Christianity endorses this view. Irvin Wyllie, in The Self-Made Man in America: The Myth of Rags to Riches, explains, "Of the virtues dear to the business community, religion exalted industry above all others. God required hard, continuous labor of rich and poor alike . . .. Labor kept man from sensuality, intemperance, and moral degeneration. It offered an opportunity to worship and glorify God through imitation of his creative labors. When combined with other virtues it allowed man to lay up treasures on earth as well as in heaven, and helped him win an earthly success which served as a measure of his heavenly salvation." (63).

Even though the self-made man really works to protect the economic, social, and political interests of the middle classes, Craik still glorifies the leveling spirit that the self-made man seems to promise. Arlene Young explains that "[t]he progress of John Halifax to gentlemanly status parallels the rise of the class he represents;" his life spans the years 1780 to 1834 – a length of time that saw the rise of the machine and the institutionalization of the middle classes; it was through events like these that social, political, and economic influence shifted from the aristocracy to the middle classes (38). As noted above, Luxmore, whose very name signifies his status, is the aristocrat who stands in juxtaposition to Halifax. In the course of the novel, Halifax's rise coincides with Luxmore's downfall, "a not very subtle process of social displacement," and Luxmore's moral worth is corrupted by his tendency toward aristocratic luxury and profligacy (Gilmour 102). On the other hand, for Halifax as for his creator, one's worth is determined by his character, not his birth. The climax of this belief comes when he explains to his family the reasons for moving to

Beechwood Hall, a manor house endowed with aristocratic significance located near his factory. Halifax explains that "the higher a man rises, the wider and nobler grows his sphere of usefulness" (302). He tells his children, who imagine life at Beechwood Hall complete with the trappings of aristocratic privilege:

> "When I was a young man, before your mother and I were married, indeed before I had ever seen her, I had strongly impressed on my mind the wish to gain influence in the world – riches if I could – but at all events, influence. I thought I could use it well, better than most men; those can best help the poor who understand the poor. And I can; since, you know, when your Uncle Phineas found me, I was –"
>
> "Father," said Guy, flushing scarlet, "we may as well pass over that fact." We are gentlefolks now."
>
> "We always were, my son. . . [N]ow twenty-five years of labour have won for me the position I desired. That is, I might have it for the claiming. I might take my place among the men who have lately risen from the people, to guide and help the people" (301)

In this passage, Halifax equates gentility with respectability, a point that he further underscores when he refuses to allow Lord Ravenel (the future Earl of Luxmore) to marry his daughter Maude, citing "the great difference between them" and the "disparity" in their ranks. Halifax explains that the disparity exists not so much in terms of worldly things, "but in things far deeper; -- personal things, which strike at the root of love, home, -- nay, honour" (378). The implication here is that by virtue

of his aristocratic birth and, hence, his idleness and general worthlessness, Lord Ravenel is not worthy of John Halifax's daughter.

Because it is ostensibly something that can be individually controlled, this emphasis on character assumes that social mobility is a viable option. Through the images of character, the self-made man represents a commitment to the potential for agency and the desire for change, both in individuals and in society generally, as Smiles suggests in his definition of self-help. One of the central criteria of the self-made man is his upstanding character. In fact, the myth of the self-made man argues that it is the merit of one's character alone that determines his status as self-made. For example, Thornton states, "It is one of the great beauties of our system, that a working-man may raise himself into the power and position of a master by his own exertions and behaviour; that, in fact, every one who rules himself to decency and sobriety of conduct, and attention to his duties, comes over to our ranks; it may not be always as a master, but as an overlooker, a cashier, a book-keeper, a clerk, one on the side of authority and order" (125). These are the occupations of the middle classes. Note the similarity in the jobs he lists – they all belong to the lower-middle-class man. The way character determines one's occupation here actually serves to limit social mobility.

The importance of the hierarchal class system is further suggested by Smiles in an allusion to G. H. Lewes's Life of Goethe (1855). In Character, Smiles states that "man is not the creature, so much as he is the creator, of circumstances" (22). He then quotes Lewes in a footnote:

> Instead of saying that man is the creature of circumstance, it would be nearer the mark to say that man is the architect of circumstance. It is character which builds an existence out of circumstance. . . . From the same materials one man builds palaces, another hovels: one warehouses, another villas. Bricks and mortar are mortar and bricks until the architect can make them something else. Thus it is that in the same family, in the same circumstances, one man rears a stately edifice, while his brother, vacillating and incompetent, lives forever amid the ruins; the block of granite which was an obstacle on the pathway of the weak, becomes a stepping-stone on the pathway of the strong. (22-23)

This architect metaphor, also used by Thornton in North and South, assumes that all men have access to the same character-building tools and materials. The lazy brother has been given the mortar and bricks, of which he makes nothing, while the industrious brother makes great things for himself. Even the references to the kinds of buildings constructed bear class implications: palaces, warehouses, and villas are all constructions of men with money and power, while the lowly hovel is representative of the laboring (i.e. lazy) classes. The edifice that Lewes argues can be built by any hard-working man is, nevertheless, already predetermined by class standing. The fact that John Halifax and his family move into the ancient manor house, Beechwood Hall, is no accident either. It is the logical conclusion for a man whose class standing is predetermined by his birth. Arlene Young explains that works

like these are really "part of the systems of power which they are intended to challenge" (Young 8).

Nevertheless, the argument that the portrait of men like Thornton and John Halifax put forward is the supposed ability of any man to become self-made if he just possesses the list of necessary characteristics: decency, sobriety, a strong work ethic, to name a few. As defined by Smiles in Self Help, the rhetoric of the self-made man suggests that it is possible to achieve great success, even if a man is not born into the upper classes, as long as his character is superior. With this philosophy, Smiles celebrated "the manliness and heroism of the English, but [Smiles'] heroes were self-made men, industrious inventors, producers, and captains of industry. Based on a new relationship between class, consumption, and the new politics of character, political legitimacy was determined by manliness, modesty, and industry – now the attributes of the self-made man" (Kuchta 149). Self-Help established as a social myth the belief that a strong character can achieve professional success through descriptive biographies of men, such as Isaac Newton, Richard Arkwright, James Watt, and Josiah Wedgwood. Smiles maintains that all these men exhibit the habits of character, like "prudence, forethought, self-denial," that made them successful (236). Smiles states, "The array of great names which we have already cursorily cited, of men springing from the ranks of the industrial classes, who have achieved distinction in various walks of life – in science, commerce, literature, and art – shows that at all events the difficulties interposed by poverty and labor are not insurmountable" (27). His use of the word "sprung" implies that overcoming these difficulties might even be

accomplished with little effort. Catherine Stevenson clarifies that these biographies "enshrine the power of personal agency in achieving autonomy and, of course, success" (11). The myth of the self-made man promises that social movement is possible, as long as a man's character and work ethic are honorable. Smiles insists that "it may be of comparatively little consequence how a man is governed from without, whilst every thing depends on how he governs himself from within" (17). Furthermore, the myth rationalizes that only with a good and honorable character can a man succeed. In fact, Stevenson argues that the stereotypical self-help plot may even deny that social structures, like gender or class, are actually determining forces (11). Instead, character is portrayed as a universal, transcending the boundaries of class and wealth. For example, Smiles explains in "Character: The True Gentleman," which is the last chapter of Self Help:

> The inbred politeness which springs from right-heartedness and kindly feelings is of no exclusive rank or station. The mechanic who works at the bench may possess it, as well as the clergyman or the peer . . . Riches and rank have no necessary connection with genuine gentlemanly qualities. The poor man may be a true gentleman – in spirit and in daily life. He may be honest, truthful, upright, polite, temperate courageous, self-respecting, and self-helping – that is, be a true gentleman. The poor man with a rich spirit is in all ways superior to the rich man with a poor spirit. (377-80)

Here, Smiles makes the case for character as the sole determining force of one's status as a gentleman and, hence, one's success.[51] Robin Gilmour notes the "appeal of the idea [of the gentleman] to those lower classes down the social ladder." She explains that for the self-made man, the greatly increased mobility of the nineteenth-century society "offered tantalizing rewards, among them, if he was to believe Samuel Smiles, the goal of becoming a gentleman" (99). Here, Gilmour points to the fiction of social mobility that the literature of self-improvement offers. It is just this simplistic, uncritical view of the relationship between character and social mobility offered by Smiles that Craik illustrates with her portrait of John Halifax, Gentleman. And this uncritical simplicity is itself a strategy of containment.

Craik insists that Halifax's "pedigree began and ended with his own honest name." From the beginning, though, Halifax is presented as the product of a

---

[51] Throughout Character he continues this line of argument. Smiles is adamant that any man can develop a strong, firm, good character. Wealth is not a necessary component, nor is class. Smiles explains that "the self-originating and sustaining force of one's own spirit" is the mainstay of a good character (Character 24). He continues, "Without a certain degree of practical efficient force – compounded of will, which is the root, and wisdom, which is the stem of character -- life will be indefinite and purposeless – like a body of stagnant water, instead of a running stream doing useful work and keeping the machinery of a district in motion " (Character 24-5). He argues, then, that all men, regardless of station, can develop respectable characters if they only adhere to the virtues of duty, hard work, honesty, kindliness, virtue, truthfulness, self-control, mercifulness, reverence, courage, and so on. Notably, his metaphor at the end of this passage compares a man without a strong spirit – the foundation of character – to standing water, while a man with strong spirit is like a river that drives a factory; he is active and powerful. Smiles implicitly aligns a man with good character with the force that powers a factory. The implication is that men who are the labor force in a factory can develop good characters. When carried to its logical conclusion, this suggests that laborers with strong characters also become docile workers. Men of good character are bound to uphold and embody the virtues of hard work and patience; therefore, they should not riot for higher wages and better working conditions. Since a man of good character is supposed to be happy and content with what he has, he won't rebel and riot. If he does, then he does not have a good character. Since character is one of the necessary components of the self-made man, without it, the laborer cannot become the master. Even though Smiles insists that all men can become self-made successes, his rhetoric simultaneously insists that self-made men of good character are to be content with their social place rather than try to rise above it. Smiles is an apt illustration that a laborer can't disassemble the master's house with the master's tools.

gentleman, whose lineage can be found in the Greek Testament that he carries. On the first page is printed: "Guy Halifax, gentleman;" John's pedigree actually begins with his father's social status (10). His Greek Testament is Halifax's only real possession at the beginning of the novel and, according to Arlene Young in her study of the middle-class gentleman, the volume "incorporates a dense conflation of symbols of the mandatory values and accomplishments of the middle-class gentleman: classical education, Christian orthodoxy, and literacy" (49). In essence John Halifax was already always a gentleman, just as Halifax himself believes. He tells his son that they "always were" gentlefolks, a claim which means that John Halifax's class status at the end of the novel is less earned by virtue of his character recovered by virtue of his birth (Gilmour 102). This inconsistency suggests the image of the self-made man serves in important ways to disable agency and deflect attempts at social change. "The deep irony of masculine self-making lies in its claim to offer the ultimate in freely formed, self-created individualism, while it actually serves to establish a social subject, a set of behavioral patterns and expectations that are already prescripted, as it were" (Catano Ragged Dicks 3). In fact, Gilmour explains that what the term "gentleman" meant was uncertain, and it was this uncertainty that made it so appealing for those "outsiders hoping to attain it" (3). In other words, the term "gentleman" was not really a very democratic notion at all. It could not have been so powerful an idea if it had been (Gilmour 4).

By and large it is the very notion of democracy itself that these novels seek to contain. These novels must be "read as symbolic resolutions of real political and

social contradictions" (Jameson 80). Dickens's rehabilitation, Gaskell's domesticity and Christian piety, and Craik's a priori gentleman are all aesthetic solutions to the "unresolvable social contradictions" that arise from the politics that characterize society and history (Jameson 79). Indeed, as Jameson explains in The Political Unconscious, "[T]here is nothing that is not social and historical . . . everything is 'in the last analysis' political" (20). Dickens may rehabilitate the self-made man, but he denies Stephen Blackpool access to that model when he denies him a chance to have a happy domesticity, when he denies him access to the middle-class God, and when he denies him the status of a gentleman even though he has the character. Gaskell argues that Dickens's rehabilitated self-made man is a possible thing for Thornton to achieve, only if his individualism, elitism, and character are domesticated and made Christian. Of course, though, Thornton is simply recovering his family's status that was lost by his father, and he really never relinquishes those negative implications; they are just whitewashed by Gaskell's solutions. Finally, Craik, completely contradicts the promise of social mobility bound up with the myth of the self- made man by arguing that Halifax was always already domesticated, always already Christian, and always already a gentleman by mere accident of his birth, while she simultaneously celebrates the leveling spirit that makes the myth so persuasive and so pervasive.

Chapter Four:

Writing Rioting: The Industrial Sublime

As the title of this chapter indicates, what I am interested in exploring is the representation of the riot in industrial writing. That "writing" and "rioting" are approximate homonyms is an interesting point at which to begin this chapter because the riot is traditionally an attempt to get attention and to air grievances when the traditional discursive methods are either not available or not effective. The riot, as a public demonstration of protest, is a form of communication that has a long history in the development of the modern state. [52] The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are peppered with a variety of riots, from eighteenth-century food riots to the Gordon riots, the Luddite riots, the Chartist riots, and the nineteenth-century factory riots, all of which provided the nineteenth-century industrialist writer with drama and conflict.[53] "Indeed, there is no doubt that the first half of the nineteenth century was a

---

[52] While providing novelists with subject matter, the riots also provide cultural historians with material. See Frank McLynn's Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-century England (226-239); E. P. Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class (62-77); George Rudé's The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England and Ideology and Popular Protest; John Plotz's The Crowd: British Literature and Public Politics; Joseph Kestner's Protest and Reform: The British Social Narrative by Women; Nicholas Rogers's Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain; Gustave Le Bon's famous 1895 study The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind; and Harold Perkin's The Structured Crowd.

[53] The Gordon "No Popery" Riots disrupted London from July 2nd through the 8th of 1780 as Lord George Gordon headed a crowd of 50,000 that marched from St. George's Fields to the houses of Parliament. The rioters held petitions to repeal a 1778 act relieving Roman Catholics of certain prejudicial disadvantages. The rioting crowd destroyed Catholic chapels, broke open prisons, and attacked the Bank of England. The Luddites were groups of British textile workers who, between 1811 and 1816, rioted and destroyed laborsaving textile machinery in the belief that such machinery would diminish employment. They were "led" by a mythological figure, General Ludd. In 1811, a group of Luddites burned one of Richard Arkwright's factories and broke into the house of James Hargreaves to smash his spinning jenny. Finally, the Chartist movement flourished between 1837 and 1848. Its primary political concern centered on reforming the political rights of the working class after the Reform Bill of 1832 did little to secure the vote for the laboring man. Their six point Charter sought to reform the parliamentary electoral system in which the poor were excluded from participating.

period of considerable social and political unrest, which manifested itself in a variety of ways from inarticulate but violent reactions to food shortages and the introduction of machinery to coherent attempts to form trade unions and political pressure groups" (Golby and Purdue 89).

In this chapter, as in the past chapters, I am interested in looking at the rhetoric of industrialization and the social, political, psychological, and gendered implications of the ways in which industrialization gets troped and constructed. This chapter on the industrial riot, then, explores an element in the rhetoric of industrialization. The way authors of industrial texts write the riot reveals assumptions about the values of labor, class, and sexuality during the nineteenth century. One consequence of the elision of human agency bound up with transformations of the laborer into a hand, the machine into a god, and the capitalist into a self-made man is that it becomes impossible to understand the laboring classes in human terms. In this chapter, I want to explore the ideological pressures that go into shaping the Victorian configuration of riots in industrial novels and texts by examining the transformation of the laboring body into the trope of sublime natural disaster. During the riot scene the body of hands is transformed into a force of nature, like a tempestuous sea, a rumbling volcano, a violent hurricane, or a vicious wild

---

These historical events find their way into many nineteenth-century novels. Harriet Martineau makes an example of the industrial riots of the nineteenth century in The Rioters, part of her collection Illustrations from Political Economy (1832-1834).Charles Dickens draws on the Gordon riots in Barnaby Rudge (1841). Benjamin Disraeli fictionalizes the Chartist movement and riots in Sybil; or The Two Nations (1845). Charlotte Brontë sets Shirley (1849) against the backdrop of the Luddite riots. Elizabeth Gaskell portrays a nineteenth-century factory riot in North and South (1855). Dinah Mulock Craik uses the food riots in John Halifax, Gentleman (1856) to highlight Halifax's self-made character.

animal. As it is troped as a natural disaster, the riot logically extends the gothic dehumanization that takes place when laborers are transformed into a body of hands in that the laboring body becomes a sublime phenomenon that hovers on the edge of terror and the supernatural.[54]

Here it should be noted that there is a distinction between the riot as a working-class expression and the riot as a middle-class literary trope. During the riot scene, the rioters come into conflict with the will of the self-made man because they desire to promote a new social order in which human will is defiant in the face of erasure. Therefore, this scene gives insight into the rioting crowd as a meaningful expression of human desire and as meaningful political protest. When viewed as such, the riot scene is not sublime, since the sublime, as traditionally construed, escapes human categories of discursive communication. However, when used as a literary trope by the middle-class author, the sublime natural disaster undercuts any sense of premeditation on the part of it the laborer – storms are not well-planned occurrences. As a middle-class trope, then, it views the laboring classes not in human

[54] While this chapter looks at the way nineteenth-century novelists employed the sublime, the rhetoric of the sublime is not only limited to novels. As some of the footnotes will point out, sublime imagery was used by a variety of writers for a variety of purposes. For example, in his history of co-operation in England, G. J. Holyoake writes:

> To what chaos is industry tending? Its insurgency increases. Will its perturbations ever end? From being aggressive will Trades Unions become destructive forces? Will the proletariat finally take the field and the capitalist have to fight for his life? Excited, empty-handed Labour seems on fire and the Political Economist, albeit a damp creature, seems powerless to extinguish it. Doctrinal streams of "supply and demand" poured upon it act as petroleum upon flame. Organized capital grinds helpless industry as in the mill of the gods – very small. Isolated labour is frightened and flees to combination for safety. No protests that capital is his friend reassures him. Terror has made him deaf and experience unbelieving. Can the struggle of ages, made deadlier now by dawning intelligence, end save by the despotism of the knife? Every man asks these questions to which there is but one answer. A new principle has entered Industry which has slowly awakened hope and will surely bring deliverance. Its name is Co-operation. (66)

form but as forces of nature in riotous conflict with the desires and will of the self-made man.

On the surface, the riot scene seems to pit the self-interests of the laboring crowd against the self-interests of the factory owner, initially giving the impression that there are indeed two distinct sides represented by two distinct literary styles. This insistence is even illustrated in some novel titles. Benjamin Disraeli's Sybil; or The Two Nations (1845) recounts the Chartist riots by drawing attention to the vast distance between classes. The two nations are, of course, the haves and the have-nots, the landed aristocracy and the laboring poor. Similarly, Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South (1855) fictionalizes industrial Manchester and pits the conventional starving, over-worked, and under-paid factory laborers against the conventional stubborn and obtuse self-made factory owner. The title of this novel refers to the north (which symbolizes industrial progress with all its sociological ramifications) and the south (which symbolizes a traditional rural culture).

Even though the industrial novel is thus grounded in the pretense that there are two sides to its industrial conflict, the resolution of the novel typically shows that these conflicting interests are really one and the same. The interests of the laborer and those of the factory owner are generally subsumed under a rhetoric of class cooperation and class mobility that is itself subsumed under the domestic romance plot, all which function as strategies of containment as explained in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, before this resolution can be reached in the industrial novel, the conflict between classes must rise to such intensity that it erupts in a riot. When

characterized as a sublime experience, the riot takes on political and social significance. In this regard, it is important to remember that during this era the French Revolution still figured imagistically in the collective imagination, especially when questions of civil unrest and disorder were posed. While no writer refers directly to the terror of the revolution in France in these industrial texts, the sublime images used to describe the mob and riot scenes reflect what the English felt during the aftermath of the democratic ideals of the French Revolution. As Frances Ferguson suggests, Edmund Burke – one of the founders of the British sublime – saw the French Revolution as an example "of the sublime functioning in an unanticipated direction . . . The ungovernability of the mob turns out to represent rather too much sublimity for Burke's taste when that ungovernability ceases to contribute to the orderly functioning of a productive society" ("Legislating the Sublime" 136). Furthermore, the sublime images used in the riot scene of the industrial novel also convey the unease that the Victorian middle classes felt about the stability of their social position. As Arlene Young explains, "The Luddites, Peterloo, the Swing Riots, and Chartism seemed to confirm the worst nightmares of the middle class, that the propensity for political restiveness and violence among the lower classes had spread to England" (50).

Certainly, it comes as no surprise that the riot as a crowd action is historically bound up with issues of class, politics, and economics, but when, in the industrial novel, it is written in the discourse of the sublime, the riot scene takes on an added

layer of complexity.[55] The riot scenes in industrial texts are not merely about the right to work, a fair wage for a day's labor, or the elimination of hand labor in the wake of automated factories.[56] These riots also speak to the tie between aesthetics and politics as well as to the tie between economics and domesticity. For Burke, the aesthetic phenomenon of the sublime is naturally evoked by politico-economic problems of civic disorder. Tom Furniss grounds his reading of Burke's A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful (1757) in the relationship between aesthetics, politics, and economics because he argues that the Enquiry "needs to be read not simply as a ground-breaking intervention within the proliferating discussion of aesthetics in Britain, but as a contribution to the hegemonic struggle of the rising middle class in the first half of the eighteenth century" (1). In the nineteenth century, writers go a step further by transforming the language of the Burkean sublime into the language of the industrial sublime. Barbara Freeman in The Feminine Sublime (1995) explains, "[T]he originality of Burke's sublime is that it calls into question our belief in the 'merely aesthetic' and unsettles the notion of an autonomous domain of human experience that exists independent of political, ethical, and social concerns" (46). By redefining the sublime as an industrial phenomenon, nineteenth-century writers continue this

[55] Even modern studies of mobs and riots rely on this persistant kind of imagistic language to describe the riot scenes. For example, Frank McLynn explains that during the food riots of the mid eighteenth-century, London had "weathered the storm of popular disturbance" and "appeared to be breasting the flood of economic and social change" (225). Nevertheless, McLynn continues that this "appearance proved to be merely the marble sea before the typhoon" (226).

[56] George Rudé, in Ideology and Popular Protest, terms these kind of beliefs "inherent ideology," by which he means the belief system that characterizes traditional beliefs and behaviors, like the right to buy bread at a just price "as determined by experience and custom" or the laborer's "claim to a 'just' wage and not simply one that responds to the whim of his employer or the new-fangled notion of supply and demand" (30).

line of thought by repositioning the sublime in the observation of a human production (i.e. a riot) instead of the observation of natural phenomena (i.e. a mountain or an ocean). At the same time, however, they seek to eliminate its unsettling force by subsuming working-class discourse within natural imagery. Effectively dehumanizing the working classes, the industrial sublime thus makes it appear that middle-class ideologies do in fact represent "an autonomous domain of human experience."

Five main elements characterize the kind of scene that I am describing as the industrial sublime. First, the atmosphere is one of precariously controlled chaos; the tenseness in the air is palpable and the industrial atmosphere suggests oppression. Second, the characters are the laborers and the self-made man, whose relationship is mediated by the heroine. Third, the setting of the industrial sublime is decidedly industrial; the riot takes place in the neighborhood of the factory, if not within its walls. Fourth, the types of imagery include images of natural disasters and wild animals. Finally, the industrial sublime could not be called "sublime" without some aspect of terror. In the romantic conception of the sublime, this terror stems from some fear of personal annihilation when faced with a great, overwhelming natural wonder; with the industrial sublime, this terror caused by the riot is complicated by a sense of laboring-class debauchery, which includes actions that are alcoholic and sexual in nature.

It is appropriate that the riot is rendered through two different literary styles: characteristics of the eighteenth-century sublime are pitted against characteristics of

nineteenth-century realism during the riot in the industrial novel. As the rioters battle the industrialist, so conventions of the sublime battle those of realism. Riots arose in part because the laborer and the capitalist were fueled by different assumptions about what it meant to be a laborer and a capitalist, in that the rioters were moved by an eighteenth-century belief in reciprocity, ritual, and tradition while the factory owner was driven by nineteenth-century individualism and laissez-faire capitalism. As E. P. Thompson explains, "The final years of the eighteenth century saw a last desperate effort by the people to reimpose the older moral economy as against the economy of the free market" (67). It makes sense then, that the rioters are represented using an eighteenth-century literary style while the industrialist is represented with a nineteenth-century one. In his overview of the development of the sublime in England, Samuel Monk explains that the sublime developed as a reaction against neo-classicism. He explains that the opposition inherent between the beautiful and the sublime symbolized the "opposition between the art of the enlightenment and that of mid-century, which was bent upon escaping the formalism and restraint of the neo-classic and which definitely moved in theory and in practice toward the romantic" (234-5). The industrial novel portrays a similar kind of opposition, this time between the Romantic sublime and high Victorian realism.

In the ten years that separate the publication of Sybil; or The Two Nations (1845), Shirley (1849), and North and South (1855), we can trace the development of the industrial sublime. We can also chart how the representation of the riot changed over the course of a decade and how these three representations of riots build on one

another. Of these three novels, Sybil contains the least amount of sublime elements; in fact, it might even be problematic to suggest that Disraeli's writing of the riot overtly employs sublime characteristics. Nevertheless, it is useful to examine Sybil's riot scene because it makes use of elements that come to comprise the industrial sublime, that are further developed in Shirley, and that culminate in North and South.

Disraeli's Sybil is set against Chartism, the laboring-class political movement that sought to reform Parliament and extend the franchise to the laboring man. As previously mentioned, the title alludes to the vast gulf between the classes. The tension between the aristocracy and the laboring class is ultimately resolved at the end of the novel, when the brutal and rioting mob, comprised of the region's laboring men, attacks Mowbray castle, home to Lord and Lady Mowbray, aristocrats who bought their way into the peerage rather than inheriting their titles. The riot itself is driven by multiple purposes: to establish Walter Gerard, the novel's Chartist leader, as the rightful landowner and lord of Mowbray Castle; to uphold the Charter's Five Points[57]; to organize the region's Labour into a cogent body; and to uphold, enforce, and illustrate the laboring-classes' mantras "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work" (372) and "when Toil plays, wealth ceases" (366). It fails to accomplish any of these, though. Gerard is killed during the riot, the Charter ultimately fails, and the leading characters who stand for and vocalize the rights of the labourer become capitalists themselves.

[57] The Charter's Five Points are universal suffrage for all men regardless of class or property; equal electoral representation in all districts; annually elected Parliaments; secret ballots; no property qualifications for Members of Parliament.

This riot scene establishes two important elements of the industrial sublime: the use of terror in terms of laboring-class debauchery, especially sexual aggression and drunkenness, and the atmosphere of controlled chaos. Of course, riots by definition are chaotic, and, of course, authorities attempt to control them. It should come as no surprise, then, that in the riot scene of the industrial novel, soldiers function as forces of authority sent in to transform chaos into order. Chaos, however, is not self-defining; and what authorities view as a riot may well be seen by those participating in it as an expressive or discursive act. It is for these reasons that we must read rioting, in the industrial novel, as a form of writing in which debauchery and chaos are tropes, not simply elements of description.

At the end of the riot in Sybil, the air is filled with "clouds of smoke" and "tongues of flame," which lend the atmosphere a feeling of hellishness and chaos. It is against this atmosphere that Sybil's purity and virtue are threatened. Disraeli characterizes the rage of the rioters as "licentious" and further illustrates this deviance by allowing a drunken faction of the rioters to threaten Sybil's sexual purity. "With shouts and oaths," the drunken ruffians surround and advance upon her. "One ruffian had grasped the arm of Sybil, another had clenched her garments" (417). In the novel, Sybil symbolizes all that is good and lovely in the world. She is pure of heart, a good daughter, a friend to the poor, a devout, angelic believer. In essence, she is the beautiful heroine. When her beauty and goodness are threatened by the rioters, so are the middle-class values of honesty, decency, and morality. Before they can accomplish any real damage, though, Sybil is saved by "an officer, covered with dust

and gore, saber in hand" who "cut down one man, thrust away another . . . and defended [Sybil] with his sword" (417). The officer is none other than Egremont, who has everything to gain by protecting Sybil's chastity because he loves her and wants to marry her.

In the eighteenth century, Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790) portrays a similar kinds of chaos and terror that pervade the streets of Paris on October 6, 1789 as the royal family is marched from Versailles to Paris amid "horrid yells, shrilling screams, and frantic dances, and infamous contumelies, and all the unutterable abominations of the furies of hell, in the abused shape of the vilest of women" (233). The noise, of course, is characteristic of the sublime, and the remarks hurled by the crowd are unrepeatable for Burke because they exceed the realm of civilized human comprehension. The sublime in these passages is no longer only or primarily an aesthetic experience for Burke; rather, it becomes a political tool in his hands as he characterizes the French revolutionaries as the destroyers of culture and civilization, a characterization of rioters not unlike Disraeli's. Burke even uses a mythological analogy to drive his point home, by comparing the carnivalesque activities of the Paris streets to the orgies of Thebes and Thrace. These orgies celebrated the god Dionysus or Bacchus. J. C. D. Clark explains that the drunk and animal-skin clad worshippers of Dionysus "were emblematic of ecstatic license before this state of mind was associated with political revolutions" (qtd. in Burke 233, footnote 284). Bacchus represents the intoxicating power of wine as well as its social and beneficial influences. However, also bound up with the image of Bacchus is the

idea of the bacchanalia, which were wild and mystic festivals characterized by drunkenness and orgies. In this passage from the Reflections, Burke's rhetoric connects the chaos and passion of the Dionysian orgy with that of the French Revolution; in effect, he politicizes the orgy, turning it from an aesthetic or sexual experience to a revolutionary one. There is the sense, here, that these French rioters, like those in the nineteenth-century British industrial writing, are destructive forces of nature, existing outside the realm of humanity, civilization and culture. Louis Sébastien Mercier, a famous eighteenth-century French journalist, uses imagery that is comparable to Burke's when he describes the Paris riots and rioters: "[T]hey imitated by their rapid turnings those whirlwinds, the forerunners of tempests, which ravage and destroy wherever they take place" (qtd. in Burke 234, footnote 284).

Burke vilifies the revolutionary French proletariat, turning its members into rapists and murderers who storm the palace and assault the Queen – not unlike the rioters at Mowbray Castle. Burke's Reflections is a classic example of the fear of politically disruptive crowd action. Nicola Trott explains that after the terror of the French Revolution, "the danger of the Burkean sublime became associated with actual revolutionary violence, its terror with the Terror. The sublime was suddenly available to (post-)revolutionary interpretation; and, by the same token, the rhetoric of revolution became merged with that of the sublime" (82).[58] In the famous scene in

[58] Trott continues to argue that this convergence of the rhetoric of revolution with that of the sublime was most readily seen in the Gothic novel. I would like to argue that even fifty years later, this conflation of rhetoric is still manifesting itself in the novel of the Industrial Revolution.

which the Queen's guard is slaughtered and her bedchamber invaded by French revolutionaries, Burke characterizes the raid as bestial at best. Burke writes:

> History will record, that on the morning of the 6th of October 1789, the king and queen of France, after a day of confusion, alarm, dismay, and slaughter, lay down, under the pledged security of public faith, to indulge nature in a few hours of respite, and troubled melancholy repose. From this sleep the queen was first startled by the voice of the centinel at her door, who cried out to her, to save herself by flight – that this was the last proof of fidelity he could give – that they were upon him, and he was dead. Instantly he was cut down. A band of cruel ruffians and assassins, reeking with [the guard's] blood, rushed into the chamber of the queen, and pierced with an hundred strokes of bayonets and poniards the bed, from whence this persecuted woman had but just time to fly almost naked . . . (232).

Burke begins this description by characterizing the raid as a moment in history, which begins with culture and civilization and ends with the destruction of those social structures. The queen – the figurative mother of the country – undergoes a near rape: the bayonets and the poniards are certainly phallic. Isaac Kramnick explains that the Queen's nakedness "becomes symbolic in the Reflections for the end of the traditional order . . . When the Jacobins uncover the particular nakedness of the

queen, they discover the principle of equality" (Kramnick 153).[59] Ronald Paulson agrees: "What Burke finds appalling is that this energy or unchecked id [of French Revolutionaries], which at its most elemental merely excretes filth and casts it on the aristocrats, on women, and on the ideal of chivalry, can be directed with such fearful intensity toward finding ways to possess the master's wife or daughter and to overthrow the king (and lead him in triumph)" ("Burke's Sublime and the Representation of Revolution" 248). In this oedipal moment, the king stands for the father and the queen for the mother, and the urges of the revolutionaries to overthrow the former and possess the latter are driven by an almost un-human motive. In his introduction to a collection of essays on the topic of Burke's Reflections, John Whale reminds us that the raid on Marie Antoinette's bedroom "has been read as symptomatic of the text's equation of revolutionary energy with sexual energy, and of its symbolic representation of a patriarchal order under threat at its most vulnerable and disturbing point" (9-10).

The chaotic atmosphere of the riot in Sybil is established by the noise produced by the rioters and by smoke – both which fill the air during the riot. In the

[59]Kramnick continues: "They destroy all rank and privilege, for in her nakedness without her regal robes, it is obvious that Marie is no different from any other woman. Contemplating the naked queen is to penetrate all the mystery of the aristocratic principle. In discovering that in her nakedness Marie is but a mere woman, Burke joins Jacobin ideology to the crudity of an obscene joke: 'On this scheme of things, a king is but a man, a queen is but a woman; a woman is but an animal, and an animal not of the highest order'" (153). Tom Furniss also comments on this joke: "It might be, though, that Burke *joins with* Jacobin ideology in the telling of this 'obscene joke'. If to strip the queen is to 'discover the principle of equality' as well as to prove one's 'masculinity in relation to the kin', the revolutionary urge combines the transgression of sexual and social boundaries. But since it is Burke's text, and not the revolutionary 'mob', which disrobes the queen (and makes a 'joke' about it), then this passage in fact enacts the revolutionary impulse it claims simply to describe. The text which seems to recoil in horror from the Revolution actually lingers voyeuristically over the women it strips and actively engages in the penetration of those mysteries which maintain aristocratic distinction (piercing her bed 'with an hundred strokes')" (166).

Enquiry, Burke explains that a sublime passion can be produced through any of the senses, but sight and sound occupy the top two places in Burke's hierarchy.[60] The sublime can be produced through sight when being confronted with the vastness, infinity, or magnitude of, for example, the ocean.[61] Through hearing it can be produced by excessive loudness, a sudden, forceful sound, an intermittent sound, or even the cries of animals. Burke states:

The noise of vast cataracts, raging storms, thunder, or artillery, awakes a great and aweful (sic) sensation in the mind, though we can observe no nicety or artifice in those sorts of music. The shouting of multitudes has a similar effect; and by the sole strength of the sound, so amazes and confounds the imagination, that in this

---

[60] Burke's hierarchy of senses that can produce the sublime begins with sight, which he breaks into several categories, starting with obscurity, vastness, infinity, magnitude, difficulty, magnificence, light, and color. Sound follows, and is broken down into three categories: suddenness, intermittence, and the cries of animals. Next are the senses of smell and taste, followed by feeling pain.

[61] Again, Holyoake uses the sublime image of the ocean to discuss the power of the co-operative principle. In this passage, he overtly uses the aesthetic of the sublime – as a terrifying experience that is mediated by safety:

> Any one sitting at the window of the Marina, St. Leonards-on-the-Sea, finds the great ocean raging before him, all alive with tumultuous and ungovernable motion. It surges and roars, tossed and driven by the masterful winds. It is close to the house. The observer knows there is unfathomable cruelty in its murderous water. It has swallowed armed hosts. Vessels laden not merely with hostile squadrons, but with anxious emigrants or peaceful men of science – have been sucked by it down to death. As far as the eye can stretch it covers all space, resembling some boundless and awful beast. Yet there is no fear for safety. It might sweep the town away as though it were a toy and leave no vestige, and a future age would dispute whether a town ever existed in that place. If the spectator saw the sight without knowledge he would be filled with terror; but he has no dread because he knows the ways of the sea. It comes up like destruction but it ebbs away at the shore. He who looks upon the restless ocean of society is alike unalarmed if he has the instruction which comes from discerning the self-regulating force of co-operative principle. . . . .Society is heaving with the unrest of competition more devastating than that of the sea. Its remorseless billows wash away the fruits of humble labour which can be recovered no more. On the shore there is no bay or cavern where property lies, but it is guarded by capitalist or trader whose knives gleam if the indigent are seen to approach it. The co-operator is not one of them. He can create wealth for himself, and foresees that the rapacity of insurgent trade and the tumult of freed will be stilled, as the principle of equity in industry comes to prevail. (66-7)

staggering, and hurry of the mind, the best established tempers can scarcely forbear being borne down, and joining in the common cry, and common resolution of the croud (sic). (82)

As a physical and mental state in which reason is suspended, the sublime can be produced by hearing a terrific sound, like artillery, animals, or storms. The last sentence of Burke's passage also speaks to the power of sound to reduce individual reason to a collective passion. In Tom Furniss's words, it represents, "a loss of individual power" because the crowd has become "an irresistible force" – which is exactly what happens when Mowbray's laborers become a rioting crowd (116, emphasis in original). Their individual tempers join in a passionate common cry and share the same fervent resolution.

The sounds that the mob makes in Sybil contribute to an overall atmosphere of chaos and cause terror in those who hear them. In fact, by describing the kinds of noises they make, Disraeli is careful to tell us that the rioters have lost all sense of civilization – something which is certainly terrifying for the aristocracy, who first try to control the rioters by meeting them with "tact and civility . . . [and] kindness" in order that they should "be induced to retire from [the castle grounds] without much annoyance" (406). The courteous, civil speeches, though, do not have the intended affect on the rioters, and the "dreadful sounds continued, increased. They seemed to approach nearer. It was impossible to distinguish a word, and yet their import was frightful and ferocious" (408). "There rose one of those universal shrieks of wild passion which announce that men have discarded all the trammels of civilisation, and

found in their licentious rage new and unforeseen sources of power and vengeance." In Sybil, this chaotic atmosphere signals the laboring-class rioters' lack of civilization, manners, and culture. "Suddenly uncouth and mysterious sounds were heard, there was a loud shriek, the gong in the hall thundered, the great alarum-bell of the tower sounded without" and the rioters broke into the castle . . . Dreadful sound were now heard; a blending of shouts and oaths, and hideous merriment" (407-8). All these sounds – much more than the sight of the rioters – strike terror into the aristocrats who inhabit the castle: "Lady Joan and Lady Maud wrung their hands in frantic terror . . . [and] their hearts trembled" (408). Nancy Armstrong explains that the portrayal of the laborers' lack of culture was part and parcel of middle-class written representations of laboring-class culture:

> Against the gathering political opposition, middle-class intellectuals pitted representations of working-class culture as lacking culture. Their gathering in pubs, for example, was attributed to the workers' failure to enjoy a stable and sustaining domestic life. In similar terms, political resistance was portrayed as primitive and self-destructive, if not criminal and a threat to order itself. (162)

George Rudé, in The Crowd in History (1964), explains that portrayals of riots and rioters conform to "the social attitudes or *values* of the writer. To those to whom the crowd's actions were wholly reprehensible, the crowd would appear to be prompted by the basest motives, by the lure of . . . gold, rape, or the prospect of

satisfying other lurking criminal instincts" (214).[62] Certainly, the portrayal of this rioting crowd seems to support this kind of reading. Disraeli's rioters are crazed, and he is careful to note with detailed lists the extent of the damage they do as they progress through the countryside on their way to Mowbray Castle:

> [They] destroyed and ravaged; sacked and gutted houses; plundered cellars; proscribed bakers as enemies of the people; sequestrated the universal stores of all truck and tommy shops; burst open doors, broke windows; destroyed the gas-works, that the towns at night might be in darkness; took union workhouses by storm, burned rate-books in the market-place, and ordered public distribution of loaves of bread and flitches of bacon to a mob; cheering and laughing amid flames and rain. (376)

This frenetic, crazed behavior contributes to an overall feeling of chaos, which also seems to suggest that the rioting crowd is bent on nothing but destruction. The implication is that the original impetuses for the riot – to uphold the Five Points and to establish fair and reasonable work-day wages – are utterly forgotten or meaningless to begin with. The civilized requests represented by the Charter have given way to a

[62] It should be noted that Rudé thinks that "none of these explanations are wholly without merit, yet all are either superficial or misleading" (214). In response to the first one, he states that its "underlying assumption appears to be that the masses have no worthwhile aspirations of their own and, being naturally venal, can be prodded into activity only by the promise of a reward by outside agents of 'conspirators.' . . . For as long as no serious attempt was made to probe the deeper aspirations of the poor, their periodic outbursts in riot or rebellion were liable to be attributed to the machinations of a political opponent or a 'hidden hand'" (214).

terrific orgy that comes to a head in the attack on Mowbray Castle, one of Disraeli's symbols for the idle aristocracy.

Once in possession of the castle, the rioters' "first great rush was to the cellars . . . the heads of the bottle were knocked off with the same promptitude and dexterity as if they were shelling nuts or decapitating shrimps; the choicest wines of Christendom were poured down the thirsty throats that ale and spirits alone had hitherto stimulated" (410-11). Wine is one of the hallmarks of culture and civilization, while laborers only drink ale and spirits. The image of the crazed rioters drinking wine bears an implicit comparison to a bacchanalia. These festivals were notorious for crimes and political conspiracies. Next, the rioting crowd parades through

> the gorgeous saloons . . . gazing with wonderment on their decorations and furniture. Some grimy ruffians had thrown themselves with disdainful delight on the satin couches and the state beds: others rifled the cabinets with an idea that they must be full of money, and finding little in their way, had strewn their contents, papers and books, and works of art, over the floor of the apartments; sometimes a band who had escaped from below with booty came up to consummate their orgies in the magnificence of the dwelling-rooms. . . . Many of these last grew frantic, and finished their debauch by the destruction of everything around them. (410-11)

The gluttonous consumption of aristocratic wine combined with the destruction of the castle seems to symbolize the destruction of an aristocracy that does little to promote the welfare of its laboring classes. Certainly, this is one of Disraeli's arguments. But the characterization of the riot, as a force driven by base, almost animal, urges seems to have elements of Mikhail Bakhtin's Carnival. At one point, near the beginning, the rioters create a scene that "was as gay and bustling as a fair" (379). As Peter Stallybrass and Allon White explain, Carnival is "a world of topsy-turvy, of heteroglot exuberance, of ceaseless overrunning and excess where all is mixed, hybrid, ritually degraded and defiled . . . The openings and orifices of this carnival body are emphasized, not its closure and finish. It is an image of impure corporeal bulk with its orifices (mouth, flared nostrils, anus) yawning wide and its lower regions (belly, legs, buttocks and genitals) given priority over its upper regions (head, 'spirit,' reason)" (8-9).

Nevertheless, the language of the riot in Sybil does not suggest the ritualized revolutionary thinking that drives the carnival. Sybil's riot, rather, parodies revolutionary thinking because these rioters are not sacking the castle for any political, social, or economic purpose. Rather, they are rioting for the bodily pleasure of rioting. Sybil, following the pattern of the industrial novel in general, fails to follow through with a paradigmatic shift of power. It is almost as if these rioters are being allowed to riot in order to reestablish the aristocracy as the supreme political, social, and economic power. Georges Balandier explains in Political Anthropology, "The supreme ruse of power is to allow itself to be contested *ritually* in order to

consolidate itself more effectively" (qtd. in Stallybrass and White 14). One aristocrat is overthrown only to establish another one in his place.

The chaotic atmosphere soon gives way to the carnivalesque, which then gives way to parody. This is especially evident when the smoke and flames that fill the air are responsible for the deaths of the rioters who are themselves responsible for the fire that consumes them. The air is filled with "a dark cloud of smoke" from muskets and carbines as well as from the castle itself (416). The rioters, "[w]hether from heedlessness or from insane intention . . . had set fire to the lower part of the building" (416). The leader of the riot "was lying senseless in the main cellar, surrounded by his chief officers in the same state: indeed the whole of the basement was covered with the recumbent figures of Hell-cats, as black and as thick as torpid flies during the last days of their career. The funeral pile . . . was a sumptious one; it was prepared and lighted by themselves" (416).

The rioting crowd in this novel has a foil, a force that supposedly represents the control of chaos and a return to civilized order. One tension that Disraeli develops in this final scene, however, is that neither the lawless rioters nor the supposedly law-upholding yeomanry seems to fall naturally into their prescribed role. One of the troops of yeomanry that meets the rioters is led by Lord Marney, the older brother of Lord Egremont, the second son who is sympathetic to the laboring cause. Like Mowbray Castle, Lord Marney also stands as a representative of the idle aristocracy, in that he does not believe in raising the wages of his workmen because he has "generally found the higher the wages the worse the workman. They only spend their

money in the beer-shops. *They* are the curse of this country" (109). And his solution to this curse is "emigration on a great scale . . . I build no cottages, and I destroy all I can; and I am not ashamed or afraid to say so" (109). As Lord Marney and his yeomanry ride to Mowbray Castle, they meet "a great multitude, now headed for purposes of peace by Walter Gerard," the leader of the region's Chartists (414). Because Lord Marney hated "at all times any popular demonstration, his lordship resolved without inquiry or preparation immediately to disperse them. The Riot Act was read with the rapidity with which grace is sometimes said at the head of a public table, a ceremony of which none but the performer and his immediate friends are conscious . . . . The people were fired on and sabred" (414). Both Gerard and Lord Marney are killed in this battle.

Disraeli thus shows that the riot is created, inadvertently, by those who oppose it. The riot is defined as such by the reading of the Riot Act by the unsympathetic and incautious Lord Marney. The supposed effect of the riot, then, is actually its cause. Because the riot is not a riot until the men in charge say so and because they men are harsh and precipitate in their actions, the chaos is being controlled by the aristocracy as it is simultaneously encouraged by the soldiers sent in to control it. Disraeli here shows the aristocracy as lacking civilization as much as the rioters do; Lord Marney is as bent on destruction as his laboring-class counterpart, Bishop Hatton. Nevertheless, the chaos of the riot appears to pave the way for a new social and political order. Because both Gerard and Marney die in the final scuffle of the riot, neither is upheld as the solution to the problem of the industrial laborer's condition in

the factory or position in society. Yet the chaos of the industrial sublime upholds, finally, the dominant social and economic power structures already in place in the world of Sybil even as it challenges some features of aristocratic behavior and belief.

While this novel does not present the fully developed industrial sublime, the element of controlled chaos, as it is developed in Sybil, lays the foundation for the industrial sublime as it appears in later works. For example, when the rioters are transformed into "drunken ruffians" (417), "dreadful sounds" (408), and "wild passion" (279), they lose civility, language, and control. In The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind (1895), Gustave Le Bon discusses this distrust of the laboring classes, which is presented as chaos in the riot using the industrial sublime. He states, "In consequence of the purely destructive nature of their power crowds act like those microbes which hasten the dissolution of enfeebled or dead bodies. When the structure of a civilisation is rotten, it is always the masses that bring about its downfall" (xviii). Apparent in Le Bon's characterization of the rioting mob is a history of skepticism toward democracy and the commoner. Sybil's riot, like most riots in the industrial novel, bears a resemblance to the age-old tradition of the mob. For centuries, there has been a history of political thought that theorizes desirable forms of government and the nature of man. We can turn to Plato's Republic to see the way in which this history has tended to move. Plato's ideal state is comprised of three classes: the merchants, the military, and the philosopher-kings. In this paradigm, there is no room for the lower classes to participate in the political life of the state. Overwhelmingly, this dominant history tends to see only the danger

inherent in a mob while overlooking the reasons by which it came to be viewed as a mob. Nicholas Rogers, in his study of crowds, culture, and politics, explains that Le Bon's take on the crowd "was deployed to discredit both the motives and legitimacy of left-wing movements. . . . Le Bon, for example, saw crowds on the same continuum as other popular associations, a correlation that fuelled his skepticism about all forms of participatory democracy" (3). Like Disraeli, Le Bon also believed that by participating in a democratic crowd action, the common man descended "several rungs on the ladder of civilization" (qtd. in Rogers 3).

Disraeli believes that the country's labor problems can be solved by effective leadership, and that these leaders will come from the ranks of a knowledgeable aristocracy in touch with its people – an aristocracy purified of characters such as Lord Marney. In fact, in Sybil, Egremont, who most nearly represents Disraeli's own point of view, speaks directly to this ideal political state of affairs. He states:

> The new generation of the aristocracy of England are not tyrants, not oppressors . . . Their intelligence, better than that, their hearts, are open to the responsibility of their position. But the work that is before them is no holiday-work. It is not the fever of superficial impulse that can remove the deep-fixed barriers of centuries of ignorance and crime. Enough that their sympathies are awakened; time and thought will bring the rest. They are the natural leaders of the People, Sybil, believe me they are the only ones. (276-77)

Sybil also has laboring-class figures who are purified. Nevertheless, after the riot, Dandy Mick and Devilsdust – who initially act as agitators for the rights of the laborer – become great, successful industrialists. The conclusion of the novel establishes Dandy Mick and Devilsdust as successful capitalists, even though they once claimed, "We will have the hymn of Labour sung by a hundred thousand voices in chorus. It will strike terror into the hearts of the Capitalists. . . . one by one, the mighty voices rose till they all blended in one vast waving sea of sound" (339). Their industrial firm "of Radley, Mowbray, and Co., is a rising one; and will probably furnish in time a crop of members of Parliament and peers of the realm" (420). The novel's riot removes one aristocrat, Lord Marney, and replaces him with the true aristocrats, Gerard and Sybil; it predicts that working-class agitators will become middle-class industrialists who eventually will become "peers of the realm"; and so the social order has not really been altered, it has simply changed hands. This situation is further underscored by the fact that Gerard, the rightful aristocrat, dies. Gerard is not the appropriate man to manage the lower classes: ideologically, if not by birth, he is one of them. Because he represents the laboring-classes' belief in their own political rights, Gerard must fall to make way for Egremont.

Sybil's riot blocks our view of a true democracy and true equal rights for laborers because it collapses into the myth of the self-made man when it turns its revolutionaries into capitalists and when it kills the only laboring-class leader (who, in any case, is really an aristocrat) and replaces him with Egremont, who is now the new Lord Marney. The fact that his name is now the same as the first, corrupt, and

idle Lord Marney underscores that perhaps "the new generation of the aristocracy of England" may have more in common with the old aristocracy than Egremont – or Disraeli – realizes. Even though the rioters are terrific, they are ultimately powerless to effect any real change in the status quo, in part because they have themselves become members of the ruling class. They have been transformed, in Thomas Carlyle's words, into Captains of Industry. [63]

This figure of the Captain of Industry or the self-made man is an important one in the industrial sublime. In the traditional sublime, the solitary subject comes up against a great or vast feature of nature (like a mountain or a canyon), and this experience triggers a moment of sublimity as the subject momentarily loses himself in the greatness of the perceived object. Neil Hertz explains that the sublime experience is the "movement of disintegration and figurative reconstitution" (14). In the industrial sublime, this figure of the solitary subject is replaced with the self-made man – who also perceives himself as solitary, although he is not – and the feature of nature is replaced by the rioting crowd. This figure of the self-made man is a standard convention of nearly every industrial novel, including Bronte's Shirley.

Shirley contributes to and extends the atmosphere of the industrial sublime that is seen in Sybil, and terror is still the reigning emotion that is caused, in part, by the chaos of the atmosphere. What Shirley adds in its own right to the industrial sublime are setting and character. Because the industrial sublime is used to characterize transformations that occur in industrial space, the factory, the mill, and

[63] For Carlyle's thoughts on the problems of democratic rule, see Past and Present, specifically the sections titled Democracy and Captains of Industry.

their environs become important settings.[64] The characters who inhabit this space are also industrial; the self-made man and his laborers each stand for his respective social class. During the riot scene in Shirley, Brontë draws attention to the standard idea that the characters belong to two distinct and opposing sides: "Caste stands up, ireful, against Caste; and the indignant, wronged spirit of the Middle Rank bears down in zeal and scorn on the famished and furious mass of the Operative Class. It is difficult to be tolerant – difficult to be just – in such moments" (168). From her syntax, it is difficult to tell just which party deserves our tolerance or justice – perhaps Brontë is suggesting that they both do. That the rioting crowd is simultaneously troped as maltreated by the self-made man – its members are "famished and furious" –and transgressing against him– he is "indignant" and "wronged" – is a tension that exists in nearly every industrial novel. In Shirley this tension between characters not only exists between the laborer and the self-made man but also between laborer and machine as well as between woman and machine. Imagistically, through all these conflicts, this novel finally pits the human against the inhuman.

Shirley is set during the early years of the nineteenth century, during the Luddite attacks and riots.[65] The Luddite concerns – that machinery would replace the

[64] While the riots in Shirley and North and South take place in this kind of industrial space, not all riots occur in factory yards. Sybil's riot bypasses the factory owned by a good and generous man in favor of a castle, owned by a member of the idle aristocracy.

[65] For an extended discussion of the Luddite riots see Adrian Randall's study Before the Luddites: Custom, Community, and Machinery in the English Woolen Industry, 1776-1809. He claims, "The story of the Luddites from Shirley onwards has also been deliberately popularized as part of a mythology of the Industrial Revolution. Millocrats, safe in the calmer waters of mid-Victorian prosperity, wished to view the triumph of industrialism, *their* triumph, as an heroic one, not one based

need for human labor – fuel the tension between Robert Moore, the self-made mill owner, and his laborers. During 1811 and 1812, there were a series of Luddite attacks on mills and machinery, which seemed to give rise to a milieu of working-class revolution that threatened middle-class stability generally and, in terms of this novel, the status of the self-made man. Moore's status as self-made is in jeopardy because it is dependent, in part, on his ability to participate competitively in the capitalist process. Brontë tells us that because his mill's machinery had become "inefficient and out of date . . . [Moore's] aim had been to effect a radical reform, which he had executed as fast as his very limited capital would allow; and the narrowness of that capital, and consequent check on his progress, was a restraint which galled his spirit sorely" (61). Without new machines, Moore cannot compete effectively. The language that Brontë uses here is particularly interesting. The "check on his progress" refers not only to his economic progress, but also to his progress as a self-made man. His mill and machines are symbols for this transformation; when they are threatened, by the attack on his new machines at the beginning of the novel and by the riot on the mill near the middle, so is the very essence of his self.

In this riot scene, Moore stands as an individual protecting his private mill, without which he is unable to participate in the larger public sphere of supply and demand (Plotz 173). The mill is a symbol of his staunch individuality as well as his connection to a larger social arena. He even describes himself as a machine; he

---

merely upon the power of economies of scale. The Luddites nicely fitted this propagandist scenario. As a dangerous amalgam of stupidity, inertia, and criminal violence they could be deemed worthy metal on which, metaphorically, to have tested the sword of the nascent industrialist, cast in the role of conquistador" (2).

exclaims, "The machinery of all my nature; the whole enginery [sic.] of this human mill: the boiler, which I take to be the heart, is fit to burst" (296). His comparison does not quite work, though, because it implies that he alone is responsible for his own success. Yet we know that he is not quite the self-made individual he thinks he is because the machine is the very thing that allows him to connect materially and economically with a larger community. Although the rhetoric of the myth of the self-made man would suggest otherwise, his self-made status is much more dependent on his mill than on his work ethic or character.

In terms of its atmosphere, the Luddite attack on the Moore's machines and mill takes place under the cover of darkness, which adds to the feeling of chaos and terror. Brontë describes the riot from the vantage point of distant observers. Caroline and Shirley, two of the novel's heroines, watch and hear the riot from the hill that overlooks the mill:

> A crash – smash – shiver – stopped their whispers. A simultaneously-hurled volley of stones had saluted the broad front of the mill, with all its windows: and now every pane of every lattice lay in shattered and pounded fragments. A yell followed this demonstration – a rioters' yell – a North-of-England – a Yorkshire – a West-riding – a West-Riding-clothing-district-of-Yorkshire rioters' yell. You never hear that sound, perhaps, reader? So much the better for your ears – perhaps for your heart; since, if it rends the air in hate to yourself, or to the men or principles you approve, the interests to which you wish well, Wrath

> wakens to the cry of Hate: the Lion shakes his mane, and rises to the howl of the Hyena . . . (335)

This passage, which begins the riot proper, establishes two important features of the industrial sublime: the chaotic atmosphere and the tension between characters, imagistically rendered as a lion and a hyena.

The noise made by the rioters, their "West-Riding-clothing-district-of-Yorkshire rioter's yell," accompanied as it is by a hurled volley of stones, establishes the chaotic atmosphere. In the Enquiry, Burke alludes to how the sublime is not only an aesthetic category but also a political one. A sublime experience is one in which something assaults the senses to the degree that the human capability to reason is suspended. One cause of this overpowering of reason, for Burke, is "excessive loudness" that has the ability "to overpower the soul, to suspend its action, and to fill it with terror" (82). His list of particular kinds of loud noises includes "vast cataracts, raging storms, thunder, or artillery . . . [or] the shouting of multitudes"(82). For Burke, the shouting of crowds turns the sublime from an aesthetic experience into one that can have political implications because crowd action often implies some kind of politically disruptive action. As Tom Furniss explains, "[I]n suspending reason, it seems that the sublime might have contradictory social effects . . . it might unleash potentially disruptive, unpredictable energies" (Aesthetic Ideology 115). Burke complicates this particular sublime experience by tying it to crowd psychology: "The shouting of multitudes has a similar effect [of overpowering reason]; and by the sole strength of the sound, so amazes and confounds the imagination, that in this

staggering, and hurry of the mind, the best established tempers can scarcely forbear being borne down, and joining in the common cry, and common resolution of the croud [sic]" (82). The power of the collective crowd's noise can remove the ability of the individual to reason and can force him to become part of the crowd itself. Furniss explains, "The crowd becomes an irresistible force, but at the cost of its reverence and respect for institutional edifices" (Aesthetic Ideology 116). It is this lack of respect for and fear of middle-class property (as exemplified by Moore's mill and machines) that motivates the chaos of the atmosphere. Furthermore, this lack of respect is also troped in animalic terms – it is the hyena who howls in the above passage, while the stereotypically noble and emblematically British lion remains indignant and silent. And this image reminds us of one tenet of the industrial sublime, developed in Sybil: the inability of the laborers to behave in a civilized manner.

The lion in the above passage, nominally an animal, immediately suggests regality and thus the British nation coming up against the hyena, that African beast who feeds as a scavenger. So already Brontë is establishing a tension between the right of the British (i.e. the self-made man) and the savage, uncivilized behavior of the African Other (i.e. the laborer). The hyena is traditionally viewed as a grotesque animal that feeds on the leftover kills of other predators, an activity that carries implications of laziness or an inability to work for one's food. As the lion stands for the right and might of the British middle class, the hyena stands for the violence and laziness of the laboring classes. These characterizations of class clarify Brontë's earlier comment about the two castes (168). Here, there is no question about which

social group stands on the side of righteousness. Because this novel is set during the Luddite conflicts, this conflict is grounded in the tension between machine and laborer.

With the musketry fire, Moore tries to protect his mill and machines against the onslaught of laborers-turned-animals. While Moore is able to thwart the rioters from burning down his mill, he appears unable to check them from damaging it. Shirley and Caroline note the extent of the perceived damage as they look on from their vantage point on the hill above the mill:

> Discord, broken loose in the night from control, had beaten the ground with his stamping hoofs, and left it waste and pulverized. The mill yawned all ruinous with unglazed frames; the yard was thickly bestrewn with stones and brickbats, and, close under the mill, with the glittering fragments of the shattered windows; muskets and other weapons lay here and there; more than one deep crimson stain was visible on the gravel: a human body lay quiet on its face near the gates; and five or six wounded men writhed and moaned in the bloody dust. (338)

Brontë's use of personification to describe the effects of the riot – "discord" or passion breaking away from "control" or reason – speaks to the power of the industrial sublime to transform progress, in the form of Moore's mill, into "a mere blot of desolation" (337). Here it needs to be noted, though, that this characterization of the effects of the riot are described through the eyes of Caroline and Shirley, who

watched the riot as it unfolded during the night. Comprised of the terrific noises of the riot and the smoke from the artillery fire, the chaotic atmosphere seems to cause only devastation. While the damage to the mill appears to be overwhelming immediately after the riot, it is, in reality, minor: when assessed the next day, "[the mill's] reparation was esteemed a light task; carpenters' and glaziers' work alone being needed" (371). Perhaps this discrepancy lies in the fact that it is Shirley and Caroline who witness, characterize, and catalogue the damage being done to the mill from their vantage point on the hill. It is their perception of the riot as a chaotic experience that causes their misreading of the effects of the riot. As Frances Ferguson explains, writing of the sublime in another context, "It is that questions of illusion and reality have been redefined so that the only vehicle of testimony about the world that Burke admits, sensory experience, has been shown to become duplicitous as soon as it develops narrative extension of any kind" (59).[66] As the women sit on the hill above the mill and narrate to each other the events of the night, the boundary between the real and the aesthetic becomes blurred. "In the *Enquiry*, the sublime . . . always reads like a moment of theatre. Indeed, the sublime is a drama that needs to suspend disbelief or it may collapse into comedy or madness" (Furniss 162-3). Apparently, the descriptions of the damage to the mill are exaggerated – almost hyperbolic in light of the reality. It is as if the terror of the night has given way, with the rising of the sun, to a picture altogether different. The

[66] In making this point, Ferguson is referring to the passage in the Enquiry in which Burke discusses the relationship between sublimity and representation in terms of "an affecting tragedy" and a public execution (Burke 47).

sublimity of the riot has dissolved into "something real, cool, and solid" – which is the promise the narrator of Shirley makes to the reader in the second paragraph of the novel. Because they sit on the hill, observing the riot, Caroline and Shirley are able to experience the riot as sublime because through their position as observers, the terror produced by the riot is mediated by a sense of safety. Burke explains that it is precisely this mediation that causes something to be perceived as sublime: "The passions which belong to self-preservation, turn on pain and danger; they are simply painful when their causes immediately affect us; they are delightful when we have an idea of pain and danger, without being actually in such circumstances; . . . whatever excites this delight I call *sublime*"(51). Neil Hertz explains, "The characteristic sublime turn is a "turning away from near-annihilation, from being "under death" to being out from under death," and it is "bound up with a transfer of power . . . from the threatening forces to the poetic activity itself" (6). In addition, this scene mediates between the romantic sublime (in the view of the riot) and novelistic realism (in the next day's view of the mill) so that eighteenth-century sublime rhetoric is united with nineteenth-century realism. Finally, this scene genders the sublime in terms of the women's aesthetic view of the riot and the men's practical, economic, and political view.

As is suggested by the women's place as observers on the hill above the mill, the riot concerns the world of male interests, and the women seem to have no place in this world except as subordinate to or serving Moore, like workers or machines. Moore personifies his economic interests as female: he calls his machines "his grim,

metal darlings" (333), and his mill is his "lady-love" (371). Because they are troped as female, his economic interests are conflated with his domestic interests; this is the world of male interests that allows the self-made man to finance his domestic world. Without the material and economic benefits from owning productive property, the self-made man cannot earn the comforts of domesticity, and when property is endangered, so are the means to domesticity. When the safety of his property (which he tropes as his domestic partner) is threatened, Moore is roused to action.

When Moore tropes his machines as his "grim, metal darlings" and his mill as his "lady-love," he does so in explicitly sexual terms that have ties to the gothic. In addition, he conflates setting and character: machines are part of the industrial factory and Moore also tropes them as characters. In fact, we can see this characterization as an industrial gothic, related to the industrial sublime. The main tenet of the gothic novel was to evoke terror through exploiting mystery and horror, especially by way of setting. The traditional gothic novel is characterized by superimposing psychological and sexual violence onto a natural landscape. For example, in Ann Radcliffe's The Mysteries of Udolpho, Emily's abused psychological state is shown through the use of gloomy and terrific landscape images: the "immense pine-forests, which, at that period, overhung these mountains . . . excluded all view but of the cliffs aspiring above" (224). "The gloom of these shades" and "their solitary silence" embody Emily's terror as she is torn from Valancourt and forced to accompany the Count Montoni, who has only lascivious plans for her future. In Shirley, the gloomy castle has been replaced by a mill, the sublime

landscape has been replaced by the mill yard, the heroine has been replaced by machines, the evil count has been replaced by rioters, and the hero himself has been replaced by an engine powered by a boiler. The logical extension of the union between Moore, as an engine, and his "grim, metal darlings" would result in the fabric that these darlings produce. One of the themes of the Gothic is the threat to the heroine's virtue. When the rioters threatened the production of fabric by breaking his machines and by accosting his mill, they are imagistically threatening the virtue of his darlings and his lady love and his factory setting. "Indeed, as far as the characters are concerned, the genre of the Gothic Novel is built essentially on the contrast between the 'sublime' villain and the 'beautiful' heroine" (Van Gorp 178). The industrial gothic, then, changes this fundamental contrast to exist not between villain and heroine but between heroine and heroine or, more specifically, between woman and machine.

In addition to being related to the gothic, Moore's "grim, metal darlings" and his "lady-love" also circumvent the presumptively natural and normal domestic relationship between a man and a woman. By taking as his figurative wife his machines and mill, Moore ignores Caroline, the novel's heroine, who loves him. The foundation for this tension between the human and the inhuman characters is laid at the beginning of the novel, when the Luddites attack and break Moore's new machinery, in fear that it will replace their hand labor. And Caroline herself makes the connection between the plight of the redundant woman and that of the redundant laborer. She exclaims, "Old maids, like the houseless and unemployed poor, should

not ask for a place and an occupation in the world" (377). Her comparison also contains the implicit tension between women, laborers, and machines. This tension reaches its pinnacle during the riot, when Moore and many the region's upper-class men rush to defend the mill and leave the women of their households unprotected, as the rioters march through the countryside, under cover of darkness. All the region's men are protecting the novel's other heroines: Moore's mill and machines. Even though the conclusion of the novel transforms Caroline into Mrs. Robert, it is never clear that Caroline will supplant his mill and machines as first in his heart. He has told us, figuratively anyway, that he is more akin to his machines than he is to Caroline. Brontë suggests that the resolution of class antagonisms will not eliminate the gender differences that are reproduced in the gendering of aesthetic viewpoints as feminine and economic-political viewpoints as masculine.

Like Shirley, Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South (1854-5) recounts the evolving relationship between a self-made factory owner, John Thornton, and his laborers, who are represented by Nicholas Higgins. Margaret Hale is the heroine of the novel who not only befriends Higgins but also is the love interest of Thornton. Margaret also mediates the ideological conflict between the laborer and factory owner and between the ideological assumptions bound up with the two opposed geographical regions. The novel is set in Milton-Northern, a fictional Manchester. The north symbolizes industrial progress, with all its sociological ramifications, and the south symbolizes an idealized English past that cannot exist as such in the modern world. Gaskell's portrayal of these tensions climaxes during the riot, which occurs

about halfway through the novel, and the riot serves as a watershed moment in the novel's industrial plot. It is in this novel that the industrial sublime reaches its full expression. It develops the chaos of the atmosphere, the terror of those who witness the riot, the factory setting, and the industrial characters. What North and South adds to the industrial sublime is its collision of images to characterize the power of the rioting crowd.

Because it is transformed into a passionate, almost supernatural, sublime force, the rioting crowd appears to exist outside the normal boundaries of society. The sublime images used to describe the rioting crowd suggest a manifestation of nature in a decidedly unnatural setting: the industrial factory yard (Dodsworth 19). The factory is a place where nature is dominated by man; it does not reign supreme here. The representation of rioting is bound up with the representation of industrial space and responds more generally to concerns about urban space as a class and gendered phenomenon. The riots take place within the neighborhood of the factory, and it is in this space that the assumptions about what it means to be a laborer or factory owner as well as what it means to be a man or a woman play out. So when the workforce is troped as natural, it signals that this is a setting that momentarily exists beyond the hierarchical social structure that characterizes the factory. This has become a sublime setting, as the imagery makes clear, but this setting does not belong to the traditional, romantic conception of the sublime, where a natural power initially seems to dominate man. Rather, this setting is the industrial sublime, which is characterized by the manifestation of nature in an industrial and, hence, unnatural

setting. With the industrial sublime, what is perceived as a sublime force is not a natural wonder, like the mountain or river gorge in Shelley's poem "Mont Blanc," but a human one, and the space in which it is perceived is not a natural setting, like the Alps, but a man-made one, like the factory yard .

As North and South makes very clear in the beginning of the novel, Milton-Northern is a manufacturing town, complete with the by-products of industry: soot, smoke, and fog. Gaskell underscores the tension between natural settings and industrial settings, which sets the stage for the industrial sublime, by allowing Margaret Hale, her genteel heroine, to compare the town to the parsonage in which she grew up. When she approaches Milton for the first time, she reminisces about her idyllic childhood home that was "half-covered with China-roses and pyracanthus – more homelike than ever in the morning sun that glittered on its windows, each belonging to some well-loved room" (92). This is certainly a picturesque description[67]; the picturesque is part of the same aesthetic as the sublime, although it does contrast with the sublime. The picturesque is a term used in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to describe a certain kind of landscape scenery in which careful cultivation was used construct artificially wild nature. Landscape gardeners would incorporate wilderness into the constructed natural scene, using strategically placed trees, rivers, and lakes. Often, to create a picturesque landscape, gardeners would incorporate fake ruins, which highlighted the wild naturalness of the scene and suggested the decay of civilization.

[67] This is the same point that John Plotz makes about the opening scene in Charlotte Brontë's Shirley (159).

Unlike the picturesque parsonage, which is covered with roses and sunshine, Milton is covered with "a deep lead-coloured cloud" (96), not unlike the one John Ruskin critiques in "The Storm-Cloud of the Nineteenth-Century" (1884).[68] As she sees the town for the first time, Margaret is whirled over "long, straight, hopeless streets of regularly-built houses, all small and of brick. Here and there a great oblong many-windowed factory stood up, like a hen among her chickens, puffing out black 'unparliamentary' smoke, and sufficiently accounting for the cloud which Margaret had taken to foretell rain" (96). The tension that exists between the natural setting of the parsonage and the industrial setting of Milton rests on the fact that Margaret sees the two landscapes as antithetical, even though both are man-made.

In her initial observations of Milton, Margaret misreads the weather indicators. The "lead-coloured cloud" that hangs over Milton's horizon is no natural phenomenon; rather, it is a product of the factories that resemble, for Margaret, hens and chicks. Margaret's use of this barnyard metaphor is inappropriate, given the industrial context, but she is trying to understand the landscape by endowing it with

---

[68] Ruskin begins this essay by explaining earlier interpretations of storm-clouds:

> In the entire system of the Firmament, thus seen and understood, there appeared to be, to all the thinkers of those ages, the incontrovertible and unmistakable evidence of a Divine Power in creation, which had fitted, as the air for human breath, so the clouds for human sight and nourishment; -- the Father who was in heaven feeding day by day the souls of His children with marvels, and satisfying them with bread, and so filling their hearts with food and gladness. (1444)

He then goes on to explain how storm-clouds are no longer natural formations, but instead caused by industrial pollution. He ends the essay by metaphorically connecting the industrial storm-cloud to the industrial relationships that exist between laborer and capitalist:

> Remember, for the last twenty years, England, and all foreign nations, either tempting her, or following her, have blasphemed the name of God deliberately and openly; and have done iniquity by proclamation, every man doing as much injustice to his brother as it is in his power to do. Of states in such moral gloom every seer of old predicted the physical gloom, saying, "The light shall be darkened in the heavens thereof, and the stars shall withdraw their shining" (1450).

familiar agrarian features. Her image might be compared to Charles Dickens's metaphor in Hard Times, also published in 1854, in which factory machines are "melancholy-mad elephants, polished and oiled up for the day's monotony" (107). Dickens, however, draws attention to the unbefitting nature of his metaphor by way of his adjectives and also by his choice of animals – elephants are not farm animals and are not native to England. Gaskell, on the other hand, does not immediately alert the reader to the oddness of Margaret's comparison, although the course of the narrative will do so. As the novel makes very clear through the portrayal of Bessy Higgins, a factory girl who dies of consumption contracted in the textile mill, the factory can literally kill physically weak people and figuratively kill the spirit of even the strongest worker. Bessy dies because neither her body nor her will to live can compete with the factory conditions. The factory is neither natural nor nurturing, as the agrarian barnyard is taken to be, and Margaret's incongruous chick and hen metaphor ironically works to underscore this point.

Obviously, this metaphor seems to suggest that the factory will look after its workers as the mother hen looks after her chicks. One of the main points of this novel, however, is that the relationship between factory owner and laborer is neither maternal nor paternal. In fact, one of the tensions in the novel is that the factory owner and the factory laborers have different sets of terms that govern their relationship. As Margaret's metaphor ironically draws attention to the tension between social classes, it also highlights the conflicting conceptions of social relationships in the factory. The capitalist-laborer relationship is a by-product of

capitalism and, as such, is characterized and complicated by issues of power. Mr. Thornton believes he has the power to control his workforce in order to heighten productivity and profits. The laborers believe that with Thornton's power also comes a certain obligation to attend to their welfare. When this obligation is not realized, the laborers riot and are transformed from human agents into a natural force. Ironically, though, while the transformation of the laboring crowd into a force of nature during the riot scene seems to endow it with a kind of power that exists outside the realm of the human, the crowd has no real sway over the factory owner. Nineteenth-century realism, as represented by the self-made man, is not affected by the eighteenth-century aesthetic of terror, as represented by the rioters.

During the riot, Gaskell endows the crowd with a variety of powers, suggested by a progression of terrific metaphors, which moves from images associated with the violent realm of man to those associated with the violent realm of nature. Initially, as the rioting crowd is attacking the factory gate in order to gain entrance to the mill and yard, it is compared to "a battering ram" that beats against the gate, making it quiver, "like reeds before the wind" (229). Once inside, the rioting crowd is compared, in terms of sight and sound, to wild beasts, "gaunt as wolves, and mad for prey," who have a "fierce growl" and "ferocious murmur" (231, 233). Finally, at the climax of the riot, as Thornton stands before it, the rioting crowd is transformed into "a sea of men" that threatens to demolish everything in its wake (233). By this time, the narrative completes the crowd's transformation from the human to the inhuman or, more precisely, to the supernatural and sublime.

Initially, the collision of images that characterizes the peak of the riot seems to grant the rioting crowd an unstoppable and uncontainable power. It is Margaret who interprets this power as being violent and uncontrollable. She hears the crowd's noise as being as "inarticulate at that of a troop of animals" (233). Because the people in the crowd have lost the power to use language, she intuits that their "stormy passions" will sweep away "all the barriers of their reason, or apprehension of consequence," if she does nothing to stop "the angry sea of men" (233). She also sees "lads in the back-ground stooping to take off their heavy wooden clogs – the readiest missile they could find; she saw it was the spark to the gunpowder" (233). It is particularly important that Margaret, not Thornton (who is standing on the steps in front of the crowd), catalogues this progression to violence because it is she who experiences the crowd as a sublime phenomenon. It is she who mediates between North and South, present and past, industry and agriculture, industrialist and laborer. Perhaps another reason Margaret experiences the crowd as sublime is because aesthetic taste depended "upon proper birth and education" (Shapiro 219). Even though Thornton actively pursues an education in the novel, he does not come from the same cultured and educated background that Margaret does. She is the novel's representative of taste, refinement, education, and culture.

As mentioned above, Gaskell begins the riot scene by comparing the rioting laborers to battering rams. As they approach the factory gate, "The maddened crowd made battering-rams of their bodies, and retreated a short space only to come with more united steady impetus against it, till their great beats made the strong gates

quiver, like reeds before the wind" (229). As they come into conflict with the factory, the rioting crowd unites to become the heavy beam used in ancient warfare to batter down the walls and gates of a place under siege**.** In this passage, the workers become things, an imagistic transformation that fulfills and extends the Luddite fear of machines replacing hand labor. In addition, it extends the industrial gothic begun in Shirley, when Moore takes his machines and mill as a figurative lover.

In order to suspend its reason and turn the rioting crowd into a force that exists outside of society, Gaskell transforms the battering-ram rioters into beasts, driven by passion and hunger. She then transforms the rioters into an "angry sea of men" whose "stormy passions" have the power to pass their bounds, and sweep "away all barriers of reason, or apprehension of consequence" (233). For Burke, "the ocean is an object of no small terror," and terror is the "ruling principle of the sublime" (58). Not only is the crowd's sublimity suggested by natural imagery, but it is also implied by its suspension of reason and by the inhuman sounds it makes. Burke tells us:

> The passion caused by the great and sublime in nature, when those causes operate most powerfully, is Astonishment; and astonishment is that state of the soul, in which all its motions are suspended, with some degree of horror. In this case the mind is so entirely filled with its object, that it cannot entertain any other, nor by consequence reason on the object which employs it. Hence arises the great power of the

> sublime, that far from being produced by them, it anticipates our reasonings, and hurries us on by an irresistible force. (57)

The sublime, then, preempts reason. Tom Furniss explains that the sublime's distinguishing effect "is an astonishment which pre-emptively disables reason . . . The sublime 'anticipates' our reasonings – at once prefiguring and pre empting, looking forward to and forestalling, reason's powers and insights" (115). Recognizing this in his laborers, Thornton warns:

> "The soldiers will be here directly, and that will bring them to reason."
>
> "To reason!' said Margaret quickly. 'What kind of reason?"
>
> "The only reason that does with men that make themselves into wild beasts." (232)

At this point in the riot, Gaskell has transformed the rioters into a machine, a sea, and a pack of wild beasts. Gaskell describes the rioting crowd's yell as that of an "inarticulate . . . troop of animals" (233). Of course, that the rioters are troped to sound more like a pack of animals than a group of demonstrating humans puts pressure on the legitimacy of the crowd's actions. In The Politics and Poetics of Transgression, Stallybrass and White explain that "the poor were interpreted as … transgressing the boundaries of the 'civilized body' and the boundaries which separated the human from the animal" (132). For Thornton, the particular kind of reason that can deal with beasts is controlled and righteous violence used to maintain, not destroy, middle-class order. In this context, we need to remember that sublimity

was traditionally connected with intimations of a divine presence and thus with the ultimate basis of reason. Peter de Bolla notes that "the experience of sublimity is directly linked to those objects in the world that are awesome, the direct expression of God's awesome power. However, that move becomes increasingly problematic as the power of speech . . . is described as producing from within itself the transport which had formerly been associated with objects created by divine fiat" (40). As it is troped here, then, the threatened industrial sublime of the crowd is transcended by the sublimity of Thornton's proposed violence in service of middle-class values. Even though the novel does not entirely agree with Thornton's point of view or with his decision to use force against the rioters, it does fundamentally suggest his middle-class values.

For example, because the novel suggests that the rioters are, in their sublimity, impotent to effect any meaningful change in the status quo as they stand before the factory owner, they seem to be stripped of moral, political, or historical justification for their actions. Even though Gaskell may not totally agree with Thornton's motivations or decisions, she still sides more with him than she does with the rioters – an alliance substantiated by the fact that she strips them of the power of their sublimity. The sublime is only effective, Burke reminds us, when the subject is confronted with a great terror that threatens its own safety. Thornton refuses to be swayed by such emotion or by the sight and sound of the rioting crowd. And while the women of the Thornton household are "fascinated to look on the scene which terrified them," they are safely tucked away from the crowd in the master's house and

only experience the riot by gathering "round the windows" (229). The explanations for Thornton's refusal to be moved by the rioters lie with Burke. In the Enquiry, he states, "Such sounds as imitate the natural inarticulate voices of men, or any animals in pain or danger, are capable of conveying great ideas; unless it be the well known voice of some creature, on which we are used to look with contempt" (84). And Thornton does have a certain amount of condescension for his laborers. He regards them as a means to his capitalistic ends, and while he is prone to regard them as "in the condition of children," he also denies any responsibility for that condition (167). As he stands among the rioting crowd, he is immobile, determined, and unafraid, and he tells them: "Now kill me, if it is your brutal will. . . . You may beat me to death – you will never move me from what I have determined upon – not you!" (235). And with these words, the rioting crowd dissipates and leaves the factory yard, its mission unaccomplished**.**

Part of Thornton's resolve and strength comes from the fact that he knows that soldiers are minutes away from his factory, on their way to defend his property and restore order. As the rioting crowd scatters, "the distant clank of the soldiers was heard," Gaskell tells us. They are "just five minutes too late to make this vanished mob feel the power of authority and order" (236). The fact that Gaskell calls the rioters a "mob" and tropes the soldiers as a "power of authority and order" draws attention to the idea that this industrial mob is a deviant force in need of an authoritative power to control and contain its actions. Unlike the yeomanry in Sybil, whose power is questionable at best, the arrival of these soldiers implies the

righteousness of middle-class order versus the criminal behavior of the laboring classes. The appearance of the soldiers, though, functions not only as a representation of middle-class power. Their presence also underscores the implication that the rioting crowd is fundamentally not a group of citizens who are engaging in a political protest. Because the rioting crowd is portrayed as being simultaneously tyrannical and powerless, all other characterizations are blocked from the imagination of the novel. That they are, above all, powerless seems to suggest that the safety of Thornton and Margaret (and their middle-class values) is already always guaranteed. Even the use of the sublime seems to suggest the same.

One characteristic of the traditional sublime is that it is fundamentally safe. Burke explains that the one feature that makes an experience sublime is terror, but that terror is mediated by distance of some sort. Terror can only be delightful when it does not truly threaten the subject's life. This element of safety, though, is not necessarily part of the industrial sublime experience. As we saw in Sybil, Sybil's safety is threatened when the rioters grab her and make a play for her virtue. In Shirley, the safety of Moore's "grim, metal darlings" and "lady-love" is threatened. Even though no real harm comes to his machines or his mill, in the immediate aftermath of the riot the mill seems to be damaged, almost beyond repair. The difference between the threat of the heroine's safety in Sybil and Shirley is that in the former the threat of violence toward the heroine is only ever a threat; we know that nothing bad will really happen to Sybil because she is consistently troped as an angel on Earth. In the latter, though, the threat of violence does indeed penetrate the way

Moore's industrial heroines are troped. That violence toward the heroine, albeit a mechanical heroine, is indeed possible is what really separates these two riots.

In North and South, this characteristic of the sublime reaches its full transformation into the industrial sublime: Margaret, the heroine, is indeed wounded during the riot; she is made to bleed, and she faints. The barrier of safety has been entirely removed from the sublime experience. There is not just a threat of violence; there is violence. This violence betrays the author's ambivalence toward the industrial experience. Because they are given the power to inflict violence, even though they cannot change the status quo, seems to suggest a kind of power in their position. If Gaskell did not believe that their grievances had any force, she would have simply made them impotent as they threaten the virtue of her heroine.

Unlike Margaret, though, Thornton, the self-made man, does not experience the riot as being sublime. He is unaffected by the terror of the rioters. In contrast to the heroine's vulnerability, his indifference suggests Gaskell's fundamental allegiance to middle-class values. It is as if the rioters in their sublimity pull out all the stops and empty their bag of tricks, only to have the self-made man remain staunchly unaffected. They can affect him only through the heroine.

In order to explain the self-made man's ability to not be affected by terror, we can turn to Burke's conception of terror, as first developed in the Enquiry and then as refined in the Reflections. In the Enquiry Burke regards terror as "the ruling principle of the sublime" (58). However, in the Reflections, as seen in his portrayal of the figurative rape of Marie Antoinette, terror works, in Barbara Freeman's words,

"as a metaphor for anarchy and political chaos: the sheer undirected energy that the early Burke regarded as sublime is now envisaged as a dangerous threat to the social and moral order, linked to the dissolution of the monarchy and the unleashing of sexual passion" (47). Thornton is not affected by the terror of the sublime rioters because he does not see them as dangerous threats to his social, moral, and middle-class order. Nevertheless, the sublime rioters are still linked imagistically to the unleashing of sexual passion – which is the only way the rioters can affect Thornton.

During this novel's riot scene, Gaskell portrays the rioting crowd as a lascivious, sexual force that threatens John Thornton's domesticity. While Gaskell tells us that the laborers riot because they are starving and out of work, another latent reason, never explicitly discussed in the novel, is the desire that the working class feels for Margaret, which is mirrored by the contempt they feel for Thornton. In psychological terms, the riot appears to be the culmination of an oedipal as well as economic and social state of affairs. Of course, I am not suggesting that the rioters themselves are aware of such motives, but the novel does support a Freudian reading of the riot scene. Thornton himself considers his laborers "in the condition of children" (167). The logical extension is that he occupies the role of the father; for Thornton, the "position of the master" is equal "to that of a parent" (168). And while this seems to be a reasonable reading, it is more complicated than a matter of

Freudian psychology because the unleashing of sexual desire during the riot scene is also bedeviled by matters of class.[69]

As discussed earlier, when confronted with the working-class men on the street, Margaret is made painfully aware of her own sexuality as they draw attention to it. While walking through Milton-Northern's streets on her daily errands, Margaret

---

[69] Much was written about the sexual delinquency of the laboring class as something that was uncontrolled and, hence, in need of containment. The rhetoric usually poses such moral delinquency as an evil effect of the factory system and as a threat to middle-class stability or to society as a whole. In The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester (1832), James Kay (Shuttleworth) describes the moral condition of the working class, noting that there is "a licentiousness capable of corrupting the whole body of society, like an insidious disease, which eludes observation, yet is equally fatal in its effects. Criminal acts may be statistically classed – the victims of the law may be enumerated – but the number of those affected with the moral leprosy of vice cannot be exhibited with mathematical precision" (62). While Kay is writing specifically about prostitution and the resultant illegitimate births, his concern is, more broadly, for the containment of working-class sexuality, the results of which can corrupt "the whole body of society."

Peter Gaskell makes a similar argument in The Manufacturing Population of England, Its Moral, Social, and Physical Conditions, and the Changes Which Have Arisen From the Use of Steam Machinery (1833). As the title indicates, this text of Gaskell's examines the effects of steam-powered machinery. One effect that concerns Gaskell deeply is the dissolution of the nuclear family and home. As women and children join the men in the factories, the morality of the laboring-class family dissolves. Girls and boys become interested in "the ultimatum of desire" (70). And men and women are more apt to be "freed from the asbestos coating of moral decency" and to "overthrow all obstacles standing between" them and the objects of their desire" (79). When he tropes "moral decency" as "asbestos coating," Gaskell is also implicitly equating workers with machines or inanimate objects. Gaskell continues this line of argument in Artisans and Machinery: The Moral and Physical Condition of the Manufacturing Population, (1836), which states that the co-mingling of sexes in factories "has been a prolific source of moral delinquency. The stimulus of a heated atmosphere, the contact of opposite sexes, the examples of license upon the animal passions – all have conspired to produce a very early development of sexual appetencies . . . Gross language, and allowance of word and deed pertaining to sexual gratification, are pregnant proofs of what the reality is when the outward form is so debased. The particular qualities of these passions – one of the most striking of these being the readiness with which they are roused by a word, look , or a gesture, and the undying hold they take on the imagination, when once permitted to revel at large – render the want of some sufficient visible check very obvious" (103).

In Manchester in 1844 (1844), Leon Faucher finds that "the union of the sexes, and the high temperature of the manufactories, act upon the organisation like the tropical sun; and puberty is developed before age and education have matured the moral sentiments. The factory girls are estrangers to modesty. Their language is gross, and often obscene; and when they do not marry early, they form illicit connexions, which degrade them still more than premature marriage. It is a common occurrence to meet in the intervals of labour, in the back streets, couples of males and females, which the caprice of the moment has brought together" (45-6). Fauther's "tropical sun" with its immoral effects is an implicitly racist image; he is equating workers with brute savages.

"was very unfortunate in falling in with [the factory people]. They came rushing along, with bold, fearless faces, and loud laughs and jests, particularly aimed at all those who appeared to be above them in rank or station" (110). From the beginning of her interactions with Milton-Northern's labouring population, Margaret's relationship with them is defined by class status. She is aware of the rules of polite conduct, whereas the factory laborers she meets are "careless of all common rules of street politeness" (110). Gaskell continues to define and complicate this relationship by explaining that while Margaret never minded meeting the factory girls on the street, "she alternately dreaded and fired up against the workmen" (110). Margaret's relationship with the workmen specifically is defined not only by class but also by gender. These men do not comment on her garments, as the factory girls do, "but on her looks" in an "open, fearless manner" (110). For Margaret, this is a complete violation of her status not only as a woman, but also as a genteel member of the upper class. Implied here is the idea that laboring-class sexual desire, unlike middle-class desire, is undisguised. Their speeches to Margaret – which Gaskell does not transcribe – make her "face scarlet" and "her dark eyes gather flame" (111). She does tell us, though, that the laborers' "undisguised admiration . . . hurt [Margaret's] delicacy" (110). Here, we see the combination of laboring-class sexual desire and middle-class virtue, which erupts in sexual violence during the riot on Thornton's factory.

This conflation of industry and domesticity is represented, in part, as a matter of setting. Thornton's factory is located right next to his house; they share the same

yard. The space where the riot occurs, the factory yard shows that there is no real boundary between domestic space and industrial space; in the industrial novel, nothing is really private. Margaret stands between Thornton and his rioters and between the factory and the house when she imagistically sacrifices her virginity to save Thornton. Her physical placement shows the interconnectedness of industry and domesticity. And open, urban space is not the only setting that conflates industry and domesticity; it happens within the seemingly protected domestic sphere as well.

Early in North and South, the Hales invite John Thornton to tea. In this domestic setting, the conflation of sexual passion and industrial passion is first introduced; later, the same conflation is echoed in the factory yard during the riot scene. In traditional fashion, Margaret is responsible for pouring and serving the tea. As she readies the cups and saucers, Thornton takes pleasure in watching her "round ivory hands" that "moved with pretty, noiseless daintiness" (120). Thornton is particularly taken with a bracelet that Margaret wears; he watches it fall up and down her arm: "It seemed as if it fascinated him to see her push it up impatiently, until it tightened her soft flesh; and then to mark the loosening – the fall. He could almost have exclaimed – 'There it goes again!'" (120). As noted in Chapter One, Thornton's fascination with hands – in the figurative sense – comes in the form of desiring to control them to fulfill his own industrial purposes. We know that Thornton sees his laboring hands as extensions of his own body, and their sole purpose is to run the looms in order to produce fabric.

During tea, Thornton's fascination with Margaret's hands takes on an air of industrial eroticism, which climaxes when he turns her hands into a machine that could gratify his own sexual pleasure. When he is ready for another cup of tea, Thornton longs "to ask [Margaret] to do for him what he saw her compelled to do for her father, who took her little finger and thumb in his masculine hand, and made them serve as sugar-tongs" (120). This desire transforms Margaret's hands from the object of his sexual gaze into an instrument that has the power to fulfill some sexual appetite. This transformation extends the industrial gothic that Brontë establishes in Shirley. Here, though, Thornton has not only chosen the flesh and blood woman, he as also transformed her into a machine. The fact that the portrayal is markedly erotic, rather than merely dehumanizing, seems to suggest that class position has much to do with gothic dehumanization. Finally, because this transformation occurs in the sanctified, middle-class space of the parlor, Thornton's display of middle-class sexuality is not truly threatening, even though Margaret feels the power of his gaze: she hands him a cup of tea "with the proud air of an unwilling slave" (120). In contrast, laboring-class sexuality is dangerous, as suggested by the fact that Margaret is imagistically raped during this novel's riot scene.

In the Romantic conception of the sublime, as in Shelley's Mont Blanc, when the individual is confronted by a powerful force of nature, he is deeply affected through such close interaction with a terrible power. In the industrial sublime, we see this tradition both recalled and transformed. Before the rioters even reach Thornton's mill yard, Margaret, who stands at the gate waiting for admittance to the Thornton

house, looks around "and [hears] the first long far-off roll of the tempest; [sees] the first slow-surging wave of the dark crowd come, with its threatening crest, tumble over, and retreat" (226). Troping the crowd as a storm, in keeping with the romantic conception of the sublime, establishes it as something that exists beyond the realm or control of the human. Gaskell explains that Margaret does not know what these circumstances mean or "what was their deep significance" (227).

Once the rioters arrive at the mill gate, they tear it down. Driven beyond reason with anger and frustration, this rioting crowd is bent on violence. Once Margaret realizes this, she challenges Thornton to speak to his laborers "as if they were human beings . . . man to man" (232). But this rioting crowd is too far gone to listen to reason, even though Margaret believes that she can protect Thornton from the violence of the crowd. In a desperate attempt to save him from men armed with clogs and stones, "She threw her arms around him; she made her body into a shield from the fierce people beyond" (234). In this dramatic moment, Margaret believes that her gender – as a symbol for middle-class virtue – has the power to control the actions of these rioters. In Fictions of Resolution (1981), Deirdre David explains that the riot scene pits the "woman as the protectress of middle-class ideals, as the centre of family life," against "an uneducated and undisciplined working class" (David 42). That Gaskell allows Margaret "to come so close to the threat of physical violence serves as a dramatic indication of how close Gaskell felt the working class could come to violating the system of which woman was the matrilineal guardian" (42). That Margaret is finally wounded, though, has already been set in place by the fact

that Thornton transforms her into a machine that would be made to serve him. That she uses her body as a shield in the industrial setting extends her use as sugar tongs in the domestic setting. Here, though, the transformation is real; in the parlor, it was only in Thornton's imagination. We have moved from the Romantic to the industrial sublime.

While I agree with David's point here, I would point out that Gaskell allows Margaret not only to come close to but also to experience physical violence. The rioting crowd here does, in fact, violate the sanctity of middle-class domesticity. Gaskell tells us that if Margaret "thought her sex would be a protection . . . she was wrong. Their reckless passion had carried them too far to stop" (234). The word "passion" here carries two important connotations. First, it signals a suspension of reason, and second, it carries sexual connotations. This is a crowd that has been transformed from a laboring body to a rioting one, and such a sublime transformation, Burke reminds us, takes us to the limits of reason.

In his introduction to North and South, Martin Dodsworth notes the connection between the sexual passion that exists between Margaret and John Thornton and the indignant passion that manifests itself in Thornton's laborers during the riot scene. He claims that the connection is a natural one, in that passion characterizes both sexual and violent actions (20). Gaskell has already established the overt sexuality of the laboring-class man when she allows Margaret to be heckled on the street. The laboring-class man, then, is driven more by passion than by reason, not only in terms of his sexual appetite for Margaret but also his anger at Thornton.

These emotions result in her figurative rape. She is wounded in the head and face by a sharp pebble, and the rioters are wakened "from their trance of passion" by "the thread of dark blood" on Margaret's face as it drips "from her wound" (235). While the rioting crowd does no damage to Thornton's factory, machines, or imported labor force, they are able to jeopardize his domestic world. By troping the rioters as sexual deviants, Gaskell discredits and silences the politics, the culture, and the voices that the crowd might otherwise be seen as representing and that we can see, for instance, in the "Five Points" of the contemporary Chartist movement.

Thus, the transformation of the sublime from an aesthetic experience, as described in Burke's Enquiry, to an overt political response to crowd action, as portrayed in the raping of the Queen and the Pairs riots in the Reflections, also happens in North and South's riot scene. About the Queen passage, Ronald Paulson notes, "We see Burke opposing a vigorous ("active"), unprincipled, rootless masculine sexuality, unleashed and irrepressible, against a gentle aristocratic family, patriarchal and based on bonds of love" (Representations of Revolution 62). Some of the basic descriptions of the riots in the Reflections and in the novel are similar. For example, in North and South the rioters raid the factory yard, assault the self-made man, and attack the heroine, all the while working themselves up into a tempest-like fury. Margaret's perception of the sublime crowd, as she waits at the Thornton's gate, triggers an political moment in the novel, as she physically protects Thornton during the riot. As in Burke's Reflections, sexual energy is equated with revolutionary energy (Whale 9). The effect is, in Neil Hertz's words, "the

representation of what would seem to be a political threat as if it were a sexual threat" (161).[70] However, the purpose in the works by Burke and Gaskell is slightly different. As Burke represents the French mobs with such shocking detail he also draws attention to the fact that these French mobs are destroying their own "national character and common humanity" (Furniss "Cementing the Nation"128). This destruction is evidenced when the rioters willfully violate "the pledged security of public faith" by which Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI "indulge nature in a few hours of respite, and troubled melancholy repose" (Burke Reflections 232). The riot scene in North and South does not show the laborers as destroying their own characters. Indeed, as discussed in the previous chapter, much of the rhetoric of the self-made man labors to exclude the factory hand from even developing character, either national or personal.

As ell can see in North and South, then, as well as in the other novels I have analyzed, the "potentially disruptive, unpredictable energies" that the sublime has the power to loose are manifested in the industrial novel in a number of ways. The most obvious, of course, are political disruptions by which the laborers challenge the new, modern power structure that seems to degrade their skills as craftsmen while it simultaneously keeps them impoverished, hungry, and out of steady work. And while the rioters' condition of life seems to be a good enough reason for the reader to sympathize with them during the riot, their attacks on middle class property, domesticity, and characters are portrayed as putting them at odds with such sympathy.

[70] For an extended discussion on how the sublime and the beautiful take on distinctly sexual characteristics see Chapter 9 in Hertz's The End of the Line.

We cannot forget that these novels were written by middle-class authors for middle-class readers. When the rioting crowd damages middle-class property, it is also imaginatively damaging the myth of the self-made man because his success is symbolized, in part, by his possessions. It should come as no surprise, though, that these authors are finally hostile to rioting crowds. What make the riot scenes interesting is not this hostility as such but rather the tensions and contradictions in the writers' attitudes and how these are dramatically regenerated. The tensions in Sybil exist between Disraeli's social criticism and aristocratic conservatism. In Shirley, they are manifested between Brontë's male and female viewpoints. And finally, in North and South, they appear between Gaskell's religious humanitarianism and middle-class identification.

Conclusion

In this conclusion I want to trace how the specific themes I discussed in this dissertation are manifested in a later Victorian industrial novel, H. G. Wells's The Time Machine (1894-5). In this novel Wells draws attention to how the rhetoric of the Industrial Revolution erases social history and whitewashes class conflict. The Time Machine critiques the notion of social and technological progress that the myth of the self-made man and the machine-turned-god seem to embody. This novel also criticizes the social divide that is bound up in the rhetorical transformations of laborers-turned-hands and riots-turned-storms. Wells's purpose with The Time Machine is to criticize the contemporary state of the divisive class system in place at the close of the nineteenth century. Therefore, my purpose in this conclusion is to trace this dissertation's themes in Wells's own critique of the late nineteenth-century technological society.

The Time Machine is one of H. G. Wells's scientific romances, the purpose of which, Wells explains, is to "reflect upon contemporary political and social discussions" (Scientific Romances ix). Certainly, The Time Machine does precisely that. In The Time Machine, which belongs to the genre of late Victorian utopian satire, Wells holds a distorted image of contemporary society for his audience to see, and his audience finally grasps that the image reflected in the novel is its own (Graff 33). The novel narrates the adventures of the Time Traveller, as Wells calls him, who leaves the comforts of his Victorian middle-class existence to travel by means of the fourth dimension to the year 802, 701. The Time Traveller expects to find

humanity's "perfect conquest over Nature," which he supposes is a utopia (33). While this futuristic world lives in endless springtime, without the threat of disease, noxious weeds or annoying insects, it is not perfect. The Time Traveller anticipates "the great triumph of Humanity," but what he finds is "a real aristocracy, armed with a perfected science and working to a logical conclusion, the industrial system of today. Its triumph had not been simply a triumph over Nature, but a triumph over Nature and the fellow-man" (48). This is a world populated by a literal upper class and a lower class, whose very roles have evolved into an ironic reversal of what the Time Traveller understands about Victorian England. "This vision of the future counters the Victorian myth of progress, and explores the interdependence of workers and masters, perverted into the dependence of the Morlocks on the flesh of the Eloi whom they formerly served" (Bignell 35).

In this novel, Wells gives Victorian England a social warning about the future consequences of the social problems bound up with class conflict and progress. And even though the Eloi, who symbolize the upper class, are still dependent on the labor of the Morlocks, who provide their clothing, no longer do they determine or dictate the behaviors, lifestyles, or occupations of the lower class. Rather, the Morlocks, who stand for the lower classes, now determine the existence of the Eloi. The Time Traveller explains, "These Eloi were mere fatted cattle, which the ant-like Morlocks preserved and preyed upon – probably saw to the breeding of" (59). The Time Traveller recognizes that the evolutionary progress toward technical sophistication and social order will lead to decadence -- as evidenced by the Eloi -- and to savagery

– as seen in the Morlocks (Bignell 35). The decadence that the Time Traveller sees in the Eloi is symbolized by the fact that the Eloi live in a beautiful yet ruinous world: "a tangled waste of beautiful bushes and flowers, a long neglected and yet weedless garden" (26). Their palaces are sumptuous yet dilapidated. And the Morlocks' savagery is also represented by their environment. They live in monstrous yet productive underground factories: "Great shapes like big machines rose out of the dimness, and cast grotesque black shadows, in which dim spectral Morlocks sheltered" (51-2). Furthermore, the Time Traveller believes that "Man had not remained one species, but had differentiated into two distinct animals: that my graceful children of the Upper-world were not the sole descendants of our generation, but that this bleached, obscene, nocturnal Thing, which had flashed before me, was also heir to all the ages" (45). The Time Traveller surmises that the Eloi are descendents of the Capitalist, while the Morlocks are descendents of the Laborer.

The Time Traveller's analysis of the literal division of classes represents, according to Bernard Bergonzi, that "the social tendencies of nineteenth century industrialism have become rigidified and then built in, as it were, to the evolutionary development of the race" (47). The Time Traveller even sees the seeds of this differentiation in his own age:

> There is a tendency to utilize underground space for the less ornamental purposes of civilization; there is the Metropolitan Railway in London, for instance, there are new electric railways, there are subways, there are underground workrooms and restaurants, and they

> increase and multiply. Evidently . . . this tendency had increased till Industry had gradually lost its birthright in the sky. I mean that it had gone deeper and deeper into larger and ever larger underground factories, spending a still-increasing amount of its time therein, till, in the end --! Even now, does not an East-end worker live in such artificial conditions as practically to be cut off from the natural surface of the world? (47)

While the fate of the Morlocks is due to segregation based on aesthetics and technological labor, the decadence that the Time Traveller observes in the Eloi is also a result of technical progress. The Time Traveller explains, "It is a law of nature we overlook, that intellectual versatility is the compensation for change, danger, and trouble. An animal in perfect harmony with its environment is a perfect mechanism" (72). The elimination "of harmful insects and of disease, of predatory animals and of overt cruelty, and especially of the need to work for one's food and shelter" underscores that "while one may be able to change undesirable aspects of Nature, one cannot change the inexorable Laws of Nature" (Firchow 131). Once humans had nothing left to conquer, they became complacent, and in their complacence they devolved into a docile, unintellectual, and fundamentally indolent new species. The Time Traveller explains, "The too-perfect security of the Upper-worlders had led them to a slow movement of degeneration, to a general dwindling in size, strength, and intelligence" (48). The members of this new species "spent all their time in playing gently, in bathing in the river, in making love in a half-playful fashion, in

eating fruit and sleeping" (41). The Time Traveller even comments that he "could not see how things were kept going" because the Eloi were never engaged in any kind of labor (41). For the Time Traveller – and for Wells – these behaviors are indicative of the aristocracy of contemporary England. The Time Traveller soon learns that the Eloi are taken care of by the Morlocks, who produce their clothes and shoes – not because they are forced to by the Eloi but because those labors are ancient habit. The interdependence represented here is, of course, perverted, and each class is simultaneously exploited and consumed by the other.

The Morlock's savageness is due to their exploitation at the hands of the Eloi and to their continued interaction with technology:

> [T]he Upper-world man had drifted towards his feeble prettiness, and the Under-world to mere mechanical industry. But that perfect state had lacked one thing even for mechanical perfection – absolute permanency. Apparently as time went on, the feeding of the Under-world . . . had become disjointed. Mother Necessity, who had been staved off for a few thousand years, came back again, and she began below. The Under-world being in contact with machinery, which, however perfect, still needs some little thought outside habit, had probably retained perforce rather more initiative, if less of every other human character, than the upper. And when other meat failed them, they turned to what old habit had hitherto forbidden. (72)

Because they continued to labor, the Time Traveller reasons, the Morlocks did not become complacent. Certainly, the Time Traveller believes that their savageness, as evidenced by their cannibalism, is also a devolution; nevertheless, as the Eloi sank into their idleness, the Morlocks rose in their industry, which allowed them to expropriate the ruling class. Even though the Time Traveller is dismayed over this pathetic fate of humankind, he still identifies with the Eloi. He believes that the initial division of the classes into new species was a "perfect state" even though it could not last. And the Time Traveller adopts the Eloi's fear and repugnance of the Morlocks – which also mirrors the Victorians' fear of the laboring classes. Darko Suvin explains that "through the discovery of degeneration and of persistence of class divisions, [the Time Traveller] arrives at the anti-utopian form most horrifying to the Victorians – a run-down class society ruled by a grotesque equivalent of the nineteenth-century proletariat" (26). It is this kind of horror and fear that, in part, drives the rhetorical transformation of laborers into hands.

In the first chapter, I discussed the implications of calling laborers hands. "Hand" underscores that the only aspect of production for which the laborer was now responsible was the manual tending of a machine that produced the commodity. The dehumanization bound up with "hand" is made possible by the division of labor, which turns laborers into freaks of nature while maintaining that transformation as natural and normal. This kind of dehumanization also reinforces the bourgeois class's sense of social superiority and rhetorically serves to separate them further from the laboring class. Ironically, the word "Hand," as it signals the dehumanization

and the social division of labor, also underscores the need that the upper class has for the lower class. As the word "Hands" serves to fragment the worker's body, erase his knowledge of his skill, and turn him into a freak of nature, so it simultaneously serves to show the dependence of one class on another.

In The Time Machine hands have become monstrous, thereby fulfilling the freakish process of dehumanization that the term "hands" implies. In the novel, this transformation is located in the Morlocks, who have devolved into simians. It is the Time Traveller himself who describes the Morlocks with such grotesque imagery. It is he who deems that they are the "inhuman sons of man," and this characterization stems directly from the fact the Time Traveller sees traces of himself in the Eloi: "However great their intellectual degradation, the Eloi had kept too much of the human form not to claim my sympathy, and to make me perforce a sharer in their degradation and their Fear" (59). As the Time Traveller adopts the Eloi's attitude toward the Morlocks, he calls the latter a series of names: "little ape-like figure" (44)."Human spider" (45), "little monster"(45), "this bleached, obscene, nocturnal Thing" (45), "worms" (49), "whitened Lemurs" (49), "this new vermin that had replaced the old" (49), and finally "these inhuman sons of men" (59). By using the rhetoric that transforms the laboring class into hands, into apes, and finally into monsters, Wells argues, through allusions to Darwin's theory of evolution, that man is, in origin and in nature, an animal and hence kin to apes. At the same time, in The Time Machine, Wells satirizes the popular middle-class conception of laborers as

hands/animals/monsters precisely by showing that the Morlocks are not born of evolutionary but made of political processes characteristic of late Victorian England.

Even though the Time Traveller abhors the Morlocks and identifies with the Eloi, he still carries the seeds of both species within himself. During the opening frame scene, Wells is very careful to identify the Eloian characteristics within the Time Traveller. The frame narrator explains:

> The fire burned brightly, and the soft radiance of the incandescent lights in the lilies of silver caught the bubbles that flashed and passed in our glasses. Our chairs, being his patents, embraced and caressed us rather than submitted to be sat upon, and there was that luxurious after-dinner atmosphere where thoughts runs gracefully free of the trammels of precision. (7)

The focus on the comfort of the fire, the luxury of the chairs, and the near-decadence of the champagne is indicative of the Eloi, who themselves have decayed because of these aristocratic values. And during this same opening scene, we are given glimpses of the Time Traveller's Morlockean inclinations as well: he refers to eating meat five times before he begins his tale, and it is exactly this carnivorous nature that defines the Morlocks as monsters for the Time Traveller. In addition, it is this carnivorous nature, and the violence that it implies, that drives his own violent fantasies about maiming and killing Morlocks; he exclaims, "And I longed very much to kill a Morlock or so Very inhuman, you may think, to want to go killing one's own descendants! But it was impossible, somehow, to feel any humanity in the things"

(63). Finally, like the Morlocks, the Time Traveller has "a certain weakness for mechanism" (62). He explains that while in the technological section of the Palace of Green Porcelain, "I was inclined to linger among these [machines]; the more so as for the most part they had the interest of puzzles, and I could make only the vaguest guesses at what they were for" (62). And it is just this curiosity that Wells implies is one reason that the Morlocks take the Time Traveller's time machine. He notes, upon finding the time machine in the pedestal of the White Sphinx, that the Morlocks "had even partially taken it to pieces while trying in their dim way to grasp its purpose" (73).

As mentioned above, the Time Traveller's fear of the Morlocks represents the contemporary middle-classes' fear of the laboring classes. The Time Traveller is a representative of the middle classes, and while he is not a declared self-made man, he certainly speaks the rhetoric: "What, unless biological science is a mass of errors, is the cause of human intelligence and vigour? Hardship and freedom: conditions under which the active, strong, and subtle survive and the weaker go to the wall; conditions that put a premium upon the loyal alliance of capable men, upon self-restraint, patience, and decision" (32). These are exactly the values that make the self-made man what he is, and they are the values celebrated by Samuel Smiles in Self-Help and Character and embodied by North and South's John Thornton, Shirley's Robert Moore, and John Halifax, Gentleman's John Halifax. The Time Traveller's position as a representative of the middle class is underscored by the array of friends that surrounds the Time Traveller at the beginning of the novel. With titles

like Editor, Medical Man, Psychologist, and Mayor, these men are members of the bourgeoisie, the class that stands between the aristocracy and the laboring poor and that has "minimal connections with the actual production of goods or capital" (Wasson 116). Darko Suvin notes that the "characters in the outer frame" represent "the almost invincible inertia and banality of prosperous bourgeois England" and "are reluctant to credit the strange newness" told by the narrator. (208). The nightmarish future that he witnesses is a product of "this age of ours, this prime of the human race," which is Victorian England (55).

The "self-made" discourse that the Time Traveller speaks and to which the characters in the frame narration allude is amplified in The Time Machine through specific allusion to Social Darwinist theory, which is the theory that people and societies, like animals and plants, compete for survival and, by extension, success in life. Before falling into disrepute in the 20th century, social Darwinism was employed by some as the philosophical underpinning for imperialism, racism and unbridled capitalism: "it was proof that nature enjoined the powerful (white, Christian, British, male) to dominate and only the fittest of them to survive" (Graff 34). In his study of Wells, John Huntington explains that Darwin restructured the "conventional logical categories by which we think about humanity and the world. And since much behavior, even the definition of civilization, then and now, is based on the assurance of the absolute and eternal borders between such categories, to bring them into question is to jeopardize longstanding moral assumptions. To put it another way, it is most easy to justify domination if you can prove separation and inferiority"

(9). By dividing humans into two groups (the strong and the weak) in the above passage, the Time Traveller directly associates the rhetoric of the self-made man with that of Social Darwinism.

In my examination of one of the most popular rhetorical transformations in the literature of the Industrial Revolution, I noted that even though the myth of the self-made man insists that anyone with those values (intelligence, vigor, hardship, freedom, capability, self-restraint, patience and decision, according to the Time Traveller) can become self-made, it also hinges on the deliberate erasure or displacement of the actual origins of the industrialist. This is the tendency that Charles Dickens satirized through the character of Bounderby in Hard Times. The myth of the self-made man downplays all the enabling factors that lie outside the will, and hence the control, of the individual. Therefore, his success is portrayed as solely of his own making, rather than as the culmination of social, familial, and economic factors. The image of the self-made man represents an idealized image of the middle-classes as a whole: they stand opposed to the aristocratic classes, which inherit rather than earn or create their status, as well as to the laboring classes, whose status is presumed to represent the social consequence of weak character or morals. The Time Traveller makes clear that the Eloi are decadent and effete while the Morlocks have no self-restraint or morals.

On a very fundamental level, the Eloi and the Morlocks are the fulfillment of the myth of the self-made man because it is the notion of progress, which drives the

self-made man, that is ultimately responsible for the breakdown of humanity. The Time Traveller explains:

> For the first time I began to realize an odd consequence of the social effort in which we are present engaged. . . . Strength is the outcome of need; security sets a premium on feebleness. The work of ameliorating the conditions of life – the true civilizing process that makes life more and more secure – had gone steadily on to a climax. One triumph of a united humanity over Nature had followed another. Things that are now mere dreams had become projects deliberately put in hand and carried forward. (31)

The Time Traveller's logic about scarcity, evolution, and class, as they produced a "united humanity," seems to suggest that all classes evolved into a society united toward one goal, which was initially utopian in nature. However, after centuries of change (the Time Traveller does note that nothing stays the same), this united humanity then devolved into two different species, based on purpose and geographic environment.

On the surface, the Eloi represent the aristocracy of capital, imaged here as resulting in an effete, decadent ruling class. In keeping with Victorian middle-class images of the traditional aristocracy, as seen in the figures of Lord Mowbray in Sybil and in Lord Luxmore in John Halifax, Gentleman, the Eloi represent the corrupting, and finally decaying, power of leisure. The Morlocks stand for the result of that power, which is inhuman and inhumane in nature, and which is represented in the

Victorian novel by means of the animalic and chaotic imagery associated with riots and rioters in Sybil, Shirley, and North and South. In The Time Machine, it is figuratively (and almost literally, given their geographic location in relation to the Eloi) upon the backs of the laboring Morlocks that the Upper world's beauty and leisure are built.

A major tenet in the Marxist theory of history regards material economic forces as the base on which sociopolitical institutions and ideas are built. Nowhere is this made more evident than when the Time Traveller visits the Palace of Green Porcelain, which he takes to be some latter-day museum of natural history, science, and industry. He sees "a very splendid array of fossils" that were decayed, "a few shriveled and blackened vestiges of what had once been stuffed animals, desiccated [sic] mummies in jars that had once held spirit," and huge bulks of big machines, all greatly corroded and . . . broken down" (61-62). Essentially, the Eloi live in on the wreckage of collapsed accomplishments (Manlove 177). The base (the conditions and means of production) has been revealed as such; the superstructure, in ruins, no longer obscures its determining power. The Morlocks – the true productive force – have become the ruling class. As Darko Suvin explains, The Time Machine "is a reversal of the popular concept by which the lower social and biological classes were considered as 'natural' prey in the struggle for survival. . . . This exalting of the humble into horrible masters supplies a subversive shock to the bourgeois believer in Social Darwinism" (213), a shock felt by both the Time Traveller and his frame audience. By inverting the assumptions bound up with Social Darwinism, Wells

shows its logical conclusion. Through their idleness, the Eloi lose their privileged position, which is then appropriated by the Morlocks. Evolutionary adaptation, then, is not necessarily progress.

In my examination of the creation of a discourse of industrialism, I considered how the plethora of ancient mythological and religious figures is used seemingly in an indiscriminate way, thus suggesting that part of the task of comprehending industrialism is to see how it can be made to fit with religion as it was formerly figured. For example, with the development of the sciences, and specifically of the machine, this discourse of industrialism suggests that there are other discursive ways (like the myth of the self-made man, the transformation of laborers into hands, the characterization of industrial riot as sublime) to provide meaning, to determine and control behavior, to explain the world and man's place in it, and to give man a purposeful existence. These other discursive ways are, then, made in addition to, not in opposition to, traditional religious and mythological rhetoric. This discourse consecrates a religion of science and industry – one that serves to ordain a new order of creation in which workers become hands and industrialists and machines become gods; in which the past vanishes in the face of innovation and progress; and in which laborers serve, even worship, machines. This discourse on industrialism removes machines from the realm of the human and, hence, draws attention away from a class system and a political economy of industry by treating industry as supernatural.

This theme is manifested in The Time Machine through the notable absence of religion in the future it portrays. Near the beginning of his tale, the Time Traveller

casually mentions that in the late nineteenth century "mystery has lost its terrors" (55). The assumption here is that science has solved all the mysteries that religion had formerly tried to answer. Religion has given way to science as a way to provide meaning. Therefore, the absence of traditional religion in The Time Machine seems to be a fulfillment of the religion of science and industry. In the most literal sense, the new order that has been ordained through this new religion is the devolution of man into two species, and the progress that the nineteenth century promises by way of that religion finally gives way to decay. The future world that the Time Traveller encounters is built upon the ruins of nineteenth-century science and industry, as the Palace of Green Porcelain suggests. Traditional religion does not figure the Time Traveller's paradigm, either in the Victorian setting or the futuristic world. The Time Machine offers its own variation on creation (much as Shirley rewrites the Genesis story) and that variation is an evolutionary model. . As a model for creation, evolution argues against the teleology offered by Christianity. Barbara-Ann Graff even explains that Darwin's On the Origin of Species supplanted "Genesis as the authoritative model, metaphor, or myth or creation" (34). Nevertheless, even though evolution has replaced Genesis as the model for creation, the Time Traveller (and Wells**,** too, for that matter) still asks his audience to have faith in his story, which is something that they cannot see.

As the Time Traveller explains the workings of the Fourth Dimension, his audience reacts with a mixture of almost-piety and almost-blasphemy. And Wells juxtaposes these two extremes. For example, while the Time Traveller explains the

function of time in the other three dimensions, the Provincial Mayor knits his brows together and lapses into an introspective state, with "his lips moving as one who repeats mystic words" (9). His reaction is similar to that of a true believer at a revival. Nevertheless, once the Time Traveller sends the model time machine off, the Medical Man exclaims unbelievingly, "Look here . . . are you in earnest about this? Do you seriously believe that that machine has travelled into time?" (13). He attributes the disappearance of the machine to "some slight-of-hand or other" (11). At the conclusion of his tale, though, the Time Traveller looks at his audience and says, "No. I cannot expect you to believe it. Take it as a lie– or as a prophecy" (79). "Prophecy," as it works in this context, suggests that the Time Traveller sees himself as a latter-day prophet, whose teachings require faith in order to accept them. He asks his audience, "Consider I have been speculating upon the destines of our race until I have hatched this fiction. Treat my assertion of its truth as a mere stroke of art to enhance its interest. And taking it as a story, what do you think of it?" (80). This is a story which is not unlike the Old Testament's Adam and Eve or the Great Flood; nor is it unlike evolution, Social Darwinism, the myth of the self-made man, or the gods at Mount Olympus.

Even though his story does not use direct references to Christian myth, Wells does make use of Greco-Roman myth to help the reader understand the Time Traveller, by alluding to the myths of Prometheus and Oedipus. Wells uses these allusions to speak about the limitations of human power, which is an interesting adaptation on the use of myth from earlier industrial literature. For example, by

comparing Richard Arkwright to Prometheus, Andrew Ure uses the comparison to celebrate the extent of human power over the natural, and by extension the industrial and social, worlds. And Charlotte Brontë's Shirley uses mythic allusions to the Titians to question issues related to industrial progress, national strength and vigor, and the class system. In The Time Machine, Wells also uses allusions to the Prometheus legend in that Time Traveller is a sort of Prometheus figure. Indeed, he steals a box of matches from the Palace of Green Porcelain and uses fire to entertain the Eloi and to terrify the Morlocks, and he claims to be "naturally inventive" (64). In the classical Greek myth, Prometheus was the Titan known to be the friend and benefactor of humanity, which is how Ure characterizes Arkwright. The Time Traveller discovers that the Palace of Green Porcelain is full of ancient and non-working appliances – descendants of Arkwright's "Iron Man" – that at one time could have been potential weapons against the Morlocks. "I fancied that if I could solve their puzzles I should find myself in possession of powers that might be of use against the Morlocks" (62). The Time Traveller believes that unlocking the mysteries of the future's technology could endow him with powers with which to fight the Morlocks. For the Time Traveller, it is belief in the power of science (as opposed to the power of God) that can save him against known evil. But because nothing more advanced can be salvaged from the museum – the power of science is now extinct –, he breaks a handle off of a machine to serve as a mace or club, a weapon which he thinks will be "more than sufficient" for any Morlocks that he might encounter (63). In The Time Machine, Wells uses the Prometheus myth, as

Brontë did**:** to criticize the belief in the all-powerful nature of science and industry by showing the Time Traveller to be a puny Prometheus, fire-wise and otherwise, just as he shows him to be a less-than-clever Oedipus figure.

In classical Greek myth, Oedipus is the son of Laius and Jocasta, king and queen of Thebes. At his birth, an oracle warns that Oedipus will kill his father and marry his mother, so he is abandoned by his parents, rescued by a shepherd, and raised by King Polybus of Corinth. Because Oedipus did not know that he was adopted, when an oracle proclaimed that he would kill his father, he left Corinth. During his wanderings Oedipus met and killed Laius, believing the king to be a robber. Oedipus then went to Thebes, where he rid the city of the Sphinx. Grateful to Oedipus, the Thebans made him their king, and he married Queen Jocasta. The couple lived happily until they discovered they were mother and son. In despair, Jocasta killed herself, and Oedipus put out his eyes and relinquished the throne.

In The Time Machine, the Oedipus story is represented by the White Sphinx and by the Time Traveller himself. In the Epilogue, the Frame Narrator explains that the Time Traveller "may even now – if I may use the phrase – be wandering on some plesiosaurus-haunted Oolitic coral reef. . . . Or did he go forward, into one of the nearer ages, in which men are still men, but with the riddles of our own time answered and its wearisome problems solved?" (83). That he refers to wandering equates the Time Traveller with Oedipus and his reference to riddles solved is a reference to the Sphinx. In the classical Greek myth, "man" is Oedipus's confident answer to the Sphinx's riddle. Furthermore, by answering the riddle and slaying the

Sphinx, Oedipus brought order from chaos to the city of Thebes. Because the Sphinx of the classical myth is vigorous, strong, and intelligent, Oedipus's defeat of it stands for his own vigor, strength, and intelligence. However, the Sphinx, in The Time Machine's adaptation of the myth, is, according to the Time Traveller, "greatly weatherworn **. . .** and imparted an unpleasant suggestion of disease" (23). With its "sightless eyes," this Sphinx represents the decline, the decay, and finally the death of the human species (Lake 78). And the "sightless eyes" should remind the reader that Oedipus blinded himself in a symbolic gesture; he could not bear to see the truth of his situation. After all, it is after immediately seeing this Sphinx that the Time Traveller questions humanity's fate:

> I looked up again at the crouching white shape, and the full temerity of my voyage came suddenly upon me. … What might not have happened to men? What if cruelty had grown into a common passion? What if in this interval the race had lost its manliness, and had developed into something inhuman, unsympathetic, and overwhelmingly powerful? (23)

After seeing the White Sphinx, the Time Traveller asks questions not unlike the one that the first Sphinx posed to Oedipus. The question that this decayed Sphinx poses to the Time Traveller is something like, "What is the destiny of the human race?" The remainder of the novel details just how much the human race had lost its manliness (the Eloi are almost androgynous) and how inhuman they had become (the Morlocks are monstrous). Because the Sphinx in The Time Machine is decayed

and diseased, "man" is no longer an appropriate answer to the Sphinx's riddle, and man no longer has the power to stop the decline of the human race (and The Time Machine also questions if man ever had that power). That the Time Traveller accidentally sets the forest on fire and loses Weena (his female Eloian companion) to the Morlocks suggests his inability to control fire or help a group of people fight the forces of chaos.

During the night that the Time Traveller and Weena spend in the forest, he makes a fire to protect them from the Morlocks. Nevertheless, the Time Traveller falls asleep and, hence, allows his fire to burn down. He wakes up to find them surrounded by Morlocks:

> Flinging off their clinging fingers I hastily felt in my pocket for the matchbox, and – it had gone! . . . The forest seemed full of the smell of burning wood. I was caught by the neck, by the hair, by the arms, and pulled down. It was indescribably horrible in the darkness to feel all these soft creatures heaped upon me. . . . I was overpowered and went down. I felt little teeth nipping at my neck. I rolled over, and as I did so my hand came against my iron lever. . . . I thrust where I judged their faces might me [sic.]. I could feel the succulent giving of flesh and bone under by blows. . . (69)

During this final battle scene with the Morlocks, the Victorian imagery that associates rioters with animals and storms comes to fruition. He compares them

again to spiders and rats, and notices that they run from the forest fire "in an incessant stream" (69).

In Chapter Four, I explored the ideological pressures that go into shaping the Victorian configuration of riots in industrial texts as they are troped as natural disasters. The riot logically extends the gothic dehumanization that takes place when laborers are transformed into a body of hands in that the laboring body becomes a sublime phenomenon that hovers on the edge of terror and the supernatural. Most basically, the sublime images used in the riot scene convey the unease that the Victorian middle classes felt about the stability of their social position. This unease is troped, in the industrial sublime, as terror.

The final battle scene between the Time Traveller and the Morlocks takes place in the forest, which the Time Traveller sets on fire in a terrified attempt to halt the Morlocks' attack. This fire scene, combined with the Time Traveller's terror of the Morlocks, is described using the language of the sublime, and while the terror that characterizes it as such does not arise from laboring-class debauchery, it does arise from the Morlocks carnivorous nature as well as from the Time Traveller's own adoption of the Eloi's fear – both of which are logical extensions of the fear of laboring-class uprisings. The Time Traveller exclaims:

> And now I was to see the most weird and horrible thing. . . . This whole space was as bright as day with the reflection of the fire. In the centre was a hillock or tumulus, surmounted by a scorched hawthorn. Beyond this was another arm of the burning forest, with yellow

> tongues already writhing from it, completely encircling the space with a fence of fire. Upon the hillside were some thirty or forty Morlocks, dazzled by the light and heat, and blundering hither and thither against each other in their bewilderment. . . . At last I sat down on the summit of the hillock, and watched this strange incredible company of blind things, groping to and fro, making uncanny noises to each other, as the glair of the fire beat on them. The coiling uprush of smoke streamed across the sky, and through the rare tatters of that red canopy, remote as though they belonged to another universe, shone the little stars" (69-70).

Wells has literalized the fear of lower-class uprisings in this novel by having the monstrous Morlocks come up out of their underground machine shops to prey upon the beautiful Eloi. In the Time Traveller's further explorations into the future, this devolution represented by the Eloi and Morlocks reaches fruition.

Robert Philmus explains, "The paradise-hell of the Eloi and the Morlocks prepares for – and perhaps, in biological terms, leads to – what the Traveller sees as the further vision of devolution – devolution tending ultimately towards the extinction of all life" (Philmus 58). Upon his initial encounter with the Eloi, the Time Traveller stands in the middle of a small group of curious Eloi, and he feels their "soft little tentacles upon [his] back and shoulders" (25). Similarly, during one of his first nights with the Eloi, the Time Traveller is given his first clue that the Eloi are not the only creatures of the future. He dreams, "I was drowned, and that sea-anemones were

feeling over my face with their soft palps. I woke with a start, and with an odd fancy that some grayish animal had just rushed out of the chamber" (43). And then upon his encounter with the Morlocks in their underground caves, he states, "Living, as they did, in what appeared to me impenetrable darkness, their eyes were abnormally large and sensitive, just as are the pupils of the abysmal fishes" (51). Through these marine metaphors, it becomes clear that both the Eloi and the Morlocks are slipping back into the primordial sea from which they originally emerged. The Time Traveller escapes from the clutches of the Morlocks by means of the time machine and lands on the shore of the Dead Sea. On this beach, he sees two creatures: "a thing like a huge white butterfly [in] . . . the sky" and a "monstrous crab-like creature" with its "many palps of its complicated mouth flickering and feeling as it moved" (76). The imagery here associated with the creatures of the distant future recalls the division of the Eloi and the Morlocks. The butterfly is associated with the Eloi not only because it belongs to the sky but also because a butterfly is one of the first things he sees in the Upper-world of the Eloi. Similarly, the imagery associated with the monster crabs is reminiscent of the Morlocks' own palps. That he escapes from the clutches of the Morlocks just in time to be attacked by the monster crabs suggests that the Morlocks, with their palps and evil intentions, have devolved into monster crabs. In order to escape the "evil eyes," the "appetite," and the "ungainly claws of the monster crabs," the Time Traveller once again shoots 1,000 years into the future. Here, at the Terminal Beach, the Time Traveller sees "a round thing, the size of a football perhaps . . . and tentacles trailed down from it; it seemed black against the weltering blood-red

water, and it was hopping fitfully about" (78). This football-like tentacled creature is the only life left at the end of the world.

The progress bound up with science and industry of the "ripe prime of mankind" finally molds the future, and it becomes nearly impossible to view the horrific world of 802,701 and late Victorian England as antithetical and differentiated. The Frame Narrator explains that the Time Traveller "thought but cheerlessly of the Advancement of Mankind, and saw in the growing pile of civilization only a foolish heaping that must inevitably fall back upon and destroy its makers in the end. If that is so, it remains for us to live as though it were not so" (83). And for himself, the Frame Narrator takes comfort in the "two strange white flowers" which symbolize "that even when mind and strength had gone, gratitude and a mutual tenderness still lived on in the heart of man" (83). This is the sentiment that Wells hopes the reader will take away; perhaps by embodying the values of gratitude and tenderness, rather than selfishness and brutality, humanity will not devolve and, finally, self-destruct.

Works Cited

Armstrong, Nancy. Desire and Domestic Fiction. New York: Oxford, 1987.

Ashfield, Andrew and Peter de Bolla, eds. The Sublime: A Reader in British Eighteenth-century Aesthetic Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Ashton, T. S. The Industrial Revolution, 1760-1830. (1948). New York: Oxford, 1964.

Babbage, Charles. On the Economy of Machines and Manufactures. 1835. 4th ed. New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1963.

Belkin, Roslyn. "Rejects of the Marketplace: Old Maids in Charlotte Brontë's Shirley." The International Journal of Women's Studies. 4.1 (1981): 50-66.

Berg, Maxine. The Machinery Question and the Making of Political Economy, 1815-1848. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.

Bergonzi, Bernard. The Early H. G. Wells: A Study of the Scientific Romances. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1961.

Bignell, Jonathan. "Another Time, Another Space: Modernity, Subjectivity, and The Time Machine." Wellsian 22 (1999): 34-47.

Bizup, Joseph. Manufacturing Culture: Vindications of Early Victorian Industry. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2003.

Bodenheimer, Rosemarie. The Politics of Story in Victorian Social Fiction. Cornell UP, 1988.

Boumelha, Penny. "Shirley." The Brontës. Patricia Ingham, ed. New York: Longman, 2003. 91-106.

Briggs, Asa. The Age of Improvement: 1783-1867. 2nd ed. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.

Brontë, Charlotte. Shirley. (1849). London: Penguin, 1987.

Brown, Richard. Society and Economy in Modern Britain, 1700-1850. London: Routledge, 1991.

Burke, Edmund. A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful. (1757) Ed. James T. Boulton. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1968.

---. Reflections on the Revolution in France. Ed. J. C. D. Clark. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2001.

Carlyle, Thomas. Chartism. (1839). Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings. Ed. Alan Shelston. London: Penguin, 1986. 149-256.

---. "Signs of the Times." (1829). Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings. Ed. Alan Shelston. London: Penguin, 1986. 59-86.

Casamian, Louis. The Social Novel in England 1830-1850: Dickens, Disraeli, Mrs. Gaskell and Kingsley. 1903. Trans. Martin Fido. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Catano, James V. Ragged Dicks: Masculinity, Steel, and the Rhetoric of the Self-Made Man. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2001.

---. "The Rhetoric of Masculinity: Origins, Institutions, and the Myth of the Self-Made Man." College English 52.4 (1990): 421-436.

Comte, Auguste. The Nature of the Positive Philosophy. (1853). Trans. Harriet Martineau. Nineteenth-Century Philosophy. Ed. Patrick Gardiner. New York: The Free Press, 1969. 133-143.

Craik, Dinah Mulock. John Halifax, Gentleman. (1856). London: Everyman, 1983.

David, Deirdre. Fictions of Resolution in Three Victorian Novels: North and South, Our Mutual Friend, and Daniel Deronda. New York: Columbia UP, 1981.

de Bolla, Peter. The Discourse of the Sublime: readings in History, Aesthetics, and the Subject. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

De Tocqueville, Alex. The Ancien Regime and the French Revolution (1856). Trans. S. Gilbert. London, Fontana, 1966.

Dickens, Charles. Hard Times. (1854). Ed. David Craig. London: Penguin, 1985.

Dennis, Richard. English Industrial Cities of the Nineteenth Century: A Social Geography. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Disraeli, Benjamin. Sybil; or The Two Nations. (1845). Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981.

Dolin, Tim. "Fictional Territory and a Woman's Place: Regional and Sexual Difference in Shirley." ELH 62.1 (1995): 197-215.

Eliot, George. Felix Holt, The Radical. (1886). Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Engels, Frederick. The Condition of the Working Class in England. (1844-5). Ed. Eric Hobsbawm. Chicago: Academy, 1969.

Faucher, M. Leon. Manchester in 1844. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., Stationers' Hall Court, 1844.

Firchow, Peter. "H. G. Wells's The Time Machine: In Search of Time Future – and Time Past." The Midwest Quarterly 45.2 (2004): 123-136.

Ferguson, Frances. Faucher, M. Leon. Manchester in 1844. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1844.

---. "Legislating the Sublime." Studies in Eighteenth-Century British Art and Aesthetics. Ed. R. Cohen. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. 128-147.

---.Solitude and the Sublime: Romanticism and the Aesthetics of Individuation. New York: Routledge: 1992.

Freeman, Barbara Claire. The Feminine Sublime: Gender and Excess in Women's Fiction. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.

Furniss, Tom. "Cementing the Nation: Burke's Reflections on Nationalism and National Identity." Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France: New Interdisciplinary Essays. Ed. John Whale. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000. 115-144.

---. Edmund Burke's Aesthetic Ideology: Language, Gender, and Political Economy in Revolution. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Gallgher, Catherine. The Industrial Reformation of Industrial Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form 1832-1867. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1985.

Gardner, Julia. "Neither Monsters nor Temptresses nor Terrors": Representing Desire in Charlotte Brontë's Shirley." Victorian Literature and Culture 26.2 (1998): 409-420.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. Mary Barton. (1848). Oxford: Oxford UP,1987.

---.North and South. (1854-5). London: Penguin, 1986.

Gaskell, Peter. Artisans and Machinery: The Moral and Physical Condition of the Manufacturing Population Considered with Reference to Mechanical Substitutes for Human Labour. London: John W. Parker, 1836.

---. The Manufacturing Population of England, Its Moral, Social, and Physical Conditions, and the Changes Which Have Arisen From the Use of Steam Machinery. London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1833.

Gilmour, Robin. The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1981.

Golby, J. M., and A. W. Purdue. The Civilisation of the Crowd: Popular Culture in England 1750-1900. New York: Schocken, 1985.

Graff, Ann-Barbara. "'Administrative Nihilism': Evolution, Ethics, and Victorian Utopian Satire.' Utopian Studies 12.2 (2001). 33-52.

Guy, Josephine. The Victorian Social Problem Novel: The Market, The individual and Communal Life. New York, St. Martin's: 1996.

Hardy, Thomas. A Pair of Blue Eyes. (1873). London: Macmillan, 1960.

Hertz, Neil. The End of the Line: Essays on Psychoanalysis and the Sublime. Columbia: Columbia UP, 1985.

Hobsbawm, Eric. Industry and Empire. London: Penguin, 1968.

---. The Age of Capital: 1848-1875. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson: 1962.

Holyoake, G. J. History of Co-Operation in England: Its Literature and its Advocates. London: Trübner & Co., 1879.

Huntington, John. The Logic of Fantasy: H. G. Wells and Science Fiction. New York: Columbia UP, 1982

Jameson, Fredric. The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP,1981.

Kay, James Phillips. The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester. (1832). Manchester: E. J. Morten, 1969.

Ketabgian, Tamara. "'Melancholy Mad Elephants'" Affect and the Animal Machine in Hard Times." Victorian Studies 45.4 (2003): 649-76.

---. "The Human Prosthesis: Workers and Machines in the Victorian Industrial Scene." Critical Matrix 11 (1997): 4-32.

Kettle, Arnold. "The Early Victorian Social-Problem Novel." From Dickens to Hardy. Ed. Boris Ford. London: Penguin. 1958. 164-81.

Kovačević, Ivanka. Fact into Fiction: English Literature and the Industrial Scene, 1750-1850. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1975.

Kramnick, Isaac. The Rage of Edmund Burke: Portrait of an Ambivalent Conservative. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kuchta, David. "The Making of the Self-Made Man: Class, Clothing, and English Masculinity, 1688-1832." The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective. Eds. Victoria de Grazia and Ellen Furlough. Berkeley: U of California P, 1996. 54-78.

---. The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity, England, 1550-1850. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002.

Lake, David J. "The White Sphinx and the Whitened Lemur: Images of Death in The Time Machine." Science Fiction Studies 6 (1979). 77-84.

Landes, David S. The Unbound Prometheus: Technological Change and Industrial Development in Western Europe from 1750 to the Present. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969.

Le Bon, Gustave. The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind. 1895. Dunwoody, GA: Norman S. Berg, 1968.

Lodge, David. Nice Work. London: Penguin, 1988.

Manlove, Colin. "Dualism in Well's The Time Machine and War of the Worlds." Riverside Quarterly 8.3 (1990): 173-81.

Marcus, Steven. The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth Century England. New York: New American Library, 1964.

Marglin, Stephen. "What Do Bosses Do?" The Division of Labour. Ed. Andre Gorz. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities, 1976. 13-54.

Marx, Karl. Grundrisse. (1857). Karl Marx: Selected Writings. ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

---. Capital. (1887). Ed. Frederick Engels. Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Averling. New York: International, 1967.

McLynn, Frank. Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-century England. London: Routledge, 1989.

Melada, Ivan. The Captain of Industry in English Fiction, 1821-1871. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1970.

Monk, Samuel H. The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England. (1935). Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1960.

Morris, Pat. "Heroes and Hero-Worship in Charlotte Brontë's Shirley.' Nineteenth Century Literature 54.3 (1999): 285-307.

Morris, R.J. and Richard Rodger, eds. "An Introduction to British Urban History, 1820-1914." The Victorian City: A Reader in British Urban History, 1820-1914. London: Longman, 1993. 1-42.

Mumford, Lewis. Technics and Civilization. (1934). San Diego: Harvest, 1962.

Paulson, Ronald. "Burke's Sublime and the Representation of Revolution." Culture and Politics from Puritanism to the Enlightenment. Ed. Perez Zagorin. Berkley: U of California P, 1980. 241-270.

---. Representations of Revolution (1789-1820). New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Philmus, Robert. "The Logic of "Prophecy" in The Time Machine. H. G. Wells: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Bernard Bergonzi. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976. 56-68.

Plotz, John. The Crowd: British Literature and Public Politics. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Poovey, Mary. Making a Social Body: British Cultural Formation; 1830-1864. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1995.

Pritchett, V. S. "The Scientific Romances." H. G. Wells: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Bernard Bergonzi. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1976. 32-38.

Randall, Adrian. Before the Luddites: Custom, Community, and Machinery in the English Woolen Industry, 1776-1809. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Reardon, Bernard M. G. Religion in the Age of Romanticism. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Robbins, Bruce. The Servant's Hand: English Fiction from Below. New York: Columbia UP, 1986.

Rogers, Nicholas. Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Rudé, George. The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

---. Ideology and Popular Protest. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

Ruskin, John. "The Nature of Gothic." (1852). Selections and Essays. Ed. Frederick William Roe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. 213-242.

---. "The Storm-Cloud of the Nineteenth Century." (1884). The Norton Anthology of English Literature. Ed. M. H. Abrams. 7th ed. Vol. 2. New York: Norton, 2000. 1443-1451.

Scott, James C. Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990.

Shapiro, Gary. "From the Sublime to the Political: Some Historical Notes." New Literary History 16.2 (1985): 213-35.

Shuttleworth. James Kay. The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester (1832). Manchester: E. J. Morten, 1969.

Smiles, Samuel. Character. Chicago: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1883.

---.Industrial Biography: Iron Workers and Tool Makers. (1863). Chicago: Bedford, Clark, and Co., 1889.

---. Self-Help. (1859). New York: A.L. Burt Co. ND. 1866.

Smith, Adam The Wealth of Nations. (1776). New York: Random House, 1937.

Smith, Andrew. Gothic Radicalism: Literature, Philosophy, and Psychoanalysis in the Nineteenth Century. London: Macmillan, 2000.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. The Politics and Poetics of Transgression. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.

Stevenson, Catherine Barnes. "Romance and the Self-Made Man: Gaskell Rewrites Bronte." The Victorian Newsletter 91 (1997): 10-16.

Sussman, Herbert. "Industrial." A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture. Ed. Herbert F. Tucker. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. 82-96.

---. The Victorians and the Machine. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1968.

Suvin, Darko. Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Taylor, W. Cooke. Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire. London: Duncan and Malcolm, 1842.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. New York: Pantheon, 1963.

---. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century" (1993). The Essential E. P. Thompson. Ed. Dorothy Thompson. New York: The New Press, 2001. 316-77.

Thomson, James. "Rule Britannia." The Longman Anthology of British Literature. 2nd ed. David Damrosch, ed. New York: Longman, 2003. 2696-2697.

Tillotson. Kathleen. Novels of the Eighteen-Forties. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Toynbee, Arnold. The Industrial Revolution. (1884). Boston: Beacon, 1956.

Tribe, Keith. Genealogies of Capitalism. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1981.

Trott, Nicola. "The Picturesque, the Beautiful and the Sublime." A Companion to Romanticism. Ed. Duncan Wu. London: Oxford UP, 1998. 72-90.

Turner, Frank M. "Why the Greeks and not the Romans in Victorian Britain?" Rediscovering Hellenism. Ed. G. W. Clarke. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. 61-81.

Ure, Andrew. The Philosophy of Manufacturers, or, An Exposition of the Scientific, Moral, and Commercial Economy of the Factory System of Great Britain. London: Charles Knight, 1835.

Vance, Norman. The Victorians and Ancient Rome. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

Van Gorp, Hendrik. "The Sublime and the Gothic." Sense and Transcendence: Essays in Honour of Herman Servotte. Ed. Ortwin de Graef. Louvain: Leuven UP, 1995. 175-85.

Wasson, Richard. "Myth and the Ex-Nomination of Class in The Time Machine." The Minnesota Review 15 (1980): 112-22.

Webb, Igor. From Custom to Capital: The English Novel and the Industrial Revolution. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.

Weiskel, Thomas. The Romantic Sublime: Studies in the Structure and Psychology of Transcendence. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.

Wells, H. G. Scientific Romances of H. G. Wells. London: Gollancz, 1933.

---. The Time Machine. (1894-5). Selected Short Stories. London: Penguin, 1968. 7-83.

Werlin, Robert J. The English Novel and the Industrial Revolution: A Study in the Sociology of Literature. Harvard Studies in Sociology. New York: Garland, 1990.

Wernick, Andrew. Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity: The Post-Theistic Program of French Social Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Whale, John, ed. Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France: New Interdisciplinary Essays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.

Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society: 1780-1950. (1958). New York: Columbia UP, 1983.

Wright, T. R. The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Wyllie, Irvin G. The Self-Made Man in America: The Myth of Rags to Riches. New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Young, Arlene. Culture, Class and Gender in the Victorian Novel: Gentlemen, Gents and Working Women. London: Macmillan, 1999.

Zimmerman, Andrew. "The Ideology of the Machine and the Spirit of the Factory: Remarx on Babbage and Ure." Cultural Critique 37 (1997): 5-29.

Zlotnick, Susan. Women, Writing, and the Industrial Revolution. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998.