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This thesis is an analysis of the writings and parliamentary activity of the Young England movement of the 1840s. Though dismissed by many historians as being well-intentioned but whimsically romantic, the movement, in fact, offered solutions to the dislocating effects of the Industrial Revolution which were often advanced for their time. Composed of young noblemen, under the titular leadership of Benjamin Disraeli, Young England sought to adapt the organic ideology of the Medieval Revivalists (Cobbett, Coleridge, Southey, and so on) to the realities of an industrialized society. The Young Englanders, on the whole, opposed the atomistic tendencies of laissez-faire Liberalism, and supported such progressive measures as the protection of the working conditions and hours of labour of the industrial worker, government sponsorship of agricultural allotments for the labouring poor, sanitary reform, and publicly-funded parks, museums, gardens, libraries, and baths which would be free and accessible to all. Though the movement fell apart over the Maynooth controversy and the repeal of the Corn Laws, several of its members continued to advocate Young England schemes until the end of the decade, at the very least.
## Contents

**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chapter One: Young England and the Historians</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chapter Two: The Contemporary Response to Young England</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chapter Three: Young England and the Medieval Revival</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chapter Four: Young England and the Sacred Trust</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Chapter Five: Young England and the Machine</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END NOTES</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young England in Parliament: A Representative Voting Record</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

**

1. Young England in Parliament: A Representative Voting Record (Appendix I) 124
I would like to thank my Thesis Advisor, Dr. James Winter, for his encouragement, patience and guidance over the last two years, my wife, Senna, for her patience and for typing out my rough drafts, and Garth Wilson for his kindness in proof-reading the various drafts.
Introduction

[Young England came from a time when] golden youth might be seen with their shirt collars turned down living on biscuits and soda water a la Byron.

- Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, 1890

*A hell of a fellow is Young England, and has handsome language at command, as also very gentlemanly clothes and most respectable hats."

- John Mitchell, a "contemporary Young Irisher, about to be transported for his ideals."

* 

It cannot be said that Young England left an indelible mark on the legislation or social life of Victorian England. As Disraeli's biographer, E.T. Raymond, has remarked, "It left no mark on the statute book. It produced no definitive effect on the course of social development." Yet, the movement is worthy of attention. As Raymond went on to add, its spirit "did not wholly perish from the minds of men." Even Robert Blake, who is generally harsh on Young England, says much the same thing. The Young Englanders, he asserts, must be regarded as symbols and examples that lend an imaginative glow to the dull course of party politics; showing that there are other ways to fame than conformism, diligence, and calculation; showing that a gesture, however absurd it may seem to contemporaries, may sometimes live longer than many Blue Books.

This spirit, anti-Utilitarian, anti-laissez-faire, and interventionist in its compassion for the labouring poor, emerged from the Romantic Medievalist revival of early nineteenth century Britain. What makes Young England unique from other Medievalists, was its advocacy in Parliament of the organic principles it held so dear. Often, these principles were as hopelessly anachronistic as critics have contended. On the other hand (and this has been ignored by a majority of scholars who have touched on the movement), Young
England attempted to make its ideals compatible with an industrial age. In fact, the kinds of criticisms the Young Englanders levelled at atomistic social and economic values, coupled with their acceptance of the dynamics of a machine society, make them, in some indirect ways, the forbears of those who implemented the British welfare state.

Initially, however, it is necessary to define the boundaries of investigation. What exactly was Young England? Who were its members? How does one define something as nebulous as a loose combination of Parliamentary "dandies"? It could, of course, be argued that Young England was never more than an idea without substance, a convenient magnet to attract anti-Peelite sentiment, or a band of naifs, manipulated by the unscrupulous Disraeli. Yet, the evidence clearly suggests that the movement did have an existence beyond that of a giddy cabal of disgruntled backbenchers and idealistic young aristocrats.

Young England had its genesis in the friendship between three young members of the nobility who had been at Cambridge together, Lord John Manners, the Hon. George Sydney Smythe, and Alexander Baillie-Cochrane. In October, 1842, Smythe and Cochrane met the maverick M.P., Benjamin Disraeli, in Paris and negotiated with him an agreement to form a party to advocate in Parliament the Romantic-Medievalist ideals they all shared. As Smythe put it in a letter to Manners, "We have settled, subject to your approval, to sit together, and to vote together, the majority deciding."

In a later letter, he added, "It is ... arranged that you, I, Diz., and Kok [Cochrane] shall vote, and Henry Baillie, if he will come into the plan." Besides these, he proposed that Quinton Dick, Henry Hope, Richard Hodgeson, Milnes, and others would vote with the party "out of personal attachment to Diz." Other names have been associated with the movement,
including three M.P.s who were personal friends of Manners and Co.: the Irish landowner, Stafford O'Brien, the Tory-Radical, W.B. Ferrand, and the Tory-Romantic, Peter Borthwick. Outside Parliament, the "irascible Russophobe", David Urquhart and John Walter II, the proprietor of The Times, gave solid support to the movement. For a while, in fact, Disraeli and Cochrane seriously considered making Walter the titular head of Young England.9

Initially, Disraeli had grandiose plans to create a party of some size. As Cochrane wrote to Manners,

D'I's head is full of great movements, vast combinations, the importance of numbers.... As I tell him, and must reiterate, supposing his views were carried out, that the Quinton Dicks, the Dick Hodgesons, and the Dicky Milnes, all these several Richards cum multis aliis of all nations, climes, and ages in number sixty should combine, give us the fulfillment of our hopes that we vote together steadily, ... above all petty jealousies, party views, and interests, how are our projects promoted? Why the moment a party exceeds that number in which personal sympathies and affections bind men to each other, and induce them to make sacrifices of views and opinions for the advantage of combination, why that instant the principle of disillusion is called forth, and the toy falls to pieces amid ridicule and contempt.

It was Cochrane's view that prevailed, and the party was limited to the four original members. As Manners's biographer, Charles Whibley, puts it, "There was no compulsion upon any [of their sympathisers] to vote with the party, and even the leaders strenuously reserved to themselves the right of public judgement."11 Furthermore, "To say they professed a practical policy would be to misunderstand them. They did not aim at a policy; they professed to cherish ideals."12 These ideals included conditional property rights, a desire to refurbish traditional institutions, a mild Tractarianism, and a concept of an organic state.

In a fundamental sense, then, Young England was a small group of four intimates who shared a common faith in High Toryism, and a common distrust of Sir Robert Peel's brand of Liberal-Conservatism. However, as a movement
that "cherished ideals" rather than aimed "at policy", its boundaries were, naturally, fluid. In fact, the Medieval Revival of the 1840s had touched the sensibilities of many of the younger Tory M.P.s who, like Young England, often sought to adapt traditional institutions to a machine age: the Milnes, Borthwicks, et al.

A table of parliamentary divisions from 1842-50, on issues of political importance, or of particular interest to Young England, provides a model with which to examine the movement [Appendix I]. It is important to note the limited number of personalities involved. Some supposed allies of Young England such as Henry Baillie and Quinton Dick voted so often against the Young England grain that they do not even appear on the table. And though it does reveal a large degree of personal idiosyncracy in voting patterns, it nevertheless points to a general concurrence on most issues. Manners and Disraeli almost invariably voted the same way. Cochrane, when he did vote, supported his colleagues on the important issues of the new Poor Law and factory legislation. Smythe generally supported the others, except on the issue of factory legislation, a fact explained by his increasingly strong predilection for the principles of Free Trade and Political Economy. On the periphery, O'Brien, Ferrand, Milnes and Borthwick voted alongside Young England with a degree of regularity. Ferrand's loyalty was particularly remarkable. He was on the best of terms with the movement and, on one occasion, Disraeli, Smythe and Manners defended his honour after he had been ejected from the Commons for some verbal indiscretions. Yet, it would be unwise to call him a Young Englisher, since most historians refer to him as a North country Tory-Radical, with close links to Richard Oastler and the Ten Hours Movement. And though Young England and Tory-Radicalism were closely associated, the two should not be confused. The latter was the spirit of the North country squirearchy, the former was that of Cambridge-educated,
aristocratic youth. As for Milnes, though in this period he was imbued with the Young England spirit, and would "hover around" Young England "half-fascinated, half-frightened and intensely jealous of Smythe who, as he rightly suspected, regarded him as a figure of fun," could one truly call him a Young Englander? In 1847, after being satirized in Disraeli's *Tancred*, he took his revenge by slashing Disraeli's Young England novels in the Whig *Edinburgh Review*, and by writing satiric verses lampooning the movement's archaic preoccupations.\(^{15}\)

The best approach, then, appears to be to concentrate on the core of the movement, Manners, Smythe, Disraeli, and Cochrane, but, when occasion demands it, not to ignore the existence of the periphery: those M.P.s who voted consistently with Young England and who addressed the same concerns in their speeches. A longer study than this one could, perhaps, attempt a thorough analysis of the Romantic-Medievalist spirit as it was exemplified in the Parliament of the 1840s.

Attention should be drawn to the two divisions at the bottom of the table, the first concerned with the 1845 grant of public funds to the Catholic seminary at Maynooth, Ireland, and the second with the 1846 repeal of the Corn Laws. Both were highly divisive issues at the time, and they crippled Young England. Certainly, after the repeal of the Corn Laws, with Smythe, Cochrane and Milnes going in one direction, and the others going in the opposite direction, the movement as such ceased to exist. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to neglect completely the succeeding years. Certainly, in the area of industrial relations, many of the Young Englanders, both of the core and the periphery, voted in tandem on major pieces of legislation. In other words, between 1842 and 1850, Young England matured, going from an earnest but unreal Medievalism to an
intelligent adaptation of organic principles so as to make them harmonious with the age. They recognized that, if poverty could not be alleviated through a revival of monastic institutions, there was no alternative to the state, even if this meant an increase in centralization. Through these necessary compromises, Young England proved to be more progressive than their critics have maintained.

What follows is not a complete analysis of Young England. A thorough history of the movement would include chapters on their historical vision, and on their attitudes to the nature of government and representation: Parliament, democracy, the role of the monarchy, and so on. Attention will be limited to the areas where Young England had practical solutions to offer to social and economic problems: particularly, industrialism, land relations, and what many contemporaries saw as the era's aridity and lack of spontaneity.
Chapter One: Young England and the Historians

The British Parliamentary movement of the 1840s known as Young England has generally received short shrift from historians of the nineteenth century. Whether of the Whig, Marxist or Conservative schools, historians have either ignored Young England or have dismissed it as being composed of immature noblemen possessed with an anachronistic desire to regain aristocratic ascendancy over British life through the application of a dreamy, unreal feudalism. Only a few scholars have chosen to take a more generous view of Young England. Unfortunately, even these latter have written about the movement only within larger contexts (e.g., biographies of Benjamin Disraeli and works on the nineteenth century medieval revival), and to date there has been no systematic academic treatment of Young England alone.

It is the contention of this thesis that this neglect has been occasioned by a widespread lack of comprehension of, or sympathy with, the movement's remedies for Britain's problems. Relying on poetry, novels, parliamentary papers, journal and newspaper articles, and memoirs, it will be argued that, underlying Young England's "medieval bric-a-brac" is a solid foundation of intelligent thought that developed into a perspicacious condemnation of laissez-faire industrial society. In place of the Liberal social and economic vision, Young England offered an alternative which was no less rational, realizable, or compelling.

It is curious, then, that a large number of the major scholarly texts of nineteenth century British history completely ignore the Young England phenomenon. Among these are some of the great names of the field. R.K. Webb in Modern England; from the Eighteenth Century to the Present has a
chapter on Peel's decade, but he does not mention Young England. Nor does Trevelyan in British History: 1782-1919, G.M. Young in Early Victorian England: Portrait of an Age, Anthony Wood in Nineteenth Century Britain, 1815-1914, nor Asa Briggs in The Age of Improvement. The Hammonds in Age of the Chartists: 1832-1854 fail to mention Young England by name, though they do make a passing reference to Lord John Manners, the main spokesman of the movement. Having acknowledged that, "In England, in the Middle Ages ..., the Church took care, so far as care was taken, of the destitute and the sick," they add in a foot-note: "Lord John Manners would have liked to revert to this system."

In more recent years, the Conservative historian, Norman Gash, makes no mention of Young England in his two broad surveys of early Victorian politics, Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics, and Politics in the Age of Peel, though his Peel biography does make a brief but not unfavourable comment on the movement:

[An] ... independent and critical group of idealists known as Young England whose ideas were an attractive and youthful compound of romantic High Churchmanship, feudal sympathy for the industrial poor, and veneration for an imaginary past. As a fervent admirer of Sir Robert Peel, Young England's bête noire, Gash has, of course, no reason to look kindly on the movement; nevertheless, his scant treatment of it in works devoted to Parliamentary politics in the age of Peel does appear odd.

Another group of scholars are those who either mention Young England only briefly, or who misunderstand the movement. The major misinterpretation of Young England, stemming no doubt from a merely superficial perusal of the facts, is the claim that it was hostile to the Victorian middle classes. Halevy in The Age of Peel and Cobden, for instance, claims that Young England
showed [an]... understanding of the workers' claims when they invited the ruling class to be reconciled with the poor, and form a common front with them against the selfishness of the lower middle class.

Walter L. Arnstein in Britain, Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present, agrees with this, though he is less sympathetic:

Disraeli's "Young England" movement had looked back to an idealised patriarchal rural England in which paternalistic landlords had earned the faithful service of devoted farmers and servants and only the money-grubbing middle-class merchants or industrialists played the role of villains.11

W.F. Monypenny in his biographical work, Life of Disraeli, also makes this error of interpretation, claiming, "Young England had an antipathy to the middle classes."12 Even E.V. Woodward, in an astute and lengthy description of Young England in Age of Reform, comments:

Smythe and Manners believed that there was a chance of avoiding revolution if upper and lower classes came together to resist radicals and manufacturers.13

There is, in fact, strong evidence against this prevalent misconception which will be detailed in a later chapter. The origin of this error seems to lie in confusing Young England's hostility to laissez-faire economics with hostility toward the class which were supposed to embrace this ideology of the cash nexus.

Another attitude among many historians is to adopt a patronising and dismissive tone toward Young England. This is seen particularly in complacent remarks concerning the so-called romantic impracticality of the movement. The historians who strike this pose, however, generally claim to be sympathetic to Young England's idealism. Monypenny, for example, claims that the minds of Young England

were fertile in ideas, some of them too picturesque, perhaps, to be practical, but all of them noble and disinterested.14

Robert Blake, a recent Disraeli biographer, is as sympathetic, but somewhat more dismissive. Having described Young England (along with Tractarianism and
the Gothic revival) as "the reaction of a defeated class to a sense of its own defeat - a sort of nostalgic escape from the disagreeable present;" he adds that at least the movement had its heart in the right place:

The movement should not be dismissed as wholly ineffective. It was not a bad thing that some generous young men should declare the owners of property to have duties as well as privileges. Blake, however, finds nothing of value in Young England's advocacy of medieval values:

And if the movement was mixed up with a good deal of ecclesiastical flummery, medieval bric-a-brac and gothic rubbish, did this really do anyone any harm? Another scholar, David Roberts, shares this condescending attitude, though he approaches Young England from a different political perspective. In his work, Paternalism in Early Victorian England, Roberts claims that "Young England... was as fragile as the myths it dabbled in." Nevertheless, he too finds things to admire in the movement:

There was much that was humane and wise in the vision of these youthful and sanguine literati. Given their own assumptions, theirs was not an inconsistent social theory. One could both attack a centralising poor law and vote economic favours to landowners if one believed landowners would use large rents for schools and clothing clubs, and their greater local power for the kinder and more intelligent relief of the poor.

It is, of course, foolish to believe that aristocrats are necessarily more charitably inclined than manufacturers; and doubtless Roberts would be correct in accusing Young England of dabbling in fragile myths, if it was true that the movement really believed this. In fact, Roberts forgets that Young England, though their social philosophy was both hierarchical and based on the constitutional importance of land, never claimed that contemporary aristocrats were morally superior to the rest of their countrymen. Rather, Manners, Smythe, Disraeli and company claimed that the aristocracy had betrayed England's ancient constitutional principles, and, more important, had abandoned an organic, Christian Zeitgeist in favour of a society predicated on atomism and the cash nexus.
A similar criticism of Young England is advanced by Charles H. Kegel. Discussing the relationship between Lord John Manners and the Medieval Revival, Kegel sees Manners as a romantic reactionary who lacked the social insights of Ruskin and William Morris. Manners, he claimed, failed to understand the gigantic political, economic, religious, and sociological changes which were taking place around him.... Manners attempted to revivify something which was dead - irrevocably so. [He] recognised neither the need nor the desirability of historical development.

Kegel also claims that though Manners sympathised with the plight of nineteenth century labourers, he had none for their political rights. This is debatable. So, for that matter, is Kegel's claim that the Romantic poet Southey's politics are "sheer reaction", medievalism at its worst.

Martin Wiener in his recent work, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, states that the cultural assault on the industrial spirit did not truly get underway until the time of the Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851. As for Young England, he has only this to say:

The trajectory of admiration for material progress had reached an apogee in the 1850s. After 1851, and especially from the sixties, currents of thought and sentiment began to flow in another direction - not toward the simplistic rejection [italics mine] of the Young England writers or Pugin, but toward the domestication of the industrial revolution.

A good deal of the rejection of Young England seems to have its roots in one poem by Lord John Manners, and the manner in which this poem has been misinterpreted exemplifies perfectly how a superficial comprehension of Young England's medievalism can lead to distortion. Written in Manners's late teens, the poem contains this notorious couplet:

Let wealth and commerce, laws and learning die,
But leave us still our old nobility.

Ever since it was lampooned in 1844 by Punch, these lines have haunted the reputation of Young England, making it appear ludicrous to many, and colouring the judgement of historians. The literalist approach to the often florid
romantic writings of Young England has, in fact, been the movement's nemesis. However, some historians have risen to the defence. Woodward is especially perceptive:

If the lines ... are considered in relation to the coalmining industry, the law under Eldon, and learning at Oxford and Cambridge in the reign of William IV, their meaning is not altogether ridiculous.25

Generally, Woodward admires Young England. Despite his erroneous belief that the movement was hostile to manufacturers, he does make some telling points. He states (as, incidentally, does Blake) that Young England "had a parliamentary importance out of proportion to its influence in the country."26

Furthermore, Manners's

... criticism of the "greasiness" of free-traders was not mere snobbery and there was some reason in his judgement that "nothing but monastic institutions can christianize Manchester." ... His solution of the problems of Industrial England has been described as a "curious mixture of public baths, public open spaces, and church festivals," yet it was no bad thing to insist upon the responsibilities of wealth, and at a time when the emphasis of religion lay upon the duties of the poor, to point out that poor men had a right to the external conditions of happiness.27

Two other scholars write on Young England in a similarly positive vein. Surprisingly, it is André Maurois in his popular biography of Disraeli who seems to have a deeper understanding than a good number of the professional historians. Like the others, he begins by mocking the rarified feudalism of much of Young England's rhetoric, describing Manners as "a Lancelot lost in a world of machinery."28 Yet, he then goes on to claim that, beneath the flowery day-dreaming, Young England was not a reactionary movement:

But not everybody laughed. The four friends [Young England] went in company to Manchester, and a working-class audience gave them a good reception. Manners and Smythe held long conversations with manufacturers, and recognised that ... most of them were humane men. There lay the elements for a new feudalism, if only it could recognize its duties. To declaim against industry was dull and contrived. The task was to win over the youth of industrialism to the beliefs of popular conservatism.29

But Maurois failed to pursue this interesting line of inquiry.
The second commentator, Alice Chandler, agrees with Maurois's judgement. In her work on the nineteenth century Medieval Revival, *A Dream of Order,* she perceives Young England as a humanising force in an age of vast social dislocation. On Manners's proposals, she comments:

"[His] recommendations had a deeper significance ... , for he was placing the Romantic regret for the loss of joy in a social framework and reminding his audience (like Matthew Arnold later) of the boring seriousness, the deadly philistinism that was beginning to depress Victorian England."  

Chandler also points out that Young England was not as antithetical to manufacturers and the factory system as many scholars have claimed:

Manners maintains that as long as proper legislative control can be maintained over such matters as unemployment, hours and work conditions "so complete a feudal system as that of the mills is not such a bad thing at all."  

Both Maurois and Chandler were on the right track, but few followed. Except for the occasional quotations from Disraeli's novels and Manners's poems, most scholars appear to rely on only one source for information on Young England: Charles Whibley's delightful but archly Conservative biography, *Lord John Manners and his Friends* (1925). For all this work's anecdotal richness, its ingenuous partisanship of archaic aristocratic (and decidedly anti-democratic) values makes it easy for scholars hostile to Young England to dismiss the movement out of hand.

It is not difficult to understand why this hostility and indifference exist. Whig and Liberal historians are probably offended by Young England's failure to subscribe to the cult of progress or are genuinely suspicious of what they perceive as the movement's feudal and authoritarian ideology. Historians of the Left will, of course, dismiss the movement as errant romanticism, seeing Young England as an elitist movement with no awareness of the futility of turning back the historical clock, or of the need for socialist democracy in an industrial age. It is less easy to comprehend why.
historians of the Right, like Norman Gash and Robert Blake, are less than enthusiastic about Young England. One possible reason could be Conservatism's perennial tension between theory and practice. Particularly in Britain, where the ruling class has been engaged in atomising capitalistic economic activities perhaps as far back as the Middle Ages, there would, no doubt, be some discomfort at the appearance of a Conservative philosophy which actually advocates the physical application of traditional Tory rhetoric concerning the need for an organic society which weaves together men of all degrees in a fabric of Christian charity and mutual obligation. How much more acceptable is Peel's adaption of traditional principles in order to make them compatible with the prevailing dogma of Political Economy! Young England, on the other hand, in its denial of market values and its advocacy of a corporate state in which the individual is subservient to higher ideals, is almost revolutionary in its implications. It is this latter interpretation of Young England which the following chapters will develop in a more comprehensive fashion.
... In those "dark ages" that the impudent Scotch economists talk about, we had a great many holidays. There were all the fairs of our own place, and all the fairs of the places just round about. There were several days at Christmas, at Easter, at Whitsuntide; and we had a day or two at Hollantide, as we used to call it, which came in November, ... and at Candlemass. Besides these, there were cricket-matches, and sigle-stick matches; and all these were not thought too much .... I never knew a labouring man, in those "dark ages," go out to his work in the morning without a bottle of beer and a satchel of victual, containing cheese, if not bacon, hung upon his crook .... Accordingly, be it observed there wanted no schools, no Lancastrian or Bell work, no Tracts, no circulation of Bibles, to make the common people generally honest and obedient.

William Cobbett, *The Autobiography*

* [Young England] professes further to sympathise with all manner of religious, or rather superstitious, and rustic mummeries .... The festivities ... are ... a revival of the absurdities of the middle ages. There is to be, or there ought to be, at this most sacred season, in all rural mansions, a gathering of the peasantry, to witness the procession of the boar's head, ... the ordination of an abbot of unreason, the monstrous follies of the masquerade and the hobby horse! We admit that these puerilities may appear at first sight utterly contemptible and nothing more: and yet, when we remember the old predilections of the establishment for Sunday sports, the extensive revival of Sabbath wakes, cricketings and the like, in so many of our more retired districts in the country, where, from the declining influence of the evangelical clergy, and total absence of any other religious instruction, regard for the Lord's day, especially in the afternoon, is even less than it was years ago, - our minds can perceive ample necessity for not being altogether off our guard .... Whatever may be the asceticism of a few prominent leaders, the religious principles of Young England are essentially secular and worldly. They are in accordance with the depravity of a fallen heart, - of that carnal mind which is altogether at enmity with God ....

Anon., the Dissenting *Eclectic Review*, 1844

* Though Young England did occasionally lapse into silliness such as their misguided enthusiasm for the doomed Carlist cause in Spain, they did know
to quote Disraeli in his novel, *Coningsby*) that "the age of ruins is past." In fact, Young England celebrated the age of the machine and the class of capitalist entrepreneurs who were transforming the face of Great Britain. In condemning the *Zeitgeist* which accompanied these vast changes, they were not being reactionary but, rather, were foreshadowing the later critics of laissez-faire capitalism who advocated the welfare state of the mid-twentieth century: a curious progeny for a movement generally dismissed as a reactionary brand of Toryism. In fact, beneath Young England's flowery medievalism and mist-wreathed evocation of the Stuart kings, there lay an intelligent critique of the problems of the age.

That the Radical and Liberal foes of paternalism should have ignored Young England's serious side is hardly surprising. More difficult to understand are those many contemporary Tories, both Peelite and traditionalist, who also condemned or haughtily dismissed the movement out of hand. It will be the contention of this chapter that the serious side of Young England caused embarrassment to those one must presume to be their potential friends because it exposed a fundamental contradiction in early Victorian Conservative thinking and arrived at an awkward moment in the history of the Conservative Party.

Such awkwardness is not apparent to readers of Liberal and Radical comments on Young England, where the prevailing note is one of self-confidence, tempered here and there by disdain, anger, ridicule, and condescension at the excesses of the movement. Liberals were confident because their ideology was still predominant. Steam Intellect, Utilitarianism, Political Economy, and the Cults of Progress and Individualism were held sacrosant by many, particularly the growing urban middle class which had not yet undergone what Martin Weiner in a recent study calls its
"gentrification." Even Radicals who were not enamoured of Political Economy were sceptical of the goals of Young England. They thought like Dickens who, on observing the Royal Chinese Junk, the Keeying, in 1851, remarked, "The true Tory spirit would have made a China of England if it could." This emphasis on the supposedly reactionary nature of the Young England brand of Romantic-Toryism was expressed in many of the reviews of Young England's literary works.

Two representatives of this approach are the anonymous review of Coningsby in the July, 1844, issue of Fraser's Magazine and the Benthamite W.E. Hickson's review of the same novel in the September, 1844, issue of the Westminster Review. Neither of these essays was at all sympathetic to Young England's organic, anti-Liberal vision, and neither deigned to mention the movement's scheme of applying feudal values to the factory system. In ridiculing the ideas developed in the novel, both reviews made light of the scene they took as most representative of Young England's philosophy: the St. Genevieve episode, where a Catholic landowner distributes alms to local paupers who have arrived at the beckoning of a tolling bell.

Hickson's critique of the almsgiving scene is predictably Utilitarian and rationalist. He begins by using the Gospel of St. Matthew to flay Young England philanthropy: "He who adheres to the forms of ostentatious charity will be supposed to do so from other motives than benevolence." He then invites Disraeli to imagine how he would feel with his own loved ones in the procession of paupers, compelled to parade their "poverty in the eyes of the World, to trudge a weary mile at the ringing of a bell." Yet, apart from these considerations, "there are others scarcely less
Few who have lived in a rural district do not know that such a neighbour as Mr. Lyle, who would set the bells of a high tower ringing to proclaim his benevolence, would be immediately invaded by the hordes of travelling mendicants who adopt distress as a profession.

Hickson's views on Young England were unambiguously in line with the Westminster Review's Utilitarian editorial policy, a fact not surprising considering that Hickson was the journal's dictatorial editor.

What is surprising is that the Tory Fraser's Magazine would publish what reads like a Whig dismissal of Young England. Though it was not uncommon for Whig/Radical periodicals to publish Tory reviews, and vice-versa, it does appear somewhat incongruous in this case. Since Fraser's was considered more compassionate than its fellows and, as the 1840s progressed, became increasingly interventionist, it should have been more receptive to Disraeli's strident demand that the aristocracy could justify itself only by the vigour of its moral reformation. Nevertheless, what mention there is of Young England is generally unfavourable. The journal's Coningsby review, for example, never seriously attempted to understand the movement's social argument. As to the archaic nature of almsgiving, et al, the reviewer wrote

Mr. Disraeli is a warm advocate of the revival of rustic sports, and the systematic distribution by landowners of alms ... . Now, this is pure fancy. You could no more revive May games and Witsuntide ales among the humbler classes, than you could create anew a taste for ... Vauxhall Gardens, among the higher ... . As to the promiscuous doling out of broken victuals ... , he may depend upon it that no good would result from the practice ... . Whether for good or for evil, the ideas of the poor are not what they used to be. If you desire to render your peasantry happy ... and respectable ... find for them steady employment; give them comfortable houses to inhabit, and attach to each a bit of garden ground, in the cultivation of which [will be found] both amusement and profit. [But], a peasant loses all respect for himself as soon as he becomes a weekly applicant at the squire's gate for a basin of broth or the scrag end of mutton. 10

This quotation illustrates well the superficiality of most Liberal criticism of Young England. In fact, it completely misinterprets the movement's
beliefs. Actually, Disraeli would almost certainly have concurred with this solution to rural ills. So would have Lord John Manners who, in fact, advocated in the Commons and on a Parliamentary Committee such measures as peasant allotments.

The Liberal novelist Thackeray was somewhat more charitable towards Young England than were many of his colleagues. In a review of Coningsby which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, he said of the movement that it is good at least to find gentlemen sitting with the present government acknowledging the cant of its professions, the entire uncertainty of its aims, the hollowness of its views, and for the imminent convulsions of the country its utter inadequacy to provide...

Mildly approving though this sounds, it is equally evident that Thackeray could not take the movement over-seriously. In a famous satire of the aristocracy, he fashioned his character Jeames de la Pluche into an admirer of "Young Hengland."

Those on the Left of the political spectrum were as predictable as the Liberals and Radicals in their observations. The Left, however, differed from the Liberals in that it mixed its censure of Young England with an occasional dollop of praise. While Liberals would, at best, applaud only Young England's condemnation of the Peel government, the Left would sometimes note with approval the movement's sympathy for the labouring poor. This mixture of attitudes sometimes led to rather contradictory judgements. For instance, one contributor to the Radical-Left *Douglas Jerrold's Shilling Magazine* condemned Young England for desiring once more to make "the peasant a serf of the soil," while a colleague on another occasion praised George Smythe for his favourable evocation of the revolutionary Jacobins.

Similar contradictions were to be found in the Chartist *Northern Star*'s treatment. Like other critics from the Left, the *Northern Star* had no
intellectual stake in the sanctity of private property or the preservation of a social order based on land. Therefore, it could openly belittle Young England's evocation of a hierarchical society founded on the duties of property, while simultaneously praising the movement's sweeping criticisms of laissez-faire capitalism. It did both in a lengthy, extended review of Coningsby which appeared between December, 1844, and March, 1845. The critic began on a sympathetic note, acknowledging Young England's anti-Peelism and compassion for the plight of the mill-workers:

The masses are at any rate so far favourably pre-disposed by the Manchester and Bingley demonstrations as to offer a willing ear ... to Young England ... . The masses now regard rather hopefully than hostilely the movements of their declared friends. 15

Nevertheless, he soon went on to criticise harshly Young England's brand of paternalism. Like previous reviewers of the novel, he vented his spleen at the almsgiving vignette, though from a perspective deriving from Proletarian radicalism rather than from the Manchester School.

To recommend seriously a system of almsgiving as a means of dealing with the "condition of England question" is preposterous:

Besides, such a return to monastic mummeries ... is hardly in accordance to the present enlightenment of the labouring classes. ... . The working classes ... will be ... little inclined to go back to the slavish, debasing system of monastic relief. Justice not charity is the requirement of the present age. 16

This ringing declamation shows no understanding of the practical solutions advocated by Young England. The critic, however, recognised an aspect of their outlook which virtually all other commentators neglected: the movement's advocacy of a kind of factory feudalism. Naturally, the critic was less than enthusiastic:

The manufacturing system [is painted] so couleur de rose that we apprehend both employers and employed will be astonished at his descriptions.

* Before that Gentleman again ventures a description of Lancashire life, we advise him to apply to Lord Ashley for a few useful facts;
and instead of sentimentalising at the Manchester Athenaeum with Cobden and Co., let him apply himself to the Manchester workers. 17

Though able to discern that Disraeli was not unsympathetic to either factories or the aspirations of the middle classes, the Chartist's mistake was to take literally Disraeli's description of Manchester and feudal mills. In fact, the evidence suggests that Disraeli was aware of the evils perpetrated in the Lancashire mills, as any reader of Sybil, published in 1845, can testify. He was equally aware that most of the landed aristocracy was not living up to its feudal responsibilities. No-one, except the Northern Star reviewer, laughed at Disraeli's evocation of the feudal mill.

A similar attitude to Young England is evident on the far Left of the political spectrum - in the writings of Marx and Engels. Engels, like his Chartist contemporary, was sympathetic to Young England, but unable to see anything progressive in their ideology. In The Condition of the Working Class in England (1844), he wrote

The hope of Young England is a restoration of the old "merry England" with its brilliant features and its romantic feudalism. The object is of course unattainable and ridiculous, a satire upon all historical development; but the good intention, the courage to resist the existing state of things and prevalent prejudices, and to recognise the vileness of our present condition is worth something anyhow. 18

Marx and Engels expanded upon this judgement in the Manifesto (1848), where they classified the movement as

Feudal socialism; half-lamentation, half-lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future ... , striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core, but always ludicrous in its effects through total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history. 19

The latter quotation was particularly valid. Feudal socialism is an apt definition of Young England and the expression "half echo of the past, half menace of the future," is perspicacious. The accusation that Young England could not "comprehend the march of modern history" is, however, questionable.
So far, this account of the contemporary reaction to Young England has been largely predictable. However, it is the reaction of Conservatives which poses the interesting problem. With only one or two exceptions, the Tory establishment were as hostile toward Young England as were the Liberals. Why did they, for the most part, have a stake in making the supporters of paternalism and the organic society appear absurd and inconsequential? The answer lies in the position of the Conservative Party in the 1840s.

The first decade of Queen Victoria's reign was one of profound political dislocation. The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, and the consequent split in the Conservative Party, were only the culmination of certain tendencies that had been extant for decades. From the beginning of the economic depression in 1837, Britain had witnessed not only the rise of the first significant working-class movement, the Chartists, but also a gradual shift in traditional party loyalties. The 1840s were years of flux and contradiction.

On the one hand, as a result of the economic troubles, these years saw the first major attempts to curb the excesses of laissez-faire capitalism: the 1843 Act to regulate the employment of coal-whippers, and the 1844 Acts to regulate railway carriages, to protect investors by regulating joint-stock companies, and most important, the Factory Act which sought to regulate the working hours of factory hands.

On the other hand, in direct contradiction to the above trend, the age also witnessed a growing advocacy of Free Trade and Political Economy from within the ranks of the protectionist Conservative Party, a tendency not limited to Sir Robert Peel and his circle, but extending even to elements of the Tory Old Guard, represented by the Quarterly Review coterie, John Wilson
Croker, John Murray, and John Lockhart, and the writers for *Blackwood's Magazine*. Meanwhile, in opposition to both the Peelites and the more obdurate elements of Old Toryism, there emerged a group of generally Conservative politicians who condemned the atomistic nature of *laissez-faire* economics and favoured the paternalist legislation put forward by philanthropist M.P.s in Parliament. While the Conservative Party in general was, to quote one historian, "hardly distinguished for its pursuit of social welfare [and] overwhelmingly supported (and later renewed) the new Poor Law which the country gentlemen welcomed because of its tendency to save rates," the philanthropic Parliamentarians had a romantic vision of the paternal duties of the traditional landed class. Deliberately retrogressive, these Tories advocated a return to ancient, organic principles in order to stem the tide of *laissez-faire* capitalism.

This faction was composed of two separate but overlapping groups. On the one hand, there were the Radical-Tories of the North Country, who included Richard Oastler and W.B. Ferrand. They campaigned against the ugly living and working conditions of the industrial cities and demanded state intervention to protect the factory operatives' well-being. They denounced the Anti-Corn Law League as a plot to lower the workers' wages. On the other hand, there were the Romantic/Medievalist Tories who tended to gravitate around Young England. The Romantics were generally more ideological than the Radical-Tories, and they took inspiration from several sources: the Tractarianism of the Oxford Movement, the Romanticism of the Lake Poëts, and the Medieval Revivalism of Kenelm Digby and Augustus Welby Pugin. Their solutions ran the gamut from the revival of monastic orders to the encouragement of peasant allotments. Together, the Romantic and Radical-Tories became a constant thorn in the side of the Peel Government. Their moment of short-lived triumph came in May, 1844, when in alliance with some
agriculturalists and Left-wing Liberals, they successfully disobeyed Peel and helped to carry Lord Ashley's Ten-Hour Amendment to the Factory Bill.

With a Conservative Party in such disarray, split into factions of Liberal-Tories, Peelites, Radical-Tories and Romantics, it is no wonder that Whigs and orthodox Liberals often did not know what to make of the Peel Government. What was one to think of a Prime Minister who seemed to admit the efficacy of Free Trade by implementing a sliding scale on the cost of imports, yet who refused to take the final logical step of repealing the Corn Laws? Boyd Hilton's recent study of Peelite Liberal-Toryism offers a fascinating interpretation of this ambiguity. In abandoning such pre-industrial concepts as the Moral Economy and the Just Price, Peel was hoping to salvage a static, hierarchical state through adapting it to the free market. In essence, he was abandoning the economic aspects of the Conservative myth, while retaining its vision of the unchanging state. If this interpretation of Peel is correct, it would be wrong to describe his policies as being the conscious apostasy of Conservative principles. It seems likely that he sincerely believed that there was no incompatability in advocating both the need to preserve ancient institutions and the necessity of atomising economic solutions:

Whereas the Classical Economists wanted free trade in order for the economy to grow ..., the Liberal-Tories, Liverpool, Peel [and so on], who implemented free trade, really saw society as a stationary, self-acting and unprogressive model, whose beneficent workings would illuminate the wisdom and glory and goodness of the Creator. Whereas Ricardians welcomed bankruptcies as weeding out the economically inefficient, in order that the "worthy" might expand more confidently, Liberal-Tories wanted to promote, not growth, but the fear of God among businessmen. 22

It is not to be wondered, then, that the Peelites were unhappy about Young England. Besides their opposition to Peel in the Commons, the movement's social vision was virtually the opposite of Peelism. If the Peelites desired to adapt a traditional, hierachical society to a laissez-faire economy, the
Young Englanders wished to adapt capitalism and machine technology to an organic vision of society.

One of the most thorough Peelite attacks on Young England was contained in a review of their literary works. Written by Alexander Hayward, a Conservative (later to be a Liberal) critic and lawyer, with close ties to leading luminaries of the Peel Government, the review appeared in an 1844 Edinburgh Review. That Hayward would contribute to a Whig periodical could, in itself, be significant. Perhaps it would have been considered unwise to attack so openly a faction of one's own party from the pages of the Conservative press.

Hayward's review is important because it is an unambiguous compilation of virtually every harsh and derogatory contemporary opinion held about Young England. Hayward condemned what he considered to be the movement's neglect of the middle class (despite no dearth of evidence to the contrary). He heaped scorn on both the Peel Government for its lack of a "fixed political faith," and on the Young Englanders for being "hare-brained speculators" and "professed posture-masters," but it was the latter who really raised his ire. He did, however, have an insight into the consequences of Young England's applied feudalism which was lacking from most other critics of the movement, past and present. He realised that beneath the reactionary surface, there were intimations of something more radical. He claimed that those who subscribed to the Young England vision were advocating that

all will be set to rights by the re-establishment of monasteries, and the resumption of those happy days,

"When good and bad were all unquestion'd fed,
When monks still practiced their dear Lord's command,
And rain'd their charity throughout the land."

To accomplish the mighty purposes of political and social regeneration, a holy alliance is recommended between the Crown and the Chartists! If these blessings are not speedily communicated to the people, or if, when given, they do not satisfy, we are informed that
"The greatest class of all shall know its rights, 
And the poor trampled people rise at last."

... A further agency, extending over all, is sought for in the Church ...
... It is to be rendered democratic in character. "The priests of God are to be the tribunes of the people," observes Mr. Disraeli. 27

Thus appeared the organic vision to a Victorian acolyte of the Manchester School, a vision in which the God of Malthusian thrift does not reign.

Hayward revealed his predilection for the classical economists towards the end of the review. He advised Young England to

"love wisely, not too well." It is not by wordy declamations against the new Poor Law, or in such unjust and unwise interferences with Labour, as were so eloquently exposed by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords, that their duty will be best performed. It is by labouring to free industry from restraint ... that they will best serve the cause of the labouring poor, and the social interests of their country. We would fain find some apology for their heresies. 28

Hayward had struck the right note. For the age, the writings and speeches of Young England essentially were heresy. William Gladstone, at this time a Minister in Peel's cabinet, attacked Young England on similar grounds, accusing them of advocating state intervention in the economy. He made these comments in a letter to Lord John Manners himself, Gladstone's constituency colleague in Parliament:

Jan 30, 1845
You ... are disappointed as to the workings of a Conservative Government ... . [However] I ... entertain the strongest impression that if, with your honourable and upright mind, you had been called upon [to be a Minister], your expectations and your dispositions towards [the Government] would be materially changed ... . The principles and moral powers of government as such are sinking day by day, and it is not by laws and parliaments that they can be renovated ..... Such schemes of regeneration as those which were propounded (not, I am bound to add, by you) at Manchester appear to be the most mournful delusions; and their reissue ..., from the bosom of the party to which we belong, an omen of the worst kind if they were likely to obtain currency under the new sanction they have received ..... . It is most easy to complain as you do of laissez-faire ...; nor do I ... presume to blame you; but I should ... blame myself if with my experience and convictions of the growing impotence of government for its highest functions, I were ... to recommend attempts beyond its powers, which would react unfavourably upon its remaining capabilities. 29

In the light of this letter, one wonders whether history has not been unfair on Lord John Manners. Here one finds Gladstone, considered one of Britain's
great reformers, prophesying the decline of state intervention, while Manners, popularly considered a deluded, well-meaning reactionary, is being chided for advocating the same role for the state that is found in modern liberal democracies.

For those Conservatives unable or unwilling to attack Young England on ideological grounds, it was always possible to ignore or trivialise the movement. One Peelite who took the latter course was Sir James Graham, Peel's Home Secretary, in a note addressed to John Wilson Croker of the Quarterly:

August 22, 1843
With respect to Young England, the puppets are moved by D'Israeli; who is the ablest among them ... . I think with you, that they will return to the crib after prancing, capering and snorting; but a crack or two of the whip well-applied may hasten and ensure their return. D'Israeli alone is mischievous ... . It would be better for the party if he were driven into the ranks of our open enemies. 30

The Tory Old Guard also tended to ignore Young England's ideology. Like Graham, they found it more politic to attack Young Englanders as individuals than to have to acknowledge that the movement was the one section of the Conservative Party sincerely propounding the implementation of traditional Tory principles through Parliament.

In the early 1840s, the Old Guard was supporting the Peel Government, though with subdued misgivings. The final rupture between the two factions came over the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. The position of this group was even more ambiguous than that of the Peelites. In many ways, their economic values seemed to contradict their social values. On the one hand, they tended to admire the Lake Poets: Southey, Coleridge, and especially Wordsworth; poets who also inspired Young England with their anti-Utilitarian Romanticism. The group of influential Conservatives associated with the Quarterly, Murray, Lockhart and Croker, had particularly close ties with the
In the same vein, Lord Ashley wrote articles for the *Quarterly Review* about the need for social paternalism, as did William Sewell, who often expressed sentiments akin to those of Young England:

Society is not a heap of sand, but a union of many in one. [Organic bodies should] consist of landlords exercising faithfully ... and affectionately the duties of little monarchs. [Together with the parish church, the landlord] would bring about a feudal system [in which] the master of the soil should stand as much as possible in a fatherly way to his tenants.

Sewell, however, did not believe that property other than land could be used for paternal purposes. He had a solution to this. In 1840, he wrote, quite seriously, that the answer to the problems of the age was to "raze, if you like, to the ground half of an overgrown metropolis." Young England could never have been capable of such pettiness of spirit.

Yet, at the same time, the Old Guard was becoming increasingly enamoured of the dogma of *laissez-faire*. This was noticeable in the journals which represented their opinions: *Blackwood's Magazine* and the *Quarterly Review*. Alison and De Quincey, the leading ideologues of *Blackwood's*, were avowed acolytes of Political Economy. Croker wrote in the *Quarterly* how much he hated that "pruriency for legislation" that arose from "false and dangerous estimates of the legitimate power and duties of government."

Croker, Alison, et al. were no more capable than Peel of seeing the contradiction in holding atomising economic principles while simultaneously conceiving the state to be unchanging and hierarchical. Nor did they see the inconsistency of advocating a Lockean vision of autonomous property while clinging to an avowed belief in landed paternalism. As a consequence, the Old Guard had no solutions for dealing with a property-owner who did not fulfill his duties, for they had closed the door to state intervention. The problem was even graver when it is noted that of the thousands of workshops,
mines and mills in Britain, no more than one in fifty had an owner with a truly beneficent view of his responsibilities to his employees.\textsuperscript{37} As the historian David Roberts has pointed out, the outcome was \textit{viz inertia}:\textsuperscript{38} a firm refusal to countenance change and an equally firm resolve to defend such changes once they had become part of the nation's fabric. As evidence of this, Roberts cites how the \textit{Quarterly} and \textit{Blackwood's} supported Ashley's Bill for the exclusion of women and children from the mines, while supporting child labour where it existed.\textsuperscript{39} Romantic-Tories, like Southey, Carlyle and the Young Englanders, however, were willing to contemplate state intervention wherever property of any kind failed to fulfill its stewardship role. Disraeli's \textit{Coningsby}, for example, explicitly condemned the \textit{viz inertia} of Old Toryism:

\begin{quote}
Whenever public opinion which this party never attempts to form, to educate, or to lead, falls into some violent perplexity, passion or caprice, this party yields without a struggle to obstruct, and obviate the logical, and ultimately the inevitable, results of the very measures they have themselves originated, or to which they have consented.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

The harshness of this kind of criticism, combined with Young England's direct evocation in Parliament of the organic myth, was enough to alienate the Old Guard. Far more than Peel, the Old Guard embodied the dilemma of Conservative thought; for, unlike the Prime Minister, the Alisons and Crokers found themselves unable to follow the logic of their economic beliefs and abandon Protection. Rather, they clung desperately to the landed class, a class hardly noted for the enthusiasm of its application of traditional paternalism.

Bearing the above in mind, it is little wonder that the Tory Establishment tended to be condescending in public about Young England, and often vindictive in private. Whichever of these attitudes was adopted, the tenor was always a dismissive one. It affected even the parents of prominent Young Englanders. On the eve of Young England's triumphal gathering at the Manchester Athenaeum, Manners's father, the Duke of Rutland, wrote to Smythe's father, Lord Strangford:
It is grievous that two young men such as John and Mr. Smythe should be led by one of whose integrity of purpose [Disraeli] I have an opinion similar to your own ... . The admirable character of our sons only makes them the more assailable by the arts of a designing person. 41

As long as Young England could be dismissed as the machinations of a renegade Jew, it was not necessary to take them seriously; nor is there any evidence that Strangford and Rutland did. E.T. Raymond in Disraeli: The Alien Patriot, offers a perceptive analysis of this Tory Establishment mentality which deserves to be quoted verbatim:

When young men of the upper classes adopt democratic politics, the paternal bosom is seldom wrung ... . But it is one thing to profess levelling opinions, and quite another to go to the lengths of really upsetting some Ministry which alone stands between society and anarchy. The Duke of Rutland and Lord Strangford felt it was time to intervene. They disliked Disraeli; they had no intention of re-erecting Maypoles; they had no notion of calling their labourers the "order of the Peasantry"; they were personally content with parsons who knew their place; and if they did not understand precisely what was meant by a "doge", they justly deemed it was not a proper name to apply to the monarch. It was time to put a stop to a lot of boy's nonsense that was being used for his own purpose by a guileful Jew. 42

This attitude was no doubt widespread among the Tory landowners. It was also common among those who spoke for the Old Guard in Parliament, and in journals such as Blackwood's and the Quarterly. In fact, Blackwood's never published a word on Young England. The Quarterly published one paragraph, which Croker appended to the end of one of his political articles. The Young Englanders are so few in number, Croker told the reader,

their views so vague, and their influence so slight, that it may seem superfluous to allude to them, but our respect for [their] personal character ... - our favourable opinion of their talents, though, rather, it must be confessed, of a belle-lettres, than a statesmanlike character - and a strong sympathy with many of their feelings - induce us to express our surprise and regret that they should not see, even with their peculiar views, the extreme inconsistency and impolicy of endeavouring to create distrust of the only statesman in whom the great Conservative body has any confidence or can have any hope. We make ... allowance for "young ambition", but we can still find no ... justification for the conduct which [Young England] have recently adopted..., the most offensive to Old England which has been made for many years. We beg leave ... to warn them against being deceived as to the quality of the notice which their singularity has obtained. 43

Beneath Croker's patronising air, there is a hint of menace. The irony is
that within two years, Croker himself was to lose all confidence in Peel and to break with him irrevocably over the Corn Laws. At least Young England possessed the clarity of vision to predict a couple of years in advance the inevitable result of Peel's conversion to Free Trade.

Often, the Tory Old Guard expressed an open contempt for the Young Englander. On the publication of Coningsby, Martin Tupper wrote to Murray, the Quarterly's publisher, asking to review it. In his letter, he referred to the novel as a "hasty, libellous and contemptible production." Murray sent this letter to Lockhart with the comment, "Coningsby! Pooh!" Lockhart was even more dismissive: "That Jew scamp has published a very blackguard novel." That Murray, Lockhart and Croker were resentful against Disraeli for personal reasons, only compounded their hostility to the novel's applied medievalism. Such sentiments extended even to the highest sphere. On June 18, 1844, Queen Victoria wrote to the Belgian king expressing her relief that the Peel Government had survived a vote of confidence on a minor Bill concerning colonial sugar:

We were really in the greatest possible danger of having a resignation of the government without knowing to whom to turn, and this from the recklessness of a handful of foolish half "Puseyite" half "Young England" people! 47

Naturally, it was Young England's evocation of applied medievalism during Parliamentary debates that caused the most vexation. On August 11, 1843, Greville noted in his diary the insolence of the soi-disant Young Englanders in the Irish Debate: "Disraeli and Smythe, who are the principal characters, together with Lord John Manners, of the little squad called "young England" were abusive and impertinent." That Young England was often seen as a refuge for embittered rebels is revealed in Fremantle's warning to Peel in September, 1843, that if Peter Borthwick was disappointed in his hope of a diplomatic
appointment, he might attach himself to "the party of malcontents, G. Smythe, D'IIsraeli, and Co."\(^{49}\)

It is evident that Liberals, Socialists, Peelites, and Old Guard Tories all had their reasons to disparage the ideology of Young England. It should not, however, be forgotten that there were those who spoke up in defence of the movement. Three journals which particularly allied themselves with the aspirations of Young England in the mid-1840s were the Morning Post, The Times, and the Spectator.

The Morning Post was the one London daily closely aligned with the Romantic-Tories, so its defence of Young England is not hard to understand. Its Peelite rival, the Standard, called it: "the pet of the petticoats,"\(^{50}\) and when the Post invited members of Young England to contribute articles, Giffard, the editor of the Standard, accused them of being "factionists, fops and crazy dotards," and denounced their "drivelling idiocy" as being at one with the "insanity of the Morning Postites."\(^{51}\) It is interesting to note that the Post shared with the Manners's faction of Young England an openness to the idea of state intervention: "the first duty of every government is to promote the welfare and happiness of the mass of the people."\(^{52}\)

The Times was in a strange position in the mid-1840s. Its publisher, John Walter II, was a fierce enemy of Peelism and Political Economy, and a tireless opponent of the new Poor Law.\(^{53}\) Both his romantic temperament and his estrangement from the Peelites led him to associate closely with Young England.\(^{54}\) On the other hand, John Delane, The Times editor, was secretly in communication with leading Peelites like Lord Aberdeen:

Delane being then in close alliance with Aberdeen in foreign policy, it was not unnatural that Peel should feel that only the personal animosity of John Walter withheld the paper's general support from the Ministry. 55
After John Walter II's death in 1847, Delane was free to orient The Times in the direction of Peelism. As a Times editorialist wrote in 1852, "In one sense we are all Peelites."\(^5\)

Yet, from 1843 to 1845, under Walter's direction, The Times was consistently favourable to Young England. A number of editorials were imbued with the Young England spirit: advocating organicism and the spurning of the cash-nexus. This spirit was well-captured in an editorial of January 11, 1844, lines which could have been penned by a Manners or a Disraeli:

We have tried long enough to go on without ... Christian charity, and the political economist has almost persuaded us into a belief that his discoveries have supplanted it, - that natural sympathy and benevolence are only the virtues of a rude state of society, and meant to give way to the development of a philosophy which produces the same ends in a more systematic way. Be it so: all we can say is, if this political economy is civilisation, let us try barbarism again; and let the nation take its stand once more upon the savage: ie. the generous principle, upon heart and feeling ..., and trust to the results.\(^5\)

Distrust of Utilitarianism and approbation for Young England ran through these editorials on matters as diverse as the Irish Arms Bill and the French imprisonment of Don Carlos of Spain. The most detailed comments on Young England, however, are to be found in the long and thorough Coningsby review of May, 1844, which was couched throughout in the language of Romantic-Toryism. The sympathetic reviewer's description of the evils besetting the British polity is the same litany as Young England's:

A church which is municipal, but not Catholic; an aristocracy privileged, but which does not lead; a Crown robbed alike of its prerogatives and its revenues; a peasantry handed over to the compendious philosophy of a central commission or the comprehensive mercies of quarter sessions; a manufacturing class keenly jealous of feudal rights, and exercising over their own dependents the might of capital, with a pressure unknown to ... feudalism; - such are the component parts of our social state - a state in which labourers burn ricks, mechanics turn Chartists, and Protestant clergymen sectarian agitators.\(^5\)

Though there was a degree of insight in these observations, they were hardly
original, coming as they did from the long tradition of Conservative
paternalism, with its perennial complaint that those of stature and property
were neglecting their duties to the commonweal. A greater originality was
revealed when the writer came to discuss the reasons why Coningsby, and by
extension Young England, presented a conundrum to contemporaries:

The opinions which it develops will be offensive to some and un-
intelligible to more. The boldness with which it attacks the favourite
conceits and fashionable conventionalities of modern politics will be
stigmatized as flippant coxcombery or dangerous Liberalism; at the same
time that the spirit of enthusiastic veneration for old names and old
feelings which it breathes throughout, its contempt for the modern
philosophy of expediency and economy, its faith ... in the Church ... 
and devotion as well to the Sovereign, will be regarded as the most
irrational sentiments of obsolete Toryism ... . Country gentlemen will
be sorely puzzled to reconcile a love of the Church with a disrespect
for the Church Establishment - a respect for patrician lineage with some-
thing like contempt for the existing House of Peers; and a most Catholic
appreciation for the energies and talents of our middle and commercial
classes with the most undisguised distrust of their political wisdom and
virtue. 59

Despite the understanding evident in this passage, the reviewer rarely rose
to the occasion elsewhere. He never mentioned, for example, the novel's
evocation of applied feudalism at industrial Millbank and rural St. Genevieve;
or, in fact, any of Disraeli's schemes for the amelioration of England's
woes. Instead, the reader was treated to vague, generalized praise for
Young England, and angry denunciations of the Tory Old Guard and Peelites.
The reviewer particularly approved of Disraeli's denunciation of Peel's 1834
Tamworth Manifesto, in which the latter had declared his hope of reaching
an accommodation with the commercial and manufacturing classes. The reviewer
added

We commend these passages to the attention of the Ministerial hacks,
who, ... wheel about at the bidding of the Premier; and ask them whether
their rotary votes on the factory question do or do not justify the
following definition of their negative creed - "Conservatism discards
prescription, shrinks from principle, disavows progress; having rejected
all respect for antiquity, it offers no redress for the future." Bitter
as this may seem, yet, when we recollect the way in which the "Great
Conservative Party" has treated the two social questions of infant labour
and the new Poor Law, we dare not deny its truth. 60

In essence, the reviewer used Coningsby as a sounding board for his own
dissatisfaction with the Conservative Party and the atomistic nature of early Victorian Britain. Though The Times review is evidence for the existence of a major Conservative crisis in the 1840s, its refusal to analyse Disraeli's applied medievalism is surely evidence for the existence of a more fundamental dichotomy within Conservatism: the problem of reconciling the Conservative myth of an organic, paternalistic, landed society with the reality of capitalised land relations.

The third journal to portray Young England in a favourable light was the Spectator. At first glance, the Spectator's sympathy for the movement appears puzzling, for the journal was Radical in its politics, and its editor, Robert Rintoul, was a friend of the Mills and was well-versed in Political Economy. Yet, on the other hand, the Spectator has been referred to as the most paternalist periodical in Britain. It crusaded for the Ten-Hour Amendment, mining and lunacy acts, poor law reform, and the Irish Poor Law of 1847. This is not, however, as great a contradiction as it appears on the surface. If Peelism was the new Conservatism, the Spectator represented the budding shoots of a new kind of enlightened Liberalism, one that believed in the efficacy of social legislation and state paternalism. Historians who dismiss Young England as little more than reactionary romanticism should ponder the significance of a journal as progressive as the Spectator advocating a union between Young England and certain Liberals. According to David Roberts, the Spectator hoped to form a new party that would be inspired by [a] new faith, one in which Liberals like Charles Buller and Lord Howick would join with Young England to create a Government that would stand in loco parentis to those who suffered social grievances. The Spectator expressed its favourable attitude to Young England in a series of 1843-44 editorials which blended open praise with an astute understanding
of the movement's antecedents and aspirations. An editorial of July, 1843, expressed unqualified approbation for Young England:

There is one ... excellent feature in the character of Young England - its sincere benevolence and kindly disposition towards the poorer classes. It is anxious to raise them in the scale of comfort, intelligence, and moral worth; and though some of its plans ... may be fanciful, it ... also advocates some that are practical - of a high moral education, of the protection of children alike from the cupidity of employers and parents, of holydays and manly sports for the poor, and ... of systematic colonization. It is doing good service on the Church question ...; its imaginative Protestantism approaches near to rational Romanism; its tone in the Irish debates is a new and pleasing feature in these discussions. Nor can men so benevolent ... really be, or at least long remain, champions ... of the Corn Laws. 64

Soon after, the writer made a perceptive observation about the subtle radicalism underlying Young England's High Toryism:

Young England is unconsciously promoting the cause of Liberalism at present; and none need be astonished to find many of its members avowing a very Liberal creed at no distant period. It is not of Tory or High Church principles the party is enamoured, but of their own ideas of what High Church and Toryism ought to be ... . The thorough-going Churchman and Tory of the old school is impatient of the philanthropy and scruples of Young England; and Young England will in time get equally tired of his plodding, prosaic, reckless partisanship. 65

This point is further developed in a later editorial which draws a distinct parallel between Young England and their mentors, the Lake Poets. Through this parallel, the problem concerning the practicality versus the rhetoric of traditional Conservative thought emerges strongly, illuminating further the reasons for the disquiet the Tory Establishment felt for Young England:

When the Lake poets ratted from the Jacobin party, they were received with open arms by the Tories ... . But, like all thinkers who unable to rest upon their own supported convictions cling to existing formulae, ... Wordsworth and Coleridge sought to give life to the mere letter of the law. The Philosophical element in their minds was too powerful to ... [remain] satisfied with empty and lifeless forms ... . The mere dogmatists, who had welcomed the Lakers as allies, did not discover this until a considerable quantity of the tares has been sown among the wheat. They have discovered it, and their praise of Wordsworth and Coleridge has of late been "craftily qualified."66

In essence, the Spectator, was not a mouth-piece of Romantic-Toryism. Nor, except in its opposition to laissez-faire, was it hostile to Peel's
fiscal, tariff and administrative reforms. What Rintoul, and his chief editorial writer Thornton Hunt, did share with Young England was compassion for the common people and, more important, an organic vision of society which they all saw as infinitely superior to the cold, impersonal web of the cash nexus.

It is not difficult to see how a superficial perusal of the contemporary reaction to Young England would lead many a historian to perceive the movement as hopelessly out of touch with reality. What, perhaps, should be acknowledged more clearly are the motives underlying these adverse responses to Young England. Rather than confront the practical schemes put forward by the movement, the critics were content to belittle its florid rhetoric. In an epoch of rampant industrialism and Ricardian economics, Young England's plans to curb the excess of capitalism through making the ruling order more responsive to the needs of their dependents, could not get far. If they thought about it at all, Young England's critics must have sensed that the ultimate corollary of such paternalistic organicism was large-scale state interventionism: to most of them, an abhorrent idea.

As for the reviewers of Young England's literary works, it is unfortunate that so few of them saw fit to use the values enunciated in them as a speculum in which to see their own beliefs and assumptions reflected. For instance, they laughed at the almsgiving scene in Coningsby without pondering whether Disraeli was smiling at their side. That he was is hinted at in his remark that, "The age of ruins is past". This observation was ignored by virtually all reviewers of the work; a neglect occasioned by their unwillingness to admit that a leading exponent of Young England was as aware as the most doctrinaire of Liberals that it was futile to attempt a literal return to the past. Nor was Disraeli alone among the Young Englanders.
Lord John Manners, George Smythe, and Baillie-Cochrane all knew that the Age of the Machine was there to stay. It was not Young England's supposed anachronisms that so disgusted the contemporary Peelite, Radical, and capital-accumulating landowner, so much as their failure to bow to the dictates of Political Economy.

Later chapters will discuss Young England's anti-laissez-faire policies in regard to industrialism and land relations. It will suffice here to point out the fundamental error committed by the movement's detractors in dismissing out of hand its insight that industrialism and evangelical Protestantism had brought about a "loss of joy". Thackeray was not the only writer to reject as preposterous Young England's nostalgia for a more organic, spontaneous past. Trollope, too, saw fit to lampoon the movement. The Ullathorne Games in *Barchester Towers* are probably a deliberate parody of Lord John Manner's schemes for reviving village games. The Radical humour magazine *Punch* mocked on several occasions the movement's respect for traditional ways, Manners's poetic effusions being particularly favoured for its jibes. Even one of Young England's erstwhile friends satirized the movement in later years. Moncton Miln, who in the mid-1840s was an M.P. on the periphery of Young England but who later converted to Liberalism, composed a lampoon entitled, "Lines to a Judge, by a Culprit Actuated by Young England Sentiments." As usual, it was the supposed archaism that was mocked:

Oh flog me with the old cat's tail,
I surely should enjoy
That fine old English punishment
I witnessed when a boy!
I should not need the mocking crows,
I should not feel the pain;
If one old English custom
Could be brought back again.

These lampoons, whether they were motivated by personal vindictiveness,
ideological differences, or simply a delight in mockery, have helped to shape modern perceptions. Yet, it was unfair to dismiss so readily Young England's criticisms of the decline of traditional pastimes and the concomitant "loss of joy", both common by-products of an early phase of industrialization.

The suppression of traditional popular amusements had coincided with calls for a disciplined time/work conscious proletariat. As Robert Malcolmson, the historian of this social phenomenon, has pointed out, "traditional recreation was rooted in a social system which was predominantly agrarian, [and] ... marked by a deep sense of corporate identity." The breakdown of this system in the congested, atomized cities of the early nineteenth century had led to a situation where, to quote Robert Slaney in 1833, "the poor workman in the large manufacturing town, was actually forced into the public house, there being no other place for him to amuse himself in."

It is in this context that Lord John Manners's advocacy of traditional popular sports and holy days must be judged. As a Tory-Romantic, his views are not surprising, and when expressed as a nostalgic regret for the passing of maypoles and morris-dancing on the village green, they were a suitable subject for ridicule. This strain in Manners's thinking was most clearly expressed in his *A Plea for National Holy Days* (1842), and in a letter he wrote to his brother Granby in September, 1842. In the letter, he asserted that it was the responsibility of the Conservative Party to assimilate its cause with that of the people,

by adding to their comforts and pleasures in the only legitimate way a legislature can do so, -vis.by voting money to build public baths, to keep up, or rather to restore, public games, to form public walks ... Let us give them back the Church holy-days, open the churches and cathedrals to them, and let our men of power in their individual capacities assume a more personal and consequently a more kind intercourse with those below them. In a word, let society take a more feudal appearance than it presents now. 73

If this were the sum total of Manners's political philosophy, it would have
been just for contemporary critics to dismiss him as a whimsical Romantic. Yet, Manners's condemnation of the "loss of joy" was not ridiculous. In an age of "rational amusement", Sabbatarianism, and fiery sermons on the wages of sin, his desire to preserve the spirit, if not the exact form, of a more organic, less alienating, past is understandable. In the name of machine efficiency the common people were being deprived of the old rural festivities and pastimes. Holy-days were being denied the worker on the specious but widely-believed grounds, "that he did not want them because he was too steadily industrious, or that when he got a holy-day, he made a beast of himself." Manners was quite content for the commoners to be given their holy-days in tandem with moral instruction from clergymen sympathetic to their needs, and then letting them find their own amusements. Maypole-dancing was no more than a useful motif to illustrate the decline of traditional culture. As Malcolmson has suggested, the period in which Manners was writing coincided with the nadir of popular recreation, when "much of the traditional culture had disintegrated, and the new possibilities were only beginning to emerge. The re-shaping of popular leisure was largely a phenomenon of the period after 1850." Manners's concern was apparent in a speech he made in Parliament on August 15, 1843, where he condemned the suppression of traditional freedoms. He wished, he said, to draw attention to a subject of considerable importance to the working classes. It appeared that some young men were on a Sunday evening recently, after the hours of divine service, about 5 or 6 o'clock, amusing themselves playing at cricket on a common ... in the County of Berks. and were taken up and brought before a magistrate, and condemned to pay a penalty which ... amounted to 15 shillings, but were told they must go to gaol immediately unless the money was paid forthwith ... . The question which he wished to ask ... was whether it was illegal for poor people to play at cricket or any other manly game on Sunday after the hours of divine service, and if that were the case, whether it was legal for the rich to have their horses and carriages and other enjoyments at the same time? 
Interestingly, it was cricket that was the "unifying bond" when Manners, Smythe and Disraeli played against their friend, W.B. Ferrand's workers at Bingley, Lancashire in October, 1844.77

Besides advocating sports and the end of fanatical Sabbatarianism, Manners had other schemes to bring the social classes together. Most specifically, he called for the establishment of lending libraries and museums, and the opening-up of parks, gardens and stately homes to the working classes, all of which to be funded through the public rates. Innocent though these proposals sound, they were still antithetical to the laissez-faire tendencies of the age. When Manners argued in the Commons (March 6, 1845) for rate-funded museums of art, Peel demurred, insisting that museums should be funded only through private subscription. In reply, Manners said that he thought it desirable that there should be places provided for the recreation of the people. He believed that the people were very grateful for any opportunity given them of visiting public exhibitions, and their conduct in every respect proved it. He was very desirous to see the working classes afforded the fullest opportunity of recreation in the enjoyment of athletic sports ... .78

His idea, that central and local authorities had a duty to assist in the cultural and recreational elevation of the people, was hardly a common one for its time. Like others of Young England's schemes, this one had to wait until the late nineteenth century for fulfillment.

In a sense, Young England's response to the loss of joy culminated in their speeches to the Manchester Athenaeum in October, 1844. Before this middle class audience, they emphasized the role of education as the new lever of fundamental change.

Manners's speech illustrated clearly the evolution of his ideas over the
years. He praised Manchester for having set an example to the rest of the country by providing "parks and walks for all classes of the community," which, he hoped, would soon be followed by the "opening of museums and collections of that nature to the people at large." He was quick, however, to differentiate such measures from what he took as the failings of the Mechanics' Institutes: "their forgetting amusement in instruction, and acting on the assumption that a man after working 12, 14 or 15 hours a day would or could sit down to recreate his mind with a course of mathematics or a lecture on geology." Nevertheless, such institutions as the Manchester Athenaeum, taken in conjunction with other endeavours, animated by a similar spirit, may go far to supply the place of that more intimate connexion which once subsisted between the master and his apprentices, and unite generally the various classes of society in the firm bonds of mutual interest and good will.

Fundamentally, then, Manners placed a great trust in communal education as a substitute for the social bonds of the Middle Ages. It was education that was to break down the walls of ignorance between classes, and lead the submerged masses to Arnoldian "Sweetness and Light." Obviously, Manners was not advocating a return to the ignorance of shackled serfdom. The spirit of the past had to be renewed, but as all progressive Medievalists realized, it would be in a different guise.

Disraeli was even more enamoured of the power of learning. This was the occasion he referred to knowledge as being like "the ladder in the patriarch's mystic dream. Its base rests on the primeval earth - its crest is lost in the shadowy splendour of the empyrean." This was also the year of Coningsby, when Disraeli, the Young Englander and Tory Democrat, was advocating that, in order for Britain to fulfill her imperial destiny, a new ruling class, based on merit not titles, would have to emerge. Thus, every individual is entitled to aspire to that position which he
believes his faculties qualify him to occupy. [Some would say]
"beware of filling the youthful mind with an impetuous tumult of
turbulent fancies; teach him rather, to be content with his position,
don't induce him to fancy that he is not, or to aspire to that which
he cannot achieve." ... These are superficial delusions. He who
enters the world finds his own level. 83

Young England, then, showed no inclination to abandon "laws and learning."
Nor, unlike many of their Tory colleagues, did they unduly fear the power
of an educated proletariat, realizing, perhaps, that a literate people are
in many ways more amenable to discipline and loyalty than a people
submerged in illiteracy.

Translated into action, then, the Young England program was not as
absurd and as reactionary as its rhetoric led critics to believe. Whether
it be Manners and Disraeli advocating education as a unifier of classes
and creator of a meritocracy, or Manners advocating the abandonment of
joyless Sabbatarianism and the public funding of free libraries, parks,
and museums, Young England often expressed a need for solutions which
were, in fact, similar to those implemented many decades later. In the old
meaning of the word, they were "revolutionaries", men who wished society to
revolve back to a more pristine past, and who could, at the same time,
acknowledge that "the age of ruins is past."

The next chapter will concentrate on Young England's relationship to
the nineteenth century Medieval Revival, for, without some understanding
of the intellectual and cultural roots of the movement, its advocacy of
progressive legislation, and its hostility to laissez-faire economics,
would be puzzling. Yet, in these, as in their criticisms of Sabbatarianism,
the Young Englanders were acting in harmony with the principles of organic
Conservatism, a fact which, as has been seen, disconcerted those Tories to
whom traditional rhetoric was, to some extent, a mask for their acceptance
of market economics.
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Chapter Three: Young England and the Medieval Revival

It would be foolhardy to discuss Young England's reactions to industrialism and land relations without first putting the movement into the context of Medieval Revivalism. Though Liberalism was the Zeitgeist of the age, the widespread prevalence of Romantic-Medievalism in Tory circles has already been remarked upon. In its most enlightened form, it was found in Cobbett, the Lake Poets, and Carlyle.

Archaic though they often were, the Medievalists did more than just bemoan the decline of traditional habits of obedience and hierarchy. Rather, at its most sublime, the movement posited a model of the world with its roots in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, based on natural order rather than on Newtonian/Lockean mechanics, and emphasizing duties and responsibilities, not abstract rights. They conceived of Man, though capable of loyalty and generous feelings, as a fallen creature, needing traditional institutions and rituals to harmonize his actions with Natural Law. For them, Reason could not be the universal panacea, and they often celebrated the intuitive and mystical. They were opposed both to the secular scepticism of Voltaire, and to the economics of Ricardo and Malthus. Since only those who knew their neighbours personally could have a genuine bond of sympathy with them, the Medievalists believed that society should consist of small, organic communities. These communities, they asserted, should be rooted in the soil, land being the fundamental element of the state.

This vision was essentially mythic. Nevertheless, it did rest on a
tenuous basis of fact. It has been suggested by G.R. Elton, for example, that Elizabethan Britain was as close as the country would come to a welfare state until the twentieth century.\(^2\) The metaphor of the monastery seemed to be a major inspiration for the nineteenth century Medievalists. Cobbett expressed an admiration for the monastics' charitable and unifying role, as did Kenelm Digby and Coleridge. In *Past and Present* (1843), Carlyle compared the workhouse of St. Ives with the ruins of St. Edmund's monastery, much to the detriment of the former.\(^3\)

The Medievalists used the past to expose the ugliness of the present. The fact of change was incontrovertible, the engine of transformation being industrialization, the passing from a traditional society, predicated on static and hierarchical values, to a modern society, predicated on the free exchange of labour and goods. The society the Medievalists attacked was one of vast social dislocation and poverty. The slums, sprawling around the grimy factories where the "wage-serfs" laboured amid noxious fumes, seemed a nightmare counter-image to peasant cottages clustered around the foundations of feudal castles. And while the latter at least offered physical protection and, through the Church, succour in times of famine, the nineteenth century factory worker could look forward only to debilitating unemployment during slumps, and the cold prospect of the workhouse in old age.

The new order had created classes of humanity, more rootless than the traditional labourer, artisan or aristocrat. The growing class of manufacturers and shopkeepers often sought justification for their activities from as far back as Newton and Locke, but, more commonly, from the Political Economists, Ricardo, Smith and Malthus. In religion, they were generally Dissenters and Methodists, alien to the rituals and
traditions of the Established Church. Theirs was an often dour Calvinist
God and, as we have seen, the age they ushered in was distinguished by its
prudery and joyless Sabbatarianism, an age in which the poor deserved their
sorry state because they lacked the grace of God that came from abstention
and thrift. If only, cried the manufacturers and the preachers who
supplied them with their beliefs, if only the labourer could learn self-
discipline and frugality, then economic freedom would beckon, if not for him,
then at least for his children.

Yet, blame for this new society could not be laid solely with the
Dissenting middle classes. As the more astute Medievalists sternly pointed
out, the traditional orders of Land and Church had long ago betrayed their
Sacred Trusts in favour of the new dispensations. Carlyle put it eloquently:

Are these millions guided? We have a Church, the venerable embodiment
of an idea which may well call itself divine .... It is a Church well
furnished with equipments and appurtenances; educated in universities;
rich in money; set on high places that it may be conspicuous to all,
honoured of all .... This Church answers: "Yes, the people are
taught." This Aristocracy, astonishment in every feature, answers: "Yes,
surely the people are guided. Do we not pass what Acts of Parliament are
needful; as many as thirty-nine for the shooting of the partridge alone.
Are there not treadmills, gibbets, even hospitals, poor-rates, New Poor
Laws?" So verily answers the Church; so answers Aristocracy ....
Fact meanwhile, takes his lucifer-box [and] sets fire to the
wheat-stacks. 4

These Romantic-Medievalists were often loath to offer solutions. Their
concept of land as inalienable property, and their evocation of small,
hermetic communities, made it difficult for them to contemplate anything as
drastic as intervention by the central state. This was a step many (Sewell,
Scott, Wordsworth, Digby) never really considered. Others, however, were
more sanguine. Southey, for example, wrote that the responsibilities of
the state are "patriarchal, that is to say, paternal; superintendence is
one of these duties and is capable of being exercised to any extent by
delegation and sub-delegation."\(^5\) Furthermore, he was receptive to taxing heavily the rich in order to provide the funds for social programs, claiming that such a policy would be more effective at alleviating suffering than the poor-rates.\(^6\) Coleridge argued that if the government spent more than it received in taxes, employment would be increased by the boost given the economy.\(^7\) Furthermore, as he remarked in his Lay Sermon, "our manufacturers must consent to regulations; our gentry must concern themselves in the education as well as in the instruction of their ... dependents."\(^8\)

Anthony Quinton comes the closest, perhaps, to defining the Medievalist vision in a few lines:

Society is a unitary, natural growth .... It is not composed of basic, abstract individuals but of social beings .... The institutions of society are thus not external disposable devices of interest to men only by reason of the individual purposes they serve; they are, rather, constitutive of the social identity of men. \(^9\)

Young England was very much the product of this philosophy. As will become evident, the movement continually echoed the sentiments of Southey, Coleridge and the other Medievalists. Their writings and speeches were full of panegyrics to the Middle Ages. Manners, Disraeli and, to an extent, Baillie-Cochrane, deplored the laissez-faire dogma which had been adopted by the Radicals and, increasingly, by their own Conservative Party. They shared Carlyle's contempt for the liberal "Voluntary Principle"\(^10\) which called men free only when all relationships between them were destroyed, and which conceived man's nature as being fundamentally good, not flawed. Like Burke, they detested the rule of "sophists, economists and calculators,"\(^11\) particularly those who talked of immutable economic laws of supply and demand, and who worshipped the autonomous individual.
The major Young Englanders - Disraeli, Cochrane, Smythe and Manners - had read the main body of Medievalist works, including Cobbett and Carlyle. The latter's favourable opinion of the French Jacobins was reflected in Smythe's *Historic Fancies*, and his celebration of the heroic leader in history found its way into *Coningsby*. However, since all the elements of Disraeli's political thought had already found expression in his *The Revolutionary Epick*, long before Carlyle's major works, it can be safely hazarded that these ideas had been widely disseminated for some time.

Smythe's main expression of Medievalism was his *Historic Fancies*. True to the creed, he argued for such anachronisms as a return to the King's Touch as a cure for scrofula, his purpose being to facilitate a renewed growth of organic ties between monarch and multitude. In a letter to Manners, dated April, 1842, he asserted the traditional Tory fear of democracy:

> I believe the government of the One is for the good of the many, the government of the few for the good of themselves, the government of the Many for the good of the One. From Monarchy results the Commonwealth. From Oligarchy - Oligarchy, from Democracy - a tyranny. 13

Interestingly, this did not deter Smythe from celebrating the Jacobins as men of passion and ideals who had risen against an aristocracy that had abandoned its duties to the commonweal. 14

Throughout his career, Disraeli liked to evoke the spirit of the Middle Ages to illustrate the deficiencies of the present. His abhorrence of the atomising tendencies of Manchester School Liberalism led him to advocate an alliance between the common people and his new meritocracy of reformed aristocrats and manufacturers. As he told the popular politician Charles Atwood in 1848, "an union between the Conservative Party and the Radical Masses offers the only means by which we can preserve the Empire. Their
interests are identical; united they form the nation." For all this, Disraeli was quick to assert that he was not a leveller. As his protagonist, Egremont, claims in *Sybil*,

> The future principle of English politics will not be a levelling principle; not a principle adverse to privileges, but favourable to their extension. It will seek to ensure equality, not by levelling the few, but by elevating the many. 16

In the same novel, Disraeli popularized the concept of the "two nations", the rich and the poor; a condition which, he claimed, was the result of a society fragmented through the dogma of Political Economy and mechanistic science. A nation divided against itself cannot stand, and such was Britain in 1845:

> Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits and thoughts and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones or inhabitants of different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws. 17

To counter-point the organicism of the past with the atomism of the present, Disraeli was also willing to invoke the Medieval monastery. This is found particularly in *Sybil*, where Medievalist sentiments were provocatively put in the mouths of Stephen Morley and Walter Gerard, the first a Socialist, the second a Physical-force Chartist. This is important in itself, revealing the extent to which Disraeli believed that the radical masses shared the same concerns as Young England. The Chartist Gerard describes why the monastics were good masters. It was, he claimed, because they were a corporate entity, lacking private property and, therefore, any desire for personal aggrandizement:

> The monastics were easy landlords; their rents were low ... . [They] could possess no private property; they could save no money; they could bequeath nothing. They lived, received and expended in common. The monastery too, was a proprietor that never died and never wasted ... . The monks were, in short, in every district a point of refuge for all who needed succour, counsel, and protection; a body of individuals, having no cares of their own; with wisdom to guide the inexperienced, with wealth to relieve the suffering, and often power to protect the oppressed. 18
The implication of this passage is clear. It hints at a scepticism about the role of private property as a mechanism to alleviate large-scale poverty. Furthermore, unless monasteries could be revived, the only corporate body left was, of course, the state. This implication is strengthened by the Socialist Morley's comparison between Medieval monasteries and the atomised individualism of his own day:

As for Community, with the monasteries expired the only type that we ever had in England of such an intercourse. There is no community in England; there is aggregation, but aggregation under circumstances which make it rather a dissociating principle than a uniting principle. 19

In other words, industrial capitalism had developed cities where community in a real sense was non-existent. Though coming from a Socialist, these were also the sentiments of a Tory-Romantic:

In great cities, men are brought together by the desire of gain. They are not in a state of cooperation, but of isolation, as to the making of fortunes; and for all the rest they are careless of neighbours. Christianity teaches us to love our neighbour as ourself; modern society acknowledges no neighbour. 20

In opposition to this wasteland, Disraeli advocated a corporate nation of Throne, Altar, and Cottage. Though willing ultimately to accept a degree of centralized state interference, he truly wished to see develop a revitalized parochial society of Coleridgean "home-born feelings", what he called the Territorial Constitution. Made up of landlords working alongside the clergy, the magistrates and the poor-law overseers, this Constitution would be entrusted with the revenue of the Church, the administration of justice, and the estate of the poor. 21

This organic social arrangement, with its roots in the soil, was obviously in contradiction with the centralized supervision of the new Poor Law. However, though that would suffice to explain the hostility of many Tories to the Law, it is not a sufficient explanation for Young England's antipathy since, in other areas, Manners, Disraeli and Cochrane
were willing to contemplate the interference of the central state. 23.

It was Cochrane, so mute on other topics, who, in Parliament in July, 1844, gave the most thorough Young England speech on the new Poor Law, touching on virtually every criticism a Medievalist could make of the Law. He complained, first, that the Poor Law was "a pernicious" system of centralization undermining all local administration. 22 Second, the Law was symptomatic of the all too pervasive loss of joy. As an example of this, he quoted the Benthamite Lord Brougham who had condemned the Elizabethan Poor Law on the grounds that its formulators did not understand the "principles of population, and wanted a Malthus to enlighten them with his doctrine." To which, Cochrane observed,

The Law, then, according to Brougham, was based upon the principle that young men must foresee events that were to occur in old age; that they were, in fact, to lay by from their wages to purchase their coffins. Was anything more fearful ever uttered? 23

Third, the new Poor Law had introduced a "labour test of poverty, ... a test out of nothing less than suffering." 24 He then went on to make one of those astute comparisons between the more organic past and the fragmented present which exemplify the Romantic-Tory spirit at its most progressive:

The Act of the 43rd of Elizabeth took for its basis the inference that when the labourer was, from whatever cause, unable to support himself, the burthen of his maintenance was thrown upon society at large. The principle of the new Poor Law ... threw the poor man entirely upon his own resources, and denied his right to assistance; and this when ... science had made such vast progress as to limit in the most perceptible manner, the field of labour of the working classes .... He asserted ... that it was not the labouring classes who were unwilling to work, 25 but it was the employers who were unable or unwilling to find them occupation ...

As with Disraeli's evocation of the corporate nature of Medieval monasteries, Cochrane's defence of the Elizabethan Poor Law for its principle of making "society at large" responsible for the maintenance of the poor, looked as much forward to the modern welfare state as it did back into the hazy past.
It was, however, Lord John Manners, the fourth member of Young England, who most clearly exemplifies the Romantic-Medievalist tradition. He was very much a product of his time. As a close friend of the Tractarian, Frederick Faber, and as an associate of the Oxford Movement, he tended to perceive a rejuvenated Established Church as the agency through which the fragmented classes of industrial Britain could once more unite as they had in the past when "there was far more real security for all classes than had existed or could ever exist under a class system as now prevailed." Only when the Church and the other traditional orders failed to advocate the corporate state of Young England's dreams, did Manners turn to solutions of more practical merit. Like Disraeli, he did not hesitate to praise the corporate charity of the monastics, a fact that did not escape Alexander Hayward in his review of Manners's *England's Trust and Other Poems*. As always in Medievalist literature, *England's Trust* contrasted a land filled with the harmonizing spirit of Christ with one formed of the cogs of a self-regulating machine:

```
The hospitality that never knew
A pilgrim-guest in vain for shelter sue;
... Where good and bad were all, unquestioned, fed
... The monks still practised their dear Lord's command,
And rained their charity throughout the land ....
And haughtiest kings have stooped to kiss the rod
Wielded by some poor minister of God.
Each knew his place ...  
The greatest owed connexion with the least;
From rank to rank the generous feeling ran,
And linked society as man to man. 28
```

And in the place of this Medieval Eden, there was "the modern slave, doomed...
... to tread his lonely path of care and toil," with only the "workhouse for [his] age." 29

As a Tory-Romantic, Manners loathed the scepticism of Sophisters and systemizers, finding it a destructive creed:

```
Each year has loosened further still the ties,
```

52
Between divine and human sympathies,
Till now, too liberal and enlightened grown,
We laugh at all commandments, save our own. 30

Inevitably, he disapproved of Socialism almost as much as he did of laissez-faire Liberalism, once referring to it as a "sad materialism". 31

This distrust of materialism was, naturally, central to the Medievalist outlook. The Medievalists realized, of course, that greed had always existed within man, but they disapproved of a society where, they believed, it had become a guiding principle. Their disdain for market economics and their reverence for a paternalistic organic order was, in a real sense, retrogressive. Yet, obversely, as seen in Carlyle, Southey, and Coleridge, Medievalism could be remarkably advanced for its time, especially in its advocacy of a strong paternal role for the state. The progressive aspect of the tradition was evident in Young England's willingness to adapt Medievalism to a modern, urban society, something which has already been demonstrated in the movement's response to the era's "loss of joy". The following chapters will develop this further, in regard to two of the fundamental problems of the age—land relations, and the dislocating effects of the Industrial Revolution. It should, however, be noted here that these two problems were impregnated with the same ideological conflict: between those who conceived property to be subservient to the nation, and those who claimed that society should be self-regulating, this predicated on the belief that the individual is the best judge of his own interests. As has been seen, this was a conflict that cut across both class and party lines. Ultimately, it divided even Young England.
... The "dark age" people were not so very foolish, when they had so many common-fields, and when almost every man that had a family also had a bit of land, either large or small. It is a very curious thing, that the enclosing of commons, that the shutting out of labourers from all share in the land; that the prohibiting of them to look at a wild animal, almost at a lark or a frog; it is curious that the hard-hearted system should have gone on, until, at last, it has produced effects so injurious and so dangerous to the grinders themselves, that they have of their own accord, and for their own safety, begun to make a step towards the ancient system.

William Cobbett, *Rural Rides*, 1830

The Medievalists of the nineteenth century, including Young England, believed land to be a Sacred Trust. This Trust embraced more than just the aristocracy, but also the parish churches, the rural judiciary, the market towns, the tenant farmers and, at the foundation of it all, the agricultural labourer. However, the aristocracy were the natural leaders of this constituency, since, in theory, their ownership of property entailed distinct paternal duties. Yet, by this period, land had become permeated by market economics to the extent that, in 1846, a large segment of the aristocracy betrayed their agricultural constituents and came out in support of the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Young England was caught in this dilemma. Though it believed the aristocracy to be the leaders of the landed interest, the movement was aware that, on the whole, the traditional elite was abrogating its paternal duties. Yet, though the more consistent Young Englanders, such as Disraeli and Manners, remained loyal to an organic vision of the land and to the idea of agricultural protection, they were not blind to the deficiencies...
of the hereditary aristocracy. Ultimately, they were willing to put their dream of a unified, paternal nation above their narrow class interests by supporting the one piece of 1840s legislation that sought, on behalf of the labouring poor, to limit the freedom of landowners - namely, William Cowper's Field-Gardens Bill.

Young England was not alone in sensing that all was not well in England's arcadia. As has been seen, most of the Medievalists realized that the cash-nexus was on the ascendency, both in the countryside and in the manufacturing districts. As Cobbett observed in *Rural Rides*, the increasing capitalization of land was destroying all vestiges of the organic society; and, as the social nexus declined, the cash nexus prospered:

... The paper system has ... drawn the real property of the nation into fewer hands; it has made land and agriculture objects of speculation; it has, in every part of the kingdom, moulded many farms into one; it has almost entirely extinguished the race of small farmers; from one end of England to the other, the houses which formerly contained little farms and their happy families, are now seen sinking into ruins, all the windows except one are stopped up, letting in just enough light for the labourer, whose father was perhaps the small farmer, to look back upon his half-naked and half-famished children, while, from his door, he surveys all around him the land teeming with the means of luxury to his overgrown and opulent master.  

A typical Medievalist *leit-motif* was that farmers and labourers no longer dined together, and that the labourers were now paid solely in money wages - a financial rather than a familial relationship. Even John Bright, the great orator of the free market, believed landowners had duties to dependents extending beyond the cash nexus:

Let [the landowner] look after his tenantry [and] his labourers ... and see that they have sufficient wages, proper and well-built cottages, good gardens ..., schools for the children.

In the 1840s, it was Thomas Carlyle who perhaps best exemplified the intellectual hostility to the dissolution of traditional ties. His works were replete with denunciations of "do-nothing aristocracies" deserving to
be swept away by a tide of honest sans-culottism. He saw modern England as supporting an idle nobility unconscious of the duties attendant on property, maintaining a large and parasitic class of rentiers, and enthusiastically imbibing the social atomism of "Dog-Madness" Utilitarianism. 5

Though Young England often concurred with Carlyle's judgement, they still had some hope for the moral reformation of the gentry. Disraeli, for example, believed a sound aristocracy to be an essential component of his Territorial Constitution, but knew that its existence had to be justified by the vigour of its concern for its dependents. His novels contain portraits of both types of aristocrat - the ideal paternalist variety, and the increasingly common do-nothing kind. In Coningsby, for instance, there is the corrupt, near-monstrous Lord Monmouth, a peer who did not trouble himself over the new Poor Law, had no concern for his tenants, and whose one ambition was to turn his coronet into a ducal crown. Juxtaposed is the Catholic landowner, Eustace de Lyle, whose paternalist almsgiving at his St. Genevieve estate so distressed Liberal and Chartist reviewers of the novel. Interestingly, de Lyle suggests two real-life Catholic paternalists, Aubrey de Vere and Ambrose Phillipps De Lisle, both Medievalists with links to Young England. 6 De Lisle and de Vere were not alone in their charitable dispositions. There was Lord Shrewsbury, in many ways the archetypal rural feudalist, renowned for his charitable works, and for providing employment "without question" to destitute labourers at road-building on his estate. 7 Another authentic paternalist lord was Manners's father, the Duke of Rutland, who believed that a landowner had the duty to respect the opinions of his farming tenants. For instance, on the occasion of the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, he rode around his estate, asking his tenants and their labourers their opinions on the matter, and it was apparently what they told him that made him decide to vote against the
measure. Unfortunately, paternalists of this calibre were few in number.

It is Disraeli's *Sybil* that presents the most thorough Young-England indictment of the landed aristocracy. The novel constructs an historical model of a nobility which had grown rich and powerful through gorging itself on the wealth of monasteries, dissolved in Tudor times. This nobility had betrayed Crown and People by supporting the usurper Prince of Orange; it was, to a great extent, composed of Peers with fraudulent titles and of obscure lineage, and was predominantly concerned with money-making and gaining status through meaningless ritual. As an example of the latter, Disraeli paints an hilarious portrait of Sir Vavasour, a Baronet who believes that the pressing question of the age is the under-valued status of his Order. Most damning of all, though, is the novel's description of the vindictive and calculating Lord Marney, the archetypal Steam-Intellect aristocrat. Marney eulogised the New Poor Law, which he declared, would be the salvation of the country, provided it was "carried out" in the [Utilitarian] spirit in which it was developed in the Marney Union ... . He was tremendously fierce against allotments, and analysed the system with merciless sarcasm. Indeed, he had no inconsiderate acquaintance with the doctrines of the economists, and was inclined to carry them into practice in every instance, except that of the landed proprietary, which he clearly proved "stood upon different grounds" from those of any other "interest" ... .

When faced with these sentiments, it is not Egremont, the brother of Lord Marney and the novel's protagonist, who delivers Young England's reply, but rather Mr. St. Lys, a Tractarian parson and, in true Disraelian fashion, a "tribune of the people":

But what is a poor man to do, after his day's work, if he return to his own roof and find no home; his fire extinguished, his food unprepared; the partner of his life, wearied with labour in the field or the factory, still absent, or perhaps in bed from exhaustion, or because she has returned wet to the skin, and has no change or raiment for her relief? We have removed woman from her sphere; we may have reduced wages by her introduction into the market of labour; but under these circumstances what we call domestic life is a condition impossible to be realized for the people of this country; and we must not therefore be surprised that they seek solace or rather refuge in the beer shop. 11
The fruit of Marney's philosophy is evident in the rural town that bore his name, a community of squalor, disease, and base wretchedness. In the over-crowded, filthy and ill-ventilated tenements,

the virtuous mother in the sacred pangs of childbirth gives forth another victim to our ... thoughtless civilization; ... while the father ... in another corner of the sordid chamber, lies stricken by that typhus ..

.. for whose next prey is perhaps destined his new-born child ... . These hovels were in many instances not provided with the commonest conveniences of the rudest police; contiguous to every door might be observed the dungheap on which every kind of filth was accumulated, for the purpose of being disposed for manure, so that, when the poor man opened his narrow habitation in the hope of refreshing it with the breeze of summer, he was met with a mixture of gases from reeking dunghills. 12

And so on, ad nauseam. Disraeli went on to delineate briefly the recent history of the town, laying the blame for its condition squarely at the feet of the landowners:

This town ... was a metropolis of agricultural labour, for the proprietors of:the neighbourhood having for the last half-century acted on the system of destroying the cottages on their estates, in order to be exempted from the maintenance of the population, [and] the expelled people had flocked to Marney. 13

Even the Radical Thackeray expressed an admiration for these passages, remarking on their "honesty, truth, and hearty sympathy." Manners, too, approved of Disraeli's descriptions of rural poverty, and was led to denounce the ideology permeating minds such as Lord Marney's:

At present, all measures are judged by the consideration "will it increase the wealth of the country?" And if a minister can show that in the present year there is more bullion in the bank ..., the mammon-worshippers are in ecstasies ... . The extent to which this wealth-adoration is pushed, is as ludicrous as it is alarming: it makes a liberal peer exact the last farthing for the rent of a lug of land from the starving peasant, and insists on the industry of the country being entirely dependent on money-wages; though it shrinks with horror from any attempt to secure the permanence or sufficency of those wages ... . 15

Furthermore, in harmony with the Medieval concept of conditional privilege, Manners seemed to believe that, under certain conditions, the common people had the right to rebel against their betters, particularly when their traditional rights or organic institutions were under assault. Thus, in a poem published in 1850, he wrote glowingly of the "Pilgrimage of Grace", a
rising of the peasantry against the nobles for their plundering of the monasteries (1536):

"For the Church and for the Poor," our victory is sure,
As we march against the foes of the spouse of our Lord.
We the Commons of the Land, will save her from the hand
Of lordly lust, and repine, by Her resistless sword. 16

In a more contemporary vein, at a meeting in Bingley, Lancashire, in 1844, Manners commented on the serious decline of organic social ties in the countryside: "He should be sorry to see the system universal, where there was nothing between the large tenant and the hired labourer."17 To this, an editorialist in The Times remarked,

There is reason enough for his sorrow; ... let us trust that there are reasonable and well-judging landlords who will begin to believe, ere it be too late, that property has its duties as well as its enjoyments. 18

Interestingly, Manners had a reputation of being a somewhat absurd defender of the aristocracy. This was a consequence of the adverse publicity he received over his notorious couplet,

Let wealth and learning, laws and commerce die,
But leave us still our old Nobility.

He remained haunted by this couplet for the rest of his life. It was lampooned in Punch and the Illustrated London News, and it was flung back in his face from a hundred political platforms (it was being quoted by Radical speech-writers as late as 1906!).19 Yet, throughout his career, Manners remained silent on the matter, making no excuses for the youthful indiscretion which had led him to compose such doggerel. It should, however, be emphasized that this couplet was no trite defence of the landed aristocracy (of which Young England had its misgivings). Rather, as Smythe pointed out to Manners in a letter of 1849,

Your idea of "Nobility" applies ... to the "statesmen" in Cumberland, or the yeoman of the South, with Squire everywhere, and the artisan, who does among us (according to our conditions of merit) what the feudal barons did in vindication of their virtue and manhood, than to modern Peers, and the Brummagem coronets of successful chicane, or sinister intrigue. 20
Basically, the couplet was concerned with what another of its defenders, Victoria, Lady Welby, called "the dignity of man and the true humility which goes with it"; a dignity which, in Manners's eyes could only come through the fusion of the individual in a greater, more organic and spiritual, whole: the nation. And if learning meant the teachings of the Political Economists or the stifling condescension of Charles Knight's Penny Magazine, and if laws meant poaching and new Poor Law legislation, possibly he had a point.

Nor was the remaining Young Englander of consequence, George Smythe, particularly enamoured of the contemporary condition of his class. With characteristic irony, he once coined the epigram, "Our hereditary aristocracy - the pale ghosts of departed criminals." No wonder Manners once felt called upon to remark in an October, 1844 letter to Disraeli that, "I take it some of our gentry are not best pleased with our movement." It was Disraeli, however, who composed the most dismissive epitaph for aristocracy,

Greatness no longer depends on rentals, the world is too rich; nor on pedigrees, the world is too knowing.

Yet a "do-nothing aristocracy" was one thing, a "Territorial Constitution" was quite another. Young England was not criticizing the aristocracy in order to destroy it but rather to galvanize it into re-discovering familial and organic roots. Just as the movement demanded that manufacturers, the new meritocracy, take on the duties of modern feudal lords, so it demanded that the hereditary nobility regain its sense of responsibility to the commonweal.

What, though, was to be done if the landed elite chose not to listen to the Medievalists' advice? In this contingency, Young England, at least as
exemplified in Manners, Disraeli and Cochrane, was willing to contemplate what Southey, Coleridge and Carlyle had advocated before them: a state which had the power to demand from property-owners a reckoning of their actions, which, when the Commonweal demanded it, was not adverse to interfering in the sanctity of property, whether industrial or agricultural. Through their support of William Cowper's Field-Gardens Bill, the Young Englanders, particularly Manners, showed a willingness to countenance a degree of public interference even in the "sacred" property-rights of landowners.

II

Cowper's Bill had its genesis in the Commons Select Committee established in 1843 to investigate whether an allotments system beneficial to the working classes should be implemented through Parliamentary legislation. Though several prominent (if maverick) Tories, Manners, Lord Ashley, W.B. Ferrand, were Committee members, interest in allotments was not limited to Conservatives. In fact, in the same period, Feargus O'Conner had attempted to set up Chartist Land Colonies established on an allotments system, a scheme which had some limited success. Interest in allotments derived substantially from the depression of 1837-42, when it was becoming increasingly evident that there had to be some means of alleviating the mass destitution caused by unemployment and wage cuts. One suggestion emanating from Tory-Romantics like Manners and Disraeli and from Tory-Radicals like Richard Oastler and Ferrand, was for labourers, agricultural and urban, to be given small plots of land to cultivate which would tide them over until the return of employment and adequate wages. It was a desire, then, to wean the British labourer away from a complete dependence on the spiritually-deadening cash nexus. These Conservatives saw another major benefit accruing from allotments, in that the possession of land would give the labourer a "feeling of independence and self-respect, ... giving him a stake in the
country," and placing him "in the class which has something to lose". In essence, this proposition of a partial return to the small-holdings of the Middle Ages was an attempt to re-create the organic relationship between the common Englishman and the land. However, it must be emphasized that the advocates of this scheme were quick to stress that allotments should be worked only in the labourer's leisure hours; the scheme was not meant as some kind of aristocratic conspiracy to undermine manufacturers by giving the working class alternative employment to the mills, though some captains of industry were no doubt suspicious of it on such grounds.

Both the Parliamentary Select Committee and Cowper's Field-Gardens Bill suggested that allotments should come from two sources: from a voluntary distribution of allotment plots by landowners, and from a legislative enactment which would make compulsory the granting of allotments to labourers as compensation for being deprived of commonage through Acts of Enclosure. Yet, despite all moral exhortations, landowners on the whole appeared to have little inclination to grant allotments. And though few Parliamentarians were against allotments, this was only so long as no coercion was exerted upon the landowner. It could be argued that, logically, Young England should have been paralysed by this dilemma. Their belief in the sanctity of fixed property should have made them adverse to the interference of government in the traditional responsibilities of the landowner. Yet, through their support of Cowper's Bill, they gave their blessing to the one attempt to legislate the public administration of allotments, a Bill which demanded that all future enclosure acts give allotments at modest rents to the neighbouring poor. For obvious reasons, Cowper's Bill was never passed into law. As The Times remarked,

No legislature in which landowners had such sway as ours would ever inflict on them so dire a foe as a body of trustees empowered to seize their land
and tear it into pieces for a set of hungry labourers. 28

Even though it was "most cautious of compulsion", 29 the Bill still appeared dangerous enough to have arrayed against it a formidable alliance of Tories and laissez-faire Radicals. It was disapproved of on several specific grounds: first, for its creation of a web of rate-payer-elected field-garden wardens with the power to demand a perpetual lease of the land they were to occupy; second, for its Field-Garden Commissioner who could fix the amount of rent to be paid for the land, with the owner being compelled to abide by his decision; third, for its allowing the Court of Quarter Sessions to revise and fix the amount of rent after seven years; and fourth, for its provision allowing the use of the poor-rates to fund the purchase of allotments. 30

Despite Cowper's almost desperate willingness to compromise, and his assertion that the Bill did not have the power to expropriate land from unwilling landowners, the Bill foundered over several sessions. On April 9, 1845, for example, B. Escott complained that the Bill was compulsory since its "machinery was to be set to work by a vote of the majority of the owners and occupiers of land in every parish, and the majority was to bind the minority." 31 G. Bouverie added darkly that, "The legislature ought to leave private parties uninterfered with to settle the value of land." 32 On another occasion, Joseph Hume argued that though allotments were a good thing, they ought to be left to the discretion of the individual proprietor. 33 Peel and Graham supported the Bill but, through amendments, postponements, and the voicing of doubt, ensured that any Bill which might have passed would have been emasculated. Despite these odds, the Bill's supporters put up a spirited defence. Moncton Milnes, on the periphery of Young England, argued that the Bill would materially benefit "mechanics living in large towns" who would have the opportunity
of cultivating, during their spare moments, a portion of land in their
neighbourhood, which would afford them some relief from their otherwise
monotonous occupation. 34

Cowper put the case against the landlords at its most blunt. When Hume and
Escott again complained against the "compulsory" nature of the Bill, he
replied,

It was notorious that in many parts ... the labourers ... could not get
[allotments] from the landowners; therefore, the voluntary system in
such districts would be perfectly inoperative ... . This was not a
gift ... [from] the landlord, but the full value was to be paid for the
land. 35

The Times was equally forthright when it expressed doubt concerning both the
Bill and its landowning detractors. Having analysed the laissez-faire
arguments used by the "manufacturers of corn" against the Bill, an editorialist
remarked,

Let these gentlemen remember that in adopting this language they desert
a certain high position which they have long arrogated, and which the
nation has long allowed. On the ground of peculiar offices and obligations
attaching to land, its owners ... are ... favoured. They enjoy a ... protection,
which constitutes what may be called a beneficial lease of
their land, and supposes a transmission of the kindness to the labourers
employed upon it. Let these gentlemen go on denouncing and deriding
the idea of any special duty to the labourer, ... and any right of
national interference - let them say, "We are like any other tradesmen,"
they will find that by the time they have asserted their liberty, they
have lost a generous master, [the state]. 36

The Times spoke with a resonating truth. To be consistent, the state could
support the privileges of the aristocracy only so long as the latter
remained true to its stewardship role; however, once it had abrogated that
role, and entered the marketplace in the pursuit of profit, it no longer had
a claim to special consideration. It appears that the Young Englanders,
collectively, were coming to the same conclusion. Their historical model
of the Whig Oligarchy and their scathing observations concerning the moral
decrepitude of their fellow aristocrats could lead them in no other direction.
It was Manners who was the main spokesman for the movement on the allotments
issue. He was an active member of the Select Committee and he made several
impassioned Parliamentary speeches in defence of Cowper's Bill. His
willingness to take action, when the reality of land relations did not live up to the ideal, was also seen in the Committee's acceptance of the principle of legislative interference:

... The allotment system is more beneficial when taken up by the landlord, than when set on foot by committees, whether voluntarily formed or with delegated authority; but seeing that this method of benefiting the poor has, from various circumstances, not been sufficiently adopted by the proprietors of land, your Committee have turned their attention towards the possibilities of promoting its extension through the means of legislation. 37

Naturally, Manners was keen to retain as much of the Territorial Constitution as possible. Many of the questions he raised on the Select Committee concerned the constitution of the proposed allotment committees. As a High Churchman with Tractarian sympathies, he was eager that local clergymen be members. 38 In his enthusiasm, however, he occasionally forgot the degree to which much of the Anglican clergy had abrogated their roles as spiritual shepherds of the people. As often as not, those questioned were less than ecstatic at the prospect. As one defender of the allotments system put it, "... the parson is not very popular in the manufacturing districts." 39 The Committee's final recommendations did, however, reflect Manners's point-of-view in that it recommended that the allotment committees be composed of the Parish incumbent, the Lord of the Manor, and two elected field-garden wardens. 40 Nevertheless, the Select Committee's compassion for the destitute labourers did over-ride the sanctity of parochial laissez-faire:

Local societies voluntarily formed of persons taking an interest in the welfare of the labouring classes, and comprising among their members some of the persons whose benefit is peculiarly aimed at, have certainly done good, and might become still more effectual if they were consolidated, assisted and controlled by central supervision. 41

From as early as May, 1843, Manners was becoming aware of the necessity of some kind of interventionism. To Sir G. Strickland, M.P., he asked,

You are of the opinion that the only way in which that difficulty of too high rent can be got over would be by those means which would give facility to the poor people of procuring those allotments from a public body? 42
To which Strickland replied with the orthodoxy of his kind: I think it is always better that land should be kept in the hands of the proprietors and not in a public body.\textsuperscript{43} The same negative response came from most representatives of landowning opinion. For example, when Manners queried, You stated that ... in all cases where it was possible the allotment system had better be under the management of the particular landlord; in the manufacturing districts, where there are large portions of wasteland, is it your opinion that good might be produced by a legislative enactment on the subject?\textsuperscript{44}

the M.P., W. Miles, replied to the effect that he thought the less legislation the better.\textsuperscript{45}

While on the committee, Manners also questioned various representatives of the working classes. On one occasion, he asked a stocking-weaver whether the obvious desire of the labouring population for allotments, "extends to a legislative enactment on the subject?"; to which the stocking-weaver replied, "They are longing for ... it."\textsuperscript{46}

Manners took it upon himself to represent these Leicestershire workers in Parliament. On June 21, 1843, he criticized an Enclosure Bill because it failed to provide "a certain portion of ground for the sports of the people." The labourers, he claimed, could not be dependent for their survival on wages alone, since they only had labour, two or three days a week .... How could that make them independent? He had presented several petitions from the manufacturing classes in Leicestershire, stating their wish for the allotment system, in order to eke out a subsistence .... He was prepared to maintain that there was nothing more ennobling than agricultural labour; [especially if one] was the cultivator of [one's] own field. \textsuperscript{47}

In a period of terrible industrial slump, before the introduction of a systematic welfare system, Manners's advocacy of allotments was not foolish. It certainly could be expected to have a greater appeal to the
working class than pauperism and the workhouse. Once again, Manners was fortunate to find an issue on which his Medievalist views coincided with the wishes of the working classes of industrial Britain. On another occasion, he went so far as to call the introduction of allotment provisions into an Enclosure Bill as "the equitable right, and if not the legal right, ought to be so, of the poor."^{48}

In 1845, Manners and his Young England colleagues threw themselves wholeheartedly behind Cowper. In his treatment of the issue, Manners had a tendency to emphasize the plight of urban or semi-rural workers. Thus, on March 4, 1845:

He might refer to the framework-knitters in the midland parts of England; these could not get gardens under the present circumstances, whereas if the House passed this Bill, he had not the slightest doubt, from his knowledge of the class to whom he referred, that they would be greatly benefitted by it. He could not avoid saying that the feelings and opinions of the people themselves ought to be respected on this question.... He was sure the overworked and underpaid artisans and mechanics of this country would ever feel grateful to them for such a proof of their sympathy.^{49}

Furthermore, when it came to the test, Manners was not adverse to supporting the compulsory clauses of Cowper's Bill with a forthrightness that many other supporters could not muster. On April 9, 1845, he decried the absurdity of leaving allotments to the mercies of *laissez-faire*:

The Hon. Member of Winchester said ... that it was a good plan, why not leave it to the care of those who were interested in it. Now, his answer to that was short and simple - that the people who were most interested in it were those who were least able to help themselves. It was a cruel assertion to make to the labouring classes that they could and ought to help themselves in the way of procuring the means of comfort, when it was notorious to all that the position in which they were placed prevented them from doing so.^{50}

Yet, the compulsory aspects of the Bill should not be over-emphasized. *The Times* was probably right to claim that it was unworkable due to its timidity in approaching the question of government interference. Nevertheless, it was still one of the few pieces of 1840s legislation that
dared to countenance such action, a fact made more surprising by its doing so on behalf of the labouring poor. Thus, despite their almost mystic reverence for the Sacred Trust, the Young Englanders were willing, in their frustration at the failure of landowners to carry out their traditional paternal duties, to support legislation which dared to interfere in the sanctity even of land. It was an issue on which even Smythe, so loath to support government interference in other areas, did not hesitate to vote alongside his Young England colleagues.

III

Young England broke up over the issue of agricultural protection. In 1846, Smythe and Cochrane, along with Moncton Milnes, joined with the Whigs, Radicals and Peelites in advocating the repeal of the Corn Laws, Smythe not least because he had been offered the position of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in Peel's Cabinet. Be that as it may, his defection to Peel was in harmony with his increasingly Liberal beliefs. Manners and Disraeli, however, despite their disenchantment with the do-nothing aristocracy, remained loyal to the landed interest. Abolition of Protection would mean the triumph of Cobdenism, the cash nexus, and Free Trade. It was in this context that Manners commented acidly on the physical and moral decline of his class:

The gentry of England must have sunk very low indeed, if they fall before King 'Udson [George Hudson, the railway entrepreneur] as their mainstay and protector; but we live in strange times, and certes he appears to possess brass and energy as well as gold: but from the Plantagenet to the Hudson is a great step, and all in five years! 52

In a sense, Manners was putting his faith in the Territorial Constitution over and above class loyalty, for, as the scholar G. Kitson Clark has discovered, the aristocracy and the landed interest were by no means identical. In fact, a large segment of the wealthy and titled landowners
in Parliament either supported Corn Laws repeal, or opposed it only because of the determined lobbying of their tenant farmer constituents.\textsuperscript{53}

From the beginning, Disraeli was fierce for Protection. Manners, however, was rightly convinced that in practical terms repeal would change little. For a while, he retained a position halfway between Smythe and Disraeli. Nevertheless, in the end his distaste for laissez-faire economics won out, and he became an inveterate Protectionist, persuaded, perhaps, by the advice he received from his friend and colleague, Augustus Stafford, to, "look on this side and do not aid the sledge-hammer of political economy to break it in pieces without one struggle."\textsuperscript{54} Manners's decision to support the Country Party did not, however, come quickly enough for his Newark constituents, and his hesitancy cost him his seat.\textsuperscript{55} Yet, as early as 1842, he had warned the Free Traders of how weak a straw the Corn Laws were as an explanation for England's ills:

He remembered the prosperity that a few years ago clothed the manufacturing districts where the distress was now so great; and also remembered that the Corn Laws were then in existence as now ... Suppose the Corn Laws were repealed; that the mills now stopped working were again in action, that the agricultural interest no longer existed to be pointed to as the cause of the manufacturing distress, and yet that distress again fell on the manufacturers, to what cause would it be attributed?\textsuperscript{56}

Disraeli made many of the same points as Manners, but more vehemently. It has been suggested, and the evidence appears to bear it out, that he opposed repeal not merely because it undermined the Territorial Constitution, but because the dogma of Free Trade was predicated on a Liberal brand of internationalism he considered far too impractical to succeed.\textsuperscript{57}

Finally, then, Young England was a movement with roots not only in Romantic Medievalism \textit{per se}, but also in the social class then dominating
British society and politics - the landed aristocracy. However, in their refusal to ape the platitudes of the Tory Old Guard concerning the supposedly innate moral superiority of the nobility, the Young Englanders succeeded in distancing themselves from their origins, even to the extent of supporting the one Parliamentary Bill which advocated a degree of public supervision over the ways landowners dealt with their property; a Bill, furthermore, in harmony with Young England's organic Medievalism, if not with the predilections of a majority of the wealthy gentry.

Nor were allotments a mere whimsical fancy. In an age where the working man had no job security or unemployment pay, giving him a plot of land on which to grow vegetables was not so ridiculous. It was, incidentally, a scheme that came to fruition in post-World War Two Britain, where allotments were attached to council housing estates, and distributed amongst the tenants at a nominal charge. On a whole, then, Young England's record in the area of land relations was not as reactionary as it could have been considering their idealization of the Sacred Trust. Significantly, a similar conclusion emerges from an examination of the movement's attitudes towards industrialism and its often dislocating consequences.
A dense cloud of pestilential smoke hangs over it for ever ... , and at night the whole region burns like a volcano spilling fire from a thousand tubes of brick. But oh the wretched one hundred and fifty thousand mortals that grind out their destiny there! In the coal mines they were literally naked, many of them, all but trousers, black as ravens; plashing about among the dripping caverns or scrambling amid heaps of broken mineral ... . In the iron mills it was a little better ... . Here they were wheeling charred coals, breaking their ironstone, and tumbling and boring cannon with a hideous shrieking noise such as the earth could hardly parallel; and through the whole, half-naked demons pouring with sweat and besmeared with soot were hurry­ing to and fro in their red nightcaps and sheet iron breeches, ... hammering and squeezing the flowing metal as if it had been wax. 1

Such was Thomas Carlyle's description of industrial Birmingham in the 1820s.

It was a vision common among those thinking men and women, whether Left-leaning Liberals like Dickens or Tory-Romantics like Coleridge or Carlyle, who rejected the Steam-Intellect Zeitgeist of the age. Many historians have tended to ascribe to Young England a similar kind of anti-industrialism, as much motivated by aristocratic hostility to the new forms of manufacturing wealth as by vague humanitarianism. According to this interpretation, the High Tory opposition to the new Poor Law and its support of factory legislation was symptomatic of the class war, an internecine struggle waged between Old and New Wealth for the political reins of power. Though this interpretation is debatable, its lingering smog still lies over Young England. The truth is, in fact, quite different.

Essentially, in their attitudes towards the machine age and the new industrial classes it was creating, Young England was sympathetic rather than hostile. Acknowledging the new order, they demanded that if political rights were to be extended to the manufacturing class, it was only right that this same class take on those concomitant paternalist duties which the
movement claimed were interwoven with the possession of property. Where Young England tended to differ from the main body of Conservative opinion was, first, in their strident calls for a physical application of traditional paternalist rhetoric; second, in their sympathetic attitude towards the manufacturing class; and, third, and most subversively, in the willingness of several of them to contemplate state intervention where property had abrogated its responsibilities to the commonweal.

It was in the third area, the role of the state in regulating commerce, that the unanimity of Young England, evident in other areas, broke down. The two members most amenable to state intervention were Lord John Manners, the spiritual heart of the movement, and Benjamin Disraeli. The other two core members, Baillie-Cochrane and Smythe, were less enamoured than their colleagues of stateism, an attitude which led them eventually to the Peelite-Liberal fold. Nevertheless, for some years, despite the final parting of the ways, they followed a similar ideological path, a path which had its origins (with the exception of Disraeli) in a common aristocratic background.

In their youth, Smythe, Manners and Cochrane possessed the general prejudices of their class. Inspired by Digby and Scott, their attitude to the machine age was hostile. In Digby's *The Broadstone of Honour*, they read that in the arcadian vales of medieval England, there were "no lawyers, no rich manufacturers to stimulate the passions of a peaceable and innocent people, no speculations ending in ruin and suicide, or success and the license of hell." Coleridge, another writer in the breviary of Young England, was equally hostile to industrial wealth. The purpose of agriculture, he insisted, was "ultimately the state of which it is the off-spring," whereas the purposes of commercial wealth do not extend beyond personal
enrichment. On a less elevated level, the visceral aristocratic discomfort with the machine age is wonderfully captured by Disraeli's *Sybil* character, Lord De Mowbray.

"I fear ... [railroads] have a dangerous tendency to equality ... . Equality, Lady Marney, equality is not our metier. If we nobles do not make a stand against the levelling spirit of the age, I am at a loss to know who will fight the battle. You may depend upon it that these railroads are very dangerous things." 4

Manners's attitude, if not as obtuse as Lord De Mowbray's, did at least echo Coleridge's sentiments. Manners had read More's *Utopia*, leading him to deplore that there were "few among our richest men who look upon their property as a sacred trust for others", and to ponder, "Must our manufacturers be curbed? Would to God they could!" 5

The catalyst which transformed Smythe's and Manners's ideas about industrialism was their October, 1841, tour of Lancashire, which they undertook in order to understand better the "Condition of England" question. While they did meet with Blake's satanic mills in the urban sprawls of Manchester, Bolton, and Stockport, they were, nevertheless, surprised to find that, in the large country mills, they often encountered the enlightened paternalism which had been so lacking among the landed gentry.

In Manchester, they met the Grant brothers, prosperous manufacturers whom Manners referred to as "most exquisite old men" 6 (and who provided the models for Dickens's Brothers Cheeryble). 7 In his journal, Manners recounted this introduction to the machine age:

25 October, 1841
Back to Manchester and at 1:00 in [a] carriage to his factory, about ten miles off; the children by the roadside as we passed, called "Hurrah for Grant!" They have some miles of the valley of the Irwell, and a very pretty place it is. There is perhaps no other such establishment as this in England: they spin, bleach, and print;
anything more perfect I never saw, and the girls and men all looked very healthy and clean too ... . 8

The following day, Smythe and Manners witnessed machine paternalism at work:

26 October, 1841

... Brother John ... showed us round the grounds, and when we returned, there was the old gentleman sitting in the porch with his feet on a mat, dispensing his charity to half a dozen men. When they were going away, John said, "I doubt, brother, whether you are doing good by this."

"Brother, brother," answered William, "the men can't starve you know! they would work if they could;" then turning to me to explain, "it's the mill up yonder, sir, has stopped; no, they mustn't starve, and if we who can afford it, don't feed them, they will get fed somehow else, and that perhaps wouldn't be so well" ... . I was never more touched than during the old man's history of himself ... . What a life has that man's been! From the boy wandering penniless by the banks of the uncontaminated Irwell - then without a chimney in its valley - to the princely manufacturer-merchant owning that very valley, and filling remotest corners of the globe with the products of his industry and wealth, and still more wonderful, retaining all the guileness and simple-heartedness of childhood. 9

In Manners's evident admiration for the Grants' rise by honest labour to a position of wealth and influence, there was none of the aristocrat's contempt for the parvenu tradesman, his hands sullied with filthy lucre.

As they progressed through Lancashire, Smythe and Manners began to realize that the Grants were not an anomaly. They encountered a German embroiderer named Schwabe who paid his men generously, more than thirty shillings weekly, even though there was little work at the time. He was a sound Tory and had no prejudice against the Corn Laws. 10 They also met a manufacturer named Ashton, "one of the richest Whig millocrats" in Lancashire. 11 Like the Grants, he had a little industrial fief of his own and treated his men well. Manners praised his "humanity, sound sense, moderation, and good feeling." 12

Most of all, Smythe and Manners were impressed by a Mr Bashall who owned a mill some five miles outside Preston. In his journal, Manners described his impressions. Mr Bashall
has built a town, a manufactory, a house where he lives, a modern feudal lord, having, in fact, an absolute dominion over his men, who rent their cottages at 3s. a week from him; this is doubtless a great improvement on town manufactories; the cottages are well-built, two storeys with two rooms in each, large windows, a back-yard, pure air . . . . One woman we spoke to seemed fully aware of her advantages saying, "In a town, sir, there's as much out as there is in." Mr Bashall is working full hours, his rooms are 280 ft. long. There are twenty holidays, he does not work at night - that prevents the rooms being ventilated . . . . He was dressed in a common working sort of dress, and seemed to have no wish beyond his factory. 13

Leaving aside the machines, this could have been a description of the kind of ideal feudalism found in the pages of Scott and Digby.

Smythe and Manners also proved amenable to paternalist manufacturers who held views opposed to their own. They were both impressed by a Mr. Ashworth's model mills at Egerton and New Ealey. Ashworth was a Radical who complained to Manners, "I have 10 children growing up, and can I bear to see them ruined to keep the purses of the landlords full?" 14 Nevertheless, the Young Englanders could not fail to observe the feudal nature of these mills, though Manners did disapprove of the fiery brand of Liberalism taught in the village school, which he characterized as "hot-bed intellect." 15 As Lord Ashley later pointed out, "Ashworth's Mills are worth seeing; [they are] clean [and] quite astonishing, [with] much discipline + order." 16

To disperse the choking, debilitating dust that was an inevitable by-product of the cotton mills, Ashworth installed large fans in both work-rooms and privies. Furthermore,

the conditions of health in the mills . . . are exceedingly favourable. The working rooms are lofty, spacious, and well-ventilated, kept at an equable temperature, and scrupulously clean. There is nothing in sight, sound or smell to offend the most fastidious sense. 18

Naturally, a feudal manufacturer like Ashworth extended a paternal eye beyond the factory gates. Like Bashall and the Grants, he provided soundly-constructed cottages for his employees and education for their children in
the village schools. Modern observers would, perhaps, be disconcerted by Ashworth and his brother's interference in the morals of their workers. Being local magistrates, they had constables patrol the villages at night-time. Apprehended wrong-doers would be warned the following day by one of the Ashworths that they "must either reform, or go about [their] business." 20

Although this Lancashire odyssey did much to dispel Smythe's and Manners's antipathy towards manufacturers as a class, they were still shocked by the conditions of the urban slums. In his journal, Manners wrote about the physical squalor in passages paraphrased in Whibley's biography:

Everywhere they went ... Manners and Smythe saw signs of the profoundest misery. Stockport, Cobden's constituency, seemed to them a city of the dead ... . Every fourth house was closed and they were not surprised when a fellow in a fustian jacket cried out, "Do you want a borough, gentlemen? This is to be let or sold." No sound was heard in the town save the funereal tolling of the great church bell, and the contrast of Stockport with the happy valley of the Grants was complete. Bolton ... was in yet worse case. There they came upon a lane in which every cottage told a tale of distress. "In no one of the houses we went into," writes Lord John in his journal "was there a blanket, in some no fires; in the bedroom upstairs an old mattress would be all the bedding and furniture of a family. One woman who seemed to be a shade better off, when asked what had become of her blanket, said she sold it last week for 4 d. after she had gone without food for two days. In one of the most desolate stood a portable pulpit, and from this, in the cold evenings the hopeless wretches, who had lost all hope on earth, and against whom the church doors are shut, would try to win some comfort. We did what we could to relieve them, and as we left one cottage some squalid haggard being would rush to us, and pray us to visit his or her misery, yet in all this we heard of no threats, hardly a murmer; they had got a stage beyond active despair. Poor devils! There was no work for them to do, nor any prospect of work, and radical employers like Ashworth "laid it all to the aristocrats". 21

Yet, Manners could not have been dismayed at the poverty alone, as his description of the portable pulpit indicates. The contrast between town and country mills struck him forcefully. In rural areas, feudal ties could develop, since the millocrat was in continual proximity to his dependents, and all "owed connexion ... man to man." 22 Here could blossom Coleridge's "Home-Born Feelings". In the countryside, ignorance of squalor was no excuse - unlike the towns where millocrats and machine-serfs lived in different
districts, hermetically sealed, one from the other. And here lay the difference. The towns were sprawling, rootless, spiritually deadening; where the only connexion between men was the cash-nexus, where the individual was a mere economic unit, a cog in a self-perpetuating machine of supply-and-demand, prey at any moment to dismissal. It was from being confronted with this contrast between urban anarchy and rural paternalism that Manners's later writings and parliamentary activity in the area of industrialism stem. The essence of his new philosophy was contained in a letter written to his brother Granby:

It's all very well for the Manchester Radicals to rail against an aristocracy, but between you and me there never was so complete a feudal system as that of the mills; soul and body are, or might be, at the absolute disposal of one man, and that to my notion is not at all a bad state of society; the worst of this manufacturing feudalism is its uncertainty, and the moment the cotton lord is done, there's an end also to his dependants' very subsistence; in legislating, this great difference between an agricultural and a trading aristocracy ought not to be lost sight of. 23

Smythe's view had also been irrevocably transformed by the Lancashire tour. He chose, however, to forget the urban slums, and to emphasize the glories of the new commerce. Smythe, according to Manners, seemed "to have run aristocracy-of-wealth mad."24 Increasingly, he came to perceive events from the perspective of the manufacturers, an attitude which led him inevitably to Peelism. In Historic Fancies, his praise of Carlist peasants and revolutionary Jacobins is joined by a panegyric to commerce, entitled "The Merchants of Old England".

The land it boasts its titled hosts - they cannot vie with these, The Merchants of Old England - the Seigneurs of the Seas, In the days of Queen Victoria, for they have borne her sway From the far Atlantic islands, to the islands of Cathay, And o'er one-sixth of all the earth, and over all the main, Like some good Fairy, Freedom marks and blesses her domain. 25

Disraeli, the titular head of Young England, was closer to Manners than to Smythe in his attitudes to the machine age. His outlook is probably best
expressed in his Young England novels, Coningsby and Sybil, rather than in his parliamentary career which, during this period, only touched on industrial matters peripherally. Yet, between them, Coningsby and Sybil offer a fascinating portrait of the Young England brand of machine feudalism.

Young Coningsby's investigative trip to Manchester and its environs was a thinly disguised account of Smythe's and Manners's 1841 tour.

Far from being lost in the mists of a romanticized past, Disraeli balanced his respect of traditional, organic institutions with a healthy awareness of the dialectic of change. It was the enigmatic and near-omniscient Jew, Sidonia, who stirred Coningsby into embarking on his Northern journey by remarking, "The age of ruïns is past; have you seen Manchester?" And when Coningsby does encounter this metropolis of steam and cotton, he is suitably overwhelmed by its almost baroque splendour:

Yet, rightly understood, Manchester is as great a human exploit as Athens ... . Now [Coningsby] was among illumined factories, with more windows than Italian Palaces, and smoking chimneys taller than Egyptian obelisks ... . He entered chambers vaster than are told of in Arabian fable, and peopled with habitants more wondrous than Afrite or Peri ... . Nor should the weaving-room be forgotten, where a thousand or fifteen hundred girls may be observed in their coral necklaces, working like Penelope ... ; some pretty, some pert, some graceful and jocund, some absorbed in their occupation; a little serious, some, few sad. And the cotton you have observed in its rude state, ... you may now watch as in a moment, it is tinted with beautiful colours ... .

The extravagance of this passage is self-evident. It has, however, caused some confusion among scholars who find its sentiments hard to reconcile with the more harshly realistic vision of industrialism portrayed in Sybil a year later. The mystery may be cleared by remembering that Coningsby is truly Smythe, and that the reader is, perhaps, viewing Manchester through his eyes, not Disraeli's. Very possibly, Disraeli was mocking his compatriot's effusive regard for commerce, just as in a later chapter he may have been gently lampooning Manners's (Lord Henry's) enthusiasm for maypoles and village sports. Disraeli seems more serious, however, when he enthuses
about the manufacturer Millbank's mill, the apotheosis of machine feudalism.

Millbank, modelled on either Bashall or Ashworth, is a paternal employer who has provided his labourers with ventilated working conditions and sturdy cottages. And yet, like Ashworth, he bears a deep grudge against the landowning class which was dominating the political and social life of Britain. It is from him that Coningsby first hears the Coleridgean idea of an aristocracy of talent as well as one of birth. Later in the novel, Disraeli argues that this manufacturing wealth "was rapidly developing classes whose power was imperfectly recognized in the constitutional scheme and whose duties in the social system seem altogether omitted."

The novel's conclusion, a marriage between the aristocratic Coningsby and Millbank's daughter Edith, is a personification of the Young England ideal - the marriage of "Norman manners" and "Saxon industry". Only through the aristocracy taking on the drive and imagination of the manufacturers, and only through the manufacturers taking on the paternal duties attendant on property, could England be saved from the spectre of revolution. At one point, Disraeli outlines the mission of Young England:

... to establish great principles which may maintain the realm, and secure the happiness of the people ...; [to] see authority once more honoured; a solemn reverence again the habit of our lives; ... [and] property acknowledging as in the old days of faith, that labour is his twin brother, that the essence of all tenure is the performance of duty.

Yet, it is Disraeli's *Sybil* (1845) that best gives the Young England (or at least the Manners-Disraeli axis) version of industrial Britain. The novel's account of industrial conditions came mainly from two sources; the Parliamentary Blue Books compiled by Lord Ashley's Factory Commission; and Disraeli's own observations taken during a prolonged stay in Lancashire in
October, 1844, where he was the guest of the Radical-Tory M.P. and Young England ally, W.B. Ferrand, "a great expert on the malpractices of manufacturers and millowners." 

The Athenaeum hailed Sybil as a sign "that the relations of rich and poor - the enlargement of the former's sympathies and the amelioration of the latter's misery - are becoming matters of interest." Others were not so happy. The Cobdenites and other Manchester Radicals, who saw something wonderful in children of five and six contributing to the prosperity of the country, thought Sybil a dangerous novel. They disliked the fact that it seemed to be advocating some form of interference in the natural workings of a competitive economic order. No doubt, their ire was particularly aroused by Disraeli's denunciation of the spirit of the age:

If a spirit of rapacious covetousness, desecrating all the humanities of life has been the besetting sin of England for the last century and a half, since the passing of the Reform Act the altar of Mammon has blazed with triple worship. To acquire, to accumulate, to plunder each other by virtue of philosophic phrases, to propose a Utopia to consist only of WEALTH and TOIL, this has been the breathless business of enfranchised England for the last twelve years, until we are startled from our voracious strife by the wail of intolerable serfage.

Having damned the spirit of this fragmented age, the "two nations", Disraeli went on to examine the conditions of the urban poor. In his descriptions of slum life, there is no hint of baroque splendour. At one point, he relates the experiences of a small child, Devilsdust:

About a fortnight after his mother had introduced him into the world she returned to her factory, and put her infant out to nurse; that is to say, paid 3 pence a week to an old woman, who takes charge of these new-born babes for the day, and gives them back at night to their mothers as they return from the scene of their labour to the dungeon or the den, which is still ... called "home". The expense is not great: laudanum and treacle ... affords these innocents a brief taste of the sweets of existence, and keeping them quiet, prepares them for the silence of their impending grave. Infanticide is practiced as extensively and as legally in England as it is on the banks of the Ganges; a circumstance which apparently has not yet engaged the attention of the Society for the Propogation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.
The next few pages pile on the horrors in true Dickensian form. It should be noted, however, that Disraeli, like Smythe in his evocation of the Jacobins, appeared to have little fear of the working-class products of this system. Even Devilsdust, the above-mentioned progeny of the twilight slums, grows to be an intelligent, responsible young man, however Radical he is in his politics. Throughout the novel, the labourers are treated with respect as well as sympathy. One should, perhaps, compare the sanguinary mob scenes found in many Liberal novels with Disraeli’s evocation of a torch-lit Chartist demonstration:

... all hurried, yet spontaneous and certain, indications how mankind, under the influence of high and earnest feelings, recur instantly to ceremony and form; how, when the imagination is excited, it ... requires for its expression something beyond the routine of daily life ... . The interminable population, the mighty melody, the incredible order, the simple yet awful solemnity, this representation of the great cause to which [Sybil] was devoted, under an aspect that at once satisfied the reason, captivated the imagination, and elevated the heart. 37

At the novel's climax, when urban distress and upper-class indifference finally lead to an uprising of the people, their conduct is generally disciplined and peaceful. The only exceptions to this are a mob of fellows called "Hell-cats", under the leadership of the "Bishop", who eventually succeed in whipping up to a fever pitch the discontent of the striking labourers. 38 The "Hell-cats" personify for Young England all that is iniquitous in a laissez-faire, egalitarian society. Wodgate, the "hell-cats'" town, is the nadir of atomism. It is a town without laws, traditions, institutions, religion and hereditary classes. The only authorities are master-artisans like the "Bishop" who bully their apprentices mercilessly. Social-Darwinism and the "survival-of-the-fittest" are the only determinants of existence. It is the teachings of Ricardo and Cobden taken to a logical extreme. 39

Naturally, as a manifestation of Young England thought, Sybil is more than
a catalogue of the evils of the machine age. It, too, evokes the image of feudal capitalism, here personified in the person of Mr. Trafford, a character who never makes a physical appearance in the novel though his spirit is everywhere. It is his mill alone in the whole of the manufacturing district of Marney that escapes being gutted. There are sound reasons for this. Trafford, a true paternal employer, has provided schools for his operatives' children, charity for when their fortunes are low, clean and ventilated working conditions, and perhaps most important of all, security of employment even in times of slump. "He is a most inveterate capitalist," complains the radical Chartist Field, "and would divert the minds of the people from the five points by allotting them gardens and giving them baths." To which the "Bishop" replies, "we will have no more gardens in England; everything shall be open, ... and baths shall only be used to drown the enemies of the people. I always was against washing ... ." 42

Yet, it must be emphasized that Disraeli had more than a condescending sympathy for the workers. He appeared to be aware that when social conditions deteriorate past a certain point, a paternalist reputation alone cannot avail against the anger of the people. It is not paternalism that stays the hands of the local workers as they prepare to storm Trafford's mill, but rather Trafford's sympathy for their cause. It is Sybil's father, Walter Gerard, Trafford's foreman but himself a leading Physical-Force Chartist, who persuades them to disperse quietly:

"There is not a machine or man that stirs here at this moment .... The master here has done his best to soften your lots. He is not one of those who deny that labour has rights .... I say that Mr. Trafford has always acknowledged the rights of labour .... The master here has no wish to interfere with the national holiday [General Strike]; all he wants to secure is that all mills and works should alike stop .... It is just; just and manly, and like a true-born Englishman, as he is, who loves the people .... ." 42

Disraeli's sensitivity here is important (and it was echoed by Manners).
Individual charity is both Christian and necessary, but it cannot avail against universal conditions of misery and neglect.

Young England's genuine sympathy for the aspirations of the manufacturing class reached its apotheosis in October, 1844, when Smythe, Manners and Disraeli travelled to Lancashire to speak at the Manchester Atheneaum, a society dedicated to disseminating culture among middle-class and artisan youth. An earlier chapter has described the general content of the Young England speeches - eg. Manners's conception of education as a modern unifying bond and his approval of Manchester's establishment of parks and walks for the community at large; and Disraeli's celebration of education as the creator of a true aristocracy-of-merit. But these wildly applauded speeches also touched on Young England's attitudes to commerce. The soiree occurred prior to the publication of Sybil, so Richard Cobden could be forgiven for claiming in his opening remarks to this assemblage of Manchester's middle class, that "they were Young Manchester, and he rejoiced to think they had Young England with them." Nevertheless, Smythe's speech could have done nothing to alarm Cobden. Echoing his poetry, Smythe spun a tapestry which equated free commerce with "free letters":

Because your ships ... are laden not alone with bales of cloth and cottons, but with goods which have neither a declared nor an official value, you carry with you truths from this free island which tend to elevate the character of man. You carry with you principles which tend to unite all nations in one fair confraternity of reciprocal assistance. Here, ... a country ruled by an enlightened sovereign, not less alive, ... to the misery of her poorer subjects ..., we are publishing the banns between ... industry and ... intellect.

Manners and Disraeli, while no less sympathetic to the achievements of commerce, tended naturally to be slightly admonitory; and both hinted at the need for improvement. Disraeli was the milder of the two:
Then, to the youth of Manchester, ... I now appeal. The leaders of [this] community have not been remiss in regard to their interests. Let them remember that when the inheritance devolves upon them they are not only to enjoy but to improve ... . Let it not be said they were deficient in public virtue and public spirit.... . 45

Manners, on the other hand, was more blunt:

Be it yours to render obsolete the taint that manufacturers must produce a dry, harsh, unpoetical material spirit; be it yours to practically refute the terrible contrast which has been drawn by the master architect of the day [Pugin], between such a town as Manchester in 1480 and 1840, by inducing a love for ... whatever is ... ennobling in the fine arts ... . 46

Yet, Manners was not so naive as to advocate culture as the only solution to the problems of the age. Ultimately, both he and Disraeli came to perceive that a path seemed to be leading inevitably from a celebration in literature of machine feudalism to actual state intervention. To understand how stateism was the logical consequence of Young England's evocation of an organic, duty-bound society, one must look once more at their parliamentary activity.

II

Manners and Disraeli were distinct from most other Medievalists of the period in that they were willing to look beyond the confines of private property and assign a major charitable role to the state, something we have already observed in the context of agriculture. Simply put, they epitomized the most forward-looking elements of the Romantic-Medievalist tradition. They shared with Coleridge and Southey an openness to state intervention, and with Carlyle a sympathy with the manufacturing class, held simultaneously with an abhorrence of Manchester School economics. The one significant advantage they had over Carlyle and the rest was that they were Members of Parliament and were thus able to advocate in a public forum the application of their principles.

In the area of factory legislation, there was no consistency within Young England. Smythe was already dedicated to *laissez-faire* and, as a
consequence, voted against the Ten Hours Bill of 1844. Disraeli's parliamentary record in this area is mildly disappointing, particularly, in light of his articulate and forthright evocation of machine feudalism in his novels; he was more concerned with foreign policy and the tactical game of undermining the Peel Government. With the exception of his impassioned speech against the new Poor Law, Baillie-Cochrane tended to be a silent voter on the side of stateist legislation. It was, however, Manners, the most historically maligned of the four, who was the one to advocate most consistently the Young England philosophy as outlined in his poems and Disraeli's novels. From the outset of his parliamentary career, he supported the application of traditional principles which, on the lips of most Tories, were mere convenient rhetoric.

None of the Young Englanders cared whether their beliefs contradicted those of their own Treasury Bench. The first salvo in the battle over industrial policy was fired by Manners in Parliament on February 10, 1842. During a heated discussion concerning the on-going slump in the manufacturing districts, Sir James Graham, the Home Secretary, claimed that reports of distress in Bolton had been exaggerated, to which Manners bluntly replied that he did not believe that the distress of Bolton had been ... exaggerated. He went himself down to the Borough to inquire into the truth of this fact, being unwilling to believe that such a state of things could have existed. As an Englishman and a Christian, he was not disposed to believe this distress, and he must bear testimony to the truth of the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Bolton on the subject. He hoped, however, that some measure would be adopted that would permanently relieve this state of things. 47

It is evident, then, that even at this stage of his career, Manners was pressing Parliament to take measures to ameliorate permanently the plight of the poor. He was soon to be more specific in his proposals. On May 30, 1842, he supported Peel on the issue of the income tax, which was being
Manners and his Young England colleagues also involved themselves in sanitary reform and urban planning. On April 5, 1842, Manners introduced the Committee on the Southwark Improvement Bill, and asked for it to be given further consideration. The Philosophic Radicals and Peelites asked for a postponement, and Manners was voted down. Baillie-Cochrane voted with his colleague. More significantly, several years later, as a consequence of Edwin Chadwick's 1842 report on the sanitary condition of the labouring population, Disraeli and Manners joined the newly-founded Health of Towns Association. Formed from an unlikely alliance of Utilitarians like Chadwick and Southwood Smith, the Tory Evangelical, Lord Ashley, Whig noblemen like Lord Morpeth, progressive Liberals like Edward Bulwer-Lytton, the economist Thomas Tooke, and Radicals like Joseph Hume, the Association did not hesitate to demand a more active role for the central government in the area of urban sanitation.

On the surface, it is hard to reconcile the down-to-earth rationalism of the Health of Towns Association with two other social issues Young England, with Manners as their spokesman, were involved with: Protestant monastic institutions and the repeal of the Law of Mortmain. The seeming archaism of these two issues is clear; nevertheless, neither one was quite as absurd as it appeared at first glance.

With its faith in the unifying mission of the Established Church, Young
England's advocacy of monastic orders (perhaps along the lines of Coleridge's Clerisy) is hardly surprising. In his *The Monastic and Manufacturing Systems*, Manners outlined the scheme at length. Believing that "great and deeply-seated evils ... exist throughout the whole of our manufacturing society,"\(^{51}\) he despaired that "nothing but monastic institutions can save Manchester."\(^{52}\) Basically, Manners advocated monastic institutions because he realized that in the manufacturing districts, the parochial system had broken down, and individual parishes now lacked the resources to provide large-scale relief to the poor:

... In overgrown neglected town populations something more than the alms-dispensing of an un-aided clergyman is required, and this is [only] to be found in the co-operation of a religious society.\(^{53}\)

However, so as to avoid the opprobrium attached to Popery, he was quick to point out that these would be institutions adapted to the age:

... Nothing would induce us for a moment to entertain the idea of the revival of monastic institutions, unless with the most unqualified assertion of direct Episcopal control, their entire subordination to the Church, and the absence of vows.\(^{54}\)

In the same pamphlet, he also suggested establishing organisations of Sisters of Charity, who would perform the same kind of good works that Elizabeth Fry was giving example of. Acknowledging the emptiness and frustration of the lives of many thousands of women of the middle and upper classes, he asked,

How many discontented, avaricious, gambling old maids, faded beauties, speculating widows have during the last three centuries wasted their energies, and died miserably, because the ... Reformation left them no scope for usefulness.\(^{55}\)

How much better it would be, he argued, if the energies of these women were channelled into systematic charity work, rather than have them drag "on their lives in a listless or fretful subjection to the world."\(^{56}\)
Before the Church could once more fulfill its organic role, it, like the aristocrats and capitalists, had to be reformed. Furthermore, if it would not mend its ways, Manners was willing to turn to the mechanisms of the corporate state. Actually, though impossible for certain social and religious reasons, his proposal was not as silly as it sounds. In the 1840s, the Church of England was a wealthy and highly organised institution. With expanded financial assistance from the government, it would, technically, have been in a position to carry out relief work on a large scale. The advantage it had over every other religious and secular organisation was, of course, its omnipresent reach into every parish of the country, and its hierarchical infrastructure which stretched from the parish vicarage, to the diocese, to the highest centralized authority, the arch-bishopric. Even on the level of the diocese, it was well-positioned to implement a program of relief, with its deacons, rectors, wardens, and other officials. Manners's scheme fell on deaf ears, not because it was technically impossible, but because it failed to take into account the divisive religious passions of the age. Under no circumstances would Methodists, Non-Conformists, and Dissenters allow the Established Church to become a nation-wide government-sponsored relief agency. In Manners's defence, it can be argued that the Protestant monasticism of which he spoke was conceived of as extending far beyond the Established Church itself, so as to include all Protestants willing to pledge themselves to defend traditional institutions, in other words, a Universal Church. However, even if seen in this light, his scheme still failed to acknowledge the fundamental reality of Britain's sectarian fragmentation. Another problem was the attitude of the appointed leaders of the Anglican faith who, with some honorable exceptions, were not keen to implement their pious platitudes about the need to respond to the physical deterioration of the labouring masses.
A similar problem arose from Manners's parliamentary lobbying, actively supported by the rest of Young England, to have the Mortmain Law abolished. The Law was a hindering device which prohibited the bequeathing of money in perpetuity to religious establishments. The significance of this Law was that it stood in the way of an extended charitable role for the Church. Although Manners's impassioned speech in favour of the proposal did lead to the establishment of a Committee with full Government support, the consequent Bill floundered. He did not, in fact, see the victory of his opinions until the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act of 1888, and its amendment three years later. What is interesting, however, is the reason Manners gave for advocating abolition. He declared that he was motivated by the Government's constant refusal to interfere on behalf of the downtrodden:

It was only after this House declared that the poor should not be instructed, and that the unemployed should not be set to work by public generosity, that he asked them to carry that principle to its legitimate extent, which alone could justify them in acting on it, and while they refused to be munificent as a state, to throw every facility in the way of private munificence. 57

Manners, then, was not indulging in romantic folly. If the state was not to be paternalistic, then it must remove all obstacles to private charity; to refuse to do so would be an apostasy of principle. The Bill was rejected on two fundamental points. First, the Philosophic Radicals feared that tying up lands in perpetuity would discourage "the spirit of commerce." Second, the Anglicans were concerned that repeal of the hindering law would allow rich Dissenters and Catholics to bolster the wealth and influence of their churches. 58 Whibley was right to declare that Manners's "equanimity ill-accorded with the spirit of the time." 59 On this issue too, Manners must be chided for not taking into account the religious dissensions of his time. His schemes were not totally far-fetched, but they were meant for a more tolerant or a more religiously unified age.

89
Young England applied both their religious tolerance and their awareness of the imperatives of a machine age to the Irish Problem. In many ways, though, they expressed the litany of Early Victorian complaints about Ireland. Disraeli stated that she was cursed with an alien Church, an absentee aristocracy and an impoverished peasantry and Manners asserted that an Irish allotments scheme should be financed through a tax levied on absentee landlords. On the other hand, the movement did have the prescience to express the need both for agricultural reform and for commercial and industrial development in Ireland, even if such progressive measures were advocated in a somewhat archaic language. Manners, for instance, invoked the ghost of the seventeenth century, reminding Parliament that Lord Strafford had been the one to introduce into Ireland the cultivation of flax and the linen trade. Such an approach, he claimed, should once more be introduced into that long-suffering land:

I agree ... that physical distress is the real effective cause of the disquiet of Ireland. And I must express my disappointment that no hopes have been held out by Her Majesty's Ministers for alleviating it, more especially as that country offers so many means of profitable employment for the people ... . If you wanted to find the real origin of Ireland's evils you are not to look to Popery, nor to democracy; you must go deeper and seek it in the destitution and agony of the people ... . I cannot refrain from quoting [Bishop Berkeley] - "Alas! how many incentives to industry offer themselves in this island, crying aloud to the inhabitants for work. Roads to be repaired, rivers navigable, fisheries on the coast, mines to be wrought, plantations to be raised, manufactures improved, and above all, lands to be tilled, and sown with all sorts of grain." 61

Some days later, Smythe recommended to the House that it act on his friend's proposals. If nothing else, Young England's approach to Ireland illustrates how wrong it is to assert that the movement was only concerned with a return to an idyllic rural past, devoid of machinery.

It was, however, Young England's support of government-directed factory reform that illustrates best its willingness (Smythe excepted) to place a
desire for a stable, organic state above its traditional reliance on the efficacy of parochial institutions. And though Manners was again the movement's spokesman on this issue, he was supported by W.B. Ferrand and Moncton Milnes who, though not part of the core of Young England, were infused with its paternal, Medievalist spirit. All three lobbied vigorously on behalf of Ashley's Ten Hours Bill and against Government amendments which would have extended to twelve hours the limit women and children could work.

Ferrand, a close friend of Manners and Disraeli and a Tory-Radical from the North country, was notorious for the ferocity of his temper and the bluntness of his language. When he spoke on factory reform, he invariably mixed a passionate sympathy for the working classes with a profound contempt for the manufacturers. Thus, on April 22, 1844, he exclaimed that the working classes had challenged the masters to meet them; they did not fear to meet them openly, face to face; they knew that on their side they had truth and justice, whilst on the side of the masters, there was falsehood and injustice. If the working classes were in fault in seeking this protection, how did it happen that the masters would not confront them, and show them that they were in error ... . The working classes were better able to discuss this question than two-thirds of the Members of that House, and they were protected under a Ten Hours Bill. Manners, on the other hand, made it clear from the outset that his opposition to a society predicated on the cash nexus did not extend to opposing factories or manufacturers in themselves. In this speech of March 22, 1844, he publicly invoked the vision of feudal capitalism that had been growing within him since his first visit to Lancashire:

In private, he had never hesitated to give that fair description of the great manufactories which he was now prepared to give in public ... . He should say that the general characteristic of the districts they had visited was a small town ... of well-built cottages ... . They saw signs of much discipline and supervision exercised over the occupants, every shop being licensed by the mill-owner and every-one being dependent upon him for the exercise of his calling. [The cottages are roomy, etc., and the work people seem healthy; the average receipt per family being an ample 30 shillings a week].
He had come to the conclusion that these comforts and conveniences were at the disposal of the manufacturing population of the large establishments ... .

Nor was Manners adverse to pointing out unpalatable facts to landowners:

In one cottage they had entered they found a woman with ten children ..., and having asked her whether she would prefer to go back into the country districts, she laughed at the idea, and said, "No, not on any account." This woman they had found, ... cooking for herself and family a meal of beef and potatoes.

Manners then explained why this benign vision did not contradict his support of the Ten Hours Bill. He stressed that the conditions of which he spoke were chiefly to be met with in the larger country establishments - whereas the noble Lord's descriptions related principally to the condition of the factory population in the great manufacturing towns ... . He had seen side by side with the prosperity of Turton enough of the misery of Bolton, to make him believe that the same country may easily at the same time "bloom a garden and a grave."

Manners went on to attack the Government's Twelve Hours Amendment. His arguments were not without wit or a good layman's understanding of economics. He drew attention to the incongruity of claiming, on the one hand, that the reduction of working hours from twelve to ten would irreparably reduce production, making Britain unable to compete with foreign markets, while, on the other hand, claiming that if the proposal was adopted, wages would fall by 25%. If the latter was so, Manners argued, surely British industry would have no problem under-pricing foreign goods.

The enemies of the Bill could not have it both ways. Manners was, in fact, quite astute at pointing out the absurd hyperbole of the Bill's opponents:

It was saying ... that the whole secret of our vast manufacturing power lay in the one hour before sunrise and in the one hour after sunset snatched from the poor people of England. And this too, after all they had heard of the iniquity of protection! ... He should rather have imagined that the protection of their manufactures existed in the exemption of machinery from taxation, ... in the power of a manufacturer to assemble around his dwelling any number of people he pleased, to make addition to his wealth by means of that machinery, if trade were brisk; and who, if trade were dull, would have no claim upon that wealth which they contributed to swell. He should have imagined it to consist in the fact of the very rooms in which that machinery worked, and of that machinery itself, paying nothing to the relief of the poor, or towards the burthens of the state - but now it seemed that the only protection
which was looked upon as essential, consisted in the over-working of mothers and infant children. 69

Without hesitation, Manners went on to defend the idea of state intervention in the economy. To Ashley's Bill

he gave his cordial and unqualified support - with no lingering regret, however, as some appeared to have done, that it infringed upon the principle of non-interference with the free exercise of labour, but because he believed that the great inquest of the nation was called upon to legislate on this question. 70

Finally, he hinted at the dire consequences of rejecting the Ten Hours Bill. By passing it,

you told the toiling people of England ... that the Legislature was prepared to interfere for the shirt-maker of London - for the poor workman of the metropolis, and on behalf of want and poverty wherever they are to be found ..., as well as in favour of the operative spinners of cotton and of flax. By that decision, you caused joy ... to prevail where before was nothing but despair - and yet that decision you now propose to reverse .... I would entreat this House to reflect for a moment on ... the last three years. Have you learnt nothing from the manufacturing insurrection in the North - ... nothing from the agrarian rebellion in Wales - nothing from the indifference with which your labourers in Cambridgeshire and elsewhere regard your flaming homesteads and fired corn-ricks? [Revolution will be the] melancholy result of your refusal to interfere in behalf of the over-worked labourer who toils beyond human endurance at the manufactories of England ... . 71

One should not fail to note that Manners mentioned agrarian unrest in the same breath as factory insurrections. It is evident that he perceived the danger not to come from machines in themselves, but rather from an ideology, laissez-faire capitalism, which had bewitched manufacturers and landowners alike. Nor was his sense of apocalyptic foreboding out of place in the mid-1840s.

Yet, it was Moncton Milnes, another Tory-Romantic ally of Young England, who put the case for government interference at its most sensible and astute. In his speech of May 13, 1844, he drew a parallel between slavery and factory work. The labourer, he claimed,

ought to be free in some other sense, than to be free to starve, or free to break the law if he chose to take the risk of punishment. It
became the Legislature then, to remove the evils which the factory system presented to the improvement of the freeman with as much zeal and earnestness as they had shown in removing slavery ... .72

Having attacked *laissez-faire*, he went on to argue in favour of factory protection. To the question, "why interfere here when you do not elsewhere?", he would answer,

because here they had the power; and because they had the power, they had also the responsibility; where they could do anything which they refused to do, to improve the moral condition of the people, they incurred great moral responsibility by the refusal. All legislation was in fact interference. Was not the stopping of the Arts Union the other day an interference with free labour? Was not the very violent ... but very proper interference of the police with the gaming houses at the West End the other evening, an interference with the free employment of capital? But, "oh, ... you will spoil the character which distinguishes Englishmen by interfering." Now, notwithstanding this independence of character, it was these very Englishmen who came and asked for protection. The question was not whether they should step in voluntarily, but whether they should refuse to step in when called upon to enter? 73

Milnes had here succeeded in giving a modern definition of the role of the state. In a sense, interference is the fundamental definition of government. The state exists as an agency to safeguard the lives and freedoms of the citizen; it has often no recourse save interference. Morally, the state has as much a duty to guarantee fair working conditions to the toiling labourer as it does to protect an aristocrat's home from burglars.

Victory on this issue did not come until June 8, 1847, when Fielden's Ten Hours Bill received royal assent. Though Young England had been mortally wounded over the repeal of the Corn Laws, it lived on in the minds of at least Manners and Disraeli. When Fielden triumphantly carried the 1847 Ten Hours Bill to the Lords, he was accompanied by twenty other members, including both Manners and Disraeli. 74

Manners continued his fight on behalf of labour. On May 20, 1846, he spoke in Parliament in defence of a Bill intended to protect lace-makers who,
he claimed, required government interference in order to better their working conditions and regulate their night-labour. As was becoming increasingly common, Smythe voted with the majority which suppressed the measure. 75

The Young England spirit shone brightest, however, in Manners's working friendship with the Radical-Tory, Richard Oastler, a man who used the phrase "the Social State" to symbolize his hopes. 76 Their relationship had begun in February, 1844, when Oastler met Manners after his release from prison (where he had been incarcerated for debt in 1840). 77 Earlier, Manners had contributed to Oastler's Liberation Fund because, as he wrote to Ferrand, "in these days of philosophical cant, Oastler has had the courage to fight the poor man's battle in the old-fashioned way." 78 They corresponded regularly and discovered that they both shared a compassion for the poor which derived from a deep religious faith. Both loathed Utilitarian economics and wished to see a reformed Establishment become more intimately involved with the physical and spiritual needs of the people. Furthermore, neither one had faith in democracy which, they felt, would do little to shackle the capitalist and lead either to the further atomization of society, or to a tyranny. 79 Manners essentially saw Oastler as an intermediary between the Protectionist rear-guarders and the industrial proletariat. As he wrote to his brother, Granby,

Oastler is the one engine, by which the manufacturing districts can be worked and I could wish Stanley send him 10 pounds with a few words of encouragement. Manchester and Leeds are not to be won by rose-water. 80

Significantly, Oastler had a more ambitious role in mind for Manners. In essence, he viewed Manners as the leader of a true Tory Democracy: a "heroic leader who would call forth from the people a spontaneous movement
for social reconstruction," (a la Carlyle). According to his biographer, Oastler approved of Young England's scheme to apply chivalry to an industrial society, and wished to see it accomplished under Manners's aegis. Yet, for all Manners's qualities, Oastler's Arthurian vision of him was an illusion. He was incapable for reasons of temperament of fulfilling the role Oastler had assigned to him. For all his intelligence and deep convictions, Manners lacked the required qualities of leadership: sustained aggressiveness and determination. By the mid-1850s, he had slipped into a kind of passivity, content to follow the lead of his more flamboyant friend, Disraeli.

Before this, however, in alliance with Oastler, the old core of Young England had one last battle to fight on behalf of the industrial worker. This arose from an attempt by a combination of Peelites, Whigs and Philosophic Radicals to make the Ten Hours Bill inoperative. On February 8, 1850, Mr. Baron Parke had argued in the Court of Exchequer for a relay system of work-shifts to be allowed in mills in order that manufacturers would not be deprived of the full control of their capital. In accordance with this decision, the Government introduced a Bill to implement the desired changes; changes which, as The Times pointed out, reduced Fielden's 1847 Bill to a nullity at one stroke. At a meeting of the Ten Hours Movement, a resolution was passed calling for a Declaratory Act which would have safeguarded the true intent of the original Ten Hours Bill. It was decided that the proposed Amendment be entrusted to three members - Lord Ashley, George Bankes, and Manners. The struggle over this issue, both in and out of Parliament, was bitter. In the end, it finally exhausted Ashley himself, who urged the Ten Hours Movement to accept the "propositions made by [the] Government." In this, he was supported by The Times. Manners, however, along
with Oastler and Ferrand, remained adamant against capitulation under the
mask of compromise. The Movement, feeling betrayed by Ashley, turned to
Manners for leadership:

The West Riding Central Committee emphatically repudiated Ashley and asked
Lord John Manners to take his place. A conference of the Fielden
Society did the same. Even the Manchester Committee ... decided to
support Lord John Manners who had promised to move a Ten Hours Amendment
to the Government's bill. 87

The Amendment was doomed from the beginning. Nevertheless, Manners
dutifully introduced it on June 14, 1850, exhorting the House to
redeem the pledge which they had given, and to prove to the working people ...
that they attached more value to the claims and rights of the
working people ..., than they did to the backstairs influence and
coffehouse combinations of any set of associated millowners ... .
He appealed to the House to show that they were not only in name, but
in very deed and reality, the representatives of the Commons of England. 88

Both Disraeli and Cochrane made speeches in support of Manners. Cochrane
argued that the Ten Hours Bill should not be altered without the consent of
the factory operatives. 89 Disraeli's speech "put Oastler's position in a
nutshell." 90 He began by acknowledging that,

although I have been in Parliament more years than I care to remember,
I have hitherto registered my vote on this subject without ever presuming
to address the House upon it. 91

On this occasion, however, he made up for the deficiencies of the past. He
reminded the House that despite its unwillingness in the past to "interfere
with regard to labour", 92 and despite the dire predictions of economic
disaster from the Philosphic Radicals, it had passed the Ten Hours Bill in
1847, "the principle which the working people ... had long desired to see
embodied in the law." 93 Why then, in a period of "commercial prosperity", 94
with a contented and well-paid labouring class, did the legislature intend
to "repeal and abrogate" this "important statute", and thereby "deprive the
people of the consequences ... of an Act of Parliament which they [had]
struggled for"? 95 He concluded by warning them of the fruits of such an
apostasy of duty:
The voice of outraged faith is no respecter of persons. Its cry cannot be stifled; it will penetrate the Senate, and reach the Throne. In true Young England fashion, Disraeli was condemning the destructive consequences of an unregulated economy. If such tendencies were not curbed, anarchy and the collapse of the traditional order would ultimately ensue. It was therefore the duty of Government to take an active paternal interest in the plight of the working class:

The reason that the Government of this country is more powerful than other Governments is, because the moral influences are those which predominate. What you have to decide tonight is whether you will taint this fountain of security, whether you can govern millions of freemen, except upon the principles of justice, benevolence, and truth.

Yet, Disraeli's eloquence could avail little, and the Amendment was decisively rejected 181 votes to 142. Nevertheless, it was an occasion where the flame of Young England flickered for one last time. On this Amendment, as on one of Ashley's introduced earlier that day concerning child factory labour, Manners, Disraeli, and Cochrane found themselves voting in favour of government intervention on behalf of the industrial worker. In the Lords, even the Malthusian Lord Brougham deplored the rejection of these Amendments, calling it a betrayal of the workers' rights. As Manners himself remarked, the Government had called the Bill a "compromise" in order to push it through. "It was in reality," he said, "a compromise of nothing but the rights of the people and of the honour of Parliament." Young England's swan-song thus ended with a diminuendo.

In essence then, there was little that could be called reactionary in Young England's approach to industrialism. Though the movement split on the questions of state intervention and Free Trade, both factions, that of Smythe and, at least on the latter question, Cochrane, and that of Manners and Disraeli, celebrated the new machinery and the emergence of a new,
dynamic social class - the manufacturers. Smythe, however, for all his sympathy for the Jacobins, found himself slipping easily into the Peelite camp. Manners and Disraeli, on the other hand, the exponents of Young England at its most consistent, realized that a strong Britain, organically linked by Throne, Altar, and Cottage, was incompatible with a society predicated on atomistic, competitive economic values. Nevertheless, since they knew that "the age of ruins" was gone forever, the new technology had to be seen as a blessing and not a curse. More than anything-else, Manners and Disraeli wanted to marry "Norman manners" to "Saxon industry",\(^{102}\) to make the new manufacturing class cognizant of the duties of property. Certain manufacturers had shown how near-feudal relations and "Home-Born Feelings" could flourish alongside profits in the large country mills, away from the pestilential labyrinths of Bolton, Birmingham and Stockport, labyrinths plagued with all the dehumanising defects of a fragmented, unregulated society. Manners praised this machine feudalism in his journal and Parliamentary speeches, as did Disraeli in his Young England novels. The recent experiences of several countries undergoing modernization suggest this vision to be more than idle speculation. Japan has shown how successful a form of semi-feudal capitalism, organically linked to past traditions, can be; while China and Yugoslavia have achieved some notable successes through establishing de-centralized industrial colonies in rural areas.\(^{103}\)

Nevertheless, Manners and Disraeli were not so foolish as to put all their hopes on moral exhortations to the manufacturers. If Britain was to avoid disintegration through the dissolution of all traditional bonds and through the increasing moral and physical decline of the labouring masses, more direct action was needed. Suspicious like all Conservatives of Benthamite-like centralism, Young England turned to stateism only with hesitation.
Manners, especially, explored the possibility of resurrecting the Church of England as a truly unifying and charitable body. However, since the Church proved unwilling to don the mantle of national paternalism, Young England undertook to support measures aimed at extending the paternal role of government. For some eight years, Manners and Disraeli supported all parliamentary legislation calling for state intervention on behalf of industrial workers.

Finally, it should be emphasized that Manners and Disraeli were motivated by more than pity when they expressed concern for the condition of the working class. Just as it has been argued that Disraeli's support for the Corn Laws was inspired more by a vision of Britain's imperial destiny than by a sentimental attachment to the landed aristocracy, so Manners's advocacy of factory legislation can be seen as partly nationalist in character. He expressed this most clearly in A Plea for National Holy Days (1842):

In a military and national point of view, we have more to fear from the physical and moral decay of the serfs of wealth than from that of the tenants and dependents of the Church; and that if it be the duty of a paternal and religious government, as I suppose most will admit it to be, to foster by all means the national strength, which is the national defence, and to ward off all that may impair it, it becomes now the duty of the government to raise the depressed condition of the working classes. 104

Not only is this an explicit advocacy of stateism, it also brings to mind one of the revelations that led to Lloyd George's National Insurance Act (1911) - the shocking rejection rates of working-class volunteers during the South African War. It appears that Young England, despite its evocation of a gilded past, was clearly aware of the imperative of the age - the reconciling of society with the invariably dislocating processes of industrialization.
CONCLUSION

Young England lasted no more than a few years and was as fragile as a house of cards. The Young Englanders often expressed ideas of sheer whimsy, such as Smythe's advocacy of the King's Touch and Manners's quixotic support of the Spanish Carlists. Nevertheless, their invocation in literature and in Parliament of the anti-atomistic ideology of the Lake Poets, Carlyle, and Cobbett, and their often enlightened attempts to reconcile a traditional, organic vision with the realities of an industrialized age, should make one hesitate before dismissing them out of hand as reactionary. In an age of often dour Sabbatarianism, they offered Sunday sports and ale for all, traditional pastimes for rural folk, and fair-grounds, free museums, parks, and lending libraries for the city poor. From both rural landowners and industrial manufacturers, they demanded a genuine noblesse-oblige, entailing not only the amelioration of the hardships of the poor, but educational, cultural and moral responsibilities as well. In return, they asked from the rural and industrial labourers loyalty to their employers, Queen and country. However, if property-owners were lax in taking on their paternal duties, Young England, as exemplified by Manners and Disraeli, was willing to contemplate the intervention of the state. For, though they were firm advocates of property rights and the parochial constitution, their vision of the duties attendant upon such rights was organic; to this extent, and one should not draw too close a parallel, their vision was collective rather than individualistic. Thus, along with Ruskin and Morris who were in many ways the heirs of this tradition, Young England offered a coherent and often insightful critique of the deficiencies of laissez-faire industrialism. And if Young England often obscured sensible policies in fragrant clouds of myth and romance, what ideology does not commit much the same crime? Both Socialism and Liberalism, for example, presume certain things
about the nature (or potential nature) of man which are so speculative as to approach the mythic. It is really only the archaic language and imagery of Young England's Romanticism that modern sensibilities find silly.

The fates of the Young Englanders varied. Baillie-Cochrane soon slipped into obscurity. Smythe held several posts in Liberal-Peelite administrations until his death at the age of forty in 1857, worn out by a dissolute life. Smythe was one of those whose Romanticism was always highly tinged with cynicism, a quality that found its way into a number of epigrams of some wit: "A middle class must make up its mind for one or two things - to support an upper class or a lower class; and the former is the cheaper of the two." For all his intelligence, politics was not Smythe's metier. He soon abandoned public life to become a respected foreign editor of the Morning Chronicle. His scandals were notorious. He had the distinction of having fought the last duel on British soil and of having married a rich heiress on his death-bed (which drew from him the question, whether there was to be "a wedding-feast or funeral baked meats").

Manners did not live up to his potential either. Though he held office as a Cabinet Minister longer than any of his contemporaries (seventeen and a half years), he never held a position higher than Post-Master General. This was not because he was considered unfit for the upper echelons of government - at various times he was offered the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, the Vice-Royalty of India, the Governorship of Canada, the War Office, and the Admiralty - it was rather his amiable lack of ambition for such honours. From 1850 on, he allowed himself to fade, as it were, into Disraeli's shadow. As the years passed, his Conservatism became increasingly orthodox. In a sense, he ceased to be a Young Englander the day in 1852 he became Commissioner of Woods and Forests - his first elected office.
Over-night he became more cautious in his approach to government. Indicative of this was the Bill he and Lord Derby introduced in 1852 which was intended to ensure that the water companies supplied pure water at reasonable rates. The Bill however, was a "clumsy and inept compromise", since both Manners and Derby were hesitant to tread too heavily on the toes of private enterprise. As a result, the Bill failed in its goal of protecting the consumer. A few years earlier, Manners would have been a good deal more adventurous in his willingness to contemplate direct state intervention. Essentially, little insight into the nature of Manners's Young England sentiments is to be found in his post-1850 activities.

Disraeli, naturally, provides the scholar with the most intriguing problem. To what extent did he as Prime Minister attempt to legislate the Young England program? Evaluations of the later Disraeli have been varied and contradictory; and this is not the place to explore them at length. Nevertheless, two are worthy of brief comment. First, one has Robert Blake's interpretation of Disraeli's debt to Young England. Blake asserts that "Disraeli had principles when he led the party and believed in them sincerely," but that "they were not the principles of Young England". Furthermore, Disraeli's supporters have too often tried to justify their hero by twisting his later policies into some sort of fulfillment of the "Tory idea" of the 1840s, and interpreting his attitude towards the monarchy, the extension of the franchise, and social reform as a realization of the ideals of Coningsby and Sybil. Yet, as to why this latter interpretation is incorrect, Blake can only remark that Disraeli was "a practical politician" whose "policy was essentially Peelite"; the implication, of course, being that Young England was not practical. One wonders, then, whether Blake's evaluation of Disraeli's later actions is not partly distorted by his hesitation to acknowledge the often progressive nature of Young England.
On the other hand, Clyde J. Lewis's interpretation, that consistency was a more important factor in Disraeli's political career than expediency, has a greater ring of authenticity. Lewis argues that, between 1835 and 1848 (his Young England phase), Disraeli proposed a positive program designed to re-establish what he conceived as the traditional constitution of Britain. After 1848 (though I would put it several years later), he abandoned this program and took up a defensive cudgel against those hostile forces of Liberalism, Socialism and Rationalism which, he believed, were undermining the nation. Lewis, quite aptly, calls this a change of tactics, not principles. As late as 1870, in the General Preface to the Novels, Disraeli expressed sentiments which were those of Young England in both content and style. One sentence, especially, contains the essence of the Young England spirit:

The feudal system may have worn out, but its main principle, that the tenure of property should be the fulfillment of duty is the essence of good government.

David Roberts's "Tory Paternalism and Social Reform" is a severe critique of the Conservatism both of the Peelites and the Romantics. Though admitting that in relation to Peelism, it was the "rural Toryism" of Ferrand, Oastler, Disraeli and Manners that most "vociferously condemned the abuses in factories," and whose leaders "sympathised most openly with the plight of the working classes," Roberts also claims that the Tory Romantics (if not the Tory Radicals) were ham-strung by their deep attachment to local interests and their distrust of centralism. As a consequence, then, "the corporate localism of Disraeli's Protectionists and the political economy of the Peelites both encouraged a practical policy of laissez-faire." There can be no denying the strong element of truth here. Manners's and Disraeli's opposition to the Mining and Merchant Marine Acts of 1850 could, perhaps, be explained by an excessive fear of centralism. Nevertheless, Roberts fails to take into
account the close links between those few Conservatives he praises, Lord Ashley and the Tory Radicals, Oastler and Ferrand, and the most consistent Young Englanders, Manners and Disraeli. Furthermore, as this study has shown, Young England was more deeply involved in the question of factory legislation than Roberts gives credit for. Finally, he passes over in virtual silence the movement's advocacy of rate-supported recreation for the working-classes and its support for the Field-Gardens Bill, which, if Roberts is to be believed, should have been anathema to supporters of a parochial, rural-based constitution.

In fact, Young England recognised that the supreme possessor of property is the state to which all owe obedience. This concept, common both to the Middle Ages and the twentieth century, never completely disappeared, though, for a century, it only just survived, a small and guttering flame, fed by the Romantic and Medievalist tradition, of which Young England was in many ways the apotheosis.
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