

Theodore Koditschek

Supplementary Notes to Chapter Three Imagining a Greater Britain: the Macaulays and the liberal romance of Empire

Note to Reader: These supplementary notes consist primarily of extended references and explanations that were cut from the original book manuscript for reasons of space. In a few instances, however, they constitute more extended subordinate narratives (with accompanying references), which are related to the book's themes, but were left out because they would have deflected from the central argument and analysis of the volume. These supplementary notes are coordinated to the footnote numbers for chapter three of *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth Century Visions of a Greater Britain*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).

1. The two generational saga of the Macaulay family provides an exemplary case study in the liberal imperialism of the second British Empire at its apogee. In particular, the Macaulays afford an excellent opportunity for exploring three more general themes: First (as I indicate in the text) the romance of freedom that began with Zachary's evangelical Christianity and abolitionist activities achieved one of its most confident and self-assertive ideological formulations when it culminated in the secular anglocentric historicism of his son. Secondly, as middle class *parvenus*, who sought to rise to the pinnacle of Britain's political establishment, the two men exemplified patterns that were common to many other less renowned nineteenth century metropolitan upstarts. Their story shows how empire was used by such people as a vehicle for personal and familial advancement, but it also shows how their own individual *parvenu* perspectives colored their approach to the civilization and improvement of colonial others on the periphery. Finally, the two Macaulays were among the leading progenitors of the three institutions -- evangelical missions, secular education, and progressive history -- that remained the primary vehicles for the dissemination of liberal imperial values well into the twentieth century. All three institutions (and the universalistic ideologies that sustained them) purveyed powerful visions of Greater Britishness, but were also beset with potentially fatal inner contradictions. The contradictions of Zachary's evangelical vision were partly discerned by his son, who recognized the dangers of seeking imperial union through the vehicle of religion. Yet, as we shall see, the younger Macaulay's secular, pedagogical, historicist alternative harbored unacknowledged contradictions of its own. His great liberal British and imperial histories did succeed in edifying hundreds of thousands of readers throughout (and beyond) the British Empire. Yet, this historicist version of liberal imperial union also contained some seeds of the

reactionary, racialized maneuvers of exclusion that would lay liberal imperialism low during the decades after 1850.

In the original design of this chapter I had intended to write more about Zachary Macaulay, and his role in setting in motion the two-generational family saga. Indeed, even if our interest is primarily in the son, it is impossible to understand T.B. Macaulay's historiographical-cum-political agenda without setting it in the context of his relationship to his father and his wider family. Somewhat to my regret, this extended treatment had to be abandoned, since it would have taken me too far afield of my focus on the uses of history and historical writing. Fortunately, Professor Catherine Hall is working on what is very likely to be the definitive work that traces the two generational liberal imperial family saga of the Macaulays. Suffice it to note here that Zachary's initial entrée into the circles of Anglican evangelical reformers came after his return from Jamaica, when he found that his older brother, Aulay, had become a clergyman of the Church of England, and that one of his sisters had married Thomas Babington, a member of the Leicestershire gentry, and a leader of the fledgling Evangelical group.

2. Improperly supervised as an apprentice in Glasgow, Zachary "began to think excess in wine, so far from being a sin, to be grounds for glorying; and it became one of the objects of my ambition to be able to see all my companions under the table." The experience of Jamaica further coarsened his behavior, but "the hour of retribution was at hand." Saved by God from a serious illness, and deflected from the path to perdition, Zachary felt himself called to the vocation of reforming a sinful world. Viscountess Knutsford, *The Life and Letters of Zachary Macaulay*, (Arnold, London, 1900), 5-11, quotes on 5 and 8.

3. Zachary's accounts of the horrors of slavery greatly interested his new relations, who hoped to lead a re-moralization of British society, and were trying to decide how the Empire would figure in their evangelical schemes. As the drama of the French Revolution unfolded across the Channel, these elite Evangelicals became increasingly fixated on the evils of slavery. Here indeed was a cause, which could mobilize the bourgeois idealism of men like Macaulay in reformist, non-revolutionary directions, and yet remain under Anglican, aristocratic control. A year earlier, 20,000 Mancunians had signed a petition against the slave trade. Now these earnest artisans, shopkeepers, and manufacturers had given up West Indian sugar in their tea. Grounded in humanitarianism, respectability and religion, their *cahiers des doléances* were all the more auspicious inasmuch as they deflected attention away from the privileges of the English landlord, and saved their indictments for the despotic slavelords across the sea. The challenge was to harness popular energies in a manner that would reinforce the power of England's enlightened patricians, while avoiding the Parisian politics of the brickbat and the street. In the bundle of bourgeois energy (and recovering slavedriver) that was Zachary Macaulay, Babington and his fellow Evangelicals had found an indispensable assistant.

Reginald Coupland, *Wilberforce: A Narrative*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1923), 1-176; Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1961), 1-186; Seymour Drescher, *Capitalism and Anti-Slavery: British Mobilization in Comparative Perspective*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986); Clare Midgley, *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780-1870*, (Routledge, London, 1992); Christopher L. Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism*, (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2006).

The Sierra Leone experiment seemed the perfect opportunity to draw the skills of a man like Zachary. He had turned the horrors of slavery into an opportunity for redemption, and Sierra Leone would (hopefully) do the same. In 1792, a group of London philanthropists formed a committee to raise funds for the new colony. The freedmen settlers would clear their own farmlands, build an entrepôt for European shipping, and – through a mixture of Christianity and commerce -- help to spread European civilization through Africa's dark, interior lands. A chartered company was formed, which raised an impressive £235,280 in capital from British investors who wagered that profits and proselytism could be combined. About two thousand settlers were persuaded to emigrate to the new colony, called Freetown, where they would obtain work, land, and even representative institutions (modeled on those of the ancient Anglo-Saxons). Nevertheless, final authority would be vested in an appointed Governor sent out from London. The first Governor, John Clarkson, was already familiar with (and generally trusted by) the black settlers. This made Thornton and Wilberforce nervous. A more reliable deputy was needed, who would ultimately replace Clarkson as Governor. They wanted someone who would be skilled at managing these 'semi-civilized' Negroes, and who would be more responsive to the interests of the London Company. Thornton and Wilberforce did not need to think twice about the most suitable candidate: Zachary Macaulay was their man. Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 12-57; Christopher Fyfe, *A History of Sierra Leone*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1962), 1-58.

4. The contradictions of the Sierra Leone project were inherent in its very name, since Freetown was haunted by the omnipresence of its opposite, the institution of slavery, which permeated the surrounding time and space. The first and second British Empires may have been logically incompatible, but they were chronologically overlapping, as we have already seen. In the case of Freetown, this fact was geographically inescapable, since the Colony had been sited only a few miles from Bance Island, Britain's major African slave processing center. This odd geographical juxtaposition was probably deliberate. Sierra Leone had a harbor that European ships could navigate, and there was a longstanding European presence in the region. Moreover, the local chiefs were habituated to dealing with Europeans, and knew enough English to make communication possible. Perhaps it was also felt that the presence of Freetown at the very center of the slave trade might offer a salutary counterweight to the culture of sin. Unfortunately, during the early years, the influence ran at least as strongly the other way. Citizens of Freetown routinely

watched as the (still perfectly legal) traffic in flesh passed before them, unable to do anything but wring their hands in dismay. Harboring fugitive slaves was a risky undertaking that left the colony open to counter-raids or reprisals. More significantly, the slave trade was extremely profitable, whereas Freetown proved to be a money-losing proposition from the start. Working for the slavers was always a temptation when other employments fell through. In his *Journal*, Macaulay recorded the names of settlers whom he suspected of secretly working for the slavers. He did not notice that his own apparently amicable socialization with the English Governor of Bance Island, might be interpreted in the same way. Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 43, 46-7, 54-89, 127-8, 164-6, 174; Fyfe, *History of Sierra Leone*, 59-61.

As the war in Europe deepened, however, the pollution of the slavers was alarmingly compounded by the menace of the French. Macaulay and the settlers had seen Africa as an escape from the furnace of Revolution, but they soon found that their new home was not exempt from its flames. In September 1794, a fleet of seven French ships appeared in Freetown Harbor. Disgorging several companies of Jacobin sailors, they proceeded to loot the extensive stores that the British Company had stocked up. Then, when there was nothing left to trash, they burned down the town. After this debacle, Freetown was slow to recover. The London Company, which lost almost all of its capital, was determined to start making money for its shareholders. Thus, Macaulay was instructed to charge the settlers quitrents for their plots. This demand sparked a near rebellion, as the settlers bitterly protested that they had been promised *free* land. When Macaulay admonished them for their ingratitude, their indignation rose: after risking their lives for the Crown, they believed that they were being cheated and oppressed all over again. Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 54-56, 77-8, 90-215, esp. 145; Clifford, *From Slavery to Freetown*, 105-215; Fyfe, *History of Sierra Leone*, 13-87.

Since Macaulay regarded most white Europeans as morally deficient, it is not surprising that he found many of the black settlers to be inadequate as well. His cold, inflexible manners did not endear him to his constituents, and tended to obscure his better qualities -- his desire to obtain the active consent of those he governed, and his freedom from overt racial prejudice. The problems of Freetown went beyond mere personalities, however. They were the product of the incoherence and inconsistency underlying the settlement's original aims. To introduce institutions of representative self-government into a colony, and then to invest the London appointed Governor with absolute power was, as in Edgeworth's Ireland, a recipe for constant political conflict and confusion.

While the original goals of the settlement may have been admirable, they were too ambitious and amorphous. What exactly was the experiment supposed to prove? Was Freetown intended to test economic alternatives to the slave trade? Was its purpose to establish sugar plantations that employed free labor, or to introduce new crops such as coffee, cinnamon, or cotton, as alternatives to the traffic in human flesh? Was it supposed to open up a direct, European trade with the interior, circumventing the coastal chiefs who were deeply implicated in the slave trade? Or

was it intended to influence these chiefs, to turn them away from the slave trade, and to convert them to British values and Christianity? Was the purpose of Freetown to serve as a staging ground for missionary activity in the African interior? Or was it a City on a Hill -- a model of what was possible in racial relations - the first wave in a tide of black Puritans who would take back Africa and cut the jungles down?

The problem with Freetown was that it was trying to accomplish all these objectives, and was not accomplishing any of them very well. Given his own evangelical leanings, Macaulay seems initially to have been attracted to the puritan vision of self-reliant, self-governing black farmers, seeding the continent with British values and hard work. The fact that many of the settlers were devout Christians was one of the features that had attracted him in the first place. In the event, the British Colonial Governor was disappointed by this democratic surfeit of evangelical faith. He found the numerous Nonconformist preachers (both black and white) to be turbulent and self-righteous. They were paranoid and seditious, he bitterly complained. Perhaps they reminded him too much of the man he might have become had the Babington connection not elevated him to his new status as imperial adjutant. Religious zeal, which was supposed to be the driving force behind the Sierra Leone experiment, was in the end the major factor in bringing it to grief. Ironically, by the time he left, Macaulay had grown disillusioned with the black settlers, and put his hopes for the future on the indigenous African chiefs. He was favorably impressed with their manners and intelligence, and concluded that they held the key to Africa's future. Though most of them participated in the slave trade, many were uneasy with that unholy commerce, and welcomed the Freetown experiment in trying to root it out. Macaulay regarded their willingness to send their children to Britain for a Western, Christian education as an auspicious portent. When he finished his term as Governor, he took a group of aristocratic African children back with him, setting them up in British boarding schools. Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 32-52, 121, 127, 196-215. Fyfe, *History of Sierra Leone*, 13-87.

After Macaulay returned home to England, he continued his involvement in Sierra Leone from afar. In 1809, when the colony was transferred to the Crown, he set himself up as an international merchant, attempting to demonstrate how a post-slave trading Africa could be integrated into the British economy. After 1802, Thornton, Wilberforce, Macaulay, and several other distinguished Anglican Evangelicals had established residences together on the edge of Clapham Common. Here they were in constant communication with one another, and only a stone's throw away from Westminster and the City. Over the next two decades, these 'Claphamites' embarked on a remarkable array of public and private projects of improvement. Taking key elements of the Edgeworth reforming program, the Evangelicals anglicized them, institutionalized them, and projected them onto a national and imperial plane. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians*, 187-316; Coupland, *Wilberforce*, 178-343.

Given his indefatigable industry and attention to detail, Zachary was drafted as a key figure in the forming and operating of the Church Missionary Society (1799), the British and Foreign Bible Society (1804), The African Institution (1807), and the National Society for the Education of the Poor (1811). Nevertheless, amidst all this flurry of philanthropic activity, Antislavery continued to absorb the greatest part of Macaulay's energy, and always remained closest to his heart. In 1807, when the British slave trade was abolished, Macaulay and his 'Saints' redirected their movement to the goal of abolishing the institution of bondage itself. Other nations had to be persuaded to close off the slave market, and this was difficult as long as Europe was engulfed in war. New committees were formed, new petition campaigns were organized, and new politicians were cultivated to introduce new bills. By 1833, when slavery was finally proscribed throughout the British Empire, Macaulay was old, infirm, and nearly bankrupt. Preoccupied with the work of the abolitionist movement, he had neglected his own business. In 1826, his financial affairs were thrown into disarray in the same credit crisis that had brought down Sir Walter Scott. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians*, 317-533; Coupland, *Wilberforce*, 346-517; Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 216-489, especially 241-2.

6. Like the other Claphamites, Zachary Macaulay saw himself embarked on an ambitious project to comprehend metropolitan and colonial reform in a single unified frame. Of all the Clapham reforming projects, anti-slavery was the one that gained the most attention and garnered the greatest support. By contrast, the Claphamites' domestic reform schemes encountered severe resistance, particularly when they proposed to create a national system of working class elementary education within the institutional structures of the Anglican Church. In the new industrial cities, the nonconformist middle class was not about to allow the Church a monopoly in such matters. In the countryside, many members of the Anglican Tory gentry were still wary of popular education in any form. Clearly, the ability of the Clapham Saints to bridge these two groups was limited, at least within Britain's shores. On the other hand, the various Clapham imperial projects -- the Bible and Missionary Societies, and the denominational schools -- went essentially uncontested. With so many lands to penetrate and so many souls to save, government and religion had to cooperate. There was work enough for every sect and every hand. Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth Century England*, (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1999); Andrew Porter, *Religion versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700 - 1914*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004), 1-162; Theodore Koditschek, *Class Formation and Urban Industrial Society: 1750-1850*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990).

7. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944) famously argued that slave labor had ceased to be profitable on the sugar plantations by the end of the eighteenth century. In the last three decades this has been disputed by Seymour Drescher *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of*

Abolition, (University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1977), and some of the essays in Barbara L. Solow and Stanley Engerman eds., *British Capitalism and Caribbean Slavery: The Legacy of Eric Williams*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987). For a modern reworking of the 'Williams Thesis' see Joseph E. Inikori, *Africans and the Industrial Revolution in England: A Study in International Trade and Economic Development*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002), especially 2-9.

It might be argued that the triumph of separate spheres actually narrowed the range of middle class gender identities during this period. In a sense, this is undoubtedly true. Yet, if *individuals* were increasingly trapped in more constraining gender identities, the *meaning* of the gendered spheres themselves could be contested, and ultimately transformed into launching pads for novel masculine and feminine activities and roles. See Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987), 416-54.

8. Personal redemption and social elevation had enabled Zachary to apply his newfound skills of spiritual self-scrutiny to the task of judging and correcting all the 'less advanced' British subjects of every color and creed. Knutsford, *Zachary Macaulay*, 250-68. If Christianity provided an idiom for this kind of cross-cultural moral assessment, its significance – as we saw in our earlier examination of the Edgeworths – went far beyond the confines of the religious sphere. This change might be seen as an instance of the larger epistemological shift that Michel Foucault sees occurring from a regime of punishment to one of discipline, during this same time period, *Discipline and Punish*, (Vintage, New York, 1977).

10. In Africa and the Caribbean, a trans-racial paternity (or even fraternity) was indeed imagined, at least during the first half of the nineteenth century, when Nonconformist missionaries believed that the conversion of natives and former slaves, would turn them into respectable Protestant Christians culturally just like themselves. Gradual disillusionment with this outcome during the second half of the nineteenth century resulted in the family metaphor being gradually withdrawn, supplanted by the distancing language of racial otherness. Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2002), 69-264; Jean and John Comaroff, *Of Revolution and Revelation: Christianity, Colonialism and Consciousness in South Africa*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1991), vol. I.

11. So, far from understanding the military and political dangers of British interference in Indian religion, Zachary Macaulay envisioned Christian proselytizing as *compensation* for the legacy of British aggressions and interference in the military and political realms. "The Hindus have sufficiently felt the superiority of our Arms;

but this feeling varies with the vicissitudes of war, and would vanish with a single defeat. . . . Our commercial and mechanical superiority, on the contrary, will exercise a more lasting influence and, if left to itself, will obtain for us a peaceful and bloodless victory. Let our people, as far as national security permits, beat their swords into plowshares; let them go forth with a Bible in one hand, and the loom in the other." *The Christian Observer*, 8, 1809, February, 84.

15. On the subject of his own personal approach to religion, T.B. Macaulay played his cards very close to his chest. During his time in India he boasted to his aging father, nineteen months before Zachary's death that

No Hindoo who has received an English education ever continues to be seriously attached to his religion, the Hindoo religion is so extravagantly absurd, it is impossible to teach a boy astronomy, geography, natural history, without completely destroying the hold which that religion has on his mind. It is sufficient to prove that the world does not rest on the back of a tortoise, or is not composed of concentric circles of wine and cake and milk, and . . . the religion is gone. Thomas Pinney, ed., *The Letters of Thomas Babington Macaulay*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976), III, 193.

If this was intended to leave the impression that the son shared his father's evangelical proclivities, it was unlikely to have had the intended effect. Zachary surely suspected that Tom was at best a weak Christian, who did not believe that the refutation of Hinduism would lead most Indians to a Protestant point of view. Throughout his career, Macaulay strenuously objected to all efforts to bring religion into politics, which he depicted as disastrous both from an historian's and a politician's point of view. Indeed, his insistence on toleration extended beyond the limits of Christianity, and his maiden speech in Parliament was a plea to end the civil disabilities of Jews. Although deeply versed in the *history* of theology, there is considerable evidence that Macaulay found the entire subject pointless, leaving hints that he regarded the existence and/or character of a deity as a question beyond the scope of human knowledge. In the words of his grand nephew, the historian G.M. Trevelyan, "Macaulay never put on record his ultimate convictions on religion, and probably never formulated them to himself. Perhaps the term 'agnostic,' in the stricter sense of that misused word, might have fitted him." One certainly has the sense, in reading many passages in Macaulay, of a writer who is being exceedingly careful to say nothing that he regards as absolutely false, while simultaneously saying nothing that might offend the conventional pieties of his day. G.M. Trevelyan, *Sir George Otto Trevelyan: A Memoir*, (Longmans, New York, 1932), 15. See also, John Clive, *Macaulay, The Shaping of the Historian*, (Knopf, New York, 1973), 248-51, 411-13; G.O. Trevelyan, *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, (Oxford University Press, London, [1876], 1932), I, 260-1, II, 9; as well as in Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976), 3-21; and Timothy Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage:*

Interpretations of a Discordant Past, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995), 53-92.

16. On Macaulay's youthful reading of Scott, see Amy Cruse, *The Englishman and His Books in the Early Nineteenth Century*, (Harrap, London, 1930), 230-1. For an interesting study of father-son relationships among early nineteenth century British intellectuals see Bruce Mazlish, *James and John Stuart Mill: Father and Son in the Nineteenth Century*, (Basic, New York, 1975). 33. For brief overviews of Macaulay's historical writings see John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent, Victorian Historians and the English Past*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981), 11-93; Owen Dudley Edwards, *Macaulay*, (St. Martin's New York, 1988); and Peter Gay, *Style in History*, (Basic, New York, 1974). See also C. H. Firth, *A Commentary on Macaulay's History of England*, (Cass, London, 1964).

19. Among the ancients, Herodotus was deemed to have exhibited too much imagination, while Thucydides (whom Macaulay later came to view more favorably) was deemed to have been excessively rationalistic. For the next two thousand years, their successors had simply replicated these fundamental imbalances, with more or less imagination and better or worse scholarship. Finally, in the eighteenth century, there had been a major breakthrough in the rationalist approach to history. During the enlightenment, Gibbon, Robertson and Hume had produced masterpieces of philosophical history which had "far excel[led] their predecessors in the art of deducing general principles from facts." Unfortunately, the *philosophes* had gone too far in this direction, force-fitting the facts to match their theories, and neglecting the subjective and circumstantial dimensions of history, which required imagination and aesthetic sense. The true historian had to be not only scientific and analytical. He had also to become an artist, and an effective narrator, who could create a vivid and authentic *tableau*. T.B. Macaulay, "History," *Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches*, (Longmans, London, 1897), 135-59. Quote on 153. For Macaulay's historical valuation of ancient Greek (and especially Athenian) society, see "On Athenian Orators," and "On Mitford's History of Greece," *Miscellaneous Writings*, 72-79, 87-105, especially the panygeric on page 101-2.

22. "The perfect historian" Macaulay concluded, "is he in whose work the spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature. He relates no fact, he attributes no expression to his characters, which is not authenticated by sufficient testimony. But, by judicious selection, rejection and arrangement, he gives to truth those attractions which have hitherto been usurped by fiction. In his narrative a due subordination is observed: some transactions are prominent, others retire. But the scale on which he represents them is increased or diminished, not according to the dignity of the persons concerned in them, but according to the degree in which they elucidate the condition of society and the nature of man. He shows us the court, the camp and the senate. But he shows us also the nation. He considers no anecdote, no peculiarity,

no familiar saying, as too insignificant for his notice which is not too insignificant to illustrate the operation of laws, of religion, and of education, and to mark the progress of the human mind." "History," *Miscellaneous Writings*, 157. See also Macaulay's speeches on copyright, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 609-23.

23. "I am no great admirer of this monastic life," he complained. "I love the cheerful blaze of a domestic hearth, and the reciprocation of mixed connection and mixed company too well to relish the state to which I am necessarily doomed." *Letters of Macaulay*, I, 106.

24. "The affection which I bear to you and Hannah," he wrote to Margaret, in 1831, "is the source of the greatest enjoyment that I have in the world. It is my strongest feeling. It is that which will determine the whole course of my life." TBM. to M. Macaulay, 8/6, 1831, in *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 85. This hungering after the chaste domesticity of unconsumatable love was characterized by Macaulay himself as "behaving with all the weakness of a woman in my heart," TBM to H. Macaulay, 7/13, 1831, *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 69. However, after Margaret married, her brother saw fit to reproach her in terms more appropriate to a jilted lover. "The wound is still fresh, no successor comes to occupy your place. You are as necessary to me as when I used to call for you every day." A year later, when Hannah followed her sister to the altar, the doubly jilted brother bewailed, "The world is a desert to me, I have nothing to live for." The worst, however, was still to come, a few months later, when Macaulay learned of Margaret's death. "Even now," he acknowledged, three years later, "I cannot bear to talk of her. The sight of anything that was hers is too much for me." TBM to Margaret Macaulay, 11/26, 1832, *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 203; TBM to Margaret Cropper née Macaulay), 1/2, 1834, *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 8; TBM to Margaret Cropper, 12/24, 1834, *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 114; Clive, *Macaulay*, 257-88, 301-2. TBM to Edward Cropper, 11/5, 1837, *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 231.

25. According to his nephew, when Macaulay and his sister "were discoursing about a work of history or biography, a bystander would have supposed that they had lived in the times of which the author treated, and had a personal acquaintance with every human being who was mentioned in his pages." Trevelyan, *Life and Letters*, I, 121. Macaulay's propensity for daydreaming and romance is discussed by John Clive, in *Not by Fact Alone: Essays on the Writing and Reading of History*, (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1989), 68-73, 184, 198-9, 261-2.

27. Unlike Scott, Macaulay had neither the luxury of inventing his characters, nor the inclination to enter into a dialogue with his readers that involved telling and retelling the story in different ways. In examining the relationship between authors and audiences in the nineteenth century, I have found the following to be especially

useful: Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution*, (Chatto and Windus, London, 1961); Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957); Jon P. Klancher, *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832*, (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1987); N.N. Feltes, *Modes of Production of Victorian Novels*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1986); J.W. Saunders, *The Profession of English Letters*, (Routledge, London, 1964); and John Gross, *The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters*, (Penguin, London, 1991). For comparisons of Scott's and Macaulay's respective approaches to history see Ina Ferris, *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History and the Waverley Novels*, (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991), 195-237; and Mark Phillips, "Macaulay, Scott and the Literary Challenge to Historiography," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50, (1979), 117-133.

28. This engraving is reproduced on the cover/dust jacket of the present volume. It was inspired by Macaulay's reflections on the strange permanence of Rome, in his "Review of Ranke's *History of the Popes*" (1840); "She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's," T.B. Macaulay, *Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome*, (Longmans, London, 1899), 548. While visiting Rome, two years before writing this review, Macaulay had noted in his *Journal* that he was often wont "to indulge in a sort of reflection which I often fall into here [in Rome] the day may come when London, then dwindled to the dimensions of the Parish of St. Martins and supported in its decay by the expenditures of wealthy Patagonians and New Zealanders . . ." Quoted in Trevelyan, *Life and Letters*, I, 458.

29. The strange permanence of post-pagan (i.e. Catholic) Rome, on which Macaulay had mused (see supplementary note 28, above) had been based on the deathlike eternity of dogma. By contrast, the secular permanence that he hoped Greater Britain might achieve, would have to be grounded in material and intellectual progress. Progress might be facilitated by governments (or the right kind of empire) but, in the end, it depended on the initiative of individuals -- something whose pace might be regulated by institutions, but whose appearance could be expected in the nature of things. "No ordinary misfortune, no ordinary misgovernment will do so much to make a nation wretched, as the constant effort of every man to better himself will do to make a nation prosperous," *The History of England from the Accession of James II*, (Harper, New York, n.d.) in five volumes. Quote on I, 209. Different forms of government were appropriate for societies at different stages of improvement, and none could become permanent until progress became irreversible, and was therefore able to take on a life of its own. It is for this reason perhaps that Macaulay put "improvement" before "liberty" and believed that

modern liberty was sustainable only after a certain level of improvement has been achieved. For this reason also, he saw no possible contradiction between improvement and true liberty, and he believed that they naturally traveled hand in hand.

34. Hume (and therefore Macaulay) addressed the question of modern progress in the context of an extensive historiographical literature that had been developing during the early modern age. As early as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Jean Bodin had begun to grasp that the Europe of their own era was not merely restoring the glory of antiquity, but was embarked on a completely novel line of development -- attaining a completely unprecedented level of material wealth and technological mastery. J.B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, (Dover, New York, 1960); Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, (Columbia University Press, New York, 1945); Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*, (Dent, London, 1973).

40. Notwithstanding his reputation as Whig house intellectual, Macaulay was never really intimate with the Whig party leaders of his day. Only Lord Holland, then in retirement, elicited expressions of personal warmth, not as an active politician, but as the last living link with the glory days of Fox. Lady Holland, a formidable woman who kept the most important Whig salon, was clearly impressed by Macaulay's brilliance. He affected, at least in his letters to his sisters, to be somewhat wary of her, regarding her as too much of a bluestocking for his taste. Nevertheless, he was clearly flattered by her attentions, and there is no question but that her matronage was an invaluable aid in his political career. TBM to H. Macaulay, 7/11, 1831, *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 66-8; TBM to H. Macaulay, 7/25/1831, *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 76-8; TBM to H. Macaulay, 8/14, 1832, *Letters of Macaulay*, II, 180-2.

41. In emphasizing centrist "trimming" (rather than the idea of gradual social progress) as the animating principle of Macaulay's life and work, Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, makes him into more of a Burkean conservative than he actually was. Macaulay's youthful streak of at least rhetorical radicalism is downplayed by Hamburger, notwithstanding the evidence of it which he himself presents.

43. In a letter to his sister, in which he described the Governor-General's summer migration to the sub-Himalayan resort of Oocatomund, he quipped that the tigers, like the English, prefer to live in the mountains, but "encounter an uncongenial climate [in the plains] for the sake of what they can get." *Letters of Macaulay*, III, to Mrs. E. Cropper, July 6, 1834, 64.

45. Dismissing the storm of bigotry that this measure elicited, Macaulay made it clear that the second British Empire would have to be grounded on the principle of formal racial equality. "Unless we mean to leave the natives exposed to the tyranny and insolence of every profligate adventurer who may visit the East, we must place the Europeans under the same power which legislates for the Hindoo. . . . India has suffered enough already from the distinction of castes. God forbid that we should inflict on her the curse of a new caste, that we should send her a new breed of Brahmins, authorized to treat all the native population as Paraias." Macaulay, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 566-7. To the charge that native judges were prone to corruption, Macaulay riposted that, if true, it provided all the more reason why Britons should be made to take an interest in the removal of the evil. "Many a grievance which would pass unredressed because unknown while only some thousands of natives feel it, will be forced to the notice of the government as soon as one of our countrymen smarts from it." C. H. Darkhar ed., *Lord Macaulay's Legislative Minutes*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1946), 190-1.

47. Given the similarity between the ways in which James Mill and T.B. Macaulay responded to India, and the fact that they had to work together closely on Indian affairs, it is interesting to consider the evolution of their relationship to one another. Five years before going to India, Macaulay had attacked Mill in a slashing review, which remorselessly depicted the older man as a desiccated Benthamite ideologue who dogmatically exaggerated the primacy of abstract reason, while obliviously ignoring the more concrete (but less calculable) attributes of human nature; imagination, sentiment, domesticity, and romance. Mill, Macaulay charged, was "an Aristotelian of the Fifteenth Century, born out of due season," and utterly out of touch with the realities of the world. "We have here," the brash reviewer mocked, "an elaborate treatise on Government, from which . . . it would not appear that the author was aware that any governments actually existed among men." Macaulay, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 160-83, quote on 161.

In the English context, Mill's neglect of history and domesticity -- particularity and romance -- made him an easy figure of fun. One can imagine Macaulay rehearsing his barbs around the family hearth with his sisters, drawing peals of laughter all around. In India, by contrast, where history was dark and domesticity degraded, romance was a dangerous, enervating indulgence. Hence, in the Indian context, Macaulay was happy to acquiesce in Mill's coldly rationalistic point of view. It was without any apparent irony that he pronounced Mill's anti-romantic, counter-historical *History of India*, "on the whole, the greatest historical work which has appeared in our language since Gibbon." The fact that Mill endorsed his appointment as Legal Member and seemed to hold no personal grudge against him also impressed Macaulay. Although he could never quite bring himself to apologize, he came to regard Mill as a valuable ally in pressing forward with an aggressively modernizing Indian policy. Macaulay, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 557; Clive, *Macaulay*, 126-31, 310-11.

Once Macaulay was installed in Calcutta, Mill generally agreed with the positions he took; however, he rejected Macaulay's arguments about the need to anglicize higher education (see next paragraph in text) because he regarded vernacular instruction as the most efficient way to convey modern knowledge to Indian children. This suggests that whereas Macaulay's cultural anglocentrism was deliberate and self-conscious, Mill's was merely incidental and implicit. Mill's primary commitment was to modernization, whereas Macaulay was much more heavily invested in the belief that modernization could only be implemented through culturally anglocentric forms.

48. Both in its substance, and in the aggressiveness with which it was pressed, Macaulay's *Minute* became an example of his high-handedness at its worst. After only a short period as Chair of the Education Committee, he promulgated it out of the blue and forced it on the Committee against a majority who were opposed. Throughout the entire process he remained unmoved, even after the extent (and the counter-arguments) of the opposition became clear. Although Legislative Council deliberations were secret, a rumor was leaked that Macaulay had convinced the Viceroy, Lord Bentinck, to abolish the Calcutta Madrasa, and Hindu Sanskrit College, by arbitrary fiat. "The whole town of Calcutta was in a ferment," H.T. Prinsep reported. "In the course of two days, a petition, respectful in language but strong in the points to which it adverted [pleading for the maintenance of oriental studies] was signed by upwards of eight thousand educated Mohommedans, and a similar petition in behalf of the Sanskrit College was under preparation by the Hindus." Because Macaulay had already gained repute as an advocate for Indian rights, his position on education seemed shocking to Indian opinion. In the later words of R.K. Das-Gupta, he was "one of the most honest Englishmen that ever came to India," and yet it was for his "rash statements" that "slighted Indian culture, and calumniated the Bengalis" that posterity had remembered him; *English Poets on India, and other Essays*, (Book House, Calcutta, n.d.); H.T. Prinsep, "Diary Extract", in H. Sharp ed., *Selection from Educational Records*, I, 1781-1839, (Government Printing, Calcutta, 1920), 137-8; David Kopf, *British Orientalism and the Bengali Renaissance: The Dynamics of Indian Modernization*, (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969), 1-216.

Macaulay's breathtaking disregard of Indian opinion, and his astonishing certainty that he possessed the key to Indian progress, has to be situated in the larger imperial context of 1835. After three astonishing years of political reform within Britain, the reforming impulse seemed to be spreading to the colonies, and reactionary establishments everywhere seemed on the point of collapse. In the West Indies, slavery had been abolished, and the half-way house of compulsory apprenticeship was about to be revoked. In the Colonial Office, the son of Charles Grant (now Lord Glenelg) had just been appointed cabinet minister, while the son of James Stephen (also James Stephen) was recruited as permanent secretary. In Jamaica, by all appearances, Baptist missionaries were converting tens of thousands of freedmen, transforming them into respectable black Britons, with British religion,

work discipline, and habits of domesticity. In South Africa, a new breed of imperial administrators seemed on the verge of brokering a compromise between natives and enlightened settlers, in which the latter would give up their propensity towards oppression and extermination, while the former would accept that their only hope for survival was to embrace habits of work discipline and settled patterns of domestic economy, and to place themselves in British tutelary hands. Properly treated, the semi-official Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Protection argued that 'savage' Africans could be gradually absorbed into civilization, and enlightened settlers would gain hard-working agricultural hands. The opening up of a vast new settler Empire in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere gave promise that the same principles might be extended on a global scale.

Given this range of projects and initiatives -- some forty-two years after Zachary Macaulay had set foot on the mud-paths of Freetown -- it was not unreasonable for his overweening son to imagine that the once fragile experiment in anglocentric liberal imperialism had become an automatic recipe of universal applicability. In other words, the hubris of Macaulay's *Minute on Education* was not simply a reflection of its author's personal arrogance. It was also fuelled by the momentum of a hegemonic ideology. That the hegemony would be brief, and the universality would soon be questioned was something that few anticipated in 1835.

49. Homi Bhabha *The Location of Culture*, (Routledge, London, 1994), 87, points out that Macaulay's vision -- itself a mimic of Charles Grant's -- can only imagine the anglicized Indian as a mimic of himself. If we consider that Macaulay was actually an Anglo-Scot, the irony of this mimicry is further deepened, albeit in a manner that somewhat deflects the astringency of Bhabha's barb, since Macaulay is only demanding of the Indian what he has already accomplished. The difference lies not, as Bhabha would have it, in the mere act of mimicry, but in the costs that this mimicry exacts on one's identity and self-integrity, relative to the benefits it confers by way of compensation. It is in this sense (as I show in the next few pages) that Macaulay is demanding a sacrifice from the Indian that he has never been obliged to make himself.

50. Macaulay, "Minute on Education," 5-6. The impact of Macaulay's *Minute* on higher education in India is traced in Arthur Mayhew, *The Education of India*, (Faber and Gwynn, London, 1926), and Bruce McCully, *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism*, (Peter Smith, Gloucester Massachusetts, 1966). For a full study of the discipline of English Studies that grew up in India on the foundation of Macaulay's *Minute*, see Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*, (Columbia University Press, New York, 1989), especially 70, 95, 165. See also Stephan Evans, "Macaulay's Minute Revisited: Colonial Language Policy in Nineteenth-Century India," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23/4, (2002), 260-281.

Viswanathan shows how the virtual worship of English literature was offered to India's educated elites during the second half of the nineteenth century as a tacit anglocentric alternative to the now discredited strategy of seeking their conversion to Christianity. Macaulay, for his part, was determined that English education in India should impart a genuine love of imaginative British literature, rather than a mere set of technical or linguistic skills. "Give a boy a Robinson Crusoe" he expostulated. "That is worth all the grammars of rhetoric and logic in the world. We ought to procure such books as are likely to give the [Indian] children a taste for the literature of the west." Quoted in Trevelyan, *Life and Letters*, I, 377-8.

When reading Macaulay's reflections on prize books for Indian students it is worth remembering that this was the very moment when his mind was crystalizing the outline of, and agenda for, his own great project of the "perfect [English] history." "Goldsmith's *Histories* of Greece and Rome are miserable performances," he complained, and second rate eighteenth century poets and dramatists hardly improved the fare for Indian boys. In student recitations, he found the pupils to be generally well crammed, but deficient in any real historical understanding. "We are attempting to introduce a great nation to a knowledge of the richest and noblest literature in the world." Why waste money on turgid textbooks and sanctimonious tracts for self-help? "A prize book ought to be a book which a boy receives with pleasure, and turns over and over, not as a task, but spontaneously." "We are attempting to raise a large class of enlightened natives," he concluded. "I hope that, twenty years hence, there will be hundreds, nay thousands, of natives familiar with the best models of composition, and well acquainted with western science." Quoted in Trevelyan, *Life and Letters*, I, 379-80. See also S.C. Sanial, "Macaulay in Lower Bengal," *Calcutta Review*, 225, (1906), 480.

53. As the Kiskey/Quongti fantasy indicates, the younger Macaulay continued to subscribe to his father's principle of universal equality, attributing apparent differences in level of civilization to the workings of culture, discrimination, and history. In 1827, when he was still heavily under the influence of his father, Macaulay even went so far as to publish an essay "On the Social and Industrial Capacity of Negroes," in the *Edinburgh Review*, XC, March 1827, 383-423. In this piece, Macaulay categorically denied that West Indian slaves were any less inherently intelligent or industrious than white Europeans. If the black slave was degraded, it was because slavery had degraded him. Grant him freedom and opportunity, and he would speedily acquire knowledge, independence, and self-control. Even the supposed antipathy of white women against intimate connection with black men was a matter of caste and class rather than of race. Remove from the black man his stigma of low status and diminished economic prospects, and white women would readily enter into interracial marriages. This essay was one of the few never reprinted in his subsequent essay collections.

54. The evolution of Macaulay's youthful political radicalism is somewhat elusive, especially inasmuch as the middle aged Whig made some efforts to cover his youthful tracks. As we have seen (notes 29, and 54, *infra*), there is compelling evidence that Macaulay at least toyed with radical, revolutionary ideas in the aftermath of Peterloo, in 1819-20. At Cambridge, the influence of Charles Austin also exposed him to radical utilitarian ideas, which influenced him considerably, his blistering attack on James Mill notwithstanding. At some point, in his twenties, he was even quoted as saying "I have been a Tory; I am a radical, but I will never be a Whig." Famous last words! See John Clive, *Macaulay*, 45-95, 125-34; Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976), 120-5, 144-9, quote on 148; and Macaulay's "Mill on Government," *Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches*, (Longmans, London, 1897), 160-83.

56. Macaulay's success in persuading himself of the essential continuity (and therefore utility) of English-cum-British history in 1834-5 must be juxtaposed against the reflections on Indian historical discontinuity that were simultaneously occupying his mind. It is certainly striking that though Macaulay found his educational work in Calcutta to be the most rewarding of his imperial missions, this work was a mere sideline to his main appointment as Legal Member of Council – a position whose duties were centered first and foremost on the task of completing Elphinstone's comprehensive Legal Code for British India. It is clear from his many complaints in letters home that Macaulay found this work of codification to be both dull and daunting, and the fact that at the time of his departure he left the Code still rudimentary and incomplete lent to his final 1837 Report a certain weary, defensive tone: the Law Commission had gotten a late start, he acknowledged, and then illness had incapacitated, at one time or another, every member but himself. Whole sections had to be rewritten again and again, on several occasions, as new facts and circumstances came to light. Given the complexity and diversity of India, even the ablest English jurist would be defeated, and his very "terseness of style and correctness of distinctions" would "leave great classes of evils wholly unprovided for, and excite strong feelings of hostility among the native population." Macaulay, of course, recognized that a constitutional code could never be some pure Benthamite exercise in abstract equity, but "ought not to disregard even the prejudices of those for whom they legislate." "If we had found India in possession of a system of criminal law which the people regarded with partiality, we should have been inclined rather to ascertain it, digest it, and moderately to correct it than to propose a system fundamentally different." *Macaulay's Legislative Minutes*, 252-60, quotes on 257 and 260.

The problem, according to Macaulay, was that Indian Law was utterly chaotic; geographically fragmented, disconnected and contradictory in its manifold parts. Different people were subject to different legal obligations depending on their caste, religion, occupation and place of birth. If one looked to find any kind of a system "all those systems are foreign, all were introduced by conquerors differing in race, manners, language and religion from the great mass of the people." Despite

hundreds of years of historical experience Hindu Law (largely theocratic) had never been effectively merged with Mughal Law (largely military), nor had either really been assimilated by the population at large. In Britain, where history had melded a multitude of local customs over many centuries, an independent Judiciary had spontaneously arisen to act as constitutional adjudicator, as a check on executive authority, and as a defender of public liberty. In India, where the courts were riddled with cronyism and corruption, no such system was possible, and it would require the despotic imposition of an alien code by an enlightened conqueror to lay down the preconditions for some future liberty. No wonder Macaulay half-regretted having spend his Indian years on this (perhaps hopelessly) contradictory project, when he might rather have been teaching his colonial wards to substitute the continuitarian glories of English-cum-British history. *Macaulay's Legislative Minutes*, 260-71, quote on 260.

57. It is perhaps telling that when Macaulay first attempted to write a *History of England* for the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, in 1828, at the age of twenty-eight, his efforts proved abortive. Clive, *Macaulay*, 112. Only later, after he was able to refract the Whig progress narrative through his own political career and experience, could he return to this project in a more satisfactory intellectual frame.

58. Macaulay's wrestling with the claims of history writing over those of his political career are discussed by William Thomas, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000), 75-8, 145-61, 234-3. Nevertheless, I think Thomas goes too far in claiming that Macaulay always intended to make his mark as an historian, rather than as a politician. Indeed, his own evidence shows that Macaulay's commitment to history shifted and wavered during various periods of his life. It was only in the mid 1830s that he resolved to prioritize it over politics largely, as I argue, because he convinced himself that British liberal history was a vehicle for advancing British liberal politics by other (superior) means.

61. Macaulay was asked to stand as M.P. for Edinburgh after his return from India; an honor he was loath to refuse. However, his correspondence expresses annoyance with the unpleasantness of having to deal with his uncouth bourgeois constituents, *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 291-2, 313-4, 350-2, 355-60; IV, 108-112, 164, 185-90. Once he joined the Government he also complained about the extent to which his ministerial duties were interfering with his historical writing and research.

A cynical interpretation might suggest that Macaulay now (1839) realized that he was never likely to be chosen as Prime Minister by the Whig/Liberal Parliamentary coalition, therefore he diverted his highest ambitions into other spheres. However, there are good reasons for thinking that he was uneasy with many of the policies that, as Minister of War, he was forced to defend. His speech on Chartism betrays a

defensive tone in its efforts to justify the repression of a political movement whose goals he might not have opposed under more favorable circumstances. Most significantly, his ministerial duties compelled Macaulay to explain and defend Britain's prosecution of the first Opium War, in which the Royal Navy compelled the Chinese Government to allow British merchants to peddle Indian grown opium within their vast territories. This Macaulay did through a combination of Palmerstonian bluster, legal technicalities, and a rather twisted definition of free trade. On the Canadian Rebellion Macaulay was strangely silent, although he expressed strong support for the Durham Report. All this suggests a certain uneasiness with the imperatives of office, and a desire to return to the study, where the progress narrative could be articulated in a purer way. Macaulay, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 573-609, 623-41, 630; *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 264, 353-4.

64. Macaulay's publisher, Longmans, wanted to make reference to an 'Introductory Essay', but the historian refused to have his work divided in this way. G.O. Trevelyan, *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, (Harpers, New York, 1876), in two volumes, vol. II, 204; *Letters of Macaulay*, III, to Macvey Napier, July 20, 1838, 252. In 1844. After Macaulay began to concentrate full-time on his *History*, his contributions to the *Edinburgh Review* diminished, but many of the subjects that any eighteenth century *History* would have confronted, had already been examined by earlier essays, albeit in compressed form.

65. Although Macaulay's 'third chapter' in the *History*, I, 210-322, was innovative and original in many ways, it falls short of the highest standards twentieth century social history scholarship. Modern social history treats society in an analytical manner, with a view to explaining social transformations. By contrast, Macaulay's chapter is alternately descriptive and contrastive. In lieu of analysis, it merely juxtaposes the social conditions of the 1680s with those of Macaulay's own day. Indeed, by providing Macaulay with an excuse for neglecting social and economic factors in the body of his narrative, this third chapter may even have contributed to the narrowly political orientation of the remainder of the *History*.

66. Ghosh correctly observes that Macaulay failed to advance the highest standards of enlightenment historiography, which would have obliged him to keep the theme of social transformation more clearly in view. But is it fair to criticize Macaulay for failing to accomplish something which scarcely existed in his day? Macaulay's model for his *History* may have been more Thucydides than Gibbon, Robertson, Ferguson, Millar, or Smith. Nevertheless, his historiographical agenda precluded any simple return to the ancient classical tradition, since (as I have argued) it obliged him to juggle the three disjunct genres of classical epic, explanatory analysis, and domestic romance. To his credit, Macaulay himself was not unaware of his book's shortcomings. When the first two volumes were about to be published, he confessed to his sister that "when I compare my book to what I imagine that History

ought to be, I feel dejected and ashamed; but when I compare it with some histories which have a high repute, I feel reassured." *Letters of Macaulay*, III, 372, TBM to Lady Trevelyan, 10/24/1848. See also Firth, *Commentary on Macaulay's History*.

67. As I hope my own analysis demonstrates, this 'gendering' is Macaulay's preferred technique for controlling his material -- but also for masking his failure to achieve this control. There is indeed something ultimately circular about Macaulay's invocation of 'manliness' to affirm the political centrism that he favors, while simultaneously affirming as 'manly', whatever political behavior he happens to approve. Had Macaulay given up this rhetorical crutch, he might have been forced to strive for more analytical rigor, exploring when compromise works, and when it does not. This would have required understanding why centrism sometimes succeeds, and other times fails, and why there can be no single 'Whiggish' formula for the satisfactory fusion of order with liberty. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, 72-5. See also, Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, 1-48. That said, for all its intellectual deficiencies, Macaulay's gendering of the narrative is often rhetorically effective. In one of his most telling passages, Macaulay explains how the sharp swings in religion and politics that characterized the entire period between 1640 and 1690 bred cynicism and duplicity in a whole generation of elites. "Hallam," *Essays*, 86-93. Even so, Macaulay's sympathy for such Machiavellian personality types is strictly limited. See his "Machiavelli," *Essays*, 28-50.

68. It is an instructive feature of Macaulay's *History* that this now middle-aged Whig historian of the mid-Victorian era can no longer sympathize with the original Whigs of the seventeenth century. There is about those discontented men of the Stuart opposition still a faint whiff of grapeshot or, alternatively, of the smoke-filled room. In Macaulay's accounts of the middle class agitators, the air of hysteria is so thick, the reader feels trapped. Worst of all, however, are the Scottish Presbyterian Covenanters (Macaulay's own remote ancestors and, perhaps, his current constituents) -- a contentious pack of 'austere fanatics'; who wreck every enterprise they join with their incessant sectarian wrangling, and who poison every atmosphere they enter with their foul odor of sanctity. The historian's sympathies are not with these meddlesome malcontents. Rather, they are with the stolid and sensible Tory gentlemen who had no desire to stir up trouble, and no original intention to resist. In Macaulay's eyes, the only flaw in these respectable property-owners is their misguided attachment to the outmoded doctrine of divine right monarchy. "During many years the zeal of the English Tory for hereditary monarchy and his zeal for established religion had grown up together and strengthened one another. It had never occurred to him that these two sentiments, which seemed inseparable and even identical, might one day be found to be not only distinct, but incompatible." Macaulay, *History*, I, 180-93, 336-8, II, 339-61, III, 438-9, quote on 439.

Contemptuously disdainful of the intellectual presumption of Whig contract theoreticians, these respectable Tory gentlemen were driven to the extremity of disobedience to their sovereign only when their property was endangered and their Protestant religion was attacked. Forced by circumstances to demand their freedom, and compelled by oppression to defend their rights, England's landed gentlemen became that oxymoron: the conservative revolutionary. "Oppression speedily did what philosophy and eloquence would have failed to do. The system of Filmer might have survived the attacks of Locke: but it never recovered from the death blow given by James." Macaulay, *History*, II, 302, 507-8.

69. "As our Revolution was a vindication of ancient rights, so it was conducted with strict attention to ancient formalities. . . . The only question was, in what sense those traditions were to be understood." Macaulay, *History*, II, 510.

70. On the Anglocentrism of much seventeenth century "British" historiography, see Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1990), 26-57; *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991), 1-70; and J. G. A. Pocock, "The Limits and Division of British History: In Search of an Unknown Subject," *American Historical Review*, 87/2, (April, 1982), 311-36. Most recently, see the review essays by David Armitage, Jane Ohlmeyer, Ned Lansman, Eliga Gould, and the commentary on J. G. A. Pocock, in *American Historical Review*, 104/2, (April, 1999).

71. Although Macaulay was greatly influenced by the four-stages theory of social evolution, his narrative strategy for making this discursive leap draws more directly on the imaginative emplotments of Scott, see Clive, *Macaulay*, 105-7; Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, 28-48. In particular, in Scotland, where the constitutional crisis between King and parliament precipitated a tribal war between long-feuding ancient clans, it is the author of *Waverley* who guides the British historian in his excursions through the peaks and glens. Here, the historian triumphantly "reclaims those materials which the novelist has appropriated," to produce a masterful, empirically-grounded ethnography of the Highland kin networks that transcends the novelists picturesque romance. Macaulay, *History*, III 196-299. But see also my strictures in supplementary note 102, *infra*.

In Macaulay's hands, the four-stages model of improvement becomes itself a kind of romance. Consider, for example, the following assertion, not of Marx, or of Braudel, but of Macaulay; "The happiness of the many commonly depends on causes independent of victories or defeats, of revolutions, or restorations . . . causes which can be regulated by no laws, and which are recorded in no archives. . . . History without these is a shell without a kernel; and such is almost all the history which is extant in the world. Paltry skirmishes and plots are reported in absurd minuteness; but improvements the most essential to the comfort of human life

extend themselves into every cottage before any annalist can condescend from the dignity of writing about generals and ambassadors, to take the least note of them." "On Mitford's History of Greece," *Miscellaneous Writings*, 100.

75. There are some tantalizing hints in the later volumes of how Macaulay might have woven a line of analysis into his narrative. Consider, for example, his account of the sequence that eventually led to the creation of the Bank of England: "During the interval between the Restoration and the Revolution," he correctly recognized, "the riches of the nation had been rapidly increasing," and yet there were no safe investments, in the seventeenth century in which men with money could put their savings with the hope of a modest but secure three or four percent return. At the same time, the cost of government was rapidly increasing, as war created new and hitherto unprecedented budgetary strains.

How indeed was it possible that a debt should not have been contracted, when one party was impelled by the strongest motives to borrow, and another was impelled by equally strong motives to lend? A moment had arrived at which the government found it impossible, without exciting the most formidable discontents, to raise by taxation the supplies necessary to defend the liberty and independence of the nation; and at that very moment, numerous capitalists were looking round them in vain for some good mode of investing their savings, and for want of such a mode, were keeping their wealth locked up, or were lavishing it on absurd projects.

"Such," Macaulay concludes, "was the origin of that debt which has since become the greatest prodigy that ever perplexed the sagacity and confounded the pride of statesmen and philosophers." Macaulay, *History*, IV, 255-69, quotes on 255, 259, 261. In the end, it must be said, Macaulay simply capitulated to the perplexity of his subjects, and never quite penetrated to the phenomenon of state-parasitic rentier capitalism which came to dominate during the eighteenth century, and which preceded the productive industrial capitalism that he celebrated as the long-term outcome in his book. Macaulay himself half-recognized the paradox, in one flashing insight about the creation of the Bank of England, when he cited fears that "the powers of the purse, the one great security of all the rights of Englishmen, will be transferred from the House of Commons to the Governor and Directors of the New Company." In other words, the new capitalist forms that the Glorious Revolution would create (rentier, mercantilist and oligarchical) would endanger the very liberty that the Glorious Revolution had gained. Macaulay, *History*, IV, 393-404, quote on 399.

76. It might even be said that by giving, in these essays, desultory and incidental evidence of the way established eighteenth century Whigs devolved into an entrenched oligarchy increasingly divorced from popular sentiment and support, Macaulay calls into question the central premise of his own *History* that all the

fundamentals of political stability had been permanently resolved by 1688. In the late essays, what followed seems more like a reverberating dialectic, in which the Revolution Whigs degenerate into an oligarchy under Walpole. Then, in the third generation, the elder Pitt tries to revive the old populist Whiggism, only to have it checked posthumously by the Toryism of his son -- which then eventuates in another wave of reformism in the early nineteenth century.

This complex and heroically compromised pattern of development might have been made comprehensible had the historian been willing to buttress his narrative of the vicissitudes of high politics, with a probing analysis of the socio-economic transformation at work underneath. This, however, has already been precluded by the 'third' chapter of volume I, in the *History*, with its contrast between the England of the 1840s and that of 1688. Forestalled by this flat 'before' and 'after' comparison is any focus on the *process*, which has played itself out in the interim and which might provide an *explanation* of the *dynamics* of social change. Such an explanation would indeed have shown that the socio-economic liberalism of the mid-nineteenth century was *not* a direct product of the Glorious Revolution but, rather, a reaction against the corrupt, restrictive mercantilist aristocratic capitalism that the Glorious Revolution had set in place.

78. 'Clement' descendants of English 'wolves' might well take pride in the following account, but it is hard to imagine the Bengali 'sheep' finding much satisfaction in it.

On one side was a band of English functionaries, daring, intelligent and eager to be rich. On the other side was a great native population, helpless, timid, accustomed to crouch under oppression. To keep the stronger race from preying upon on the weaker was an undertaking which tasked to the utmost the talents and energy of Clive. . . . Against misgovernment such as afflicted Bengal it was impossible to struggle. The superior intelligence and energy of the dominant class made their power irresistible. A war of Bengalees against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, of men against demons. The only protection which the conquered could find was in the moderation, the clemency, the enlarged policy of the conquerors. That protection, at a later period [i.e. Macaulay's period] they found. But first English power came among them unaccompanied by English morality . . . During that interval the business of a servant of the Company was simply to wring out of the natives a hundred or two hundred thousand pounds as speedily as possible, that he might return home before his constitution had suffered from the heat. Macaulay, "Hastings," *Essays*, 607.

80. Beyond a certain point, however, Macaulay recognized that the British Empire in India could not be pigeonholed into conventional categories. It was *sui generis*, and entirely without historical precedent: "But what constitution can we give to our Indian Empire which shall not be strange, which shall not be anomalous? The

Empire is itself the strangest of all political anomalies. That a handful of adventurers from an island in the Atlantic should have subjugated a vast country divided from their place of birth by half the globe . . . a territory more populous than France, Spain Italy and Germany put together, a territory, the present clear revenue of which exceeds the present clear revenue of any state in the world, France excepted; a territory inhabited by men differing from us in race, colour, language, manners, morals, religion, these are prodigies to which the world has seen nothing similar: Reason is confounded. We interrogate the past in vain." *Miscellaneous Writings*, 558-9.

83. Macaulay's drift here into the language of racial or national character is especially striking given his father's (and to a lesser extent his own) commitment to the abstract principle of racial equality. Evidently, by the late 1830s, his continued commitment to the notion that backward peoples could be made fit for self-government was premised on their willingness to submit to the kind of cultural anglicization, of which he and his father were sterling examples. In the case of the Bengalis and, even more, with the Irish (see note 87, *infra*), the failure to assimilate to British norms and values drove Macaulay to toy with the kind of racialized typologies, which he rejected in the abstract. See also, Macaulay, *Speeches*, 571.

86. "The contest was terrible but short, the weaker went down. His fate was cruel. . . . The effect of the insane attempt to subjugate England by means of Ireland was that the Irish became the hewers of wood and the drawers of water to the English." Macaulay, *History of England*, II, 104-5.

88. "Betrayed, deserted, disorganised, unprovided with resources, begirt with enemies the noble settlement was still no easy conquest. Whatever an engineer might think of the strength of the ramparts, all that was most intelligent, most courageous, most highspirited among the Englishry of Leinster and of Northern Ulster was crowded behind them. . . . They had much in common with that sober, resolute and Godfearing class out of which Cromwell had formed his unconquerable army." Macaulay, *History of England*, III, 152-3.

93. The *History*, of course, was extensively reviewed. When the first two volumes appeared, the Whig *Edinburgh Review* was predictably glowing in its praise, while the Tory *Quarterly Review* was predictably vitriolic in its attack. See William Thomas, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000). Both reviewers, however, acknowledged that the public had already cast its verdict, and reviews were almost beside the point. *The Quarterly Review*, LXXXIV, (Murray, London, 1849), 549-630; *The Edinburgh Review*, XC, (Longman Edinburgh, 1849), 249-292.

95. The widespread popularity of Macaulay spanned the entire political spectrum, from right to left. According to John M. Mackenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1984), 179, he remained one of the most frequently quoted historians in school texts through the 1950s.

96. For example, see Anthony Trollope's sometimes approving, but sometimes caustic, marginal notes on his copy of Macaulay's *Essays*. Ernest Chew, "Anthony Trollope's Marginalia in *Macaulay's Critical and Historical Essays*," *Notes and Queries*, 48/2, (June, 2001), 152-5.

102. Macaulay's handling of Scottish history was not as egregious as handling of Irish events, though it was unpleasantly colored by a certain parvenu impulse to repudiate his own "primitive" Highland ancestry – for example, in his explanation for English indifference to the Glencoe massacre: "To the Londoner of those days [late seventeenth century] Appin was what Caffraria or Borneo is to us. He was not more moved by hearing that some Highland thieves had been surprised and killed than we are by hearing that a band of Amakosah cattle stealers has been cut off, or that a bark full of Malay pirates has been sunk." Macaulay, *History*, IV, 173. In 1855, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* commented on Macaulay's unwillingness to identify with his Scottish heritage: "We do not count him for a renegade, but are honestly persuaded that he is no Scotsman, and never was." CCCCXC, LXXX, (Edinburgh, 1856). In a subsequent essay, *Blackwood's* noted that Macaulay's paternal grandparents were Highlanders, while his maternal grandparents were Quakers -- two groups that were mercilessly caricatured in his writings. "Lord Macaulay's description of the Highlands is accordingly so vituperative, so spiteful, so grotesque -- it displays such command of the language of hatred, and such astonishing power of abuse that, coming from a writer who challenges a place by the side of Hume and Gibbon, it takes the breath away." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, DXXV, LXXXV, (Edinburgh, 1859), 1-23, 162-74, quote on 160.

104. Macaulay would doubtless have been pleased to learn that the young Herbert Morrison began his political self-education with Macaulay's *History*. He would have been less pleased with the socialist politician that this education produced. One wonders what Macaulay would have made of Millicent Fawcett's observation that her feminist consciousness had been initially awakened by childhood discussions of the great historian's books. That the book intended for the night tables of young ladies might have the effect of stimulating womens' own demands for the 'manly' rights of British citizenship was probably an outcome that he did not anticipate. Cruse, *Victorians and their Reading*, 348; Bernard Donoughue and W.G. Jones, *Herbert Morrison: Portrait of a Politician*, (Phoenix, London, 2001), 175.

105. The note of contempt that entered into Macaulay's judgments of racial and/or religious others suggests that his sympathies for the oppressed and exploited correspondingly diminished as he rose to fame and fortune himself. It is striking that Zachary Macaulay's purgative engagement with the evils of slavery and violence is notably absent from the mature writings of his son. The former slavedriver understood that the reconstruction of the second British Empire had to be grounded in a repudiation of the evils of the first. But this insight was rather lost in the *parvenu* accomplishments of his more successfully assimilated offspring. The younger Macaulay felt no guilt, because he did not believe that he had anything to apologize for. As a result, he felt no ambivalence about the virtues of the British establishment that he had spent his life trying to join. Clive, *Not by Fact Alone*, 222.