

Theodore Koditschek**Supplementary Notes to Chapter Four****Re-imagining a Greater Britain: J.A. Froude: Counter-romance and controversy**

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 four of *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth Century Visions of a Greater Britain*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).

5. Froude had always taken a strong interest in history. What presented itself as a crisis in religious faith, he experienced more fundamentally as a crisis over the validity of history. As he wrote of his abortive collaboration with Newman in 1845, "The Saint's Life-writing had to be abandoned as hopeless, but my two-year study had turned the historical ground where I had hoped to find a footing a bottomless morass, covered over by a thin skin of imaginative stories, where nothing grew, or could grow but grass and bog myrtle." Quoted in Waldo Hilary Dunn, *James Anthony Froude, A Biography, I, 1818-1856*, (Oxford, 1961); *II, 1857-94* (Oxford, 1963), I, 72. Froude's solution was simply to move out of the bottomless morass of pure religion, to the higher ground of a kind of history (i.e. the rise of Greater Britain), which could be both spiritually exalted, and empirically confirmed. For a rather different approach to Froude's religion, which places greater emphasis on its substantive content see, Jane Garnett, "Protestant Histories: James Anthony Froude, Partisanship and National Identity," in Peter Ghosh and Lawrence Goldman eds., *Politics and Culture in Victorian Britain: Essays in Memory of Colin Matthew*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006), 171-191.

6. "I examined ruined churches, I heard local tradition and local ballads reminding me of Ossian. But alas, the more I saw and the more I read, the more the individual figure of the great saints of Ireland dissolved into mist like the sons of Fingal on the rocks of Morven." Dunn, *Froude*, I, 62-71, 86-92, quote on 86.

10. This entire episode has been well recounted by Rosemary Ashton in *142 Strand: A Radical Address in Victorian London*, (Vintage, London, 2008), 51-81.

12. Froude was amused by the great Whig aristocratic dynasties, like the Russells, which espoused the liberal ideology of progress, but ruled their rural estate dependents in the traditional paternalistic way. James Anthony Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, (Scribners, New York, 1883), IV, 312-51, especially 316, 318. In 1876, he articulated his vision of the role of the landed gentry in English society:

“Speaking generally, the landed gentry are enduring witnesses of past worth and good work done, and until they forfeit our esteem by demerits of their own, they deserve to be respected and honoured. High place is lost so easily, that when a family has been of long continuance we may be sure that it has survived by exceptional merit. Nature rapidly finds out when the wrong sort have stolen into promotion. When a knave makes a fortune his son spends it – one generation sees the end of him. . . . Each age has its own heroes, who in its own eyes are greater than all that went before. The worn-out material is for ever being replaced with new. Each family thus is raised on its trial. Those who survive remain as links between the present and the past, and carry on unbroken the continuity of our national existence. In such families the old expression *Noblesse oblige* is a genuine force. . . . It appears to me, for the reasons I have given, that a landed gentry of some sort must exist in a country so conditioned as ours. The only question is whether we shall be satisfied with those that we have, or whether we wish to see them displaced in favor of others to whom the land would, or might be a mere commercial speculation. Abolish primogeniture, compel either by law or by the weight of opinion, a subdivision of landed property, it will still be bought up and held in large quantities, but it will be held by successful men of business . . . A change of this kind will not conduce to our national welfare.” Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, III, 280-308, quotes on 303-5.

13. It is richly ironic that Carlyle, of all people, should complain about anyone else displaying their “interior crudities” and “agonizing bellyaches.” No doubt, he believed that those rights were exclusively his own. For a revealing assessment of Carlyle’s gastrointestinal disturbances, and their relation to his literary bile, see Fred Kaplan, *Thomas Carlyle, A Biography*, (Cornell, 1983), especially 61-4, 85-88, 110-12, 233-5. In his memorandum, James Anthony Froude, *My Relationship with Carlyle*, (Longmans and Green, London, 1903), 6-7, Froude pointedly, (albeit regretfully) takes note of this striking failure of “self-restraint.”

19. In a Macaulay dominated age of improvement, Froude avows, “it is no easy matter to throw ourselves back into a time in which, for centuries, the European world grew upon a single type, in which the forms of the father’s thoughts were the

forms of the son's, and the late descendant was occupied in treading into paths the footsteps of his distant ancestors." James Anthony Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*, 12 vols. (London, 1862-70, New York, 1969), I, 1. Such an imaginative leap, however, was necessary to understand the material and moral world of the sixteenth century, before 'progress' uprooted traditional beliefs and institutions of every kind.

20. Froude's essentially annalistic approach prevents him from any deep exploration of the underlying problems of the old church. He is skeptical of the horror stories peddled by Protestant propagandists about sexual depravity or other abuses in the monasteries. He sees only minimal links between Lollardy and the new Protestantism, emphasising the influence of Luther, instead. The fact that the Reformation caught fire particularly in Germany and in Britain, however, leads him to speculate about a "Teutonic" racial propensity. The contingent circumstances that "connected a suit for divorce with the reformation of religion," were undergirded by deeper (albeit largely mysterious) forces, which exposed the Church's bankruptcy and unleashed new spiritual energies. Froude, *History of England*, I, 93-370, quote on 138. See also, II, 145.

21. Froude's *History of England* has not been much discussed in the secondary literature. John Burrow, one of the few who has considered it, dismisses it as "sprawling" and "ill-organized." John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981), 231-285, quotes on page 268. This was Carlyle's criticism, which is reprinted by Dunn, *Froude*, I, 245-51, and Rosemary Jann, *The Art and Science of Victorian History*, (Ohio State University Press, Ohio, 1985), 105-40. See also Jeffrey Von Arx, *Progress and Pessimism, Religion, Politics and History in Late Nineteenth Century Britain*, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1985), 173-200.

23. "It is certain that the behaviour of the sufferers was the argument which at last converted the nation." And so, "the struggle went forward; a forlorn hope of Saints led the way up the breach, and paved the way with their bodies a broad road into the new era." Froude, *History of England*, II, 90. What made these saints so effective in their time (and so acceptable to Froude) was the remarkable absence of any hint of political radicalism. Obey your secular ruler, Luther had charged. To outworn dogmas of orthodoxy, they counterposed "no opposite schemes of doctrine, no 'plans of salvation' no positive system of theology which held it a duty to believe." Such disagreeable accretions were the products "of later growth [in the history of Protestant sectarianism] when it again became necessary to clothe the living spirit in a perishable body." By contrast, the message of the early martyrs was at once humility and simplicity. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for that is the whole duty of man." Froude, *History of England*, II, 34.

24. “We shall understand better what is called the ‘tyranny’ of Henry VIII . . . and rather admire the judgment than condemn the resolution which steered the country safe among those dangerous shoals.” Froude, *History of England*, II, 343. In *A Liberal Descent* p. 235, John Burrow notes “It would be possible to interpret much of Froude’s writing in terms of his relations to his father and his elder brother.” Burrow adds “no such systematic reduction will be attempted here.” Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, 235. If I have attempted the ‘reduction’ that Burrow passed up, it is not because of any theoretical attachment to Freudian psychohistory. On the contrary, it is because Froude’s referencing of his own ‘family romance’ was almost certainly a deliberate authorial strategy, whose meaning was transparent to anyone who knew his personal circumstances. In the early volumes of his *History of England*, Froude had not yet entirely purged the impulses towards personal confessional that had fuelled his first two novels.

26. Froude claims that Henry was personally un-superstitious, Froude, *History of England*, II, 198, that he was influenced by Cromwell and Latimer, II, 356, that he was nearly persuaded to sign the Confession of Augsburg, II, 424-5, and that he personally sponsored Tyndall’s translation of the Bible, II, 38, III, 74-85. “Cromwell had struck the line on which the forces of nature were truly moving . . . To him belonged the rare privilege of genius, to see what other men could not see; and therefore he was condemned to rule a generation which hated him.” Froude, *History of England*, II, 206. The king however, remained vacillating, as Froude acknowledges. “Nine days in ten he was the clear-headed energetic, powerful statesman; on the tenth he was looking wistfully to the superstitions which he had left.” Froude, *History of England*, II, 206. For this reason, however, the Reformation would never carry the people of England with it until the king had fully embraced it. This turning point, according to Froude, came in 1534-5, shortly after the Act of Supremacy, and the final break with Rome. “Henry’s character was not what it had been when he won his title of Defender of the Faith. In the experience of the last few years, he had learned to conceive some broader sense of the meaning of the Reformation; and he had gathered from Cromwell and Latimer a more noble conception of Protestant doctrines.” Froude, *History of England*, II, 356-7, 406, IV, 536.

28. Froude is not unduly troubled by the heresy and treason trials of the early 1540s, nor by Henry’s attempt (ultimately unsuccessful) to renew his alliance with the Catholic Emperor, Charles V. These were strategic moves, necessitated by temporary circumstances, which were largely reversed during the last years of Henry’s life. He had irrevocably cast his lot with the Reformation, but he was the guide and moderator, rather than the creator of that movement. His job was to steer the ship of state through the dangerous world of the early sixteenth century. Inevitably, this involved a series of tacking maneuvers, sometimes to the right, sometimes to the left. Froude, *History of England*, III, 66-7. This is quite a different role from that of the Macaulayite centrist. Recall the strangely passive demeanor of

Macaulay's William III, who has but to discover the vital center towards which British history is naturally tending on its own. By contrast, Froude's sixteenth century England is a far more turbulent, dangerous, and intemperate world. Henry and his children could successfully navigate these cross-currents only by taking great risks, and plunging into the waves. "The Tudor princes were invariably most calm when those around them were most panic-stricken. From the moment that real danger was known, the King's own hand was on the helm -- his own voice dictating his orders." Froude, *History of England*, III, 163.

29. See especially Froude's moving account of the burnings of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer, Froude, *History of England*, VI, 369-430. For Froude's use of gender in his account of Mary's hysterical false pregnancies, see Froude, *History of England*, VI, 228-9, 349-56, and Pole's inquisitorial effeminacy, Froude, *History of England*, VI, 264-9, 312-4, 446-50, 524-6. Before Froude, most Protestant histories had taken their cue from *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, W. Grinton Berry, ed., (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1996), resting the case for the Reformation on the horrors of the Marian persecutions. Froude paints a more complex picture, acknowledging that the majority of the population was quite happy to accept a return to Rome. Ironically, it was Pole himself who providentially assured the future triumph of Protestantism, by turning malcontents into martyrs. Froude, *History of England*, VI, 534.

"On three sides," the historian sarcastically notes, "the Protector had provided himself with occupation. He had war with France and Scotland; he had undertaken a metamorphosis of religion; and he was going to extirpate avarice, selfishness, and cruelty out of the heart of mankind, and bring back the Golden Age." Froude, *History of England*, V, 1-515, quote on 127. See also Froude's claim, that Somerset "had attempted the work of a giant with the strength of a woman." Froude, *History of England*, V, 225.

30. For a general account of the shift towards a 'harder,' more strident masculinity in later Victorian bourgeois culture see John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle Class Home Victorian England*, (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1999), 145-199; as well as the essays in Michael Roper and John Tosh eds., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, (Routledge, London, 1991).

31. Corresponding with the desire for a strong manly leader, of course, came the need for a comforting feminine hand. Time Coates, ed., *Florence Nightingale and the Crimea, 1854-55*, (H.M. Stationary Office, [1855], 2000); Martha Vicinus and Bea Nergaard eds., *Ever Yours, Florence Nightingale: Selected Letters*, (Virago, London, 1989), 77-234.

36. Froude was hardly alone in his national security panic. In May, 1871, *Blackwoods* published a sensational account of a fictional invasion of England by a coalition of continental powers that was timed to coincide with uprisings in Ireland and India. Written by Colonel George T. Chesney, but published anonymously, "The Battle of Dorking: Reminiscences of a Volunteer," was widely discussed, and reprinted, many times in a variety of diverse venues over the next few decades. According to I.F. Clarke, *Voices Prophesying War: Future Wars, 1763-1984*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992), 27-130, this cautionary tale had a significant effect on subsequent reformulations of British defense and even diplomatic policy.

37. See also J.A. Froude, "The *Edinburgh Review* and Mr. Froude's History," *Fraser's Magazine*, 58 (September, 1858), 377.

38. Froude's inability to handle Elizabeth's gender is well illustrated by the following: "Elizabeth was a strange woman; or rather she was a woman and a man; she was herself and Cecil; and while her acts were the joint result of her own inclinations and Cecil's counsel, she gave way among her own women and her favourites to her personal humours." Froude, *History of England*, X, 52. Froude could not accept that it was precisely this female sovereign's escape from marriage that preserved England's independence and autonomy. He is loath to accept that arrangements for an orderly succession might have issued from her brain and not from her womb. For Elizabeth's reliance on Cecil see Froude, *History of England*, VII, 461-2, see also IX, 357. For her reliance on her other male advisors see Froude, *History of England*, VII, 18, 42, 317; VIII, 278, 391-6; IX, 135-6; XI, 226; XII, 22-4, 314-15.

42. This tendency of the Norman and English conquerors to 'go native' after a few generations, is a fact which Froude can neither deny nor explain. "It would have been equally reasonable to expect that the modern Englishman would adopt the habits of the Hindoo or the Mohican, as that the fiery knights of Normandy would have stooped to imitate a race whom they despised as slaves. . . . Such, however, was the extraordinary fact. . . . Fresh colonists were sent over to restore the system, but only for themselves or their children to be swept into the stream; and from the century which succeeded the Conquest, till the reign of the eighth Henry, the strange phenomenon repeated itself, generation after generation." Froude, *History of England*, II, 253-4. Even Henry, however, did not really break the pattern. "He was encumbered with a country from which he could not retreat; which he could not govern: which was incapable of a noble independence, and incapable equally of noble submission; which remained, and would remain, in a chronic disorder, exhausting alike the English exchequer and the English patience." Froude, *History of England*, IV, 82.

45. To Froude, the only thing worse than Shan savage, was Shan with pretensions to becoming civilized. “Lord Sussex had a sister with him in Dublin, and Shan sent an intimation that if the Deputy would take him for a brother-in-law their relations for the future might be improved. The present sovereign of England would perhaps give one of her daughters to the King of Dahomey with more readiness than the Earl of Sussex would have consigned his sister to Shan O’Neil.” Froude, *History of England*, VIII, 38-9.

In the sixteenth century, the difficulty of eradicating the native Irish was not ethical, but logistical. In the late 1560s, Cecil, and others, proposed ambitious schemes of government sponsored colonization that would engage in the kind of ethnic cleansing that Froude describes. Once the natives were removed, these new, politically reliable Protestant colonists would no longer ‘go native’ as so many of their predecessors had done. In the event, the government lacked the resources for such extensive plans. But what the state could not accomplish, private investors and the great Protestant seamen, and stalwart Wessex noblemen could. “These Western gentlemen [of Cornwall and Devonshire] had been trained in the French wars and privateer fleets, or on the coast of Africa, and the lives of a few thousand savages were infinitely unimportant to them.” Froude, *History of England*, X, 477-563, quote on 491.

53. “Negro slavery,” he has the temerity to claim, “was an invention of philanthropy – like the modern Coolie trade, an unobjectionable and useful substitute for the oppression of races [i.e. Anglo-Saxon] to whom loss of freedom was death.” Unfortunately, it was marred in practice “with the fatal blot that the consent of the Negroes themselves, who were so largely interested in the transaction, was neither sought nor obtained.” “The European,” he reluctantly concludes, “first converted the negro into a savage, and then made use of his brutality as an excuse for plunging him into slavery.” Did Froude see that he had executed exactly the same displacement in his own historical work? Obligated to report the genocidal enterprises of his beloved British empire-builders, he turns their victims into others, inferior even to the Irish, and then makes use of this inferiority as the basis on which the perpetrator can be acquitted, and the victim must be blamed. Froude, *History of England*, VIII, 464-83, especially 470; IX, 358-80.

65. On mid and late-Victorian Irish republicanism see T.W. Moody ed., *The Fenian Movement*, (Mercer, Cork, 1978); R.V. Comerford, *The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848-82*, (Wolfhound, Dublin, 1985); John Newsinger, *Fenianism in Mid-Victorian Britain*, (Pluto, London, 1994); and Owen McGee, *The IRB, The Irish Republican Brotherhood from the Land League to Sinn Fein*, (Four Courts, Dublin, 2005).

77. "I have no hesitation," said Lecky, upon his discovery of Buckle in 1861, "in saying that I believe him to be the very greatest thinker and scholar now living." "There is something almost miraculous," he continued, "in the combination in one man of such extraordinary subtlety of thought and reasoning, such boundless learning, such a keen appreciation of every side of every subject, and such clear and transparent eloquence. . . . It is perhaps the most suggestive book I have ever read." After six months reflection his appreciation had scarcely changed. "I have a greater faith in his [Buckle's] intellect than in that of any living man, a very profound belief in many of his principles, and an admiration for his book which was almost stronger after the fifth reading, than after the first." Quoted in Donal McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky: Historian and Politician, 1838-1903*, (Lilliput Press, Dublin, 1994), 29. See pages 26-56 for a general discussion of Buckle's influence.

By contrast, Froude was dismissive of Buckle, who "would deliver himself from the eccentricities of this and that individual by a doctrine of averages." "Unfortunately," he continued, "the average of one generation need not be the average of the next. . . . As the planet varies with the atmosphere that surrounds it, so each new generation varies from the last, because it inhales as its atmosphere the accumulated experience and knowledge of the whole past of the world." J.A Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, I (New York, 1894), I, 27.

80. For more recent approaches to the role of the past in forging and reconfiguring national identity see Raphael Samuel ed., *Patriotism: The Making and Un-making of British National Identity*, in three vols. (Routledge, London, 1989); Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory*, vol. II., *Island Stories*, (Verso, London, 1998); Keith Robbins, *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness*, (Addison Weley Longman, Harlow, Essex, 1998); John R. Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994); Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1995); Fintan O'Toole, *The Lie of the Land: Irish Identities*, (Verso, London, 1997).

81. "To decide whether a nation is right in invading, dispossessing, or enslaving another, the one real question is whether she is able to do it. If she is, the pretext she chooses is of little consequence. Her ultimate success is her justification." W.E.H. Lecky, "Mr. Froude's English in Ireland," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XXVII (January, 1873), 246-64, quote on 246. See also W.E.H. Lecky, "Mr. Froude's English in Ireland," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XXX (June, 1874), 166-84.

83. "In the present condition of public opinion in Ireland, at a time when there is some hope that ancient animosities may slowly subside under the influence of the great legislative measures of the last few years, the most ordinary patriotism should counsel great caution and moderation in treating of the confiscations and massacres of the past. No such spirit has been shown by Mr. Froude. With a recklessness of

consequences that cannot be too deeply deplored . . . he has thrown a new brand of discord into the smouldering embers of Irish discontent.” Lecky, “Froude’s English in Ireland,” (1873), 253, quote on 264. “It is indeed hardly possible that any Irish Catholic can read this book without being more or less alienated from Great Britain.” Lecky, “Froude’s English in Ireland,” (1874), 174-5.

84. In the hands of Lecky, Froude’s endless cycles of resistance/repression are reversed. In 1641, he acknowledges, there had been occasional massacres of Protestants, but Froude’s accounts were grossly exaggerated, and the killings were largely confined to Ulster, where they betokened the desperate recoil of a forcibly dispossessed aristocracy. By contrast, the subsequent brutality of the Cromwellians in repressing and dispossessing Irish Catholics throughout the island was truly breathtaking in its ambition and lack of restraint. By 1652, according to William Petty, one third of Ireland’s inhabitants had perished by violence, epidemic, or artificial famine. After the defeats of 1690, when the Irish Catholics finally laid down their arms, they were deceived with promises of fair treatment and toleration, but then got only the harsh, vindictive penal code as recompense for their conciliatory pains. W.E.H. Lecky, *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 5 vols. (London, 1892), I, 116-170. As late as 1890, Lecky was still staggered by Froude’s historiographical partisanship. Referencing the Englishman’s injudicious remarks about the subjectivism of all historical interpretations (see supplementary note 125, *infra*), Lecky wrote;

“There is a method of dealing with historical facts which has been happily compared to a child with his box of letters, who picks out and arranges those letters, and those only, which will spell the words on which he has previously determined, leaving all others untouched. In Irish history this method has been abundantly practiced, and among the many crimes and errors that have been committed by all parties, it is not difficult to select on either side the materials of a very effective party narrative. I have endeavoured to write this history in a different spirit. Perhaps another generation may be more capable than the present one, of judging how far I have succeeded.” Quoted in L.P. Curtis, “Introduction” to Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1972), xxvii.

101. Froude’s ethnographic capabilities were limited, to put it mildly. The encounter that occasioned this comment had been in Natal, when “forty or fifty Kaffirs were brought in for my amusement.” From a distance they had approached with “a long low monotonous cry.”

“Presently, a naked figure, with feathers in his hair, ran in on all fours like a baboon, capered round the fire dangling an assegai and disappeared. More howling followed, and the procession came out from behind the bushes, chanting something which was like the baying of hounds at the moon, and stamping violently in time. The creatures ranged themselves round the fire and squatted on their haunches.

Two or three had shirts, the rest had a thin short wisp of goat's hair round their loins, and that was all. In the uncertain light, in which they looked horribly ape-like, they continued their song or whatever it was. 'Ho ha yah, ho ha yah,' growing gradually louder and more guttural into 'Hogh ha hungh ha,' till their chests began to heave and work, and fifty human beings were grunting like so many mad pigs inspired suddenly with an ambition to become musicians." Froude, *Short Studies*, III, 361.

102. After the death of his wife, Carlyle had asked Froude for advice about how he should handle public revelations regarding the unsatisfactory state of their marriage. This gradually drifted into a vague implication that Froude would serve as Carlyle's biographer; a job that Froude did not want, in a genre in which Carlyle professed not to believe. Nevertheless, Carlyle's passive-aggressive behavior left Froude feeling manipulated into accepting this obligation. Between 1881, when Carlyle died, and 1884, Froude worked diligently at this charge, producing a four-volume biography that (among much other information) publicly revealed Jane Carlyle's unhappiness, and hinted at her husband's sexual impotence. James Anthony Froude, *Thomas Carlyle: A History of the First Forty Years of his Life: 1795-1835*, two vols. (Longmans, London, 1882); J. A. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle: A History of his Life in London: 1834-1881*, two vols. (Longmans, London, 1884). These books unleashed a storm of outrage from many Carlyle worshippers, and caused Froude nearly a decade of annoyance and legal wrangling for control of the Carlyle papers. Froude documented this entire debacle in a memorandum, James Anthony Froude, *My Relations With Carlyle*, (Books for Libraries Press, Freeport, New York, 1971).

104. While Froude accepted the inevitability of democracy in settler colonies, among people of Anglo-Saxon racial stock, this concession was in tension with a general skepticism about the viability of democracy, which he saw as inherently unstable. Presumably the degradation that it set in motion would eventually leave its mark even on the master race: "Popular governments have hitherto uniformly glided into democracies, and democracies, as uniformly perish of their own excess. If they escape a violent end by faction, they die of a disease which they cannot escape. Men are made by nature unequal. It is in vain therefore to treat them as if they were equal. . . . Equality is too jealous to allow differences of rank and power, and differences of wealth alone remain. The pursuit of wealth becomes thus the predominant passion, degrades the national character, raises to elevation the least worthy of elevation . . . and flings the worth and intellect into the dustheap." Froude, *Short Studies*, III, 316.

108. "The English race should not come to New Zealand to renew the town life which they left behind them, with a hand-to-mouth subsistence, as earners of wages on improved conditions. . . . Fine men and women are not to be reared in towns, among taverns and theaters, and idle chatter of politics. They are nature's choicest

creations, and can be produced only on nature's own conditions; under the free air of heaven, on the green earth amidst woods and waters, and in the wholesome occupation of cultivating the soil." J.A. Froude, *Oceana*, (New York, 1886), 245-6.

120. Froude did meet with one distinguished black man, the Chief Justice of Barbados. In this conversation he made a show of expressing skepticism about reports of cannibalism in Haiti. He promised to look into the matter when he visited the island. The Chief Justice "took leave of me with an expression of passionate anxiety that it might be found possible to remove so black a stain from his unfortunate race." J.A. Froude, *The English in West Indies: or The Bow of Ulysses*, (Scribner's New York, [1888], 1890), 124-8.

125. Though often cast as the bumbling amateur, Froude had a remarkably sophisticated understanding of the question of truth in history. He understood that while the historian must strive as far as possible for accuracy, all interpretations are, to a greater or lesser degree, subjective, and can be fairly evaluated only within the context of their particular agenda for reconstructing the past. At his most skeptical, Froude went so far as to wonder whether "History was like a child's box of letters, with which we can spell any word we please." Froude, "The Science of History," *Short Studies*, I, 7-36, quote on 7. This injudicious statement -- which has been used as ammunition against Froude by the many critics, who have disparaged his craftsmanship, and doubted his veracity -- was much modified in the course of his discussion, and should not be quoted out of context. By the end of his essay Froude concludes that history "is a voice forever sounding across the centuries, the laws of right and wrong." The problem is that Froude's "right" will be wrong for any believer in human equality, social justice, or world peace. These were things in which Froude decidedly *did not* believe.

127. It may be tentatively hypothesized that Froude had a special appeal to a critical transitional group known as the 'Villa Tories' -- successful second or third generation businessmen, professionals, and their families, who gradually, between the 1850s and the 1890s, shed the liberal proclivities of their parents for an overtly conservative (or at least Unionist) personal and political identity. The phrase "Villa Toryism" was coined at the time, and was used by Lord Salisbury, the Tory leader himself. Robert Blake, *The Conservative Party from Peel to Churchill*, (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1970), 154. The phenomenon has been documented and statistically analyzed by a number of political historians, most notably, James Cornford, "The Transformation of Conservatism in the Late Nineteenth Century," in P. Stansky ed., *The Victorian Revolution: Government and Society in Victorian Britain*, (New Viewpoints, New York, 1973), 287-322; Henry Pelling, *Social Geography of British Elections: 1885-1910*, (Macmillan, London, 1967); and Martin Pugh, *The Making of Modern British Politics, 1867-1939*, (Blackwell, Oxford, 1982), 40-63.

Writing at a higher level of intellectual sophistication than the panegyrics to imperial soldiers that quickened the pulse of patriotic adolescents, Froude gave more mature Villa Tories reason to think that their newfound politics were rational, even inevitable, outgrowths of events. In this regard, Froude may be seen as providing a more elevated version of the hyper-masculinist imperialism, whose more plebeian purveyors are surveyed in John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1984); Mackenzie, John M. ed., *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1986); Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*, (Routledge, London, 1994), 1-166.

In a sense, Froude was himself the quintessential Villa Tory, registering the transit from the idealistic liberalism of youth to the disillusioned reaction of a privilege-conserving maturity. Although his father was certainly no liberal, Anthony's succession to family leadership aptly mirrors the metamorphosis of the nineteenth-century Tory party, as it was transformed from the embodiment of the Anglican Church and rural gentry, to the political representative of the suburban bourgeoisie. Froude, like many other young men in the 1840s, had undergone wrenching crises of religion and masculinity. His achievement was to resolve both together, in a manner that proved eminently transmissible to other members of his generation and class: The faith that such men had formerly invested in a universal deity would henceforth be transferred to worship of the imperial state bequeathed to them by their national history. State worship, which had formerly been feared as a form of sacrilege, was henceforth to be elevated into the highest form of religion -- a means of restoring hierarchy and order to a disorderly world, and thus of transforming feelings of fear into dreams of security.

Froude's appeal lay in his ability to take what might otherwise appear as a naked, sordid grasping after power and to turn it into a mysterious spiritual principle of authoritarian legitimacy. The fears of the Villa Tory -- of impending bankruptcy, of German or American competition, of French designs on his Suez Canal shares, or of Russian threats to his Indian railway investments -- could be converted from coin of self-interest into the gold of pure patriotism by a judicious application of the Froudian philosophy. Refracting anxieties about international competition through the lenses of Elizabeth and Burleigh, Froude reassured his Victorian readers that they could surmount what were merely up-dated versions of crises that their ancestors had successfully mastered in the sixteenth century. After all, Britons need not fear competition with distant super-power rivals if they could keep their own far-flung empire intact. The key to this internal ordering of the Empire however lay in the natural hierarchies of race.

For Froude and his Villa Tory readers, danger and disorder threatened when the races of the Empire moved out of their proper evolutionary/functional place: anxiety about Germans, Russians or Americans was thereby displaced onto fears that the West Indian Negro would abandon the plantation, that the Indian Sepoy

would refuse to fight proxy wars in Asia, that the South African tribesman would sabotage settled agriculture, that the stubborn Boer would cling to his autonomous republic, or -- worst of all -- that the distant Anglo-Saxon kin would cease to be loyal to their Greater British family. These were the true threats to the standing of Greater Britain. Froude did sterling service to the cause of Villa Toryism by targeting the irresponsibility of liberal politicians who would betray the master race and the Protestant nation by abandoning private property, by granting Rome-Rule to treasonous Irishmen, by indulging the whims of work-shy black laborers, or by willfully dismantling the globe-spanning Empire that nobler ancestors had fought for and won.

It mattered little that few, if any, of these liberal politicians actually advocated the policies of imperial abdication for which Froude assailed them. The pieties of the older Macaulayite liberal imperialism no longer seemed to be working. It was necessary to devise an alternative master-narrative of the place of the Empire and its many graduated races in British national life and history. To newspaper and magazine readers of the 1850s, 60s, 70s and 80s, the Empire was suddenly becoming much closer and omnipresent. For the first time, it was becoming a mere telegraph message or steamer ticket away. Staring from shop windows, advertisements, soap bars, carriage tires, and cotton clothing in the metropolis, it required a new interpreter, like Froude, who could situate its relation to the Home Island, and articulate all the ways in which the racial/colonial other had come to figure centrally in Britons' own sovereign sense of themselves. The Empire could become Britain's salvation in its dealings with its neighbors, but it harbored formidable internal dangers and anxieties within itself. When Indian rebels crowded angry newspaper columns, lazy Negroes were caricatured on West End stages, and bomb-throwing Irish Fenians exploded onto the pages of *Punch*, readers and spectators (especially if they were Villa Tories) knew they could turn to Froude. In his new post-liberal version of the imperial romance it was the duty of manly Anglo-Saxon men to go out and master these dark, erratic, and primordial creatures for the Empire's advantage, and the savages' own good. For most Villa Tories, of course, this would be a vicarious adventure, and Froude presented himself as the perfect Cook Tourist, who would enlist the best planters and proconsuls to guide them along the way.

On imperial tourism and imagery see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, (Routledge, London, 1992), 201-50; Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*, (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1990); and Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*, (Routledge, New York, 1995), 18-257. I treat these matters further in Theodore Koditschek, "Capitalism Race and Evolution in Imperial Britain," in Theodore Koditschek, Sundiata Cha-Jua, and Helen Neville eds., *Race Struggle*, (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 2009), 48-79.

Moreover, Froude's service to the emerging creed of Villa Toryism should not be assessed entirely in narrow class terms. The rising generation of Conservative

politicians understood that they could not achieve and maintain power through Villa Toryism alone. To gain majorities in the House of Commons, at a time when the franchise was expanding, it was necessary to attract a significant minority of working class voters, especially in the Home Counties, Lancashire, and the West Midlands. In the elections of 1874, 1886, 1895, and 1900, this electoral strategy bore ever ripening fruit, as Liberal strength among rural laborers and on the Celtic Fringe was countered by Tory majorities in the metropolitan centers. Here too, Froude made a contribution by translating the politics of racial, religious and gender exclusion into a language that was acceptable to both working class conservatives and educated elites. By lending an aura of respectability to anti-Catholicism, hatred of the Irish, Protestant chauvinism, and contempt for people of color, Froude contributed no small part to the creation of a Tory alliance based on a xenophobic, nationalist, authoritarian ideology. Pelling, *Social Geography of British Elections*, 1-86, 175-203, 239-87, 414-37; Peter Marsh, *The Discipline of Popular Government; Lord Salisbury's Domestic Statecraft, 1881-1902*, (Harvester, Sussex, 1978), 34-67; H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management; Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone*, (Longmans, London, 1959), especially 194-5, 220-1, 226-7, and 358-9; E. Spencer Wellhofer, *Democracy, Capitalism and Empire in Late Victorian Britain*, (Macmillan, London, 1996), 135-67.

Unlike the politician Randolph Churchill, who admitted it was “mostly opportunism,” Froude took “Tory Democracy” very seriously. Long hostile to the forces of democratic enfranchisement, he ultimately resigned himself to the recognition that democracy was inevitable. His contribution was to show how it could be rendered safe and tolerable to the forces of property and order, so long as it was restricted to Anglo-Saxons in Britain and in the white-majority colonies. “If we are to have democracy, as I suppose we are, let us go into it with our eyes open. I don’t like drifting among cataracts, hiding reality from ourselves by forms which are not allowed either sense or power. That, I suppose to be Lord Salisbury’s feeling,” he wrote to Lady Derby in 1884. Three years later, he complained to her of “the persistence in applying to conquered countries and colonies a form of government which can only succeed among men of our own race who are part of ourselves and of whose loyalty there can be no question.” Quoted in Dunn, *Froude*, II, 515-5, 549.

Attitudes such as this, expressed most explicitly in Froude’s *Oceana*, have led Duncan Bell to classify him among other late Victorian civic imperialists along with J.R. Seeley and Goldwin Smith. Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2007). In his “Republican Imperialism: J.A. Froude and the Virtue of Empire,” *History of Political Thought*, XXX, 1 (Spring, 2009), 166-96, Duncan Bell marshals further evidence of Froude’s neo-classical orientation, and of the extent to which republican notions of civic virtue fuelled his opposition to conventional Victorian liberal thought. To complete this picture, however, I would argue that Froude’s authoritarianism has to be factored into the neo-classical mix. In his *Caesar, A Sketch*, (Scribner’s, New York, 1880), Froude made clear his understanding that when Republicans assume imperial burdens, they will likely leave behind the

legacies of internal egalitarianism and adopt autocratic political forms. In 1886, when Joseph Chamberlain broke with the Liberal Party, and joined the Villa Tories (whom he later came so quintessentially to represent), Froude admitted that he himself half “despair[ed] of Parliamentary Government, and shall pray for a Chamberlain Dictatorship.” Herbert Paul, *Life of Froude*, (New York, 1905), 346.