



Hard Times and the Factory Controversy: Dickens vs. Harriet Martineau

K. J. Fielding; Anne Smith

Nineteenth-Century Fiction, Vol. 24, No. 4, The Charles Dickens Centennial. (Mar., 1970), pp. 404-427.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-0564%28197003%2924%3A4%3C404%3AHTATFC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Nineteenth-Century Fiction is currently published by University of California Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucal.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hard Times and the Factory Controversy

Dickens vs. Harriet Martineau

K. J. FIELDING and ANNE SMITH

HARD TIMES is possibly now accepted as the most central of Dickens's works to an understanding of his attitude to society. It has been studied, for example, in relation to his beliefs about education, the Preston strike, disputes between capital and labor, and his general views on the quality of nineteenth-century urban industrial civilization. Yet one obvious gap remains in investigations about the beliefs and experience that lay behind the creation of the novel: his attitude to the workers themselves, the lives they led, and the conditions they worked in. In general, critics are so dismayed by the saintly character of the power loom weaver, Stephen Blackpool, that they do their best to ignore this part of the novel. Whether in Dickens's day or ours, they (like John Ruskin) think of Stephen as "a dramatic perfection" rather than "an honest workman," or (like George Orwell) dismiss him as "merely pathetic," or (like Harold Perkin) assume that in *Household Words* (in which *Hard Times* appeared) Dickens simply purveys "edifying tales, and cautionary advice against strikes."¹

This is quite true about Stephen Blackpool though much too simple a generalization about *Household Words*. But if we are to consider the novel at all seriously as a study of the "times," it needs some explanation, if not defense, for the way in which parts of it are so vehemently simplified. This is too large a prob-

¹ Ruskin, "Unto This Last": *Four Essays on the First Principles of Political Economy* (London, 1862), p. 14; Orwell, "Charles Dickens," in *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*, 4 vols. (London, 1968), 1:426; Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society: 1780-1880* (Toronto, 1969), p. 307.

lem for the present essay. It includes the question of Dickens's changing attitude to changing industrialism, a question which needs a fuller examination if it is to be understood. But within this last question lies another which brings us down to the simpler detail of the rights and wrongs of a dispute in which he was involved when he was writing *Hard Times*. The dispute had a direct effect on the novel, and it may even have helped to form and alter Dickens's opinion about the subject he had taken up. It also leads one to a better understanding of Dickens's attitudes to the new world of large-scale industry. This is, perhaps, a subject within our scope.

As far as Dickens's own response to the wonders of the industrial revolution goes, there is no doubt that he welcomed them at the beginning of the 1850s. Dickens had a pride in progress even though he opposed any mechanization of the spirit. It is no doubt true, as Herbert L. Sussman says, that "although he saw the factories of England and America at first hand, his imagination never thrilled to mechanized manufacturing as it did to the railway."² All the same, when he began *Household Words* he made some striking affirmations in "A Preliminary Word" in the first number (30 March 1850). He welcomes the "stirring world around us"; he expresses faith in the "progress of mankind" and gratitude for "the privilege of living in this summer-dawn of time"; he reminds his readers that the "mightier inventions of this age are not all material"; and he feels that "all the voices *we* hear, cry Go on!" Later, in the third volume in an article written jointly with R. H. Horne, "The Great Exhibition and the Little One," the two countries which showed respectively "the greatest degree of progress and the least," England and China, are compared, and Dickens's optimism is even more explicit:

That we are moving in a right direction towards some superior condition of society—politically, morally, intellectually, and religiously—that newly turned-up furrows of the earth are being sown with larger, nobler, and more healthy seed than the earth has ever yet received, we humbly yet proudly, and with heartfelt joy that partakes of solemnity, do fully recognise as a great fact.³

² *Victorians and the Machine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 61

³ *Household Words* (hereafter *HW*) 3 (12 July 1851):356, comparing the Great Exhibition with one in the Chinese Gallery, Hyde Park Place; cf. Dickens's "The Chinese Junk," *Examiner*, 24 June 1848, which takes the same view.

With *Bleak House* (1852–53) it is reasonable to read the novel as showing that, as between the old order and the new, Dickens's sympathies are with the Ironmaster. Yet in *Hard Times*, barely a year later, we can see him revealing a much greater awareness of what this new order was to cost. It is true that the novels are set in different times, with the industrialist in each of them shown in a different social and fictional context. Yet the change may well be thought to suggest that Dickens's position had shifted: that the author of *Hard Times* apparently holds different beliefs and that as far as these went he is hardly the same man as the author of "A Preliminary Word" in 1850.

Another way in which we can see this change illustrated is in Dickens's relations with Harriet Martineau as a contributor to *Household Words*. Miss Martineau, then in her late forties, was a forceful journalist whom Dickens had been glad to enlist when the periodical was founded. She had a ready pen, wrote clearly, and even more evidently than Dickens she was a firm believer in progress. In 1855 she wrote in her *Autobiography*:

It appears to me now that, while I see much more of human difficulty from ignorance, and from the slow working (as we weak and transitory beings consider it) of the law of Progress, I discern the working of that great law with far more clearness, and therefore with a far stronger confidence, than I ever did before.⁴

In her obituary in the *Daily News* (29 June 1879), which she wrote herself, she echoes this earlier statement of faith: "She saw the human race, as she believed, advancing under the law of progress" (*Autobiography*, 3:470). But in spite of this shared belief, the temporary and uneasy alliance (for five years) between Dickens and Harriet Martineau came to be sharply broken, and the main reason for the disruption appears to have been their disagreements arising from the publication of *Hard Times* and certain articles associated with it. For the novel, as Harriet Martineau writes, "startled" her (2:419).

Her own account of the break is given in her *Autobiography*, where she explains that it was finally caused by what she saw as Dickens's prejudice against Roman Catholics. Yet, as she says, for a long while before this she had been "uneasy about the way

⁴ *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography with Memorials by Maria Weston Chapman*, 3 vols. (London, 1877), 2:447; further references are in our text by volume and page numbers.

'Household Words' was going on" (2:418). She ascribes her growing concern to three causes: Dickens's attitude to the social role of women, allegedly expressed in a number of articles; his account of the Preston Strike;⁵ and his treatment of the "Factory and Wages controversy" in *Hard Times*. Writing in the *Autobiography*, she declares that she thought the proprietors of *Household Words* "grievously inadequate to their function, philosophically and morally" (2:418). She is more specific in an earlier comment in the same work in which she says that *Hard Times* shows Dickens's "vigorous erroneousness about matters of science" in connection with "the controversies of employers" (2:378). She also attacks him for showing "irresponsible sentimentality": "Nobody wants to make Mr. Dickens a Political Economist; but there are many who wish that he would abstain from a set of difficult subjects, on which all true sentiment must be underlain by a sort of knowledge which he has not" (2:378).

What is rather strange is that in her account of their differences, Harriet Martineau, the exact and high-principled economist, is almost inconceivably irresponsible or forgetful about matters of fact. For example, she says in the *Autobiography*:

In the autumn of 1849, my misgivings first became serious. Mr. Wills [subeditor of *Household Words*] proposed my doing some articles on the Employments of Women, (especially in connexion with the Schools of Design and branches of Fine-Art manufacture;) and was quite unable to see that every contribution of the kind was necessarily excluded by Mr. Dickens's prior articles on behalf of his view of Woman's position; articles in which he ignored the fact that nineteen-twentieths of the women of England earn their bread, and in which he prescribes the function of Women; viz., to dress well and look pretty, as an adornment to the homes of men. I was startled by this; and at the same time, and for many weeks after, by Mr. Dickens's treatment in his Magazine of the Preston Strike, then existing, and of the Factory and Wages controversy, in his tale of "Hard Times." (2:419)

She goes on to say that a "more serious incident still occurred in the same autumn" and then tells how a story she had written for a Christmas number was rejected because it gave a favorable view

⁵"On Strike," *HW* 8 (11 Feb. 1854):553-59; see also James Lowe's "Locked Out," *HW* 8 (10 Dec. 1853):345-48. All articles were published anonymously; identification is from a typed copy of the *HW* Contributors' Book, the original of which is now in the Princeton Univ. Library. Harriet Martineau did not know which articles were by Dickens and which by other contributors. For "the social role of women" see n. 6.

of the Roman Catholic faith. Later in this passage she writes that the time of this occurrence was "at the end of 1853" (2:421), as it was.

Now all this is rather astonishing. It is hard to accept that a regular journalist and the author of *The Thirty Years Peace* could not remember the year when *Household Words* began (March 1850). It is odd that she should say that William Henry Wills approached her in 1849 when he had not even been engaged as sub-editor by then. Her apparent belief that Dickens wrote certain articles on "his view of Woman's position" is part of the same muddle, since he had written none at all, nor had he published any, and it is hard to imagine what articles she may have meant of a subsequent date. She even seems to have thought that the Preston Strike happened in 1850 instead of 1853-54. It leaves one nonplussed. "Vigorous erroneousness" was almost her own speciality, and it must briefly be said that her paragraph is extremely confused. The tone of respect in which she was treated throughout the subsequent controversy and with which she has sometimes been treated since (merely with regard to that controversy) is undeserved, and, as this passage suggests, her grasp of the situation was incompetent.⁶

There are several excuses to be made for her. Although she had many years in which to revise the *Autobiography*, she did not bring it out herself. She had been very ill, she composed it hastily, and the period at which she wrote it (according to Mrs. Fenwick Miller) "was the most aggressive and unpleasant of her whole life."⁷ W. R. Greg, who reviewed the *Autobiography* for *Nine-*

⁶ For the date of Wills's engagement see Dickens to Wills, 22 Jan. 1850, *The Letters of Charles Dickens*, ed. Walter Dexter, 3 vols. (Bloomsbury [London], 1938), 2:200. The remarks about Dickens's "articles" on women can refer to at most only one by him, which was partly about an American emancipationist, Mrs. Amelia Jenks Bloomer ("Sucking Pigs," *HW* 4 [8 Nov. 1851]:145-47), and there do not appear to be any of the kind by other contributors. It is true that Harriet Martineau may have been rather vexed by Mrs. Jellyby's specifically feminist activities referred to in the last chapter of *Bleak House*, as she shows by her remarks in *The Factory Controversy: A Warning Against Meddling Legislation* (Manchester, 1855), pp. 35-36 and 45, though she cannot spell her name. For the factory articles see n. 11 below. Her last contribution to *HW* was "The Hampshire Militia," 10 (13 Jan. 1855): 505-11. Harriet Martineau's own "erroneousness" has corrupted her biographers such as R. K. Webb, who writes in his *Harriet Martineau: A Radical Victorian* (London, 1960): "The connection ceased in 1857 when, alarmed by the anti-Catholic bias of the paper, she turned her artillery of principle on W. H. Wills, the editor, while Dickens ran increasingly afoul of her for his crudity, his attitude towards women, and his sentimentalizing about factories in *Household Words*" (312); the date and the plain statements here are wrong.

⁷ *Harriet Martineau*, 4th ed. (London, 1896), p. 176.

teenth Century in 1877, commented that in speaking of herself she gave a false impression of ill nature, bitterness and depreciation, but added that "in conveying this impression she does herself grievous injustice. There has seldom been a more kindly-hearted or affectionate person" (2:100). She is possibly, as Walter Houghton suggests, a typical example of the Victorian who was dogmatic or rigid because he felt that he must hold fast to his own convictions in the midst of confusion.⁸ In addition she may well have regarded herself as an acknowledged authority whose position was being undermined, and the controversy which arose out of the *Household Words* articles and *Hard Times* possibly affected her even more acutely because she herself had written a somewhat similar story with a very different outcome over twenty years before.⁹ All of which both helps to excuse and explain her; yet it does not prevent her account of her relations with Dickens from being misleading.

What had really happened was that they *had* differed very sharply indeed over Dickens's views on political economy, factory employment, workmen's compensation, and certain manufacturers' defiance of the law. And in spite of what she says about rejecting Wills's proposal, she *did* write a series of articles on factory employment with some special reference to women between 1851 and 1852. All these incidents, taken together, are possibly as helpful to us now as they were to Dickens at that time in defining his opinions. As Humphry House remarks of a similar situation, "if we now wonder how Fezziwig's 'oily rich, fat, jovial voice' could have seemed tolerable, even to Dickens, in the 'forties, we must look for the answer in Harriet Martineau and the *Westminster Review*." ¹⁰ Equally if we want to understand how Dickens could so simplify Coketown and sanctify Stephen Blackpool we must read Miss Martineau's *The Factory Controversy* and her articles in *Household Words*.¹¹

⁸ *The Victorian Frame of Mind* (New Haven, 1966), pp. 137-80 (chaps. 6-7).

⁹ *The Hill and the Valley*, vol. 1 of *Illustrations of Political Economy*, 9 vols. (London, 1833). It is a story about a strike in a South Wales ironworks which follows the death of a boy who, "most unfortunately . . . was careless, and put himself in the way of a blow on the head, which killed him on the spot" (92). It is written clearly and intelligently but entirely from the point of view of the fair-minded, hard-working owner-employers who close down their factory when the strike makes it impossible for them to go on. We owe this reference to Ada Nisbet; no doubt detailed comparisons of interest might be made between *Hard Times* and several of Martineau's stories.

¹⁰ *The Dickens World* (London, 1941), p. 69, cf. pp. 74-75.

¹¹ These articles, published from 18 Oct. 1851 to 17 April 1852, are: "Flower

The dispute came into the open after she had finished her *Autobiography* (late 1855) and had published a pamphlet entitled *The Factory Controversy: A Warning Against Meddling Legislation* (issued by the National Association of Factory Occupiers, Manchester, 1855).¹² The pamphlet is largely made up of a scathing criticism of the so-called "editors" of *Household Words* for their publication of a series of articles on factory accidents advocating enforcement of the law requiring proper fencing-in of factory machinery.¹³ In these articles Henry Morley, one of Dickens's regular assistants, argues on behalf of the enforcement of the Factory Act of 1844, which ruled that "all parts of the mill-gearing in a factory should be securely fenced." The factory inspectors had issued a circular on 31 January 1854 saying that they would have to "compel every shaft of machinery, at whatever cost and of whatever kind, to be fenced off," because of the annual toll of fatal accidents and mutilations (about forty) from unfenced machinery.¹⁴ The reaction of the manufacturers to this belated decision to enforce the law had been to form an association. Morley makes no objection to the formation of a manufacturers' association for mutual insurance against claims, but he does object to the outright illegality of their express intention to resist the law by paying the fines imposed on any manufacturer for refusing to fence his machinery. He represents it as a threat to society and

Shows in a Birmingham Hot-House," 4:82-85; "The Magic Troughs at Birmingham," 4:113-17; "Wonders of Nails and Screws," 4:138-42; "The Miller and His Men," 4:415-20; "Gold and Gems," 4:449-55; "Rainbow Making," 4:485-90; "Needles," 4:540-46; "Time and the Hour," 4:555-59; "Guns and Pistols," 4:580-85; "Birmingham Glass Works," 5:32-38; "What There is in a Button," 5:106-12; and "Tubal Cain," 5:192-97. Similar "process-articles" (about factories and their manufactures) by Dickens and others had already been published.

¹² It was first sent to the *Westminster Review* and rejected. She then offered it on her own initiative to the National Association of Factory Occupiers which delightedly gave her a hundred guineas for it. It was set out in the form of a review of a variety of parliamentary, legal, and manufacturers' reports, newspaper reports, and four articles in *HW* 11 (1855): "Fencing with Humanity," 241-44; "Death's Cyphering Book," 337-41; "Deadly Shafts," 494-95; and "More Grist to the Mill," 605-6. Further references to the pamphlet are included in our text.

¹³ Those listed in n. 12 above but with the addition of "Two Shillings per Horse-power," *HW* 12 (8 Sept. 1855):130-31. Dickens was the sole editor.

¹⁴ *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department for the Half-Year Ending 30th April 1854* quotes from a factory inspectors' circular (15 March 1854) "that above forty persons employed in factories annually lose their lives or suffer mutilations from unfenced shafts which the law requires to be securely fenced" (59); it adds that in the previous half year there had been six deaths and thirteen mutilations. Hereafter these semiannual inspectors' studies are referred to as *Reports*.

objects to the monstrosity of their risking even one death for the sake of saving the expense of adequate fences.¹⁵

Harriet Martineau retaliated by defending the manufacturers, arguing that they were not (as Morley said) "striking" against the law but against an interpretation of it by men less qualified than themselves. Speaking for the factory owners, she agrees with their interpretation of the law to mean that it was enough for the machinery to be encased to the height of seven feet. She then argues the question of moral responsibility on the grounds that if any workman (or child) climbed above the height of seven feet, even if in the course of his work, he was responsible for his own safety. Writing specifically against Dickens (although *Household Words* was not alone in its protest but had fairly widespread support including that of Leonard Horner, the most active of the factory inspectors), Miss Martineau says that she holds Dickens "alone" to be "answerable" for the "disgrace" of the series of articles in *Household Words*:

He uses the opportunities of the subject in the palpable way which a just-minded writer would scrupulously avoid,—vividly describing the crushing of bones and the rending of flesh, and the tearing of joints out of their sockets, carrying this method so far as to speak of the members of the Association as "men not squeamish about a few spots of spilt brain, or a leg or an arm more or less upon a poor man's body." (37)

Here Harriet Martineau represents the inhuman school of political economy which Dickens often satirizes so bitterly. The contrast between the two points of view is plain, and surely there is nothing out of place in Morley's plea for a greater assumption of responsibility on the manufacturer's part to avoid scenes like the one she objects to:

Perhaps it is not good [writes Morley] when a factory girl, who has not the whole spirit of play spun out of her for want of meadows, gambols upon bags of wool, a little too near the exposed machinery that is to work it up, and is immediately seized, and punished by the merciless machine that digs its shaft into her pinafore and hoists her

¹⁵ Cf. Maurice W. Thomas, *Early Factory Legislation* (Leigh-on-Sea, 1948), and John Trevor Ward, *The Factory Movement: 1830-1855* (London/New York, 1962); but although these partly help to confirm what was said in the dispute, they add little in detail and nothing in sophistication. More important are the *Factories Acts* and the *Reports* reviewed by Martineau (n. 12, p. 410) as well as those for the

up, tears her left arm at the shoulder joint, breaks her right arm, and beats her on the head.¹⁶

This was in fact an incident (typical of several in the factory reports) which Dickens originally meant to carry right into *Hard Times*, for the manuscript and extant corrected proofs of book 1, chapter 13, show him as not only identifying this girl as Rachael's younger sister but intending to footnote the text with a reference to Morley's article.¹⁷ Why he finally cut it out is now impossible to say. Partly it may have been because he disliked footnotes in fiction and partly also because it would have been too specific, whereas in *Hard Times* he wanted to avoid (as he says) incidents being "localised."¹⁸

Whatever the reason, Harriet Martineau accuses the author of the *Household Words* articles (Dickens, "or," as she says, "his contributor") of "unscrupulous statement, insolence, arrogance, and cant" (35). She turns on him directly with the old charge that his inaccuracies in past novels were always excused because "he was a novelist; and no one was eager to call to account on any matter of doctrine a very imaginative writer of fiction. . . . But Mr. Dickens himself changed the conditions of his responsibilities and other people's judgements when he set up 'Household Words' as an avowed agency of popular instruction and social reform" (36). In her outrage she deplores the lack of room (in fifty pages) "to convict the humanity-monger . . . of all his acts of unfairness and untruth" (44). It is only the "benevolence of their employers" which "has generated a mutual understanding" that saves "Mr. Dickens's representations" from causing "deadly mischief" among the workers (45).

Dickens was in Paris at the time the pamphlet was published,

rest of 1855 and 1856. Although the *Reports* are cited by Martineau, they offer evidence to show that the fencing asked for and refused did reduce accidents, and they clarify both the legal and moral positions, even though written by men who believed (as did Leonard Horner, the chief factory inspector) that the "law is an interference with private enterprise only justified by a strong moral necessity" (*Reports . . . Ending 30th April 1855*, p. 5).

¹⁶ "Ground in the Mill," *HW* 9 (22 April 1854):224; almost certainly taken from "Extracts from Reports of Certifying Surgeons," in *Reports . . . Ending 31st October 1853*, about a young girl who had been "playing . . . above some bags of wool" and whose injuries were "left arm torn out at shoulder joint, right arm fractured, and contusion of head" (113). The *Reports* are outspoken in detailing injuries, and apart from their "personifying" the machine, there is nothing "sentimental" about Morley's or Dickens's remarks.

¹⁷ George Ford and Sylvère Monod, eds., *Hard Times* (New York, 1966), p. 252 (textual notes). This edition also includes part of Martineau's pamphlet, pp. 302-5.

¹⁸ To Peter Cunningham, 11 March 1854, *Letters*, 2:546.

and it was left to Wills to ask Morley to write a reply and have it set up in proof. He then sent it to Dickens, who was in the middle of writing *Little Dorrit* and who replied expressing the wish "to avoid reading Miss Martineau's outpouring of conceit" and saying that he was putting it by for a while "without opening it."¹⁹ But three days later he went carefully over Morley's draft reply, evidently making revisions and additions, returning it to Wills with the remark, "I do suppose that there never was such a wrong-headed woman born—such a vain one—or such a Humbug."²⁰

The reply written by Morley and Dickens appears in *Household Words* as "Our Wicked Mis-Statements,"²¹ and the position taken is that "it is strictly within the province of the law to protect life." It is a humble position, arguing against her insistence that Factory-owners should refuse to obey "meddling legislation":

Might we not say . . . that a writer who believes in his heart that resistance to a given law dooms large numbers of men to mutilation, and not few to horrible deaths, may honestly speak with some indignation of the resistance by which those deaths are produced; and that the same right to be angry is not equally possessed by an advocate who argues that the deaths cannot be helped, and that nobody has a right to meddle specially in any way with a mill-owner's trade? (14)

Now, after over a hundred years, it is possible to make a careful, point by point reading of the original articles by Morley, the pamphlet by Harriet Martineau, and the Morley-Dickens reply, and to try to come to an impartial conclusion. It is only too clear that neither his privately expressed opinion that she was a conceited "Humbug" nor her public charges that he was unscrupulous, untruthful, and unfair, are dispassionate, but it is our judgment, without going into every detail here, that the arguments used by Miss Martineau and her accusations against Dickens are wrong.

For his part Dickens (with Morley) notes how quick Miss

¹⁹ 3 Jan. 1856, *Letters*, 2:720.

²⁰ 6 Jan. 1856, *Letters*, 2:721.

²¹ 13 (19 Jan. 1856):13–19; see also *Charles Dickens' Uncollected Writings from "Household Words": 1850–1859*, ed. Harry Stone, 2 vols. (Bloomington, 1968), 2: 550–62. The article is listed in the Contributors' Book as solely by Henry Morley, probably because the first draft to be set up in type was written entirely by him on Wills's initiative. But from Dickens's letters and from internal evidence it seems clear that Dickens took an effective part in modifying it. See Stone, with whom we agree.

Martineau is to take up the Bounderby view that the factories might as well be thrown into the Atlantic if their owners have to bear the expense of protecting their own workers.²² For she clearly says, on behalf of the factory-owners, that "if the charge is thrown upon the employers of industry, they will retire from occupations so intolerably burdensome" and that everyone with "any common sense" could see that "our manufactures must cease, or the Factory Laws, as expounded by Mr. Horner, must give way" (46). Yet the expense of complying with the ten-year-old law was certainly small,²³ and the positions she takes on the practical difficulties of applying the law and on the liability of employers to pay compensation were both shown (in the course of a few years) to be unfair in the light of "common sense" and untenable in principle. In their use of facts, dates, figures, statistics, and references to the law, Dickens and Morley are well informed, restrained, and accurate.²⁴

On her part there is a personal element in Harriet Martineau's attack in the way in which she lays down that Dickens must "confine himself to fiction" (38), declaring that "as a matter of taste" it was "a pity . . . that a writer of fiction should choose topics in which political philosophy and morality were involved" (36). Dickens replies by pointing out that she herself was extremely well known as the author of *Forest and Game-Law Tales* and "many volumes of Stories on Political Economy"; but Miss Martineau evidently regarded her own fiction as somehow "true," since the doctrines or principles it teaches were, as she thought, scientifically established. This dogma is given *ex cathedra* and is closed to any rational examination; and in some ways her arguments can best be understood as the embodiment of all that the fable of *Hard Times* rejects. It is remarkable that Dickens did not foresee from the first that there was this risk in inviting her to be a contributor, and

²² P. 16: "We believe it was Mr. Bounderby who was always going to throw his property into the Atlantic."

²³ See *Reports . . . Ending 31st October 1855*, pp. 56 and 110.

²⁴ See Ward, pp. 401-3. In the short run the Association was actually successful in some of its aims, but by 1860 Rev. George Stringer Bull could fairly claim that "there is now scarcely a manufacturer who does not thank God for the factory regulations which were forced from an unwilling government" (*Richard Oastler: A Sermon* [Bradford, 1861], p. 12). That Dickens was well informed is shown not only by his part in the articles written by Morley and himself which can be checked against the *Reports*, but also from his letters (e.g., to Wills, 10 Jan. 1856, *Letters*, 2:724-26); he was clearly quick to see points involved and understood, e.g., the implications of Lord Campbell's Act, 9 and 10 Vict. 93, which for the first time allowed the relatives of someone killed at work to sue for compensation.

it is not less surprising that she should have agreed to become one in spite of knowing very well from his earlier works that as soon as either of them touched on political economy they were bound to be in fundamental disagreement. It was inevitable therefore that their relationship should end sooner or later with exasperation on Dickens's side and disdainful withdrawal on hers.

As we have already noted, difficulties first came into the open when her story for the Christmas number of 1853 was rejected, when she says that she decided that she could "never again write fiction" for *Household Words* "nor anything in which principle or feeling were concerned"; although it is characteristic that, as she correctly explains elsewhere in the *Autobiography*, she had in fact already given up submitting fiction. Their final rupture came only in 1854, apparently over another difference about Roman Catholicism, following which, since she received no expression of "repentance or amendment" (*Autobiography*, 2:422), she at last withdrew.

Now, leaving on one side the question of Dickens's prejudice against Roman Catholicism (about which she may have been in the right), her treatment of contemporary industrial life in her contributions remains most interesting. Even as subedited by Wills and Dickens they are a remarkable illustration of some of the assumptions of the class and world of Bounderby and Gradgrind. In fact, so marked are these assumptions and so strikingly do they conflict with Dickens's editorial views that they suggest that differences about political economy must have underlain and caused the whole disagreement.

At first, as we have seen, Dickens and Harriet Martineau had been united by a faith in progress. Yet by 1854 Dickens was increasingly concerned with reports of industrial strife, and, with a visit to Preston and publication of his article "On Strike" (11 February 1854), he began to put forward his opinions about political economy again more clearly. They may seem moderate now, but there are three references in the article which must have been extremely disturbing to Miss Martineau. The first of these is similar to Sissy Jupe's attempted definition of statistics in *Hard Times* (book 1, chap. 9) and is a protest against the undue veneration claimed for the subject. Dickens remarks that: "Political Economy was a great and useful science in its own way and in its own place; but . . . I did not transplant my definition of it from the Common

Prayer Book, and make it a great king above all gods." Then, although admitting that political economy was useful, Dickens maintains that its validity is severely limited by its usual exclusion of the human factor, stating his belief that

into the relations between employers and employed, as into all the relations of this life, there must enter something of feeling and sentiment; something of mutual explanation, forbearance and consideration; something which is not to be found in Mr. M'Culloch's dictionary, and is not exactly stateable in figures; otherwise those relations are wrong and rotten at the core and will never bear sound fruit.

Dickens also stresses that unless political economy "has a little human covering and filling out," it is a "mere skeleton." This was a fundamental belief. He writes to Wilkie Collins about this time of his sympathy for "the working people" with "their wretched arena chalked out for them . . . by small political economists."²⁵ There is also a letter to Charles Knight about his scorn for mere "figures and averages," respected by "addled heads who would take the average of cold in the Crimea during twelve months as a reason for clothing a soldier in nankeens on a night when he would be frozen to death in fur."²⁶ Such a point of view is completely antipathetic to Harriet Martineau's, as can be seen in her pamphlet in which she complains that "Mr. Dickens cannot endure a comparative number which may diminish the show he makes with a positive one" (38). For, rather like Mr. M'Choakumchild (*Hard Times*, book 1, chap. 9), she demonstrates that although there might be over four thousand workers a year injured by machinery in textile factories, "only" twelve of that number were killed because machinery was still unfenced and that in "no other" occupation was "the proportion of deaths so small" (*Factory Controversy*, 9).

Harriet Martineau's pamphlet did not, of course, appear until well after *Hard Times*; it was partly a consequence of the novel, not a provocation. But although she was a self-appointed spokeswoman, she graphically represents views already held by the factory-occupiers who welcomed her support. It is not surprising, therefore, if Dickens's exasperation with such views led him into the trap of idealizing Stephen Blackpool, nor that his severe judg-

²⁵ 17 Dec. 1854, *Letters*, 2:609.

²⁶ 30 Jan. 1855, *Letters*, 2:620.

ment of utilitarianism in *Hard Times* should aggravate the annoyance given Miss Martineau by the earlier *Household Words* articles on workers' injuries in factories.

At the same time, although the break between them was not final until early 1855, Dickens had been growing increasingly disillusioned with her contributions. The opening paragraphs of "Our Wicked Mis-Statements" are determinedly fair:

We have a respect for Miss Martineau, won by many good works she has written and many good deeds she has done, which nothing that she can now say or do will destroy; and we most heartily claim for her the respect of our readers as a thing not to be forfeited for a few hasty words.

Yet his letters to Wills show his private complaints about her being "grimly bent upon the enlightenment of mankind."²⁷ There are possibly two reasons for this alteration in his attitude. One is the change in Dickens himself, which we have already glanced at, and the other is an increased awareness that they were both looking very differently at the industrial scene. It is true that for a time Dickens almost became what Ruskin was to call him, "the leader of the steam-whistle party *par excellence*."²⁸ But at no time in his career did he forget the nature of human participation in industry. As early as the absurd Miss Monflathers, for example, in *The Old Curiosity Shop* (chap. 31) he had satirized those who *did* forget:

"Don't you feel how naughty it is of you," resumed Miss Monflathers, "to be a wax-work child, when you might have the proud consciousness of assisting, to the extent of your infant powers, the manufactures of your country; of improving your mind by the constant contemplation of the steam-engine; and of earning a comfortable and independent subsistence of from two-and-ninepence to three shillings a week?"

There is much more to Dickens's view than this, but for the moment it may be illuminating to turn aside and see what Harriet Martineau wrote for him in her series of factory articles in *Household Words*. It reveals how narrow but how vitally important the divisions could be among those who sincerely believed in progress, especially when some of them remained so severely aloof

²⁷ 14 Oct. 1854, *Letters*, 2:597.

²⁸ Letter to Charles Eliot Norton, 19 June 1870, *The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, 39 vols. (London/New York, 1903-12), 37:7.

from the workers who helped to make it possible. It reminds us that although Dickens kept a close control over *Household Words*, it cannot be argued that every word in it gives opinions he approved; it may help to suggest how his views were often shaped by a response to others; and it makes clear how Miss Martineau was welcomed as a contributor at first, even though disagreement seems to have been inevitable as they went on.

Harriet Martineau's first contributions to *Household Words* (begun as early as 25 May 1850) are in the form of fiction: four of her stories appear in the first three volumes, seven in the first six up to December 1852. Her series of factory articles began on 18 October 1851. She later explains that after giving up fiction she decided that "a full, but picturesque account of manufactures and other productive processes might be valuable, both for instruction and entertainment" (*Autobiography*, 2:385). So she visited her brother in Birmingham and with the advantage of his introductions and technical knowledge went to work on the series there. Her titles give some idea of her approach to the subject. A description of the manufacture of papier-mâché tea trays, for example, is "Flower Shows in a Birmingham Hot-House," electroplating is dealt with as "The Magic Troughs of Birmingham," and a visit to a nail factory is entitled "Wonders of Nails and Screws." It was an interesting approach, and was no doubt (as she says) "eagerly accepted." The articles were good publicity for the firms concerned, and she received pressing invitations from other districts. But she and Dickens prudently agreed that "our chief textile manufactures were already familiar to every body's knowledge" (2:388).

Yet in this series of articles she is doing more than writing clear descriptions of little-known processes. She writes persuasively, using what are now some of the familiar techniques of advertising or public relations. Some of the unpleasant aspects of the factories are noted, but quickly erased from a reader's impression by pleasing contrasts with other parts of the work or by thoughts of their ultimate contribution to progress. Miss Martineau herself was not only deaf but had no sense of smell (she was assisted on her visits by her sister-in-law and nieces); thus much unpleasantness may have escaped her notice.

The articles are remarkably detailed and vivid. In "Rainbow Making" we see how she offsets a recognition of the physical discomfort by an excited appreciation of the brilliance of dyed silks:

"From trough to trough we go, breathing steam, and stepping into puddles, or reeking rivulets rippling over the stones of the pavements; but we are tempted on, like children, by the charm of the brilliant colours that flash upon the sight whichever way we turn." An assumed childlike awe at the accomplishments of British manufacture pervades every article. "There is a mystery in most houses of business," she writes in "Time and the Hour." And in "The Magic Troughs": "As for the gilding and silvering chambers, they are like seats of magic. One might look on for a year, and have no idea of the process, but that it must be done by magic." Of the machine process of worming screws, she declares "it is wonderful to see." Every process has her unbounded admiration: "But, oh! the beauty of those candlesticks, and of the ornamented parts of the gas-fittings, and of the most massive of the chains. And the ingenuity too!—the cleverness with which the tubing is concealed in gas-furniture" ("Tubal Cain"). Even the outside of the factories could be attractive—seen in a certain light. After a walk through the ancient streets of Coventry, she remarks: "It is strange, after this, to see the factory chimney, straight, tall and handsome, in its way, with its inlaying of coloured bricks, towering before us, to about the height of a hundred and thirty feet" ("Rainbow Making").

Outside the factories with their "Magic Troughs," workmen are "improvident"; inside they have something of a Carlylean dignity, and craftsmen become artists: "The chasing of the cast articles is one of the most astonishing processes . . . it seems as if every man . . . must be an artist." She has great patriotic pride. The contribution of each factory to the Great Exhibition has a proud notice.

All this, it hardly needs saying, is in strong contrast with *Hard Times*, in which Coketown is "a town of machinery and tall chimneys," savage, monotonous, and dirty (book 1, chap. 5), where the chimneys are "built in an immense variety of stunted and crooked shapes," like "the kind of people who might be expected" to live there; where it is only to "travellers by express-train" that the great factories look "illuminated, like Fairy Palaces"; and where those who work in them leave their shifts, like Stephen, with "the odd sensation . . . which the stoppage of the machinery always produced . . . of its having worked and stopped in his own head" (book 1, chap. 10).

To Harriet Martineau the workpeople are most admired when

they do go like machinery. There is little difference in the kind of admiration she has for the human and for the mechanical as long as each is performing its function. In the button factory she is delighted with the row of "harping lathes" which in "their clean and rapid work are perhaps the prettiest part of the whole show." Her approval of the human machines in the screw factory is expressed in much the same tones:

The job looks anything but a tidy one, while we regard the process alone. But it is different when we stand aside, and survey the room. Then we see that these six score women are neatly dressed; hair smooth, or cap clean—handkerchief or little shawl nicely crossed over, and fastened behind; faces healthy, and countenances cheerful.

In the same piece she may reveal her identification of women and machines by the use of metaphor:

As we turned away from the hundreds of women thus respectably earning their bread, we could but hope that they would look to it that there was no screw loose in their household ways, that the machinery of their daily life might work as truly and effectually as that dead mechanism which is revolving under their care, for so many hours of every day.

A passage in "Gold and Gems" shows the total identification of worker and product in the author's mind, as she describes women who give a special polish to metalware by burnishing it with their bare hands:

What curious finger-ends they have—those women who chafe the precious metals into their last degree of polish! They are broad—the joint so flexible that it is bent considerably backwards when in use; and the skin has a peculiar smoothness: more mechanical, we fancy, than vital. However that may be, the burnish they produce is strikingly superior to any hitherto achieved by friction with any other substance.

Elsewhere a machine is seen as almost human: "Probably the first thing every stranger does on entering the grinding-room is to burst out a-laughing,—the machinery is so grotesque;—so like being alive and full of affectations" ("Birmingham Glass Works"). The description has a Dickensian touch that is not unlike the pistons of the Coketown factories, working "monotonously up and down like the head of an elephant in a state of melancholy

madness" (book 1, chap. 5), except that in Coketown it does not seem so amusing.

Yet people are not nearly so reliable as machinery; as they age they are less productive:

We saw a woman in her own home . . . tacking the buttons on their stiff paper, for sale . . . This woman sews forty gross in a day. She could formerly, by excessive diligence, sew fifty or sixty gross; but forty is her number now—and a large number it is, considering that each button has to be picked up from the heap before her, ranged in its row, and tacked with two stitches. ("What there is in a Button")

It does not occur to the author to wonder whether this employment has anything to do with the woman's deterioration as well as age. Ruskin, faced with his Birmingham nail makers, is saddened by their "manufacturing toil" which left them with "no form of comeliness."²⁹ Dickens sees Blackpool imaginatively as "Old Stephen" (at forty) since "he had had a hard life" (book 1, chap. 10). But Harriet Martineau appears as coolly detached as Gradgrind in his Stone Lodge and as warmly disapproving of any self-indulgence of the workers as Mr. Bounderby with his comments on "turtle-soup and venison" (book 2, chap. 2).

Harriet Martineau never stresses the dangers of industrial work, merely notes them occasionally in passing, and rejoices to report when the manufacturer has made conditions better. She describes such conditions as those she finds at the glassworks:

We find ourselves on a sort of platform, in front of six furnace mouths, which disclose such a fire within as throws us into a secret despair; despair for ourselves, lest we should lose our senses, and for the men, because it seems impossible to live through the day in such a heat. ("Birmingham Glass Works")

Similarly with the women who work in the heavy air of the lacquering-room at a brass foundry: "There sit companies of women. . . . One wonders that they can be healthy, sitting in such a heat, and in such a smell. They earn good wages" ("Tubal Cain"; the wages were 11 shillings per week). It is always implied that the workpeople are capable of adapting themselves to any conditions. In the description of varnishing and "stoving" tea trays she remarks: "This

²⁹ Letter 80 (16 July 1877), *Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of England* (8 vols. [London, 1871–84]), in *Works*, 29:172 and 175.

must be unwholesome work to the superintendents of the process. The heat of the stove rooms is very great, and the smell of baked varnish is almost intolerable to novices." To Harriet Martineau accidents are all preventable by the workpeople themselves. As she describes the glass-blowing, she makes no mention of the dangers to the workmen, but she is well aware of them for herself:

All swing their glowing cylinders as if they were desperate or demented; a condition which we suspect we are approaching under the pressure of the heat, and the strangeness and the hurry of incessantly getting out of the way of red-hot globes, long pipes, and whirling cylinders.

Writing about wire drawing, she notes:

Women are preferred to boys for this work. Their attention is more steady, and they are more careful of their own flesh and blood. Boys are apt to make mischief; and, if they look off their work, it is too likely that they may lose their finger-ends. It is in this department of the business that most of the accidents happen. ("Nails and Screws")

Yet she does give a lengthy description of the attempts made by needle manufacturers to get their employees to wear masks which would prevent their fatally inhaling tiny pieces of ground steel. In this case it is the employees who refuse the protection offered them—a fact which she makes much of. It is the employers who have "saved" the needle-grinders from "their own folly."³⁰

Inevitably Harriet Martineau's justifications for the working conditions she found are that mass production made necessities cheaper and that all present-day working conditions are an improvement on the past: "Cyclopaedias of the present century—

³⁰ To be fair to Harriet Martineau, this was no doubt a genuine problem, and Dickens himself was to write about "knowing from the instance of the Sheffield Sword Grinders and their magnetic mask, and from other analogous cases, how difficult it is to induce ignorant people to take precautions provided for them when doing dangerous work" (29 Dec. 1868, *Letters*, 3:692). This letter was in reply to a reasoned protest from the proprietors of Limehouse lead mills who were disturbed by what Dickens had written about some cases of lead poisoning in "A Small Star in the East" (*All the Year Round*, n.s.1 [19 Dec. 1868], 61–66). It is worth remarking that Dickens taking a doctor with him had visited some of the victims and talked to them in their own homes. He came back to the subject in "On an Amateur Beat" (*All the Year Round*, n.s.1 [27 Feb. 1869], 300–303) after a further visit to the mills when he noted the precautions taken and praised the employers' care but still concluded that the work was highly dangerous. His remarks ended by looking to "American inventiveness" for an advance which would make the production of white lead possible "entirely by machinery."

within the last thirty years, even—give such an account of the formation of a needle, as appears quite piteous to one who was at Redditch yesterday.” Manufacturers are never blamed for bad working conditions; they are invariably praised for their care. Good working conditions are noted with complacency. Winding silk is “easy work,” many of the women are allowed to sit at their reels, and the air is “pure and cool.” She congratulates the employees in the needle factory: “Those who work on Mr. James’s premises are well off for air, light, and cheerfulness.” Similarly where labor relations are good, the credit goes to the employer. It is true that the employer, himself, may say that their improved “health, understanding, and morals” is simply the result of “Sunday schools . . . and the good free-school”—and he may be right. But she thinks that: “There is something in the tone of the intercourse between himself and everybody on his premises, which convinces a stranger that there is also somebody else to thank for the improvement, which drives out all the stranger’s preconceptions of the wretchedness of needle-makers” (“Needles”). All the best points of the employers are dwelt on, their ingenuity, enterprise, and economy being judged the most praiseworthy. Her series is thus an enormously forceful exaltation of “the entrepreneurial ideal,”⁸¹ appearing in the same journal that was to call the Preston Strike an employers’ “Lock-Out,” to deride a sympathizer of the factory-occupiers (in “On Strike”) as “Mr. Snapper,” to suggest that strikes might even be justified, and to ridicule the “masters” in Josiah Bounderby. Yet to Harriet Martineau the only fault of the masters is that they are too complacent about their workers’ improvidence: “It is too common to hear employers speak coolly, if not with satisfaction, of this state of things, because it keeps the workmen dependent and humble, and lessens the dangers of those strikes about wages, which are the plague of the manufacturer’s life” (“The Magic Troughs at Birmingham”).

The same series of articles shows her severity when she has to remark on any legislative interference in trade. She objects particularly to taxation and import dues. The paper duty forces the manufacturer to use cheap materials. Coventry ribbon-workers are blamed for their “tenacity about protective duties.” A whole page in “Time and the Hour” is devoted to commenting on “legislative impediments which annoy the manufacturer. . . . What confusion,

⁸¹ Perkin, *Origins*, chap. 8.

and trouble, and waste, are caused by all these legislative meddlings!" The only answer is Free Trade. In her last process article ("How to Get Paper"), which Dickens found so "grimly determined," she writes against the paper tax once more. This was a tax which, in spite of the unpopularity it brought him, Dickens defended in preference to other forms of taxation which he judged bore more heavily on the poor.³² It is one instance of the way in which he did *not* insist that no contributor should express views contrary to his own.

In all these articles there is not even the Smilesian encouragement to the worker to "come and join the masters," although they are written in the belief that society's problems can be solved only by self-help. Their author may have been cut off by her deafness, yet, even though writing for such a popular periodical as *Household Words*, she shows no personal interest in the people she meets, notes no conversations with the workers, and merely expresses the hope that they can be improved by education. In her eyes the workers appear difficult children, and she is the teacher, as when she cheerfully lectures them on how they must adapt themselves to the machine: "Here must be no Monday laziness after Sunday's rest; no caprice as to going to work or staying away. Like time and tide—like brewing and dyeing—the work at Messrs. Elkington's cannot wait for men's humours" ("Magic Troughs").

Nothing could be more dissimilar to Dickens's approach, whether in his own journalism in which the personal interest is emphasized or in his admission in *Hard Times* that he entertains "a weak idea that the English people are as hard-worked as any people on whom the sun shines" (book 1, chap. 10). Being the daughter of a ruined manufacturer may have helped to shape Harriet Martineau's ideas of the relations between "masters and men"—as much as Dickens's childhood experiences affected his. What is curious, though not altogether surprising, is that Harriet Martineau's nonfiction, which is supposedly the work of a dispassionate observer, may be thought to be as strongly marked by its author's characteristic preferences as Dickens's fiction.

Part of the interest of all this lies, moreover, in the change (as we have explained) that had been taking place in Dickens. And it could hardly be more strikingly shown than in his having allowed Harriet Martineau her head in her factory articles for *Household*

³² To Charles Knight, 8 Feb. 1850, *Letters*, 2:205.

Words and then having felt driven to repudiate everything she stood for in *Hard Times*. For as he shows in "A Preliminary Word," he had also been fascinated by "the mightier inventions of the age"; he had been ready himself to pay tribute to the manufacturers; and early in 1853 he could speak of seeing "in the factories and workshops of Birmingham such beautiful order and regularity, and such great consideration for the workpeople provided, that they must be justly entitled to be considered educational too."³³ And of course he never questioned that, with good will, the interests of all classes "are identical."

The difference that existed from the first between him and those who thought like Miss Martineau lay chiefly in his deep concern both for the individual and for the quality of working-class life. It shows chiefly in his novels, but it is also reflected in such *Household Words* articles as "The Amusements of the People—I" (30 March 1850) in which he says that the people have "a right to be amused," or in "To Working Men" (7 October 1854) in which he declares that they have "a right to every means of life and health that Providence has afforded." He can write of such a city as Manchester in 1852 as an "awful machine," kept "in harmony" only with the help of such institutions as its new Public Library;³⁴ and fascinated as he may be by the new inventions he refuses to admit that "the hardest workers at this whirring wheel of toil" are to be "excluded from the sympathies and graces of imagination" ("A Preliminary Word," 30 March 1850).

But with *Hard Times* a change arose. He decided to write it for *Household Words* because the journal was thought to be declining; and he may have thought that with contributors such as Miss Martineau it had become rather too complacent about workmen and the conditions in which they lived and worked. He certainly found himself, as he wrote to Mrs. Gaskell (21 April 1854), rebelling against "the monstrous claims at domination made by a certain class of manufacturer,"³⁵ and he declared that the "idea" of the novel had "laid hold" of him "by the throat in a very violent manner."³⁶

Nor was this quite all. For one of the consequences of the

³³ 3 Jan., *Speeches of Charles Dickens*, ed. K. J. Fielding (Oxford, 1960), p. 160.

³⁴ *Speeches*, pp. 153–54, Pierpont Morgan Library, ms quoting letter to Miss Coutts, 3 Sept. 1852.

³⁵ *Letters*, 2:554.

³⁶ To Hon. Mrs. Richard Watson, 1 Nov. 1854, *Letters*, 2:602.

Martineau dispute was that he certainly recognized where his sympathies lay when the spinners and piecers struck in Manchester (November 1855 to January 1856) following a reduction in wages at a time of higher prices. So when Morley sent him the draft of an article about the strike, at about the same time as his draft of "Our Wicked Mis-Statements," Dickens was uncompromising in his demand that Morley's article be rewritten. The creator of Slackbridge, the union agitator, and of the antiunionist Stephen Blackpool gives very clear instructions in a letter to Wills that this strike-article cannot possibly put forward the opinion that "all strikes among this unhappy class . . . are always necessarily wrong."³⁷ He is clearer than ever before that to open such a piece "by saying that the men are '*of course* entirely and painfully in the wrong' . . . would be monstrous." Nor would he concede that they were wrong because such a strike would throw other men out of work without their consent, exclaiming "O Good God when Morley treats of the suffering of wife and children, can he suppose that these mistaken men don't feel it in the depths of their hearts, and don't honestly and honorably—most devoutly and faithfully—believe—that for those very children when they shall have children, they are bearing all these miseries now!" Morley's draft was immediately revised and published as "The Manchester Strike" (2 February 1856); from it we can see the curious result that the editor (and in some instances author) of articles on the wonders of new manufacturing processes is now represented as holding that "unwholesomely cheap production" is "a perversion of the common law of trade, which will in the course of time be blotted out by the advance of education." He is shown as arguing that though free competition is healthy, the unskilled worker is at such a disadvantage that he has no freedom to compete, and that ("O, political economist!") such a class must be protected.

To account in this way for what happened in the Dickens-Martineau dispute is not merely to offer a small gathering of facts as part of a centenary tribute. In the course of their differences we can see a development in Dickens which also partly underlies his fiction. It is evident that this was a period of crisis for him. Of course it is obvious how painfully inadequate Stephen Blackpool is, but we have also to consider how extraordinarily confined up to this time had been the imaginative understanding even of Dickens

³⁷ 6 Jan. 1856, *Letters*, 2:721–22.

and certainly of most of his readers when faced with the results of the industrial revolution. Industrial life was a new experience for the imaginative writer; its achievements were at first a matter of simple wonder to everyone; and the break with the dominant “entrepreneurial deal” was something which not only had to occur within Dickens’s own general editorial policy but within himself, and this was in defiance of the very strongest tendencies of the age as well as his own. The effects of the break can be seen in *Hard Times*; also in *Little Dorrit* in the partnership of the inventor Daniel Doyce and the factory manager Arthur Clennam; they can even be seen in *Great Expectations* and certainly in the spirit of the *Uncommercial Traveller*. George Orwell may be right in saying that Dickens was “not mechanically minded,”³⁸ but he had to adapt to the machine age. That he did so deserves to be recognized more clearly by those who now read Dickens’s novels at all closely.

³⁸ *Collected Journalism*, 1:444.