

## *Beauchamp's Career:* Politics, Realism and Romance

In 1867 George Meredith's friend Commander Frederick Maxse stood as a Radical candidate at a Southampton by-election, and was defeated. Meredith spent two months in Southampton helping Maxse in his campaign, and the grounding in this experience is obvious in the novel, not only in the physical description of the town of 'Bevisham' and its environs, the harbour (Southampton water), the island (Isle of Wight) and the yachting on the Solent, but also in the central figure of Beauchamp. We need not agree with Siegfried Sassoon that 'Beauchamp is Maxse' (157) but the similarities are clear enough – both Maxse and Beauchamp moving from naval careers (and retaining their military titles) into radical politics. G. M. Young has remarked that 'Meredith did not learn his politics from Maxse, but the experiences they shared in the Southampton canvass gave him an insight into the nature of the political animal, whether candidate or elector, which would make *Beauchamp's Career* even if it were nothing else, a document – and a most far-sighted document – for the political history of its time' (xiii). Contemporary reviewers of *Beauchamp's Career* (1875) remarked upon the documentary accuracy of the party-political analysis Meredith presented. H. D. Traill in the *Pall Mall Gazette* pointed to

the completeness with which the author has succeeded in individualising a series of characters belonging generically to the same type in respect of social position and politics ... The feudal Toryism of Everard Romfrey, the martinet unidea-ed Toryism of Colonel Halkett ... the hard-headed Philistine Toryism of Blackburn Tuckham, and the sceptical eclectic Conservatism of Seymour Austin and Stukely Culbrett, belonging to four separate and clearly marked types ... Nor is there less felicity of discrimination displayed in the Radicalism of Nevil Beauchamp,

of Dr. Shrapnel and of Lydiard. Mr. Grancey Lespel represents thoroughly well the 'landed variety' of the old Whig ... (12)

The documentary basis for the political portraits in the novel is firmly grounded, then, and attested by contemporaries. Similarly the political issues – the Game laws, the press servilely dependent on its advertisers, the Navy estimates – are very specific issues; even Nevil's programme for opening museums on Sundays was the sort of thing radicals found themselves caught up in; it was still an issue in William Morris's 1877 lecture, 'The Decorative Arts'.

Such documentary specificity is basic to the political accuracy of the novel. Although larger issues, ideas rather than particular reforms, are discussed in the novel – capitalism, the existence of a leisure class, the role of the clergy as establishment lackeys – many of the conversations are firmly based on specific, contemporary issues. So we encounter the future of Gibraltar, the war against the Chinese, the Manchester free traders. Margaret Harris has explored this topicality of the novel. Both components are necessarily there, the general issues and the specific details. One of the concerns of *Beauchamp's Career* is the problem of translating political enthusiasm, abstract political conviction, into specific political action. The documentary detail is necessary to show the political objectives of that moment in time; and then we can see how far away those specific objectives are from political ideals and abstractions and enthusiasms. Nevil's initial theoretical political enthusiasm has to be tested by its ability to survive the mundane and trivial documentary detail, and to realise that not all that detail is unimportant.

Morris E. Speare in *The Political Novel* remarked that '*Beauchamp's Career* is rather a satire upon English political Conservatism than it is an encomium upon the political thought of Bright and Cobden'. (241) Taking care not to accept any implicit slight of the novel's radicalism here, it is worth taking Speare's other point. The novel is set almost entirely amongst the families of the aristocracy and upper middle class – frequently amongst naval or military families. It is in this essentially an anatomy of the establishment. The majority of the scenes take place in country houses serviced by armies of servants, with an occasional diversion on horseback or on a yacht. Meredith is not concerned to present a

## *Beauchamp's Career*

picture of English society in its entirety, he is not concerned with a social cross-section here; the working-class hardly figures. Gillian Beer has remarked on that omission, though referring to the working class simply as 'the poor' is to share the non-dynamic, depoliticized perceptions of the establishment class Meredith is portraying.

For a novel with a Radical hero *Beauchamp's Career* gives very little place to the poor: a vignette of a poor man's cottage, a group waiting for news at the crisis of Beauchamp's illness, a passing reference to a poacher, the mother of the boy Beauchamp saved. Yet it is a more genuinely radical novel than, for example, *Felix Holt the Radical*, because it is concerned with transforming the sensibility not only of its characters but of its readers. (102)

Had Meredith purported to be writing a social novel of politics and class in England, his omission would have been absurd. But he does not attempt even the incomplete spread of George Eliot in *Felix Holt* or *Middlemarch*. V. S. Pritchett has stressed another aspect of the deliberate limitation of Meredith's focus.

Beauchamp's England is the south; the scene of unrest is the not very politically-minded city of Southampton. The real drama, of course, is in the north and that has to be reported by hearsay. The debate, as in Peacock's attacks on industrialism, child labour and so on, is conversation and hot-tempered epigram about Tories, Whigs and the Manchester manufacturers. (102)

Insofar as the politics of Manchester industry enter *Beauchamp's Career*, they are refracted through the establishment consciousness. Meredith is primarily concerned with presenting an anatomy of establishment conservatism, and with attitude change in a given, closed environment. He is not presenting the conflicting demands of different social classes: rather he is demonstrating the solidarity of the establishment.

But the demonstration comes from a radical perspective. By the presentation of the consciousness of the radical protagonist, and more especially by the more coherently radical figure, Dr. Shrapnel, we are given a context in which to view the establishment

conservatism. Arnold Kettle stresses the central importance of Nevil's radical consciousness to this political novel:

to compare the effect of Meredith's with George Eliot's novel is immediately to be aware of an essential difference. *Felix Holt* is about Radicalism, but what we tend to remember is not so much its 'subject' as the personal stories of Mrs. Transome and Harold, of Esther and Felix, and the two centres of interest, the personal and the political, never quite unite, except in the very opening chapters. With *Beauchamp's Career* there is no such duality. Whether one says that the novel is about Radicalism or about Beauchamp makes little difference, for the two elements within the conception of the book, the general and the particular, the politico-social and the personal, are inseparable. Nevil Beauchamp is interesting because he is a romantic Radical; romantic Radicalism as a human and historical phenomenon is interesting because the presentation of Nevil Beauchamp's career makes it so. (190)

Nevil's romantic radical consciousness is in constant relationship with both the conservatism of his own establishment class, and with the practical requirements of unromantic radical politics. Gillian Beer is quite wrong when she claims that the plot does not arise from the political:

*Beauchamp's Career* is a novel of politics. Yet none of the crucial *actions* of the characters derives directly from political principle. The narrative incidents are deliberately and often painfully inadequate as a dramatization of the complex emotional pressures which produce them. (105)

If political principle is narrowly related to party-political programmes, then it is possible to understand Beer's objection. But Meredith's concern, of course, is the distance between party-political programmes and romantic radical impulses: and the distance of both of those from establishment conservatism. The narrative incidents arise from the interplay of Nevil's romanticism with the establishment conservatives, and with the necessities of dull party-political work. That narrative incidents are often

## *Beauchamp's Career*

deliberately and painfully inadequate is Meredith's comment on the nature of Nevil's romanticism working in this context.

How radical is Meredith's orientation to his establishment material? Leavis's dismissal of Meredith in *The Great Tradition* might lead us to suspect that hidden beneath the robes of the stylist, which is what the bourgeois critics foreground, is a radical thinker. And in *Romance and Realism* Christopher Caudwell recognized the critic of bourgeois society in Meredith, but saw him as nonetheless trapped in bourgeois notions.

Not only *The Egoist* but all Meredith's books are about egoists and careerists, and their difficulties in the intricate world of bourgeois rights. This of course accounts for the peculiar coldness and falsity of Meredith's love passages, for egoism chills love and makes it a mere extension of the ego ...

But both the insincerity of his love scenes and the critical attitude of his witty (rather than comic) spirit were reflections of the advanced decay of bourgeois culture. Like Wells and Shaw at a later date, this careerist tailor's grandchild saw the falsity of the values of the stratum into which he had risen. But he could see no other, and so his only resource is mockery ... (81-2)

The very title *Beauchamp's Career* indicates that same careerism. But the critical spirit here is exploring values other than bourgeois ones. Indeed, setting the novel in the high-bourgeois and aristocratic milieu is one part of its rejection of the bourgeoisie; and looking for solutions in Radicalism is its rejection of all those milieux – aristocratic, bourgeois, feudal, military.

The class solidarity of the establishment is attested importantly. Nevil Beauchamp is standing as second liberal candidate to Mr. Cougham, the senior candidate; but 'Cougham had passed through his Radical phase, as one does on the road to wisdom ... though they were yoked they stood at the opposite ends of the process of evolution' (19;159). Cougham, though standing as a liberal, was 'chrysalis Tory' (19;160). Opposition candidates were, are, so often of the same social class and political views as the establishment sitting candidates: Cougham standing as a liberal is a Tory standing in opposition to another Tory.

But the irony does not rest only on Mr. Cougham the liberal

being in fact a Tory. Nevil Beauchamp himself is central to this irony. The tight-knit structure of the English establishment has often enough been indicated. Dissent comes from the same family as conservatism – just a different wing of the family making sure the family stays in control of the conservative establishment and the radical anti-establishment. Nevil with his firmly establishment background, environment, friends stands as a radical liberal, as a people's champion. To the sceptical eye, he could be just as conservative as his family, engaged in a bit of generational struggle no doubt, so calling himself radical.

This is the situation Meredith explores. Is Nevil just another establishment ploy – an establishment move to control and contain radicalism so it doesn't get out of the hands of the 'natural leaders'? Or is Nevil in fact a genuine radical, rebelling against the values of his class, genuinely committed to massive social change? Not only is Meredith's analysis concentrated onto one class, this class focus is narrowed down further to a concentration onto the family. The familial unit is stressed in the novel when Nevil's cousin Baskett is nominated to stand as second Tory candidate for Bevisham, against Nevil. The fact of their cousinship is exploited to discredit Nevil's radicalism in the eyes of the radical voters. Whatever political position you vote for, the same establishment, the same family even, will be there. Nor is the 'radical' Nevil's platform that challenging.

The Address, moreover, was ultra-Radical: museums to be opened on Sundays; ominous references to the Land question, &c.; no smooth passing mention of Reform, such as the Liberal, become stately, adopts in speaking of that property of his, but swinging blows on the heads of many a denounced iniquity.  
(11;90)

Meredith keeps the address deliberately vague; the only specific point – that museums should open on Sundays – is so trivial amidst the splendid abstractions, that the effect is comic; at the same time its specificness points up the vagueness of the rest of the speech. And as for the threats on property, Nevil is thoroughly dependent on his own unearned income, on his allowance from his uncle. His schemes and tastes are thoroughly aristocratic; for his later scheme, to run a radical newspaper, he would need a fortune. He is a radical

## *Beauchamp's Career*

who believes in an aristocracy:

One may venerate old families when they show the blood of the founder, and are not dead wood. I do. And I believe the blood of the founder, though the man may have been a savage and a robber, had in his day finer elements in it than were common. But let me say at a meeting that I respect true aristocracy, I hear a growl and a hiss beginning: why? Don't judge them hastily: because the people have seen the aristocracy opposed to the cause that was weak, and only submitting to it when it commanded them to resist at their peril; clinging to traditions, and not anywhere standing for humanity: much more a herd than the people themselves. Ah! well, we won't talk of it now. I say that is no aristocracy, if it does not head the people in virtue – military, political, national: I mean the qualities required by the times for leadership. (28;269)

He is annoyed at his uncle's marrying Rosamund Culling;

He had no wish to meet his uncle, whose behaviour in contracting a misalliance and casting a shadow on the family, in a manner so perfectly objectless and senseless, appeared to him to call for the reverse of compliments. (44;434)

He inveighs against the 'flood of luxury' of the aristocracy, while the poor go hungry, and after inveighing

He called for claret and water, sighing as he munched bread in vast portions, evidently conceiving that to eat unbuttered bread was to abstain from luxury. He praised passingly the quality of the bread. It came from Steynham, and so did the milk and cream, the butter, chicken and eggs. He was good enough not to object to the expenditure upon the transmission of the accustomed dainties. (42;411)

Such, then, is the radical Nevil Beauchamp. Rosamund remarks on his similarity to his uncle, Everard Romfrey (35;342. 53;517). Everard's reply is 'Two ends of a stick are pretty much alike: they're all that length apart'. Their similarities are stressed when

each ends up offering the other an ultimatum for an apology. The central episode of the novel is Everard Romfrey's thrashing Dr. Shrapnel. In Everard's scheme it is a moral and chivalrous act: he is defying those members of society who give Rosamund Culling a bad name for living with him unmarried. The chapter in which Everard sets out is entitled 'Showing a Chivalrous Gentleman set in Motion' (31;302). But it is a barbarous act – and the barbarity is sanctioned by the establishment. There is never any suggestion that there might be a court case or that Dr. Shrapnel might be recompensed. Nevil helps nurse him back to health, certainly. But Nevil's main objection to the whipping is not the suffering of Dr. Shrapnel, but the fact that such an act reflects on the family honour. The 'honour' of the family is still a basic priority for this radical – and it is to redeem the family's name that Nevil demands an apology from Everard. It was to avenge Rosamund's name and honour that Everard performed the whipping in the first place. And after all, it was for a similar defence of Rosamund's good name that Nevil as a child had thrashed Cecil Baskett. Uncle and nephew are very similar.

The episode is paradigmatic of Everard's and Nevil's attitudes. Everard never has any doubt that this is the way to act – he naturally takes the law into his own hands in this pre-social, aristocratic warrior, individualist way. Everard is presented as 'in person a noticeable gentleman, in mind a medieval baron, in politics a crotchety unintelligible Whig ... At one time he was a hot Parliamentarian, calling himself a Whig, called by the Whigs a Radical, called by the Radicals a Tory, and very happy in fighting them all round' (2;14–15). 'A medieval gentleman with the docile notions of the twelfth century, complacently driving them to grass and wattling them in the nineteenth ...' (3;27). The hot-headedness, the impetuosity, the anarchic individualistic aspect of Nevil's radicalism, proclaim the similarity of the uncle to Nevil.

If Nevil is like his uncle, and his uncle is a member of the establishment – even if a crotchety member – what are the values of that establishment class that might come into conflict with Nevil's radicalism – or that might throw light on the extent of that radicalism? The property bonds within the establishment are demonstrated fully by Meredith – bonds that keep the establishment close knit. In so far as there is any 'plot' it revolves round the



possible marriage between Nevil and Cecilia Halkett – a marriage both Colonel Halkett and Everard Romfrey are at first concerned to settle, for the cementing of class and property bonds. It is not a romance extraneous to the political theme as, say, that between Felix and Esther that George Eliot offers us in *Felix Holt*. Meredith has tied it into his social analysis. In the end Cecilia marries Blackburn Tuckham, the Tory candidate. Politics-property-marriage are all necessarily involved here. The loyalties members of the class show to each other, and the ideas they are in agreement over are demonstrated in Colonel Halkett's defence of Romfrey's whipping of Dr. Shrapnel even though he has no knowledge of what it was in response to, let alone whether it was a justified response (which even in Romfrey's barbarous system it turns out not to be).

Though he could not guess the reason for Mr. Romfrey's visit to Bevisham, he was, he said, quite prepared to maintain that Mr. Romfrey had a perfect justification for his conduct.

Cecilia hinted at barbarism. The colonel hinted at high police duties that gentlemen were sometimes called on to perform for the protection of society ... Evidently he had resolved to back Mr. Romfrey blindly. That epistle of Dr. Shrapnel's merited condign punishment and had met with it, he seemed to rejoice in saying: and this was his abstract of the same: 'An old charlatan who tells his dupe to pray every night of his life for the beheading of kings and princes, and scattering of the clergy, and disbanding the army, that he and his rabble may fall upon the wealthy, and show us numbers win; and he'll undertake to make them moral!' (32;317)

Because of his political views, the establishment class believe that Shrapnel deserved to be whipped anyway, whatever else he might have done. Romfrey was only doing his social duty in acting for all of them, expressing their wish.

'And he deserved it!' the colonel pursued, on emerging from the cabin at Lord Lockrace's heels. 'I've no doubt he richly deserved it. The writer of that letter we heard Captain Baskett read the other day deserves the very worst he gets.'

'Baskett bored the Club the other night with a letter of a

Radical fellow,' said Lord Lockrace. 'Men who write that stuff should be strung up and whipped by the common hangman.'

.....

Colonel Halkett protested that he never could quite make out what Radicals were driving at.

'The rents,' Lord Lockrace observed in the conclusive tone of brevity. (32;315)

Lord Lockrace is, of course, quite right. For Lockrace and the rest of Meredith's characters here pretty well, the rents are their god-given due. It is by their land, their property, their unearned income that this conservative class can live the way it does – can live at all. And Meredith absorbs into this attack on landowners and capital Arnold's attack on the barbarism of the aristocracy and philistinism of the middle classes – an attack on the English establishment mindlessness, its contempt for the arts. The two qualities are not necessarily associated – and Meredith does not assert that they are; indeed, he shows with the French count, Renée's father, an equally inequitable political and social system supporting a man of taste; the count looks at the art treasures of Venice on his feudal, unearned wealth; while Romfrey wouldn't go to visit Nevil in Venice – it would mean 'breaking loose from shooting engagements at a minute's notice, to rush off to a fetid foreign city notorious for mud and mosquitoes' (5;42).

A love for art does not justify or even soften the count's feudalism. However a specific contempt for art is usually a sign with Meredith of something wrong with a character.

Captain Baskett respected the poetic art for its magical power over woman's virtue, but he disliked hearing verses ... He abused his friend roundly, telling him it was contemptible to be quoting verses. (30;301).

The Tory Blackburn Tuckham remarks

'We've got ten thousand too many fellows writing already ... it's all unproductive dead weight on the country, these fellows with their writings!' (28;266)

Indeed, that is true; if the country is to be the sort of country the Tuckhams and Baskett's want, writing is a dead weight on the country. It is Tuckham who gives the most coherent defence of capitalism and property:

'Property is ballast as well as treasure. I call property funded good sense. I would give it every privilege. If we are to speak of patriotism, I say the possession of property guarantees it. I maintain that the lead of men or property is in most cases sure to be the safe one ...'

Mr. Tuckham grew fervent in his allusions to our wealth and our commerce. Having won the race and gained the prize, shall we let it slip out of our grasp? Upon this topic his voice descended to tones of priestlike awe; for are we not the envy of the world? Our wealth is countless, fabulous. It may well inspire veneration. And we have won it with our hands, thanks (he implied it so) to our religion ... We perish as a Great Power if we cease to look sharp ahead, hold firm together, and make the utmost of what we possess. The word for the performance of those duties is Toryism: a word with an older flavour than Conservatism, and Mr. Tuckham preferred it. By all means let working men be free men: but a man must earn his freedom daily, or he will become a slave in some form or another: and the way to earn it is by work and obedience to right direction. In a country like ours, open on all sides to the competition of intelligence and strength, with a Press that is the voice of all parties and of every interest; in a country offering to your investments three and a half and more per cent., secure as the firmament! –

He perceived an amazed expression on Miss Halkett's countenance; and 'Ay,' said he, 'that means the certainty of food to millions of mouths, and comforts, if not luxuries, to half the population. A safe percentage on savings is the basis of civilization.' (26;247–8)

And he goes on to drink his claret – luxuries are allowed for him – and 'commended the fishing here, the shooting there'; he's exempt from the necessities of daily work and earning his freedom anew each day. Beauchamp elsewhere deals with the question of the press,

which Meredith shows us quite clearly did not give voice to all parties and to every interest.

Tuckham's conservatism is one that believes in the necessity of capitalist industry. Romfrey, however, is opposed to that; he hates the free traders of Manchester as 'negrophiles and sweaters of Christians.' The collocation is interesting – and worthy of *Huckleberry Finn* for its encapsulation of an ideology. Romfrey's dislike of the 'sweaters of Christians' is not the result of any belief in the equality of man, the brotherhood of humanity: he condemns Manchester as negrophile – and he has no sympathy with Nevil's serving in the navy to catch slavetraders. Romfrey's objection is that industry is something ignoble, noisy and vulgar, unEnglish; that Romfrey and his like are more and more dependent for their leisured existence on the profits of industry, he does not recognize. Romfrey's ethos is brilliantly caught by Meredith in a passage shortly after the horsewhipping of Shrapnel.

Moreover, the month of September was drawing nigh; he had plenty to think of. The entire land (signifying all but all of those who occupy the situation of thinkers in it) may be said to have been exhaling the same thought in connexion with September. Our England holds possession of a considerable portion of the globe, and it keeps the world in awe to see her bestowing so considerable a portion of her intelligence upon her recreations. To prosecute them with her whole heart is an ingenious exhibition of her power. Mr. Romfrey was of those who said to his countrymen, 'Go yachting; go cricketing; go boat-racing; go shooting; go horse-racing, nine months of the year, while the other Europeans go marching and drilling.' Those occupations he considered good for us; and our much talking, writing, and thinking about them characteristic, and therefore good. And he was not one of those who do penance for that sweating indolence in the fits of desperate panic. Beauchamp's argument that the rich idler begets the idling vagabond, the rich wagger the brutal swindler, the general thirst for a mad round of recreation a generally-increasing disposition to avoid serious work, and the unbraced moral tone of the country an indifference to national responsibility (an argument doubtless extracted from Shrapnel, talk tall as the very demagogue when he stood

## *Beauchamp's Career*

upright), Mr. Romfrey laughed at scornfully, affirming that our manufactures could take care of themselves. As for invasion, we are circled by the sea. Providence has done that for us, and may be relied upon to do more in an emergency. – The children of wealth and the children of the sun alike believe that Providence is for them, and it would seem that the former can do without it less than the latter, though the former are less inclined to give it personification. (33;320–1)

There is no need to demonstrate further Meredith's analysis of the beliefs and attitudes of the upper and upper-middle class establishment; his exposure of philistine conservatism, of feudal barbarity informs the whole novel, and once noticed (and so many critics have not remarked on it) its central importance is obvious. And the radical protagonist Nevil Beauchamp belongs to this establishment world being analysed. His attachment to it and his sharing unconsciously much of its ideology is basic to his character and to Meredith's theme. But Meredith's theme is also one of political change, political conversion. The radicalism that is part of the novel is a dynamic radicalism – it isn't safely contained like Felix Holt's radicalism, but it works evaluatively within the novel. The more radical Nevil becomes, the more radical the book becomes, the more all of it can be re-read from this critical radical position. And Meredith involves this with a theme of conversion – the form of the novel enacting the conversion of its protagonist. So we see Nevil belonging firmly to the conservative establishment that is analyzed, and then we see his attempts to break away from it, his attempts to preach radicalism in it, and his gradual understanding of what radicalism in fact is – the continuing radicalization of Nevil that only his sudden death curtails. In this sense the death is tragic; it wasn't a convenient death, arriving when he has no more to say.

The enthusiasm that drives Nevil into political action is initially a romantic, chivalric enthusiasm – something associable with the feudal, with his uncle. He fights for Rosamund's good name as a child; he performs valiantly in the Crimean war; his valour is of the single-handed individual hero variety. Romfrey wrote to him:

They tell me that while you were facing the enemy, temporarily

attaching yourself to one of the regiments – I forget which, though I have heard it named – you sprang out under fire on an eagle clawing a hare. I like that.

and again

I have a letter from your captain, informing me that I am unlikely to see you home unless you learn to hold yourself in. (4;36–7)

Individual valour and a sentimental sympathy for the victim inspired his single-handed acts of rash courage. And a certain lack of conventional proportion. This sympathy for the underdog was of course there before Nevil left for the war, when he stopped the keepers chasing a poacher and went in chase himself. ‘I caught him myself, but recognized him as one of a family I take an interest in, and let him run before they came up.’ (3;29) It is an incident that causes one of Nevil’s early clashes with Romfrey – and shares, of course, all Romfrey’s arbitrary impetuosity.

Nevil at the beginning of the novel promises to be a hero of a romantic episode with Renée, only daughter of the Comte de Croisnel. Nevil has saved the life of her brother Roland – so ‘he who had saved her brother must be nearly brother himself, yet was not quite, yet must be loved, yet not approached’ (5;43). But the Renée episode is an important development and qualification of story-book romance. The total romantic situation – beautiful woman, man who’s saved her brother’s life – doesn’t issue in romance. Nevil’s very romantic chivalrous illusions complicate the simplicity of the plot line, and leave us unclear as to what his motives might be. In his chivalric and sentimental way he believes he is doing a good thing in saving Renée from what as an Englishman he abhors – an arranged marriage to a man old enough to be her father. But how far that is a rationalisation of simple sexual desire, is never clear. Meredith brilliantly presents it as ambiguous.

Renée’s appeal to Nevil is two-fold: she is as a woman a second-class citizen, a victim of feudal attitudes to marriage, and so she needs – he has no doubt – his support and sympathy; but secondly, she is also an aristocrat, with all the appeal of a mysterious and

aristocratic culture. Renée's aristocratic birth is essential. This is the sort of person Nevil is, Meredith is stressing, so that the extent of his radicalization can be realised – that is the battle radicalism has in England.

Class, 'good family' and such like are important to this 'radical'. And indeed he *seems* like he should be the ideal, stereotypical 'romantic' lover – dumb, ex-military chap. He certainly chooses to associate with the people who would expect him to be like that – that is the social milieu he remains in. Nevil's continued devotion both to Renée and to upper-middle class Cecilia, attachments persisting long into his developing radicalism, indicates the extent of his class attitudes; in personal terms he is attached to these aristocratic and upper-middle class ladies even when politically he is in opposition to the values of their class. This has of course become such an accepted fact of leftist politicians in the years since Meredith wrote that we probably don't even realize that Meredith is being *ironic* about the idea, he thinks it's grotesque, and has built the grotesqueries into the centre of his conception of the novel. Meredith no doubt observed from 1870s realities; he could hardly have imagined that only a hundred years later, his satirical observation would have achieved the status of a truism.

It is only right at the end of his career that Nevil breaks away from both Renée and Cecilia and marries Jenny Denham, niece of the radical Dr. Shrapnel; but even she is no daughter of the people. Nonetheless, her background and attitudes are vastly different from Renée and Cecilia's.

We have then initially a dashing Romantic hero – brilliant reputation from the Crimean war, distinguished family, and, to make him sympathetic, he has a generous kind spirit for the underdog. And the structure of the novel promises to be romantic, centres on such romantic aspects of a young man's career; following, that is, the one hero in a romantic way, not proposing to offer a picture of a cross section of society with balanced interest spread through three or four main characters. And we have the romantic settings – Venice, the wooing by Nevil of Renée, the plan to elope by sea.

But *Beauchamp's Career* develops very differently. The hero's expectations and the novel's structural promise are foiled jointly. For it is a novel about politics, modern politics, radicalism. And

Meredith goes on to demonstrate that the romantic individualistic commitment of Nevil's is not appropriate for political action: the novel is concerned to deal with the gulf between on the one hand enthusiasm, commitment, ideas, and on the other hand the political practicalities. Individualistic romantic enthusiasm needs to be channelled into socialized practicality. The romantic is frustrated and ends continually in the bathetic. Nevil does not elope with Renée; nothing splendid happens. The incident parallels that episode of his singlehanded youthful challenge to the French guard in defence of England's honour – when nothing happened. Nevil's feudal chivalry (inherited from his uncle's medieval baronial attitudes) are inappropriate for the nineteenth-century. Every time Nevil succumbs to these emotions, disaster results. In the middle of his electoral campaign, he receives the summons from Renée – and romantically dashes over in response to her cryptic note. But she is not waiting to be rescued from dire distress; she simply had a wager with an effete French aristocrat that Nevil would respond to her summons. It is unlikely that Nevil would have won the election anyway but his absurd departure, and the consequent scandal from which his opponents make political capital, demonstrate the gulf between his romantic enthusiasms, and the realities of parliamentary, political action.

His commitment to radical politics – developing on from his vaguer humanitarian single-handed hero exploits, and his serving on an anti-slave trade frigate – occurred within two hours of landing in England. His impetuosity is emphasized. But his impetuosity is not to be ridiculed; it is the force of his commitment, it is that that drives him into politics, – unlike, say, the fence-sitting aphoristic, epigrammatic, negative wit and wisdom of Stukely Culbrett. But it is an impetuosity and energy that must be channeled if it can be of any use, if it is not to be lost in the indulgent and counter-effective. The inappropriateness of Nevil's romanticism, and the frustration of his romantic hopes, goes along with a similar frustration of romantic episodes in the novel. The elopement with Renée at Venice comes to nothing, the summons from Renée during the election is all for nothing; and when later she comes to England, instead of their love at last being dramatically and romantically and passionately fulfilled, in some beautiful yet absurd operatic way, Nevil calls for Rosamund to stay in the house to stop any breath of



## *Beauchamp's Career*

scandal and rejects Renée. It is not even a grandiose, heart-rending, romantic rejection – but a prosaic, practical one. And of course it isn't even *practical*, it fails in its object anyway, scandal isn't prevented – and how could summoning Rosamund, for so long a figure of scandal living in sin (Nevil has fought for her 'name', Everard horsewhips Shrapnel over it), ever be imagined to produce the desired effect? There is an element of self-destructiveness, of blind compulsive accident-proneness in Nevil, as if psychically he summons the very thing he feared – and maybe wanted all along; maybe he does essentially want to get rid of Renée to free himself for his radical commitments. And doesn't his radicalism stand for a total objection to the life style and values of the establishment, doesn't it stand for a world in which he could have an affair with Renée if he wanted; and he could chose not to have one and not compromise her if he wanted; and in that sort of ideal society there wouldn't be any 'compromising'?

All these possibilities are raised by the deliberate frustration of plot suspense – the continual explosion of or bathetic curtailment of some potentially romantic cliché activity. Meredith early on in the novel remarks on what he is doing, to let us know that what he is doing is intentional, that it isn't ineptitude in handling romance, but a deliberate frustration of romance:

I am reminded by Mr. Romfrey's profound disappointment in the youth, that it will be repeatedly shared by many others: and I am bound to forewarn readers of this history that there is no plot in it. The hero is chargeable with the official disqualification of constantly-offending prejudices, never seeking to please; and all the while it is upon him the narrative hangs. (4;33)

And Meredith goes on to tell how Nevil 'with every inducement to offer himself for a romantic figure ... despises the pomades and curling-irons of modern romance' (4;34). Brought up, as we have seen, in an environment conducive to his becoming a romantic hero, and conducting his early career with an appropriate romantic individualist impetuosity, he destroys the romantic image continually – by allying himself with radicalism especially; and he goes on, after his romantic commitment to radicalism, to shun that romanticism that is politically unhelpful. He renounces Renée most

unromantically: because she will not live in England, and he must remain there for his political aims. And because Dr. Shrapnel is always advising him to avoid sexual scandal.

Translating political enthusiasm into action requires not the military, single-handed derring-do, the old knightly bravery, that Nevil has in common with his uncle Everard, but the constant platforming, speech-making, canvassing, being pelted with fruit. The romantic settings of Venice are replaced by English provincial church halls. It is all ignominious, vulgar, and slow after Nevil's military fame. But he accepts it readily. Nevil's initial program has little practical about it, and anyway it is disrupted by the romantic flight to Renée. There is initially a tragic, and absurd, gulf between political conviction, enthusiasm and idealism – and political action. But it is a gulf that has to be bridged. Significantly, Meredith moves from disrupted romantic action to the canvassing episode. The dreary routine, the personal humiliations, the endless arguments of canvassing are the bridge for converting Nevil's enthusiasm into action; this is the way to win votes, and if he can win sufficient votes he can get elected, and if he can get elected ... It is all very remote and laborious after rescuing a hare from an eagle in mid-battle. The canvassing episode is the new battlefield for the election campaign. Nevil, of course, loses the fight.

It is one of the significant exceptions to the overall upper-crusty settings of the novel. The scenes in the yachts, drawing-rooms and chateaux have demonstrated all too clearly the barbarian political prejudice, the hostility to ideas, the reactionary nature of 1870s English – and European – establishment life. To translate political enthusiasm into political action in a parliamentary way, this blind prejudice has to be converted; because this blindly prejudiced establishment controls the political machine, the suffrage, the parties. The political problem is seen by Meredith as a problem of changing human attitudes, as a drama of consciousness.

And Nevil's solution is to bring the war back home; not only to fight on his lecture tours with Dr. Shrapnel, but to fight in the drawing-rooms of his family and class; these provide the wider, enduring battleground for Nevil. And Meredith presents it as a valid area of activity. For until the individual is changed, there can be no political change. Political change here is seen as the sum of individual changes. If he cannot succeed in the public meeting,

## *Beauchamp's Career*

maybe Nevil can succeed in private conversation. And to change one consciousness in the establishment ...

With this in mind we can see the significance of Romfrey's remark towards the end of the novel. Rosamund says

'what I feel is that he – our Nevil! – has accomplished hardly anything, if anything!'

'He hasn't marched on London with a couple of hundred thousand men: no, he hasn't done that,' the earl said, glancing back in his mind through Beauchamp's career. 'And he escapes what Stukely calls his nation's scourge, in the shape of a statue turned out by an English chisel. No: we haven't had much public excitement out of him. But one thing he did do: *he got me down on my knees!*'

Lord Romfrey pronounced these words with a sober emphasis that struck the humour of it sharply into Rosamund's heart, through some contrast it presented between Nevil's aim at the world and hit of a man: the immense deal thought of it by the earl, and the very little that Nevil would think of it – the great domestic achievement to be boasted of by an enthusiastic devotee of politics! (55; 534)

For the political Romantic, which Nevil never wholly ceases to be, as Rosamund realizes in recognizing how he wouldn't attach Lord Romfrey's significance to this event, getting Romfrey on his knees to apologize to the outsider radical Shrapnel, is merely bathetic as the high point of a career that aimed at political significance. The comedy is there. But Romfrey's emphasis is from another perspective the correct one. The great domestic achievement, Rosamund called it. But it is just because it is a domestic achievement that it is politically significant. We saw earlier the familial interrelationships of the conservative establishment. To begin to achieve political change the conservative establishment must be made, taught, wooed, converted, to think differently; and this means the conversion must occur largely within the family and by the family. Dr. Shrapnel would never be admitted into the house to begin propagandizing directly to any of these establishment conservatives. By getting Romfrey to apologise to Dr. Shrapnel, Nevil has achieved a major change of consciousness

in his uncle: it was an activity unthinkable at the novel's opening: and at the novel's end, we see Dr. Shrapnel and Lord Romfrey side by side, united in their grief at Nevil's death, but also united in a developing understanding. To find them together, to find their concerns and fates touching, is a mark of the change Nevil has achieved. To have them standing here together, on this same spot, is a fine visual image of the achieved relationship between the two men: I won't say unity, because it clearly isn't that. But at the beginning of the novel they could never have been seen in the same frame as this dual image. Contrast it, for instance with that often cited ending of E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924), where Aziz and Fielding are separated by their horses swerving apart. Or the epigraph to *Howards End* (1910), 'only connect'. Meredith achieved, equally visually, the reverse of Forster's political image, and expressed the fulfilment of that epigram. Nevil, after all, has achieved something. He has made a connection. He has led no revolution, he has not even got into the corruptly elected parliament when the novel ends. But he has achieved individual successes: small, unromantic, bathetic, mundane successes – but the necessary basis for social change. Romfrey is one; in more practical, political terms, there is the success in getting Carpendike to vote for him. Walter Wright has commented on how 'the converting of one man by argument and character was in the direction of progress for Meredith' (125). But perhaps his most significant, and the most realized in fictional terms, example of change is that of Cecilia. Nevil's own conversion to radicalism, and his conversion to subduing his personality to the rigours of disciplined campaigning, we do not see. The first meeting with Dr. Shrapnel, and the campaigning tours, occur offstage. Meredith is uninterested in these – he senses that for him at any rate they would be dull, tedious, even distasteful perhaps. Meredith has a theme he finds more interesting, more complex and subtle and offering of manoeuvre for sardonic ironies as well as a mark of the battles radicalism will have to encounter. So he focusses on Nevil's arguments with Cecilia, his attempts to convert her, bully her, woo her politically; and then he goes on to show Cecilia using Nevil's arguments in resisting the barbarism and political benightedness of her family; it is in Cecilia that we see the fullest drama of the consciousness, in her we see the process of resistance, considering,

## *Beauchamp's Career*

wavering, conversion and change. With Everard Romfrey the change is a personal one; but it is a necessary beginning; without such personal conversion there is unlikely to be a political change of heart. With Cecilia we see the further change of her political opinions, the modification of her ideology. With Renée, the love of his aristocratic, pre-radical days, Nevil does not really argue: on the ship to Venice, he bullies her into a submission to him, but mainly assumes responsibility for her thoughts, answering for her. When Nevil refuses to return to Venice, and Renée's brother tells him, 'You heard her wish to return to Venice, I say,' Nevil replies simply, 'She has no wish that is not mine' (10;76), justifying this arrogance on his usual liberal sentimental grounds – that her brother always speaks for her so she never expresses her true feelings: 'she can neither speak nor think for herself: you lead her blindfolded.' If she is not allowed to express her thoughts, Nevil will express them for her and coincidentally they are exactly the thoughts he would have expressed himself anyway. With Meredith, man's relationship and attitude towards woman is a pretty clear index of his further politico-social attitudes. He had identified the concept male chauvinism some ninety years before the concept or phrase became widely current, and he had related it to other forms of political and social oppressions.

But Nevil develops. When Nevil rushes off to Tourdestelle at Renée's summons in the middle of his election campaign, Meredith remarks, 'He thought little of politics in relation to Renée' (23;209). But politics are present in Nevil's first meeting with Cecilia on his return to England. Delighted to see him, she is somewhat shattered when it turns out he has called in order to get her father to vote for him. And not only is his being merely political in his visit shattering, the fact that he has chosen radicalism is some sort of lunatic betrayal. 'Have you gone over to the enemy, Nevil?' she asks, and elaborates

We are Tories, you know, Nevil. Papa is a thorough Tory. He cannot vote for you. Indeed I have heard him say he is anxious to defeat the plots of an old Republican in Bevisham – some doctor there; and I believe he went to London to look out for a second Tory candidate to oppose to the Liberals. Our present Member is quite safe, of course. Nevil, this makes me unhappy. Do you not

feel that it is playing traitor to one's class to join those men?'  
(15;131)

Her attitudes are totally those of her class, and direct paraphrases of her father's views (male domination of woman identified with this reactionary politics that are imposed onto the women – the political nature of male chauvinism emerges again and again).

'Yet the wealthier we are the more an army is wanted, both to defend our wealth and to preserve order. I fancy he half inclines to compulsory enlistment. Do speak to him on that subject.'

... (Nevil) nodded and spoke coolly, 'An army to *preserve order*? So, then, an army to threaten civil war!'

'To crush revolutionists.'

'Agitators, you mean ... ' (17;144)

The grotesquerie is not caricature, as Meredith knew. Troops had been used to put down radicals before, at Peterloo, and were to be used again. As Nevil, one time Naval officer himself, remarks, drawing on discussions with Dr. Shrapnel,

as the middle-class are the party in power, they would not, if they knew the use of arms, move an inch farther in Reform, for they would no longer be in fear of the class below them.

(17;144)

The 'if' is somewhat gracious – or a mark of Meredith's own mystification – the desperate refusal to recognize that the middle-class indeed did, do, know the use of arms. Cecilia expresses her class views in conversation, in argument with Nevil. There is a dialectic, there is change. She is surprised afterwards to find herself taking on certain of Nevil's emotional attitudes and positions. Angered at the ballad about Nevil and the 'French Marquees', she expresses her disgust at politics involving such 'disgraceful squibs'. Her father replies,

'there's pitch and tar in politics as well as on shipboard.'

'I do not see that there should be,' said Cecilia resolutely.

'We can't hope to have what should be.'

## *Beauchamp's Career*

'Why not? I would have it: I would do my utmost to have it,' she flamed out. (17;149–50)

She looks forward to Ursula in *The Rainbow* in her impassioned refusal to accept things as they are, just because they are as they are. Her father notices the Beauchamp-like emphases flaming out.

'Your *utmost*?' Her father was glancing at her foregone mimicry of Beauchamp's occasional strokes of emphasis. 'Do your utmost to have your bonnet on in time for us to walk to church. I can't bear driving there.'

Cecilia went to her room with the curious reflection, awakened by what her father had chanced to suggest to her mind, that she likewise could be fervid, positive, uncompromising – who knows? Radicalish, perhaps, when she looked eye to eye on an evil. For a moment or so she espied within herself a gulf of possibilities, wherein black nightbirds, known as queries, roused by shot of light, do flap their wings. – Her utmost to have be what should be. And why not? (17;150)

It is a slow, a gradual change. But it is Cecilia's conversion from mindless Toryism, into thinking about politics. She asks Austin to 'Recommend me some hard books to study through the Winter' (28; 263) and her father is appalled to find she has been reading 'three privately-printed full reports of Commander Beauchamp's speeches' (28;271). When Dr. Shrapnel is horsewhipped by Romfrey, she is horrified at the self-satisfied Tory-authoritarian-barbarism of the action. Late in the novel Rosamund tells Nevil that

Colonel Halkett and Cecilia called on us at Steynham. She was looking beautiful; a trifle melancholy. The talk was of your – that – I do not like it, but you hold those opinions – the Republicanism. She had read your published letters. She spoke to me of your sincerity. Colonel Halkett of course was vexed. It is the same with all your friends. She, however, by her tone, led me to think that she sees you as you are, more than in what you do. (44;433)

This attestation of Cecilia's belief in Nevil's sincerity (whereas her

father and his set think Nevil's a criminal lunatic), is given especial force by its context of Rosamund's nervousness and abhorrence of even mentioning the word 'Radicalism'. To have persuaded Cecilia of his sincerity and integrity when there was every pressure to make her hold the beliefs of her father and Rosamund, is one of Nevil's political achievements.

Though she lapses back. Converting the establishment to radicalism is a slow, maybe even a hopeless task; maybe Nevil is misguided and only mass revolution will change things. Maybe it isn't worth trying to convert the establishment. Maybe they can never be permanently, sincerely, genuinely changed. Horrified that Nevil is possibly still in love with Renée, and wanting to marry Cecilia merely for her fortune which he will need in order to finance his radical newspaper, Cecilia withdraws from him, and finally marries the Tory Tuckham. All we have is the hope that she will not simply relapse back into mindless Toryism; maybe – surely – Nevil's example, arguments, persuasion will have made some small enduring impression. But we are left with the question, a possibility – not any certainty.

Such small, personal and insecure, shaky conversions are Nevil's achievement. But slight and temporary as they may be, he has at least done *something*. When he is lying sick at Dr. Shrapnel's, weak but recovered, Jenny Denham tells her uncle, Dr. Shrapnel, not to bring home deputations of working men to see Nevil. And Nevil at first agrees. Shrapnel explodes.

'Wrong!' the doctor cried! 'wrong! wrong! Six men won't hurt you more than one. And why check them when their feelings are up? They burn to be speaking some words to you. Trust me, Beauchamp, if we shun to encounter the good warm soul of numbers, our hearts are narrowed to them. The business of our modern world is to open heart and stretch out arms to numbers. In numbers we have our sinews; they are our iron and gold. Scatter them not; teach them the secret of cohesion. Practically, since they gave you not their entire confidence once, you should not rebuff them to suspicions of you as aristocrat, when they rise on the effort to believe a man of, as 'tis called, birth their undivided friend. Meet them!'

'Send them,' said Beauchamp. (54;524)



## *Beauchamp's Career*

He has, then, inspired some people, cooperated in the development of a movement, won some people's confidence. And now he must move from the easy one-to-one confrontation, and face a mass organization; leave the drawing rooms of the establishment altogether, and get out into wider organizing activity. It is all so different from his earlier romantic notions; but he has been changing throughout. His initial evasiveness about the game-laws – sharing something of his uncle's landowning, hunting, shooting and fishing attitudes – has changed and we find him, when Shrapnel is ill, conducting Shrapnel's correspondence on behalf of poachers. And it is the unglamorous handling of correspondence we see him involved in – contrasting with his earlier impetuous derring-do-catching, and releasing of his own accord, that single poacher.

This developing co-operative, disciplined activity is disrupted by Nevil's final gesture, a resurgence of the old, single-handed romanticism as he drowns while attempting to save two small boys. Romfrey and Shrapnel watch the attempts to find his body in the novel's last scene. Romfrey approaches Shrapnel:

He put his arm within the arm of the heavily-breathing man whom he had once flung to the ground, to support him.

'My lord! my lord!' sobbed the woman, and dropped on her knees.

'What's this?' the earl said, drawing his hand away from the woman's clutch at it.

And it's the boy Nevil saved, lost his life for.

Dr. Shrapnel's eyes and Lord Romfrey's fell on the abashed little creature. The boy struck out both arms to get his fists against his eyelids.

This is what we have in exchange for Beauchamp!

It was not uttered, but it was visible in the blank stare at one another of the two men who loved Beauchamp, after they had examined the insignificant bit of mudbank life remaining in this world in the place of him. (56;547)

It is a deeply disturbing ending, and one that has aroused extraordinary critical hostility. Sassoon, for instance, remarks 'it makes

one feel as if Meredith had lost patience with the tale and thrown it aside with a savage gesture' (157). The comment is absurd, but it indicates the savage gesture of rejection of the ending many readers feel compelled to make, especially those who retain attachment to the earlier romantic individualist hero image of Nevil. And the rejection is enacted in Romfrey's rejection of the working-class woman and the saved 'insignificant bit of mudbank life'. All the class tensions of the novel, all the uneasy, unresolved conflicts of elitism and co-operation implicit in Nevil's radicalism, are resurrected at this moment of the death of the hero. Romfrey's 'What's this?' rather than 'Who's this?' nicely catches the way his class sees the working-class as not people but impersonal things. Nevil had certainly moved beyond that point; and Nevil's attempt at saving the two working-class children is psychologically true of his unsubdued, romantic chivalrous impetuses, and also of his developing sense of solidarity with the working-class. But it is an attempt that shows the limits of such individual attempts; for the cause of radicalism is certainly not advanced by his death. And yet what would have been the worth of Nevil's ideals had he not attempted to save the children, had he rowed past saying, my political career is more important, my political success will save the mass, so this drowning pair must be abandoned? Jack Lindsay remarks correctly that Beauchamp 'cannot advance to mass struggle. He dies in an individual act of heroism, which expresses his anguished desire for union with the common people but which also kills him, returning him to romantic loss' (220). And Lindsay's complaint that Beauchampism 'still can conceive only of individual action, individual heroism and self sacrifice', and fails to grasp 'the secret of cohesion' is true; but in this concrete instance, Beauchamp has no alternative; this was a case where individual heroism was the only choice.

We are forced back to reappraise our concealed assumptions, our suppressed elitism: was this 'insignificant bit of mudbank life' worth Nevil's life? Romfrey withdraws his hand from the woman's grasp spontaneously, instinctively, expressing an unambiguous rejection of the worth of the sacrifice. Lindsay writes, 'There can be no irony in the end of such a man; the saved child is the future for which he has striven; the child is the working-class with whom the next word lies' (220). The novel consider both these conclusions, ends

### *Beauchamp's Career*

with nagging questions rather than certainties. We have seen Nevil progressively dropping his aristocratic characteristics, slowly becoming involved in the radical struggle, subduing his impetuous individuality, eroding the certainties of his uncle and of Cecilia. His final act is the result of a consistent direction, a synthesis of his new radicalism and the best of the old noble qualities of his knight in shining armour style behaviour. But is Nevil's programme impossible? Is the only hope for the radicalisation of the establishment its own extinction, its self-sacrifice, its voluntary self-destruction? Will the change come after all not from the Nevils but from the anonymous mudbank life that has not been examined? Has the whole novel been focussed on the wrong representative consciousness? Has it been the study of a class on the verge of extinction, rather than that or an emergent new radical impulse? Or is Nevil the deviant of that class doomed to extinction? Maybe the establishment will hold onto power and the radicals will be the sacrificial victims of that power's perpetuation. Meredith doesn't have the future perspective of a William Morris or a Jack London to be able to say, yes, repression will continue to dominate for years to come but in the end radicalism will triumph, bits of mudbank life will no longer be insignificant. His ending is deeply problematic, generating a series of questions, not any proclaimed hope or convinced faith.

# Bibliography

- Allen, Walter, *All In A Lifetime* (1959), introduction by Alan Sillitoe, London: Hogarth Press, 1986.
- Anderson, Don, and Stephen Knight, eds, *Cunning Exiles*, London: Angus & Robertson, 1974.
- Anderson, Don, *Hot Copy: Reading and Writing Now*, Ringwood: Penguin, 1986.
- Beer, Gillian, *Meredith: A Change of Masks*, London: Athlone, 1970.
- Benjamin, Walter, *Illuminations*, London: Fontana, 1973.
- Bogarde, Dirk, British Film Institute Lecture, *The Listener* (2 September, 1971): 304.
- Booth, William, *In Darkest England and The Way Out*, London: Salvation Army, 1890.
- Boyers, Robert, *Atrocity and Amnesia: The Political Novel Since 1945*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Brissenden, R. F., ed. *Studies in the Eighteenth Century II*, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1973.
- Bullock, Chris, and David Peck, *Guide to Marxist Literary Criticism*, Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
- Capek, Josef and Karel, *The Life of the Insects*, in *International Modern Plays*, Everyman's Library, London: Dent: 1950.
- Carlisle, Olga, 'Down Life's dark tunnels with Milan Kundera', *The Weekend Australian* (8-9 June, 1985): 16.
- Case, A.E., *Four Essays on Gulliver's Travels*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945.

## Bibliography

- Caudwell, Christopher, *Romance and Realism: a study in English Bourgeois Literature*, ed. Samuel Hynes, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970 .
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, 'The Nun's Priest's Tale', in *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F.N. Robinson, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957.
- Cohn, Dorrit, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes For Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Coleman, John, 'The Unthinkables' (review of Sillitoe, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*), *New Statesman* (27 October, 1961): 39-41.
- Conrad, Joseph, 'Anatole France', in *Notes on Life and Letters*, London: Dent, 1949.
- Conrad, Joseph, *Heart of Darkness*, ed. Robert Kimbrough , New York: Norton, 1971.
- Conrad, Joseph, *Letters to William Blackwood and David S. Meldrum*, ed. William Blackburn, Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1958.
- Conrad, Joseph, *Nostromo: a tale of the Seaboard*, London and New York: Harper, 1905.
- Cooper, Christopher, *Conrad and the Human Dilemma*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1970.
- Craig, David, 'The British Working Class Novel Today', *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 11 (1963): 29-41.
- Craig, David, and Michael Egan, *Extreme Situations*, London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Dickens, Charles, *Our Mutual Friend* (1865), ed. Stephen Gill, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Criticism and Ideology*, London: NLB, 1976.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Exiles and Emigrés*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1970.

*Social Visions*

- Eagleton, Terry, *Literary Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Marxism and Literary Criticism*, London: Methuen, 1976.
- Ehrenpreis, Irvin, 'Swift on Liberty', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 13 (1952): 131-146.
- Eliot, George, *Felix Holt, The Radical* (1866), ed. Fred C. Thomson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Eliot, George, *Middlemarch* (1871), ed. David Carroll, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Empson, William, *Some Versions of Pastoral*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1935.
- Faulkner, William, *The Sound and The Fury* (1929), London: Chatto and Windus, 1966.
- Fink, Z. A., 'Political Theory in *Gulliver's Travels*', *ELH: A Journal of English Literary History* 14 (1947): 151-61.
- Firth, Charles, 'The Political Significance of *Gulliver's Travels*', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 9 (1919-20): 237-59.
- Fleishman, Avrom, *Conrad's Politics: Community and Anarchy in the Fiction of Joseph Conrad*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967.
- Ford, Ford Madox, *Thus to Revisit* (1921), New York: Octagon, 1966.
- Forster, E. M., *A Passage to India*, London: Edward Arnold, 1924.
- Forster, E. M., *Howards End*, London: Edward Arnold, 1910.
- Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Furbank, P. N., *Unholy Pleasure or The Idea of Social Class*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Gindin, James, 'Alan Sillitoe's Jungle', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 4 (1962): 35-48.
- Gindin, James, *Postwar British Fiction*, Berkeley: University of

## Bibliography

- California Press, 1962.
- Goldmann, Lucien, *Towards a Sociology of the Novel*, (1964), London: Tavistock, 1975.
- Gray, Nigel, *The Silent Majority: a Study of the Working Class in Post-war British Fiction*, London: Vision, 1973.
- Gribble, Jennifer, 'The Fogginess of *Heart of Darkness*', *Sydney Studies in English* 11 (1985-6): 83-94.
- Guerard, Albert J., *Conrad the Novelist*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Hajek, Igor, 'Morning Coffee with Alan Sillitoe', *Nation*, 55 (27 January, 1969): 122-4.
- Harris, Margaret, 'The Topicality of Beauchamp's Career', *REAL: The Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature* 4 (1986): 135-94.
- Harth, Phillip, 'The Problem of Political Allegory in *Gulliver's Travels*', *Modern Philology* 73 (1976): 540-7.
- Hawkins, Hunt, 'Conrad's Critique of Imperialism in *Heart of Darkness*', *PMLA* 94 (1979): 286-99.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy, ed., *The English Working Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, London: Edward Arnold, 1984.
- Hennessy, Brendan, 'Alan Sillitoe', *Transatlantic Review* 41 (1972): 108-113.
- Hergenhan, L. T., 'Meredith Achieves Recognition: The Reception of *Beauchamp's Career* and *The Egoist*', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 11 (1969): 1247-68.
- Hewitt, Douglas, *Conrad; a Reassessment*, Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952.
- Hitchcock, Peter, *Working-Class Fiction in Theory and Practice: A Reading of Alan Sillitoe*, Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1989.
- Howe, Irving, 'In Fear of Thinking' (review of Sillitoe, *Key to the Door*), *New Republic* (28 May, 1962): 25-6.

- Howe, Irving, 'The Worker as a Young Tough' (review of Sillitoe, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*), *Nation* (24 August, 1959): 27-8.
- Howe, Irving, *Politics and the Novel*, London: Stevens, 1961.
- James, Henry, *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881), introduction by W. W. Robson, Everyman Library, London: Dent, 1983.
- Jameson, Fredric, *Fables of Aggression: Wyndham Lewis, the Modernist as Fascist*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Jameson, Fredric, *Marxism and Form*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Jameson, Fredric, *The Political Unconscious*, London: Methuen, 1981.
- Jameson, Fredric, *The Prison House of Language*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Jean-Aubry, G., *Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters*, 2 vols. London: Heinemann, 1927.
- Joyce, James, *Ulysses* (1922), London: Bodley Head, 1937.
- Keeseey, Donald, 'The Distorted Image: Swift's Yahoos and the Critics', *Papers on Language and Literature* 15 (1979): 320-32.
- Kermode, Frank, *Essays on Fiction*, London: Routledge, 1983.
- Kermode, Frank, *Modern Essays*, London: Fontana, 1971.
- Kerouac, Jack, *On the Road* (1957), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Kettle, Arnold, 'Beauchamp's Career' in Ian Fletcher, ed., *Meredith Now: Some Critical Essays*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Kettle, Arnold, *An Introduction to the English Novel*, 2 volumes, (1951), London: Arrow, 1962.
- Klaus, H. Gustav, ed., *The Socialist Novel in Britain*, Brighton: Harvester, 1982.



## Bibliography

- Klaus, H. Gustav, ed., *The Rise of Socialist Fiction*, Brighton: Harvester, 1987.
- Klotz, Gunther, 'Naturalistische Züge in Alan Sillitoes Roman "Saturday Night and Sunday Morning"', *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Americanistik* 10 (1962): 153-61.
- Knapp Hay, Eloise, *The Political Novels of Joseph Conrad*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Knight, Stephen, *Form and Ideology in Crime Fiction*, London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Kostelanetz, Richard, ed., *A Critical (Ninth) Assembling*, New York: Assembly Press, 1979.
- Lawrence, D. H., *Kangaroo*, London: Secker, 1923.
- Lawrence, D. H., *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, London: Secker, 1932.
- Lawrence, D. H., *The Rainbow* (1915), ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Leavis, F.R., *The Common Pursuit* (1952), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962.
- Leavis, F. R., *The Great Tradition* (1948), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962.
- Lindsay, Jack, *Decay and Renewal*, Sydney: Wild and Woolley, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1976.
- Lindsay, Jack, *George Meredith: His Life and Work*, London: Bodley Head, 1956.
- Lindsay, Jack, Introduction to Jack London, *The People of the Abyss*, London: Journeyman, 1977.
- Lodge, David, 'Milan Kundera and the idea of the author in Modern Criticism', *Critical Quarterly* 26 (1984): 105-21.
- Lodge, David, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, London: Routledge, 1990.
- Lodge, David, *Language of Fiction*, London: Routledge, 1966, second edition, 1984.

*Social Visions*

- London, Jack, *The Iron Heel* (1907), London: Journeyman, 1976.
- Lucas, John, ed., *Literature and Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Methuen, 1971.
- Lukacs, Georg, *Marxism and Human Liberation*, ed. E. San Juan Jr., New York: Delta, 1973.
- Lukacs, Georg, *The Historical Novel*, London: Merlin, 1962.
- Lukacs, Georg, *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*, London: Merlin, 1963.
- Lukacs, Georg, *Writer and Critic*, London: Merlin, 1970.
- Macherey, Pierre, *A Theory of Literary Production*, London: Routledge, 1978.
- Maloff, Saul, 'The Eccentricity of Alan Sillitoe', in Charles Shapiro ed., *Contemporary British Novelists*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
- Marvell, Andrew, *Andrew Marvell*, ed. Frank Kermode and Keith Walker, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Marx, Karl, 'The Future Results of the British Rule in India', in *On Colonialism*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, n.d.
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, translated by Samuel Moore, (1888), Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973.
- Marx, Karl, *Capital* volume I, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling (1887) and edited by Frederick Engels, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978.
- Matveyeva, Nina, 'Alan Sillitoe Visits our Office', *Soviet Literature* 9 (1963): 180-2.
- McDougall, Bonnie S., ed., *Mao Zedong's "Talks at the Yan'an Conference on Literature and Art"* (1943), Ann Arbor: Michigan Papers in Chinese Studies, 1980.
- McEwan, Ian, 'An Interview with Milan Kundera', *Granta* 11 (1984): 21-37.

## Bibliography

- McLauchlan, Juliet, 'The Politics of *Nostramo*', *Essays in Criticism* 17 (1967): 398-406.
- Meredith, George, *Beauchamp's Career* (1875), ed. Margaret Harris, *World's Classics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Miller, Henry, *Tropic of Cancer*, Paris: Obelisk Press, 1934.
- Milton, John, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649) in J. Max Patrick ed., *The Prose of John Milton*, New York: Doubleday, 1967.
- Morris, William, *News from Nowhere* (1890) in *Three Works by William Morris*, ed. A.L. Morton, Berlin: Seven Seas, 1968.
- Morris, William, *Political Writings*, ed. A.L. Morton, Berlin: Seven Seas; New York: International; London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1973.
- Ohmann, Richard, *English in America*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Orwell, George, *Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, 4 volumes, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-four* (1949), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961.
- Penner, Allen Richard, 'The Political Prologue and Two Parts of a Trilogy: *The Death of William Posters* and *A Tree on Fire: A Liturgy for Revolution*', *University Review Kansas City* 35 (1963): 11-20.
- Penner, Allen Richard, *Alan Sillitoe*, New York: Twayne, 1972.
- Pritchett, V.S., *George Meredith and English Comedy*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1976.
- Raskin, Jonah, 'Imperialism: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*' in Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse, *Literature and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Harper & Row, 1967: originally *Journal of Contemporary History* 2 (1967).

*Social Visions*

- Raskin, Jonah, *The Mythology of Imperialism*, (1971 ), New York: Delta, 1973 .
- Rawson, Claude J., 'Gulliver, Marlow and the Flat-Nosed People', *Dutch Quarterly Review* 13 (1984): 162-78, 282-99.
- Robson, W. W., *The Definition of Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Rosselli, John, 'A Cry from the Brick Streets' (review of Sillitoe), *The Reporter* 33 (10 November, 1960): 37-42.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul, Preface to Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), New York: Grove, 1964.
- Sassoon, Siegfried, *Meredith* (1948), London: Arrow, 1959.
- Shestakov, Dmitri, 'Alan Sillitoe from Nottingham', *Soviet Literature* 9 (1963): 176-9.
- Sillitoe, Alan, 'Both Sides of the Street', *Times Literary Supplement* (8 July, 1960), reprinted in *The Writers Dilemma*, London: Oxford University Press, 1961, pp.68-76.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *A Start in Life*, London: W. H. Allen, 1970.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *A Tree on Fire*, London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *Key to the Door*, London: W.H. Allen, 1961.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1958), London: Pan, 1960.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *The Death of William Posters*, London: W.H. Allen, 1965.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *The Flame of Life*, (1974), London: Star, 1976.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner*, London, W.H. Allen, 1959.
- Singer, Isaac, *Enemies: A Love Story*, London: Cape, 1972.
- Singer, Isaac, *Love and Exile*, New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Singer, Isaac, *Shosha*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

## Bibliography

- Singer, Isaac, *The Image and Other Stories*, London: Cape, 1986.
- Singer, Isaac, *The Penitent*, London: Cape, 1984.
- Speare, Morris Edmund, *The Political Novel*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Thomas P. Roche, Jr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Stewart, Garrett, 'Lying as Dying in *Heart of Darkness*', *PMLA* 95 (1980): 319-31.
- Swift, Jonathan, *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), volume 11, *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, Oxford: Blackwell, 1941.
- Swift, Jonathan, 'A Modest Proposal', in *Irish Tracts, 1728-1733*, volume 12, *The Prose Works of Jonathon Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.
- Swift, Jonathan, 'The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit', in *A Tale of A Tub with Other Early Works, 1697-1707*, volume 1, *The Prose Works of Jonathon Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, Oxford: Blackwell, 1939.
- Traill, H. D., 'Beauchamp's Career', *Pall Mall Gazette* (February 5, 1876): 11-12.
- Tressell, Robert, *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists* (1914), London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955.
- Trotsky, Leon, *The Permanent Revolution*, London: New Park, 1962.
- Twain, Mark, *King Leopold's Soliloquy* (1905), introduction by Stefan Heym, Berlin: Seven Seas, 1961.
- Twain, Mark, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885), ed. Peter Coveney, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.
- Vidan, Ivo, 'The Politics of *Nostromo*', *Essays in Criticism* 17 (1967): 392-8.
- Watt, Ian, *Nostromo*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

*Social Visions*

- Widdowson, Peter, ed, *Re-reading English*, London: Methuen, 1982.
- Wilding, Michael, *Political Fictions*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980 .
- Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961.
- Williams, Raymond, *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Williams, Raymond, *Politics and Letters*, London: NLB, 1979.
- Williams, Raymond, *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*, St. Albans: Paladin, 1974.
- Williams, Raymond, *The Long Revolution* (1961), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965.
- Williams, Raymond, *Writing in Society*, London: Verso, 1983.
- Winstanley, Gerard, *The Law of Freedom and Other Writings*, ed. Christopher Hill, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- Wright, Walter F., *Art and Substance in George Meredith*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1953.
- Young, G.M., Introduction to George Meredith, *Beauchamp's Career*, World's Classics, London: Oxford University Press, 1950.