LIBERALISM AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN EARLY VICTORIAN LONDON

Of what do our enemies complain!... I will not hesitate to say that we shall not h any 26 men who are to be seen issuing at the same time through the doorway ons.

MAGOG. Coal dues City tolls Sewers &c. &c.

Spare the City ___ My Lord

Stand back ___ useless member of Society

We the Royal Commissioners begin to feel that we are amongst th City Nuisances ___

"Oh' the nasty Sewers! Oh' the unjust Coal dues! Oh' the City tolls!"

REFORM

Benjamin Weinstein

LIBERALISM AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN EARLY VICTORIAN LONDON

LIBERALISM AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN EARLY VICTORIAN LONDON

Benjamin Weinstein

FOR SAM

Contents

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to Peter Mandler, whose work has inspired in me an enduring fascination with Victorian political culture. Fourteen years after first reading *Aristocratic government in the age of reform* I can still vividly recall the immense thrill that Peter's analysis of Foxite cosmopolitan paternalism gave me in the summer of 1997. It was my great fortune that Peter came to Cambridge just as I began my research and agreed to be my supervisor from the beginning. Admired authors sometimes disappoint in the flesh, but this was emphatically not the case with Peter. Peter proved to be attentive, generous, astute, supportive and critical in just the right measure. Looking back on the early drafts of the chapters which were eventually revised to comprise this book, I am forcefully struck by Peter's patience and support. I can only hope that the following pages justify and reward that support sufficiently.

Boyd Hilton has provided me with invaluable advice, criticism and encouragement in the course of putting this book together. I am forever grateful to him for generously sharing his immense expertise and erudition. Jon Parry provided insightful guidance from a very early stage of my research and disabused me of many misconceptions about Victorian politics. One particular discussion on King's Parade, which he might not remember, but which I certainly do, on the relationship between English patriotism and the rhetoric of 'local self-government', has been crucial to this project. Larry Klein provided me with indispensible advice on the nature of eighteenth-century Whiggery and the particular importance of Addison to the Foxite self-identity. Iorwerth Prothero, who had a visiting fellowship at Selwyn College while I was a postgraduate student there, has been exceptionally generous in sharing his unrivalled expertise on the nature of early Victorian metropolitan radicalism. Without Iorwerth's input I simply would not have understood the social dynamics of 'shopocratic' liberalism. I owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude. I would also like to thank my fellow postgraduates Paul Corthorn, Michael Dolescal, Joe Bord and Jon Conlin for helping me to understand what 'political culture' actually means.

Miles Taylor is responsible for getting this project off the ground and for shaping it in its early stages. Without Miles's formative direction, this book would not exist. I am profoundly indebted to him for his belief that something might be made out of my vague interest in urban paternalism. Hannah

Abbreviations

BHM	*Bulletin of the History of Medicine*
BIHR	*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*
EHR	*English Historical Review*
HJ	*Historical Journal*
HWJ	*History Workshop Journal*
JBS	*Journal of British Studies*
LJ	*London Journal*
PH	*Parliamentary History*
P&P	*Past & Present*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
VS	*Victorian Studies*

BL	British Library, London
Bodl. Lib.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
CRAS	Church Rate Abolition Society
GBH	General Board of Health
HLA	Health of London Association
HTA	Health of Towns Association
LWMA	London Working Men's Association
MAIDIC	Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes
MBW	Metropolitan Board of Works
MCA	Metropolitan Commission for Sewers
MSA	Metropolitan Sanitary Association
NPA	National Philanthropic Association
NPU	National Political Union
PP	Parliamentary Papers
RPA	Ratepayers' Protection Association
SRA	Southwark Reform Association

Introduction

This book considers the development of London's liberal political culture between the general election of 1832 and the establishment of the Metropolitan Board of Works in 1855. Such an undertaking is badly needed. While excellent work has been produced on London's Regency, mid-Victorian and late Victorian political culture, accounts of the early Victorian period are relatively scarce.[1] Moreover, much of what has been produced focuses quite narrowly on the sociology of early Victorian 'popular radicalism'. David Goodway's analysis of London Chartism and Geoffrey Crossick's study of politicised artisans in Kentish Town are representative of this approach, which seems to have grown out of D. J. Rowe's earlier engagements with London's early Victorian radical political culture.[2] Although William Thomas's *Philosophic radicals* pays greater attention to the impact of *ideas*, it is only incidentally *about* London, and in fact many of its various 'character studies' can be abstracted from the metropolitan context altogether. The same can be said of Miles Taylor's *Decline of British radicalism*, which contains

---

[1] The Regency period has been particularly well served. See J. A. Hone, *For the cause of truth: radicalism in London, 1796–1820*, Oxford 1980; J. Belchem, *Orator Hunt: Henry Hunt and English working-class radicalism*, Oxford 1988; I. McCalman, *Radical underworld: prophets, revolutionaries, and pornographers in London, 1795–1840*, Oxford 1993; J. Wiener, *Radicalism and freethought in nineteenth-century Britain: the life of Richard Carlile*, Westport, CN 1983; and I. Prothero, *Artisans and politics in the early nineteenth century: John Gast and his times*, London 1979. Prothero's monograph admittedly covers the late 1830s and early 1840s to good effect. For the best of mid- and late Victorian London see J. Davis, *Reforming London: the 'London government problem', 1855–1900*, Oxford 1988; D. Owen, *The government of Victorian London*, London 1982; and P. Thompson, *Socialists, Liberals, and Labour: the struggle for London, 1885–1914*, London 1967. The 'political' chapters of D. Feldman and G. Stedman Jones (eds), *Metropolis London: histories and representations since 1800*, London 1989, are likewise all concerned with late Victorian and Edwardian themes.

[2] David Goodway argues, for instance, that in London 'radicalism, political or industrial, was most closely correlated to the economic difficulties currently encountered by a given trade': *London Chartism, 1838–1848*, Cambridge 1982, 18. See also G. Crossick, *An artisan elite in Victorian society: Kentish London, 1840–1880*, London 1978; D. Large, 'London in the year of revolutions, 1848', in J. Stevenson (ed.), *London in the age of reform*, Oxford 1977, 177–211; D. J. Rowe, 'The London Working Men's Association and the "people's charter"', *P&P* xxxvi (1967), 169–74; 'The failure of London Chartism', *HJ* xi (1968), 472–87; and 'Class and political radicalism in London, 1831–2', *HJ* xiii (1970), 31–47; and I. Prothero, 'The London Working Men's Association and the "people's charter"', *P&P* xxxviii (1967), 169–74.

many insights into the metropolitan political culture, but which, given the book's scope, never lingers on London for long.[3]

Liberalism and local government proposes a fresh interpretation of London's early Victorian political culture. It does this by devoting particular attention to the relationship which existed within London between Russellite Whigs on the one hand, and vestry-based radicals on the other. In considering this relationship, this study argues that Whiggery – a political creed heretofore thought out of place and out of favour in large urban settings – was an especially potent force within early Victorian London. In the first place, Whiggery's metropolitan influence went a long way towards determining the character of metropolitan radicalism during this period. It can be argued, for instance, that the anti-statist and anti-aristocratic agenda promoted so successfully by *Reynolds*-style radicalism in the 1850s was resonant in London precisely because the Whig aristocracy, and the Russellite vision of an enlarged state in particular, remained such a prominent influence on metropolitan political culture during the '40s and '50s. Although metropolitan radicalism was by no means merely reactive to Whig policy, Whiggery did exert a powerful 'negative influence' on the construction of the early Victorian metropolitan radical identity. The decline of Toryism within the metropolitan boroughs after 1832, and Whiggery's simultaneous elevation into a creed of government, enhanced and ensured this influence. Each of these developments remobilised metropolitan radicals into a more direct confrontation with Whiggery in the metropolitan constituencies and this newly antagonistic relationship altered electoral strategies for Whigs and radicals alike. In this context, metropolitan radicals began to portray Whiggery as a creed of administrative centralisation while loudly promoting themselves as the defenders of English 'local self-government'.

However, despite these attacks, Whiggery remained a potent political force in the metropolitan boroughs. In addition to the widespread cultural permeation of the Russellite mission for social reform, Whiggery also exerted a surprisingly strong and immediate influence over London's electoral politics. In fact, by 1841, Whiggery's influence extended so far as to prompt *The Times* into describing London's largest and most plebeian borough, Tower Hamlets, as a 'Whig rotten borough'.[4] During the period covered in this book, 30 per cent (twelve out of forty) of all metropolitan MPs had strong ties to either the Melbourne or Russell ministries. Moreover, no fewer than five of these metropolitan members – Lord John Russell, Hugh

---

[3] W. Thomas, *The philosophic radicals: nine studies in theory and practice, 1817–1841*, Oxford 1979; M. Taylor, *The decline of British radicalism, 1847–1860*, Oxford 1995.
[4] *The Times*, 5 July 1841, 4.

Fortescue, Viscount Portman, Lord Robert Grosvenor and Charles Richard Fox – also belonged to the Grand Whig 'sacred circle of the great-grandmotherhood'. Russell, Grosvenor and Fox were each also sons of substantial metropolitan landowners, while Portman was a substantial metropolitan landowner himself. As this book argues, it was no mere coincidence that the metropolitan boroughs which contained both the greatest Whig landlords and the largest number of petty ratepayers were the same boroughs in which vestry radicals were most critical of Whiggery. This dynamic helps to explain the relative militancy of vestry radicalism in Marylebone and Westminster (which were, in fact, the only two boroughs with Hobhouse vestries) and the relative apathy of vestry radicalism in the 'Whig rotten borough' of Tower Hamlets.

In making the case for Whiggery's importance, this book hopes to problematise the view, articulated most forcefully by Donald Southgate, that 'a connection between the Whig aristocracy and a large popular electorate was not very common', and that Whiggery 'lacked vulgar appeal and mass support'.[5] While Peter Mandler has shown that many Whig grandees took 'vulgar appeal and mass support' very seriously, the reverse argument (i.e. that Whiggery benefited from 'mass support') has not been made.[6] Accounts of Russellite involvement in the pre-Metroplitan Board of Works struggle for metropolitan sanitation reform, meanwhile, have been presented almost exclusively in terms of high politics, and have consequently neglected the important role played by public opinion in the resolution of the struggle.[7] This book rounds off the decidedly 'high politics' picture drawn by Anthony Brundage, S. E. Finer and others by illustrating the ways in which Russellite Whigs found popular support for their sanitary agenda within the populous

---

5 D. Southgate, *The passing of the Whigs, 1832–1886*, London 1962, 96.
6 P. Mandler, *Aristocratic government in the age of reform: Whigs and liberals, 1830–1852*, Oxford 1990. Recent Whig revisionists have stopped short of this important point. For the 'Whig revision' see R. Brent, *Liberal Anglican politics: Whiggery, religion, and reform, 1830–1841*, Oxford 1987; T. A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery, and the Liberal party, 1874–1886*, Oxford 1988; I. D. C Newbould, 'The Whigs, the Church, and education, 1839', *JBS* xxvi (1987), 332–46, and 'Whiggery and the dilemma of reform: liberals, radicals, and the Melbourne administration, 1835–9', *BIHR* liii (1980), 229–41; and J. P. Parry, 'Past and future in the later career of Lord John Russell', in T. C. W. Blanning and D. Cannadine (eds), *History and biography*, Cambridge 1996, 142–72.
7 See, particularly, S. E. Finer, *The life and times of Sir Edwin Chadwick*, London 1952; R. A. Lewis, *Edwin Chadwick and the public health movement, 1832–1854*, London 1952; C. Hamlin, *Public health and social justice in the age of Chadwick, 1800–1854*, Cambridge 1998; A. Brundage, *England's 'Prussian minister': Edwin Chadwick and the politics of government growth, 1832–1854*, University Park, PA 1988; and W. Lubenow, *The politics of government growth: early-Victorian attitudes toward state intervention, 1833–1848*, Newton Abbot 1971.

and open London boroughs. In particular it will argue that the Russellite social reform programme found a powerful support network amongst London's large professional community.

In the absence of Whiggery's metropolitan influence, London's radical culture would almost certainly have developed differently. As it happened, continual conflict between Whigs and radicals in the metropolitan constituencies kept both liberal subcultures fresh, and gave London a singularly contested and therefore vibrant and self-aware liberal political culture. Keeping this in mind, this book challenges the view that post-1832 metropolitan radicalism was in any way 'stagnant', or indeed 'impotent', as has been claimed.[8] It argues instead that opposition to a series of Whig engagements with the so-called 'London government problem' gave metropolitan radicals both an enemy to rally against (i.e. centralisation) and an issue to rally around (i.e. local self-government). As metropolitan radicals began to articulate coherent responses to Whig solutions to the 'London government problem', they began to develop into a unified and coherent group themselves. This book argues that, from the late 1830s, the cause of local self-government began to displace older narratives of 'constitutional purification' and 're-balance' within London, and in doing so drove metropolitan radicalism away from its earlier cosiness with Foxite Whiggery and towards a much more libertarian, anti-statist and anti-aristocratic liberalism.[9] While in some respects this move did not represent a major ideological break (metropolitan radicalism had always been critical of the leviathan state and its parasitic placemen), it none the less did have far-reaching repercussions for the construction of new radical identities.

Eventually, London's libertarian radicals would form an important core of supporters for Palmerstonian liberalism – an essentially capacious movement which contained Whiggish elements (Palmerston was, after all, an aristocratic Whig and a virtual reincarnation of Lord Melbourne) but which, in London, celebrated domestic retrenchment and patriotism as core 'liberal' values. From the mid-1830s these values had been increasingly incorporated

---

[8]   See, for instance, Rowe, 'London Chartism'. For a fuller discussion of this view see pp. 43–55 below.

[9]   Historians have recognised the importance of the movement for 'local self–government' in London, but most have misunderstood its nature and direction. For instance, F. D. Roberts claims that 'the northern radicals, proud of their growing cities and tenacious in their advocacy of laisses faire, took a much more hostile attitude to central government than did the London liberals, who were more philosophical and more mindful of the whole nation's welfare': *The Victorian origins of the British welfare state*, New Haven 1961, 79. In fact, mainstream metropolitan radicals (i.e. non-Benthamites) and liberals were almost certainly more outraged by and opposed to centralisation than their northern counterparts.

by the metropolitan vestry radical movement into a principled rejection of, and alternative to, what they identified as 'Whiggery'. In 1818 metropolitan radicalism was firmly attached to Burdettite Whiggishness; by 1855 it had largely shaken off Burdett's constitutionalist preoccupations and had embraced Palmerstonian liberalism. Although still Whiggish in many important respects, metropolitan radicalism had undergone a significant ideological, and indeed cultural, reorientation. In one sense, this book tells the story of how metropolitan radicalism accomplished this reorientation. The study therefore closes in 1855 with the establishment of the MBW – a resounding triumph for the libertarian principles of state retrenchment and local self-determination and a crushing defeat for Russellite Whiggery's bloated and, as some argued, corrupt centralism. Of course, 1855 was also the year of Palmerston's final ascension over Russell to the leadership of the 'Liberal' party. Metropolitan radicals were delighted by this changing of the guard, and many profited by it.

The move toward the Palmerstonian position should not, however, be understood as a liberal triumph over radicalism. Such an interpretation would overlook the extensive ideological interplay that characterised radical relationships to the newly emerging popular liberalism of the 1850s.[10] Although ultra-radicals were increasingly marginalised during the 1840s, and a metropolitan radical consensus began to consolidate around a moderate vestry-driven reform programme, mainstream metropolitan radicalism was by no means blindly subservient to its Palmerstonian allies. The relationship that the leading Palmerstonian Benjamin Hall maintained with the radicals of Marylebone provides a nice example of this dynamic.[11] While it is true that Hall's Metropolis Local Management Act could have done more to promote local democracy (many officers of the MBW were indirectly elected, for instance, and board membership was restricted by rather substantial property qualifications), the measure was none the less interpreted by metropolitan radicals as a firm victory not only for liberal notions of retrenchment and *laissez-faire*, but also for the idea of local self-government and self-determination. In London, as elsewhere, the radical movement collaborated with, but also subverted, liberalism and used its emergent language of retrenchment to service an agenda for greater individual freedom and political empowerment. Moreover, few ultra-radicals actually objected to the

---

[10] For this interplay see T. Tholfsen, *Working-class radicalism in mid-Victorian England*, New York 1976; M. Finn, *After Chartism: class and nation in English radical politics, 1848–1874*, Cambridge 1993; and E. Biagini, *Liberty, retrenchment, and reform: popular liberalism in the age of Gladstone, 1860–1880*, Cambridge 1992.

[11] The dynamics of this relationship are elaborated upon in chapter 5 below and in the conclusion.

entrepreneurial and retrenchment-minded agenda promoted in the vestries. G. M. Young once wrote that

> In many ways the change from early to late-Victorian England is symbolized in the names of two great cities: Manchester, solid, uniform, pacific, the native home of the great economic creed on which aristocratic England has always looked, and educated England was beginning to look [at the turn of the twentieth century], with some aversion and some contempt; Birmingham, experimental, adventurous, where old radicalism might in one decade flower into lavish Socialism, in another into pugnacious Imperialism.[12]

Tellingly, London did not figure in Young's vision of change. In explicit contrast to the so-called 'shock towns' of the north and midlands, London's political culture was characterised by Young in terms of continuity and even stagnation. Organic 'old radicalism', which was said to have 'blossomed' into new and advanced forms of radicalism in Birmingham, was in London characterised as a stubborn retardant to political innovation.

Over the years, Young's interpretation has found much support and suffered very little criticism. Asa Briggs's *Victorian cities*, for instance, whole-heartedly endorsed Young's view by casting Manchester as the 'symbol of a new age' and Birmingham as the birthplace of 'the civic gospel'. Like Young, Briggs conceived of the 1832 Reform Act as essentially London's final contribution to the national political life before the emergence of Fabian socialism in the 1880s.[13] This chronology has become a virtual orthodoxy of Victorian political historiography, and in the process it has left a 'politics-shaped' hole in the history of London, and a 'London-shaped hole' in the history of nineteenth-century politics.[14] One finds Francis Sheppard, for instance, claiming that 'from the early 1830s to the early 1880's, London's political influence was in eclipse … it did not provide the main driving force behind many if the most important agitations … if one ignores Sir Francis

---

[12] G. M. Young, *Portrait of an age: Victorian England*, London 1977, 128–9.
[13] A. Briggs, *Victorian cities*, Harmondsworth 1963, 327–43; Young, *Portrait of an age*, 166–7. While Paul Thompson criticises Briggs's view, he does so only with respect to the importance of the Fabians, and actually endorses Briggs's take on the unimportance of early and mid-Victorian London politics: *Socialists, Liberals, and Labour*, 294–5. For a more recent endorsement of this chronology see C. Waters, *British socialists and the politics of popular culture, 1884–1914*, Manchester 1990.
[14] Recently 'cultural' treatments such as L. Nead, *Victorian Babylon: people, streets, and images in nineteenth-century London*, London 2000, and D. Arnold (ed.), *Re-presenting the metropolis: architecture, urban experience and social life in London, 1800–1840*, London 2000, have flourished. For a useful survey of fairly recent work on Victorian London see John Davis, 'Modern London, 1850–1939', review article, *LJ* xx (1995), 56–90.

Burdett, who was more a survivor from the days of Wilkes than a portent of the future, London never had a great leader of its own, like Thomas Attwood or Joseph Chamberlain or Richard Cobden or John Bright'.[15] Patricia Garside has presented much the same story, within a slightly different time-frame, conceding that

> despite the hopes of a metropolitan radical movement, the focus of political attention began to shift to the provinces after 1815. Though the retreat of London radicalism should not be overemphasised, London failed to maintain its previously high level of political involvement and leadership … in the half century between 1820–1870, London indeed appeared to be overshadowed by these provincial towns – economically, politically, administratively.[16]

Even H. J. Dyos, whose aim was always to illuminate why London mattered, could not escape the orthodox chronology of London's early and mid-Victorian unimportance. On metropolitan radical decline in the wake of 1832, he wrote that 'it was not until the 1880s that London was again capable of producing its own discontents in sufficient numbers to command any degree of national attention. It remained until then completely overshadowed by the provinces'.[17]

Of course, this picture of northern dynamism and metropolitan eclipse and stagnation should not be attributed entirely to Young's lingering influence. Labour and Chartist historians such as Simon Maccoby, John Foster and D. J. Rowe and, more recently, 'entrepreneurial' historians like G. R. Searle and Anthony Howe, have been equally responsible for reinforcing this interpretation.[18] According to these complementary analyses, London's relative unreceptiveness to both Chartism and the free trade movement (one the supposedly quintessential working-class movement of early Victorian Britain, and the other its equally quintessential middle-class counterpart) has

---

[15] F. Sheppard, 'London and the nation in the nineteenth century', *TRHS* xxxv (1985), 56, 60.

[16] P. L. Garside, 'London and the home counties', in F. M. L. Thompson (ed.), *Cambridge social history of Britain, 1750–1950*, I: *Regions and communities*, Cambridge 1990, 488, 490.

[17] H. J. Dyos, 'Greater and greater London: metropolis and provinces in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', in D. Cannadine and D. Reader (eds), *Exploring the urban past: essays in urban history by H. J. Dyos*, Cambridge 1982, 43.

[18] S. Maccoby, *English radicalism, 1832–52*, London 1935; J. Foster, *Class struggle and the industrial revolution*, London 1974; Rowe 'London Chartism'; A. Howe, *The cotton masters, 1830–1860*, Oxford 1984; G. R. Searle, *Entrepreneurial politics in mid-Victorian Britain*, London 1993. See also D. Read, *The English provinces, 1760–1960: a study in influence*, London 1964, and A. Briggs, 'The local background of Chartism', in A. Briggs (ed.), *Chartist studies*, New York 1959.

contrasted metropolitan 'apathy' all too easily and neatly against provincial 'vigour' and, ultimately, relevance. Miles Taylor was undoubtedly right to bemoan the fact that the study of early and mid-Victorian radicalism has been 'subsumed by a wider social and economic history, to the point where many studies of mid-Victorian politics are now routinely based on the premise that British politics after 1848 were based on distinct middle and working-class strategies'.[19] London, which lacked the 'class' dynamics supposedly experienced by many so-called 'shock towns', has perhaps been the biggest loser under this socio-economically informed approach to Victorian politics. In the wake of more recent, avowedly politically informed interpretations of Victorian politics, London's role and relevance cries out for a reassessment.

Taking these recent historiographical developments into consideration, this book argues that historians who have characterised metropolitan politics as 'stagnant' have mistakenly interpreted metropolitan anti-aristocratic and anti-statist attitudes as proof of the continuance of 'old radicalism', when in fact these attitudes actually contributed to the development of the 'popular liberalism' or 'new radicalism' recently described by historians such as Margot Finn and Eugenio Biagini. In fact, this book argues that, by the 1840s, London was actually in the vanguard of 'popular liberalism' – a creed and movement which came to dominate the Victorian political landscape during the 1850s and beyond. When considered in this way, London's political culture assumes a far greater importance in the national Victorian political culture. At the same time, conflict between London's competing liberal subgroups produced a metropolitan political culture which, far from being stagnant or anachronistic, was both vibrant and dynamic.

The metropolitan *lacuna* created by socio-economic readings of early and mid-Victorian politics has both grown out of and reinforced the curious view that the 1832 Reform Act had a much more transformative effect on electoral politics in the north of England than on the political life of London. While it is undeniably true that the vast majority of new seats were given to the industrial districts of Yorkshire and Lancashire (meaning that, comparatively, northern industrial areas gained more from the act than London did), and that growing urban centres such as Manchester and Leeds were literally brought into parliamentary life, it is equally true that the 1832 act more than doubled the parliamentary representation of metropolitan London. Perhaps even more important, it can be argued that the 1832 act laid the foundations

---

[19] Taylor, *Decline of British radicalism*, 3. See also his 'Rethinking the Chartists: searching for synthesis in the historiography of Chartism', *HJ* xxxix (1996), 479–95.

for a complete revolution in metropolitan political culture by creating a cluster of metropolitan boroughs with wildly different interests. Like the great northern industrial cities, the fastest growing sections of the metropolis had been completely unrepresented under the unreformed system; and like these same industrial towns after the act, London's fastest-growing districts became thriving outposts of new political creeds and radicalisms. The parish of St Pancras, for instance, was itself larger than most provincial cities. When combined with the neighbouring parishes of St Marylebone and Paddington to form the parliamentary borough of Marylebone, St Pancras became part of one of the largest and wealthiest constituencies in the United Kingdom. Ironically, although 1832 was quite obviously a watershed moment in the history of metropolitan politics, it is precisely the point at which orthodox accounts of London's political life stop. Indeed, if the outcome of the 1832 act were to be judged according to how much has been written about the politics of localities after its passing, it would undoubtedly seem that London had been disfranchised rather than enfranchised.

Liberalism and local government re-evaluates London's early Victorian political culture by simultaneously critiquing the orthodox historiographical view of London's marginality to the construction of Victorian popular liberalism (a view which has been informed by serious misreadings and misrepresentations of London's Victorian social character), while also analysing, for the first time, the ways in which London's early Victorian local politics informed and were integrated with parliamentary politics in the metropolitan constituencies. Liberalism and local government begins with an examination of the ways in which both Whigs and constitutional radicals interacted with and understood the unreformed metropolis. Although Whigs and constitutional radicals often came into conflict in the unreformed metropolitan constituencies, they none the less tended to engage with the idea of 'London' in similar and complimentary ways. This investigation of pre-reform liberal attachments to London is followed, in chapter 2, by an analysis of the post-reform successes of parochialist ultra-radicals in Marylebone, Southwark, Westminster, Finsbury and Lambeth. As constitutional radicalism fell into disrepair (with the defections of Burdett to Toryism and Hobhouse to Whiggery) the ultra-radical movement became invigorated, and its metropolitan ascendancy was facilitated by two pieces of legislation: Hobhouse's Select Vestries Act of 1831 and the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. The first measure enabled ultra-radicals to organise themselves within the parish vestry, while the second gave them a Whig measure to rally against. Metropolitan radical opposition to Whiggery is explored in greater depth in chapter 3, as is the character and extent of the metropolitan support network for Russellite Whiggery. The polarisation of metropolitan liberalism, which took place primarily during the later 1830s and early 1840s, was prompted by cultural