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The autobiography of Ada Bennett (b. 1901) offers her readers a disconcerting description of poor-law institutions because it departs from typical expectations for such a memoir: Bennett expresses fondness for a workhouse and its affiliated district school. This attitude was at least partly a consequence of the domestic deprivation she endured beyond institutional walls. In contrast to hunger at home she enjoyed the material comforts that entry to a workhouse and its school could offer. Her father was a painter and decorator (and a widower) who took his children home when he was in work but otherwise lodged them in the Southwark workhouse. From the workhouse they were periodically transferred to the Central London District School at Hanwell. Bennett was accompanied on these institutional sojourns by a sibling, an older brother, and although the rules of the workhouse and school required that they be separated from one another, Bennett remembered her school days with evident affection. Her memoirs cannot be suspected of white-washing a difficult past by claiming an *unalloyed* depiction of happiness, because she contrasted her enjoyment at being given six pence each at New Year, to spend on sweets when out for walks, with the discipline enacted on girls who wet their beds. Her brother even tried running away. Nonetheless she also remarked that, as an adult, her brother ‘was very grateful for the way the school had looked after us’.[[2]](#footnote-2) The Bennett children left Hanwell for the last time when their father remarried; Bennett concluded her reminiscences at this point in her history with the faintly ominous phrase ‘and that is another story’.[[3]](#footnote-3) Arguably the workhouse and school provided Ada and her brother with structure, and creature comforts, during an otherwise uncertain childhood while contrasting with their experience of a perhaps antipathetic step-mother. At the same time the autobiography offers us an unusual view of the place of poor-law interventions in the life course and the emotional memory of its clientele.

The post-1834 workhouse and its satellite institutions including district schools, cottage homes, and infirmaries possess a long and detailed historiography. The earliest retrospectives offered by those commenting on the poor law as a contemporaneous system attempted a broad-brush policy view, while subsequent scholarly work has become ever-more focussed on place, period, or on extraordinary events which spurred public reaction or government response (or both).[[4]](#footnote-4) Latterly this specificity has included a greater representation for the poor themselves. Letters written by or on behalf of paupers or their families offer hard evidence of perspectives among people in the ambit of poor-law attention.[[5]](#footnote-5) These works might cover an aspect of institutional life over a longer period; equally they can illuminate an establishment at a moment of particular interest, crisis, or scandal. They are less able to comment on the importance of institutional living for the individual inmates in the context of their broader life-course, since even persons with repeat admissions to successive buildings overwhelmingly left their pre- and post-residence life at the door. If they address the place of the workhouse in the affective landscape of the poor, they typically do so by reference to well-worn assumptions, such as that the poor found the workhouse so oppressive and repellent that they avoided it at all costs.[[6]](#footnote-6)

This article makes use of autobiographical accounts of poor-law institutions to speak to the writers’ life-courses, and the emotions they ascribed to historic experiences. It surveys the scope, depth and emphases of surviving life narratives that make significant mention of workhouses, schools, infirmaries and cottage homes in the period up to 1913, and considers the methodological problems they raise. It focusses on the narrative typologies that are evident in different clusters of text, and the range of meanings invested in them.[[7]](#footnote-7) It then turns to two lengthier accounts for closer scrutiny, by interleaving the narratives with individual and family histories retrievable from census and other records. Here the inherently patchy, accidental, contingent aspects of autobiographies can be understood, and turned to good account. Institutions were inhabited and run by people with a very broad variety of expectations, practices, and responses, so the character of the autobiographer and of the people they met can be investigated to weigh the impact of institutional systems against that of individuality, personality and feeling. The experiences of children or adolescents and family context is given priority in this final section, in analysing depictions of London’s workhouse district schools and their subsequent affective influence over a life. The article concludes that autobiographies add a distinctive dimension to the history of poor law institutions, enabling us to expand our appreciation of the potential for trauma suffered by inmates but also to understand the importance of other emotions including nostalgia, and quasi-familial identification.

**Emotions, Institutions, and Families**

Working-class autobiographies are the only sources which can speak to both the practical and the emotional impact of institutional residence on a person’s life-course. When the history of poverty meets the history of the emotions, it is necessary to ask ‘what constituted acceptable emotional expression among those remembering poor-law assistance?’. Admittedly histories of the emotions have not always framed questions in quite this way. Starting with ‘anger’ there is now an established literature that addresses specific emotions, and/or interrogates the relationship between the words used as descriptors and the bodily feelings they represent.[[8]](#footnote-8) This article is directed at a different tradition that starts by problematising a period or context. In writing about the middle ages Barbara Rosenwein suggests historical actors inhabited ‘emotional communities’, contiguous with social communities but where the focus is on systems of feeling: as people moved between communities, they adjusted both their judgments of advantage or detriment, and their concomitant displays of emotion.[[9]](#footnote-9) In this way communities shaped emotions differently, but in accordance with ‘feeling rules’ conferred by context and experience.[[10]](#footnote-10) William Reddy points additionally to the fact that ‘Emotion and emotional expression interact in a dynamic way’: the act of describing an emotion can distil or complicate the experience of feeling giving rise to ‘emotional regimes’.[[11]](#footnote-11) The mutability of regimes altered what could be felt.

This combination of fluidity and constraint implies that we should identify the norms and extremes of emotional expression in relation to (for example) inmates of poor-law institutions to understand more about the emotional climate of poverty and welfare from 1834 onwards. Was there room for flex, or were emotional statements the result of ‘overlearned habit’?[[12]](#footnote-12) This sort of perspective enables secondary questions about the function of remembered emotion in rendering autobiographies coherent and persuasive accounts of a life. Emotional style may well be ‘a marker of class identity’ but how far did a working-class identity determine discrete responses, or confessed responses, to the poor law?[[13]](#footnote-13) Or was one’s emotional style towards the workhouse a reflection instead of one’s increased distance from it in later life, and incorporation of sentiments from beyond the working-class? Access to varied emotional styles probably improved: Cas Wouters points to the erosion of formality and the blurring of class lines in written evidence of emotion management drawn from the first half of the twentieth century. Autobiographers would have been permitted by these means ‘to draw dividing lines on the basis of certain kinds of behaviour, not certain kinds of people’ and so to have protested the validity of their own experience and demeanour, including in the context of exposure to the poor law.[[14]](#footnote-14) Did individualisation influence these writers, and mean they gained access to a ‘second draft’ of their emotional responses?[[15]](#footnote-15) Or did it render their task more difficult, if they felt invited or obliged to inhabit more than one community or regime? Fortunately the subset of autobiographies that treat life in poor-law institutions, unlike those in other surveys, are relatively well stocked with evidence of emotion with which to work.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Expressions of experience and emotion may be partial or fulsome, even-tempered or impassioned, but to qualify fully as an autobiographical account authors will have invoked context, and one form of context is both prominent and pervasive. Family background is important to most autobiographers, and sometimes occupies a dominant portion early in the narrative.[[17]](#footnote-17) Writers typically try to situate themselves in a family context, particularly in birth order and relationships with parents and siblings.[[18]](#footnote-18) They are much more attentive to interactions with their mother and father than they are to their experience as parents to their own children.[[19]](#footnote-19) This feature of autobiographical writing provides connections that do not usually arise among primary sources for institutions wherever admission arose in childhood or adolescence. Parental failing and/or the break-up of the birth household is positioned as the cause of institutional experience, and the behaviour of staff who shared a diluted *loco parentis* role can assume very great significance in the afterlives of former inmates. This means that the place of any one institution in a written life is given direct counterweight by the affective significance – positive or negative - of family. This emphasis on family is not an attempt on my part to hark back to a form of social history that predates the ‘cultural turn’. Instead, and in line with Michael Roper’s injunction for gender history to avoid the lifelessness that ensues when ‘signification is the start and end point of study’, I aim to amalgamate literary representation with the material of genealogy.[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Working-class autobiographies: surviving narratives**

Working-class autobiographies have taken an acknowledged place in the roster of social and economic historians’ sources, particularly when used in large numbers to consider expansive topics like industrialisation.[[21]](#footnote-21) Whether taken as the source of factual material, or as the pathways to subjective truths, they have won a ‘claim to embeddedness within real experience.’[[22]](#footnote-22) They can also be used selectively to address issues less extensively represented in the genre.[[23]](#footnote-23) Poor-law institutions are often referenced in working-class autobiographies, but much more frequently by external commentators than by residents. Among those authors who incorporated institutional experience into their narratives, an even smaller group reflect on a single institution as a permanent inmate with a legal settlement, as opposed to multiple institutions as a vagrant inmate. Just twenty-five autobiographies of the 2444 catalogued by Burnett, Mayall, and Vincent provide accounts of post-1834 workhouses or affiliated institutions from the perspective of a resident inmate who was not solely admitted to a vagrancy ward up to 1914. Of these only eleven treat the relevant period of writers’ lives at length or in detail. [[24]](#footnote-24) This means that, the many glancing references to workhouses and satellite institutions aside, extended commentary from within is confined to these eleven texts, augmented by two further narratives emerging since the late 1980s.[[25]](#footnote-25) The substantive analysis below is based on this core subset of thirteen texts.[[26]](#footnote-26)

More, and more representative accounts, may yet be found: as Vincent observes ‘the tail of printed ephemera and unpublished reminiscences has no ending’, and approximately a fifth of citations in Emma Griffin’s research on working-class autobiographies *per se* are in addition to those calendared by Burnett, Mayall, and Vincent.[[27]](#footnote-27) Until more specifically poor-law memoirs are discovered, though, the narratives that survive display some noteworthy emphases. They focus on institutions in the south of England, with London predominating, while individual outliers treat workhouses in Bedford, Birmingham, Staffordshire, and St Asaph in Wales. Furthermore, the majority of these works were written by men, since there are just three by women (and only one among the core texts treating institutional memories at length).

These are read here not for fact but for perspective. The most prominent consistency between the accounts is that they were chiefly composed in old age when authors’ contact with the poor law was at least a decade in the past, or more commonly multiple decades before. They were therefore the product of conscious self-fashioning with the scope for a good deal of hindsight, reflection and ‘residues of earlier versions of selfhood’.[[28]](#footnote-28) This distant perspective is given a further refinement in that most of the authors were under twenty when they experienced poor-law institutions. It is noteworthy that just one of the core writers surveyed here mentioned receipt of welfare in later life.[[29]](#footnote-29)

This means there is a need to consider the likely impact of childhood on memory-making. If we acknowledge the use of modern psychoanalytical techniques in the historical study of childhood memories, there are aspects of current understanding that are pertinent. It is possible to detect a tendency among impoverished children, for example, to make the best of things and become attached to people and places no matter how challenging the circumstances and this can be witnessed among biographers with poor-law experience.[[30]](#footnote-30) ‘Emma Smith’ describes her childhood as replete with parental abandonment, workhouse residence, sexual abuse and extreme material deprivation yet even she reflects on the appearance of happy moments; she eventually became strongly attached to a Sister in the penitentiary she entered aged twelve.[[31]](#footnote-31) There is scope for childhood memories of institutional life to be set in a positive mould in a way that identical exposure at a more mature age would qualify or reject.

This is useful to bear in mind, but for the purposes of this article it is teamed with additional twentieth-century research which is redolent of William Reddy: the telling and retelling of emotion may consolidate memories of feeling in ways that confer authenticity on first-person recall of childhood by adults, whether or not they were formed in situations of stress. Neil Sutherland argues that memories of repeated events or circumstances generate ‘scripts’ of generalised memory.[[32]](#footnote-32) Childhood’s scripts, he argues, emanate from highly structured situations: structured by the demands of domestic life such as ‘wash day’, by the timetables that governed work or education, or by features imposed by the generational stage of the child. Furthermore, children share their stories with others at the time (family, friends, and teachers or holders of official roles). As the child who experiences becomes the adult who remembers, the stories they tell emerge from the general patterns of scripted memories.[[33]](#footnote-33) By these means the ascription of emotion becomes fuller rather than more tenuous.

**Dynamic Policies and Static Perceptions**

In using autobiographies to write about the New Poor Law of 1834 onwards, this article runs a number of gauntlets, not least a chronological one. Poor-law historians rightly see the trajectory of welfare historiography from 1834 onwards as shifting very significantly from the founding of the law in the 1830s, through early trials and scandals to establish acceptable policy, to the crusade against out-relief, and ultimately the political changes wrought by the introduction of working-class Guardians and the Liberal welfare reforms of 1906-9. In the existing literature, the workhouse of 1914 and its myriad of connected buildings is an entirely different institution from its predecessor in 1834. Furthermore since all but one of the core poor-law autobiographers wrote in old age about youth, no authors were writing in the earliest decades of the New Poor Law, and many did not write or publish until the twentieth century. This means that recollections were recorded or made public in decades when quite different welfare policies than the ones under description were in place.

In contrast to this historical literature, periodisation is largely missing from autobiographical writings. The workhouse, district school, or infirmary might as well have been eternal and unchanging so far as the authors were concerned. Undoubtedly this partly arises from autobiographers’ relatively short residences across a lengthy institutional career: none of the writers surveyed here reported remaining in poor-law accommodation for more than thirteen years and most stays were much shorter. It may also be a feature of the authors’ youth at the time of admission. They experienced what was in front of them in a quotidian way, and had no occasion to gain a broader view of an establishment under the control of a central authority and answerable to Parliament.[[34]](#footnote-34) They knew of a specific master, matron, nurse, teacher, doctor or porter, not of the generalised qualities desirable for these posts or the ways their behaviour was regulated. Similarly they may have been little inclined in retrospect to consider these adults as employees, potentially with inadequate training, support, and oversight of their role.[[35]](#footnote-35) The fixity of workhouse and poor-law experiences could certainly be the view among the working classes who did *not* become inmates. As one writer put it, from the perspective of an observer rather than a resident, ‘The Poor Law, as far as I can gather, had not changed much, except for the worse, since it was begun by Henry the Eighth or the first Elizabeth until it was finished in 1949’.[[36]](#footnote-36)

A lack of autobiographers’ attention to changing poor-law practices may also be a testament to the complex relationship between ideological change, policy shift, implementation of change and maturation of process. Samantha Shave’s recent work that puts policy process at the heart of developments in poor-law policy points to the slow, piecemeal, haphazard or unintended consequences of administrative change, and the parallel, sometimes disconnected activities of poor-law employees that were undertaken without reference to official guidance.[[37]](#footnote-37) Autobiographies disrupt the coherence of institutions in the same way that Shave’s research disrupts the coherence of policy. The reformed poor law may have been *designed* to suppress local variation and replace it with systematic and accountable uniformity, and institutions have subsequently been *perceived* as possessing the power to structure social relations decisively to inmates’ detriment.[[38]](#footnote-38) Writers’ individual experiences are structured by neither system nor considerations of abstract power but by the stories they have heard about institutions and their own unique exposure to one or other of them.

And the stories were powerful. Engels saw this clearly when he distinguished between the humane provision that technically underlay the poor law, and the intention or spirit of the law to criminalise poverty and stigmatise the dependent poor: Workhouse paupers were regarded as ‘objects of disgust and repulsion’.[[39]](#footnote-39) That this revulsion was felt keenly by some or most among the working classes has become a shibboleth of the popular perception of workhouses.[[40]](#footnote-40) An act of writing that took place in the early- or mid-twentieth century could also draw on updated models for emotional understanding of childhood experience, but new models did not necessarily swamp old ones: in common with works reflecting on the First World War, ‘post-war use in memoirs of concepts such as ‘unconscious’, ‘repression’ and ‘sublimation’ was always mediated by older languages of the self’.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Therefore we need to recognise the likely impacts of both chronological distance and trauma on the memory of workhouse inhabitants, particularly when combined with the presence of other, apparently confirmatory cultural narratives: ‘not only the narrative offered, but also the meanings invested in it’.[[42]](#footnote-42) Recent work on war veterans and their memoirs suggests that people undergoing traumatic events later find that their recollections become uncannily similar to pervasive, popular, but imagined accounts. This ‘assimilation to the dominant narrative’ introduces the possibility that there was contextual pressure to adhere to or align with the pervasive image of poor-law institutions even when a person’s own experience of day-to-day life in that institution was not predominantly characterised by hunger and physical violence.[[43]](#footnote-43) Like the survivors of twentieth-century war, poor-law inmates might have been writing what their readers wanted or expected to see, namely a familiar albeit shocking account eliciting a sympathetic, outraged and relatively unquestioning response.[[44]](#footnote-44)

So while the poor law has been systematically de-mythologised by local studies and historiographical specificity, most participants lived through only a small portion of their institution’s history and potentially fell prey to the myth. On the evidence of this array of narratives covering institutional residence memoirists certainly acknowledged other stories, but they also expressed their recollections in distinctive and individual voices that did not consistently cohere to a single generalising schema.

**Narrative diversity**

Autobiographers covering institutional life confronted a paradox; they were attempting to characterise and shape their life, but for a period of reduced or absent personal agency. Whatever they felt about being an inmate, there was a limit to what they could do as a lone actor to alter their account of subjection to administrative structures or personnel. At the same time they were generally aware of similar or parallel lives in the public domain. A small roster of well-known working-class autobiographical texts in fairly wide circulation up to the 1960s comprised merely the most visible among a larger pool of local memoirs produced quietly, informally, or in small runs by provincial presses.[[45]](#footnote-45) Parallel lives were being rendered in compelling ways in fiction.[[46]](#footnote-46) By these means the scope of expression expanded drastically from the earliest start point of relevant texts (the implementation of the reformed poor law in 1834) to the latest feasible point of writing (after the last person who remembers workhouse life has died, following the end-point for this paper in 1914). The voice or tone assumed by authors illustrates the way they managed their feelings or ‘emotional economy’ in the context of diminished agency.[[47]](#footnote-47)

For these reasons, when beginning this research, I confess that I had *Oliver Twist* firmly in mind. Having been published in the early days of the New Poor Law, readers of this novel (or non-readers aware of its early chapters) could have relied on a template for the child-victim role where inmates were starved, and the likely result of workhouse admission for both children and adults was death, overseen by Mr and Mrs Bumble. The boy who asked for more, and the context of his request, ‘remained the standard image [of the workhouse child] for the Victorian age’, and is familiar even among people who have never read the book or seen filmed adaptations.[[48]](#footnote-48) Jonathan Rose credits Dickens with a ‘dominating presence’ in working-class memoirs beyond those concerned with the poor law, wherever writers concluded that the novelist was ‘the man who got it right’.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Thus it is unsurprising to find that this biographical facsimile did contribute to the repertoire of narratives available to life-writers. Frank Stone (pseudonym Frank Steel) was the most explicit in this respect, titling one of his chapter ‘Breakfast with Bumble’ and citing multiple other points of comparison.[[50]](#footnote-50) Henry Price regarded the workhouse diet shortly after 1834 as ‘semistarvation’ and thought himself ‘Oliver Twist like’ in being apprenticed from the workhouse to a carpenter.[[51]](#footnote-51) Five more of the core thirteen texts are redolent of the Dickensian pattern, whereby institutional living gives rise to itemised depictions of deprivation, or physical and psychological violence (albeit without further reference to Twist or Dickens specifically). Charlie Chaplin and Fred Copeman commented on their personal experience of isolation and shame.[[52]](#footnote-52) Others like Henry Morton Stanley in St Asaph remembered appalling regimes of corporal punishment.[[53]](#footnote-53) William Hew Ross recalled being beaten so regularly that his fear induced persistent stammering, and he judged that one unprovoked blow to the head was the origin of his periodic ear pain and dizziness into adulthood.[[54]](#footnote-54) An influential example in this vein was the autobiography of Charles Shaw, admitted to the Wolstanton and Burlsem Union workhouse at Chell in North Staffordshire when he was aged around ten.[[55]](#footnote-55) His four or five weeks in the workhouse remained a cause of anger sixty years later when he reflected on the inedible diet – on this description no-one would have asked for more under any inducement - and the fear of being housed in the same dormitories as more unruly boys without adult oversight. His account has subsequently been used to inform literary fiction and historical scholarship.[[56]](#footnote-56)

What I had not anticipated was the variety of emotions which were attached to institutional memories by authors who pulled away from the famously negative exemplar, from a pointed separation from *Oliver Twist* to an array of different narratives. Samuel Shaw openly repudiated a negative reading of institutional life to insist on his contentment in the workhouse and its various departments. Born in 1884, this second Shaw proved in adult life a ‘fervent anti-socialist’ engaged in opposition to trades unions and public speaking for the Conservative party; this outlook must be allowed to have influenced his published recollection of welfare institutions and his determination to reject the Dickensian example.[[57]](#footnote-57) Aged around eight, he and his sister entered the Erdington workhouse. They progressed to a cottage home and to the Birmingham workhouse infirmary before being discharged approximately two years later. Shaw concluded that he ‘must have been fairly well fed’ in direct contradiction of the *Oliver Twist* model, since he referenced workhouse descriptions by ‘writers of immortal fame’ (ie Dickens) but did not recall himself asking for more. He was particularly upbeat about the infirmary. He spent months in these ‘pleasant surroundings’, clearly not meant to be read ironically, and apparently left ‘restored to health and vigour…with happy memories of the kindness showered on us’.[[58]](#footnote-58)

Beyond the clearest instances of Dickensian influence (Steel, Price, and Sam Shaw), the remaining core autobiographies offer a variegated emotional landscape for institutional residency. Broadly they wrote improvement or self-improvement dramas, which permitted authors to depict entry to a poor-law institution as the nadir from which they returned, where emotional investment in the associated memories illustrated their changed or changing fortunes. Ada Bennett, quoted in the introduction, was one such, and Edward Balne was a contemporary of Bennett’s at the same institution with similarly positive views.[[59]](#footnote-59) William Hew Ross blurs the line between a potentially Dickensian-model workhouse and personal self-improvement when he valorises the opportunity offered him by the workhouse district school, but then his autobiography arises because he was specifically asked to write it: he went from a child as a ‘little heathen’ destined for prison to becoming a workhouse schoolmaster in later life.[[60]](#footnote-60) John Castle’s autobiography described a childhood and adolescence of increasing poverty and marginalisation, wherein *departure* from the workhouse comprised the lowest point, followed by an adulthood of agency and productivity.[[61]](#footnote-61) Castle was aged seventeen when he was admitted to the house of the Leighton Buzzard Union in 1837 alongside his older brother and sister-in-law. Leighton Buzzard workhouse was an early, mid-sized institution, having been built in 1836 to accommodate 350 people.[[62]](#footnote-62) Castle was resident for only a short time before a minor misdemeanour roused the attention and anger of the chairman of the Guardians. He was told he would be sent out of the house, despite clearly having a settlement in the district and having no other means of support (and therefore in contravention of the provisions of the law). On 1 April 1837 he was escorted to the gate, given four shillings, and told to go for a soldier. Distantly aware that this was not legitimate, Castle retorted that after he had spent the money he would be brought back, to which the relieving officer said ‘We wont have you’. Castle left and ‘wept bitterly…till…my eyes seemed swollen in my head.’[[63]](#footnote-63)

Castle’s misery was twofold, in that he was forced to separate from his brother and was being removed from an institution of last resort. Yet his fortunes improved dramatically after he found work in London, and eighteen months later he reappeared at the Leighton Buzzard workhouse door ‘in a different character from the one I was expelled with’: he went back for a social visit.

I pulled the bell out came poor old Culverhouse, the Porter, bowing at me, thinking I suppose, I might be some Inspector, I smiled at him and said ‘Don’t you know me Culverhouse?’…he shook hands and said ‘Come in, Mr Bromley will be glad to see you’, and so he was… the Master took me into the men’s ward there I saw several faces I knew…I made myself known to them, gave them a few pence and bade them farewell[[64]](#footnote-64)

Reports in the nineteenth-century press sometimes suggested that paupers returned to workhouses after their discharge, perhaps to partake in Christmas dinner, so providing workhouse philanthropists with an opportunity for display.[[65]](#footnote-65) Castle returned for his own purposes. He was clearly proud of himself, a young man transformed, now bestowing beneficence rather than a supplicant having relief withheld.

 There was the additional choice of a highly positive construction of self while within institutional walls. Joseph Bell offers one of the two most sustained portraits of life in a workhouse, since half of his surviving 200-page typescript is devoted to his memories of the Bedford Union workhouse school. His account ends at the point of his apprenticeship aged 13, so his later career as a master bootmaker in St Albans is entirely omitted, and he side-steps the opportunity to showcase his occupational achievements. Instead he recounts his personal and educational successes while still at school alongside an indicative commentary on his feelings. Bell was born in 1846, and had three older sisters when he was orphaned in 1858. At the workhouse school in Bedford he quickly made friends among the boys and became acquainted with the wider cohort of workhouse inmates. In direct contrast to Charles Shaw’s dread of bedtime and the dormitory terrorised by the bigger boys, Bell relished the prospect of telling bedtime stories to his peers. An early school yard fight apparently established him as ‘a great favourite’, and he repeatedly described himself at this time as ‘quite happy’ or ‘very happy’.[[66]](#footnote-66) The boys’ teacher was ‘fatherly’ and ‘a dear old boy’.[[67]](#footnote-67) Bell credits himself with becoming something of a leader, well-regarded by staff, inmates, and pupils alike, capable of extensive agency. In illustration of the latter he claims to have instituted the practice of children managing patches of the workhouse garden, and to have run illicit errands for the adult inmates when he undertook official commissions in the town of Bedford.

 He became thoroughly disenchanted by school life when after a residence of about six months he was subjected to fierce corporal punishment, but even this demonstrated an exercise of choice. He was beaten for refusing to reveal the authorship of an inflammatory letter, and although he had composed the letter (in defence of the head girls), it had been physically written by others. He withheld the names of his collaborators, and felt very harshly treated when the punishment of bread and water followed by twelve strokes of the birch was carried out. He took solace from his determination to be punished alone, and was given retrospective approval by a teacher for his loyalty to his friends, so construing this miserable episode as an example of his assertion of autonomy. He left school for an apprenticeship at the earliest opportunity, in defiance of advice from his teacher.

In these ways working-class authors give a variety of accounts featuring poor-law residence as a child, which could reasonably be said to cover an emotional range from child as dispossessed victim (Charles Shaw) to child agency triumphant (Bell). They tacitly illustrate the difficulty for authors forced to accommodate such memories following admission in adulthood, because there is only one core narrative dealing with the ‘in and out’ experience of adult inmates in workhouses proper (as opposed to its vagrancy wards only) that is a recognised feature in workhouse historiography, and it is too problematic to use here.[[68]](#footnote-68) Collectively, though, they push the range of stories about poor-law institutions beyond any easy assumptions about a Dickensian model and problematise our understanding of the workhouse and its associated residences in paupers’ emotional lives and life courses. Closer attention to two of these narratives, from autobiographers who give drastically divergent accounts of spent time in a London workhouse district school, give further exposure to the tensions and evasions inherent in life-writing that juxtaposes institutional guardianship with familial alternatives.

**Memories of District Schools**

District schools were first advocated in the 1830s as a way to provide a combination of education and industrial training to pauper children who would then enjoy a life of independence without the need for welfare. They were designed to accommodate children from a number of Poor-Law Unions while spreading the cost but, despite both the fond hopes of influential promoters like Edward Tufnell and the enabling District School Act of 1848, only ten were opened before 1880.[[69]](#footnote-69) The schools which were established followed a conventional academic curriculum but tended to enjoy very good facilities for selected non-academic pursuits such as sport and music. Boys and girls who remained in the schools when they reached 14 entered military or domestic service respectively.[[70]](#footnote-70)

The schools were supposed to remove children from the contaminating atmosphere of adult workhouse pauperism., so while workhouses have been seen as embedded within communities, district schools were decisively isolated from them.[[71]](#footnote-71) Schools catered for more than one workhouse, and intentionally pulled children even further away from their families, logistically and geographically, which could inhibit parents’ visits to children. Schools eventually became part of a poor-law policy trend towards children to ameliorate exposure to the workhouse proper; the smaller-scale cottage homes for children instituted in selected locations from the 1870s were another reflection of this trend.[[72]](#footnote-72) With hindsight, though, institutional separation from workhouses was unlikely to be effective on its own as a means to attenuating the pauper ‘taint’. The children remained under the authority of the Poor Law Board or its successors and both Schools and cottage homes were subject to the same concerns about financial stringency as other institutions. The District Schools also drew on poor-law precedents for diet, staffing, and organisation (both within buildings and by apportioning hours in the day) including poor-law directives about corporal punishment. Autobiographies have already been deployed to argue that district schooling was primarily characterised by physical discipline and a stultifying curriculum that proved every bit as punitive as the predecessor workhouse regime.[[73]](#footnote-73)

It was beyond schools’ remit or capacity to monitor children’s subsequent independence from welfare. Conversely it was in Edward Tuffnell’s interest to demonstrate the schools’ effectiveness, and he was one of the few to attempt mapping children’s future careers by soliciting correspondence from former pupils; inevitably his personal investment in the district-school project renders his anecdotal positivity quite suspect.[[74]](#footnote-74) Fortunately, protracted autobiographical accounts of school life by former pupils can be scrutinised in two contrasting ways to reveal more about the place of the institution in an individual’s life course. First the tenor and content of the text can be positioned in relation to the character of the other available narratives, to find what the author is willing to reveal about the material *and* emotional impact of their residential experience, marrying discursive formulation with practical activity.[[75]](#footnote-75) Second the texts can be compared with the broader historical record to find coalescences and divergences between the autobiographical story and the relatively neutral entries in parish registers, censuses, institutional admissions and discharge records, and mundane poor-law correspondence (so not merely those documents associated with a particular scandal or inquiry). This comparison is not used as an exercise in catching out authors whose memories were faulty as to specific dates or events. Instead it provides an opportunity to evaluate the writer’s own estimation of their life against that of an array of alternative witnesses to their lives, families, and careers, witnesses who however self-interested in their own right were not hailing from the same perspective or with the same agenda as the autobiographer.[[76]](#footnote-76) This work demonstrates that the narratives broadly aligned with either *Oliver Twist* or self-improvement cannot contain institutional memories without extensive adaptation. The models prove insufficient in ways that are both positive and negative for district schools’ reputations and for the family as a preferable antithesis to poor-law intervention.

One of the longest and most accessible accounts of district school life makes a clear statement about the long-term harm inflicted by institutional living on the author, arising from abuse that went far beyond simple nutritional or emotional deprivation. It was written in the *Oliver Twist* vein, by a man who admired Dickens above all other writers, but with the additional penalty of suffering drastic trauma and no significant emotional recovery from childhood oppression. This is in contrast to Oliver himself, who is presumed to have put his childhood sufferings behind him by the end of the novel. Frank Stone was born in 1860 and died in 1939. His autobiography *Ditcher’s Row* runs to nearly 300 pages, but over a third of the narrative is occupied by his account of life in a workhouse district school.[[77]](#footnote-77) The author’s introduction makes this emphasis the justification for his writing, on the grounds that no other published account to his knowledge dealt with these schools, but like other autobiographies the book begins with his parents and his earliest memories. These reminiscences can now be augmented with genealogical research into specifics, despite Stone’s adoption of the pseudonym ‘Frank Steel’.

Stone’s father Edwin married the much younger Emma Purkin in Camberwell in 1856 and the couple quickly had three sons whose places of birth give testimony to the household’s frequent removals across Middlesex and Hertfordshire.[[78]](#footnote-78) Edwin was described as a draper’s assistant, then publican, engineer, sawmill proprietor, and later timber merchant (glossed by Frank as a travelling salesman of the laths for venetian blinds). The family’s poverty by the time of Frank’s early childhood was palpable. Stone recalls an incident of a dropped half sovereign, and the despair on his mother’s face when it was finally given up as lost. This is unsurprising given that his father Edwin had already spent time in the Whitecross street debtor’s prison and suffered subsequent bankruptcy.[[79]](#footnote-79)

The autobiography clearly urges that Stone’s parents were not to blame for their financial misfortunes. Stone is quick to exonerate his father and implicate instead ‘a hard, mean, ill-regulated world which, instead of affording recognition and a place for every kind of merit, reserves its favours for the “strength” of selfishness and cunning.’[[80]](#footnote-80) If his father had any fault, it was that ‘he lacked acquisitiveness and “shove”’, being too gentlemanly for business. Similarly Emma Stone was credited as ‘the embodiment of the genius of motherhood’ who maintained the idea of home when circumstances had deprived the family of the material means.[[81]](#footnote-81) That said, the non-judgemental reasoning given for the family’s poverty does rest on Edwin, whose generous diffidence and lifestyle ‘foibles’ did not tend towards comfortable solvency. Stone recalled his mother Emma saying that, given her time over, she ‘would never again sit back worshipping masculine wisdom and holding my peace till the mischief was done.’[[82]](#footnote-82) This parental portrait underscores ‘a model of unemployed fathering not as failure but, rather, as fragility’.[[83]](#footnote-83)

Stone was admitted to the workhouse in Hackney in the summer of 1868 and was swiftly transferred to the Forest Gate District School, along with his brother Henry (identified as ‘Reggie’ in the narrative) who was one year his senior.[[84]](#footnote-84) The brothers remained at Forest Gate until April 1872 when their nuclear family regrouped.[[85]](#footnote-85) Forest Gate in east London had only been open for a matter of months when Stone was admitted, although the buildings had previously formed the premises of an industrial school for the Whitechapel Union and inherited a number of the existing Whitechapel staff. It was a fairly large establishment, catering for 700-900 children, with predictable divisions between boys and girls, younger and older children.[[86]](#footnote-86)

Stone’s account spans the launch and development of the ‘crusade’ against outdoor relief and the alleged philosophical shifts it caused to the poor law *per se*. Nonetheless it makes no explicit mention of the crusade and Stone’s experiences were entirely disconnected from it, since his time as a pupil was tortuous from 1868-1870, and improved thereafter. Stone’s is undoubtedly a trauma narrative, quite possibly written in an attempt at self-analysis, to achieve a form of therapy and relieve pain.[[87]](#footnote-87) He felt a life-long sense of emotional disablement deriving from his sufferings in youth, and specifically from his time at residential school. He concludes his memoir with a deeply-depressed summation:

As I look back over my life, what do I see down all the vista of years but long drab stretches of discouragement and disappointment; of hopeless, or but half-hopeful because always cramped and hindered, endeavour; of heart-breaking hope-deferred; Just as one was thinking: ‘Here comes the sun at last!’ – the cheering rift closed in and all was overcast again.[[88]](#footnote-88)

 The place of the school in Stone’s life-course, therefore, was wholly negative in his opinion. It did not insure him against poverty in adulthood, and seemingly guaranteed a lifetime of disappointment and shame.

The evidence he offers of school life comprises an authentic and disturbing account of physical and psychological abuse by a single member of staff which in hindsight coheres convincingly with the effects he describes. Stone was separated from his brother by the internal management of the school and allocated to the care of a boy’s nurse whom he called ‘Kate’; this was Catherine KcKennon, aged 22 in 1868, who had domestic charge of all of the younger boys at Forest Gate when they were not being taught.[[89]](#footnote-89) Kate proved a violent custodian of pauper children in that, according to Stone, she smacked the boys in her care repeatedly and daily, with her hands or with a wooden battledore, on the face, limbs, and elsewhere on their bodies. He recalled that her brutality was expressed most intensely following evidence of illness among the children; chilblains or ophthalmia (severe conjunctivitis) were guaranteed to result in a beating. Illnesses were amenable to punishment according to Kate’s philosophy because she believed that the children induced them wilfully by, for example, rubbing their eyes, in order the secure admission to the school’s infirmary. They also gave rise to Kate’s own version of ‘treatment’, which in the case of chilblains involved holding hands or feet in the fire until they were burned. Stone records the sense that she relished the power of chastisement, noticing her ‘smirk of malicious enjoyment’ at the children’s evident fear. In addition to physical violence bordering on torture, the boys were abused verbally, by means of Kate’s ‘cruel, piercing, scornful tones’ and the ‘spiteful taunting drawl’ in which she would castigate them as ‘varmins’ or more sinisterly as ‘my beauty’.[[90]](#footnote-90)

This sort of physical punishment was not endorsed by the Poor Law Board, and by implication it was forbidden, so if Stone was recalling Kate’s chastisements accurately, she was drastically exceeding her remit. Children in district schools were subject to the same rules of punishment as their counterparts in internal workhouse schools, where regulations on punishment were first set by the Poor Law Commissioners’ report of 1841 and made part of a General Order of 24 July 1847. This forbade any corporal punishment of female children, and technically restricted the delivery of physical punishments to male children under 15 by the workhouse master or schoolmaster. Punishment of male children was to be inflicted only with an approved form of rod, and only then after six hours had elapsed after the detection of the offence. Female nurses are not included as potential sources of chastisement[[91]](#footnote-91) Unequivocal prohibition of physical punishment by female attendants was presumably thought to be unnecessary, or the requirement for such prohibition simply did not occur to the Board. The specific rules governing Forest Gate were an adaptation of these earlier statutes, and while the lapse of time between misdemenour and punishment was reduced to two hours, the other provisions remained.[[92]](#footnote-92) Therefore when Stone could only attribute Kate’s occasional referrals of boys to the headmaster for punishment to ‘a spice of deep-laid diplomacy’ we can appreciate that strappings by the schoolmaster were the only legitimate punishments applied.[[93]](#footnote-93)

Kate was one employee among many at Forest Gate, and Stone acknowledged that other nurses, teachers and officers at the school were not guilty of such grotesque behaviour. When Stone was promoted to join the older boys, his life changed dramatically; ‘Starved and stunted might be (and were) our lives; and we had our troubles in class and among our fellows, of course, as all schoolboys have; but the ‘reign of terror’ was over for me.’[[94]](#footnote-94) Unusually he speculated on the forces which drove ‘Kate’ to behave in such a way and concluded that there was no systematic policy or requirement to terrorise the children but that she affected these methods out of personal vanity and to secure advancement.[[95]](#footnote-95) Her career within the school suggests he may have been partly right, in as much as her transfer to the girl’s infirmary in 1871 resulted in an increase in Kate’s pay from £14 to £18 per annum.[[96]](#footnote-96) Stone construed her painful treatments for minor ailments as an attempt to keep the children in her charge off the school’s infirmary register. What Stone could not have known at the time, and may not have appreciated in retrospect, was that the general health of children in London’s district schools had become a matter of Parliamentary scrutiny, and that rates of ophthalmia and the consequential risk of children losing their eyesight was a burgeoning national scandal.[[97]](#footnote-97) It was also the case that the school’s medical officer Thomas Vallance endorsed Kate’s view that the children invited eye infections, telling the Poor Law Board ‘the evil is the recurrence of attacks in the same child, very frequently however produced by themselves for the purposes of getting to the infirmary.’[[98]](#footnote-98) Stone would hardly have understood these factors as mitigation for Kate’s alleged behaviour, but it does suggest a context of general institutional pressure and a specific desire to drive down the spread of eye infections that was felt by the children’s nurses.

In this way, Stone’s interpretation of his residence in the district school places heavy emphasis on the contingency of staff characteristics, which were in themselves shaped by structural forces as well as personality. The institution does not escape without inherent blame, as ‘the system’s machinery of humbug’ provided a facsimile of care rather than its reality, but it was Kate’s unfettered physical authority that made Stone’s life hellish. The punitive years of life in the district school were also given definition by the staff who did not conform to Kate’s model of cruelty. The staff in the receiving wards (opened to provide a barrier to whole-school infection by new admissions) was administered by ‘angels of loving kindness as compared with that fury Kate’ and intervention by a young male teacher resulted in ‘the most truly wonderful moment of my life’ (namely his discovery of a fine singing voice).[[99]](#footnote-99)

It also demonstrates, in a more muted way, the role of family dynamics in framing the place of the workhouse and school in his memory. Stone recalls his father Edwin’s admission to the workhouse with as much or more horror as his own, induced by seeing his father in the shameful corduroy attire of the house. Stone took up some of the emotional burden of his father’s workhouse admission without apparently being able to share his own feelings with other family members. When the boys were transferred to the school his older brother Henry lay out of Kate’s jurisdiction from the first and instead fell under the care of a male supervisor ‘easy-going Old Jerry’. This forcibly pointed up the differences between the brothers as they had very different exposure to the school’s staff and, like many victims of abuse, Frank felt he could not tell Henry the full range of his sufferings.[[100]](#footnote-100)

The autobiography also raises questions around the termination of Stone’s school experiences which points to family choices exacerbating institutional experience. Frank and Henry were given no intimation that their stay at Forest Gate was coming to an end: one day they were summarily transferred back to the Hackney workhouse, where they met their father and walked away to resume their home life. Thereafter their mother referred to her time in the workhouse ‘seldom’ and their father ‘never’.[[101]](#footnote-101) What, then, informed the decision to regroup and the timing of the boys’ leaving school?

Emma Stone sought her release from the workhouse relatively early to set up a cookshop in Shoreditch, and was not joined by her husband and children for an unspecified amount of time. When Frank and Henry were discharged from school, it was to an immediate transfer to working life. Did their mother permit them to remain in Forest Gate for longer than might have been the case, perhaps to extend their education and prevent their having to go out to work at an even earlier age? Other parents of children in Forest Gate took quite a different line in their deployment of poor-law resources: Sarah Harrison’s daughters were admitted and discharged from the school up to fifteen times each, for stays of months or mere days at a time, in the two decades after Stone’s admission.[[102]](#footnote-102) The short-term stay was much more characteristic of children’s institutional life than the exposure for years at a time, and parents manipulated children’s discharge dates to avoid their being sent from workhouses to district schools.[[103]](#footnote-103) Therefore the duration of the Stone brothers’ school residence, and the occasional character of their contact with parents, was probably as much a matter of parental choice as compulsion.

Stone did not question the terms of his leaving school, or at least not within the scope of his autobiography, despite the dispiriting period which followed. He worked long hours for low wages, and ploughed all of his earnings into the maintenance of his parents and their repeatedly failing schemes for income. Stone took a sort of universal discouragement from these experiences, summed up as ‘Don’t attempt anything! The cards of the system are stacked against you, *and you are bound to lose*!’[[104]](#footnote-104) Superficially this makes Stone look something like the passive victim of economic determinism, a type familiar in other non-poor-law narratives.[[105]](#footnote-105) But in Frank’s estimation the Stone family was uniquely victimised, not as part of a group, because others appeared to succeed where they failed. So while Stone’s parents are never identified unequivocally as at fault in his memoir, they were clearly contributors to the length of his stay at school, his need for employment no matter the terms, and his crushing sense of inevitable failure.

Similarly Stones claim for an unalleviated, depressive emotional legacy arising out of institutional residence is out of alignment with the observable historical record and with Stone’s material fortunes in the second half of his life course. Success came to Stone in his thirties, significantly in a period not much covered by his autobiography. He moved first to Canada and then to California, at least in part for his wife’s health. The couple had two children, and Stone became an artist in medallion portraits and sculpture. He worked within the state but exhibited nationally, winning a gold medal at the Alaska-Yukon expo held in Seattle in 1909.[[106]](#footnote-106) This startling post-emigration resumé is indicated only faintly in the book by very scattered reference to his later artistic career.[[107]](#footnote-107) He was diffident about publishing at all: correspondence with Sidgwick and Jackson proves that he had a draft available by 1919, resubmitted in 1926 and finally released the third attempt in 1939.[[108]](#footnote-108) In this way Stone makes a convincing case for his life having been scarred by failure, even when to outward appearance he became a commercial success.

Stone’s autobiography has been used by several historians in passing to illustrate the long-term stigmatising effects of institutional life under the New Poor Law without the realisation that he wrote pseudonymously.[[109]](#footnote-109) But Stone’s is not the only account of district-school life, and it is not so unequivocal in its implications as might appear at first glance. To read this memoir as the only possible account of schools risks ‘mistaking the exceptionally brutal for the average.’[[110]](#footnote-110) Just as the character or behaviour of institutional employees, and harsh family choices, could have a negative impact on children, the reverse could also hold true.[[111]](#footnote-111) Discretionary action by employees might conceivably work in paupers’ favour where individuals were kindly disposed, and dysfunctional families might put the district school into an entirely different light in other life narratives. Stone’s own acknowledged debts to staff other than Kate, and his review of family finances, both begin to point in this direction.

The Central London District School at Hanwell was an early foundation in the district school movement, since it was built from 1856 onwards and was predicated on an earlier school at Norwood. It was a large institution, catering for around 1200 children.[[112]](#footnote-112) It also has a small run of former pupils who described their experiences at school in later life; most famous of these was Charlie Chaplin, whose account spans the child-victim/self-improvement models.[[113]](#footnote-113)

Two further narratives stretch the depiction of district schools much further, by demonstrating active enjoyment of institutional living at Hanwell and either a wariness or tacit rejection of family life, at least during childhood. Ada Bennett (b. 1901, cited in the introduction) and Edward Balne (1894-1983) were both residents of the Central London District School at Hanwell in Middlesex between 1903 and 1913.[[114]](#footnote-114) The time-lapse between Stone’s discharge from Forest Gate and the arrival of these two children in Hanwell potentially allowed for an improvement in school conditions between the 1870s and the 1910s. There was the scope for ‘real’ change, effected by the introduction of female and working-class poor-law Guardians from 1875 and 1892 respectively. Bennett’s receipt of sixpence at New Year seems to speak to this sort of progress. Nonetheless two additional points are indicative: first, observers and managers of district schools remained concerned about many of the same issues that had exercised their predecessors, and became more attentive to the ways that large district schools might not be well suited to child welfare, yet schools remained open into the mid-twentieth century.[[115]](#footnote-115) Second, both Stone and Balne clearly ascribe the extremities of their experience to individual abusive personalities whether inside or outside schools.

Edward Balne’s time at Hanwell is described in emphatically nostalgic terms. Balne was born in 1895 and may never have lived with his parents; he mentioned that he did not remember ever having met them.[[116]](#footnote-116) His earliest memories were of the Southwark workhouse where he was apparently treated with kindness; later he was sent to Hanwell and remained there until 1909. Balne and his fellow school-children identified parent substitutes among the teaching staff, most notably in ‘Daddy’ Wadsworth.[[117]](#footnote-117) Balne recalled with pleasure his own prowess at cricket, his enjoyment of his musical education (he became a trumpeter), and felt it ‘a great wrench’ to leave the school to enter the army as a bandsman aged 14: he characterised it as having been his home for twelve and a half years of his life.[[118]](#footnote-118) His subsequent career in military service included severe injury at Gallipoli. Balne’s comparative physical enjoyment of youth at Hanwell is therefore tacitly contrasted with disablement in adult life, and considerable pain conferred by a lengthy experience of kidney disease.

In composing this history, Balne was consciously or unconsciously editing his wider birth family out of his childhood memories. Close attention to the admission and discharge records of Hanwell reveal that he was not admitted until aged eight, and this later admission is confirmed by the 1901 census which clearly identifies him aged six living in Newington as the adopted son of one Charles Balne (a paternal uncle), Charles’s wife Margaret Balne formerly Ashworth, and the couple’s three natural children.[[119]](#footnote-119) The household probably broke up in the wake of Margaret’s death in 1903, when the couple’s youngest natural child was already thirteen but Balne was only eight; he was admitted to first Newington workhouse then Hanwell school just a few months after his adopted mother’s death.[[120]](#footnote-120) This means that Edward Balne had clear experience of domestic life at an age when he should have remembered it, but he writes this period entirely out of his memoir to concentrate on Hanwell instead. The school was certainly aware of his adopted family, because it listed his nearest known relation as Mrs Ashworth (possibly the wife of one of Margaret Balne’s sons by her first marriage).[[121]](#footnote-121)

At the outset of Balne’s account he wrote ‘I have never known a single personal relative’ excepting only those by marriage.[[122]](#footnote-122) The wider Balne family was not subsequently mentioned at any point in the written recollections, and he even presses home this point when he was invalided out of the army; on release from hospital in 1916 he lodged with the parents of a fellow army bandsman ‘having no home of any sort or relatives.’[[123]](#footnote-123) This rejection of family fits with a different narrative tradition, but not one found very readily among working-class autobiographers. Instead it speaks to the refrains of philanthropic reformers throughout the Victorian and Edwardian periods who stereotyped children as orphans or deserted by parents. Lydia Murdoch has charted the fracture lines between these stock representations of poor children by middle-class commentators and the everyday usage of charitable and poor-law services by poor families, with particular attention to the increasing vilification of parents from the 1870s.[[124]](#footnote-124) Balne’s memoir avoids the reformers’ trope of parental abuse and exploitation of children, but aligns very decisively with their invested optimism in institutional provision.

Even if Balne did not remember his biological family, someone among their number would have remembered him. At the time of his admission to school both of his parents and at least two siblings were alive. Edward Thomas Balne and Caroline Dinah Balne née Reeves had married in 1885 and had at least five children born alive: Violet, Thomas, Edward, Albert and Reginald.[[125]](#footnote-125) Violet and Reginald died in infancy, but the family household in 1901 comprised both parents and their sons Thomas and Albert.[[126]](#footnote-126) Caroline died in 1908 and Edward senior in 1915, while Edward’s two older brothers grew up from at least 1911 with the Reeves family.[[127]](#footnote-127) Only Edward was cut adrift from his parents’ relations. He may have been entirely unaware of the fact, so nothing firm can be drawn from their omission in his autobiography, but the upbeat investment in Hanwell District School is rendered more notable. The elision of the entirety of Balne’s early life with his school days, and his adherence to the line that he had no effectual relationship with members of his birth family, means that the school and army peers acted as his surrogate family in a way that he did not reject and firmly embraced.

Balne’s neglect by his parental families does invite consideration of the multiple ways that families could fail, short of parental death. Caroline Balne died of phthisis in 1908 while living with her brother.[[128]](#footnote-128) This eventual diagnosis, plus the distribution of the couple’s children among aunts and uncles, gives rise to a number of possibilities for the life choices of Edward and Caroline Balne in the period between Balne the memoirists birth in 1895 and his mother’s death in 1908. Did the parental couple chose to give up their middle child, or was their hand forced or encouraged by other factors such as Caroline’s developing the illness that killed her? Did they suffer a breakdown in their marriage prompting Caroline’s retreat to a sibling’s household? None of these options would have been unremarkable in themselves, but the resulting events *did* leave Edward Balne junior isolated and institutionalised when his brothers were not, and the story opens up the possibility of other failings by parents that were less coincidental or blameless. Parents could treat children differently or neglectfully if there was some question-mark over their legitimacy – did Caroline have an extra-marital liaison which resulted in Edward junior’s birth?

In addition to the marked absence of family, there is a second and unique feature to Balne’s account. He describes the moment when he says he was made to realise his marginal life status. This did not take place in school, but outside in the community. Balne was routinely chosen to score for the local adult’s cricket team, and one Saturday

I first became conscious of my lowly status in society. And being a highly sensitive lad, I was never to forget the incident (which I will not describe here) which occurred that afternoon. The shock of the realisation that I was considered to be a member of the lowest form of human creation was an experience from which I have never fully recovered. It affected my nerves and my whole outlook upon life. It affected my confidence and personality and it left a feeling of a deep and profound inferiority complex which generally has overshadowed everything I have tried to accomplish over the years.[[129]](#footnote-129)

Like Frank Stone, treatment in childhood delivered by a single person blighted his emotional life, but unlike Stone, Balne did not have these feelings instilled exclusively by an institution or by an adult employee; rather he was given some sudden, cruel (and, given his reticence, possibly sexually abusive) induction into the stigmatising effects of the poor law by someone, presumably an adult man, outside of the relief system. For Balne, the Hanwell District School had in effect operated like a protective family *shielding* a low-status member from stigma.[[130]](#footnote-130) The realities of life beyond or after district school were perhaps part and parcel of having been a pauper child, but the school itself could be construed with hindsight to mitigate the classification of pauperism and be viewed as a site of contentment and quasi-familial significance before the trials of adulthood.

**Conclusion**

Historians of the emotions have considered the scope for sweeping change in the bodily experience and expressive diction of feeling. They have generally pointed to the greater assertion of emotional control over time, combined with oscillating localised trends. This article has taken a much narrower focus, the emotional communities among former poor-law inmates, where the sentiments of recollection were not explicitly driven by central policy change but by a combination of personalities, family context, later experience, and the pre-existing stories available for co-option.

The Oliver-Twist narrative comprised one model for this emotional community of poor-law users, but the diversity of narratives beyond the Dickensian option make two things plain: first, the scope for institutional abuse and *de facto* psychological scarring have been underestimated in even the most drastic popular stories, which have dwelt upon the immediate risks of nutritional and emotional deprivation rather than the long-standing damage inflicted by effectual torture or protracted/permanent parental absence. The emotional impact of school admission over the life course could be devastating. Second, surrender or rejection by parents meant that children sought alternative forms of comfort which were not necessarily overwritten by subsequent or adult affiliations. Schools’ staff or fellow pupils could substitute for parents, grandparents, or lateral kin where these did not prove adequate in childhood or subsequently. This is not to say that poor-law institutions were anything other than a blunt and insufficiently regulated tool to address literal or effectual orphan-hood, but it does imply that for some children, institutions went some way to supply a deficiency of care, and inspired appreciative sentiments in later life.

The intention of the 1834 law was to provide systematic relief in institutions which replicated welfare features across the country. Facilities for children in all locations were supposed to be ameliorated across the period, from dormitories within general workhouses to dedicated schools and cottage homes by 1913. What multiple local studies suggest though, and what this research confirms in details such as Castle’s illegitimate ejection from the workhouse and ‘Kate’s’ unauthorised chastisement of the boys in her ward, is that there were multiple poor laws in operation. This was the case despite the illusion of central oversight, fostered by policy lag and overwhelmingly by individuals’ interpretation of their duties and experiences. Guardians, workhouse staff, and paupers all brought their preconceptions and their personal mores to their specific institution, with drastic consequences for the uniformity of poor-law practice and reception. The diversity, waywardness or downright neglect of policy implementation means that we need a new, affective chronology of the poor law, consciously diminishing the Dickensian stereotype and validating the diversity of other voices.
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