

munity is composed, that is their pleasures and their security, is the end and the sole end which the legislator ought to have in view: the sole standard, in conformity to which each individual ought, as far as depends upon the legislator, to be *made* to fashion his behaviour. But whether it be this or any thing else that is to be *done*, there is nothing by which a man can ultimately be *made* to do it, but either pain or pleasure. Having taken a general view of these two grand objects (*viz.* pleasure, and what comes to the same thing, immunity from pain) in the character of *final* causes; it will be necessary to take a view of pleasure and pain itself, in the character of *efficient* causes or means.

There are four distinguishable sources from which pleasure and pain are in use to flow: considered separately, they may be termed the *physical*, the *political*, the *moral*, and the *religious*: and inasmuch as the pleasures and pains belonging to each of them are capable of giving a binding force to any law or rule of conduct, they may all of them be termed *sanctions*.

If it be in the present life, and from the ordinary course of nature, not purposely modified by the interposition of the will of any human being, nor by any extraordinary interposition of any superior invisible being, that the pleasure or the pain takes place or is expected, it may be said to issue from or to belong to the *physical sanction*. . . .

Pleasures or pains which may be expected to issue from the *physical*, *political*, or *moral* sanctions, must all of them be expected to be experienced, if ever, in the *present* life: those which may be expected to issue from the *religious* sanction, may be expected to be experienced either in the *present* life or in a *future*.

Those which can be experienced in the present life, can of course be no others than such as human nature in the course of the present life is susceptible of: and from each of these sources may flow all the pleasures or pains of which, in the course of the present life, human nature is susceptible. With regard to these then (with which alone we have in this place any concern) those of them which belong to any one of those sanctions, differ not ultimately in kind from those which belong to any one of the other three: the only difference there is among them lies in the circumstances that accompany their production. A suffering which befalls a man in the natural and spontaneous course of things, shall be styled, for instance, a *calamity*; in which case, if it be supposed to befall him through any imprudence of his, it may be styled a punishment issuing from the physical sanction. Now this same suffering, if inflicted by the law, will be what is commonly called a *punishment*; if incurred for want of any friendly assistance, which the misconduct, or supposed misconduct, of the sufferer has occasioned to be withholden, a punishment issuing from the *moral* sanction; if through the immediate interposition of a particular providence, a punishment issuing from the religious sanction. . . .

#### 4. THE SADLER REPORT—FACTORY CONDITIONS AT LEEDS\*

Industrialization and the factory system, which spread rapidly across the English midlands by the early nineteenth century, brought a swift growth of cities. Many of the early factories and factory towns were characterized by

\* Charles Wing, *Evils of the Factory System* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1837), pp. 9-10.

appalling squalor, poor working conditions, and uncontrolled human exploitation. Humanitarians and some of the leading figures in English society strove to improve the desperate conditions in industrial communities. In 1832 a royal commission concluded an investigation of conditions in English textile factories with a series of hearings before a parliamentary committee headed by Michael Sadler. The published report of the Committee's findings revealed the abuses of the factory system in such graphic terms that few members of Parliament could fail to recognize the necessity of reform. By the end of the nineteenth century, child labor had been prohibited and adolescent employment had been reduced to a ten-hour day. In the selection which follows, what particular dilemma did Miss Elizabeth Bentley face at age twenty-three? What were the most degrading aspects of textile work? What methods were employed by the overlooker in order to maintain production quotas?

[ABRIDGMENT OF EVIDENCE]

BENTLEY, ELIZABETH, age 23,—examined, 4th June, 1832,—as doffer, began to work, when six years old, in a flax mill, at Leeds.

1. What were your hours of labour? — From five in the morning, till nine at night, when they were thronged.

2. For how long a time together have you worked that excessive length of time? — For about half a year.

3. What were your usual hours of labour, when you were not so thronged? — From six in the morning, till seven at night.

4. What time was allowed for your meals? — Forty minutes at noon.

5. Had you any time to get your breakfast, or drinking? — No, we got it as we could.

6. And when your work was bad, you had hardly any time to eat it at all? — No; we were obliged to leave it or to take it home, and when we did not take it, the overlooker took it, and gave it to his pigs.

7. Do you consider doffing a laborious employment? — Yes; when the frames are full, they have to stop the frames, and take the flyers off, and take the full bobbins off, and carry them to the roller, and then put empty ones on, and set the frames going again.

8. Does that keep you constantly on your feet? — Yes; there are so many frames, and they run so quick.

9. Suppose you flagged a little, or were too late, what would they do? — Strap us.

10. Girls as well as boys? — Yes.

11. Have you ever been strapped? — Yes, severely.

12. Were you strapped if you were too much fatigued to keep up with the machinery? — Yes; the overlooker I was under was a very severe man, and when we have been fatigued, and worn out, and had not baskets to put the bobbins in, we used to put them in the window bottoms, and that broke the panes sometimes, and I broke one one time, and the overlooker strapped me on the arm, and it rose a blister, and I ran home to my mother.

13. How long were you in your first situation? — Three or four years.

14. Where did you go then? — To Benyon's factory.

15. What were you there? — A weigher in the card-room.

16. How long did you work there? — From half-past five, till eight at night.

17. The carding-room is more oppressive than the spinning department? — Yes, it is so dusty; they cannot see each other for dust.

18. Did working in the card-room affect your health? — Yes; it was so dusty, the dust got up my lungs, and the work was so hard; I was middling strong when I went there, but the work was so bad; I got so bad in health, that when I pulled the baskets down, I pulled my bones out of their places.

19. You are considerably deformed in your person in consequence of this labour? — Yes, I am.

20. At what time did it come on? — I was about thirteen years old when it began coming, and it has got worse since; it is five years since my mother died, and my mother was never able to get me a pair of good stays to hold me up; when my mother died, I had to do for myself, and got me a pair.

21. Were you straight till you were thirteen? — Yes, I was.

22. Have you been attended to by any medical gentleman at Leeds, or the neighbourhood? — Yes, I have been under Mr. Hares.

23. To what did he attribute it? — He said it was owing to hard labour, and working in the factories.

24. Where are you now? — In the poor house.

25. Do any of your former employers come to see you? — No.

26. Did you ever receive anything from them when you became afflicted? — When I was at home, Mr. Walker made me a present of 1s. or 2s.; but since I have left my work and gone to the poor house, they have not come nigh me.

27. You are supported by the parish? — Yes.

28. You are utterly incapable now of any exertion in the factories? — Yes.

29. You were very willing to have worked as long as you were able, from your earliest age? — Yes.

30. And to have supported your widowed mother as long as you could? — Yes. . . .

##### 5. BENJAMIN DISRAELI: SYBIL\*

The active political career of Benjamin Disraeli (1804–81) began during the period of expanding industrialism, Chartist agitation, and the anti-Corn Law movement and closed amid militant unionism, imperialist upsurge, and the controversy over Irish Home Rule. He served in three cabinets and was Prime Minister in two others. Two years before entering the House of Commons in 1837 Disraeli published his *Vindication of the British Constitution*, in which he subscribed to the Burkean tradition as the best guide for England's future development. In addition to his political activities, Disraeli wrote eight novels and established a reputation of respectable literary merit. His best known novel, *Sybil* (1845), was rich with the political-economic philosophy expressed by a group of Tory aristocrats generally referred to as Young England. Disraeli called for a fulfillment of what he conceived as the aristocratic mission to serve the needs of the masses, a goal which he believed the Whigs could not achieve because of their classical liberal doctrines.

In the passages below, Disraeli provided a description of the rural town of Marney and depicted the drudgery of mining life. What were the most serious

\* Benjamin Disraeli, *Sybil* (London: R. Brimley Johnson, 1904), pp. 69–71, 184–86, 86–88.