Peter N. Stearns

"THE EYE MUST ENTRAP THE MIND": ARMY SPECTACLE AND PARADIGM IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

By Scott Hughes Myerly   Minot State University

Spectacle is an intrinsic dimension of armies and conflict,[1] but the impact of army spectacle upon nineteenth-century Britain has been neglected by scholars. This omission is puzzling, for a number of writers, most notably Max Weber, have claimed that the military serves as a metaphoric model of organization in civilian society, yet no scholarly work has examined the appeal of the military show or the relationship between this spectacle and the adoption of the military paradigm in civilian life.[2]

The present study seeks to examine this significant but neglected subject by focusing on values inherent in the military paradigm which were adopted by British society. The nineteenth century is particularly appropriate for two reasons: first, the long French wars made the greatest military impact on British society of any previous period in history, and second, between 1815 and 1855 the army reached the high point of its sartorial brilliance.[3] Military spectacle was undeniably conspicuous during this era, and the first part of this article will examine the public's fascination with this display, demonstrating that the show's enormous popularity led to the adoption of military themes in civilian culture. The second part will examine how values which were visually inherent in the military imagery became an inspirational model and paradigm in a variety of non-military endeavors, all of which were linked with social control and large-scale organization, but especially with institutions.

These relationships have been overlooked, in part because the subject is complicated in several ways. The small size of the army and its deliberate isolation from the public in barracks might mislead a scholar to believe that the contacts between soldiers and civilians were of limited importance.[4] The public's attitude toward the army was also paradoxical, and the civilian response to the military often depended upon context. During peacetime, civilians often neglected and ignored the military or complained that it was a wasteful expense,[5] yet during a European war, many of these same people gave wholehearted support to the armed forces.[6] This very ambivalence shows that historians cannot view the homeservice army only in terms of its role as an internal police force or as a political issue: these views fail to note the enormous attraction of the spectacle, an omission largely shared by recent works on the era's popular entertainment and recreations.[7] But soldiers were a most unlikely group for admiration, for on one level, the army was viewed by Britons with mistrust and distaste, due to poor discipline and its forming a sub-culture in British life.[8] The Other Ranks were commonly seen as being pathetic slaves in red coats—the passive machinery in an engine of oppression, and therefore most un-English—but also as coarse, drunken, louts whose brawls with civilians and each other were a widespread problem. They were also despised as lazy wastrels and the outcasts and dregs of society; the officers were often viewed as violent, drunken scoundrels and arrogant snobs, and all ranks had a reputation as unprincipled seducers.[9]

The respectable middle classes were disgusted by such behavior and many of the well-to-do agreed,[10] but the military was most passionately hated by the laboring classes and the poor. The army was the primary coercive means used to put down civil disturbances in this harsh era of industrialization, including the many riots, strikes, lockouts, Chartist actions and minor rebellions of the period. The enlistment of a lad from a poor but respectable family was also regarded as a disaster, since he was not likely to return again to his people.[11]

But on another level the public's perception of the army was quite different, and while scholars have documented the hostility shown toward soldiers, they have relegated the resplendent display of army imagery to a status of an insignificant backdrop. To contemporaries, however, this show was most impressive: the brilliant uniforms of the period with their vivid colors, huge and imposing plumed headgear, and the bullion lace on officers' coats and equipment, presented an enormously popular free entertainment for all classes of society, at a time when many traditional recreations were being suppressed.[12]

For army commanders the maintenance of this visual magnificence was intrinsic to duty. Endless drill was essential for maintaining control over the era's machine-like formations in the chaotic conditions of combat, and a fine appearance also stimulated recruiting, while the management of both discipline and morale were considerably aided by the imagery.[13] This factor played a central role in the nineteenth century art of war, as one officer noted: "The principle commonly assumed by tacticians as the base on which the military instrument is formed ... is appearance." [14] The perfectionist standard was rigidly enforced in the soldiers' dress, equipment, drill and in the "correct style" of their movements. Yet this emphasis upon appearance often transcended the needs of training to the extent that the soldiers' health could be undermined, and their effectiveness as a fighting force might be materially diminished.[15]

Nevertheless, even ordinary duties were rendered into spectacle by the idealized image. Routine tasks such as sentry and escort duty, marching, Sunday church parades, off-duty soldiers walking out in the street with the correct manner and "air," and the endless public drills elicited great excitement.[16] So great was the emphasis on show that a recruit asked his mates in 1871: "'Is this a fightin' machine, or a blinkin' circus?' The self-appointed commission of recruits voted unanimously for the circus ... [and] it was not trained solely, nor even principally, for war."[17]

The spectacle—usually accompanied by martial music—was enhanced at the mass rituals and ceremonies in which entire regiments participated. These shows included the presentation of new colours (flags) to a regiment, the changing of the guard, trooping the colours, field days, the quarterly and yearly inspections, funerals, and so on, which were normally played out before an audience composed of crowds of civilians who gathered to watch the performances.[18]

The review, however, constituted the most popular and elaborate public manifestation of the military spectacle and usually included more than one corps performing together. The action on the field consisted of evolutions of drill, musket volleys with blanks, and cannon salutes. Often a sham battle or mock-siege would be staged between two opposing units, or a bayonet or cavalry charge would be a part of the show. Reviews might last for three to five hours,[19] and

even more elaborate grand reviews were held on special occasions or for special reasons. During the French wars these shows were often quite spectacular:

> A military review was at that time [1804] a brilliant exhibition—a gorgeous display of millinery taste.... The size, figure, and complexion of the men presented a dazzling *coup d'oeil* to the common observer.... The dazzling colour of the uniform, the variety of the facings, the contrasts of the different parts of the dress, the profusion of ornaments, namely feathers, frisures, powdered locks, ponderous queues, and polished accoutrements, were singularly contrived to strike the admiring multitude.[20]

In wartime, the review played an especially important role as a means of boosting morale at home and strengthening loyalty to the crown. Military spectacles took place regularly for the duration of the French wars, and in 1798, 1803 and 1815 when war excitement was at a fever pitch, some martial ceremony, such as presenting regiments with new colours, took place almost every week.[21] The spectacle of war was a craze; an Edinburgh lawyer recalled that in 1803, "We were all soldiers, one way or another ... the parade and the review formed the staple of men's talk and thoughts.... And similar scenes were familiar in every town and every shire of the kingdom."[22] Yet this surge of patriotism and loyalty during wartime cannot entirely explain the public clamor for military spectacle.

The situation of British volunteer regiments during the French wars is a case in point. Volunteer units mushroomed all across Great Britain, but many had no weapons.[23] This did not deter them from performing at reviews, however, and the public eagerly attended these spectacles. So great was the martial enthusiasm that the government was besieged by an "insurrection of loyalty," yet Charles James Fox believed that these units had little to do with war and called them a "theatrical, ostentatious foppery," fit only to be put on the top of a hill and admired from afar.[24] Their excesses highlight the fact that such military exercises transcended warlike purposes, and suggest that the dimension of spectacle was for many Britons—both participants and spectators—the most important appeal in these displays.

But other reviews presented an awesome sight; in 1811 when the Prince Regent held a Royal Review at Wimbledon Common to help celebrate his accession to the Regency, 20,000 soldiers performed, drawn up in two parallel lines which extended for two miles. The number of spectators was reported to be a "full 200,000," and the carts and wagons belonging to them "formed a circle of full six or eight miles in circumference."[25] The Prince Regent, who always made a great presence at public ceremonies, outdid himself at this one; accompanied by a "vast retinue," his saddle alone was reported to have cost nearly 500 guineas. "Military Tellegraphs" (heliographs), then a novelty, were used to convey orders along the line of troops.[26]

Grand reviews were usually held in conjunction with some major event, such as on the anniversary of a battle, a royal accession or birthday, or some other activity connected with a royal celebration, and they often involved immense numbers of soldiers and spectators. On these occasions, at least one member of the royal family would attend, or sometimes the commander-in-chief, and programs were usually printed up for the public.[27] Reviews which were connected

with celebrations were often followed by feasts for the soldiers, which helped to strengthen their loyalty to the monarch.[28]

Yet it would be a mistake to interpret such events only as war-time efforts to raise morale or to inspire civilians with patriotic fervor, for reviews were extremely popular in peacetime as well. A review held in July, 1817 at Hounslow Heath caused an immense traffic jam: "The road to Hounslow [from London] was, at a very early hour, crowded with vehicles of all kinds, and every horse was put in requisition long previous to the day appointed for the review."[29] In 1830 during the first week of King William IV's reign, at least three grand reviews took place.[30] At the first of these it was reported that

> the number of persons assembled was immense. The top of the Horse Guards, Admiralty, Treasury, and all the adjacent buildings were completely covered, and presented but one mass of both sexes. The park was so full it was nearly impossible to move along.[31]

Only four days later at another London review, an entire regiment of cavalry and 600 policemen were required to cordon off the ground,[32] and the crowd was described as being "immense beyond description."[33] Two days later William IV was officially proclaimed King at another review, where it was reported that one-fourth of the entire population of greater London attended.[34]

The love of royalty probably accounts for part of the attraction, but the fact that the smaller-scale shows which were held throughout the realm—and not attended by royalty—also drew large numbers of civilian spectators indicates that the imagery provided much of the appeal for these events. A military gymnastics event held in 1828 by the 50th foot regiment at Manchester, "attracted an immense concourse of spectators."[35] A similar crowd was reported in 1831 at a presentation of new colours to the 30th foot at Ashton-under-Lyme.[36]

While the poor comprised the majority of spectators, wealthier people also found military displays to be most compelling; fashionable people held social events in conjunction with reviews. Mary Anne Wyndham Lewis (the future wife of Benjamin Disraeli) held a party in 1829 for ninety guests, half of them lords and ladies, to watch a review in Hyde Park.[37] Perhaps the most famous review specta- tor was Charles Dickens's character, Mr. Pickwick, a typically middle-class early Victorian who was "an enthusiastic admirer of the army." In The Pickwick Papers, he attends a grand review, together with "the whole population of Rochester and the adjoining towns ... in a state of utmost bustle and excitement."[38]

The powerful appeal of these shows—whether large or small—is best un- derstood by their context. In the nineteenth century a gratis public spectacle that involved hundreds or thousands of fancy-dress performers, complete with "fireworks" was quite a treat for all. But an important added dimension was the military music that accompanied almost any movement or exercise of a group of soldiers on duty.[39] The bandsmen's brilliant uniforms were especially colorful, and one veteran asked: "whether it was the splendor of their uniforms, or the beauty of their music, that at all times attracted so great a crowd about them."[40]

This music was most exciting; a contemporary in 1856 noted "the strains of martial music cause the pulse to pound and fire the imagination ... "[41] Until the 1840's one or more Black musicians often performed in each band, usually as drummers or drum-majors, dressed in rich, splendid costumes which were a cross

between Middle Eastern ("Turkish") and European military dress. They wore silk turbans with brilliant, brightly-colored uniforms, decorated with generous quantities of bullion lace, adding a touch of the exotic oriental to the show.[42]

Military bands often performed at private social functions as well, such as parties or weddings, and played at public non-military events, including the dedication of new churches and canals, drawing large crowds.[43] The fancy 11th Hussars band frequently played for "crowds of a thousand or more" at the fashionable seaside resort of Brighton during summer evenings when the regiment was quartered there in 1840.[44]

The bands were so popular that Britons apparently came to expect the show as a right. The editor of the United Service Journal in 1829 pointed out that this seemed to be the public perception, after he received a letter from a civilian who complained "rather angrily" of the late exclusion of the public from the Sunday performances of the Coldstream Guards band at the Tower of London.[45] Likewise, the reviews were also viewed as a public right, and after a hoax was perpetrated in 1816 that one would be held at Wimbledon to commemorate Waterloo, the angry, disappointed crowd set Combe Wood heath on fire. The spectators, however, at last got to see the Guards when a detachment was sent to disperse the riot.[46]

The reviews remained popular despite some disadvantages and disappointments; bad weather might force a cancellation and an unexpected rain shower might damage the uniforms. In 1845 Punch humorously suggested that the troops be equipped with umbrellas.[47] The huge size of the crowds at these events also meant that many could not see the show or hope to enjoy much more than the music and the firing of the guns. But despite problems, the shows' great popularity was encouraged by army commanders, such as Colonel Vandeleur and the officers of the 10th Hussars, who "were ever ready to promote the pleasure of the citizens by the presence of their Band on all public occasions."[48]

The extent of the shows' popularity is further illustrated by the appearance of military themes in civilian culture, reflecting and reenforcing their influence and highlighting the image's great appeal to Britons. This occurred in a wide variety of forms, such as popular entertainments, pastimes and amusements as well as in reading, art, literature, folk songs, and fashion. Children were especially impressed by the military display, and an imposing ritual might remain stamped upon a child's memory for the rest of its life. A six-year-old who saw a military funeral in 1846 received such a vivid impression that he talked about it until his death in 1935 at the age ninety-five.[49] Patterns of play also reflected this fascination and contained many military themes. In wartime, groups of children formed "ragged regiments" and played at drill with homemade uniforms.[50] In late 1790's Edinburgh, the continual military display of volunteer units was imitated by the city's children: "several regiments of little boys in the New Town who had flags, drums, swords, belts and military caps."[51] During the invasion scare of 1803, one toymaker stated that "every child was a soldier."[52]

Another image of war was manifested by toy soldiers, and by the mid 1780's, "soldiers and forts of every variety" were sold in London. Paper toy soldiers were available in the growing toy market after 1815, with colorful, interchangeable clothes.[53] Male dolls dressed as officers were popular for small girls.[54] Children— together with the rest of the family—were also charmed by the miniature "toy

theater," developed in 1813; the inventor's best selling play was the *Battle of Waterloo*, of which "nearly 10,000" copies were printed, and others imitated his success.[55]

The incorporation of military imagery into theatrical productions was a part of legitimate theater as well, and many plays incorporated contemporary military dress in the show. Productions of Shakespeare and other period plays featured characters in military roles wearing regimentals, as a blending of historical styles was typical of the time.[56] Sometimes theater managers enhanced the visual impact by hiring soldiers in uniform to participate as performers, but many units forbade their men to appear in uniform on stage,[57] probably because they feared that the military spectacle might be ridiculed, and thus rendered less imposing. However, it appears that these performances had useful propaganda effects in wartime, and guardsmen "were allowed by the authorities" to take part in a London production of the Battle of Inkermann in August, 1855.[58]

Musical stage productions were also influenced by military images, and not long after the first marching bands appeared in British regiments around 1720, musicals began to include military marches as part of the repertoire.[59] A variety of now archaic dramatic forms which were popular on stage in the first part of the nineteenth century—including pantomimes, extravaganzas, comic operas and burlettas—might feature martial music and drill.[60] The opera also utilized military themes; in 1815 a London opera featured "A wonderful piece of music ... descriptive of the sounds peculiar to a field of battle."[61]

More modest entrepreneurs also profited from the public taste for productions involving martial images. Street entertainers put on battle productions in magic lantern shows, shadow-boxes and other "exhibitions," probably in the attempt to capitalize on the success of the larger productions. These represented to many Britons the most significant—and often the only visual—account they received of particular battles.[62]

But the most spectacular manifestation of martial themes in the nineteenth century was equestrian drama, and elaborate military productions were staged with hundreds of horses and uniformed actors. Like the military spectacle they copied, these shows were in the words of one scholar: "naive, colourful, melodramatic and, above all, popular";[63] and were well-attended by the burgeoning numbers of the working classes.[64] The greatest of the hippodromes was Astley's Amphitheater, and after the successful production of *Harlequin Mamluke, or the British in Egypt*, battles became a stock theme.[65] The action was realistic, as one officer who attended wrote: "I was amazed at the accuracy with which the military evolutions were executed."[66] Recent battles were normally produced as soon as the news of them arrived; *The Battle of the Alma* (with 400 extras) was done only thirty-three days after the event,[67] and the continued popularity of battle pieces in peacetime illustrates the sustained public enthusiasm for military spectacle. For example, in 1850 three separate productions were being performed in greater London.[68]

The military origin of these equestrian shows is underscored by the life of founder Philip Astley, who had been a sergeant-major in the 15th Light Dragoons where he gained invaluable experience in training army horses.[69] But his influence is broader still, since he also founded the modern circus which uti-

lized numerous martial images, including military-style brass bands (sometimes mounted) with uniformed performers and ringmasters dressed like cavalry officers, a fashion set by the Astley's famous ringmaster Widdecombe, who also adopted a machine-like, superior military mien.[70] Other related entertainments also utilized military elements; a famous gymnast astonished his public "by throwing a somerset [sic] over a dozen grenadiers, standing at 'present arms,' with fixed bayonets."[71]

Non-performance elements in early nineteenth century British circuses and other places of entertainment could also include military images, such as paintings displayed in a series of canvases, known as "panoramas," which often featured dramatic events, including military subjects. The first of many nineteenth century battle panoramas was The Storming of Seringapatam by Robert Ker Porter. Displayed on 2,550 square feet of canvas for an admission of 1s., its London exhibition (17 April, 1800–10 January, 1801) netted Porter a "clear profit of 1,202.14s. 7 1/2d." (which makes over 24,000 admissions without including deductions for expenses) and it later toured in both Britain and America.[72] Panoramas brought art to the more isolated parts of the British Isles and were seriously reviewed by the critics.[73] Battle painting also had a significant effect upon the production of military prints at the cheaper end of the art market, which made up a significant share of nineteenth-century print production, attracting patrons who might have scorned battle painting.[74]

Military themes were also popular for nineteenth-century illustrated sheet music covers, especially from the 1840's when the piano's price was lowered, placing it within the reach of the middle classes. Nearly 500 pre-1914 illustrated sheet music covers are known to have incorporated military motifs.[75] Folk songs held a prominent place in the lives of common people and also featured military themes; in the long wars with France, military music was a familiar feature that readily became incorporated into the folk music of the day. A contemporary wrote that in 1803 "every town was a sort of garrison. . . . In one place [people heard the music of] . . . the tattoo of some youth learning to play the drum, at another place some march or national air being practiced on the fife."[76] One Scottish folk song collector has noted that "the twenty years that ended with Waterloo have left more traces on our popular minstrelsy than any other period of our history has done."[77] Another important source of music for the poor was the ballad-singer, and during the French wars balladeer Charles Dibdin was even paid to compose by the government to "keep up the national feeling against the French."[78]

Military themes also flourished in literature, and a large body of military memoirs was published after 1800, some of which went into three printings.[79] The popular novels of "Harry Lorrequer" (Charles Lever) on the Peninsular Wars were best-sellers from the 1830's, and were issued as cheap "railway novels" well beyond the Crimean war.[80] The cumulative effect of the various printed mediums was that "newspapers, journals, cheap book printing, ballad sheets and prints were vital in the process of manufacturing an heroic image."[81]

This military image and its elements were also adopted for civilian fashion, and during the French wars the influence of uniform on civilian dress greatly increased, building on George III's creation of the "Windsor uniform" in

1778.[82] Likewise, the nobility utilized military elements in clothing male servants.[83]

By the end of the eighteenth century the uniform had come to replace the *habit habille*, the European elite's formal wear in this period, but some fashionable trends worked against this influence, most notably those promoted by George "Beau" Brummel.[84] His values were quite different from military uniform and included restraint, naturalness and simplicity, using subdued colors such as dark blue, buff, brown, and white; he maintained that a gentleman should never dress so as to attract attention in the street.[85] Nothing could have been more contrary to this notion than the effect of military uniform, yet both shared a tight fit.[86] This was a factor in the subsequent merging of the two styles, which became the era's extravagant "dandy" image, a significant variant of male high fashion, sometimes called the "Butterfly dandy," which lasted from the Regency until well into the 1830's.[87] A satirical poem refers to

> My pigeon breasts and padded sleeves,
> Made my whole front en militaire ...
> By their aid youth receives
> The approbation of the Fair.[88]

But this image did not sufficiently capture the uniform's appeal for some young civilians of modest means who wished to cut a dashing figure, and they bought secondhand officer's uniforms to wear for strutting around in public. In Scotland, Highland regimental dress was said in 1819 to be "now universally looked upon as the holy-day uniform of all the writers' clerks in Edinburgh," and the masquerade continued for years.[89]

After the dandy image abated in popularity (although it never completely disappeared) male fashion became less ornate, reflecting the growing image of middle-class respectability. Many military motifs have been adapted for civilian dress, however, including lapels, cuffs, straps, pocket flaps, extra buttons, buckles, ties, etc.[90] The overall military impact upon civilian dress has been most significant, and gentlemen's fashions in Britain (and Europe as a whole) have fundamentally been those of an officer or a huntsman.[91]

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, women's clothing also adopted military motifs; officer's wives wore female versions of their husband's uniforms in the later eighteenth century, and this custom was a precursor of styles inspired by uniforms in the French wars.[92] Fashionable women wore clothes inspired by the popular rifle regiments' uniforms, with green velvet rifle dresses and hats, and by hussar uniforms and headgear, of which the pelisse (originally a hussar jacket) is a now much-altered descendant.[93] This trend continued into the Regency, and in Scotland the pride taken in the Highland regiments' part at Waterloo resulted in the adoption by noblewomen of Highland jackets and plumed bonnets.[94] The Crimean war later inspired a new color, "Alma Brown" (from the battle) and leather belts, thick military heels and jackets modeled on those worn by dragoons also became fashionable in 1856, while the cardigan sweater and raglan sleeve made more enduring contributions to ladies' fashions.[95]

Military dress also influenced children's clothes in wartime, and like their mothers, girls dressed in fashionable hussar jackets, epaulets and feathered

shakos.[96] Boys were dressed as soldiers or highlanders from the end of the eighteenth century, and by the time of Waterloo military dress for children had become "quite a vogue."[97] A Berkshire lad in the 1820's seems to have imbibed some of the martial mentality associated with his hussar cap and jacket, and was described as "the youngest piece of gravity and dignity I ever encountered. . . . He stalks about . . . like a piece of machinery. . . . "[98]

Military imagery thus proved very attractive to the British public, but the show was also useful to the state. When war broke out it was intrinsic to the process of mobilizing both the army and public support, and Britons tended to be much more positive and enthusiastic about the forces than in peacetime, especially if they believed that the country was threatened. But while anti-military feelings were temporarily eclipsed, they persisted under the surface, and this latent hostility could re-emerge with greater vigor after the war ended—especially in 1815 when an enormous war debt had accumulated and large numbers of unemployed soldiers and sailors returned to seek work in a weak economy.

Thus, the attractiveness of the peacetime military spectacle was an important concern of military leaders, and some of their opponents recognized the imagery's almost mesmerizing effect. Chartist leader William Lovett denounced: "war, glory, splendor, fame, spectacles, songs and every other brutalizing and degrading means the demon of evil could suggest."[99] Journalist Douglas Jerrold believed that Britain's rulers used the show as a means to counteract the army's negative image.

> When nations . . . cut each others throats . . . we must have red coats and muskets and sabres; but seeing that the duty of their bearers squares neither with our innate good sense, nor our notions of what ought to be—we are fain to gild the matter over—to try to conceal, from ourselves, the butchering nature of the business we are sometimes forced to undertake, and so spring up military spectacle—military finery—military music. . . . Clothe war therefore in gayer colours than peace . . . let the steel which cuts glitter like valued gems; the evolutions which destroy, be graceful as the motions of dancing girls![100]

Indeed, commanders paid careful attention to spectacle; the *York Herald* recorded Col. Vandeleur's successful promotion of the 10th Hussars on their departure from the city: "an immense mass of people assembled at the railway station on the morning of [the 10th's] departure and relieved their friendly feeling to the regiment by loud and repeated cheers. . . . "[101]

This enthusiasm could also have political overtones; during the first Great Reform Bill crisis an officer believed that

> The radical and leveling press . . . has for years directed it fiercest attacks against the British army, but has not yet been able to destroy, or even to weaken its popularity: the failure may seem strange to some but . . . there is yet an honest manliness of feeling about the people of Britain that makes them delight even in the contemplation of deeds of hardihood and danger; and makes them proud of the unrivaled achievements of their sons, brothers and countrymen, as well as of the country that produced, and of the institutions that fostered, such men, because it enables the most peaceful citizens to say with inward satisfaction—Even such would have been my conduct had chance placed me in the ranks of war, instead of casting my lot in a happier and more peaceful sphere![102]

The spectacle thus helped to override the traditional dislike most Britons felt toward the military, and the authorities encouraged spectators to the extent that the army's function as entertainment might even interfere with training for war. In 1853 at the experimental Chobham Camp where much-needed, large scale maneuvers were held, "the good effect" was said to be pervading the whole population, and the public was allowed "the most liberal freedom of the camp, to make it as popular as the [Great] Exhibition," even though this policy interfered with the maneuvers. Commanders believed that the long-term benefits would overcome these short-term disadvantages, and by encouraging civilians to see the training it was hoped to induce members of Parliament to vote for more military spending.[103] Mr. Punch—whose wit had targeted the army for years— was certainly won over, publishing a poem at the end of the summer entitled: "Farewell to the Camp," concluding with the lines: "And we'll mark the M.P. for a short-sighted scamp/ Who grudges one mil for the Chobhamite Camp."[104]

But the spectacle had a deeper impact on British society which transcended both the army's public image-building and funding problems—and these influences continued long after the Crimean war. This effect was intrinsic to the nature of the show's images, and embodied a discrete set of values which were proclaimed to spectators through the spectacle's visual (and auditory) images.

Discipline and order, hierarchy, conformity, efficiency and *esprit de corps* were all inherent to the spectacle, displayed whenever soldiers appeared in public and manifested by the sight of a lone sentry or at a grand review with thousands of performers. The messages were straightforward and easy to understand; the spotless, colorful and attractive uniform visually isolated soldiers from civilians (reenforced by the soldiers' feelings of superiority toward them) and set the army apart as a separate, distinctive group, highlighting the sense of solidarity amongst the men. The dress bore marks of *esprit de corps*, such as the regimental facing color and badges; these were tokens of a regiment's extraordinary achievements and glorious status, which was further symbolized by the privilege of bearing arms.

Hierarchy, conformity and solidarity were also visually expressed since the men of a unit were all dressed in the same colors on a single pattern, with a variety of elements differentiating the ranks to denote hierarchy. The richness and quantity of the decorative elements, and the different grades of the cloth, headgear, arms and equipment all signified the various levels of authority and prestige within the unit. Generally, the more richly clothed the man, the greater was his status and power, although some important exceptions existed to the formal rules of the show.[105]

Discipline was strengthened by these hierarchical elements but aided further by the attention which was paid to the smallest details of the kit, with the relentless goal of an idealized, pristine order and cleanliness in dress—which in turn rendered the show even more impressive. Control was enhanced by the physical effects of the clothing; the uniform was very tight and kept the soldier's body rigidly encased, confining movement and forcing the body into the correct military posture, all under the eye of a non-commissioned officer who could instantly detect any deviation. Posture was rigid and the bodily motions stiff, and this psychological influence was especially effective since the men were

themselves the means of control, being forced to participate in regulating their own bodies.[106]

The image's effect suggested a machine, and the military was called a "machine" and the men "automatons" by both soldiers and civilians—terms signifying an absolute control. The spatial relationship of the parade-ground also denoted this, since the men were carefully arranged in a regular order with all movements uniformly coordinated—again like a machine.

But this machine was unlike any other; while most impressive as a spectacle it also possessed the fascination of being both powerful and dangerous, and its purpose was to inflict the ultimate power of destruction by threatening or destroying human life and property with the most dangerous weapons available. Yet this was no cold, lifeless engine of destruction; its components were human— Britannia's sons, a bulwark of both British rights and independence, and of the majesty, dignity and glory of the British monarchy and state.

The charismatic appeal of the military machine's brilliant panoply was thus enhanced by its human components, who were not performers or actors, but real soldiers—whose profession was associated in the public mind with glory, self-sacrifice and the defence of the realm. Yet the spectacle's role in displaying its values was further enhanced since it was presented in a carefully controlled context, with the troops being normally isolated from the public. The effect was that the martial values were presented in an idealized manner—or as advertisement.[107]

This fascination was most compelling in an age which was increasingly dominated by machines and the interests of their masters. As a visual image, it echoed and reenforced the new and essential values and needs of the industrial revolution—discipline, conformity, uniformity and efficiency—and these ingredients in turn rendered the show more tolerable to those Britons who disapproved of the traditional recreations.[108]

But the imagery's portrayal of a vision of order, solidarity of purpose and enthusiasm for duty was most attractive to those in positions of authority.[109] From their perspective, these values suggested an ideal for how operations ought to run, especially because of the utter necessity of the new—but highly unpopular— pattern of work discipline, which the large scale of factories rendered a formidable task.[110]

Even from the early days of industrialization this paradigm possessed an appeal for owners, especially in reference to labor discipline. The army was one of the few examples of a large-scale, complex and far-flung organization. Pioneer industrialists were fascinated by military images and the army thus served as a model for operations in the new factories. Josiah Wedgwood thought of himself as a sort of general, commanding his worker troops. He employed military metaphors in instructions to subordinates, and desired "to make such *machines* of the *Men* as cannot err," and thought "it is *glorious* to conquer so great an Empire [making ordinary men into artists] . . . with raw, undisciplined recruits." He also awarded clothing to workers, both as a reward and a badge of good behavior.[111]

Another early industrialist caught up with the military spectacle was Robert Owen; although famous for his "benevolent approach" to management, he demanded military-style discipline from subordinates, and his factories were com-

pared to barracks with himself as Commander-in-chief. Workers marched be-
tween jobs "in strict military order" at the Queenwood, Hampshire community,
and at New Lanark workers' children were organized into "regular companies and
divisions" and drilled every day in military formations with fife and drum bands,
wearing a Roman-style uniform of his design.[112] He wrote that the "execution of
combined movements" was "calculated to produce regularity and order," appeal-
ing to children *"through their amusements."* [113] Owen also used military "emblems"
to teach them grammar, with each part of speech personified by military rank,
such as General Noun "in his cocked hat, sword and double epaulettes," Colonel
Verb, Corporal Adverb, and so on.[114] Martial titles appealed to other men in
positions of authority too, being adopted by early British railway executives and
managers of large ports.[115]

   While the theme of order was one of the military paradigm's major attractions
for the captains of industry, ironically, the new techniques of production and
the rapid urban growth their operations stimulated had done much to generate
chaotic and disturbing problems in British society. These consisted of a vast
array of serious urban, political, domestic, spiritual and other social patholo-
gies, all of which have been described in detail by a number of contemporaries
and historians.[116] Many of these were not then—or subsequently—satisfactorily
resolved.

   In this often confusing and disturbing environment, Britons felt that they
had lost many of the certainties of their traditional life. Carlyle wrote that: "The
intellectual lightships had broken from their moorings ... [leaving] the lights all
drifting, the compasses all awry, and [there was] nothing left to steer by except the
stars."[117] Order and discipline were increasingly perceived as being the guiding
lights which society needed to function, and for many Britons the most effective
means for regulating their lives was the gospel of self-help, a doctrine which also
utilized the military paradigm.[118]

   Samuel Smiles, that extremely influential, "do-it-yourself" Victorian educator,
perceived military virtues as a major source of inspiration for the correct notion
of one's obligations in life, noting "we often connect the idea of duty with a
soldier's trust." He included almost 70 pages of military and naval heroes as
examples in *Duty, With Illustrations of Courage, Patience, and Endurance*, with
numerous examples in his other books, such as *Character* and *Self-Help*.[119] The
power of Smiles's enthusiasm is heard in his prose:

> These soldiers—who are ready to march steadily against bristling bayonets ...
> were once tailors, shoemakers, mechanics, weavers and ploughmen; with mouths
> gaping, shoulders stooping, feet straggling, arms and hands like great fins hanging
> by their sides; but now their gait is firm and martial, their figures are erect and they
> march along to the sound of music, with a tread that makes the earth to shake.[120]

   For him the truest duty was mechanical, in which the subject ideally was
totally devoid of all thought of his or her own interests. "Duty in its purest form
is so constraining that one never thinks, in performing it, of one's self at all ...
it has to be done without any thought of self-sacrifice.... The truest source of
enjoyment is found in the paths of duty alone ... "[121] Thus, underlings were not
to allow themselves the luxury of claiming any credit for their work, while the act
of performing labor was to be so innately satisfying that it constituted a worker's

greatest source of pleasure. In such a view, any dispute over workplace conditions or wages (soldiers earned very low wages) would seem to be nothing less than disloyalty towards the sanctity of labor itself, as well as treason against the quest for victory in the momentous economic battles of the industrial regiment—or in any workplace.[122]

But this ideal provided a model for Britons in a variety of other contexts too, and might apply equally to any sort of duty, such as paying taxes, church-going, philanthropy for the needy, family obligations, or the like, and since progress for resolving social problems was slow at best and individuals had little control over them (however optimistic the spirit of the age) many believed that in using this technique they could exert some control in the midst of confusing and disturbing surroundings.

The military virtues were also stressed in organizations in which participation was not only a duty, but also a pleasure. Whatever threat was kept at bay after 1859 by the amateur soldiers of the Volunteer Movement, it is a major example of the effects of military discipline in shaping members' personal lives. This service was believed to have exerted important effects upon the participants' attitudes and behavior in civilian life, and "the world of the factory was reproduced on the parade ground,"[123] inspiring part-time soldiers "with habits of order, silence, obedience, cleanliness, punctuality and courtesy."[124] The result was thought to have had the desired effect, and "the toils of the countinghouse, the warehouse and the shop would be undertaken in a new spirit of dutiful delight. . . . "[125] But there were further effects, and the *Times* expressed the view that

> the man who enters a Volunteer Regiment cannot, even if he would, escape the influence of *esprit de corps*. He is enlisted at once on the side of "order"; he may have been inclined to disorder, or even to sedition, but when he becomes a soldier, a citizen soldier, he feels that he has ranged himself on the opposite side to all disturbers of society. . . . [126]

The Movement's military values were also thought to be a defense against the "chaos and irreligion" of the great cities, as well as a model of organization designed to protect the young from moral contamination. These values included "a strong belief in the abstract value of regular military drill and military organization," and were a direct inspiration for the creation of the Boys' Brigades of the 1880's, in which the military model was applied in the attempt to protect the young from the moral contamination of city life. Drill was also thought to have beneficial economic effects, and was adopted by British schools in the 1870's.[127] A better-known example of the martial model as a weapon in the war against moral decay was William Booth's Salvation Army; he utilized most of the panoply of the spectacle including uniforms, a system of ranks, flags, marching bands, etc., and organized parades which drew as many as 50,000 marchers.[128] An increase of the wearing of uniforms by civilians was also typical of the latter nineteenth century, when much of the traditional occupational clothing—signifying one's job and status—was transformed into uniforms, and subtly changed into an image of duty.[129]

A successor to the Boy's Brigade, the Boy Scouts also utilized the military model and uniform, and in the group's creation the notion of never-ending war was implicit in the mind of the founder, General Robert Baden-Powell. In

addition to the importance he put on flags and uniforms, his book, *Scouting for Boys* (1908) was founded upon a militaristic view of life which reflects the new rightist concepts then emerging:

> War ... constitutes the central metaphoric conception of the vision of human life implicit in the book ... and a set of assumptions that place struggle and violence of all kinds squarely at the heart of things.

Smiles's ideas about dedication to work also appear, but in the context of the battlefield: "Be PREPARED to die for your country ... not caring whether you are going to be killed or not."[130]

But behind these messages lay another, most captivating image, with a broader appeal than encouragements to scorn death, and even transcending the attraction of the army's latent but mighty power. While watching the review, Mr. Pickwick felt that "nothing could have ... harmonized so well with the particular feeling of each of his companions as this sight," and for Mr. Snodgrass its spell touched deep-seated emotions, since "in ... [his] bosom a blaze of poetry was rapidly bursting forth."[131]

For poet and writer Rudyard Kipling, this harmonious vision was so stimulating that it showed an inspiration for forging unity out of the sharp discords of early twentieth century British society. The short story "The Army of a Dream" (1904) presented the notion that an idealized, national unity could be created by an England which accepted military service for all young men (only those who had served could vote). In the story, military drill was taught in school at an early stage, and as Kipling's biographer points out "shows army organization deliberately used to alter the social structure by encouragement of the efficient and the officer type." But he also points out that the most effective part of this social manipulation utilized military spectacle, since

> nothing has done more ... to reconcile the ordinary city-dwellers to the new national life than the privilege of free military funerals for all and the free spectacle of seeing so many corteges pass in the streets.

Thus in this "ideal state ... all classes pull together," and the powerful also have lost their exalted status.[132]

This vision of harmony in which society was free of discord, everyone had his own place, and the whole moved and functioned with efficiency, precision and order, thus constituting a living denial of conflict, doubt and defeat.[133] This was a most potent attraction in an age beset by many bitter and destructive conflicts: between labor and management, the poor and the rich, country and city, and the old and the new—besides being especially helpful in mobilizing support at the start of a war.

This harmonious vision highlights the broad scope of the imagery's appeal, and it would be a mistake to assume that only those who supported the status quo admired and utilized the vision and its values. Army veteran Robert Blatchford, editor of the socialist periodical *Clarion*, wrote: "The drilling of masses of men together makes a community of thought and feeling; makes a crowd into a regiment, makes a rabble into a nation."[134] But Blatchford's view also suggests a primary advantage of the paradigm: it illustrates an effective means of spiritually

unifying a group of people for the purpose of wielding power. This element is intrinsic to the imagery and its values, and it was adopted by associations who fought in the streets against the laws and policies of the state.[135] These included labor organizations and Chartists, Irish, Welsh, Scottish and English rebels, and even gangs of thieves.[136] Such groups utilized various elements of the imagery to promote discipline and morale, including military music, marching, drill, a system of ranks, flags, and uniforms, while even British military dress was sometimes worn.[137]

These advantages were also utilized in other contexts where organization was essential, and appeared in the colonies. Overseas, the military paradigm often applied, being utilized by administrators (often ex-soldiers) and missionaries, but it was even adopted by some of the victims of imperialism—whose social, spiritual and political institutions were severely damaged or destroyed by colonialism. A system of uniforms and ranks were adopted by a Black church in Africa, reportedly "without any instruction or intervention from any white man."[138]

With the foes and targets of military coercion openly embracing military imagery and values, we have come full circle. So successful was the spectacle in transcending the military's negative reputation—together with its deadly work— that even those who were enthralled by the show and adopted its elements for their own uses might still abhor violence, or like Smiles be opposed to military spending, which he considered wasteful.[139]

But the spectacle exerted even greater effects, and the dazzling show actually deluded some who viewed it, convincing fervent spectators that the vision embodied traits quite different from what was actually seen. Dickens noted this power to instill self-delusion in enthusiastic spectators, as is shown by Mr. Snodgrass's reaction to the review, where he convinced himself the soldiers' faces were

> beaming—not with warlike ferocity, but with civilized gentleness: their eyes flashing—not with the rude fire of rapine or revenge, but with the soft light of humanity and intelligence.

While Mr. Pickwick "entered into the spirit of this eulogium" he could not quite agree, since

> the soft light of intelligence burned rather feebly in the eyes of the warriors, inasmuch as the command "eyes front" had been given; and all the spectator saw before him was several pairs of optics staring straight forward, wholly divested of any expression whatsoever.[140]

Smiles also had a comparable delusion when he wrote that the discipline of army service would render the British people more "sober"—a dubious claim in light of the soldiers' reputation. Similarly, he also mistook the mechanistic, psychological imprinting of drill for "education": "Wonderful is the magic of Drill! Drill means ... education," yet in the army itself education was considered suspect and even dangerous.[141]

More remarkable still is the fact that for socialist Robert Blatchford, this most innately dehumanizing aspect of the military image was transformed into something very different from its actual nature: "The drilling of masses of men to-

gether ... develops in men a new faculty of humanism."[142] That this technique
of domination was equated with "humanism" highlights the image's facility for
delusion, obscuring the actual substance which lay behind the carefully-regulated
facade; it also obscured and obliterated many realities about the army itself.[143]
This was a magic of great and subtle power.[144]

For the nineteenth-century spectator the military spectacle could advertise
a paradigm for social and institutional organization and discipline. The back-
ground of this development, however, was the long-term evolution of an ex-
panding, increasingly centralized society. In pre-industrial British societies, the
traditional patterns of family and community life provided greater intrinsic in-
centives amongst members for voluntary cooperation. But as the ubiquitous
functions of these older groups were gradually reduced and superseded by cen-
tralization, and the population also increased, it became essential to ensure that
the human components of the new, proliferating institutions would be induced—
or compelled—to work effectively towards organizational goals, performing their
tasks as those in authority required.

The subjects of these institutions also had to be induced to voluntarily adopt
new patterns of discipline, in place of the decreasing effectiveness of the older
constraints of family and community. For those whose lives were increasingly
intertwined in the constraints of institutions, and for many who desired a means
for exerting self-control, some model was necessary, and it was essential that it
be inspirational. For these problems, the army served as a significant paradigm
of organization and control which to a great extent was communicated through
the military spectacle.[145]

Consequently, understanding the creation, manipulation and consequences
of military (and related forms of mechanistic imagery) is a question of great
importance, and with the colonial expansion of Western economic and political
systems and institutions around the world over the past few centuries, it becomes
relevant for virtually every country's modern history.[146] At the same time, the
spectacle form of the late 18th and 19th centuries in Britain presented certain
characteristics peculiar to the age. Most obviously, the gaudy uniforms that so
delighted crowds would give way in the 20th century to a toned down version
of military spectacle, with duller uniforms and a new emphasis on technological
display. Military spectacle in this new age would continue to have wide impact,
primarily through television and film, but with a meaning that is essentially
unchanged.

Department of History
Minot, North Dakota 58701

ENDNOTES

1.   No comprehensive study of warfare and imagery has appeared; for a brief introduction
see: Christian Feest, The Art of War (London, 1980). I would like to thank Walter
Arnstein, Geoffrey Symcox, Sheperd Paine and Tamara Hunt for their comments on
earlier drafts of this paper.

2.   "The discipline of well-trained armies ... [has had] lasting effects upon the political and social order." Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. and trans. (New York, 1946), p. 257; and see: Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (Oxford, 1985), p. 152.

3.   "There ... is certainly not one [British family] who had not, at some point or other during the contest, a kinsman serving in the British ranks." Clive Emsley, *British Society and the French Wars, 1793–1815* (Totowa, N.J., 1979), p. 169.

4.   During the 1846 invasion scare the Master-General of Ordnance reported that after soldiers were found for fortresses and posts, only 5,000–10,000 men were available for a field army. Correlli Barnett, *Britain and Her Army 1509–1970, A Military, Political and Social Survey* (Bungay, Suffolk, 1974), p. 279.

5.   For frequent complaints about the cost of the army, see Edward Spiers, *The Army and Society, 1815–1914* (London, 1980), p. 74–6, and Elie Halevy, *The Liberal Awakening: 1815–1830* (New York, 1961), pp. 6–7. But many ignored the army entirely, and one colonel was led to complain that "the English as a nation are so inconceivably ignorant of ... everything connected with the army.... " Jonathan Leach, *Rambles along the Banks of the Styx* (London, 1847), p. 23.

6.   For public attitudes about the army, see: Spiers, *Army and Society*, pp. 72–3, and J. W. Fortescue, *A History of the British Army*, 13 vols. (London, 1923), 11:46–7. For the Crimean war: Alan Palmer, *The Banner of Battle: The Story of the Crimean War* (London, 1987), pp. 43, 47 and 71. For the constitutional issue: Elie Halevy, *A History of the English People in 1815* (London, 1987), pp. 60–3. For army reform: Hew Strachan, *Wellington's Legacy: The Reform of the British Army, 1830–54* (Manchester, 1984). This article is largely based upon my PhD dissertation "Spectacle and Power: Military Imagery and the British Army, 1803–56" (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1990), pp. 57–88.

7.   Military spectacle is absent from Robert W. Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700–1850* (Cambridge, 1973). James Walvin, *Leisure and Society, 1830–1950* (New York, 1978), Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational recreation and the contest for control, 1830–1885* (London, 1978) and Hugh Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution c. 1780–1880* (New York, 1980) make only brief references to military shows.

8.   Most of the army was stationed abroad throughout the century. The discipline which was "very ill indeed" is discussed in Halevy, *History of the English People*, pp. 73–7.

9.   Common soldiers, "a wildish lot," wore side-arms before 1838 with the uniform, either a sword or bayonet (despite many attempts since the late seventeenth century to ban them) and "stabbing was not uncommon." Col. Anstruther Thomson, *Eighty Years' Reminiscences* (London, 1904), pp. 40–1. Officers often wore mufti (civilian dress) on the street but the Other Ranks were not allowed to possess it due to desertions. All the negative stereotypes can be found in the caricatures of the period. Prior to 1832, see: M. Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vols. VII–XI (London, 1943–56). For after 1841, see *Punch*.

10.   The Duke of Wellington wrote "the British army ... [is] disliked by [British] inhabitants, particularly by the higher orders, some of whom never allow one of their family to serve in it." *Memorandum on the ... Discipline of the Army*, April 22, 1829 in the Duke of Wellington, *Despatches, Correspondence and Memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington, K. C.*, 8 vols. (Millwood, N.Y., 1973), 8:344.

11. There were very high casualty rates; none but the desperate or romantic fools would take the shilling and thus be condemned to the extremely harsh and dangerous conditions of military life. One Scottish recruit's enlistment caused his mother to exclaim: "Poor infatuated boy!.... Now you are lost to us and to yourself." Joseph Donaldson, *Recollections of an Eventful Life, Chiefly Passed in the Army* (Glasgow, 1824). pp. 66–7.

12. A sufficient notion of the styles can be found in the large literature of uniform books. A few of the best are: Philip J. Haythornthwaite, *British Infantry of the Napoleonic Wars* (London, 1987); Michael Barthorp, *British Cavalry Uniforms Since 1660* (Poole, Dorset, 1984) and *British Infantry Uniforms Since 1660* (Poole, Dorset, 1982); and D. S. V. and B. K. Fosten, *The Thin Red Line: Uniforms of the British Army between 1751 and 1914* (London, 1989). For recreations, see: Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations*, chapters 6 and 7.

13. See Myerly, "Spectacle and Power," chapters 4, 5 & 7.

14. Dr. Robert Jackson, *A View of the Formation, Discipline and Economy of Armies*, 3d rev. ed. (London, 1845), p. 2.

15. For the perfectionist standards and health hazards of military dress, see Myerly "Spectacle and Power," Chapter 2.

16. In 1841 at Dorchester the march of cavalry to church resulted in a fire; when a man frying bacon heard a shout that soldiers were going by he upset the pan and started a grease fire that destroyed a dozen houses. Thomson, *Reminiscences*, p. 77.

17. Robert Blatchford, *My Life in the Army* (London, n.d.), p. 140.

18. In 1854 a fashionable young lady remained at a hotel longer than she had intended because a captain with smallpox was staying there—and she hoped he would die so that she could see his funeral. She was "much disappointed" when he recovered. James Howard Harris, Earl of Malmsbury, *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister: an Autobiography*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (London, 1884), 1:444–5.

19. A review held at Hounslow Heath in the summer of 1817, for example, lasted three and one-half hours. *Times*, 26 July, 1817.

20. Jackson, *A View*, p. 185.

21. Thomas W. Laqueur, "The Ideology and Symbolism of Legitimation in England, 1792–1799," in *The Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, Proceedings*, ed. Owen Connelly (Athens, GA, 1979), p. 276. Often the only regular infantry units (except the guards) involved in London's wartime reviews were of nonprofessional corps, for example, the grand review held on 10 June, 1811. The Royal Horse Artillery, regular cavalry and volunteer infantry participated, but no unit of the regular infantry attended. *Times*, 11 June, 1811.

22. Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of His Time*, ed. Karl F. C. Miller (London, 1974), pp. 180–1.

23. Philip Ziegler, *Addington: A Life of Henry, First Viscount Sidmouth* (London, 1965), p. 201. The displays of the volunteers and other non-professional corps were modeled on the army, but these were less popular than the regulars.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 200.

25. Louis Simond, *An American in Regency England*, ed. Christopher Hibbert (London, 1968), p. 146.

26. *Times*, 11 June, 1811.

27. For the 1811 review, "General Orders" were published for the public. Simond, *An American*, p. 146. The "Official Programme for the Triumphal Entry of the Guards into London, Wednesday, July 9th, 1856" is preserved at the Scottish United Services Museum at Edinburgh Castle, file F.G. 856.1.

28. John Patterson, *Camp and Quarters: Scenes and Impressions of Military Life*, 2 vols. (London, 1840), 1:101.

29. *Times*, 26 July, 1817.

30. David Cannadine's essay, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition' c. 1820–1977," in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 101–64, has overlooked the role of the grand military review as part of the public ceremonial of the British crown. The reign of William IV is described in terms which leave the impression that he avoided all such public events (p. 118). The king attended a series of grand reviews after his accession in the summer of 1830 and was the centerpiece of the show, displaying a great interest in the proceedings: "His Majesty walked up and down the ranks, paying the most minute attention to the military and clean appearance of the men." *Times* 23 July, 1830. A private in the Royal Horse Guards (Blue) wrote: "our late lamented Sovereign ... during the latter years of his life was particularly partial to military shows." Charles Cozens, *Adventures of a Guardsman* (London, 1848), p. 32. This contradicts Cannadine's statement that William "loathed ceremonial and ostentation" (p. 118). Clearly, a significant part of the story has been omitted in this essay.

31. *Times*, 23 July, 1830.

32. *Times*, 27 July, 1830. If the entire regiment was at hand, this made a total of nearly 1,000 men used for crowd control.

33. *John Bull*, 1 August, 1830.

34. "The Editor's Portfolio," *United Service Journal* no. 2 (1830): 239.

35. "Boat Lancers," *Naval and Military Magazine* 4 (September, 1828): li.

36. Item, *United Service Journal* no. 2 (1831): 266.

37. Robert Blake, *Disraeli* (New York, 1967), p. 151.

38. Charles Dickens, *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club* (London, 1849); reprint ed., New York, n.d.), p. 48.

39. Richard Rolt, *On Moral Command* (London, 1842), p. 96. For a short essay on military music, see Donald Van Ess, "Band Music," in *The Athlone History of Music in Britain*, vol. 5: *The Romantic Age: 1800–1914*, ed. Nicholas Temperley (London, 1981), pp. 135–37.

40. Patterson, *Camp and Quarters*, 1:101–102.

41. Walvin, *Leisure and Society*, p. 103.

42. Many other elements of nineteenth century European military imagery originated in—or were transmitted through—the Islamic states and the borderlands between Christian Europe and the Middle East, including hussar and lancer dress, the grenadier cap, the shako and the mamluk sword. The military band constitutes a significant cultural manifestation of "orientalism," as is analyzed in Edward Said's *Orientalism* (New York, 1979), but is not mentioned in that book.

43. For example, see George Calladine, *The Diary of Colour-Sargeant George Calladine, 19th Foot, 1793–1837*, ed. M. L. Ferrar (London, 1922), p. 186.

44. Its popularity was said to be equal to that of the famous actor, Charles Kean, who was performing Shakespeare at the nearby Theatre Royale. Donald Thomas, *Cardigan* (New York, 1974), p. 95.

45. The editor wrote: "A 'Civilian' has no more 'right' to their music than the Coldstream have to insist on *his* playing the fiddle to *them*." "Regimental Music at the Tower," *United Service Journal* no. 2 (1829): 240.

46. This incident is enshrined in a contemporary caricature. "The Wimbledon Hoax! or Waterloo Review!!! !!! June 18th, 1816." Published by J. Johnston, George Cruikshank, artist. Huntington Library print, Pr. Box 216/60.

47. "The Troops and the Weather," *Punch* 9 (1845): 84.

48. Excerpt from the *York Herald*, April, 1846, as quoted in Col. John Vandeleur, *Letters of Colonel John Vandeleur, 1810–1946* (London, 1846), p. 185. Bands were paid for by the regimental officers, whose permission was needed for performing when not on duty.

49. The soldier had died after a flogging. Harry Hopkins, *The Strange Death of Private White, A Victorian Scandal that made History* (London, 1977), p. 100.

50. Artist George Cruikshank described this, see: Blanchard Jerrold, *Life of Cruikshank*, 2 vols. (New York, 1882), 1:50–51; "Twelve Years' Military Adventure," *United Service Journal* no. 1 (1892), p. 96.

51. Robert Butler, *Narrative of the Life and Times of Serjeant Butler* (1854), p. 24.

52. Henry Mayhew, *The Unknown Mayhew*, ed. Eileen Yeo and E. P. Thompson (New York, 1971), p. 293.

53. J. H. Plumb, "The New World of Children," in Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1982), p. 310.

54. The expensive dolls were elaborate wax or earthenware models, some with jointed bodies and wardrobes. "Dolly Dearest," exhibition of Victorian dolls, City of London Museum, 1986; Plumb, "The New World of Children," p. 310.

55. The theaters were made of wood, costing from a few shillings to a pound; pamphlets of dialogues together with punch-out paper "actors" were purchased separately. Texts were always "strictly subservient to the spectacle," with instructions on making fires, explosions and other special effects. See: *Pollock's Characters & Scenes in the Battle of Waterloo*, with an introduction by Eric Underwood (London, 1842; reprint ed., London, 1970), p. iv (this text cost 4d). Henry Mayhew interviewed the inventor: Mayhew, "The Toy-Makers," in *Unknown Mayhew*, pp. 286–7.

56. George Rowell, *The Victorian Theater, 1792–1914: A Survey*, 2d ed. (Cambridge,

1978), p. 15. The famous actor David Garrick played Othello wearing "English Regimentals."

57. Soldiers performed on stage at Dublin. *Roscius* Feb. 1, 1825; cited in A. H. Saxon, *The Life and Art of Andrew Ducrow & the Romantic Age of the English Circus* (Hamden, Conn., 1978), p. 127; "No soldier is to appear on the stage of the theater in any part of his regimentals except when on duty." "Memorandum of Instructions to the Officers of the Scots Fusilier Guards," (1830), p. 52.

58. *Punch* 29 (1855), p. 76.

59. Composer Georg Frederick Handel wrote a march in 1745 for a London regiment of volunteers. Henry George Farmer, "The Martial Music of the Georges," *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 42 (1963): 203, 204.

60. Nicol Smith, "The British Grenadiers," *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 6 (1927): 23.

61. Harry Austin, *Guards Hussars and Infantry*, 3 vols., (London, 1838), 3:290.

62. One veteran considered this influence important enough to complain that the panoramic exhibitions of Waterloo shown in Edinburgh a few months after the battle presented a distorted view of the conflict. Only Scots soldiers were portrayed as having been significant in the victory, the Scots Greys (the 2d Royal North British Dragoons) and the Highlanders having been depicted as giants in the foreground, and "John Bull and Pat [the Irish] were little better than idle spectators on the left of the British position," depicted as "pigmies" in the background. Lt. Col. Jonathan Leach, *Rough Sketches of the Life of an Old Soldier* (London, 1831), p. 399.

63. Anthony D. Hippisley Coxe, "Equestrian Drama and the Circus," in: David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt, eds., *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 109.

64. Rowell, *Victorian Theater*, p. 9.

65. Ninety horses performed during one scene in 1831. A. H. Saxon, *Enter Foot and Horse* (New Haven, 1968), p. 141.

66. Benson Earle Hill, *Playing About; or, Theatrical Anecdotes and Adventures, with Scenes of a General Nature from the Life*, 2 vols. (London, 1849), 1:234.

67. Coxe, "Equestrian Drama," p. 112.

68. Chelsea's Cremorne gardens did *The Storming of Mooltan*, the Surrey Zoological Gardens put on *The Siege of Badajos*, and Astley's staged the "New Grand Equestrian Military Spectacle" entitled *Mooltan and Goojerat, or the Conquest of the Sikhs*, "The Fortunes of War," *Punch* 17 (1850), p. 11.

69. John Malcolm Bullock, "Soldiering and Circuses," *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 8 (1929): 184–9.

70. Saxon, *Ducrow*, p. 131–2.

71. This was seen by General Thomas Picton who could not bear to watch: "A battle is nothing to that." Heaton Bowstead Robinson, *Memoirs of Lieutenant-General Sir Thomas Picton, G.C.B.&c. including His Correspondence*, 2d rev. ed., 2 vols. (London, 1836), 1:406.

72. The panorama was shown at: Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, Belfast, Liverpool, Chester, Sheffield, Bury St. Edmunds, Tavistock and Plymouth, but was probably displayed at other places too. Ralph Hyde, *Panoramania!: The Art and Entertainment of the 'All Embracing' View* (London, 1988), p. 65; Plumb, "The New World of Children," p. 308.

73. For example, the panorama "The Siege of Brussels" was reviewed in the "Fine Arts" section of *The Anthenaeum*, March 16, 1833, p. 171.

74. After 1815, patrons considered martial themes in painting to be militaristic, but the topic gradually became more popular. As a less exalted medium, the print was more acceptable for martial themes. Joan Winifred Martin Hirshberger, *Images of the Army: the Military in British Art, 1815–1914* (Manchester, 1988), pp. 12–13 & 53.

75. Ogilby Trust comp. *Index to British Military Costume Prints: 1500–1914* (London, 1972), pp. 200–219.

76. George Cruikshank, *A Pop-gun Fired off by George Cruikshank in Defence of the British Volunteers of 1803* (London, 1866), p. 11.

77. Gavin Gleig, *Folk Songs of the North-East*, 3 vols. (Peterhead, 1907), vol. 1, pt. 25, p. 2.

78. George Hogarth, *The Songs of Charles Dibdin*, 2 vols., (London, 1848), 2:383.

79. A satire noted "there are few [regimental] messes which cannot boast of a considerable number of authors—historians, novelists, and memoir writers.... " [James White], *Adventures of Sir Pumpkin Frizzle: Nights at Mess and Other Tales* (Edinburgh, 1836), p. 1.

80. S. G. P. Ward, "Major Monsoon," *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 59 (1980): 65.

81. Hirshberger, *Images*, p. 6.

82. This court livery was originally created for servants and men who came to court, but by the late 1790's wealthy men wore it in society, possibly to avoid an unfavorable comparison with soldiers, but also as a mark of loyalty. Charles Mansel, "Monarchy, Uniform and the Rise of the *Frac*, 1760–1830," *Past and Present* 96 (August 1982): 115–116.

83. However, the sumptuary laws forbade too close an imitation of either the Windsor uniform or army dress. Such restrictions were not limited to Britain: while at Ravenna in 1820, Lord Byron's liverymen appeared so similar to the Papal Guard Carabiniers that the unit petitioned the local Cardinal against the liveries. Lord Byron, *Byron's Letters and Journals*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, 9 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), 7:118.

84. Ellen Moers, *The Dandy* (London, 1960), p. 33.

85. *Ibid.*, pp. 33–34.

86. Brummel was influenced by military dress in some details, adopting tasseled "Hessian" (hussar) boots and the *chapeau bras. Ibid.*, see graphic opposite p. 32, & 45.

87. One fashion historian described it as "a certain swaggering flashiness and exaggeration of effect ... reflected from the theatricality of uniforms on to the latest clothing for civilian men." Geoffrey Squire, *Dress and Society: 1560–1970* (New York, 1974), p. 138.

88. Thomas Moore, *Journal of Sir Valentine Sleek*, (n.p., 1818), cited in *Ibid.*, p. 142.

89. Letter from "An Half-Pay Officer," *The New Military Register* (London), 14 April 1819. Many soldiers were horrified and complained to the press. C. H., "Medal or Other Distinction for Service," *United Service Journal* no. 2 (1830), p. 881. Large numbers of second-hand uniforms were available after the post-war reductions, and penniless, half-pay officers often supplemented their incomes by selling their uniforms to old clothes dealers.

90. Anne Hollander, *Seeing Through Clothes*, (New York, 1975), p. 474.

91. Quentin Bell, *Of Human Finery*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York, 1976), p. 43. The development of uniforms—along with sports clothes and the sewing machine—are considered to be the most significant factors in the development of male dress in the last 300 years. See: Penelope Byrde, *The Male Image: Men's Fashion in Britain, 1300–1970* (Tiptree, Essex, 1979), p. 73.

92. Philip Haythornthwaite, *Uniforms of the French Revolutionary Wars: 1789–1802* (Poole, Dorset, 1981), p. 110.

93. At Bath in 1812 a Canadian saw "crowds of ladies" wearing "pelisses with gold cords and hussar's hats. . . . " Matilda Edgar, *Ten Years of Upper Canada in Peace and War, 1805–1815* (Toronto, 1890), pp. 90–1.

94. William Donaldson, *The Jacobite Song: Political Myth and National Identity* (Aberdeen, 1988), p. 92.

95. C. Willettt Cunningham, *English Women's Clothing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1937), p. 439; Elizabeth Ewing, *Women in Uniform* (Totowa, New Jersey, 1975), p. 64; and Cecil Woodham-Smith, *The Reason Why* (New York, 1960), p. 263.

96. Elizabeth Ewing, *History of Children's Costume* (New York, 1977), p. 82.

97. Plumb, "The New World of Children," p. 311; Ewing, *Children's Costume*, p. 82.

98. Mary Russell Mitford, *Our Village* (London, 1824; reprint ed., Philadelphia, n.d.), p. 58.

99. The Lovett Papers, Vol. I, ff. 26–7; cited in: Joel H. Wiener, *The War of the Unstamped* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1969), p. 135.

100. *Douglas Jerrold's Shilling Magazine* 1 (1845): 40.

101. *York Herald* April, 1846, quoted in Vandeleur, *Letters*, p.186.

102. J. M., "Fragments from the Portfolio of a Field Officer," *United Service Journal*, no. 1 (1831): 304.

103. Seaton Papers, Gen. Sir Henry Hardinge to Lord Seaton, 16 June, 1853, cited in Strachan, *Wellington's Legacy*, p. 167.

104. *Punch* 25 (1853), p. 92.

105. Much depended upon the whims of the colonel. Bandsmen were colorfully dressed and sometimes wore much bullion lace—even exceeding that worn by officers, but they had an inferior status, being a regimental entertainment and mere ornaments. Although they carried swords, they did not fight.

106. This was noted for Louis XIV's first military review in 1666 by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1979), p.

188–9, and describes the review, as depicted on the event's commemorative medal, as "architecture", and "a uniformly repeated attitude of ranks and lines: a tactical unity."

107. Since the visual elements were a matter of regulation the soldiers' own feelings were irrelevant to the message, much as a modern advertising model's opinions about the product being promoted have no bearing upon the images which are created, although the model's appearance and spoken lines are designed to convey the illusion of an objective message.

108. "Underlying much of the growing hostility towards [traditional] popular recreation was the concern for effective labour discipline." Malcomson, *Popular Recreations*, p. 89. While spending time at a review might also have been deemed wasteful, the show depicted this same discipline, and thus might have been considered preferable to other recreations.

109. Lewis Mumford argues that the military paradigm was previously borrowed from the idea of the machine, which itself dated from antiquity. *Technics and Civilization* (New York, 1934), and *The Myth of the Machine*, 2 vols., (New York, 1966), passim.

110. "It is absolutely necessary to maintain a proper authority, and keep uniform good order, as the end of all government is order." James Montgomery, *The Carding and Spinning Master's Assistant: Or the Theory and Practice of Cotton Spinning* (Glasgow, 1832) reprinted in : Alfred D. Chandler, ed., *Precursors of Modern Management* (New York, 1979), p. 221.

111. Quoted in N. McKendrick, "Josiah Wedgewood and Factory Discipline," *Historical Journal* 41 (1961): 35.

112. *New Moral World*, XI (4 March, 1843), cited in : J. F. C. Harrison, *Quest for the New Moral World: Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America* (London, 1969), p. 187; Margaret Cole, *Robert Owen* (New York, 1953), pp. 84–5.

113. Robert Owen, *A New View of Society*, (New York, 1927), p. 291.

114. Frank Podmore, *Robert Owen: A Biography* (New York, 1924), p. 144.

115. Hobsbawm, *Age of Capital*, p. 238. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in *The Communist Manifesto* (Baltimore, 1967) described factory workers as "privates of the industrial army." (pp. 87–8) and that the effect of contemporary bourgeois culture "is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine." (p. 99). Thomas Carlyle wrote of industrial "regiments," noting that "Captains of Industry are the True Fighters ... and lead Mankind in that great, and alone true, and universal warfare," while laborers were "noble Worker warriors." Carlyle, *Past and Present* (New York, 1977), pp. 208 and 268–9. Thomas Hughes, the author of *Tom Brown's School Days*, had similar views. "From cradle to the grave, fighting, rightly understood, is the business, the real, highest, honestest business of every son of man. ... " Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830–1870* (New Haven, 1985), p. 203.

116. In a sermon of 1839 Thomas Arnold spoke of "our monstrous society—absolutely without a parallel in the history of the world." Quoted in W. L. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation* (New York, 1964), p. 65.

117. Quoted in Burn, *Age of Equipoise*, p. 65.

118. Asa Briggs, *Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes, 1851–1867*, rev. ed. (Chicago, 1972), p. 116.

119. *Character* (New York, n.d.) and *Self-Help* (New York, n.d.). He even found one for *Thrift* (New York, 1876), p. 152, although soldiers were scarcely famous for frugality.

120. Asa Briggs, *Victorian People* (New York, 1972), p. 127.

121. Samuel Smiles, *Duty, with illustrations of Courage, Patience, and Endurance* (New York, 1881) pp. 12, 19. One wonders if the idea for the American World War II slogan "Work To Keep Free," or the Nazi slogan "Arbeit Macht Frei" painted on the entrance signs of the death camps, originated from Smiles.

122. In the nineteenth century military discipline was directly applied to regulate employees in some institutions. The modeling of the British police on military institutions is well known; the best book on the early police is Stanley H. Palmer, *Police and Protest in England and Ireland: 1780–1850* (Cambridge, 1988) which points out that the Irish police (essentially military in character) was the major prototype for the English police. From the end of the Napoleonic wars, British prisons also acquired a distinctive martial tone; see Michael Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain: the Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution* (New York, 1978), pp. 191–2. Likewise, other institutions derived inspiration from the military paradigm; for example, the proprietor of a private madhouse thought that the sense of duty for mad-house attendants should be like that of soldiers. Thomas Bakewell, *A Letter addressed to the Chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to enquire into the State of Madhouses: to which is subjoined Remarks on the Nature, Causes and Cure of Mental Derangement* (Stafford, 1815), p. 53, cited in: William Ll. Parry-Jones, *The Trade in Lunacy: A Study of Private Madhouses in England in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (London, 1972), p. 175.

123. Hugh Cunningham, *The Volunteer Force: A Social and Political History, 1859–1908* (Hamden, Conn., 1975), p. 64.

124. Ian F. W. Beckett, *Riflemen Form: A Study of the Rifle Volunteer Movement, 1859–1908* (Inverness, 1982), pp. 108–9.

125. *Volunteer Service Gazette* (1859), p. 351, cited in Beckett, *Riflemen Form*, p. 109.

126. Cited in Cunningham, *Volunteer Force*, p. 82.

127. H. J. Hanham, "Religion and Nationality in the Mid-Victorian Army," in M. R. D. Foot, ed., *War and Society: Historical Essays in Honour and Memory of J. R. Western 1928–1971* (London, 1973), p. 172. "With such training, claimed [Edwin] Chadwick, three might eventually do the work of five ... " Bailey, *Leisure and Class*: p. 139.

128. The Archbishop of Canterbury observed that Booth's "Peculiar mode of proceeding was such as might have considerable influence over uncultivated minds." But the parades created much resentment when residents were awakened every Sunday morning by the army's "unbearable" din. An opposition group arose calling itself the "Skeleton Army." Armed with a black skull and crossbones flag, mud, stones, dead cats, paint and live coals, they fought the paraders. 3 *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* 269 (1882): 822 cited by Donald C. Richter, *Riotous Victorians* (Athens, Ohio, 1981), pp. 74–5. Salvation Army bandsmen wore second-hand British army uniforms before getting their own. Ewing, *Women in Uniform*, p. 59.

129. Ewing, *Women in Uniform*, p. 58.

130. Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory: Baden-Powell and the Origins of the Boy Scout Movement* (New York, 1984), pp. 164–5.

131. Dickens, *Pickwick Papers*, pp. 48, 50.

132. Kipling shared Smiles's sharp ambivalence towards the martial model, and "would have abhorred the form right-wing corporativism took under Hitler in Germany," and the

story includes Jewish schoolboys winning at a military exercise contest. But the vision's allure influenced his judgment; the biographer writes that it marks a "significant decline in artistic balance," and is "both absurd and remote from the facts of English life." Angus Wilson, *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling* (New York, 1977), pp. 241–3.

133. There were of course mistakes made at reviews, and some were deliberate—such as officers appearing in mufti instead of uniform. But the spectacle was based upon an idealized image and like any other show, it rarely came off in perfect order. Jeffrey L. Lant has discussed the problems at royal spectacles in *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony & Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court* (New York, 1980).

134. Blatchford, *Life*, p. 139.

135. Charles Tilly's *The Contentious French* (London, 1986), p. 4, notes that in 400 years of French popular struggle "the more closely we look at . . . [conflict] the more we discover order."

136. See Myerly, "Spectacle and Power", pp. 166–207. In Somerset a gang of forty turnip-stealers had a captain who gave military orders. *Times*, 24 December, 1816 cited in Clifford Morsley, ed., *News from the English Countryside, 1750–1850* (London, 1979), p. 204.

137. This phenomenon is an element of the ancient—and apparently universal—practice of adopting an enemy's warlike panoply, and thereby magically absorbing the foe's powers. Robert Elliot, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, and Art* (Princeton, N. J., 1960), p. 65.

138. Terence Ranger, "The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa," in Hobsbawm and Ranger, eds., *Invention of Tradition*, pp. 245–6. The impact of military rule upon seventeenth-century colonies has received treatment in : Stephen Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General: The English Army and the Definition of Empire, 1569–1681* (Chapel Hill, 1979). But the significant effects of military culture and the army as an institution upon indigenous cultures and peoples around the world, as well as its role in the development of colonial societies, has not been much studied. An exception for Canada is: Elinor Kyte Senior, *British Regulars in Montreal: An Imperial Garrison, 1832–1854* (Montreal, 1981).

139. Briggs, *Victorian People*, p. 127.

140. This scene was soon rendered comic when the spectators were saluted with a volley of blank cartridges, and at the discharge "something" whistled close past Mr. Winkle's ear. The troops then charged with fixed bayonets directly at the spot where the Pickwickians were standing, and they fled for their lives. Dickens, *Pickwick Papers* pp. 48–51. The negative side of the ambivalent army/civilian relationship sometimes emerged with such threatening actions at reviews, adding some thrills to the show.

141. Quoted in Briggs, *Victorian People* p. 127. Henry Havelock was the object of much anger at the Horse Guards (the office of the Commander-in-chief) when he wrote a history of the First Burmese war. British officers were among the worst educated in Europe, and many played field sports rather than learn their duty. Only the absolute necessity of changing techniques in war eventually forced the army to demand some modest degree of education from its officers. Enlisted men presented a dilemma: literate non-commissioned officers were essential while ignorant common soldiers were preferred. Many colonels before the Crimean war believed that creating enlisted men's libraries was tantamount to encouraging mutiny.

142. Blatchford, *Life*, p. 139.

143. In this context the military image constitutes a major theme in the pre-history of advertising, in addition to its frequent utilization by that industry.

144. The advent of World War I decreased some of the elements of the show, and ex-cept for the highly visible guards units, the old scarlet and blue uniforms went into store and were abolished after the war ended. But despite the growing importance of cam-ouflage in twentieth-century warfare, symbolizing the great importance of much more lethal weapons as the means to attain victory, British army spectacle retains more of its nineteenth-century character than most other contemporary armies. Much less emphasis is placed upon the display of high-tech weapons, and (unlike the American army) each regiment maintains a band wearing traditional uniforms which appear in a variety of pub-lic contexts—just as in the nineteenth century. When entire regiments appear in public they usually wear their #1 dress, consisting of blue patrol jackets—the successor of the nineteenth-century frock coat. The show of the last century thus continues to be most popular in Britain, and not primarily as a draw for tourists either, although the obligatory photos of guardsman in British tourist pamphlets might give the opposite impression. At the "Trooping to the Colours" ceremony only those holding tickets are admitted, which are not available to tourists but distributed free to Britons from high social circles. I am indebted to Sheperd Paine for this information.

145. This hierarchical—and thus fundamentally authoritarian—structure is essential for all large institutions, and has often been manipulated to promote—and disguise—the aims and values of those in power. While such groups may claim to uphold egalitarian princi-ples, hierarchy and discipline renders this ideal most difficult to achieve and maintain, since these regulating features are intrinsic to the nature of large institutions, regardless of whether they are characterized by elections or whatever idealistic, well-intentioned egalitarian principles are championed by those in authority.

146. The westernization of independent, non-European lands has also been characterized first and foremost by the necessity to upgrade military capabilities, such as in Russia, the Ottoman Empire, Egypt, Japan, etc., and the adoption of the outward image of the European art of war has always been a significant factor. For example, see: L. Carl Brown, *The Tunisia of Ahmad Bey, 1837–1855* (Princeton, 1974), pp. 265–6 and 355. This process has sometimes been accompanied by attempts to force the adoption of western dress upon civilian populations, often with tragi-comic results.