Trolloпian “Foreign Policy”: Rootedness and Cosmopolitanism in the Mid-Victorian Global Imaginary

LAUREN M. E. GOODLAD

He isn't of our sort. He's too clever, too cosmopolitan,—a sort of man whitewashed of all prejudices, who wouldn't mind whether he ate horseflesh or beef if horseflesh were as good as beef, and never had an association in his life.

—Anthony Trollope, The Prime Minister (1876)

CAN CRITICISM OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE ILLUMINATE our globalizing world in the first decade of the twenty-first century? If one is to judge from the conceptual vocabulary at play in recent work by literary scholars, the answer may well be yes. Certainly, the turn away from insular nationalist frameworks and toward the embrace of notions such as cosmopolitanism is inspired partly by the present-day challenges of an ongoing capitalist globalization that, for all its immediacy, was visibly under way in the world of Anthony Trollope. As critics retool so as to capture the global provenance of what can no longer adequately be described as “Victorian” literature, they strive to detach their analyses from the presumed predominance of the sovereign nation-state and to produce global understandings of empire, beyond the dyad of colonizer and colonized.

But does cosmopolitanism provide a useful framework for this critical endeavor? Although the answer to that question could be yes, in this essay I emphasize the disconnect between cosmopolitan theories today and the material history of globalizing capital in the nineteenth century. The critical perspective most familiar to literary scholars, exemplified in studies such as Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins’s Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation (1998), contrasts the lofty ideality of Enlightenment cosmopolitanisms with the “actually existing” practices highlighted in recent alternatives. As Robbins explains in his introduction, whereas cosmopolitanism
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once denoted an elitist “view from above,” the term now seeks to capture a wide range of “transnational experiences that are particular rather than universal” and are “unprivileged” or even “coerced” (1). Although the focus has shifted from abstract to concrete conceptions, the primary object of these newly grounded cosmopolitanisms is not to explore particular cosmopolitan histories but to repair the ethical failings of past formations. This emphasis on reconciling eighteenth-century ideals with late-twentieth-century materialities slides nineteenth-century contexts that, as I aim to show, may be as useful in assessing the vitality of a cosmopolitan ethico-political project as in providing a richer history of globalization’s Victorian antecedents.

The distinction between ideal and real conditions of possibility is, of course, difficult to maintain; cosmopolitanism’s most serious challenges are not “in theory but in practice” (Malcolmson 238). When cosmopolitan democracy is put forward as an ethical objective without serious attention to the systemic structural inequalities that immobilize it, the idea may ignore or even encourage imperial and neoimperial expansion. As Simon Gikandi warns, those who seek to recuperate and revise the Enlightenment’s ideals must face the possibility that the “institutions that were supposed to will into being universal and cosmopolitan identities were not simply corrupted by racialism, but were immanently racialist, if not racist” (“Race” 599). In Craig Calhoun’s words, theories of cosmopolitanism need at the very least “to approach both cross-cultural relations and the construction of social solidarities with a deeper recognition of the significance of diverse starting points and potential outcomes” and to articulate greater “commitment to the reduction of material inequality, and more openness to radical change” (108).

In the field of Victorian studies, influential critics of cosmopolitanism such as Amanda Anderson have sought to recuperate aspects of British literature that exemplify “the critique of modernity” in Western “modernity itself” (“Cosmopolitanism” 272; see also Powers 63). Whether her topic is fiction, nonfiction prose, or political discourse, Anderson has argued that literary critics shortchange the ethical and political potential of mid-Victorian culture when they reflexively associate it with the “more blinkered aspects” of the Enlightenment (“Victorian Studies” 198). Writing in a similar vein, Christopher M. Keirstead has turned to Robert Browning’s poetry to describe the cosmopolitan ideal as a lived “capacity for sorting out competing ideas and offering in return a tolerant, humane understanding” (423). Both Anderson and Keirstead note the tensions between Victorian literature’s ethically and artistically compelling engagements with multiplicity and its comparatively inert challenges to—and often embrace of—hierarchies of nationality, race, class, and gender. Keirstead, for instance, notes how Browning’s cosmopolitan “political ambitions” run up against their origins in “class and gender privilege” (429–30). The limit of such Victorianist scholarship is not, therefore, its political blind spots but its finite expectations. Writing from a postcolonial vantage that recognizes the pervasiveness of Eurocentricism, Anglocentricism, and racism, literary historians of nineteenth-century cosmopolitan ideals are bound to predict the flummoxing of the ethical aspirations they describe.

In this essay I propose a different literary-critical endeavor that takes the recent interest in actually existing cosmopolitanisms for its cue. My argument is that Anthony Trollope’s articulation of “foreign policy” illustrates a prominent mid-Victorian mode of actually existing cosmopolitanism that can be usefully compared with critical projects today. The Trollopian foreign policy I describe entailed productive play between perceptions of England’s rootedness and its colonial cosmopolitanism—but its effect was most unlike the
“rooted cosmopolitanism” that Kwame Anthony Appiah and others have offered for reflection on contemporary ethics (cf. Stanton). A pronounced racist and Anglo-Saxon expansionist, Trollope was not a writer whose cosmopolitan attitude inspired modes of thinking or feeling beyond the nation; and yet he was undeniably one of the era’s most consummate transnational figures—“the greatest traveler among mid-Victorian novelists,” according to Michael Cotsell (243), and, according to Catherine Hall, the nineteenth century’s archetypal “Imperial Man” (“Going”, Civilising 211–13). Trollope’s reputation as the “ Chronicler of Barsetshire,” the author of provincial novels such as The Warden (1855), has tended to obscure the fact that he also penned travel writings depicting all but one of the major contact zones of British imperialism: The West Indies and the Spanish Main (1859), North America (1862), Australia and New Zealand (1873), and South Africa (1878). Trollope’s works remind us that from a Victorian perspective, the word cosmopolitan was more likely to evoke the impersonal structures of capitalism and imperialism than an ethos of tolerance, world citizenship, or multiculturalism.

To be sure, Trollope did not claim the term cosmopolitan to describe any aspect of his writing. His definition, like that of many Victorians, inclined toward the pejorative. An English landowner in The Prime Minister (1876) uses the word to describe the dubious, deracinated qualities of a man who “isn’t of our sort”—one Ferdinand Lopez (141). This contemporary usage of cosmopolitan—in which the word stands for the social impact of capitalist mobility and, by extension, for the shadowy attributes of Jews and other perceived arrivistes—is, as I will show, ultimately inseparable from the qualities attributed to the “Colonial Man” of Trollope’s travel writings. Trollope thus exemplifies a mid-Victorian tendency to regard modernity’s cosmopolitan features with ambivalence—as the by-product of a capitalist and colonial expansion of British sovereignty in tension with England’s heirloom roots.

In a way that captures a mid-Victorian zeitgeist, Trollope’s writings of the 1850s and 1860s imaginatively address the dilemma of British sovereignty. By penning a series of novels that eulogize England’s rootedness alongside first-person accounts of colonial travel, Trollope became the arch exemplar of a twoparty foreign policy. The works he produced as the Chronicler of Barsetshire are veritable archetypes of “autoethnographic” fiction—exerting “centripetal force” against the imperial dispersion of English identity by offering textual “stand-ins for the boundaries of culture and nation” (Buzard 43). Trollope’s novels, as R. H. Hutton remarked in 1882, “contain a larger mass of evidence as to the character and aspects of English Society . . . than any other writer of his day has left behind him” (505). But the travel writings he composed as Colonial Man thrust outside the purview of the British Isles even as his English novels parry with acts of serial autoethnography. Whereas the Chronicler’s insular imaginary focuses on the cultivated class credentials and venerable institutions of a hereditary national elite, Colonial Man uses racial discourse to construct a transportable, and thus cosmopolitan, mode of proprietary Englishness. Evoking the asymmetrical play between two notions of property—heirloom “rootedness” and capitalist “cosmopolitanism”—Trollope’s mid-Victorian global imaginary simulates, even as it evacuates, the liberal-humanist ideal of a genuinely “negotiated” rooted cosmopolitanism (Appiah, Ethics 232).

Trollopian Foreign Policy

In suggesting foreign policy as the optic for a globally situated literary criticism, my aim is not to document a wonkish discourse or to focus on the rarefied activities of the British Foreign Office. My broader usage designates a nationalist discourse on the global that professed to explain
Britain's place in the world and in history. Precisely because it reeks of disavowed imperialism, Anglo-Saxon exceptionalism, and reflexive adherence to the self-interested sovereign state, Trollopian foreign policy illuminates the structures, both material and conceptual, that critics today aim to historicize.10

Of course, to speak of British imperialism is to condense a heterogeneous English expansion that had begun with Ireland in the sixteenth century and by the 1850s had come to include settlement colonies such as Canada and Australia, West Indian colonies for the production of commodities, the aftermath of the slave trade, and a presence on the Indian subcontinent that had mutated from a commercial monopoly into a territorial empire, enlarged by conquest and sustained by the rule and taxation of a vast non-European population. In the mid-Victorian era, many writers distinguished between Britain's "colonies" of settlement in the world's temperate zones and its "dependencies" in densely populated South Asia.11 Colonies of settlement could be differentiated from the imperial rule of subject peoples in part because their indigenous inhabitants were regarded as stagnant "races" on the verge of extinction (Brantlinger, Dark Vanishing). Thus, according to Trollope, the British emigrants who had settled in the United States were nonimperialists: "driven by no thirst of conquest, by no greed of gold, dreaming of no Western empire such as Cortez had achieved and Raleigh had meditated" (North America 28–29). In viewing settler colonies as organic extensions of the Anglo-Saxon metropole, Trollope anticipated the "Greater British" imaginary of later thinkers such as Charles Dilke and J. R. Seeley.12

Trollope's travel writings naturalized practices of empire, embedding them in a domesticated understanding of Britain's perceived historical role as the world's most economically advanced and politically liberal power. The mid-Victorian outlook he helped popularize is illustrated by an 1859 article in Macmillan's Magazine, one of a running series on current events titled "Politics of the Present, Foreign and Domestic." The author, David Masson, describes Britain as standing "on the fringe" of a precariously "continental state."13 As the empires of France, Russia, and Austria strive to enhance their power in Europe; as the Ottoman Empire's hold over eastern Europe declines; and as the "passion for unity" creates nationalist unrest, "all is glaringly out of equilibrium" (2–3). It is only after portraying Britain as a relatively pacific power, compelled to defend "her shores" against the power struggles of illiberal continental regimes (2), that the article alludes to Britain's territorial interests outside Europe: "Britain must make herself safe. That is the first duty. There must be a navy sufficient to ride round and round her, to keep the silver seas clear between her and the rest of the world and to maintain guard over her scattered dependencies" (4). Britain's sovereign reach includes "scattered dependencies" as well as native shores. Yet while the article alludes to the settler colonies and the difficult "imperial question of India," neither aspect of Britain's "varied and ocean-dislocated Empire" claims prolonged attention (8–10). On the other hand, Masson goes to some lengths to establish Britain's world-historical role as a beacon of liberal opinion, morally "bound to extend . . . the spirit of liberty" (6). "A blow at the appendages of our Empire were nothing so fatal as a blow at this liberty of our heart" (5). How such commitment to liberty squares with the maintenance of imperial "appendages" (within recent memory of the Indian rebellion, no less) is never explained. Nor would one realize from reading the article that Britain's special stake in the Crimean War was to guard the shortest routes to India against the threat of Russian interference. In the nineteenth century, Britain repeatedly sought to shore up the Ottoman Empire, despite its reputation as a retrograde "Oriental" power, in order to enhance the security of imperial
interests in nearby India. Such motives explained not only the Crimean War but also the First Anglo-Afghan War from 1838 to 1842, the deployment of gunboats against Egypt in 1840, and the annexation of the Cape Colony in 1806, through which Britain secured the long route to India (Davison; O'Brien).

Mid-Victorian foreign policy discourse naturalized a vision of the world in which major Western states vied to defend and extend the territories over which they claimed sovereignty. The monadic nation-state arose in conjunction with a proprietarian understanding of the individual, a Lockean subject whose self-owned capacity to produce economic value provided ideological justification for the settlement of land outside English borders (Wood 82). According to Masson,

A man...lives not only in the spot which he personally occupies, but in every spot to which he may extend his action, or to which he may conceive it possible that his action should be extended. And so, wherever over the world British influence penetrates, or can conceive itself penetrating, there, and not in the mere islands where we have our footing, Great Britain lives. (4)

Here is a homology between British man and British empire that illustrates how the self-possessed Anglo-Saxon traveler personified in Trollope's travel writings authorizes a sovereignty that extends well beyond “the mere islands” of the British metropole. For in a way that structurally reproduces the relation between English “footing” and global reach, Trollope is famous for “thoroughly English” novels even as his travel writings depict colonial expansion as “central to Englishness, [and] part of what was special about the Anglo-Saxon race” (Trollope, Autobiography 95; Hall, “Going” 184). For Hall, the relation between the two modes of writing is contiguity: Trollope reveals “a particular preoccupation with the details” of English culture “can sit alongside a set of assumptions about other societies, ‘races’ and peoples” (“Going” 184). But Masson’s article evokes a more productive relation between Colonial Man and the “spot” from which he launches his expansionist aims. The Great Britain that “lives” coextensively with its “influence” may do so because the space that Britons “personally occupy” provides an exceptional ground, irreducible to geography or geopolitics, for such ambitious reach. This productive play between sovereign rootedness and cosmopolitan expansion, deriving from the geopolitics of an ambitious global power, was brilliantly articulated in a Trollopian foreign policy discourse that lasted through the decade-long span of the Barsetshire novels (1855–67)—the peak of the author’s popularity and prestige.

Rootedness as Heirloom Sovereignty

To speak of England’s rootedness is implicitly to invoke the Barsetshire novels. Their in-depth portraits of England’s provincial interior exert centripetal force against dispersion by a variety of global effects, including London’s capitalist metropolis, Europe’s geopolitical wrangling, projects of Great and Greater Britain, and the impact of a “varied and ocean-dislocated Empire.” If, as Benedict Anderson has argued, the modern nation is constituted as an imagined community, then in its best-known Trollopian formation the English nation is constituted as Barsetshire, the imagined county of an imagined “Cathedral city”—an autoethnographic synecdoche (Trollope, Autobiography 63). Nineteenth-century foreign policy discourse persistently asserted Britain’s vanguard status: the Victorian public “believe[d] that Britain held a unique position in the world” and “liked to believe both in British benevolence and British power” (Chamberlain 6, 7). The achievement of Trollope’s Barsetshire novels was to insist that though England was indeed “a commercial country,” its exceptionality was founded on a nobler conception of property
than that to which “buying and selling” gives rise (Trollope, Doctor 12).

Trollope’s first Barsetshire novel, *The Warden*, is a rumination on property, its plot inspired by debates over the Church of England’s management of charitable endowments. But while contemporary newspaper coverage focused on flagrant abuses—negligent clergymen who occupied multiple places and farmed out their duties to low-paid proxies—Trollope’s Mr. Harding, a dutiful pastor, is “the moral center of the Barsetshire novels” (Nardin 8). The novel’s obvious point is that Harding is not the corrupt caricature of reformist rhetoric. But its subtle message is to concede the legitimacy of moderate reform even while demonstrating that the law, the supposed moral compass of a secular modernity, is inadequate to provide authoritative judgment on questions of rightful ownership. When Harding asks Sir Abraham Haphazard if he is “legally and distinctly entitled to the proceeds of the property” he oversees (152), the answer he receives from the “eminent Queen’s Counsel” is inconclusive (37). Since the precise modern meaning of John Hiram's will is debatable, the only relevant legal point is that the suit has been abandoned: “nobody now questions [the] justness” of the warden’s income. Harding replies, “I question it myself,” stating an ethical concern that leads him to resign rather than risk appropriating “the property of the poor” (154).

*The Warden* is a fable in which the problem articulated in *The New Zealander*—the problem of how the English can “make [themselves] an honest people” (12)—is imaginatively resolved.16 The moral center of the Barsetshire novels is the “sheer Quixotism” of an elderly eccentric (Warden 154); its most potent expression is the intuitive ethic, symbolized by Harding’s performance on an imaginary cello, that triumphs over the interests of the Church of England, self-righteous reforms, and the struggle for power to which both are subject. “Whatever men do they should certainly do honestly,” wrote Trollope in *North America*, and yet “[w]hen men have political ends to gain they regard their opponents as adversaries, and . . . the old rule of war is brought to bear” (14). Though Trollope is discussing the politics of a looming civil war in the United States, he might be describing Archdeacon Granty, who, as he prepares to defend “ecclesiastical revenues,” “shakes his feathers, and erects his comb” like an “indomitable cock preparing for . . . combat” (Warden 36). Although the narrator of *The Warden* is ironic, both works attest to a Hobbesian world in which the law, for all its importance in securing property, is ultimately a weapon to be wielded by powerful factions. As the novel makes clear, neither sovereign legislature nor sovereign electorate warrant a truly ethical ownership since both bodies dissolve into the material interests of the Lockeian monads who compose them.17

*The Warden*, an early novel, sets the stage for the quietistic, almost cynical literary realism of which Trollope is often taken as arch practitioner. For George Levine, Trollope’s perception of a “compromised world” is so strong that it frees the novelist “to accept the disenchantment that dispels ideals for reality” (182, 192). And yet that common view of Trollope’s realism is not adequate to capturing *The Warden*’s evocation of an ethico-culturally embedded English sovereignty. Political sovereignty was a subject of recurring interest to Trollope, discussed in *The New Zealander* (144–50) and, more than ten years later on the eve of electoral reform, in an 1867 article for *St. Paul’s Magazine*. “On Sovereignty” portrays England’s constitutional monarchy as the nation’s heirloom—a legacy that United States republicans cannot comprehend and French subjects of the Second Empire cannot produce. Indeed, England’s constitution is so elusive that it defies representation: “so intricate in its arrangements” that it cannot be “produced ready made by any brain”; “a thing so complex that gray-headed statesmen”
spend their lives interpreting it and "foreigners" fail to grasp its perfection (85–86). In the end, to conjure such ineffable sovereignty, Trollope invokes a Barset-like analogy, comparing England’s constitution to Salisbury Cathedral and likening the English throne to the "beautiful" "tower" and "spire":

The real work for which [the cathedral] was built is not done within those beautiful but narrow confines. But from the tower comes that peal of bells which calls the people to the worship they love, and the spire was built that it might be seen from afar off, and recognised as the symbol in those parts of the religion of the country. (87)\(^\text{18}\)

Here is a noteworthy exception to the view of Trollope as a staunchly antiromantic practitioner of complacent moral compromise. The Warden depicts English sovereignty as the product of an organic national history—a cherished legacy, "the beautiful and decorous" parts of which, like the "theatrical show" Walter Bagehot more cynically described in The English Constitution (1867), provide a crucial symbolic function (248). Trollope’s depiction of English sovereignty resists realist disenchantment in pitting the cathedral’s "real work" (analogous to prosaic modern governance) against the sublime aesthetic effects of its tower and spire. In The Warden the inspirational institutions that exalt England’s sovereignty are not mere instrumentalities, as are Bagehot’s "decorous" parts, but a romantic structure through which to imagine the potential capture of Harding’s embodied ethic. Trollope’s "cathedral sublimities" thus seek to locate the warden’s irreducible morality in The Warden’s figuration of an enchanted heirloom space and time.\(^\text{19}\)

As commentators since Karl Marx’s day have noted, capitalist modernity produces the spatiotemporal compression that Walter Benjamin described as "homogeneous, empty time" (264). Locke’s possessive individual is a symptom of such modern abstraction—the bearer of sovereign rights that derive from a disembodied and atomized conception of ownership. Yet by the late eighteenth century Romantics such as Edmund Burke were arguing for the particularity and historicity of ownership—for a holistic notion of property that answered to noneconomic criteria such as who possessed what and for how long. This was an attempt to instill in modern property the concrete imbuing of time with space or place with history that for Trollope constitutes the heirloom’s status as noninstrumentality, the cathedral’s status as a privileged English location, the status of Britain’s sovereignty as the embedded growth of the nation’s ongoing historical progress—and, one might add, The Warden’s status as a realist’s fable.

Trollope’s notion of the heirloom thus describes a form of property that accumulates particular ethical and cultural worth in excess of abstract economic value and, in so doing, binds rather than atomizes.\(^\text{20}\) The Warden seems to look back to Burke’s Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790). Why, asks Burke, should the expenditures of "a great landed property" trouble anyone when it produces "the accumulation of vast libraries," "great collections of antient records, medals, and coins," "paintings and statues," and so on—in a word, heirlooms, or aural autoethnographic objects. In a rhetorical question that one may imagine earning the endorsement of Archdeacon Grantly, Burke asks, "If, by great permanent establishments, all these objects of expence are better secured from the inconstant sport of personal caprice... are they worse than if the same tastes prevailed in scattered individuals?" (272). And yet when Trollope poses a similar question in The Warden, his irony distinguishes Burke’s robust post-Enlightenment conservatism from the realist novelist’s mid-Victorian defense against the capitalist modernity he ambivalently embraces.

Determined to take on "the Church’s enemies," Grantly has set out to visit his unreliable father-in-law. The privileged locality of "the
hallowed close" surfaces through the ironizing frame of his indignation (37). Although the point has not been to demolish Grantly's sincerity—he is nothing if not a zealous believer in his cause—the narrator's sudden leap toward Burke-like affirmation of "great permanent establishments" comes as a surprise. Calling on readers to relax their suspicion and join the archdeacon's appreciation of hallowed ground, the novel momentarily asserts the holistic power of spatiotemporal enchantment:

And who has not felt the same? We believe that [the most ardent reformers of the day] would relent, were [they] to allow themselves to stroll by moonlight round the towers of some of our ancient churches. Who would not feel charity for a prebendary, when walking the quiet length of that long aisle at Winchester . . . feeling, as one must, the solemn orderly comfort of the spot! . . . Who could lie basking in the cloisters of Salisbury, and gaze on . . . that unequalled spire, without feeling that bishops should sometimes be rich? (37–38; emphasis added)

The passage is remarkable for its subtle recasting of Burke. "The tone of our archdeacon's mind must not astonish us," the narrator continues; "it has been the growth of centuries of Church ascendancy" (38). In other words, though Grantly's belief in his own propaganda may at first give pause, why, on reflection, should the ancient institutions he is fighting to preserve "appear intolerable to you or to me"? "Who, without remorse can batter down the dead branches of an old oak . . . without feeling that they sheltered the younger plants?" (38). Reading such passages, one almost hears the confirmatory voice of Burke's Reflections: "A disposition to preserve, and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard. . . . Every thing else is vulgar in the conception, perilous in the execution" (267).

And yet, though Trollope's writing is saturated with such calls for moderation, the author of The Warden is not precisely Burkan. Trollope's reverence for established hierarchies was in tension with the decidedly individualist entrepreneurial ethos with which he identified when, for example, he recalled his own rise from the shabbiest of genteel origins to literary renown (see Autobiography). When Burke makes a case for "hereditary possession," he is not merely arguing that the heirs of great family fortunes are culturally superior to the "great masses," he is also endowing such scions with an ethical power to "graft benevolence . . . upon avarice" (140–41). Trollope, a self-made man in the literary marketplace, had a more complicated view of individual self-interest, which was imaginatively incarnated with England’s expansion. "Greed and covetousness are no doubt vices," he wrote in The West Indies and the Spanish Main, "but they are vices which have grown from connate virtues. Without a desire for property, man could make no progress" (62). Such acquisitive "virtue" is of more use to Trollope, the upwardly mobile man of letters, than to Grantly, the defender of established privilege.

Of course, it is not Grantly's militant defense of clerical incomes that makes cathedral sublimity a compelling aesthetic but his father-in-law's ethical leap away from property and privilege. Trollope's narrator thus affirms the existing social order while casting doubt on the moral purity of those who benefit most from its unequal dispensation. In crafting this compromise the novel purposely conflates two underlying conceptions of property: the holistic heirloom, of presumed benefit to all, and the unabashedly individually held property that constitutes the Lockean subject. The result in The Warden is to align British sovereignty, symbolized by the spires of England's ancient cathedrals, not only with the Crown (as in the St. Paul's essay) but also with the less exalted aspects of a conservative ideology, including the prosaic idea that "bishops should sometimes be rich." This Grantlyan recasting of Burke's response to the French Revolution is deliberately ironic: a kind of mid-Victorian rewriting of tragedy as farce.
Crucially, then, the loyal Bunce, Harding’s favorite among the impoverished bedesmen, defends the existing social hierarchy. Bunce neutralizes the specter of redistribution, not by mocking equality but by articulating an extraneous version of it that comports with Burke’s view of property. As he rebukes his fellow bedesmen for hankering after Harding’s income, asking, “An’t you all as rich in your ways as he is in his?” (34), Bunce insists on the holist effects of an established governing class. He describes a form of rootedness—at bottom, a classist fantasy of nonindividualist ownership with the potential to enchant—that Trollope’s cosmopolitan travel writings cannot readily incorporate. Whereas the Barsetshire novels offer a potent class mythology in which England’s sovereignty is rooted in an established hierarchy, the travel writings imagine “race” as the warrant for a very different and yet geopolitically necessary project of colonial expansion and class mobility.

The Way We Colonize Now

With their strong emphasis on race as a determinant of human difference, Trollope’s travel writings were at the vanguard of the increasing tendency for mid-Victorian liberals to abandon the universalistic views of the Enlightenment. But because Trollope’s racialism derives from a cosmopolitan conception of global commerce, his ideas differ from polygenetic theories that viewed racial intermixture as biologically impossible. In his 1859 book on the West Indies, Trollope sees racial hybridity as part of “the Creator’s scheme,” a by-product of the world’s economic progress (West Indies 63). Decades after the abolition of slavery, as a mixed race of “coloured people” clamors for self-rule (80), Trollope regards the work of British colonialism in the Caribbean as all but complete. Having spread “civilization,” “commerce,” and the presumed racial benefits of Anglo-Saxon “blood,” Britons should soon “bid farewell to the West Indies.” Rather than “sweater . . . in the tropics,” Trollope’s readers should turn their sights on North America and Australia, temperate lands that await “the foot of the Englishman” (82). Notably, in climates deemed hospitable to Anglo-Saxon settlement, Trollope envisions no role for racial intermixture. His assumption that in settler contexts indigenous people will simply “melt away” on contact with a “higher race” (Australia 2: 123–24) is part of the ubiquitous extinction discourse that, as Patrick Brantlinger has shown, anticipated the vanishing of indigene “wherever and whenever” they encountered Europeans (Dark Vanishings 1). Whether touting racial hybridity in the tropics or lamenting the inevitable “extermination” of “natives” in the settler colonies (Tireless Traveler 200), Colonial Man cultivates a global outlook premised on racialized hierarchies of civilization and progress.

Of course, postcolonial critics have noted the inherent instabilities of such overarching imperial identity. Travel writers such as Trollope, writes Gikandi, needed to explore “the extremities of empire” to discover their own self-proclaimed Englishness (Maps 89). British imperialism, notes Ian Baucom, entailed an inevitable “loss of cultural certainty,” a “scattering” of the “locations of identity” on which the stability of Englishness depended (220). If for Hall Trollope’s jaunty Anglo-Saxon traveler “reassured his readers that all was indeed in place” (“Going” 185), for Baucom imperialism’s jarring dispersal of “privileged spaces” left English identities vulnerable and unlocated (220). The imaginative work of sustaining a far-flung Anglo-Saxon identity is, as Baucom suggests, precarious. Nonetheless, the Chronicler of Barsetshire does not simply blunder into colonial projects but, rather, describes himself within a structure of cosmopolitan expansion that explicitly requires them.

According to Ellen Meiksins Wood, England’s colonies of settlement were the first “form of imperialism driven by the logic of capitalism,” justifying the colonization
of land not in a political right to rule, such as that which authorizes a hereditary elite, but in an economic "obligation to produce exchange-value" (73, 99). Settler colonialism advanced the "possessive individual," the self-owned subject of Lockean theory (Macpherson), authorizing the expansion of British sovereignty. But Trollope's works express persistent dissatisfaction with possessive individualism, figured as a corrosive modern tendency to unleash Hobbesian selfishness at the expense of the crucial holist restraints that heirloom institutions are alleged to preserve.

In works from every stage in his career, across a range of genres, Trollope depicts competitive individualism as a threat to honesty, the moral and aesthetic standard that he is least willing to compromise. And yet the "desire for property" is also what makes civilization possible, separating Anglo-Saxons from allegedly nonprogressive races such as the Afro-Caribbean "negro" (West Indies 62). In Trollope, race thus plays the paradoxical part of affirming the progressiveness of English capitalism and providing a necessary escape from its pitfalls. His colonial works mythologize Anglo-Saxon "race" in the effort to root and to moralize expropriative practices that, in Barsetshire's imaginary, require the civilizing legacy of heirloom institutions.

In North America, the first of Trollope's travel works to focus on the "Greater British" imaginary, class mobility is the predominant theme. Although Trollope is impressed by the transformative impact of owning property, he is decidedly ambivalent toward the possessive individualism thus produced: "The western American has no love for his own soil, or his own house. The matter with him is simply one of dollars. To keep a farm which he could sell at an advantage from any feeling of affection,—from what we should call an association of ideas,—would be to him . . . ridiculous" (128). It is hard to imagine a less Barset-like image, one less complementary to the Warden's careful tending of a garden that he holds in trust for the Church of England and, by extension, for the benefit of humble bedesmen. Trollope's purpose, however, is not to impugn the American landowner as a de-racinated homo economicus.

[T]his man has his romance . . . and above all his manly dignity. Visit him, and you will find him without coat or waistcoat . . . too often bearing on his lantern jaws the signs of age and sickness; but he will stand upright before you and speak to you with all the ease of a lettered gentleman in his own library. . . . He is his own master, standing on his own threshold. . . . He is delighted to see you, and bids you sit down on his battered bench without dreaming of any such apology as an English cottier offers to a Lady Bountiful when she calls. (128)

Whereas the "rough fellow" who farms for "dollars" in the American West attains "the ease of a lettered gentleman in his own library," the English laborer's deference hobbles manly dignity. To be sure, Trollope has not lost faith in the ethico-cultural value of English gentlemen. But from the vantage of North America's working proprietors, he finds it impossible to dignify the dependent laboring-class condition on which English gentility partly rests. Trollope goes so far as to extend this invidious contrast in racial terms: "I defy you not to feel that [the North American settler] is superior to the race from whence he has sprung in England or Ireland" (129; cf. Australia 1: 180).

Trollope's complicated views on Irishness originated in a sustained encounter with colonized people who were not, like the natives of North America and Australia, expected to "melt away." Sentimental and racialized depictions of Irishness are a recurrent feature of his works. Trollope's decision to close his journey in North America with a stop in Ireland is, therefore, no accident. It functions as a necessary restorative to undo the jarring effects of settler mobility, including the stunning transformation of Irish settlers. Neither
fully a colonizer, like the Anglo-Saxon settler, nor fully colonized like the “kinsman” of Trollope’s “intimacy,” the Irishman who “expatriates himself” is a markedly rootless cosmopolitan (599). This deracinated Irishman loses much of that affectionate, confiding, master-worshipping nature which makes him so good a fellow at home. But he becomes more of man. He assumes a dignity which he never has known before. He learns to regard his labour as his own property. That which he earns he takes without thanks, but he desires to take no more than he earns. To me personally he has become much less pleasant than he was. But to himself—! It seems to me that such a man must feel himself half a god… (600)

Clearly, in the Irish case Trollope’s ambivalence toward the individualizing effects of the settler condition intensifies. He is torn between affection for the essentialized Irishman—a nonautonomous, nonpossessive subject of imperialism (emotional, “master-worshipping,” and nonproprietary)—and admiration for colonial conditions of possibility, which turn all able-bodied comers into comparable variations on homo economicus, with or without Anglo-Saxon bona fides. Whereas the racialized and presumably static Irishman of An Autobiography is “little bound by the love of truth” (46), the upwardly mobile Irishman of North America “take[s] no more than he earns” but takes his earnings “without thanks.” The result is a provoking indeterminacy. Trollope’s travel writings attempt to root Englishness in blood and language rather than place, imagining an Anglo-Saxon mastery of space and time independent of British political sovereignty or the cultivation of English institutions on colonial soil. But the vision of an Irish homo economicus threatens to dissolve such transportable roots. Trollope declares himself “fond of Irish beggars,” but in the United States “men and women do not beg” (600). The ground of this new-model possessive individual is neither blood nor place but mere ownership of property, including ownership of one’s own self and labor.

This tendency for settlers to appear as proprietary monads and rootless cosmopolitans counters the comforting notion of an essentialized and portable Anglo-Saxon identity. At such moments, Trollopian cosmopolitanism does not so much spatially scatter as stumble over the patent falseness of the moralized expropriation for which Anglo-Saxonness stands. Thus, for all Trollope’s enthusiasm for propertarian manhood, the closing paragraphs of North America, much like the Barsetshire novels, suggest an author deeply invested in a hierarchical society in which property is a privilege and proximity to “affectionate” colonial subjects one of its prequisites. What the United States ultimately produces is not the rooted Anglo-Saxon settler of the Greater British imaginary but, rather, Cosmopolitan Man at his most deracinated. North America’s halting valorization of homo economicus ends with a question mark (601)—as though to admit that Greater Britain may have its limits.

Striking though such ambivalence is, it is the inevitable result of Trollope’s two-part foreign policy. As both Chronicler of Barsetshire and Colonial Man, Trollope could, on balance, reassure his middle-class readers. The Trollopian play of rootedness and cosmopolitanism articulates a basic geopolitical relation between Britain and its settler colonies that reproduces England’s exceptional global status. Whereas the seemingly limitless resources of the colony enable possessive individuals to propagate, Barsetshire’s limited but richly cultivated supply requires venerated establishments to conserve a shared sovereign history. This Trollopian writing of foreign policy underwrites the uneven developments of a global economy, creating productive tension between the rootedness of an “old country” and the cosmopolitanism of its expanding frontier (Australia 745). The prosperous nineteenth-century reader, putting down Macmillan’s and picking up Trollope, perceives that as a global vanguard, England’s
heirloom social hierarchy produces genteel governing classes unique to its soil, even as its settler colonies cultivate more democratic versions of Anglo-Saxon, or even Celtic, virtue. It is an exquisitely flexible construction, yet one that requires readiness to affirm a Barsetshire-like English gentry, ethico-culturally equipped to carry on the “noblest work.”

Trollope’s deepening pessimism about England in the 1870s is often explained as the direct effect of his growing admiration for the settler colony—for example, The Way We Live Now has been described as a “sequel to the glowing” portrayal “of the new settler society arising in the Antipodes” (Davidson 306–07; cf. Sutherland vii; Buzard 50). But it seems equally important to note that the zealous endorsement of colonialism in Australia and New Zealand was written after the last Barsetshire novel in 1867, in which Septimus Harding is buried “in the cathedral which he had loved so well” (Last Chronicle 862). The scene of The Eustace Diamonds (written before the author’s 1871 departure for Australia but published in 1873), The Way We Live Now (1875), and The Prime Minister (1876) is the London metropolis, a growing center of global finance and imperial policy. Thus, the 1870s saw Trollope ceasing to write about “the dear country” he knew so well and instead writing novels in which the forces of capitalist expansion visibly transmogrify the English metropole (Autobiography 101). What does such “reverse colonization” suggest about the play of rootedness and cosmopolitanism that, in the Barsetshire decades, had sustained far-reaching expansion without compromising England’s hallowed domain? As England’s heirloom sovereignty melts into air, Trollope’s works cease to articulate an intelligible foreign policy discourse, and “cosmopolitanism” emerges as a racialized signifier of non-Englishness.

“A Race of Gentlemen”

Trollope’s Barsetshire novels figure an England imbued with a still-palpable ethico-cultural richness in which the heirs of the past continue meaningfully to signify “more truly than any written history can do, how Englishmen have become what they are” (Doctor 12). By contrast, his global capitalist novels of the 1870s are sites of breached sovereignty and spatiotemporal annihilation; they portray a disenchanted modernity in which Hobbesian combatants struggle to wrest money and power from the all-but-substanceless flow of capital and commodities, an “apparent chaos” that is metonymically expressed in the Tenway Junction (Prime Minister 517). With fraudulent ladies like Lizzie Eustace, cads like Sir Felix Carbury, and would-be leaders like Plantagenet Palliser demoralized by corruption, it is no wonder that England’s social hierarchy has ceased to figure substantive holism as it did in The Warden. Nor is it surprising to find England’s hereditary ruling class borrowing racial discourse from Colonial Man to shore up increasingly feeble claims to ethico-cultural authority. Thus, when “cosmopolitanism” returns to England it does so as a discourse of blood without roots, capitalism’s blood—the blood of Jews.

“What’s the use of money you can see?” says Ferdinand Lopez to Sexty Parker, the partner he coolly ruins (Prime Minister 401). As one who is “too cosmopolitan” (141), Lopez not only traffics in surreal commodities such as South American guano, New Zealand kauri gum, and African “Bios,” he does so, as Parker’s unhappy wife protests, without any “money to pay for [them]” (399). Such desire to “get rich” (400) without “hard work,” she declares, “ain’t what [she] call[s] manly” (404). In saying so she provides a potential antithesis between London’s speculative global economy and the settler colony’s productive labor. Yet, while Mrs. Parker knows that an ambitious bachelor might “go to the Colonies” much as Trollope’s son Frederic went to Australia, The Prime Minister is not a novel in which Greater Britain revitalizes an ailing metropole (400). To the contrary, the City is the site of colo-
nial blowback, as though the exportation of acquisitive settlers has returned in the un-English speculation of Lopez and Augustus Melmote (cf. Cotsell 253). Trollope's novels thus seek to isolate the pernicious effects of capitalist globalization in the figure of the Jew, that archetypal foreigner whose organic relation to the "growing cosmopolitanism of capital" seemed obvious even to a high-minded anti-imperialist such as J. A. Hobson (51).²⁸

John Fletcher’s description of Lopez as "too cosmopolitan,” a man “whitewashed of all prejudices,” who, like a North American settler, “never had an association in his life” (Prime Minister 141), is, from this view, a sally against the capitalist disruptions the novel aims imaginatively to redress.²⁹ John's brother Arthur is not merely a gentleman on the model of Grantly, Harding, or Josiah Crawley but also "the very pearl of the Fletcher tribe" (125), his fair Anglo-Saxon features repeatedly contrasted to those of Lopez, a “swarthy son of Judah” (35). As Audrey Jaffe notes, “Trollope makes it the business of his novels to delineate the distinctions in feeling that separate the gentleman from the non-gentlemen” (49). Yet it is not enough that Lopez be a rootless, disaffected homo economicus. In The Prime Minister, Lopez's nongenity must somehow go all the way down, beyond cosmopolitan lack. The novel thus affirms racial essence even as the author who narrates it shows his continuing awareness that race is often an alibi for the deceits of capitalist modernity.³⁰

Lopez’s constitutive ambiguity—is he a born scoundrel or just a garden-variety blackguard, and is either characterization determined by Jewish blood?—enables a novel that operates as both critique of and pretext for capitalist globalization. It is notable, then, that the world at large is less prone to demonize Lopez than are the members of "the Wharton and Fletcher families," that tight-knit "tribe," more exclusive in many ways than the highly public Pallisers, who have insisted on his racial otherness from the start (531). For all Trollope’s belief that Englishness is a “race,” the narrator distances himself from the novel’s racists, leaving the impression of an author who knows that racial pride is no match for Harding’s ethics or even Grantly’s zealous partisanship. Ironically, the closer Trollope comes to visualizing England’s social structure in terms of blood, not place—the language of portable, not historical, roots—the more he seems to realize that capitalism’s contradictions are untenable and require the production of scapegoats.

Lopez’s fate is to be "knocked into bloody atoms" at a descent in the Tenway Junction created "for certain purposes of traffic" (520, 519)—a spatial figure in which hell and capitalist modernity are brilliantly collapsed. To this grim fate he descends with "gentle, and apparently unhurried steps" (520), as if the novel, having imagined Lopez’s racialized nongenity as an alibi, is eager to vindicate his manners after all. Race, for all its provoking indeterminacy, has come to pervade the metropolitan imaginary as it never did Barsetshire’s. England’s sovereignty is ineradicably breached: the unanticipated triumph of "routes" over "roots" (Gilroy), colonial cosmopolitanism over heirloom "footing"; the end of a two-part Trollopian foreign policy.

As an actually existing cosmopolitanism expressive of nineteenth-century ambivalence toward capitalism and imperialism, Trollopian foreign policy underscores the challenges of ethical goals today. Although Trollope’s play of rootedness and cosmopolitanism fails as moral or political imaginary, it offers an aesthetic rendering of mid-nineteenth-century globalization that resonates with our own concerns.³¹ Racial and other esssentials, as well as the individualist contradictions they mask, are as fundamental to present-day debates over immigration and terrorism as to Colonial Man’s fantasies of limitless sovereignty. If, as Timothy Brennan suggests, the new cosmopolitanisms ought to focus less on juridical conceits and more on equitable “material
conditions," that task is as much one of understanding culture as one of politics narrowly construed (42). An "internationalist ethic or culture" is necessary to spur transnational political movements beyond the monadic actors that consolidated in Trollope's time (Robbins, *Feeling* 17). To be sure, debates over cosmopolitan theory will continue: can the idea be redeemed from its Enlightenment-era exclusivity or is the very premise of an inclusive, emancipatory humanism itself an engine of hierarchy and exclusion? Since the heterogeneity of transnational experience does not in itself ensure justice or democracy, global rhetorics are as susceptible to "foreign policy" today as in the days when patriotic Britons imagined themselves as beacons of world progress and liberty. It is a debate that the mid-Victorian perception of "cosmopolitanism" as a structured effect of globalizing capital can enrich.

4. See also A. Anderson, *Powers* 89–90. Browning's poetry, Keirstead explains, provides not "a blueprint for cosmopolitanism, but rather a warning of its complexity, one that takes on renewed pertinence in a time when crossing borders has supposedly become easier thanks to open markets, cell phones, the Internet, and other technologies promising a more 'connected' world" (430).

5. Trollope's reticence on India is no accident and a subject I explore in forthcoming work. On Trollope and imperialism see Birns; Davidson; Brantlinger, *Rule* 4–8 and *Dark Vanishings* 111–16. I borrow "Chronicler of Barsetshire" from R. H. Super's biography.

6. *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines cosmopolitan as the condition of "belonging to all parts of the world," and the first citation takes capital, not human personality, for its object. The reference is to *The Principles of Political Economy* (1848), in which John Stuart Mill alleged that "capital is becoming more and more cosmopolitan" (588). Marx and Engels describe the "cosmopolitan character [of] production and consumption" in comparable terms (476). For a compact survey of cosmopolitanism's shift from relatively positive usages to the Victorian era's often pejorative meanings, see Goodlad and Wright.

7. I choose "Colonial Man" over Hall's "Imperial Man" as the most applicable term. As Hall recognizes, Trollope was at odds with the New Imperialism of the 1870s: his enthusiasm for British expansion was focused on white settler colonies, not imperial domination of subject people in Asia or Africa.


9. Although the *OED*'s first citation for foreign policy is an 1859 *Saturday Review* article, a more interesting appearance is in Marx's 1853 analysis of Lord Palmerston, who, Marx believed, was "responsible for the whole foreign policy England ha[d] pursued since 1830" (art. 2). See also Trollope, *Lord Palmerston*.

10. Foreign policy in this sense affirmed imperialism as well as the more purely economic forms of expansion that are associated with globalization today. Capitalism's history, as Wood cogently argues, is inseparable from imperialism: although capitalism is generally imagined to operate independently of political and military power, the globalization of capital in actuality relies on extra-economic and, often, imperial forms of domination.

11. E.g., Arnold 464; Martineau 178; Trollope, *Tireless Traveler* 200.

12. On the vision of a federation of white settler colonies, exemplified by Dikke's *Greater Britain* (1868), see Bell.

13. Masson, writing anonymously, was *Macmillan*'s first editor, a seasoned journalist and literary critic.

14. On the confluence between the sovereign nation-state and "the single-point perspective of the autonomous individual," see Lefitin 39.

16. Drafted in the 1850s and published in 1971, *The New Zealander* is not a travel account but a series of essays on the condition of England. For a reading that emphasizes Trollope’s turn away from such strident critique in favor of the temperate Barsetshire novels, see Goodlad, ch. 4.

17. On Trollope’s efforts to “define an honest understanding of ownership” in *The Justine Diamonds*, see A. Miller 163; on Trollopean honesty, see Kucich, ch. 1; on Trollope and the law, see Cunningham.

18. For an earlier version of the metaphor, see *New Zealander* 49.

19. I borrow “cathedral sublimities” from Gilmour’s introduction to *The Warden* (xxvii). According to arRoberts, the “more flexible morality” Trollope sought is determined by “ethical ends” (52). On the importance of music in articulating the Warden’s transfigurative ethics, see Hawkin; on his “exemplary instance of performative self-determination,” see Earle 23.

20. For a contrast between Lockean and Burkean notions of property, to which I am indebted, see Goh 164–68. For a reading of the heirloom in *The Eustace Diamonds*, see Psmiadis. Ilana Blumberg’s articulation of “mutual benefit” tallies with my reading up to a point (520). Although Blumberg rightly argues that Harding’s act exemplifies “collective benefit” rather than conventional self-sacrifice, she does not note *The Warden’s* striving for a noneconomic conception of ownership.

21. On such views as proliferated through racist anthropology, see Ellington 248–62 and Stocking 248–54.

22. Trollope’s racialization of Irishness took another form, expressive of colonial paternalism. By contrast, his comparative disinclination toward imperial expansion in South Asia and Africa stemmed from an antipaternalistic but also racialized reluctance to see Britain undertake “extended dominion over black subjects” (Tireless Traveler 200). While Trollope consistently imagines a racial hierarchy, the geopolitical particularities of particular foreign policies explain his oscillation between racial intermixture and racial extinction, colonial paternalism and antipaternalism.

23. On Trollope’s residence in Ireland in the 1840s and 1850s, during which he launched his literary career, see *Autobiography*, ch. 4, which describes the Irish as thrifty and intelligent but also “pervasive, irrational, and but little bound by the law of truth” (46). Trollope opposed home rule, a measure that Thines Finn, the Irish MP of the Palliser novels, says he would no more grant to Ireland than he would “allow a son to ruin himself because he asked [him] to” (Prime Minister 104; cf. *Autobiography* 51). Trollope tends to figure the Irish as infantile objects of a caring paternalism (cf. Corbett, ch. 4, and Lonergan).

24. On “portable roots” in relation to Latina women, see Findlay. On the importance of “tangible objects” in constructing a portable “Englishness abroad,” see Plotz 312.

25. Cf. Davidson on the “unwritten code of Barsetshire. . . . In the last analysis a gentleman could be neither imported nor exported” (309). I do not argue that Barsetshire’s discourse of class and nation is innocent of the presumption of Anglo-Saxon racial supremacy (see Langbauer’s case for “the hidden notions of race that underlie *Framley Parsonage*” [113]). Yet, so long as heirloom sovereignty holds, there is no preponderant need for “race” in England (as there is in the colonies where racial discourse forecasts the extinction of indigenous peoples and provides a fantasy of transportable Anglo-Saxon roots). The distinction is important because where “race” appears in the English novels it testifies to a devastating breach of sovereignty—an insidious metropolitan cosmopolitanism.

26. Trollope’s failed bid for Parliament in 1868 is another biographical event adduced to explain the pessimism of the later novels (e.g., Hasperin 111; McMaster 225n1). See Michie for an account of Barsetshire’s end in the light of capitalist developments, Franklin for a Bourdieuan reading of *Last Chronicle*, and Dames for a contrast between Barsetshire’s relatively stable conflicts and those of the Palliser novels (265). As I argue in a forthcoming chapter, Trollope’s dissatisfaction with the emerging New Imperialism, including his racist dislike for Benjamin Disraeli, is yet another key context for the breached sovereignty depicted in the later novels.

27. On the “remarkable frequency” of reverse-colonization narratives “throughout the last decades of the century,” see Arata 625.

28. Hobson identifies Jews as “men of a single and peculiar race, who have behind them many centuries of financial experience” and “are in a unique position to manipulate the policy of nations” (57; cf. 56, 59). For illuminating discussions of “the Jew” in Trollope, see Baumgarten; Chayette 23–42; Dellamora, ch. 4; Freedman, ch. 2; Litvak; Ragussis 236–60.

29. For a comparable usage, see ch. 30 of Trollope’s *The Way We Live Now*, which describes Mervallo’s bogus North American railway, ironically, as “a great cosmopolitan fact” (277).

30. Cf. Langbauer: Jewish questionability “does not indict capitalism (or imperialism, or racism), but provides them all with a convenient scapegoat to blame and punish” (111).

31. Trollope thus instances the kind of “geopolitical aesthetic”—the expression of a “collective effort” to “figure out” the “landscapes and forces” of a global situation—that Fredric Jameson describes with postmodern contexts in mind (3).

32. As Bonnie Honig writes, those who rely on the accelerated mobility and tempo of late modernity “to produce a postnational politics wrongly rely on a mere fact to do the work of politics” (128n23).
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