



University
of Glasgow

Freeman, M. (2001) *Journeys into poverty kingdom: complete participation and the British vagrant, 1866-1914*. History Workshop Journal (52). pp. 99-121. ISSN 1363-3554

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/6316/>

Deposited on: 19 May 2010

‘Journeys into Poverty Kingdom’: Complete Participation and the British Vagrant, 1866-1914

Going in disguise to observe social groups remote from one’s own has a long history. James V of Scotland is only one of many kings renowned in literature and folklore for his exploits mixing ‘amongst the peasantry that he might know their wants, study their character, and delineate their manners’.¹ By the act of divesting himself of his kingly garb, and attiring himself in the clothes and affecting the manners of a peasant, he also discharged himself of the trappings of kingship and made himself accessible to those about whom he wanted to learn. ‘Dressing down’ has been a long-standing theme in both fictional and non-fictional literature, George Orwell’s exploits as a tramp, recounted in *Down and Out in Paris and London*, being perhaps the best known non-fictional example. This article examines some of Orwell’s predecessors in the tradition of going ‘on tramp’, observing the underworld while, temporarily, participating in it. Although in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries British social research was beginning to be organised on a more ‘scientific’ and statistical basis – the development of systematic statistical inquiry was epitomised by the social surveys carried out by Charles Booth, Seebohm Rowntree and Arthur Bowley – a parallel tradition of participant observation continued and, in some respects, developed at the same time; the phrase ‘social exploration’ has been used to describe it.² Although now marginalised by historians of social research, the social explorers of the Edwardian period enjoyed a high profile and some respect within the investigative community. Indeed, although many social groups were susceptible to the statistical inquiry, vagrants and some other groups could not easily, if at all, be brought into its purview; and Anne Crowther has argued that knowledge and understanding of vagrant life was peculiarly dependent on literary and descriptive sources. Vagrancy, ‘more elusive than most social problems’, ‘remained an issue where the creative writer offered as much guidance as a blue book, especially as the basic tools of the reformer – plausible statistics – were lacking’.³

The make-believe vagrants were not creative writers – at least they claimed to give an accurate representation of their tramping experiences – but historians have tended to view their accounts as representative of a journalistic tradition which has much in common with the imaginative literature of the period, or to use them as elements in the analysis of wider discursive contexts. Peter Keating, for example, has positioned James Greenwood and George Sims as non-fictional elements in a tradition of Victorian working-class literature in which ‘the image of the urban explorer’ was the prevailing theme.⁴ Indeed, he explains elsewhere that ‘there is barely an area of nineteenth-century fictional and non-fictional prose, in which the central attitudes and terminology of social exploration do not appear’.⁵ Keating focuses on the imagery rather than the methodology of social exploration, and this has been followed by other historians. Thus Judith Walkowitz, in a recent article on Olive Christian Malvery’s incognito explorations into the slums of London, concentrates on genre rather than method, and contrasts the ‘representational strategies’ employed in the descriptions of native Londoners and Jewish immigrants.⁶ Like a number of other historians who have examined the social exploration genre, Walkowitz contextualises Malvery’s investigations within the imagery of imperial exploration that was frequently drawn upon in the social exploration literature of the period. This informed Malvery’s narrativisation strategy: ‘Like female imperial explorers, [she] represents herself as a figure who wanders through a foreign landscape with no specific program and plan, observes exotic others who exist in an “ethnographic present,” and returns with stories

of her picaresque adventures.’⁷ These narrativisation strategies, it is argued, were employed by Malvery and other authors, notably Jack London, to impose a formal coherence onto their work, while the literary quality of the genre is emphasised at the expense of the sociological value of the investigator’s findings. Naturally, any analysis of this literature will necessarily examine the imposition of the authors’ constructions of themselves and the ‘Others’ they describe onto the style and course of the narrative; and although much of what is revealing about the texts lies in the language used to describe the groups among whom the author claimed to have travelled, there is also a case for situating them in the context of contemporaneous developments in social survey methodology, and hence of sociological understandings of participant observation.

Today participant observation is a highly theorised area of sociological research. Fieldwork methodology is often explained in terms of a fourfold typology of participant observation roles, each involving different degrees of immersion into the situation studied: the complete observer, the observer-as-participant, the participant-as-observer and the complete participant.⁸ The complete participant is not known to be a researcher by any, or at least most, of those under investigation. In this role, as Buford Junker has explained, ‘[t]he field worker is or becomes a complete member of an in-group, thus sharing secret information guarded from outsiders’, often only after a long period of assimilation.⁹ Religious sects and deviant subcultures have been particularly common subjects of complete participant studies. Benetta Jules-Rosette, for example, became a member of an indigenous African church in order to discover more about its organisation and rituals;¹⁰ and in Britain, Bryan R. Wilson penetrated three religious sects through ‘prolonged participation’ in their congregations.¹¹ Neither this nor even Frank Burton’s participant observation study of a Catholic community in Belfast,¹² were strictly complete participation studies; but James Patrick’s *A Glasgow Gang Observed* (1973) was based on the author’s experiences in the city’s criminal underworld in the 1960s, where, unknown to all but one member of the gang, he played as full a part as he ethically could in its life. Similarly, John Rex and Robert Moore, carrying out a detailed study of race relations in Sparkbrook, Birmingham, supplemented their use of official statistics and detailed interviewing by sending a West Indian student into a lodging-house, securing ‘an inside view of West Indian life which we would not otherwise have had’.¹³

The complete participant role is not commonly adopted. Many of the classic participant observation studies, such as William Foote Whyte’s *Street Corner Society* (1943), in fact involved the researcher adopting a participant-as-observer role.¹⁴ The difficulties that stand in the way in terms of the effects on the complete participant’s personal life, the possible dangers he or she may encounter and the barriers to complete assimilation within a particular group are all deterrents to the use of the method, not to mention the ethical considerations involved. The complete participant needs to exhibit characteristics similar to those under investigation, while still maintaining an intellectual distance from them, in order both to participate and to investigate. The tensions between these two objectives can result in the researcher, even as a complete participant, influencing the activities of those with whom he or she consorts, and thereby obtaining an impression distorted by his or her own involvement. Moreover, there is a danger of over-identification with the studied group, which some theorists have argued can compromise the researcher’s neutrality. Hammersley and Atkinson have suggested that the ethnographer, through excessive participation, can develop ‘over-rapport’ with members of observed groups, resulting in the ‘danger of “identifying with” such members’ perspectives, and hence of failing to treat these as problematic’.¹⁵ In this model the researcher is tempted to engage in ‘advocacy’ on the part of the investigated population. This can become particularly

distorting when the research is directed towards some social or political end, for example when linked to social policy research. The dangers of 'advocacy' increase with the intimacy and extent of the researcher's connection with the studied group: James Spradley counsels that 'the more you know about a situation as an ordinary participant, the more difficult it is to study it as an ethnographer'.¹⁶

The difference between most participant observers today and those who are the subject of this article is that today's practitioners are usually based in universities (complete participants have tended to be graduate students) and take their licence to practise, as it were, from their academic status. In the Victorian and Edwardian period, complete participation was generally an activity of investigative journalists, social reformers or charity workers, who wrote accordingly either to earn money, to shape views of social problems in order to influence legislative or other remedies, or to influence patterns of philanthropy. They were not informed by the theoretical framework which has since grown up around qualitative social research; and most published their work first in newspapers or periodicals, and then in book or pamphlet form. Their findings therefore lacked both the legitimacy conferred by academic status and the respectability derived from the detached 'scientific' methods of inquiry employed by Booth and Rowntree. Thus when A. F. Wells, an early historian of the social survey, contrasted the quantitative certainties that could apparently be derived from the survey method with the impressionistic findings to which the 'journalistic method' was limited, he decided, citing Henry Mayhew's studies of *London Labour and the London Poor* as an example, that 'the journalistic method when used by itself is unsafe, even dangerous'.¹⁷ Wells's concern was to legitimate the social survey (chiefly, according to his definition, concerned with 'working-class poverty and with the nature and problems of the community') at the expense of the descriptive method of social inquiry, relegating the latter to a subsidiary genre which might be of value if it happened to reveal the truth about social conditions, but which was essentially a hit-and-miss method requiring verification from other sources.

The Victorian and Edwardian complete participants were not ethnographers in the sense that we might understand the term today: they tended not to draw on the findings of other complete participants and they did not seek to advance or modify any more general sociological or anthropological theory. Anne Crowther suggests that most such accounts of vagrancy 'tended to concentrate less on the vagrants themselves than on the physical conditions in the casual ward': 'the nature of vagrancy is not usually the main issue'.¹⁸ This was partly a function of the tendency of British social research of all kinds in this period to aim (if not necessarily to succeed) at contributing to social policy debates. Edward Shils has pointed out that the early social inquiries in both Britain and America 'confined themselves largely to external economic matters and to publicly observable actions',¹⁹ and although this is not wholly true of the investigators examined in this article, it reflects the close association between research and policy-making. While the academicisation of the sociological discipline has undoubtedly undermined if not broken this association, the Victorian conception of 'social science', as Lawrence Goldman has shown, was 'inextricably linked to the practice of social reform'.²⁰ The history of British sociology, 'generally presented as a history of the academy without reference to a wider social context and to styles of social science that were institutionalized outside formal academic structures', has marginalised groups such as the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science;²¹ it has also marginalised less institutionalised styles of social research that only slowly became incorporated into modern sociological practice. In this context, 'advocacy' was not so neatly separable from 'research' in the Victorian and Edwardian periods as some theorists of practice would like it to be; and this holds true for both systematic 'scientific' and

impressionistic methods of inquiry. The 'journalistic method' was just one of a range of approaches to the investigation of social conditions; and if the poverty surveys of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries can still be considered as ancestors of modern survey methodology, then the complete participant accounts of the social explorers should at least be viewed as precursors in the tradition of participant observation. Indeed, they exhibited many of the same methodological preoccupations and justified the approach in much the same way as have more recent users of the complete participation method. Paul Thompson has even claimed some of them as forerunners of the present-day oral historian.²²

Probably the most celebrated exponent of mid-Victorian complete participation was James Greenwood, the 'Amateur Casual', whose reports on 'A Night in the Workhouse' in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and subsequently reprinted in *The Times* and in pamphlet form, in 1866 sparked an immediate outcry about the treatment of casual paupers.²³ Greenwood spent a night in the casual ward of Lambeth workhouse, dressed as a tramp, and experiencing the conditions at first hand. Cutting 'a sly and ruffianly figure, marked with every sign of squalor', he entered the ward, pretending to be an out-of-work engraver, and was fed, bathed and put to bed in a large room where about thirty vagrants were asleep on beds of hay. Among the horrors he experienced was a large patch of blood on the bed in which he was to sleep, the offensive language of many of his fellow inmates, and the foul 'toke' (bread) and 'skilly' (oatmeal porridge) that was served. In the morning he and the others had to complete the work task that was demanded of those who used the casual ward – in this case grinding corn, but elsewhere often breaking stones or picking oakum – and were not allowed to leave until eleven o'clock in the morning. There was an extraordinary reaction to Greenwood's articles. He gained the status of a hero – one commentator remarked that he deserved the Victoria Cross – and his journalistic career rapidly took off. His Lambeth exploits were immediately followed by a female equivalent. J. H. Stallard, a medical reformer, sent a working-class woman, 'Ellen Stanley', to visit various metropolitan casual wards, and the published reports told much the same story as Greenwood's, confirming the poor sanitation and moral depravity that Greenwood had identified.²⁴ In the 1880s, as Rachel Vorse has pointed out, there was a 'resurgence of middle-class vagrant impersonators', as well as inquiries carried out by men like F. G. Wallace-Goodbody, working-class investigators who also explored the tramp world.²⁵ For example, in 1887 C. W. Craven of Keighley published an account of a disguised visit to his local casual ward, having had 'a desire for a long time to obtain an insight into the vicissitudes of a vagrant's life'.²⁶

However, it was in the 1890s and, especially, the 1900s that the spotlight was thrown most fiercely onto the tramping class. Tramps were the subject of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy, which reported in 1906, and were one of the many social groups considered by the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress; but for much of its information on the life of vagrants the public still relied on the heirs of the 'Amateur Casual' who ventured incognito into the 'abyss'. Perhaps the best known of these was Jack London, whose *The People of the Abyss* is one of the few books of this type still in print. London, already a well-known American novelist, visited Britain in the summer of 1902 at the age of twenty-six and arrived at the intention of 'sinking [him]self down' into the East End, 'that human wilderness of which nobody [in London] seemed to know anything'.²⁷ With the assistance and protection of a private detective, 'Johnny Upright', he took lodgings in 'the most respectable street in the East End',²⁸ in which he based himself during his various excursions among the local people. Dressed in a stoker's singlet, into which he sewed a sovereign for use in an emergency, he found himself able to interact with a

variety of tramps, casual workers, and East Enders who, accompanied by him, travelled from the metropolis to Kent to pick hops in the summer months. He gave particularly vivid descriptions of a night in the workhouse casual ward, or 'spike', and a night 'carrying the banner', in other words spending all night outdoors, and subsequently eating breakfast in a Salvation Army 'peg'.²⁹

Another American, Josiah Flynt,³⁰ who spent years tramping in his own country and had also tramped through Germany, visited Britain in 1892 and 1893, travelling to York, Newcastle, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Liverpool and Dublin with a German friend. Flynt claimed that his 'purpose in seeking them [tramps] out was to learn about their life; and I soon saw that, to know it well, I must become joined to it and be part and parcel of its various manifestations.'³¹ Similarly, in the late 1890s Robert Sherard, who also investigated the conditions of factory and domestic workers in the Black Country, travelled around twelve British provincial towns, staying in lodging-houses and meeting their inmates: these encounters he published as *The Cry of the Poor* (1901). Some years later, another explorer, Everard Wyrall, also set out with the intention of interacting with tramps and experiencing the conditions in which they lived, dressing up in dilapidated clothes, visiting the Embankment and experiencing some of the casual wards on the London tramps' circuit. His experiences were described in a pamphlet entitled simply *The Spike*, which appeared in 1910. The same year saw the publication of Denis Crane's *A Vicarious Vagabond*, stories of the journalist's disguised exploits tramping in London, selling matches in the streets, working as a casual porter at King's Cross station, and sleeping in casual wards and Salvation Army night shelters.³²

While these men were going 'on tramp', two women, one in Oldham and one in London, and both friends of W. T. Stead, were doing the same. Mary Higgs,³³ born in 1854, was the Cambridge-educated wife of a Congregationalist pastor in Oldham, where she involved herself in social work, especially workhouse visiting; and she was known for taking destitute women into her house to talk to them. In 1903 she and a friend travelled to various lodging houses and casual wards; and during the following years she made a total of six visits to night shelters and casual wards, her collected experiences being published as *Glimpses into the Abyss* (1906). Much of her work reached a wide audience in the *Daily Mail*. She drew on these experiences as a witness before the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy; and later became secretary of the northern branch of the National Association for Women's Lodging Houses. Higgs was unusually old to embark on adventures like this, being in her early fifties when she started; but she lived on until 1937, receiving an OBE in that year. Olive Malvery was born in India and moved to London to study music, becoming a successful concert singer; she regularly sang for charity, and worked at a girls' club in Lambeth. She and her husband, Archibald MacKirdy, were active members of the Salvation Army, and established the MacKirdy Hostel in Great Titchfield Street, London. Malvery's experience of working-class and tramp life was wider and deeper than almost anyone's. At first, using her own skills, she tried street singing, and later worked with coster girls, in shops, in factories, as well as with sweated female home-workers, and also spent time on the Embankment and elsewhere with female tramps, describing these 'journeys into Poverty Kingdom'³⁴ firstly in a series in *Pearson's Magazine* in 1904 and then in *The Soul Market* (1906).³⁵

These explorers were all convinced that the act of disguising themselves gave them an advantage over those who viewed working-class life from the outside. Malvery explained that among 'the labouring and poor classes, an outsider is very quickly recognised',³⁶ and likely to be mistrusted; and dressing up and living as a coster girl was the only way 'to know them and understand them'.³⁷ Sherard's journey was 'subterranean throughout, and, except on very few occasions, I travelled

as a pariah, lived in the lodgings, and fed on the food of the pariahs, dressed as a pariah, shared in their coarse pleasures, and, generally speaking, identified myself with them altogether. In no other way could I have obtained the information of which I was in quest.³⁸ The successful incognito explorer would be told things that were unlikely to be disclosed to an observer who outwardly came from a different class. Crane knew that the poor 'detest being questioned ... [b]ut study them in their unguarded hours ... and you will soon learn all it is essential to know'.³⁹ London claimed that during his experiences, the inevitable air of patronage, that the middle-class observer carried and the working classes exploited, was effaced:

For the first time, I met the English lower classes face to face, and knew them for what they were. When loungers and workmen, at street corners and in public-houses, talked with me, they talked as one man to another, and they talked as natural men should talk, without the least idea of getting anything out of me for what they talked or the way they talked.⁴⁰

The value of the incognito approach was illustrated by what happened when it failed. On the way to Poplar workhouse, London met two old men, a carter and a carpenter, who spent most of the journey telling him about the work required and the quality of the 'skilly' in various casual wards (all the while openly eating pieces of discarded fruit they picked up from the pavement). When they failed to gain admittance to the workhouse, London was forced to resort to the gold sovereign sewn into his stoker's singlet, and hence had to explain the real reason for his presence. The result was that 'at once they shut up like clams. I was not of their kind; my speech had changed, the tones of my voice were different, in short, I was a superior, and they were superbly class conscious.'⁴¹ The relationship between researcher and researched had changed; London was now an external questioner rather than a partaker in their life, an observer-as-participant rather than a complete participant.

When the method succeeded, much could be learned. Higgs found that it was impossible to spend two days and nights with women under the difficult circumstance of a tramp ward 'without eliciting confidence'.⁴² She claimed to have come to know the inmates of the casual ward 'intimately', and that she 'extracted much information and confirmation of personal histories and social conditions'.⁴³ In tramp wards and lodging houses, most of the inmates had a personal story, and were probably willing and eager to tell it, and thus many life stories were related to investigators like Flynt and London, who had fabricated a complicated but apparently credible story of his own. Some striking insights were gained. Craven, for example, talked to a tramp in Keighley casual ward who told him that he never went out on Sundays because all the respectable inhabitants were about, and he did not like the way they shunned him.⁴⁴ Both Higgs and London pointed out that a spell in prison was not considered unattractive by the poor compared with the unpleasantness of the 'spike', the lodging house or the open road.⁴⁵ When working in a fancy-box factory Malvery heard many girls complaining of the favouritism and injustice of the foremen and managers who supervised them;⁴⁶ and elsewhere she discovered that both factory and home workers despised the inspectors who were ostensibly there for their own benefit, and colluded with their employers in 'hoodwinking the inspectors, and in breaking the law also'.⁴⁷

All those who attempted complete participation admitted to having found the venture difficult. Most stood out in one way or another: Flynt because of his too obviously American-style hat,⁴⁸ and London because of his American accent (he was also taller and better-nourished than most East Enders);⁴⁹ while Wyrall, it appears, was simply no master of disguise, was therefore forever arousing suspicion, and was once discharged from a casual ward because, so he believed, the officials realised who

he was.⁵⁰ If clothing was easy to change, an accent was not; and Wyrall found that one young boy whom he addressed was very puzzled at the apparent contradiction between his ragged clothing and educated voice.⁵¹ Higgs remarked on the strangeness of her own educated speech, but noted that several other female casuals spoke similarly; however, she did arouse curiosity when she played on a lodging-house piano.⁵² Some found it difficult to reconcile their own middle-class outlook with the necessities of disguise. Thus Higgs and her companion met a drunken prostitute whom they wished to save, but as Higgs explained rather comically, '[w]e were now going to make a struggle for this girl's salvation, but it was very difficult to do so without exciting suspicion.'⁵³ Malvery once nearly gave her disguise away 'by advocating more air' to a coster girl whose husband was consumptive: 'The one thing the poor will not tolerate in their dwelling-rooms is fresh air.'⁵⁴ In a Plymouth lodging house, Sherard was suspected of being a detective, and therefore treated with reserve, this reserve only receding when it was rumoured that he was 'lag' just released from Dartmoor, and thereafter treated more sympathetically!⁵⁵ Any display of excessive curiosity, any unwitting exhibition of characteristics that were unusual or inappropriate, and the explorer could be discovered. Moreover, the explorer rarely travelled alone. Greenwood was accompanied by his friend Bittlestone; London had the support of 'Johnny Upright'; Malvery was advised by the ever-present but shadowy 'Mr. C.'; Wyrall, when visiting one particularly notorious 'spike', took a friend with him;⁵⁶ and Mary Higgs always travelled with a companion, except on one occasion when she could find nobody to accompany her, and arranged instead to be shadowed by a plain-clothed policeman.⁵⁷ The 'abyss' was not the investigators' own territory, and some sort of assistance was usually needed in order to penetrate it effectively and safely.

It was rarely penetrated for long periods at a time. Greenwood and Craven based pamphlets on one night in a workhouse; London only 'sall[ied] forth' among the tramps, staying at other times in the lodgings procured for him by 'Johnny Upright';⁵⁸ and Higgs did stints of one night, three nights and five nights. Of these investigators, only Malvery actually took lodgings as a poor woman with poor people for lengthy periods at a time; this was naturally less uncomfortable than spending several nights in succession in casual wards or doss-houses. Her trips to the Embankment to meet the poorest of the poor – where, on one occasion, she claimed to have saved a girl from committing suicide⁵⁹ – were infrequent and brief; and only once did she record spending a night in the 'spike'.⁶⁰ Conditions were simply too bad for incognito investigators to risk their health over long periods. As it was, the food was so bad in casual wards that few of them actually ate it: Greenwood gave his 'toke' away, and London could only stomach half a dozen mouthfuls of the bread and 'skilly' on offer in the Whitechapel 'spike' for dinner, and at breakfast he ate nothing at all.⁶¹ The dry workhouse bread tended to make those unused to it, or not in such a condition of hunger as to be desperate to eat it, uncomfortably thirsty.⁶² Both Malvery and Higgs ate Plasman biscuits to keep their strength up during their adventures, and Malvery also carried meat lozenges.⁶³ Crane, in his outdoor explorations, wore two layers of underclothes for warmth, in contrast to his vagrant companions, who wore only a layer of brown paper.⁶⁴ None, then, really experienced tramp life as the tramp did. They really only had 'glimpses into the abyss', even if, like Greenwood, Malvery and Crane, they kept on going back for more; and the brevity of this interaction meant that a leap of imagination was required if they were to attempt to describe the longer-term effects of tramp life on those who actually lived it.

Nevertheless, it was, arguably, and with some mastery of the required disguise, relatively easy to make friends quickly in the 'abyss'. In a modern context,

Danny L. Jorgensen has explained that '[a]lthough researchers tend to worry about gaining access to hidden or secretive phenomena, such as ... deviance, or criminality, it generally is more difficult to gain access to the backstage regions of otherwise public and frontstage settings'.⁶⁵ Thus it might be argued that, to those willing to become participants, tramp life was accessible compared with the relatively closed domestic life of the urban working classes. Men like F. W. Head, Reginald Bray and Charles Masterman, who attempted participant observation studies of the 'respectable' working classes of South London, found significant barriers to entry;⁶⁶ and the experience of work or home life among the poor required a longer-term and more dedicated spell of participant observation. Masterman explained that, in the working-class district in which he lived, '[t]here is no speech or language, no manifest human intercourse', and that 'next-door neighbours are strangers to each other; in the midst of this human hive many walk solitary'.⁶⁷ By contrast, Flynt pointed out that '[o]ne of the first noticeable features of low life is its gregariousness';⁶⁸ and Crane identified a 'freemasonry of want' among the 'outcasts' with whom he consorted.⁶⁹ Tramps were often talkative, and there were many occasions in a their life at which a conversation might be struck up. Queuing, which the casual had to do frequently in the course of obtaining food or shelter, was a favourite, whether it was London in line at the 'spike', Wyrall in the doss-house queue or Craven waiting for breakfast.⁷⁰ Drinking was another: Higgs, despite her disapproval of alcoholic excess, found that drink made at least one woman very talkative, and as a result learnt a life story she may otherwise not have heard.⁷¹ The squalid conditions were a shared subject of contention; and after a few nights in workhouses or lodging houses, investigators had their own experiences, and were able to swap reminiscences of different 'spikes' with other tramps, adding to the credibility of their pretence.⁷²

As part of the experience, the social explorer joined the 'freemasonry of want', even while remaining conscious of his or her role as an investigator and alert to opportunities of discussing the subjects on which he or she wanted to gain information. Indeed, they often suggested in their accounts that their own personalities had undergone a temporary but significant change. Keating has argued that '[t]he use of disguise did not bring with it a corresponding change in personality, the transformation was largely external';⁷³ however, in their accounts they often claimed to have experienced the feelings of the tramp. Wyrall, for example, almost as soon as he had donned his tramp's clothes, found himself shunned by passers-by in the street, and learned 'how deeply one can be made to feel poverty', feeling an overwhelming desire to hide himself away.⁷⁴ Similarly, Higgs, walking past a barge from which leering men beckoned at her, recalled that she 'could not help contrasting the way in which men looked at us with the usual bearing of a man towards a *well-dressed* female ... The bold, free look of a man at a destitute woman must be felt to be realised.'⁷⁵ Crane, too, felt that he was doing more than simply donning old clothes: he claimed that 'during these days among the poor I not only played, but experienced, my part', feeling in his casual ward cell (this workhouse detained vagrants in solitary confinement) that he 'could not shake off the conviction that [he] had committed some horrible crime and was awaiting trial or death'.⁷⁶ Lines like these enhanced the literary qualities of the accounts, but they also suggest that the investigator came in some way, even if only or primarily for literary purposes, to identify with the class he or she was studying.

With this identification came, in some cases, a tendency to write from the point of view of the investigated group. It is, naturally, hard to assess how far the widely varying remedies they suggested were directly or indirectly affected by the experiences described; however, the sympathy that the contact with tramps bred in the investigator sometimes spilled over into 'advocacy'. London and Crane, in particular,

presented themselves on occasions as spokesmen for the classes with whom they consorted. Thus Crane argued that ‘sociological students’, concerned to understand more about working-class and vagrant life, approached it from the wrong direction: ‘Their knowledge is at best that of the onlooker (who in this case does *not* see most of the game); something vastly, incredibly different from the poignant knowledge of the victim.’⁷⁷ Crane, on becoming temporarily a part of this ‘victim’ group, felt that he was in a position to represent them. Writing, supposedly, at 3 a.m. in a Church Army shelter when all his fellow inmates were asleep (whether this was literally true or a literary device we cannot tell, but it does not really matter: it gives the account a sense of immediacy and reinforces the author’s identification with his companions), he addressed his readers in these terms:

We are used to hardness and damp. Indeed, by armchair critics we are supposed to like them, or at any rate to prefer them to their contraries earned by labour. “The homeless,” “the destitute,” “the unfortunate,” “the ne’er-do-wells,” “the work-shy,” “the Weary Willies” – these are our popular patronymics, according to the depth of your ignorance or the playfulness of your humour. Some people think they have solved a problem when they have given it a name, but reform is more than nomenclature.⁷⁸

This ‘we’/‘you’ antagonism reinforces the sense that the author, because he has ‘been there’,⁷⁹ knows more than the reader (the ‘sociological student’), who has not ‘been there’ but has merely played the part of an ‘armchair critic’. The conclusion Crane drew from all this was expressed in a sharp rebuke to those who framed legislation and distributed charity, who he claimed ‘minister not to the real wants of the person concerned ... but to what, according to their own standards of life, *ought* to be his wants. No method of relief can be permanently successful nor even long tolerable that does not take into account what the recipient himself thinks and feels.’⁸⁰

Having said this, other investigators who adopted the same complete participant role came to markedly less sympathetic conclusions. Flynt, for example, who had probably the widest experience of tramp life of any of these investigators, argued that a more punitive attitude to vagrants was essential, and their spirit needed to be crushed before they could be helped. The punishment for begging was too lenient: Flynt thought the professional beggar should be locked up indefinitely.⁸¹ Crane himself, sympathetic though he was to the casual match-seller, the station tout or the honest unemployed labourer, had no time for the ‘downright’, who begged without even the small pretence of selling anything, and was in ninety percent of cases a ‘downright fraud’: ‘a pest that needs to be exterminated’.⁸² Greenwood contrasted the industrious men in the casual ward with those who were disinclined to work, used repellent language and gave clear verbal evidence of being habitually involved in crime. Some of these juxtapositions echo the long-standing and pervasive ‘deserving’/‘undeserving’ distinctions that characterised much philanthropic work and many legislative remedies for pauperism and poverty; others, however, reflect the claim of the incognito investigator that only through close personal contact with the poor could the subtleties of the social and moral divisions within the apparently homogenous mass be fully understood.⁸³ Whether condemnatory or sympathetic, the concern of the incognito investigator was to show that he or she, unlike the reader, had ‘been there’, had seen the conditions personally, and was therefore in a better position to suggest remedies. These people signalled themselves as the fortunate few who had obtained special access to the life of the vagrant class, and on this claim they based their authority as spokespersons.

They were also exploiting a popular infatuation with the exotic, or the 'attraction of repulsion', as Dickens called it:⁸⁴ an attraction intensified because of the geographical nearness of the exotic group. In modern parlance, they were ethnographers in a domestic setting; and as Bruce L. Berg has suggested, 'there is something romantic and exciting about the image of an ethnographer spending time with potentially dangerous people, in interesting, albeit grimy, bars, gambling houses, and after-hours spots'.⁸⁵ Swap the bar and gambling-house for the casual ward or the lodging house, and the same applies to the Edwardian social explorer. Dressing up as a tramp was a dramatic act; thus London's and Wyrall's narratives began by telling the story of the actual shedding of the middle-class clothing and the early stages of the experience, when the transition was still novel and the success of the venture still in question. The authors usually spent some time describing their encounters with figures of authority – would Greenwood be discovered when he told the workhouse clerk that he was an out-of-work engraver? would London be allowed to leave the Salvation Army 'peg' after breakfast without staying for the compulsory religious service?⁸⁶ – and with fellow tramps, who treated them as one of their own for as long as the deceit was maintained. The emphasis on the quality of their deceit and the risks they ran enhanced the authority of their findings.

These findings were presented in such a way as to emphasise the alienness of the 'abyss': prostitution, incest, filth, squalor, violence and ignorance seem to have been the norm among those they investigated. It was standard practice (in these and in non-participant accounts) to include a line like the one Greenwood used to conclude his account of Lambeth workhouse – 'I have avoided the detail of horrors infinitely more revolting than anything that appears [here]'⁸⁷ – to suggest that far more might have been disclosed had the authors not been aware of the sensibilities of their readers. Instances of the depths of the degradation to which many of those under investigation had plummeted were common. London was shown Spitalfields Garden, where women would 'sell themselves for thru'pence, or tu'pence, or a loaf of stale bread';⁸⁸ in the 'worst street in London' Malvery found the inhabitants openly admitted to being thieves;⁸⁹ and Higgs heard that the northern prostitutes did not mind going to hospital or prison, as it gave them a rest for a while: 'Here, then, was womanhood devoid of fear! Social restraints had vanished – as with the tramp, so with the harlot!'⁹⁰ Stories of people eating pieces of food from pavement or dustbins, men and women swearing habitually, verminous sleeping quarters in the 'spike', the brutality of workhouse taskmasters and sometimes of passers-by: all these were calculated to arouse shock, pity and anger in the readers.

The complete participant method was, naturally, open to the charge of inaccuracy – the narratives were written from memory, usually uncorroborated and in some cases undoubtedly embellished – and to the accusation that the scenes described were unrepresentative. Vorspan thinks it 'unlikely' that they were representative of the usual casual ward regime, arguing that investigators might have deliberately visited notorious workhouses;⁹¹ and this is partly corroborated by Wyrall's admission that one (but only one) of the three 'spikes' he used was deliberately chosen for its notoriety.⁹² However, Jack London, according to his own account, only managed to gain entry to the third 'spike' at which he queued, and generally followed those tramps with whom he fell in on the road, suggesting a less deliberate and organised strategy. Moreover, many observations are common to most of the accounts, suggesting that wherever the explorer ventured some of the same experiences were to be had. For example, the quietness or silence of crowds of poor people, especially outdoors, on the Embankment or in London's parks, and at mealtimes in institutions, was regularly noticed.⁹³ The poor quality of workhouse food was another recurring theme,⁹⁴ as was the coarseness of the language heard.⁹⁵ Greenwood, London and

Crane all commented on the coughs, sneezes, snoring, shrieks and yells coming from their fellow inmates during the night.⁹⁶ That the method was impressionistic and anecdotal is undeniable, but this did not necessarily make the accounts less valuable. At very least, they conveyed the general tenor of the life of the underworld to a readership that was largely ignorant of it.

Although predominant in complete participant accounts of the period, tramps were not the only social group and the casual ward not the only place investigated in this way. A variety of other investigators adopted the role. For example, Richard Jefferies, whose two-volume *Hodge and His Masters* (1880) described in great detail the life of the south-western English rural population, disguised himself and travelled around twelve different counties talking to members of the farming and labouring classes. One of his many admirers explained:

As [Jefferies] had perfect command of the broad Wiltshire dialect, and a close acquaintance with the details of country life, it was easy for him, with a change of dress, to be taken for some kind of superior labourer himself, and so hear and gather the intimate opinions of these men. What seems to have impressed his mind was the gusto with which they would dwell on the coming day when it would fall to their lot to plough up this and the other gentleman's "bloody park" ... The incident shows how futile it is to hope to gain any just idea of the rustic's thoughts by means of formal interrogation. Often the awkward clown who scratches his head, and, before a questioner, seems the picture of stupidity, is glib enough among his own cronies.⁹⁷

Jefferies's example was followed in 1913 by 'Christopher Holdenby', a fruit farmer who dressed up as an agricultural labourer, and described his experiences in *Folk of the Furrow* (1913). Urban investigators used participant observation, and sometimes complete participation, as well. In one of the best known passages of *Life and Labour of the People in London*, Charles Booth described the three short periods he had spent as a lodger in a working-class street, in an attempt to adjudge the happiness of the classes he interacted with. These experiences supplied him with illustrative material that he hoped would help to 'make the dry bones [of his statistical survey] live'.⁹⁸ Similarly, Beatrice Webb, when investigating the tailoring trades for the Industry series of *Life and Labour*, took employment as a 'plain trouser hand' in a number of workshops. and to produce a literary account of the experience.⁹⁹ Her 'Pages from a Work-Girl's Diary' addressed many of the themes that appear in other participant accounts. She felt herself an 'impostor' when looking for work, and was unable to affect a working-class accent; and her poor performance at the tailoring work marked her out from the other employees.¹⁰⁰ She did manage to gain the sympathy and confidence of her fellow workers: on one occasion she would have only a cup of tea and a bun for her dinner, which was indicative of 'great poverty'.¹⁰¹ Webb never forgot she was an investigator, however: she pointed out that her experiences enabled her to verify the material she had collected elsewhere using other methods.¹⁰²

It is easy to describe the influence of Booth and Webb on the later development of social survey methodology; by contrast, it is much more difficult to trace a line of descent between the inquiries made by the incognito social explorers and the participant observation studies of later years. Sidelined in interwar Britain by an academic sociological establishment which set much greater value on the quantitative social survey than on the impressionistic account, participant observation as a sociological technique developed more quickly, and was theorised more completely, in the United States. In Britain, the early heirs to the participant observation tradition were men like Orwell and Hugh Massingham rather than academic sociologists and

anthropologists. The most notable participant observation study of unemployment in Britain between the wars was carried out in Greenwich by an American, E. Wight Bakke of Yale University, who ‘determined ... to take lodgings with a working-class family ... to join in their activities or loaf on the streets or at the factory gates as the occasion might require’, and so on.¹⁰³ Although ‘community studies’ often made some use of participant observation, the tradition was revived in an academic setting in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, influenced by developments in the USA. The technique had been sufficiently transformed – and academicised – that it is impossible to trace direct links between the journalistic pioneers of complete participation and the studies carried out in the mid- to late-twentieth century. Nevertheless, many similarities can be discerned. Flynt, according to one admirer, ‘had a profound contempt for ... [t]he confessions of the vagrant in captivity [which] are always, he said, false’;¹⁰⁴ and by the same token James Patrick, himself an approved school teacher in Glasgow, believed that the ‘free-ranging delinquent, observed in his natural habitat, is a very different character from the time-serving, compliant boy in the artificial setting of an approved school or borstal’.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, the theme of the barriers to entry and the necessity of observing and learning the customs of the researched group persisted. Malvery was advised by ‘Mr. C.’ to knock on doors only once – “‘One never knocks a double knock,” ... “it would be likely to alarm the inhabitants. Only doctors or officials double knock in this sort of neighbourhood”’¹⁰⁶ – and this finds an echo in Bakke’s experiences, when prospective visitors to his Greenwich lodgings asked the bemused American student how many knocks they should give.¹⁰⁷

More important for the historian than the subsequent lineage of the complete participation tradition is how it was received by contemporaries, and how they positioned it with regard to other forms of social inquiry. On the face of it, there was an antagonism between the two approaches, reflected in Crane’s denunciation of ‘sociological students’ and Flynt’s contempt for ‘gentlemen who have academic positions, and say “sociology”’.¹⁰⁸ Another participant observer (a participant-as-observer rather than a complete participant), Stephen Reynolds, author of *A Poor Man’s House*, who for a number of years lived and worked with a fisherman’s family in Sidmouth, was equally scathing about the new kinds of social inquiry, arguing that ‘one of the vices of modern social and political thought [is that it] reduces the uncalculable to the bogus calculable, and proceeds to argue therefrom ... if it hasn’t the facts, it invents them, and that which cannot be expressed in facts and figures, it ignores’.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, many contemporaries recognised that there was room for a variety of approaches to social inquiry. Reginald Bray, himself a participant observer and an investigator of urban child life,¹¹⁰ reviewing *A Poor Man’s House* in the *Sociological Review*, defended Reynolds’s inclusion in the sociological canon:

W[e] are in an age which desires exact knowledge; and that desire, in its craving after satisfaction, takes many forms. It may find its fulfilment in long columns of statistics; it may see itself realised in an intricate chain of reasoning; or it may win its goal in a series of impressionist studies ... Any one of these deserves the epithet scientific, provided the result is an accurate picture of facts...¹¹¹

It is doubtful that Reynolds was grateful for this endorsement, which was forthcoming despite his own insistence that he should not be considered as an investigator,¹¹² but it shows that participant observation studies, even if they resulted from a different series of ambitions from the systematic social survey, were accorded some respect as a genre of social commentary. Indeed, although the *Sociological Review* ignored most complete participation accounts, the *Economic Journal* carried largely favourable

reviews of both Flynt's *Tramping with Tramps* and Higgs's *Glimpses from the Abyss*. William Beveridge's review of the latter saw considerable value in the alternative perspective on the life of the tramp that her account provided:

For the most part, knowledge as to this class has to come through the various institutions which provide for it – that is to say, from the accounts of those in charge of casual wards, shelters, and common lodging-houses. Mrs. Higgs is able to show the homeless life from another point of view, and to supplement the study of the vagrant through the institutions as they appear to the vagrant.¹¹³

According to Beveridge, her impressionistic accounts 'carry the stamp of truth, and are indeed completely in accord with other evidence'.¹¹⁴ Indeed, although Beveridge recognised the dangers of 'advocacy' inherent in Higgs's perspective – 'She has so much entered into the vagrant's own point of view that she is a little unthinking both in her praise of such comfort as she found in the [Salvation Army] shelters, and in her criticism of the harshness she endured in the casual ward'¹¹⁵ – Higgs herself declared that 'exploration' was 'the method of science'.¹¹⁶ Flynt, more ambiguously, thought his experience of tramp life 'may be called scientific in so far as it deals with the subject on its own ground and in its peculiar conditions and environment'; and claimed that his tramping venture in Germany was carried out at the suggestion of Dr. Berthold of the German Bureau of Statistics, which held no statistics on vagrancy.¹¹⁷ Even more explicitly, Horace Plunkett, in his introduction to Holdenby's *Folk of the Furrow*, explained that '[t]he main purpose of the book is to reveal to us the heart and mind of the folk ... Mr. Holdenby's literary sense adorns but does not obscure the analysis he makes of the labourers' activities, and his study has a true kinship with Mr. Rowntree's survey of their domestic economy.'¹¹⁸

The incognito exploration, then, was one of a number of ways of investigating working-class and vagrant life, giving the investigator an unusual kind of contact with the poor. Although their encounters were usually brief, and although they could certainly not claim that their experiences were in any way typical or even representative of underworld life, complete participants could get to the heart of the matter quickly and supply interesting insights into the living realities of the poor man's or woman's world. Confidences, which the well-meaning Salvation Army or Charity Organisation Society volunteer might require months or years of patient personal intercourse with an individual to hear, could fall from the lips of one tramp to another in an instant. Moreover, such investigators were able to give a personal account of the treatment meted out to casual paupers, the physical conditions in lodging houses, the food eaten in the 'abyss', and so on: all matters that, when reported from the point of view of the 'onlooker' rather than the 'victim', lost much of their poignancy. Although, unlike today's sociological investigators, this disparate group of journalists, reformers and philanthropists were initially motivated (with some exceptions) by a desire to experience material conditions rather than to understand social organisation and culture among the investigated groups, the complete participant had more opportunity than the external observer to explain the effects of these conditions on those who experienced them. If the published accounts were not always 'neutral' in tone, this did not deny them value as social documents; and by avoiding the pretence of 'scientific' accuracy such investigations may have misled the reader less than the dry and authoritative reports of official inquiries or social surveys. In becoming somebody else, however temporarily, the incognito investigators, by shedding the trappings of their own lifestyle, were able to give a unique account of working-class and vagrant life; and, for all the flaws of the method, it was one of the

few viable methods of gaining access to the alien world that such people appeared to inhabit.

-
- ¹ James Paterson, *James the Fifth; or the 'Gudeman of Ballangeich': His Poetry and Adventures* (Edinburgh, 1861), p. 163; see also David Stevenson, 'The Gudeman of Ballangeich', in David Hopkin (ed.), *Folklore and the Historian* (forthcoming).
- ² Peter Keating, *Into Unknown England 1866-1913: Selections from the Social Explorers* (Manchester, 1976); Raymond A. Kent, *A History of British Empirical Sociology* (1981), pp. 37-73. Both these authors adopt a broad definition of the social explorer, encompassing Booth and (in Keating's case) Rowntree, as well as Mayhew, Engels, Greenwood and so on.
- ³ M. A. Crowther, 'The Tramp', in Roy Porter (ed.), *Myths of the English* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 101, 110.
- ⁴ P. J. Keating, *The Working Classes in Victorian Fiction* (1971), p. 40.
- ⁵ Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 13.
- ⁶ Judith Walkowitz, 'The Indian Woman, the Flower Girl and the Jew: Photojournalism in Edwardian London', *Victorian Studies*, vol. XLII (1998), pp. 3-46.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ⁸ See for example Buford Junker, *Field Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences* (Chicago, 1960), pp. 35-40; Danny L. Jorgensen, *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies* (1989), pp. 55-6.
- ⁹ Junker, *Field Work*, p. 36.
- ¹⁰ Benetta Jules-Rosette, 'The Veil of Objectivity: Prophecy, Divination, and Social Inquiry', *American Anthropologist*, vol. LXXX (1978), pp. 549-70.
- ¹¹ Bryan R. Wilson, *Sects and Society: A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain* (1961), p. 7.
- ¹² Frank Burton, *The Politics of Legitimacy: Struggles in a Belfast Community* (1978). Burton's methodological appendix deals in detail with the advantages and pitfalls of participant observation studies.
- ¹³ John Rex & Robert Moore, *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (Oxford, 1967), pp. xv (quote), 133-46.
- ¹⁴ William Foote Whyte, *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum* (Chicago, 1981 [1st. ed. Chicago, 1943], appendix A; Junker, *Field Work*, pp. 36-7.
- ¹⁵ Martyn Hammersley & Paul Atkinson, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (1983), p. 98.
- ¹⁶ James Spradley, *Participant Observation* (1980), p. 61.
- ¹⁷ A. F. Wells, *The Local Social Survey in Great Britain* (1935), p. 14n1.
- ¹⁸ Crowther, 'The Tramp', p. 101.
- ¹⁹ Edward Shils, 'Social Inquiry and the Autonomy of the Individual', in Martin Bulmer (ed.), *Social Research Ethics: An Examination of the Merits of Covert Participant Observation* (1982), p. 127. The article was first published in 1959.
- ²⁰ Lawrence Goldman, 'A Peculiarity of the English? The Social Science Association and the Absence of Sociology in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, no. 114 (1987), p. 171.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 167.
- ²² Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford, 1988 [1st. ed. Oxford, 1978]), pp. 40-1.
- ²³ The story is told in more detail in J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Story of the Pall Mall Gazette* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 166-9; W. T. Stead, 'The Pall Mall Gazette', *Review of Reviews*, vol. VII (1893), pp. 139-56; Keating, *Into Unknown England*, pp. 16-17, 33-54, in which the whole pamphlet is reprinted, and from which all quotations from Greenwood in this article are taken.

-
- ²⁴ J. H. Stallard, *The Female Casual and Her Lodging* (1866).
- ²⁵ Rachel Vorspan, 'Vagrancy and the New Poor Law in Late-Victorian and Edwardian England', *English Historical Review*, vol. XCII (1977), pp. 66-7; F. G. Wallace-Goodbody, 'The Tramp's Haven', *Gentleman's Magazine*, no. 254 (1883).
- ²⁶ C. W. Craven, *A Night in a Workhouse* (Keighley, 1887), p. 2.
- ²⁷ Jack London, *The People of the Abyss* (1917 [1st. ed. New York, 1903]), pp. 13, 17.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 28 (quote), 35.
- ²⁹ The 'peg' was, in East End tramp parlance, 'the place where a free meal may be obtained' (*Ibid.*, p. 145).
- ³⁰ Much of this information is from Josiah Flynt, *My Life* (New York, 1908).
- ³¹ Josiah Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps: Studies and Sketches of Vagabond Life* (New York, 1899), p. 3.
- ³² 'Denis Crane' was the pseudonym of the journalist Walter Thomas Cranfield.
- ³³ Most of the following account of Higgs's life is taken from Mary Kingsland Higgs, *Mary Higgs of Oldham* (1954).
- ³⁴ Olive Christian Malvery, *The Soul Market, with which is Included The Heart of Things* (1906), p. 264. See also her *A Year and a Day* (1912).
- ³⁵ For a detailed examination of Malvery, see Walkowitz, 'Indian Woman'.
- ³⁶ Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 134.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 68.
- ³⁸ Robert H. Sherard, *The Cry of the Poor* (1901), p. 11.
- ³⁹ Denis Crane, *A Vicarious Vagabond* (1910), pp. 144-5.
- ⁴⁰ London, *People of the Abyss*, p. 27.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- ⁴² Mary Higgs, *Glimpses into the Abyss* (1906), p. 151.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 161, 166.
- ⁴⁴ Craven, *A Night in a Workhouse*, p. 4.
- ⁴⁵ Mary Higgs, *Three Nights in Women's Lodging Houses* (Oldham, 1905), p. 14; London, *People of the Abyss*, p. 82.
- ⁴⁶ Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 81.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 180 (quote).
- ⁴⁸ Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps*, p. 234.
- ⁴⁹ London, *People of the Abyss*, p. 153.
- ⁵⁰ Everard Wyrall, *The Spike* (1910), pp. 37, 48.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁵² Higgs, *Glimpses*, pp. 161-2, 133.
- ⁵³ Higgs, *Three Nights in Women's Lodging Houses*, p. 13.
- ⁵⁴ Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 137.
- ⁵⁵ Sherard, *Cry of the Poor*, p. 29.
- ⁵⁶ Wyrall, *The Spike*, p. 39.
- ⁵⁷ Higgs, *Glimpses*, pp. 250-1.
- ⁵⁸ London, *People of the Abyss*, p. 17.
- ⁵⁹ Malvery, *Soul Market*, pp. 228-9.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 51-7.
- ⁶¹ London, *People of the Abyss*, pp. 123-4, 130.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 96-7; Higgs, *Glimpses*, p. 113.
- ⁶³ Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 138; Higgs, *Glimpses*, pp. 87-8.
- ⁶⁴ Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, p. 40.
- ⁶⁵ Jorgensen, *Participant Observation*, p. 48.
- ⁶⁶ Lucy Masterman, *C. F. G Masterman: A Biography* (1939), pp. 26-9; C. F. G. Masterman, *From the Abyss* (1902).

-
- ⁶⁷ Masterman, *From the Abyss*, pp. 86, 33.
- ⁶⁸ Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps*, p. 67.
- ⁶⁹ Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, pp. 105-6, 26.
- ⁷⁰ London, *People of the Abyss*, pp. 80-2; Wyrall, *The Spike*, pp. 53-4; Craven, *A Night in a Workhouse*, p. 5.
- ⁷¹ Higgs, *Three Nights in Women's Lodging Houses*, p. 11.
- ⁷² Wyrall, *The Spike*, pp. 53-4; Higgs, *Glimpses*, p. 161.
- ⁷³ Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 17.
- ⁷⁴ Wyrall, *The Spike*, pp. 3-4.
- ⁷⁵ Higgs, *Glimpses*, p. 94. Original emphasis.
- ⁷⁶ Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, pp. 25, 115.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. viii. See also pp. 144-5.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- ⁷⁹ For a discussion of modern anthropologists' concerns to establish with their readership that they have 'been there', see Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Cambridge, 1988)..
- ⁸⁰ Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, p. 135.
- ⁸¹ Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps*, pp. 81, 135-6, 266.
- ⁸² Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, pp. 44-5.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 135; Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 134.
- ⁸⁴ Philip Collins, 'Dickens and London', in H. J. Dyos & M. Wolff, *The Victorian City: Images and Realities* (2 vols., 1973), vol. II, p. 537.
- ⁸⁵ Bruce L. Berg, *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (3rd. ed., 1998 [1st. ed. 1989]), p. 129.
- ⁸⁶ Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 35; London, *People of the Abyss*, pp. 157-60.
- ⁸⁷ Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 54.
- ⁸⁸ London, *People of the Abyss*, p. 78.
- ⁸⁹ Malvery, *Soul Market*, pp. 238, 243.
- ⁹⁰ Higgs, *Three Nights in Women's Lodging Houses*, p. 14.
- ⁹¹ Vorspan, 'Vagrancy', p. 68.
- ⁹² Wyrall, *The Spike*, p. 39.
- ⁹³ See for example Wyrall, *The Spike*, p. 58; Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 226; Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, p. 81.
- ⁹⁴ Higgs, *Glimpses*, pp. 113, 123-4; London, *People of the Abyss*, pp. 123-4; Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, p. 96.
- ⁹⁵ Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, p. 82; Keating, *Into Unknown England*, pp. 42-3; Higgs, *Glimpses*, p. 92.
- ⁹⁶ Keating, *Into Unknown England*, pp. 45-6; London, *People of the Abyss*, pp. 129-30; Crane, *Vicarious Vagabond*, pp. 89-90, 102.
- ⁹⁷ P. Anderson Graham, *The Rural Exodus: The Problem of the Village and the Town* (1892), pp. 84-5.
- ⁹⁸ In Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 125.
- ⁹⁹ Beatrice Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (Harmondsworth, 1971 [1st. ed. 1926]), pp. 323-5; 'Pages from a Work-Girl's Diary', *Nineteenth Century*, vol. XXIV (1888), pp. 301-14.
- ¹⁰⁰ Webb, 'Pages from a Work-Girl's Diary', pp. 301-2, 307.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 313.
- ¹⁰² Webb, *My Apprenticeship*, p. 323.
- ¹⁰³ E. Wight Bakke, *The Unemployed Man: A Social Study* (1933), p. xiv.
- ¹⁰⁴ Alfred Hodder, in Flynt, *My Life*, pp. 346-7.
- ¹⁰⁵ James Patrick, *A Glasgow Gang Observed* (1973), p. 155.

-
- ¹⁰⁶ Malvery, *Soul Market*, p. 70.
- ¹⁰⁷ Bakke, *Unemployed Man*, p. 154.
- ¹⁰⁸ Flynt, *My Life*, p. 346.
- ¹⁰⁹ Stephen Reynolds, *The Lower Deck: The Navy and the Nation* (1912), pp. 73-4.
- ¹¹⁰ Reginald A. Bray, *The Town Child* (1907); Masterman, *From the Abyss*; Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 240.
- ¹¹¹ *Sociological Review*, vol. II (1909), p. 196.
- ¹¹² Stephen Reynolds, *A Poor Man's House* (1909 [1st. ed. 1908]), p. x.
- ¹¹³ *Economic Journal*, vol. XVI (1906), p. 581.
- ¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 583.
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 583; for the review of *Tramping with Tramps* see *Economic Journal*, vol. X (1900), pp. 75-8.
- ¹¹⁶ Higgs, *Glimpses*, p. vii; also quoted in Keating, *Into Unknown England*, p. 28. (Keating gives the page reference as p. xi.)
- ¹¹⁷ Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps*, pp. ix, 170.
- ¹¹⁸ Christopher Holdenby, *Folk of the Furrow* (1913), p. x.