

SUSAN ASH

Dr Barnardo and “The Queen’s Shades”: Liminal London, Hospitality and Victorian Child Rescue

1. Dr. Barnardo

To support his ubiquitous philanthropic enterprises, Dr. Barnardo published tales set in the typical London spaces where homeless children often took shelter: lodging houses, stairwells, archways and bridges. Promoted as “true” and “drawn from life,” these narratives render the city into recognizable tropes associated with dirt, darkness, and abjection, derived in part from “literary” fiction, such as Dickens’ *Oliver Twist* (serialised 1837-9), and Evangelical “waif” novels, such as Hesba Stretton’s *Jessica’s First Prayer* (serialised 1867).¹ Barnardo’s promotional literature may also constitute an emergent Victorian genre focussing on pervasive urban threat, as Tina Young Choi points out, unveiling the city’s filth and poverty in modes that “nearly always” collapse into representations of “lower-class space.”² In this essay I consider Barnardo’s treatment of the site known as “The Queen’s Shades,”³ an actual “doss” familiar to Barnardo in the 1860s, formed by a mound of discarded boxes and detritus near the “old” Billingsgate fish market on Lower Thames Street. “The Shades” is the setting for significant episodes in *Our Father’s Sparrows*, Barnardo’s novel for children, and

“God’s Guiding Hand,”⁴ a short autobiographical narrative in which Barnardo accounts for the beginning of his career and his highly individual practices as a child reformer.

Barnardo promoted his work as continuous and pervasive, declaring that by “DAY ... we train, teach, visit, preach, and sometimes write,” and by “NIGHT we visit lodging houses, interview policemen” to “seek and find” children “in the most unlikely places.”⁵

Recent research has focused on Barnardo’s repressive policies and practices, informed by a penchant for melodramatic self-promotion.⁶ I will argue, however, that Barnardo’s writing suggests a more ambivalent relationship with the London “waif.” *Our Father’s Sparrows* depicts an opportunity for hospitality between children that indicates Barnardo’s capacity to recognise and even admire the agency and generosity practiced *between* London’s poorest children. In contrast, “God’s Guiding Hand,” represents an invasive reformer who penetrates deeply, even scandalously, *into* the liminal crevices of London’s East End and lives of children. My discussion draws on Jacques Derrida’s illumination of hospitality to demonstrate how the force that makes Barnardo’s power both benevolent and dreadful is related to conflicted authority associated with the rights of the “host” and the impossible obligations inherent in hospitality itself. In short, I will argue that the two narratives set in “The Shades” raise crucial questions about thresholds, about borders between inside/outside, animate and inanimate, indeed between human and not-human. I will demonstrate how “the Shades” operates as a powerful trope in which human sensations, corporal bodies and architectural detritus merge to reflect fears regarding the stability of the wider, English social body.

2. Orphans, Waifs and Arabs

Our Father's Sparrows tells the story of two newly orphaned children, twelve year old Tom and his ten year old sister Nell, who walk from Portsmouth to London. As essentially middle-class children by birth (their mother had disobeyed her family and married well beneath her class), Tom and Nell are poor candidates for survival on the streets of London, where each East End “refuge” proves more threatening than the last. A lodging house on their first night is crowded with “boisterous laughter and profane talk,” filling them with “sheer terror.”⁷ The children shift from stone doorsteps on Mint Street, to “stone recesses” under London Bridge, to an archway by the side of Fishmongers Hall, “where the great stone steps lead down to Lower Thames Street,” down “dark, damp steps” into a space “where they might creep and hide.” Here groups of older boys, fully “accustomed to the streets,” whistle, jeer and jostle the two orphans.⁸ The narrative constructs a veritable map of stone cold places in London, through Long Acre, James Street, Covent Garden, into the dark shadows of the market where eventually Tom and Nell creep into an empty hogshead. The children do not realise until morning that the barrel already shelters another child, “Carrotty Sue,” an experienced eleven year old “waif and stray,” who becomes their guide and protector throughout the first half of the narrative.

Carrotty Sue acts as a touchstone for Barnardo’s stratified conception of “classes” of street children.⁹ Her wiry “rough head of unkempt red hair,” “shrill voice,” bare feet, head and arms (despite the extreme cold) visibly contrast with the more sombre and tidy Tom and Nell.¹⁰ Sue is a “restless,” “wild creature,” one of the “gutter-snipes” whose “ceaseless pranks and roguish tricks” had already frightened Tom and Nelly since arriving in London.¹¹ Nevertheless, Sue’s moral character elevates her over at least two other “classes” of “city arabs” in the novel. Although street smart, she neither scams nor

abuses others. She demonstrates initiative by teaching Tom and Nell to pawn clothes and obtain “browns,” capital for a street-vendor enterprise selling watercress, providing profits which the children share equally. Such actions positively differentiate Carrotty Sue from the “arab” gangs of children exhibiting the “gaunt, wolfish look” of extreme hunger and neglect, who fight “as savagely as dogs” over “a morsel of fish, half-decayed and blackened.”¹² The novel emphasises both the sub-human status of these racialised “arab” boys as well as their basis in facts: a footnote in the novel assures child readers that Barnardo himself had often witnessed such bestial behaviour in the streets.¹³ Such passages indicate fears about how boundaries between human and animal have slipped to create the English urban “savage” who is neither fully human nor completely animal. Barnardo characteristically constructed this desperate “class” in terms that breach categories between animal and human, referring in numerous articles to the waif as a “specimen of the ‘genus’ of ‘Street Arab.’”¹⁴ In effect, Barnardo’s “genus” classifies the waif not just as a subordinate species, but as an altogether other entity, building on the link in the Victorian imagination between itinerancy and savageness firmly in place at least since Henry Mayhew published *London Labour and the London Poor* in the early 1850s and coined the term, “vagabond savage,” for those subservient to “sensation and the animal faculties.”¹⁵

Barnardo’s writing suggests his ongoing ambivalence towards the slippery “grade” of criminal street child. Promotional literature circulated his policy to refuse children “tainted” with crime, despite the ever-present catch-phrase, “no destitute child refused admission.” At the same time, he expressed admiration for the waif boys who resisted his entreaties to enter his Homes. Accounts which are not altogether critical permeate his writing, describing boys, for example, who preferred the “restless free life” of roaming over confinement,¹⁶ or those who liked “an impish lark.”¹⁷ In *Our Father’s*

Sparrows, this larrikin role is played out by a fourth significant child, Punch, a young thief introduced as he robs Tom and Nelly.¹⁸ With his gang who “look up” to him as the “nearest approach to a hero,”¹⁹ Punch lives well (if sporadically) and, as a measure of his success, is resoundingly robust. The narrator describes Punch as a braggart of “unholy deeds,” whose “utter profane words” could not be printed in the context of children’s fiction.²⁰ Nevertheless, Punch is treated as redeemable, with innate qualities “recognised” by the novel’s Evangelical reformer’s special gift in physiognomy. Barnardo himself seems to have thrived on the self-imposed challenge to differentiate between classes based on what he perceived as his highly developed skill in reading the physiognomic signs.²¹ He claimed only a two percent “failure” rate in his dealings with over 50,000 children.²² Of these “scourings of the street,” he wrote, even the most “ferocious expression” and “roguish leer” needed only a short time in Barnardo’s care for “the lines” of “physiognomy” to undergo a “complete metamorphosis.”²³ Thus, Barnardo presents both himself and, as we shall see, his narrative alter ego in *Sparrows*, Pelham, as uniquely gifted in consistently sustaining their own physical and moral boundaries while in direct contact with corrupted bodies and language exemplified by characters such as Punch.

Rachel Ablow has argued that for the Victorians emotions functioned as an epistemological tool,²⁴ which Our *Father’s Sparrows* exemplifies, linking all the “city arabs” emotionally by their excessive displays of bravura and cheerfulness. Of course, Evangelicalism operated as a legitimate mode for bringing emotion into the public sphere, and as an Evangelical, Barnardo’s cues toward appropriate religious belief and emotional expression are coded through his commitment to the “religion of the heart,” where fervour and tears could denote genuine religious experience.²⁵ The appropriate expression of emotion is crucial not just to the genuinely converted, but also the

potentially redeemable individual. Thus, while Sue's hardy "loud" demeanour may align her with the "street Arab," she also demonstrates a capacity to be "touched," moved to pity by the sight of a less fortunate child, Nelly, who "aroused in her heart as much pity as she was capable, and made her assume a softer, and gentler manner" that ultimately indicates her capacity for redemption.²⁶ Punch is firmly entrenched in the criminal category, yet he too operates as a redeemable interface between all three "classes" through his capacity to feel both empathy and remorse. Once "moved" by Nell's "fair face with its sweet expression," Punch tries to redress his crime of theft by guiding the novel's child rescuer, Pelham, in his search to locate the children.²⁷ Predictably, Punch will relinquish the criminal life and enter the reformer's Homes, eventually to emerge a fully-fledged working "citizen."

Nell is obviously borrowed from sentimental fiction and Dickens's *Old Curiosity Shop*, operating as a mute cipher to "move" the best of the street children to desire and seek redemption. Barnardo deploys these carefully constructed models of correct and incorrect emotionality to evoke similar emotional responses in his readers, in order to form communities through tenderness and a strong sense of human and civil responsibility that will act out of Christian love.²⁸ Like Harriet Beecher Stowe, whom he admired and emulated, Barnardo sought to elicit "right feeling" from his readers not for its own sake, but to generate participation in highly specific fundraising activities and volunteer work. Tears on their own, however, were of little practical use to child rescue initiatives, and Barnardo insisted spontaneous emotive actions were counterproductive. Rather than one-off gifts, he privileged regular donation inspired by the "touching scenes" of his stories and the privileged reformer's "manifest adaptability" for the work.²⁹ Indeed, Barnardo represents perhaps the most pervasive example of individual-inspired philanthropy on a global scale in the late Victorian

period.³⁰ It is this notion of community to which I turn now, comparing Carrotty Sue's spontaneous but fragile generosity to the professional reformer's version of "hospitality."

3. Thresholds, Hosts and Hospitality

For Derrida, hospitality's very possibility lies in thresholds, the liminal sites where its practical conditions are negotiated. He writes at length about hospitality's double imperative. On the one hand, hospitality implies an *unconditional welcome*: where anyone may enter as a guest and the guest's right to hospitality is absolute. On the other hand, hospitality also involves a necessarily *conditional welcome*, contingent upon answers to questions such as: Who are you? Where do you come from? Why have you come here? Are you willing to abide by the rules of the host? The guest's entry depends upon compliance: on identifying oneself and accepting the conditional rules. Every event in which hospitality is at stake requires the careful negotiating between these two poles. I will argue that interactions between "waifs" and "reformers" in the events associated with "The Shades" demonstrate exactly this conundrum, raising issues associated with hospitality and philanthropy that reflect, but also exceed, a single practitioner such as Barnardo. To make this argument, I will briefly tease out the oppositional character of hospitality.

Derrida argues that hospitality involves a "contract" between host and potential guest in which the first act of violence is the interrogation upon arrival at the threshold.³¹ For Derrida this "foreigner" is "someone with whom, to receive him, you begin by asking his name; ... to guarantee his identity, as you would a witness before a court."³² Thus, by already introducing circles of conditionality, the host who interrogates at the threshold "delimits the place of hospitality and maintains authority

over it,” a restriction that Derrida says is the very “condition of the gift” of hospitality itself.³³ In the context of Victorian philanthropy, this liminal moment at the threshold is all important because what follows will either be the invitation to come in or stay out. Furthermore, the permission to enter inevitably will be followed up in the form of reciprocal obligations between host and guest. As Derrida says, it is never a “straightforward extension of an individual right” for either host or guest.³⁴ Negotiating the right to “relief” is, of course, fundamental to Victorian practices of state and religious-based charity. From the start, Barnardo took great pains to broadcast globally the policies which he believed differentiated his Homes from practices associated with the New Poor Laws which had underpinned workhouse relief since 1834 and religious-based charity monitored by the Charity Organisation Society from 1869. Support from these sources was predicated on “worthiness” and a policy of less eligibility; in other words, any indoor aid was conceived and designed as punitive deterrence.

In principle and in practice, Barnardo detested the Workhouse which, he wrote, “stamped” the “pauper child” with the “brand of his pauperism in huge barrack workhouses” where “all the inmates lost their rights and individuality, and became machine-turned figures.”³⁵ The “little pauper,” he continued, was “dressed in a hideous uniform” and “trained as one in a hundred or a thousand.” He or she “was never mothered, never loved, never individualised. He was fed, clothed, and educated by contract....” Crucial for my argument here, he argued that the boys “had neither moral fibre nor physical stamina;” girls became the “prey of the destroyer, recruits in the black army of the lost.” In one workhouse alone he claimed that all eighty girls domiciled there had “gone out to service” and yet “*every one* of them was on the streets!”³⁶ In contrast to the “loving” family or Barnardo Home, the workhouse failed to “individualise” child “inmates.” Far from hospitable, the institution operated by

“contract” rather than any feeling. According to Barnardo, the workhouse barrack system lacked the crucial, fine divisions both spatially and socially which inspire and control human emotion. Thus, any support predicated upon the policy of punitive deterrence eliminated natural emotions from children to the detriment of the national, social body’s well-being. Barnardo advocated the “Cottage system,” especially for girls, that emulated Christian home and domesticity, with a mother figure and girls of all ages domiciled in small bedrooms as if sisters. Barnardo accounted for his decision to build his Girls’ Home (opened July 1876) in Barkingside, well beyond London’s city parameters at that time, in “How I Retrieved a Blunder.” He wrote that the nature of conversations overheard between “girl savages” in his early barrack accommodation (1870-73) were “shocking in the extreme, appalling in their revelations of neglect, degradation, and even bestiality,” ultimately motivating his desire to virtually excise girls from mass housing associated with the East End. Without the control of boundaries in small family groups, Barnardo argued that a girl did not develop any natural capacity to empathise; as an “untutored savage,” she had “no imagination... she was incapable of putting herself in another’s place.”³⁷ Thus, barrack accommodation, without fixed borders and firmly divided spaces, blunted emotionality, consequently to decrease moral stature.

I am arguing that in offering shelter in such a way that only the most desperate would accept its terms, workhouse accommodation reflects hospitality’s divided etymology, its [Latin] roots to both hospitality and hostility as articulated by Derrida. Derrida examines the lexicon of related concepts that clusters around this opposition: the patron/host who “receives,” welcomes, offers the gift of “home,” as opposed to what is fundamentally at stake, that is, remaining “master” and protector of the home (city, state). Derrida crucially asks: *must* hospitality necessarily “consist in interrogating the

new arrival?”³⁸ He asks if it is “more just and more loving to question or not to question?” raising a crucial point in the context of philanthropic shelter.³⁹ Dr. Barnardo vehemently differentiated himself in the mid-Victorian charity marketplace, first in London (and eventually globally) by his pronounced policy to admit all destitute children. His identifying brand was the “ever open doors;” a trompe l’oeil effect painted onto the doors of the Stepney Home that survived well into the twentieth century.⁴⁰ *Our Father’s Sparrows* reiterates Barnardo’s premise to admit children “...at any hour of day or night” without “recommendation, voting, money payments, or any of those other conditions so common in such institutions, and which are often found ... to cause additional trial and suffering among the very class for whose benefit they are established.”⁴¹ However, the implication that Barnardo’s Homes accepted children without question is far from actual practice. Children’s stories were rigorously investigated by a crew of Barnardo’s professional beadles. Furthermore, doors may have been “open” but neither Barnardo nor Pelham remain at the thresholds, as hosts waiting to admit (or exclude) visitants; rather they fashion their child reformer role as intrepid anthropologist-explorer.⁴² For example, accompanied by his “native informant” Punch, Pelham undertakes “investigations” of a “most searching kind” in the deep of the night in courts, alleys, empty market places, and in the “shelving river foreshore,” anywhere the street “arab” takes hidden shelter.⁴³ In both his novel and non-fiction, Barnardo’s language reflects his perception of vigorously active philanthropy, using words such as “find” “catch” “snatch” (abduct, steal) to describe his practice as opposed to the more passive terms: welcome, receive, accept.⁴⁴ Indeed, he conceived (and promoted) his own actions “not under the shelter of the law,” but as the “*philanthropic abduction pursued as a fine art* – an art painfully acquired by years of laborious

effort.”⁴⁵ Barnardo claimed that he had the “*moral* law” on “his side.” Here Barnardo privileges “duties” over “rights.”⁴⁶

In short, Barnardo legitimates his authority, admitting no impediments (including legal) to either his physical or social mobility, as he inserts himself into the lowest and highest ranks of the English class structure throughout his career. He presents himself as being equally comfortable with the inhabitants of common lodging houses as in the company of Royalty, who officially opened the Girls’ Home and attended annual general meetings. Although his late night “trawling” certainly decreased over the years, we know he continued to organise late night investigations throughout London.⁴⁷ In 1898, for example, he describes his practice to “cut up the great metropolis into districts” and “allot” one to each individual worker, including himself, so that “no place that night” would go “unvisited.” He describes a virtual “invasion” throughout all of London “inspecting” with “vigilance” doors, staircases, cellars, market places and packages, barge holds, Thames embankments, indeed “every hole and cranny” that was “used habitually as a refuge.”⁴⁸

In his practice as peripatetic “child catcher,” Barnardo claimed to be unconstrained by middle-class “sensitivity”: routinely over time taking in stride the sights and language that he claimed the more delicate sensibility could not bear. He decried the reformer who based conclusions on short sojourns, who produced “sensationalist” accounts and “random statements” without extensive first-hand knowledge of the actual children or their parents in situ.⁴⁹ In contrast, Barnardo typically played variations on the theme of sustained (heroic) contact and the capacity to “bear” details “too revolting” to print, stressing that his narratives were not intended “merely to excite” his readers’ emotions, but written to express “the dread realities of the life with which we are brought into contact day after day.”⁵⁰ His rhetoric is couched

in conventional missionary discourse intent on bringing the “*heathen in London*” into “Christ’s Church,” emphasising his singular capacity to penetrate the “deeper depth” of London, the “doorways of fetid, pestiferous houses in the lowest courts and alleys” and sustain contact with children, “*beyond the reach*” of any mere “*visitor*.” This account emphasises Barnardo’s capacity to sustain physical and moral contact, despite seemingly intolerable conditions, to engage in conversation and learn individual stories, a power he invests in “Mr. Pelham,” his doppelganger in *Our Father’s Sparrows*.⁵¹

Pelham bears strong physical resemblance to Barnardo himself, drawing on two recognizable tropes: the muscular Christian subject emerging at this time and an older notion of the man of sentiment, conjoining vitality with emotional sensibility.⁵² Since Barnardo was sensitive to charges that charismatic, individual-based charity could not be trusted, he deploys Pelham in the novel precisely to amalgamate a special capacity to feel with an extraordinary energy to act, crucially aligned with the mental discernment to “recognise” the many “grades of street society.”⁵³ It is precisely the “unusual” triumvirate of feeling, action and intellectual discernment that distinguishes Pelham’s (Barnardo’s) work. Indeed, the novel also justifies a (male) capacity for reform based on the unique “rapidity” of “mental and physical” movement, investing Pelham with the gift not only to “read faces,” but also “situations,” in order to instantly “determine” the correct solution “before all others” and thereby act decisively.⁵⁴

In striking contrast to such professional “hosts,” Carroty Sue operates closer to the receptive, unconditional end of the hospitality continuum: she neither seeks out nor interrogates her “guests” at their first point of meeting. In the hogshead barrel, when she realises she is not alone, her first words are a protective warning rather than a question: “Now then, young ‘uns, look alive, or you’ll catch it if old Bogey comes round this way.” Only later, after they rise and prepare to leave the barrel, does she continue,

“Who’s that gal there? When did yer come into my doss? How long hev you bin about these parts? What’s yer pertickler lay?”⁵⁵ In other words, hospitality in this context privileges the welfare of the guest before the questioning of identity. She hands over all her food with a story about having fed so well earlier she was no longer hungry, a ruse predicated, at the very least, by a hospitable etiquette. She provides a “fust-rater” “blowout” of a breakfast, and as I suggest above, teaches the children prudence and thrift. Instead of lodging house accommodation, she guides the pair to another “fust rate” hidey-hole, “The Shades” as she says, “a reglar ’ot house, ’ot as a hoven,” at the “wery centre of a lot of crates and things.”⁵⁶ Barnardo further describes “The Shades” as a “narrow crack or passage between the heavy cases that formed the thick part of the pile.” The children climb up and through this massive mound of packing detritus and push through a “gap” into a “little hollow.” From this small “room,” the trio climb further into the pitch dark, up the slopes of crates to the top to form small “couches” from old sacking. Once Tom and Nell are safely ensconced, Sue returns to its entrance to close off or at least disguise any entry points, “We don’t want no wisitors here!”⁵⁷ To “fix that passage,” she manages “in her ingenious way” to pull off the tarpaulin “where it lapped over the opening by which they had entered,” eventually to “secure” it “with a large pin which she fortunately had in her skirt, thereby closing the ends of the tarpaulin together.”⁵⁸

Mr Pelham arrives at 3 AM, not as host, but as “visitor” with a bullnose lantern, disturbing their “rest,”⁵⁹ accompanied by his guide, “Punch,” who investigates “The Shades” by “roofing” the structure: climbing up the slope of boxes to stamp over the entire structure (“they’d cry out if they felt my boots”). He informs Pelham that nothing larger than a “mouse or maggot” could creep into “The Shades.”⁶⁰ Ultimately, and as we shall see, in contrast to Barnardo’s non-fictional accounts of his personal experience at

“The Shades,” Pelham is unable to penetrate the “narrow aperture” concealed by Sue’s single pin. He and Punch give up the search and leave. Thus, in effect, the children’s novel examines “The Shades” from the inside out, from the perspective of children who form a family bond, however tenuous, who take shelter to protect themselves and each other, though only minimal interrogation has taken place, and the “home” in question is insubstantial. The intrusion, however, sparks a discussion regarding the conditions of hospitality at Pelham’s Homes where Sue mis-advises Tom that ““if yer once gets inside one o’ them there refidges, yer never gets out agin!””⁶¹ Clearly from Barnardo’s perspective, Sue misconceives, or is unable to discern the proper protection that firm (Christian) walls and a lock provide over tarpaulins and pins.

In order to constitute the space of a “habitable house and a home,” Derrida focuses on the “opening,” the necessity of doors and windows and giving up “a passage to the outside world.”⁶² At stake is the control of flow: the power not only to open but also to shut the home. The near encounter between reformer and waif at “The Shades” suggests the widest associative continuum for home and hospitality: the “right” stable and fixed reformer’s “Home” (Tom Pelham’s) with its “openings” firmly in the reformer’s control, in contrast to the wrong sort of refuge, a permeable structure without proper doors or windows. In “The Shades” Sue misconceives Pelham’s “true” hospitality as a prison (“yer never gets out agin”) that divides families (brothers from sisters) in distant, separate locations. Ultimately, in failing to discern crucial differences between “Home” and outside, in misrepresenting Pelham’s “ever open doors” as closed, Sue will nearly cause the death of the fragile Nell who falls ill from exposure. Nevertheless, in this scene depicting a child’s generosity to other children, an *aporia* emerges, a classic deconstructive moment where the “proper” and “improper” versions of hospitality no longer fit neatly or remain in the assigned categories. The line between protection and

imprisonment is fluid: indeed, Barnardo was in fact in the courts more than once for refusing to let some children *out* of his Homes.⁶³ In contrast, although inadequate, “The Shades” is represented as safer than the inside of lodging houses or the outside archways and doorways, providing a recognised sense of warmth and belonging. In this episode, no stranger penetrates to the inside, including Pelham. The failure to discover the children, of course, drives the narrative forward, extending its “suspense,” but does not fully undercut or demean Sue’s offer of hospitality. A parallel event in Barnardo’s “God’s Guiding Hand,” where borders are breached dramatically, will complicate our understanding of hospitality and refuge.

4. Doors, Homes and Liminal London

In “God’s Guiding Hand,” Barnardo describes how his extemporaneous speech in 1867, which referred to London’s homeless children, incited incredulous protest in the city papers. Consequently, Lord Shaftesbury, the leading figure in English philanthropy at that time, invited him to dine.⁶⁴ Barnardo’s readers would have recognised Shaftesbury as the Chairman of the Ragged School Association, as an early advocate for dwelling reform, significantly influencing the Lodging House Act in the 1850s and originating his own model village, not to mention his work as a leader in the Shoeblack and training ship movements. In other words, wherever Barnardo hoped to go in the world of social and religious philanthropy, Lord Shaftesbury had already been. Barnardo describes how at dinner Shaftesbury first interrogated and then “challenged” him to prove the veracity of his publicised reports to all the gentlemen congregated in his home (behaviour which in itself reflects on hospitality, a point Barnardo did not seem to miss either). Barnardo writes:

I do not think that he really believed that ... any very large number of Waif children ... were to be found homeless and sleeping out in the metropolis night

after night; and I fear it was his impression that I had deliberately exaggerated the state of the case.⁶⁵

The men follow Barnardo from the West End to a cul de sac by Billingsgate Fish market, to the site we know as “The Shades.” Here a “huge pile of goods of the most varied kind” await barges for removal, ““empties,”” that are covered over “tightly by several enormous tarpaulins, which effectively preserved the goods from damp....”⁶⁶ Barnardo is accompanied by a Punch-like guide, but in marked contrast to Pelham who never penetrates or even touches “The Shades,” Barnardo describes himself deeply engaged in first-hand, physical contact with his territory:

I knew my ground well, for I had often been down to this place before. Indeed, from underneath these very tarpaulins I had frequently drawn forth a number of homeless lads, who obtained their living by selling papers, cigar lights, flowers, or other oddments on the streets.⁶⁷

Here the verb, “drawn forth,” does not reflect a host who waits passively at the threshold, as Derrida describes, for the unknown visitor who might arrive. Instead the invitation to reside at Barnardo’s “Home” takes the form of active peripatetic search and extrication by Barnardo’s (not God’s) own hand.

In contrast to the parallel episode narrated in *Our Father’s Sparrows*, the prospect of hospitality on this occasion tips over into hostility. Unlike Pelham, who fails even to discern an entry, Barnardo represents himself as the only man in a crowd of luminaries who can detect an opening. He steps forward and:

...where two tarpaulins met, I inserted my hand and then pushed my arm and shoulder within as far as I could. On groping with my hand in various directions under the tarpaulin, I suddenly encountered what I expected: a naked foot and ankle! This I seized firmly, and pushing my other hand in and up, I soon came to the knee. Then gently but firmly I threw my weight upon my prize and presently I drew down a poor, ragged, half-starved-looking boy! As he half alighted, half fell at my feet, his eyes still blinded with sleep,... he began to whine a remonstrance.⁶⁸

Setting aside the sexual for the obstetric implications, Barnardo appears to deliver not a boy but an animal, as he plunges his arms into the “slit,” up to his own shoulders to grab, twist and violently yank the little body who arrives, still “blind” like a puppy. Perhaps it is the very creature-status of the delivery that justifies the violence of the penetration. Although he doesn’t allow Pelham the same access or power, Barnardo demonstrates the vulnerability of the seams that enclose “The Shades” which he easily penetrates. In this episode, the reformer’s guide similarly acts as midwife, to “roof ‘em,” to “clamber to the top,” and to “dance a kind of tattoo, in which he pounded his feet as heavily as he could.”⁶⁹ As a result:

the whole mass appeared to seethe and move on the top, struggling beneath his kicks. One boy after another slipped down and appeared at the slit between the tarpaulins, and would have withdrawn in fright at the sight of our assembled company. But we held them firmly as they reached us.⁷⁰

Sustained only by the presence of bodies, “The Shades” subsequently begins to disintegrate: “tarpaulins, hitherto stretched so tightly over so large an area, began to collapse” and more children emerge for “want of the human stay that kept them up...” Eventually, seventy-three boys stand “in a single line before” the men; as Barnardo writes, a “strange array” of “homeless childhood – a terrible proof, as Lord Shaftesbury remarked, of the sad state of things , and of the need of such work as I was even then beginning to do.”⁷¹ Ultimately, this passage represents “The Shades” as the site of the coincidental “collapse” of physicality and sensibility, with Barnardo urging readers to understand the episode as the last possible moment, the last chance for rescue. In a double movement, Barnardo depends upon a “normal” aversion reaction from his readers, enabling him to deploy his own heroic overcoming of disgust.

Shurlee Swain argues that in the context of Victorian social reform, the domestic mission in England and the colonial enterprise abroad had to be brought together into

one analytic frame within which child rescuers proposed corrections, but did not develop any critique of the social conditions that produced such destitution, preferring to promote the “radical action” of removing children from the “primary source of danger,” their parents.⁷² While the complete absence of such a critique is debatable, certainly Barnardo’s “tales” of child rescue symbolically support Swain’s conclusion. In “God’s Guiding Hand,” Barnardo encourages his readers to regard ‘The Shades’ and the body of the child, both in agonised deterioration, as representative of a degraded social body. The “delivered,” mewling figures who emerge at “The Shades” are neither recklessly cheerful nor able to savagely fight over bits of decayed meat, and come to signify an appalling maternal failure. Indeed, for these children, genuine sensibility is represented as not just blunted, but no longer evolving. By extension, the fate of a nation depends upon Barnardo’s last assisted delivery in “The Shades,” locating, removing and resituating children from a morally contaminated, as well as physically debilitated, environment.

Thus, in “God’s Own Hand,” “The Shades” comes to exemplify a corporeal and architectural collapse, a connection between human sensations and architectural detritus representing, I would argue, what Grace Kehler has called in her discussion of the Gothic features of early Victorian reform treaties, the “radical porousness” of the poor.⁷³ The tarpaulin, the skin or membrane of “The Shades,” no longer sustains the divide between inside and outside, and Barnardo legitimates the forcible invasion of the malappropriate, maternal body on behalf of the children who would otherwise perish. Thus, as both a maternal and architectural space, “The Shades” is monstrous not in vitality, but in ruin, animated by disease, rot and death rather than life-giving forces. In dissolving borders, Barnardo represents both the poorest class’s permeability to the intervention of the “right” reformer, and also a Gothic fear of dissolving borders. As

Kehler suggests, dissolving boundaries between the inanimate and animate, between building and body, constitutes a “concatenated metonymic exchange” calculated to show the misery and wretchedness of built environments.⁷⁴ In the novel, “the Shades” plays its part in a melodramatic series of events related to lost and found family, but Barnardo’s imagery in “God’s Own Hand” also evokes the Gothic, not in the least in the structure’s endless, secret passages (seventy three boys!) we might associate with the haunted house of that genre. Furthermore, the boys it “delivers” operate more as spectres, not quite present, than as entities. The episode sensationalises psychic states (blunted emotion) and physicality (bodies and structures), but rather than the child’s inner turmoil, I would argue that, ultimately, it is Barnardo’s own emotional and conflicted relations with the “city arab” that are projected on to physical structures. Specifically “The Shades” resonates with commercial associations linked to the poor (not) working and debased body. Where other reformers tended to sentimentalise childhood as a lost garden,⁷⁵ Barnardo’s tales actually privilege (Evangelical) industry and work ethic. In place of the Gothic nightmare ruins, that is, “The Shades” with its compromised interior domain, Barnardo substitutes a dream of domesticity (his Homes) and industry (his training businesses) with the moral power to transform the pauper child.

Barnardo’s liminal “delivery” at “The Shades” thus may represent a kind of phallic-rape, a violent penetration of the slit that would otherwise remain closed, but the scandal it signifies relates closely to his larger project to substitute his “Homes” for home and benevolence for deviance. He moves from the nightmare of delivery virtually in the streets, with “The Shades” as a kind of gothic haunting of the social wellbeing, to the dream of Evangelicalised domesticity. Jeanne Elders DeWaard has argued that the Gothic is preoccupied with home and inner life, “intensely concerned with private,

interior spaces,” as well as the “sensory experience and physical manifestations of interiority.” She states further that these impulses produce “conflicted understandings of culpability, transgression, and victimization” which manifest in the Gothic’s capacity to elicit both horror and moral sympathy,⁷⁶ certainly an objective here for Barnardo. These “disruptive aspects of Gothic corporeality” do not work alone, she argues, but rather in conjunction with “legal-sentimental constructions” of “racialised will.”⁷⁷ Similarly, Barnardo invests “The Shades” with implications for both reforming practices as well as the legal apparatus. He skips over the rights of children (not actually legal subjects) and impugns maternity to justify the intervention of male reform, not just to the external reader, but crucially to his internal listeners, Shaftesbury and guests, whom he represents as his social superiors, but reforming inferiors. He writes not only to influence affect, to induce his audiences to “feel right,” and act appropriately based solely on his own discretion. As both the events narrated and the original point of writing predate any legalised intervention by the State to take over parental duties, Barnardo takes pains to represent his own work as best situated for successful intervention, establishing his business as more viscerally-informed than even any other Evangelical philanthropist, including Shaftesbury, and more morally informed than any potential state mechanism, including the law. Thus, I would stress that this tale of Barnardo’s origins is not so much about the children as it is about the men. He writes revealingly, that “Lord Shaftesbury now received proof” that his accounts were clearly “not exaggerated, as [Shaftesbury] had clearly supposed.” The story winds up with Shaftesbury’s melodramatic announcement “whispered” only to Barnardo: “All London shall know of this!”⁷⁸ Barnardo thus manages both to discredit and to claim Shaftesbury as patron. Subsequently he constructs his own success on the ability to penetrate class and spatial boundaries, which allows him socially to insinuate himself into

Shaftesbury's world of philanthropy. In other words, "The Shades" represents not only a liminal space, but also a liminal moment at the threshold of his career, when he himself asks to enter, to be admitted to the more influential philanthropic community; a moment that rests upon his ability to move his titled audience emotionally (and in this case, literally) into the liminal spaces of London.

5. "The Queen's Shades"

My intention here is not to reveal pejoratively these contradictions in thought as merely another example of the "Victorian repressive" apparatus.⁷⁹ Michael Naas writes that hospitality is not so much a matter of right or wrong behaviour but rather a matter of inflection – how one negotiates between two imperatives: the offer to shelter, to protect unconditionally the guest who arrives unexpectedly while simultaneously sustaining one's own home, rights and even life.⁸⁰ That condition often involves another affect, disgust, which is the direction I would take this work now. Robert Kaster points out that, as a pattern of engagement and aversion, fastidiousness may operate as a form of social relations in itself.⁸¹ Rejecting the body of the guest who turns up often involves what theorists, such as Sylvan Tomkins, analyse as the disgust reaction, the physical response to stimuli that causes the involuntary physical (and figurative) shudder. Theorists (and Barnardo for that matter) talk about turning up one's nose. If the ethics of hospitality depends upon straddling its double imperative between unconditional and conditional support, a second ethical double-bind presents itself between desire and disgust, another liminal interface that also involves panic and protection, where hospitality and hostility collide.

How might we then regard this treatment of liminal space? How different are Barnardo's two accounts of "The Queen's Shades"? In *Our Father's Sparrows*,

“dwelling” is reduced to spaces in London to which his (middle-class) child readers had little or no access. Children are encouraged to feel fear regarding unfixed dwelling, leading to compassion. However, rather than elicit disgust, “The Shades” operates here as a site of adventure, a curious temporary excursion, where generosity between children may be admired, even emulated. In contrast, the tarpaulin in “God’s Own Hand” symbolises a radical porosity, a membrane that can no longer sustain, even temporarily, the divide between inside and outside, between covered and open, indeed between human and other. In both narratives, of course, “bodies” operate as the raw material in nation-building. Indeed, Barnardo routes Victorian Evangelical social reform through the corporal and architectural in order to teach potential donors of all ages and classes to “read” with their senses, purposely to transform feeling into action. Gothic and melodramatic ploys encourage readers to perceive outcast waifs through their senses, to fill in narrative omissions with visceral reactions, but at the same time, to place trust (decisions and funds) solely in the discriminating hands of the gifted reformer.

Notes

1. Barnardo himself serialised Hesba Stretton’s novel, *A Night and a Day*, in his periodical, *The Children’s Treasury*, between July and October, 1876. He launched his adult periodical, *Night and Day*, the following year in 1877. I have found no evidence to indicate that Stretton’s title influenced Barnardo in naming his periodical that represented the work of his philanthropic enterprises. This essay draws heavily on *Night and Day*, accessed in the Barnardo Head Office archive by the kind permission of Barnardo’s Children’s Charity in Barkingside in 2005, 2007 and 2008. *Night and Day* was published either monthly or bi-monthly, and then sold in bound annual volumes that I cite here, using publication years and ongoing pagination in this format.
2. Tina Young Choi, ‘Writing the Victorian City: Discourses of Risk, Connection, and Inevitability,’ *Victorian Studies* 43.4 (2001): 262-263.

3. I have yet to find irrefutable evidence to explain the name of this structure. In this essay I follow Barnardo's example, and use his shorter title, "The Shades."
4. Barnardo published this novel, *Our Father's Sparrows*, three times. In this essay I cite the version published serially in *The Children's Treasury* (1879). Barnardo republished the text in his second periodical, *Our Darlings* (1885-1886); he printed a somewhat revised version under the title *City Sparrows* in his third periodicals, *Bubble*, in the mid 1890s. Only a partial copy remains in Barnardo's Barkingside archives. The autobiographical tale, "God's Guiding Hand," was published several times, including as part of a chapter in his posthumous volume of memoirs. In this essay I cite the version Barnardo published in *Night and Day* (1899): 11-15; 31-32, not the least for the convenience of an identifying title in that journal and its metonymic resonances. No specific date for the episode narrated is recorded in the sources I have located.
5. Barnardo, "Preface," *Night and Day* (1877): 2.
6. In analysing Barnardo's use of melodramatic tropes for converting street children into model citizens of the Empire, Lydia Murdoch argues that melodrama "was central to Barnardo's fund-raising, serving as a tool to structure the details of child poverty in a manner that would resonate with the public and ultimately help shape child welfare policies." *Imagined Orphans: Poor Families, Child Welfare, and Contested Citizenship in London* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006), 17. Murdoch seeks to demonstrate that the pervasive Victorian symbol of the orphan was a myth and that poor parents actively employed both a sense of English citizenship and related rights to negotiate welfare systems in supporting their children. Lindsay Smith similarly focuses on Barnardo's performative strategies in her essay, "The Shoe-black to the Crossing Sweeper: Victorian Street Arabs and Photography," *Textual Practice* 10.1 (1996): 29-55. See also Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004).
7. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 4.
8. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 4-5.
9. Although I discuss roughly three "waif" identities here, Barnardo himself identified eight "classes" of "waifs:" "Class I, Children Delivered from Common Lodging Houses Associations;" "Class II, Children Rescued from Cruel Treatment and Gross Neglect;" "Class III, Children Rescued from Immoral Surroundings;" "Class IV, Children Rescued from a Street Life;" "Class V, Crippled and Incurable Children;" "Class VI, Orphan Children;" "Class VII, Children from the Decent but Destitute Poor;" "Class VIII, "Youths of Seventeen and over." ("Selected Cases from Admission Registers," *Night and Day*, [1900]: 30) These distinct categories were circulated in promotion materials as well as published in Annual Reports. Of course, the categories did not remain distinct in practice. For example, "Mary B. (10)" in 1900 was both a victim of cruel parents as well as rescued by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children from a "common lodging house in a Surrey town." (ibid.).

10. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 112.
11. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 122-3.
12. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 147-8.
13. Subsequently in *Our Father's Sparrows*, Barnardo includes an extended digression on the nature of the “city arab,” describing the “wild nature” of foraging parties” who gather in markets in the “grey of morning” with “eyes sharp as birds of prey,” who “greedily devour offal discarded by the salesmen such as would not be proper sustenance for an animal which the owner had any regard.” (244) Indeed, he informs readers, “many animals would be quickly poisoned were they compelled to breathe the fetid atmosphere.” (232) This digression had also been published almost verbatim the previous year in *Night and Day* not as fiction, but as an “essay” titled “The Street Arab’s World,” exemplifying Barnardo’s constant blurring between fiction and exegesis in his promotional writing. (1878:75-76).
14. Barnardo, “Saved from a Crime,” *Night and Day* (1887): 144. Barnardo randomly used both lower and upper case spellings of the word arab, which I have standardised in this essay to lower, except in this instance where he so clearly wishes to evoke scientific associations with another ‘species.’
15. See Henry Mayhew, Chapter One, *London Labour and the London Poor*, accessed online, <http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/MayLond.html>
 Adam Hansen argues that Mayhew demonstrates (as will Barnardo a generation later) “confusions” related to the colonial scheme determining distinction between the local, and the global; the roguish and the decent: and the savage and the civilised. “Exhibiting Vagrancy, 1851”: Victorian London and the ‘Vagabond Savage’” in *Literary London: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Representation of London*, 2:2 (2004): paragraph 4.
<http://www.Literarylondon.org/london-journal/september%202004/hansen.html>
 Lydia Murdoch contextualises Barnardo’s pervasive use of this “common label,” arguing that he drew on the “rhetoric of class, race, and nationality” which reformers had circulated “to distance children from their families and local communities.” (Ibid. 25) She notes the “confused mixture” of “terminology” that draws on the “ethnographic, anthropological, biological and even zoological,” (Ibid. 26) arguing that his representations of poor children exaggerated key physical characteristics while accentuating the “liminal, nomadic position” to construct a pervasive concept of the child savage. (Ibid. 31) Her account is foundational, yet we may address further differences within Barnardo’s “street Arab” classification, and the implications regarding masculinity which Barnardo explicitly raises in his promotional writing, which is beyond the scope of this essay.
16. Barnardo, “Wandering Joe,” *Night and Day* (1880): 77.
17. Barnardo, “From the Streets and Lanes of the City,” *Night and Day* (1890): 76.
18. Punch may obviously channel the “Artful Dodger,” but he is not limited to discursive origins. Barnardo subsequently published an account of a real child named “Punch” who lived in Holborn, whom Barnardo wrote was distinguished from the “army without fixed abode” by his “countenance” that “seemed impressed” with both “candour and honesty” as well as an

- audacious expression and “irresistible spirited appearance.” (“Rescued from Life: The True Story of a Young Thief,” *Night and Day* [1882]: 113) Indeed, he wrote here that Punch seemed entirely void of the “furtive glance” and nervous twitching” that exposed the child thief; all physical signs of virtue however are obliterated as soon as Punch spoke with characteristic profanity. (Ibid. 115).
19. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 159.
 20. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 149.
 21. Murdoch discusses the way Barnardo’s photographs of children were constructed to encourage viewers to “interpret” the physiognomic qualities as “signs of physical, moral and intellectual difference.” (Ibid. 27) See also Seth Koven’s discussion of Barnardo’s perambulations and photographs.
 22. Barnardo, “About Heredity,” *Night and Day* (1904): 8.
 23. Barnardo, “Personal Notes,” *Night and Day* (1890): 101.
 24. Rachel Ablow, “Introduction: Victorian Emotions,” *Victorian Studies* 50.3 (2008): 375.
 25. John Tosh considers the pressure Evangelicalism placed on moral life in *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005). Ian Bradley addresses emotion in *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians* (Oxford: Lion Hudson, 1976; 2006), particularly in the first two chapters. Frank Prochaska makes the link between Wilberforce’s “Practical Christianity,” the expression of “public spirit,” and Evangelicalism in *Christianity & Social Service in Modern Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). See also Gesa Stedmen’s analysis of how religion operated as an acceptable outlet for emotion in *Stemming the Torrent: Expression and Control in the Victorian Discourses on Emotion* (London: Ashgate, 2002).
 26. Barnardo, *Sparrows* 123. Mary-Catherine Harrison has argued that Victorian literature had its “own critical premium on the emotional response” in “The Paradox of Fiction and the Ethics of Empathy: Reconceiving Dickens’ Realism,” in *Narrative* 16.3 (2008): 256-278. She demonstrates how calculated ploys to “move” an audience to action and “ethical behaviour” can be documented as successfully motivating readers to intervene not in the “character’s lives” but rather “on behalf of someone “like” them.” (262).
 27. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 159.
 28. Haggis and Allen make a similar argument in relation to Victorian Missionary periodicals in “Imperial Emotions: Affective Communities of Mission in British Protestant Women’s Missionary Publications c1880-1920,” *Journal of Social History* 41:3 (2008): 691-716.
 29. Barnardo, *Sparrows* 254. Misguided charity is exemplified in the novel through the figure of a clergyman, Mr. Owen, whose occasional, impulsive invitations to street children to reside in his home are rewarded routinely by the theft of a few household items, demonstrating that even Evangelically-inspired charity will not necessarily secure successful outcomes.
 30. Barnardo differentiated himself both against the problematic indiscriminate giving that characterised charity in mid- to late-Victorian England, but also against the Charity

Organisation Society, founded in 1869 to regulate both duplication and indiscriminate charity. Barnardo sustained an antagonistic relation with this organisation throughout his career. See Wagner on the court arbitration case in 1877 between Barnardo and agents of the COS. By his death he had initiated expansive enterprises in Australia and Canada, as well as outreach “Open Door” facilities for children in more than a dozen British cities. He ran extensive training schemes beginning in the 1870s. All were funded by donation from his multifarious schemes that used both discursive and actual bodies to recruit volunteers and money in a global community of philanthropy that virtually spanned the class system from Royal patrons to the street children themselves. My wider research investigates Barnardo’s innovative fundraising schemes, specifically the recruitment of all classes of children for active philanthropic work.

31. Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, trans. R. Bowlby (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 27.
32. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 27.
33. Derrida, ‘Hostipitality,’ *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 5.3 2000: 4.
34. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 23.
35. Barnardo, *Night and Day*, “Presentation to the Editor,” (1895): 132.
36. Barnardo, “Presentation to the Editor,” 132. In the same issue of *Night and Day*, Barnardo reprinted a series of letters which demonstrated that for children of parents in remand, the workhouse operated exactly as a prison for the duration of their parents’ incarceration, although Barnardo offered to open his Homes to these children, a proposal rejected by the President of the Local Government Board. (“Children Under Remand in Workhouses,” *Night and Day*, [1995]: 133-4).
37. Barnardo, “How I Retrieved a Blunder,” *Night and Day* (1903): 57. Here he describes not only child suicides, but also attempts to maim or even kill other children. In one case, he claimed a girl, who sat on the face of an infant after filling her mouth with sand, was neither “cruel” not “murderous,” but “simply curious to know what would happen....” (Ibid.)
38. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 27. Derrida is concerned here with an *ethics of hospitality* which might be applied to a range of thorny issues, including asylum seekers who knock at a nation’s door for shelter.
39. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 29.
40. If we doubt the sincerity of this premise, we only need to google Barnardo to find very current (old boy) websites which continue to proclaim and appreciate how the policy benefited them.
41. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 52.
42. Murdoch, makes this point, arguing that Barnardo “styled himself as an adventurer-evangelist” who was “ready to do battle in God’s name. Murdoch, 18.
43. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 231.
44. See Jack London’s discussion in *The People of the Abyss* where he refers to Barnardo as a “child-catcher” who “snatches nine waifs from the streets” every day, “jerk[ing]” children “out from the very bottom of the abyss” only moments before they are “set, hardened, in the

- vicious mould.” (London, J. (1903). *The People of the Abyss*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1903, 253-4, accessed online, <http://london.sonoma.edu/Writings/PeopleOfTheAbyss>
45. Barnardo, “Is Philanthropic Abduction Ever Justifiable?,” *Night and Day* (1885): 150.
 46. Barnardo, “Is Philanthropic Abduction Ever Justifiable?,” 151.
 47. Murdoch’s research in the Barnardo organisation’s archives indicates that by the mid-1880s “hardly any children” actually entered the Homes as a result of the night expeditions, although the notion of the evangelical prophet with the bull-nose lantern continued to operate as a “powerful image for fund-raising literature” (Ibid. 18).
 48. Barnardo, “A Romance of the Slums,” *Night and Day* (1898): 65. Other periodicals at that time also document Barnardo’s continued employment of several men for peripatetic searches. For example, in *The Woman at Home*, Marion Leslie wrote that Barnardo employed “twenty experienced agents” who “continually” paid “visits to common lodging houses, tramps” kitchens, casual wards, the poorest city lanes, alleys and marketplaces, in search of the waif and stray class. Leslie may have recycled Barnardo’s own rhetoric, but the explicit number (twenty) of agents indicates ongoing practices. *The Woman at Home*, n. d., Nineteenth Century U. K. Periodical, database, accessed 17 November 2008, <http://find.galegroup.com/ukpc>.
 49. Barnardo, “Street Arabism: A Review,” *Night and Day*, (1880): 94-5. While less critical of Andrew Mearns’ influential exposé, “The Bitter Cry of Outcast London: An Inquiry into the Condition of the Abject Poor” (1883), Barnardo did publish his own “Bitter Cry” in which he claims that the “dreadful disclosures” (141) by Mearns were not only long familiar, but in fact “almost decent” compared to his own experience of “abominations” so extreme that even he was “almost compelled” to almost give up visiting. (“The Bitter Cry of the Outcast Children,” *Night and Day* (1883: 140-141).
 50. Barnardo, “Personal Notes,” *Night and Day* (1885): 23.
 51. Barnardo, “Personal Notes,” 23.
 52. Barnardo’s first reference to Pelham’s own “touching” stories occurs in *The Children’s Treasury* (1 November 1874 n. p.).
 53. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 243.
 54. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 221.
 55. Barnardo, *Sparrow*, 111-112.
 56. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 172.
 57. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 195.
 58. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 195.
 59. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 219.
 60. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 220.
 61. Barnardo, *Sparrows*, 220-221.
 62. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 61.

63. See Gillian Wagner's comprehensive and critical biography, *Barnardo* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979).
64. According to Andrew Lloyd Webber's website, this meeting and the consequent tour of late night London is one episode in his first collaboration with Tim Rice, a 1965 musical based on Barnardo's early work, unperformed until 2005, its 40th anniversary, but also the hundredth anniversary of Barnardo's death. In 2008, the pair released rights for amateur performance, and included a clip from a production in Ilford (near Barnardo's headquarters in Barkingside. Ironically, promoted as a "true-life" story about Barnardo (which stretches the truth), Webber and Rice will donate a portion of their related income to Barnardo's until the end of 2010.
65. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
66. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
67. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
68. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
69. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
70. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
71. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 31.
72. Shurlee Swain, "Centre and Periphery in British Child Rescue Discourse," in *Rethinking Colonial Histories: New and Alternative Approaches*, ed. S. Furphy, (Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, 2008), 158.
73. Grace Kehler, "Gothic Pedagogy and Victorian Reform Treatises," *Victorian Studies* 50.3 (2008): 439.
74. Kehler, 438.
75. Swain, 158.
76. Jeanne Elders DeWaard, "'The Shadow of Law': Sentimental Interiority, Gothic Terror, and the Legal Subject," *Arizona Quarterly* 62.4 (2006): 4; 6.
77. DeWaard, 21.
78. Barnardo, "God's Hand," 21.
79. I am not suggesting that Barnardo was merely concerned with his reputation according to titled (potential) benefactors. Another "true account" of Barnardo's early work in "The Shades" takes place before Barnardo's crucial meeting with Lord Shaftesbury. In "The Story of Carrots," (also published in *The Children's Treasury*) Barnardo relates the "tragic fate" of an eleven year old boy, known as "Carrots by his fellow street-arabs," whom Barnardo met late one night at "The Shades." He writes that he didn't believe he had sufficient room in his shelter to admit Carrots that night, and a few days later he learns the child had died from exhaustion and "want of food." The fact of death, its looming proximity, as Carrots is found already cold in a hogshead barrel, is associated with the site, and subsequently, Barnardo uses this event near "The Shades" as the reason for his inclusive policy, his branded "ever-open doors." (S. Barnardo and J. Marchant, eds. "The Story of Carrots," in *The Memoirs of the Late Dr. Barnardo*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905, 353-4.

80. Michael Naas, "Alors, qui êtes-vous?: Jacques Derrida and the Question of Hospitality," *SubStance* 106 34.1 (2005): 8.
81. See Robert A. Kaster, "The Dynamics of *Fastidium* and the Ideology of Disgust," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131 (2001): 143-189.