Pre-Membering Joe

POPULARITY, POLITICS OR PRIDE?
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In the days following the death of Joseph Chamberlain in July 1914, the streets of Birmingham were host to the most extraordinary scenes of public adoration, the likes of which have not been witnessed before or since. Indeed, a strong desire was expressed by many for a flamboyant Westminster funeral of the type usually reserved for royalty and heads of state. Yet, in accordance with his Unitarian family’s wishes, such ostentation was forgone in favour of a small private ceremony and a relatively understated grave at Birmingham’s unofficially Non-Conformist Key Hill Cemetery.

It was an ironic decision considering that, in life, Joe himself appears to have shown no such inhibitions. Certainly, the restrained nature of this event stands in stark contrast to the public commemorative practices during his lifetime when his personal material celebration could be said to have bordered on the prolific in comparison to that of his peers. The Chamberlain Memorial Fountain, erected in 1880, is arguably the grandest monument to an individual in the entire city; it stands in the centre of Chamberlain Square in what was the very heart of Victorian Birmingham. His name is emblazoned upon the foundation stone of the 135-year-old Council House for all to see. A clock dedicated to him in 1903 dominates the centre of the Jewellery Quarter, one of the city’s most important manufacturing districts. The University of Birmingham’s clock tower – begun in 1900 and the largest of its type in the world – is officially named in his honour.

Yet was this phenomenon of his ‘pre-membrance’ a genuine sign of public affection, the symptom of a wider political trend in the use of memory and reputation as a political commodity, or simply self-aggrandisement on his part?
Broad Appeal

That Joe was a figure of public popularity in Birmingham is undeniable: he was credited with many benevolent acts, including securing affordable and reliable supplies of gas and clean drinking water for the town, clearing slums, constructing libraries and public swimming pools and championing free, non-secular education. Whilst his motives, and the extent to which he personally engineered these developments, are debatable, the fact that he was perceived at the time by many to be the instigator or overseer of them is not.

In the eyes of much of Victorian Birmingham’s population, Joe was the man attributed with earning the town the moniker of ‘best governed city in the world’. His apparent ability almost single-handedly to reinvigorate a previously disparate town council, his advocacy of and adherence to a ‘civic gospel’ of municipal improvement and his unyielding support for local business elevated him, in the eyes of many, to the rank of champion of the Birmingham man.

It is a testament to the strength of this perception that it still resonates with the people of the city to this day: a century after his death, there are still those in Birmingham who affectionately refer to Chamberlain as ‘our Joe’. It would seem churlish at the very least, then, to suggest that anything other than admiration was the motive for these memorials.

Opposition and Distrust

Yet, despite the high regard in which he was held by much of Birmingham’s wider population, Joe upset many smaller groups of influential people. Politically, he was seen to have maintained a twenty-year stranglehold on the town’s electorate through the machinations of the Birmingham Liberal Association, (BLA) which naturally fostered a great deal of resentment among the non-Liberal population.

His later political history, defecting from the Liberal Party when he formed the Liberal Unionists and then supporting the Conservatives with whom he was an unreliable ally, caused further upset and distrust. In addition, the higher taxes necessary to implement and develop the improvement schemes he championed were unpopular and liable to alienate precisely those people most likely to contribute money to fund such public memorials or even approve their undertaking.

It is certainly curious that this commemorative phenomenon did not continue beyond Joe’s death, whilst Liberal MP John Bright’s popularity in the town is commonly accepted as having far exceeded that of Chamberlain, his honours paled by comparison, achieving only a single statue and street named after him. Indeed, in the 1880 General Election, of the three Liberal Candidates returned for Birmingham, Joe ranked third, below both Bright and Philip Henry Muntz. Consequently, the assumption that Joe’s popularity was the principal motive in his relatively prolific memorialisation seems uncertain at best.

The Chamberlain Memorial Fountain

The scale, location and timing of the Chamberlain Memorial Fountain suggest an alternative explanation. Joe was undoubtedly a powerful symbol to the electorate of all that local government had achieved for the people of Birmingham. Therefore, a grandiose monument in his honour, erected immediately adjacent to the Council House at a time when the incumbent Liberal-dominated council were seeking to rally support, can be interpreted as a deliberate act of political propaganda in the guise of a public tribute.
Of course, such a claim could be dismissed as purely coincidental, were it not for the fact that it was not an isolated case: during the past decades of Liberal rule, a number of public memorials to ‘great men’ of the town were erected, the allegiances of whom were – conveniently – almost unanimously Liberal. Indeed, the only Conservative to achieve such physical immortality in the town during this period was national hero and 1880 parliamentary candidate Colonel Fred Burnaby. Yet even he could only achieve a simple obelisk, relegated to the churchyard of St. Philip’s – significantly, one of the few pieces of public land within the town over which the Council had no jurisdiction.

It is also notable that in the early 1880s, as pressure mounted on the BLA from an increasingly organised Tory party under Lord Randolph Churchill, these Liberal ‘statements’ increased in regularity with five monuments being erected in as many years in the first half of the decade. Thus, Joe’s fountain was part of an already-established trend, utilising physical structures to anchor Liberal dominance in the consciousness of the town’s population. It was a strategy that, even at the time, did not go unnoticed by a sceptical minority – as the Dart cartoon on page 37 clearly shows.

Joe’s Two Towers
Nor is this the only one of Joe’s monuments to have been erected at a politically convenient time and location: the construction of the clock tower in the centre of the Jewellery Quarter, ostensibly in honour of his visit to South Africa, coincided almost exactly with his decision to resign his cabinet post to campaign for protectionist tariff reform – an endeavour for which he would clearly require the support of the city’s leading manufacturers. The jewellers were one such large and influential group and, given Joe’s valuable support for the abolition of silver plate duties over a decade earlier, this was much to their advantage. It seems likely that this memorial may have served as a timely reminder of his previous benevolence.

Similarly, the clock tower at the University, possibly intended to be named in honour of John Henry Poynting, one of the institution’s first academics, was instead dedicated to Joe. Conveniently, this decision appears to have been made when Joe’s national popularity was diminishing due to his questionable handling of the second Boer War in his role as Secretary of State for the Colonies. This physical reassocation of his name with education, a positive cause for which he had been well known since the beginning of his political career, would have been an opportune retort to such negative publicity.

Council House and Corporation Street
Finally, in addition to these political motives, there appears to have been an element of vanity too: the new Council House was neither Joe’s idea, nor was its commission a result of his mayoralty – he was merely the incumbent at the beginning of construction. Despite this, it was still his name that went on the foundation stone, having never been involved in its inception. Indeed, by the time of the construction of the University’s clock tower, he already had a central thoroughfare, an impressive memorial and the city’s main civic building dedicated to him. Yet this still appears to have been insufficient.

Ephemeral Memorabilia
Of course, there remain a whole host of other memorials and testaments to Joe which are less than complimentary, such as the cartoons of satirical journals and even music hall songs. Crucially, however, of those that portray him in a positive light, many seem to have been instigated under the auspices of either himself or his colleagues and, conveniently, at times when it was politically advantageous to remind the electorate of his achievements. It is too simplistic, therefore, to assume that these memorials are irrefutable proof of Joe’s overwhelming public popularity.

Whilst there is evidence that this is the case, there are also strong indications that there are political motives and, possibly, those of sheer personal indulgence as well. The ‘pre–membrance’ of Joseph Chamberlain, it seems, may say as much about his own ambitions and those of his political peers as it does of the wider population of Victorian Birmingham’s affection for him.
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