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The Case of William Smith

Draft letter to the *Daily News* [late 1869 to early 1870]

*John Stuart Mill Papers, Yale University Library*
EUGENE SUE

EXAMINER, 11 DEC., 1847, P. 787

The *Daily News* had published a series of articles on 26 Oct., and 2, 9, 25, and 29 Nov., 1847, entitled “The Literature of the Lower Orders,” by William Hepworth Dixon (1821-79), journalist, historian, and traveller. The editor of the *Examiner*, John Forster (1812-76), excerpted from and endorsed these articles in pieces entitled “The Moral Epidemic,” 30 Oct., pp. 690-1, and “Literature of the Lower Orders,” 6 Nov., p. 709. Mill’s response, in a letter to the editor, in which Harriet Taylor probably had a hand, is his first contribution to the *Examiner* since August 1842 (No. 293). It appears in the “Political Examiner,” headed as title, with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Examiner.” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter signed J.S. in the *Examiner* of 11th December 1847 remonstrating against an attack on Sue’s novel of Martin l’Enfant trouvé”

(MacMinn, p. 69).

Sir,—

You have lately quoted with approval, and thereby given additional publicity and weight to some articles in the *Daily News*, which purported to give an account of “The Literature of the Lower Orders,” meaning the cheap periodicals, and publications in series. The quality of the mental food and entertainment provided for the “lower orders” (if they are really the purchasers of this cheap literature) is so important a subject, that the *Daily News* is to be commended for directing attention to it; but that paper has unfortunately delegated the office of examining the publications in question to a person so little worthy of the judicial trust reposed in him, as to heap all the terms of moral reprobation in his vocabulary upon works with which he seems entirely unacquainted. He has already been under the necessity of retracting the words in which he had accused one publication (the production, too, of a woman), of “looseness, warmth of colouring in criminal scenes, and a false glow cast round guilty indulgences.”¹ Among the other works which he has designated by name as forming the literature which he terms “a chaos of corruption,”² there is one characterised by him in the following words, which have been quoted in the *Examiner*.
Martin the Foundling, our readers already know too well as the most disgusting production of a writer who was never remarkable for his purity. In these penny numbers, largely circulated and almost universally devoured by eager female readers [the italics are the writer’s own] his most obscene and intoxicating details are reproduced with all the minute fidelity of which the English language is capable, and this very fidelity is flaunted forth as the chief recommendation of this edition. The translations current in the superior ranks are expurgated; but in spite of that necessary care for the taste and better feeling of the educated English reader, the tale is utterly disgusting.

It is not often that a single paragraph displays such complicated unfitness in the writer of it, for having anything to do with the subject which he affects to treat of, as is shown in these sentences. So uneducated is he, as to suppose that “educated English readers” read French books in a translation. So ignorant of life and the world as not to know that the demand for M. Sue’s and all other French novels among the “superior ranks,” the “eager female readers” of the English nobility and higher classes, is so great and incessant that the libraries in Bond street cannot supply them fast enough or in quantity enough. And, to crown all, he has never read the book he condemns. I, having read it, doubt whether he has even looked at it. He has charged it with being what it is not, and entirely missed what it is. It does not contain “obscene and intoxicating details.” It does not describe scenes of sensuality, or introduce any licentious characters except those whom it intends in other respects to inspire disgust. Martin l’Enfant trouvé is a book which no one can read without seeing that it is written with a serious moral and even political purpose. It is a manifesto against the relation between rich and poor, such as the present institutions of society have made it. The author aims at exhibiting the moral perversion which the existing state of society engenders in a part of the rich and in a part of the poor; and this is done with something of the melodramatic exaggeration of the Mysteries of Paris, though in a far less degree. But he also presents, from both classes, characters of the noblest and highest principle, and the most conscientious self-control, and I do not fear to add that there are diffused through the book, and illustrated by the conduct and maxims of those characters, many principles of conduct and ideas of moral and social improvement, decidedly in advance of the age, and showing in the writer no ordinary degree of the desire and the capacity both to improve the outward condition of mankind, and to raise the tone of their minds; notwithstanding some errors, and among the rest a very decided tendency towards Communism, which in this most improving writer further reflection will probably reduce within just bounds.

I confess I feel indignant at seeing one of the very few popular imaginative writers of our time, who aim at any noble objects or inculcate any lessons but the most beaten and trivial moralities, made a byeword by people who have never read him for the extreme contrary of all that he is and desires to be. I know nothing of M. Sue except his works, but the more recent of them, and especially Martin, have given me the highest esteem for his intentions and for many of his principles, and I protest, with all the force I am capable of, against the calumnious representation of them which the Daily News has sent forth, and which you have, I am sure unwittingly, assisted in diffusing.
A remonstrance, addressed to the *Daily News*, not having been inserted, I address this protest to you.

J.S.

7
370.

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT IN FRANCE

SPECTATOR, 18 MAR., 1848, P. 273

The banning of the culminating banquet (planned for 22 Feb., 1848), in a series designed to promote parliamentary reform, led to demonstrations, and Louis Philippe dismissed Guizot. Troops fired on demonstrators on the 23rd, and armed insurrection resulted. On the 24th Louis Philippe (aged seventy-four) abdicated in favour of his ten-year-old grandson, the comte de Paris, and went into exile in Britain (where he died three years later); revolutionary leaders set up a provisional republican government at the Hôtel de Ville. Mill is here responding to “News of the Week,” Spectator, 11 Mar., 1848, p. 237, from which the quotations are taken. The letter, headed “To the Editor of the Spectator,” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter signed J.S.M. in the Spectator of 18th March 1848, on some proceedings of the Provisional Government of France”

(MacMinn, p. 69).

Sir,—

The opening remarks of the commentary on French affairs in your last paper recommend, in the best possible spirit, forbearance in judging and liberality in interpreting the conduct of the Provisional Government of France. I beg you to consider whether, in the detailed criticisms which immediately follow this recommendation, you have acted up to your own very proper canon. You blame the Provisional Government for “going beyond its provisional function to undertake legislation of a permanent character.” The first instance with which you support this censure is not felicitous. You say, “It was, for example, within its province to suspend the sitting of the Peers, but not to abolish the order of Peerage by abolishing titles.”

Surely you must be aware that the French nonhereditary Peerage had nothing to do with titles: a vast majority of titled persons were not Peers, and a large proportion of the Chamber of Peers were not titled. With reference to the other acts of the Government on which you comment unfavourably, such as the reduction of the hours of labour, may it not be said in your own words, that “they are acting upon views and under compulsions which we cannot fully appreciate”? Yet even what we can already see of their situation may well be conceived amply to justify every act hitherto ascribed to them. Is it not their grand business as a Provisional Government to keep the peace and restore order? and was it possible to do this after such a revolution, unless on the foundation of a compromise which should afford some immediate satisfaction to the demands and expectations of the classes by whom the revolution was made? We must remember that no act of the Provisional Government is anything more than provisional. They very properly disclaim all right or power to make
permanent laws; and they have convoked an Assembly who must necessarily reconsider all their acts, and who have power instantly to set those acts aside.

The general colouring given by you to your description of events in France, tends (I am sure contrary to your intention) to encourage those who, wishing the Republican Government to fail, look out for every pretext to prophesy its failure. Where was the necessity for citing some idle rumour of an intended resignation of Lamartine, and accounting for it by supposing that he “probably discovers too much of the rude and sordid in the work of revolutionary politics”? Where is there the slightest sign in any public manifestation of M. De Lamartine, that he thinks any part of the work he is engaged in “rude and sordid”? and how unworthy must he be of such a position if he could think so? Again, you have given an entirely mistaken account of the admirable experiment which “a leading journal,” and it may be added a leading railway company, have organized for associating the labourers employed by them in the profits of the undertaking. You call it, with great exaggeration, a “community of property”; and you accuse it of “subjecting the men, who have hitherto counted on regular wages, to the vicissitudes of profit and loss.” If you had read with any care the particulars given in the daily newspapers, you would have seen that the plan does nothing of the kind. Every member of the establishment continues to receive a fixed salary as before; but, after deducting this and all other expenses, and allowing 5 per cent to the proprietors, any surplus profit is to be divided among all concerned, in the ratio of their fixed gains. It is exactly the plan successfully adopted some years ago by an individual at Paris, employing some hundreds of labourers, M. Leclaire; descriptions of which have been given in the Edinburgh Review and in Chambers’s Journal.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J.S.M.
GEORGE SAND

UNPUBLISHED LETTER TO THE VOIX DES FEMMES
[AFTER 9 APR., 1848]

Amandine Aurore Lucie Dupin, baronne Dudevant (1804-76), who wrote under the name “George Sand,” attacked established views of society and marriage in her novels and her life. La Réforme published on 9 Apr., 1848, p. 3, a letter to the editor from her (dated 8 Apr.), in which she objected to “Candidature de George Sand,” an article in the short-lived feminist and socialist newspaper, the Voix des Femmes (6 Apr., p. 1), by the editor Eugénie Niboyet (1797-1883), suggesting that Sand would be an ideal candidate for the National Assembly. Niboyet also read her article at a meeting of a feminist club on the same day. In her letter Sand denied knowing the people involved in the proposal, saying she did not wish to remain silent lest the “joke” might be thought to entail her acceptance of their proposal and ideas. The Voix des Femmes reprinted her letter (10 Apr., pp. 1-2), and reported that Sand’s candidature had formally been proposed at the Jacobin Club on the 9th. The MS of this undated draft letter, in Mill’s hand but undoubtedly a “joint production” with Harriet Taylor, is in the Mill-Taylor Collection, Vol. XLI, No. 2, ff. 10-12, on paper watermarked 1846. The MS of the English draft, also in Mill’s hand and undated (printed in App. D below), is ibid., ff. 18-19. As the letter was not published, it is not listed in Mill’s bibliography.

depuis longtemps admiratrice de George Sand, je fus des premiers à lui rendre honneur et justice. Lorsqu’en Angleterre tous se ruèrent sur elle comme sur un écrivain immoral et indécent, nous fûmes, moi et un cercle d’amis non sans influence, les premiers à nous récrier contre les accusations qu’alors on prodiguait à ses écrits. A tous ceux qui les condamnaient nous invoquions contre leur jugement d’alors leur jugement d’aujourd’hui, et l’événement est venu justifier notre appel. Comment donc exprimer ce que j’éprouve d’étonnement, de honte et de chagrin en apprenant que lors de la grande crise politique et sociale de l’humanité, amenée par le noble élan de Paris, Mme George Sand, au lieu d’avancer, recule—que non seulement elle ne prend aucune initiative, n’énonce aucuns principes, mais pareille à une lady timide et vulgaire, elle rejette les flatteries amicales qui lui ont été faites par votre journal, et tâche d’écraser du haut de sa célébrité littéraire celles qui ont osé la prendre pour chef d’une opinion qu’elles étaient bien en droit de lui attribuer.

Sa protestation dans la Réforme contre l’usage que vous avez fait de son nom ne peut s’expliquer que par la crainte que son amour propre d’auteur pourrait être compromis par le soupçon d’une relation quelconque entre sa réputation faite et des réputations encore à faire. Quoiqu’il en soit, la réponse que vous avez faite à cette lettre lui est autant supérieure en dignité et en désintéressement, que la gloire littéraire de Mme
Sand l’est à la vôtre. Serait-elle retombée au niveau de nos femmes-auteur anglaises, qui s’empressent toujours à déclarer qu’elles ne veulent pas soutenir l’émancipation des femmes tandis que c’est à l’émancipation partielle, conquise par des âmes plus généreuses, qu’elles sont redevables de pouvoir élever la voix, et se faire la position sociale et l’influence littéraire qu’elles craignent de compromettre en donnant la moindre aide au mouvement qui les a fait ce qu’elles sont. La littérature féminine de notre pays nous a bien habitués à ces petites bassesses, effets de la peur. Ce n’est pas ainsi que nous aurions voulu parler de G. Sand. Mais je crains qu’elle ne soit destinée à ne servir à la cause des femmes, cause inséparable de tous les grands intérêts de l’humanité, que de la manière dont toute femme éminente lui sert, l’aide par le seul fait d’être femme. Au reste je partage toute votre admiration pour son superbe talent, ses beaux romans et son merveilleux style. Mais je pense que vous tombez dans une erreur très nuisible à la cause des femmes, en la qualiﬁant de philosophe. Au point de vue philosophique rien ne me semble autant caractériser les écrits de Sand que la présence de l’imagination et du sentiment et l’absence de l’esprit logique et de principes exacts.

Permettez qu’en vous exprimant les voeux que toute femme d’un esprit élevé et d’un coeur large devrait émettre pour le succès de votre entreprise j’ajoute mon espoir que vous traitez tout désaveu de sympathie pour cette entreprise de la part d’une femme quelle qu’elle soit, avec la pitié indulgente que réclament la faiblesse et la timidité.
The agitation for repeal of the union of Ireland with Great Britain, having died down in 1843, began again in late 1847. The French Revolution of February 1848 and the Chartist agitation sparked hopes of a bloodless revolution in Ireland, aided by the French; the Nation in April called for a national guard, and issued a radical creed. This letter from Mill, dated 5 May, is in response to “Repeal of the Union,” Examiner, 29 Apr., pp. 275-6 (from which the quotations are taken), by Thomas Carlyle. It signals the chasm that now separated their social and political views, as Mill, though one of Carlyle’s “earliest admirers,” now saw his views as pernicious, while Carlyle thought Mill’s valueless. (Their conflict over “The Negro Question” in 1849 may be compared; see CW, Vol. XXI, pp. 85-95.) This letter to the editor appears in the “Political Examiner” headed as title, with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Examiner.” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter signed M on ‘England and Ireland’ in the Examiner of 13th May 1848”

Sir,—

In your last week’s paper you published a dissertation by a writer whom, even if you had not named him, it would have been impossible to mistake, expressive of his judgment on the question of Irish Repeal. Will you permit one of that writer’s earliest admirers to express, through the same medium, the grounds on which he feels compelled to declare unqualified dissent from the judgment thus promulgated?

Let me premise that I am not an Irishman, but an Englishman; that I do not desire Repeal, but, on the contrary, should regard it as a misfortune to all concerned. It is good government that should be agitated for, not separate government: but separation is better than bad government; and I entirely sympathize in the indignation which an Irishman is entitled to feel at the reasons given by your correspondent for refusing it.

The doctrine of your correspondent is (to quote his own words) that “the Destinies have laid upon England a heavier, terribler job of labour than any people has been saddled with in these generations”—no other than that of “conquering Anarchy”: that this, which is “England’s work, appointed her by the so-called Destinies and Divine Providences,” cannot go on unless Ireland is either English, or in English hands; and that consequently the repeal of the Union is “flatly forbidden by the laws of the universe.”
This is a new phasis of the Hebrew prophet of these later days, the Ezekiel of England. The spirit of his prophesying is quite changed. Instead of telling of the sins and errors of England, and warning her of “wrath to come,”\(^1\) as he has been wont to do, he preaches the divine Messiahship of England, proclaims her the prime minister of Omnipotence on this earth, commissioned to reduce it all (or as much of it as is convenient to herself) into order and harmony, or at all events, under that pretext, into submission, even into “slavery,” under her own power—will it or will it not.

When an assumption of this sort is coolly made, and the already ample self-conceit of John Bull encouraged to invest itself with the imaginary dignity of an appointed minister of “the laws of the universe,” the proper answer would seem to be, simply to deny the premises. Where is the evidence that England has received any such mandate from the supreme powers? Where are her credentials? By what signs has she shown that the “conquering of anarchy” is the work specially appointed to her from above?

If the test is to be (and one cannot imagine your correspondent appealing to any other), her having given proof of the capacity to do it, it so happens that England is precisely the one country among all others, which has had the opportunity of showing, and has conclusively shown, that she has not that capacity. For five centuries, to speak within bounds, has this very corner of earth in question, this Ireland, been given over to her by the “destinies and divine providences,” as a test of what capacity she has for reducing chaos into order.\(^2\) For five centuries has she had Ireland under her absolute, resistless power, to show what she could do in the way of “conquering anarchy”—and the result is the most total, disastrous, ignominious failure yet known to history. No other nation ever had such an opportunity for so prolonged a period, and made such a use of it. The Romans were in many respects barbarians, yet the Gauls, within a century after being conquered by them, were a civilized people; and the most recalcitrant of all subjects with whom they had to deal, the people who then, as now, had the strongest natural tendency to anarchy of any in Europe, the Iberian Spaniards, in 150 years after the conquest were perfectly peaceable, and far more civilized than the Romans themselves were when they conquered them. Mahomet, one of your correspondent’s heroes,\(^3\) was a savage, and a leader of savages; he lived in one of the worst times of the world’s history, yet in a century after his death the most civilized monarchy in the western world, one which kept arts, letters, and commerce alive when they seemed to have perished everywhere else, had been founded at Grenada by the descendants of his wild Arabs. These may be called conquerors of anarchy. But England! and in Ireland! For the first four and a half of her five centuries she had not so much as the wish to do aught but oppress and trample on Ireland for her own supposed benefit. I waive penal laws\(^4\) and all controversial topics, but even in the eighteenth century she purposely and avowedly crushed the nascent manufactures of Ireland (the hopeful germ of so much that Ireland still needs), lest they should compete with her own.\(^5\) And there was not one of her statesmen who would not have thought it disgracefully unpatriotic to have acted otherwise. This is no peculiar reproach to England; it was the infernal spirit of that time—a time at which England, now the liberator of the negro slave, made wars and treaties for the sake of Assiento contracts for supplying negroes to be worked to death in Spanish America.\(^6\) It is to the honour of England that she was the first to cast off this spirit: and during the present generation, the policy of England towards Ireland has been, in point of intention, as
upright and even as generous as was consistent with the inveterate English habit of making the interest of the aristocracy and of the landlords the first consideration. As between the two countries, nothing can now be more disinterested than the policy of England. It is a pity we should be obliged to add, nothing more imbecile; more devoid of plan, of purpose, of ideas, of practical resource. Omitting former times, we had, two years ago, what may prove to have been a last opportunity of regenerating Ireland. A terrible calamity quelled all active opposition to our government, and Ireland was once more a tabula rasa on which we might have inscribed what we pleased. This was an occasion for English politicians to show what they had in them. Here was a field to exercise this divine gift of bringing chaos into order. Whatever ideas they had, they must have then displayed; and it proved that they had none. They spent ten millions in effecting what seemed impossible—in making Ireland worse than before. They demoralized and disorganized what little of rational industry the country contained; and the only permanent thing with which they endowed Ireland, was the only curse which her evil destiny seemed previously to have spared her—a bad poor law.

The eternal laws of justice, which one might have expected that your correspondent at least would have stood champion for, will not permit that a country which has for five hundred years had the power to make what it pleased of another, and has used that power as England has done, and which has no more idea now, than it had 500 years ago, how to make any good use of the power, should now—when its unhappy dependent, weary of such government, declares that it will try what can be done by and for itself—should now say to the dependent, I am appointed to improve and civilize you, and rather than let go my hold of you, I will make you suffer “a doom that makes me shudder.” You appointed! the dependent country may well retort; then why did you not set about it before? What proof do you give that you mean to attempt it now? And even if you do, has not your capacity, both long since and down to this very hour, been weighed in the balance and found wanting?

There might be somewhat to be said for a pretension of this sort, if made in behalf of England by a Cromwell. If courage and capacity of the highest order, proved through a long period of confusion, in which capacity of every sort rose to the top, had invested some eminent ruler of this island with a temporary dictatorship, thereby enabling him more effectually and speedily to clear away all obstacles to future progress, and erect on the ground thus cleared an enduring edifice of good government, and if every part of his conduct steadily manifested that such was really his purpose, I for one should have nothing to object, if such a ruler claimed it as his duty, and consequently his right, having already Ireland under his power, to do a similar good work for it also; nor is it likely that either the duty or the right would in such case be gainsaid by Ireland itself. But at present the individual in whom England is personified, and who is to regard himself as the chosen instrument of heaven for making Ireland what it ought to be, and is encouraged to carry fire and sword through Ireland if that assumption should be disputed, is—Lord John Russell!

In regard to the 150,000,000 of subjects whom your correspondent says that the English nation has to care for; it is quite true that in India, having to do, not with “anarchy” (save in some passing exceptional case, like that of the Sikhs), but with a
people inured from numberless generations to submission, the English nation does
contrive to govern them some degrees better than they were governed by their
tyrannical or incapable native despots. And inasmuch as England was able to do this
in spite of Napoleon and of united Europe, she could probably continue to do so in
spite of Ireland. As for the remainder of the 150,000,000 (except the comparatively
insignificant negro colonies), I am yet to learn that England does any one thing for
them which they could not do better for themselves; or that her good government of
them consists when at the best, in anything better than in leaving them alone. With
respect to the “world just now fallen into bottomless anarchy,” and which your
correspondent seems to think may expect to be helped out of it by England, is not this
the case for saying, “Physician, heal thyself!” The quellers of anarchy among the
English ruling classes will have work enough of that sort to do at home, unless the
author of Past and Present is a false prophet. With what sort of mental furniture
they are fitted out for doing it, we have had some recent specimens in the childish
panic of a few days ago, the childish exultation when the panic was over, and that
precious proposal from the leaders of all the parties in the state for a “Public Order
Memorial”—a thing to convulse gods and men with “unextinguishable laughter.”
These sages are hardly yet fairly in the wood, when they begin to holloa as if they
were already out of it.

No, sir: rely on it, that England has no mission, just now, to keep other nations out of
anarchy; but on the contrary, will have to learn, from the experience which other
nations are now in a way of acquiring, the means by which alone it can henceforth be
averted from herself. And your correspondent, of all persons, might have been
expected to acknowledge that there is not one of the working men and women now in
conference with Louis Blanc at the Luxembourg on the “organization of labour,”
who is not a degree nearer to the overcoming of this difficulty than Lord John Russell
or Sir Robert Peel; since those at least know what the problem is, and (however crude
and wild their present notions are) place their hopes in attaining a rational and
peaceful solution of it, while the Englishmen place theirs in nothing but in crushing it
down, and preventing it from being mooted at all. Before I cease to intrude on your
space, let me be permitted to express the opinion that Europe, and especially France,
which are accused, and by your correspondent, of rushing headlong into anarchy, are
in reality affording a proof, and a most precious and salutary one, how utterly
repugnant all approach to anarchy is to the present state of the European mind. For six
weeks after the revolution there was no police, no organized force, the city guard was
annihilated, the troops banished, the Government had no means of making itself
obeyed but by argument and persuasion; nothing apparently stood between Paris and
anarchy; yet nothing worse is known to have happened than a few forced
illuminations in honour of trees of liberty; and even of common offences, it is said
that a smaller number were committed than in ordinary times. Most remarkable is it,
that so far from being an anarchical spirit, the spirit which is now abroad is one which
demands too much government; it is wholly a spirit of association, of organization;
even the most extreme anti-property doctrines take the form of Communism, of
Fourierism, of some scheme not for emancipating human life from external
restraint, but for subjecting it to much more restraint than it has heretofore been
subject to, or ever ought to be; and the apostles of those doctrines rely avowedly on
moral force and on bringing the rest of mankind to their opinion by experiment and discussion.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

M.\textsuperscript{17}
THE REFORM DEBATE
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if the condition and prospects of a great popular question may be estimated at each period by the character of the opposition to it, the reform movement has made great progress in the interval between the first debate on Mr. Hume’s motion and that of Thursday last; for the change in the complexion of the anti-reform advocacy is most perceptible. On the first occasion, the tone was that of a champion who is quite persuaded that he is safe, and only for form’s sake exchanges a few thrusts. Lord John Russell’s speech sounded like an echo of Mr. Canning in days long gone by, when nobody in parliament took reform au sérieux, and the orator well knew that what his hearers demanded from him was not reason or argument, but a colour, to put upon the vote they were predetermined to give. All Lord John Russell’s points were an exact repetition of Mr. Canning’s. The country did not want organic change. Our constitution was the admiration and envy of surrounding nations. In England, a man might rise from the lowest station in society to the highest. If the House of Commons were reformed, it would not be compatible with an unreformed House of Lords. All these saws Lord J. Russell had heard, twenty times from Mr. Canning, in opposition to his own motions for reform; and there was as much truth and pertinency in them then as there is now. Whether Lord John, a tardy pupil in his opponents’ school, now actually thinks that these are arguments, we do not know; but we feel sure that Mr. Canning did not, that (to use a stale metaphor) he laughed in his sleeve at them, and that if he had ever been brought to close quarters, he would have fought the battle with weapons totally different. He estimated his tory supporters very justly in supposing that they did not require anything better, and as for reformers they were not strong enough (at least he thought so) to be worth the trouble of any more ingenious sophistry.

It is possible that Lord John Russell, when he delivered his speech against reform, may have been of a somewhat similar way of thinking. It was not then many weeks since the glorious tenth of April, when the demon revolution, or at least a noisy
braggart that attempted to look like him, sneaked away at the sight of a special constable’s staff; and perhaps Lord John thought that democracy had been extinguished with Mr. Cuffey. If so, subsequent reflection has brought wisdom, if not to him, at least to his supporters, for on Thursday there was no renewal of this old and once serviceable style of argumentation. Nobody took down from their shelves any more of Mr. Canning’s dusty instruments of warfare, or borrowed from Lord John those which he had brushed and burnished for the former occasion. The speakers on Thursday had completely altered their tactics. They no longer took their stand in defence of “things as they are.” They gave up the defence of their own position, and only tried to show that their assailants where as vulnerable as themselves. The series of speeches against Mr. Hume’s motion was a succession of assaults not upon reform, but upon the details of the particular plan of reform which Mr. Hume has brought forward. The burden of the complaint was that the plan is not systematic—that it rests on no definite principles, and is open, at various points, to the double question, why go so far; and, since you go so far, why not go farther?

The assertion is only true in a sense in which it is denied by no one. Mr. Cobden accepted the charge and none of Mr. Hume’s supporters repudiate it. But it comes with an ill grace from the speakers and writers who advance it. There is not one of them who does not proclaim that he also is for reform. A member of Sir Robert Peel’s cabinet congratulates the ministry on having done with finality and we find, to our great edification, that all the world are reformers, each in his little way. Then, may not Mr. Hume retort on his assailants their cavilling objection against himself? Does any one of their little plans rest on any abstract principle any more than his, or contain in itself any demonstrative reason for doing exactly so much and no more? In what, then, do their schemes of reform differ from his? In that which is of more importance than anything else—that his proposition is for a great reform, theirs for a small one. If it is asked what principle is involved in Mr. Hume’s proposition, this is the principle. It is the principle of a large reform.

Whatever people may say, for the sake of success in a debate or in a leading article, every one knows that the question is not about any particular collection of details, about any six points, or four, or five. The question is that of a large alteration in our representative system. Any plan which is brought forward as a standard for a party to rally round, must be of the nature of a compromise. The new reform bill is neither more nor less so than the old one. There is probably as much variety of opinion among those who voted with Mr. Hume, as there was among those who voted with Lord Grey in 1831. But they are agreed in this, that they demand a large measure. There is no other principle in the matter, and there needs no other. The measure is intended to be such as all may vote for, who think that a large reform of parliament, in a democratic direction, is desirable in itself, and suitable to the circumstances of the present time. In this respect the scheme perfectly fulfils its purpose. It draws the line with sufficient distinctness. Those who are for no change at all, or for such changes only as would make no difference in the spirit of the government, of course vote against it. All others may vote for it, reserving their ulterior opinions. It excludes all who do not come up to its mark, but admits all who go beyond it.
One lesson the consistent supporters of reform may take to themselves—a lesson which becomes more important in proportion as the contest ceases to be a mere mock fight and becomes a serious conflict of opposing reasons. Their practical conduct as politicians necessarily partakes of compromise. Their demands and systematic aims must often fall short of their principles. But let them not therefore cut down their principles to the measure of their demands. If they do, they lose far more in vigour of argument, and in the imposing influence of a sense of consistency and power, than they can possibly gain in charming away the fears of those who would, but dare not, follow them. Let them disclaim nothing which is a legitimate consequence of their principles. Let them tell the truth—when it is the truth—that their private opinion goes further than their public demands, and that if they ask less than what their principles would justify, it is not because they fear to avow, or are unable to defend, their principles, but because they think they are doing more good by uniting their efforts with those of others to attain a nearer object, and one more immediately practicable.
ON REFORM

DAILY NEWS, 19 JULY, 1848, P. 2

This unheaded leader (following the parliamentary report), which again brings French experience to bear on English reform, is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on Reform (1st leader), in the Daily News of 19th July 1848” (MacMinn, p. 70).

the more reasonable class of the opponents of reform do not attempt to defend the present constitution of parliament by any very confident appeal to its fruits; they find little to say in recommendation of the sort of government, or the sort of governors, which our present institutions give us; but they are unable to persuade themselves that matters would be at all mended by giving a more democratic character to the popular branch of the legislature. The fault, they say, is in the country itself; in the national education; in the state of the public mind; not in the constitution of parliament. If our statesmen are without ideas and without purposes, weak, passive, opinionless; if they have neither head nor heart to face the difficulties of any great question; if they rarely aspire to leave any of the larger interests of the people they profess to govern in a better condition than they found them; this is not (in the opinion of some persons) the fault of the men, so much as of the age and country, which have not produced better men, or have produced them only as scattered, obscure individuals, quite as likely to be overlooked by a numerous constituency as by a narrow one. If the classes who now rule in parliament are so deficient in the qualities which should belong to rulers, do the masses possess them? The knowledge, the vigour of intellect, the freedom from prejudice, the judgment undivided by selfishness or partiality, which we so deeply desiderate in the rich and high-born, do we find them in the poor? That clear-sighted justice and high-minded generosity, combined with practical resource, which the times demand—without which this great transitional period in opinions and institutions may be lengthened out in fruitless oscillations—what reason have we to flatter ourselves that these endowments, which we seek vainly among our so-called educated classes, will be found in the untaught delegates of the factory and the workshop? Is it not much, and more than we can expect, if those for whom society has done nothing, prove no worse than those on whom it has lavished all its means of instruction and improvement?

This objection assumes, as the natural and intended effect of popular institutions, that the crude opinions and unguided instincts of the working classes would be the directing power in the state. We have no such expectation from any extension of the franchise. Reformers have always maintained, and the example of France is now before us to show, that views of things taken from the peculiar position of the working classes are not likely to predominate, or to have at all more than their just influence,
even in a legislature chosen by universal suffrage. After a revolution made by
workmen, not twenty members in an assembly of nine hundred are working men.
Scarcely in our own parliament do opinions with any semblance of an anti-property
character meet with a more hostile reception; and it is evident that the errors of the
assembly are more likely to be on the side of conservatisn than of revolution. Then
what has France gained, it may be asked, or what would England gain by the
admission of the working classes to the franchise? A gain beyond all price, the effects
of which may not show themselves in a day, or in a year, but are calculated to spread
over and elevate the future. This gain does not consist in turning the propertied classes
out of the government and transferring it to the unpropertied, but in compelling the
propertied classes to carry it on in a manner which they shall be capable of justifying
to the unpropertied.

Grant but a democratic suffrage, and all the conditions of government are changed.
Whoever may be the rulers, the interest of the great mass of the community must then
stand foremost among the actuating principles in the conduct of public affairs. The
legislature must from that time make both the real and the apparent interests of the
most numerous classes an object of incessant solicitude; and whenever it does things
which are opposed to those apparent interests, it must defend them by reasons drawn
from the interests of those same classes, and appealing to their understandings. The
consequences of this would be incalculable. The discussions of parliament and of the
press would be, what they ought to be, a continued course of political instruction for
the working classes. Let those classes be as ignorant, prejudiced, passionate as any
one may choose to represent them; let them be full of all sorts of prepossessions
against property and order—those who are interested in property and order would feel
all the more strongly that their safety depended on enlightening that ignorance,
prejudice, and passion. One of the first measures of the democratic government of
France has been a bill to bestow gratuitous education, at the expense of the state, upon
the whole rising generation of the French people. Where the poorest have votes, the
richest can no longer be indifferent to the state of their mental cultivation. To educate
the whole community up to the highest point attainable is not then a matter of choice
but of fortunate necessity.

This, however, is only one, and the most obvious, of the benefits which would arise
from making the labouring masses a great power in the state. Nothing can be
imagined which would tend so much to regenerate the intellectual vigour of the
classes, who are now letting the powers of government perish in their hands from
mere mental feebleness. Every one who knows history or the human mind is aware,
that powerful intellects and strong characters are formed by conflict, and that the
times which have produced brilliant developments of mental accomplishment in
public stations have been those in which great principles and important social
elements have been fighting each other hand to hand—times of struggle for national
independence, political freedom, or religious emancipation. The present age also is an
age of struggle between conflicting principles which it is the work of this time, and
perhaps of many generations more, to bring into a just relation with one another. The
conflict now going on is between the instincts and immediate interests of the
propertied classes and those of the unpropertied. This opposition of interests—partly
real, partly only apparent—is at present the grand difficulty of government. All other
questions with which governments have yet begun to occupy themselves, are difficult chiefly by their connexion with this. Now, of those two opposing forces—neither of which can be disregarded, neither of which can or ought to triumph over the other, but which it is the grand business of government to attempt to reconcile—one only is represented in the British parliament. The ministry, be it what it may, exclusively represents the propertied classes; and the two houses of parliament are unanimously on the same side of the question as itself. It has to make out a case to the satisfaction solely of its own party. The murmurs of the other party it only hears at a distance, and is under no greater necessity of attending to them than the cabinet of a despot. There are no recognised organs for that other power, no way in which it can show itself above ground, and the extent of its subterraneous working will therefore only be known when some day, as at Vienna, it explodes and blows up the whole fabric of society.  

Is it not of old one of the principal and acknowledged uses of parliament, that all which agitates and divides society should make itself felt by a corresponding agitation and division there? Ought not parliament to be the place of discussion for adverse interests and principles, the arena where opposing forces should meet and fight out their battle, that they may not find themselves reduced to fight it in a less pacific field? If so, the British parliament does not fulfil its office; for the vital question with which all Europe rings, and which fills every thinking mind, both in England and on the continent, with anxiety—the question how to make the rights of property acceptable to the unpropertied classes, is unheard of in that assembly, which it ought more than anything else to occupy; and the subjects which engross parliamentary debates, compared with the great and urgent interests of the nation, form a contrast as full of irony, as the Byzantine multitude occupying itself with the factions of the circus when Attila was at their gates.  

So it will be until the rulers of the country have to meet face to face in parliament the representatives of those interests and feelings of which they are now ignorant, or from which they superciliously turn aside. They have to learn the difficult but necessary act of looking at established institutions and opinions from the point of view of those who are not on the sunny but on the shady side of the social edifice. Defects by which other people alone suffer are seldom seen until the sufferers point them out. When the unpropertied are fairly represented in the House of Commons, their just claims will, for the first time, obtain a really impartial hearing, and their unreasonable demands will, also for the first time, be so resisted as not to leave a stinging sense of injustice behind.
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the most important point in Mr. Hume’s plan of reform is the equalisation of the electoral districts. This one thing would do more towards diminishing the undue ascendancy of landed and moneyed wealth than all the other points, even of the charter,¹ without it. It would reduce the nominees of the landlords in the House of Commons from about two-thirds of the whole assembly to about one-third. And by making every electoral body too numerous to be bribed, it would put an end to the obtaining seats by mere expenditure, an object for which so much virtuous zeal is so ineffectually professed by all classes of half-reformers.

This, then, being, of all the “points,” by far the most disagreeable to the present ruling powers, the opposition to it is proportionally more obstinate than to any other. But as it is not convenient to say that the real objection to the measure is its efficacy, every encouragement is held out to the invention of sentimental objections. Electoral districts are said to be mechanical, pedantic, a rule-and-square system; and all the other phrases usually employed to throw discredit on precise and business-like modes of conducting any transaction. Serjeant Talfourd, the “good poet but bad politician,”² lent himself as an organ for this style of declamation; and clenched his first specimen with the passage, known to all readers of poetry from Coleridge’s translation of Schiller’s Wallenstein, in which the crafty Ottavio Piccolomini inculcates on his high-minded son the superiority of tortuous courses:

Straightforward flies
The lightning flash, and straight the cannon-ball,
Shattering that it may reach, and shattering what it reaches.³

So, because the lightning and the cannon-ball fly straight to their mark, nothing else should. Straightforwardness and directness of aim are declared to be discreditible things, and whatever takes the straight road to its object is an agent of destruction. Let us rather say that directness and power are the same thing or always accompany each other. If the object be to destroy, the means which are most direct are the most effectual; and so they are when the object is to preserve. When a person is in the water
and drowning, Mr. Talfourd would hardly quote Schiller in favour of going round about, instead of straight in to deliver him. If it is absolutely necessary to have an illustration from visible nature, the sunbeams move in straight lines as well as the lightning; indeed more so, for the lightning makes no objection to twisting and turning in order to accommodate itself to the direction of the conducting medium. A steamship, also, would have been a more appropriate exemplification of rectilineal movement than a cannon-ball. The poet goes on to say that the road on which blessing travels

Winds round the corn field and the hill of vines,
Honouring the holy bounds of property;\footnote{4}

but the very words of the quotation suggest that the illustration and the philosophy are both antiquated, and that roads, in these days, are not made on the principle which the poet patronises. Does it not occur to the admirers of crooked paths that we are living in an age of railroads; and that, now-a-days, rather than not go straight to our object, instead of winding round the hill we even tunnel through it? The spirit of the time requires that its machinery, whether for physical or for political purposes, shall be efficient. It is not reckoned a merit in machinery to imitate the pleasing irregularities of nature. Its beauty is in its accuracy: it works by straight lines and right angles, and works best when its lines are most correctly straight, its angles most exactly square.

Coleridge himself, though fond of quoting the passage which Mr. Talfourd cited from him,\footnote{5} is an authority in favour of electoral districts. He recommended, we think in his Church and State, a new administrative division of the country, describing the present one as barbarous, and a great obstacle to improvement.\footnote{6} Even Schiller is against Mr. Talfourd; for the fine verses put into the mouth of Piccolomini do not express Schiller’s opinions; on the contrary the whole tragedy is a demonstration, not for, but against Piccolomini’s maxims and conduct.

Electoral districts are mechanical. And why not? In whatever manner members of parliament are elected, there must be mechanical arrangement of some sort; and what these should be is not a question of poetry or the picturesque, but of means to an end. What is the right end, and by what means can it be accomplished? Is it the proper end of a House of Commons to make the landed and monied aristocracies the masters of the legislature? If so, keep the system as it is. Is it the object that no class shall predominate, but that all sections of the community shall be powerful in proportion to their numbers and their intelligence? A new division and constitution of the electoral body is then imperative; and the more nearly equal the number of electors in each constituency the more nearly is the end attained. There is a sentiment concerned in the matter, without doubt, but it is that of justice. When just ends are aimed at by just means, and means well adapted to their attainment, all other sentiment will take care of itself. Sentiment, and of the best kind, is sure to gather round all things which are large diffusers of good among the human race.

Unfortunately, reformers no more than anti-reformers have yet learned to make great principles their object, and in this lies the secret in the affairs of communities no less than in those of individuals, of ineffectual struggles and mean results. The world will
rally round a truly great principle, and be as much the better for the contest as for the attainment; but the petty objects by the pursuit of which no principle is asserted, are fruitless even when attained.
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from the day when the people of Paris expelled the ruler who had been called the monarch of the middle classes, and proclaimed a democratic republic, it has been evident that the fate of political and social improvement in Europe, for many years to come, was to be decided in France. If the revolution, after its first difficulties are over, issues in a government which at once preserves order and accelerates progress—makes the laws obeyed, and labours actively to improve them—then in England, and in all Europe, faith in improvement, and determination to effect it, will become general, and the watchword of improvement will once more be, as it was of old, the emancipation of the oppressed classes. If, on the other hand, the French people allow their republican institutions to be filched from them by artifice, or yield them up under the ascendancy of some popular chief, or under the panic caused by insurrection, or compromise them by an indefinite succession of disorders, repressed only by a succession of illegal violences on the part of the government, the tendency in this and other countries to the extension of political rights or the redress of social injustices, may be for a long time suspended. The tide will set in in a retrograde direction, and a timid conservative instinct will probably take the place of even that moderate taste for improvement which did exist in a certain portion of the influential classes of this country before February last.

The enemies of reform in England know all this, and their tactics are accommodated to it. Events in France itself are fortunately out of their power. If anything which they were able to do could make the revolution in France really a disastrous failure, it would be done. Lacking this, the most that there is any chance of accomplishing is to make it be thought a failure. And to effect this, there is hardly any exaggeration or misrepresentation which is not resorted to. Those whose notions of the state of France are taken from the leading articles of almost any English newspaper, are much worse than ignorant, they are entirely misinformed. The writers do not even preserve a decent consistency with the facts published by themselves. It has repeatedly happened, that the Paris correspondent in one column has given an authoritative denial of some slanderer’s report, which is expatiated on as an admitted truth in the same day’s editorial article. In other cases similar slanders, after having for several days served their purpose as texts for blackening the revolution, or some individual or party connected with it, have been contradicted in half-a-dozen words, and in a
corner, a week or more after the official contradiction had gone the round of the French newspapers. Oftener still, the denial, or positive disproof, given in the French papers, has not been noticed at all, while the calumny has continued to be assumed as an indisputable fact. Instances of all these kinds of misrepresentations have occurred (for example), with regard to the imputed atrocities of the late unsuccessful insurgents. There was no limit to the absurd incredibility of the things at first asserted respecting these people. The English journals eagerly circulated them all—even the nonsense about waylaying the troops and the national guard to poison them with brandy, and such cock and bull stories, which bore their absurdity on the face of them—to which nothing but the extreme of terror and exasperation combined could have made the greatest gobemouche in Paris give credit for an instant. This, and all the tales about poisoned balls and other peculiarly murderous missiles made and used by the insurgents, have been proved and are now admitted to be, not exaggerations, but absolute fictions, without the smallest pretence of a fact to ground them on. There is not a single imputation of cruelty or ferocity of anything like a general character which is not now given up; the only assertions of the kind as yet unrefuted are of two or three insulated acts by individuals, and it remains to be seen whether even these will stand the test of judicial inquiry. Yet the English public are still led to believe, and do believe, that the insurrection was something unheard-of for its horrible barbarity; and the journals which led them into this belief take care not to disabuse them of it. Nor are the victors in the late contest more spared by calumny than the vanquished. We are told with the coolest effrontery in leading articles about the number of persons who have been shot by order of the present French government—it being a notorious fact that not one person has been shot, not one life taken, by the authority of government in consequence of the insurrection, while it is expected that none will be taken even after trial. The mildness and moderation of the sincerely republican party are as conspicuous in the present head of the government and his cabinet as in the provisional government and executive commission who preceded him.

The readers of both whig and tory papers really ought to receive with distrust the statements which they find in those papers disadvantageous to France. They ought to consider how great an interest those papers have, or think they have, in putting the worst colour on French affairs. It is the only chance of preventing reform. There is no way now of discrediting reform without blackening France. The enemies of popular institutions have lost their most potent weapon, fear of the unknown. Democracy, in the popular signification of the term, exists as a fact, among our nearest neighbours. There, under our eyes, is universal suffrage, or what is usually, though improperly, called by that name; a sovereign assembly, elected by the whole male population; no aristocracy as a clog on its movements; and the motto of this government is Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Here, then, is an actual trial of the experiment; with what success depends on circumstances of which no one is yet in a condition to judge; but if the result should be a social system, which, with any amount of allowance for human imperfection, does sincerely, and in a manner not to be mistaken, aim at guiding its practice by the spirit of its motto, surely it cannot have other than a beneficial influence? Other countries will not fear anything worse for themselves from popular institutions than France suffers, or than they can be made to believe that France suffers. We may be certain, therefore, that the bad side of everything will be
made the most of; that every idle or malicious rumour of mischief will be circulated as a fact, and when each particular rumour is proved to be false, the general impression made by such false assertions will be studiously kept up, and that, fairly or foully, events in France will continue to be represented in the blackest colours in which there is any hope of representing them successfully. And such is, unfortunately, the general ignorance in this country respecting foreign affairs, that a large amount of misrepresentation may as yet be ventured upon without any considerable danger of detection.
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the journal of the agricultural society of ireland for last month contains an article by Sir Robert Kane, entitled, “The Large or Small Farm Question Considered,” in which he promulgates his sentiments on the economical condition of Ireland. The reputation of Sir Robert Kane, and the public position which he has held, give a sort of scientific, and at the same time official, weight to his opinions, and therefore common sense and common arithmetic, coming from him, may carry an authority which, on the wretched subject of Ireland, they seldom obtain by their intrinsic merits. The clamourers against small holdings and the division of the land may perhaps give heed to him, when he proves by figures that small farms, in the existing circumstances of Ireland, are a necessity; since on the large farm system there would be employment for no more than two-fifths of the present agricultural population, the other three-fifths becoming paupers, to be supported from the produce raised by the labour of the former. Perhaps, too, such an authority will be believed when he says that a small farm (meaning not the thirty acres of the Farmers’ Estate Bill, but farms of from ten to fourteen acres), “will always,” when the skill of the farmer and his appliances are equal, “produce more, acre for acre, and pay a higher rent than the large farm;” and he sees no reason why the appliances should not be equal, for there is, according to him, among the cultivating classes of Ireland, “a vast quantity of capital which would be rapidly drawn forth under a proper small-farm system.” [Pp. 165, 166.] “If the real circumstances of the small farmers of Ireland be looked into, it will be found that the investment of a capital of from 80l. to 90l. on a farm of fourteen acres” would be by no means beyond their capability. [P. 165.] “There exists,” he continues, “amongst our poorer classes a show of poverty beyond what even the reality would justify. . . . They are afraid to let it be known they have money, lest their rent should be raised; they are afraid to improve their land, lest their rent should be raised; they are afraid to wear good clothes, lest they might appear to be deriving more from the produce of their farm than the miserable means of physical existence which their landlord will allow them to retain. Hence the money hid in thatch and buried in barns. Hence the secret and illegal deposits in savings’ banks in fictitious names.” [Ibid.]
It is hardly possible, we should think, for the most exclusive admirer of English farming to read this paper, and continue to believe that the most available remedy for Irish poverty is the clearing of estates and consolidation of small farms into large ones; and if the writer is correct in his opinion that there exists in the hands of small farmers sufficient capital for carrying on “a proper small-farm system” in such a manner as to yield, acre for acre, a greater produce than that of large farms, the road to the economical regeneration of Ireland is sufficiently plain. The reader who has followed Sir Robert Kane thus far is anxious to know how, in his opinion, this “proper small-farm system” is to be arrived at. We are sorry to be obliged to tell him that, on this subject, he will get no help from Sir R. Kane. The evils Sir Robert can understand, but on the subject of remedies nothing can be more lame and impotent than his conclusion. The same fear which paralyses every minister, every member of parliament, and almost every public writer when the real evils of Ireland come into question, ties his tongue. Most gladly would they do anything for Ireland, only there must not be a word said of the one vital point in the constitution of society as it exists in Ireland—the tenure of land. To fill Ireland with soldiers, blockade her with ships, to seize presses, confiscate newspapers, and imprison men without trial under a Habeas Corpus Suspension Act—these things are easy; but to brave the clamour of the men who call even the sale of land to pay the debts of the proprietor a “confiscation of all the land of Ireland,” is a thing which cannot be risked even to get rid of the main source of Irish misery and Irish disaffection together. And Sir Robert Kane, although not privileged, like a minister of state, to be ignorant of his business, can propose nothing as a remedy for Ireland but to instruct the people in agriculture: as if any quantity of instruction in farming would make people improve their farms who, on his own showing, hide their money in the thatch, for fear that if their landlord knew of it he would raise the rent! Is it not a mockery to talk of doing any good to the peasantry of a country in such a state of things as this? Who can expect agricultural improvement where the rent depends on the good pleasure of the landlords, and of such landlords?

Yet Sir Robert Kane writes strongly and boldly, while confining himself to generals:

The landlord [he says] has to learn that feudalism is extinct; that Great Britain and Ireland are the only places in the world where feudal landlordism is not extinct, except where the people are still slaves, and that there is a very large and intelligent class who think that the time is close at hand for reforming landlordism here also. The landed interests of this country, shut out by their insular position, by their ignorance and their pride, from making themselves acquainted with the forces of thought that have grown up within the last half-century, and which now govern the opinion of Europe, will only endanger their legitimate influence and position if they attempt to retain for the future the feudal privileges and territorial powers which were the natural social circumstances of the ancient times. Even in Ireland, the hospital for the aged and disabled ideas of Europe, feudalism, and the divine power of land, is dying—its worn out form crushed by the iron power of the industrial spirit.

[Pp. 167-9.]
This is excellent; but, unfortunately, Sir R. Kane does not mean it in the sense in which it can be of any practical use. For the old, worn out theory which he so justly repudiates, that landlords have the duties and are entitled to the rights of governors, he would substitute the doctrine that land falls under the same rules as any other article of commerce, and that neither law nor opinion has anything to do with the mode in which the owner manages it for his own interest.

A landowner is simply a dealer in land—a capitalist who has, either by himself or by his ancestor, invested his capital or his skill in land; he hires out the use of it to certain parties, who pay him therefor, as they pay for the cloth for their clothes, or the furniture for their rooms; and not merely the right, but the plain duty of the landlord is, to get the highest possible price he can for his land, and to compel the payment of that price by law.

We will not comment on this absurd notion of “duty,” nor will we discuss the question—How many of the 8,000 Irish landlords ever did, either by themselves or their ancestors, invest any particle of “capital or skill,” in their land; because we readily allow that the right of property in land in the present day ought not to depend on the manner in which the land was acquired centuries ago. But we do say that this theory of the purely commercial character of contracts for land, wherever else it may be applicable, does not and cannot apply to a country in the exceptional situation of Ireland. The contract for rent, in Ireland, is not between the landlord and a capitalist farmer, who is able to take care of his own interest, and makes no bargain but such as he believes to be commercially advantageous to him. The Irish landlord’s contract is with a peasant labourer, who cultivates not for profit but for existence, and who, if he cannot obtain a piece of land, has no choice but beggary or the poor-rate. It is not peasant farming that is objectionable; on this point we wholly agree with Sir R. Kane; but peasant-farming in an over-peopled country, and at a rent fixed by competition, we hold to be the main cause of all Ireland’s evils. The competition of superabundant numbers makes the tenants promise, and legally bind themselves, to pay nominal rents, exceeding not merely their means of payment, but the entire capabilities of the soil. On the “commercial principle” the landlord could sweep away the last potato; and the only estates in Ireland which are exceptions to the general wretchedness are those of which the owners, abandoning the commercial principle altogether, have taken upon themselves the tenant’s side of the question as well as their own, and have considered, not what the tenant will offer, but what the landlord ought to accept. The public, therefore, is interested, and very greatly so, in the mode in which landlords manage their estates; and if it is their general practice to manage them on a system of which all that we see in Ireland is the natural result, it will not do to say, with Sir R. Kane, that “it is the simple right of an owner of land to sell or let it at the highest price the market will afford.” [P. 169.] It is time to revert to just principles, and to regulate the supposed right of an owner of land in such a manner as to make it at least consistent with the essential conditions of industry, prudence, and material comfort, in the agricultural population.
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THE FRENCH LAW AGAINST THE PRESS

SPECTATOR, 19 AUG., 1848, P. 800

On 11 Aug., 1848, the National Assembly in France promulgated a law severely restricting the freedom of the press (Bull. 60, No. 621), which Mill here quotes in translation. The article, headed “[From a Correspondent.]”, is described in Mill’s bibliography as “An article headed ‘from a Correspondent’ on the French law against the press, in the Spectator of 19th August 1848” (MacMinn, p. 70).

the decree against the press, just passed almost with unanimity by the National Assembly of France, is one of the most monstrous outrages on the idea of freedom of discussion ever committed by the legislature of a country pretending to be free. It is the very law of Louis Philippe—the September law, once so indignantly denounced—with scarcely any alteration but the substitution of the word “Republic” for “Monarchy.”

This precious specimen of Liberal legislation declares punishable by fine and imprisonment all attacks on “the rights and authority of the National Assembly—on the rights and authority which the members of the Executive derive from the decrees of the Assembly—on the Republican institutions and the Constitution—on the principle of the sovereignty of the people and of universal suffrage—on the liberty of worship, the principle of property, and the rights of family”; [Art. 1] besides which, it ordains similar punishments for “exciting hatred and contempt towards the Government of the Republic,” [Art. 4] and for “public outrage committed (in their public character) against one or more members of the National Assembly, or against a Minister of any religion paid by the State.” [Art. 5.]

This list of subjects on which discussion is prohibited, or permitted only on one side, includes all the great political and social questions of the age. If only one set of opinions is to be permitted on any matter which involves the right of property, the rights or obligations of family, the question of Republicanism, of universal suffrage, even the particular constitution which the Assembly may hereafter adopt, or the rightfulness of abolishing that constitution—what are the subjects, worth discussing, on which freedom of political discussion is to exist? “The acts of the Executive,” says the decree. “The present provision is not to affect the right of discussion and censure on the acts of the Executive and of the Ministers.” [Art. 4.] A most liberal concession, truly! The law is worse, with only this reservation in favour of freedom, than if there were no reservation at all; for the most tyrannical court of justice which could now exist in civilized Europe would reserve more than this. It is not declared that even the actions of the Legislature may be censured, but only those of the Executive; and with
regard to laws or institutions, no liberty of censure is reserved at all. There was a
wretched pretence by one or two of the speakers, that no restraint was intended on the
“freedom of philosophical discussion”—that nothing was to be forbidden but
incitement to hatred and contempt. But the decree says nothing of the kind. The
decree prohibits “any attack.” [Art. 1.] The distinction is good for nothing, even if it
were made. To say that attacks are permitted, but not incitements to hatred and
contempt, would be to say that discussion shall be lawful on condition that it be cold,
dry, and unimpressive; that the dull and the indifferent shall be allowed to express
opinions, but that persons of genius and feeling must hold their peace. Under such
laws, it has been truly said in one of the French journals, Rousseau’s discourse on
Inequality never could have been published. Nor could any great writings of great
reformers, religious or political, have seen the light if such laws had existed and had
been obeyed.

How long shall we continue to see the regard for freedom of opinion, which all parties
profess while they are on the oppressed side, thrown off by them all as soon as they
are in the majority? How much longer must we wait for an example, anywhere in
Europe, of a ruler or a ruling party who really desire fair play for any opinions
contrary to their own? Is it not shameful that no sooner has a reforming party
accomplished as much change in the institutions of the country as itself deems
desirable, than it proceeds to decree that every person shall be fined or imprisoned,
who proposes either to go a single step further or a step back? We are aware of the
allowances to be made for men lately engaged in a desperate and at one time a
doubtful contest against a determined attempt at insurrection; and we know too that
this decree is avowedly a temporary measure, to be hereafter superseded by more
deliberate legislation. But we lament to say, that in the tone assumed, and the
doctrines professed by the speakers, we see no ground of assurance that the permanent
measure will be at all different, in spirit and principle, from the transitional one.

It is not, however, for English Conservatives, either Whig or Tory, to indulge any
self-complacent triumph over French Republicans. The new act of the French
Assembly does not make the laws of France on the freedom of the press worse than
those of England have always been. The freedom of the press, in England, is entirely
an affair of opinion and custom, not of law. It exists because the laws are not
enforced. The law of political libel, as laid down in all the books, is as inconsistent
with free discussion as the laws of Russia. There is no censure of any established
institution or constituted authority which is not an offence by law. And within these
few months it has been seen how eagerly the English Parliament, under the influence
of a far less degree of panic, have rushed to make the laws against what was deemed
seditious speaking or writing more stringent than before.

A government cannot be blamed for defending itself against insurrection. But it
deserves the severest blame if to prevent insurrection it prevents the promulgation
of opinion. If it does so, it actually justifies insurrection in those to whom it denies the
use of peaceful means to make their opinions prevail. Hitherto the French
Government has been altogether in the right against all attempts to overthrow it. But
by what right can the Assembly now reprobate any future attempt, either by
Monarchists or Socialists, to rise in arms against the Government? It denies them free
discussion. It says they shall not be suffered to bring their opinions to the touchstone of the public reason and conscience. It refuses them the chance which every sincere opinion can justly claim, of triumphing in a fair field. It fights them with weapons which can as easily be used to put down the most valuable truth as the most pernicious error. It tells them that they must prevail by violence before they shall be allowed to contend by argument. Who can blame persons who are deeply convinced of the truth and importance of their opinions, for asserting them by force, when that is the only means left them of obtaining even a hearing? When their mouths are gagged, can they be reproached for using their arms?
379.

BAIN’S ON THE APPLICATIONS OF SCIENCE TO HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

EXAMINER, 2 SEPT., 1848, P. 565

Alexander Bain (1818-1903), Mill’s friend and future biographer, who had written for the Westminster and helped Mill to revise his Logic, had held several posts as lecturer in moral and natural philosophy in Scottish universities. The pamphlet here reviewed was the first of four lectures, all on the same subject, which he had given at the Edinburgh Philosophic Institution in 1847. Mill’s review, in the “Literary Examiner,” is headed “On the Applications of Science to Human Health and Well-being, being a Lecture, introductory to a Course ‘on the Application of Physics to Common Life,’ delivered at the Edinburgh Institution in June, 1847. By Alexander Bain, [London:] A.M. Taylor [in fact, John J. Griffin]. [Glasgow: Richard Griffin, 1848.]” This review is not in Mill’s bibliography, but may be confidently attributed to him on the basis of the comment by Bain: “Chadwick had the fancy that my introductory lecture to the Edinburgh Course would be a recommendation in procuring the official consent to my being appointed [to the Metropolitan Sanitary Commission]. Accordingly, I threw off a number of copies, and gave them as presents, and exposed some for sale with Griffin, the publisher. John Mill prepared a notice of the lecture in the Examiner newspaper.” (Bain, Autobiography [London: Longmans, Green, 1904], p. 197n.)

there is no more popular subject at present than the applications of physical science; and there can be none more appropriate for a popular lecturer, combining as it does an inexhaustible store of wonders with a direct influence on the most obvious and universal interests of life. Few persons are so competent to treat this class of topics usefully and attractively, as Mr. Bain. His knowledge of the leading departments of physical science is accurate and profound; and he has a happy faculty for clearly explaining and familiarly illustrating what he knows. To these he adds the still rarer attribute, of a mind which looks ever through and beyond its immediate subject; scrupulously exact in details, yet not treating them like a mere man of detail, but as materials towards building up a nobler and happier scheme of human existence.

These general ideas and aspirations naturally come most distinctly to view in the present publication, which is but an introductory lecture. The following extract is illustrative of this portion of the author’s views:

There are two great stages in the progress of the various arts and productive occupations of human life. The earliest set of devices are derived from men’s ordinary and unassisted observation of the usual course of nature. The methods of mining, building, ploughing, sowing, spinning, dyeing, metal working, carrying from place to place, navigating, and so forth, are got at after trying many different methods and
implements until it is seen that some answer better than the rest, these being once approved of, are then handed down to posterity, and they may often remain unchanged for a long course of ages. In fact, unassisted reason soon comes to a standstill; as we see in such nations as the Hindoos and Chinese, who have never reached scientific methods of acquiring a knowledge of Nature. The second stage of progress is entered on, when, by the perfection of the knowledge-seeking art, the hidden laws of things are brought to light, and a vast number of additional properties discovered in the various objects of the world; when, for instance, by looking into the composition of vegetable bodies, and into the matters making up the soil that nourishes them, we can specifically and exactly suit the one to the other, instead of depending on a vague experience of gross results. On this second stage the European world entered last century, in regard to the mechanical arts; so that, in fact, we are only beginning to develop the vast resources of our planet, and we have now to look forward to a long and unremitting series of improvements.

But I must next call your attention to the difference between the Arts of Life, and the Art of Living,—or between man’s powers in farming, building, manufacturing and trading, and his ability to apply the results of all these to his own life and well-being; for this is the final intention of such manifold labours. Because we have very much improved the Arts of Life, it does not follow that we have equally improved the Art of Living. We may increase our abundance of the things that are useful and good, without acquiring the skill to apply them in proper measure, and in well-timed arrangement to the highly complex structure and constitution of our living framework.

It is, beyond all question, desirable that each one of us should contrive our arrangements and daily ongoings so as to make the very most of life; to render our existence as rich and effective, and great and brilliant, as it can be made; to combine the choicest enjoyments with the most wide-ranging and beneficial activity. Now it is only by knowledge and skill going along with adequate force of resolution, that we can so use the resources of the world on the one hand, and so control the impulses of our own nature on the other, as to maintain the highest possible pitch of vitality, and cause a constant current of our finest emotions and activities.

The Art of Living is the method of stretching out the resources of the world to the measure of human wants, desires, and capabilities. Each person has to consider his own peculiar situation and framework, and to select from among his possessions and opportunities, what will do most to yield him a grand and beautiful existence. We have all a certain command of what supports and gratifies body and mind; we have our homes, our city, our companions, our books, our means of accomplishment and instruction, our walks and excursions, the face of nature, the inspiration of art, the ongoings of the world, and many other things capable of influencing us to our very inmost being; on the other side, we are liable to burdens and toils, to violent shocks and slow miseries, to weariness and depression, to temptations and failures; and it becomes our task to dispose all these things to the making our lives joyous rather than grievous, powerful and benignant, rather than empty and hurtful.

[Pp. 6-8.]
After showing the insufficiency of merely empirical observation, without a scientific study of the powers of nature to form an adequate basis for the regulation of life, the author continues:

That the Art of Living has not yet come to great perfection is testified by the deplorable experience of the human race. The perplexity, and discord, and difficulties of life have been the theme of complaints that ring through all the ages of men; yielding Cynic and Stoic philosophies, self-inflicted tortures and immolations, voluntary banishment from the world, gloomy speculations, suicides and crimes. It is surely worth while trying whether a better knowledge of the actual course of things, and of the beneficial agencies wrapt up in the womb of nature, may not help, among other causes, to stem such a torrent of despair, and prove the possibility of a great and harmonious existence for man.

For this end we are anxious that the Art of Living should be based, not as heretofore, upon vague experience, however extensive, but on the well-sifted and thoroughly tested experience that constitutes our Exact Sciences. And it is a satisfaction to know that several of these sciences have already yielded important contributions to this great practical object.

[Pp. 10-11.]

A brief survey follows of what has been done, and of much more which is yet to be done by the various sciences, in furnishing means to lighten the burdens and increase the enjoyments and powers of human existence; not omitting the, as yet, infant sciences of the human mind and of human society.

A brief syllabus is annexed of the course, consisting of four lectures, of which the one now published was the first. The topics treated appear to have been chiefly the application to the health and comfort of life, and of what science has ascertained respecting the laws and properties of heat, water, air, and the effects of action and repose. A portion of the second lecture is given at length, relating to the bath and its uses, which affords a favourable idea of the lecturer’s talent for popular exposition of the details of his subject.
This third newspaper review of Grote’s History (see Nos. 304 and 368) is the first of two dealing with Volumes V and VI (see No. 381 for the second part). Writing to Grote in January 1849, Mill notes that he has just finished reading the two volumes (published in December 1848) with “the greatest pleasure and admiration,” adding that “Every great result which you have attempted to deduce seems to me most thoroughly made out” (LL, CW, Vol. XIV, p. 3). The review, in the “Books” section, is headed “Grote’s History of Greece,” with the heading footnoted: “History of Greece. By George Grote, Esq. Volumes V and VI. Published by Murray. [London, 1848.]” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A first notice of the 5th and 6th volumes of Grote’s History of Greece, in the Spectator of 3d March 1849” (MacMinn, p. 70). A large portion of this review was quoted by Mill when he revised “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” Edinburgh Review, XCVIII (Oct. 1853), 425-47 (a review of Vols. IX-XI), for incorporation into his Dissertations and Discussions, 1st ed. (1859), Vol. II, pp. 510-54 (CW, Vol. XI, pp. 307-37); in the variant notes, “59” indicates D&D.

in his former volumes Mr. Grote brought down the Grecian history only to the battle of Marathon and the repulse of the first Persian invasion. He had thus barely arrived at the times for which the historian possesses the advantage of detailed information derived from contemporary authorities; and the view which he was able to exhibit of early Grecian events was necessarily so general, was collected from such scattered sources, and required so much of inference and even conjecture to piece it together, that, except in the few concluding chapters, the author’s powers as a mere narrator were not brought to any decisive test. With so little of story to tell, he had nevertheless, by a skilful manner of grouping the few known or ascertainable facts, and by the high character of the personal and political interest with which he was able to invest the early stages of Grecian freedom and civilization, given earnest of what he was likely to accomplish when he reached the period during which it is given us to know, not only the great events in the life of the Hellenic states, but the steps by which these were brought about, and many of the striking incidents which marked their course.

In the present volumes, Mr. Grote has the assistance throughout of eminent contemporary historians. In the earlier chapters, he travels under the guidance of the candid and inquisitive Herodotus, whose veracity he successfully vindicates against its ancient and modern assailants: a writer now known to be as trustworthy as he is picturesque, and who is here speaking of events contemporaneous with his own childhood—events with the actors in which, in many cases, he must have familiarly conversed. Where Herodotus fails, a still higher authority, the thoughtful,
experienced, and accurate Thucydides, succeeds. A consecutive and authentic narrative therefore is here possible. In these volumes the recital of events assumes for the first time a marked predominance over the investigation of obscure facts, the discussion of evidence, and political and philosophical reflection. It is at this point, therefore, that the amount of Mr. Grote’s skill as a narrator can for the first time be decisively judged of.

The result of the trial is highly satisfactory. The sixth volume, especially, is a specimen of narrative which it would be difficult to surpass, in its own kind, from the writings of any English historian. Its excellence does not consist (any more than that of some of the most successful specimens of historical narrative which English literature already possessed) in the painting of mere externals. But in the truth and vividness of his conception of the events and in their essentials, and in his power of imparting this to the reader, we should be inclined to place him at the head of all English historians; and in what may be termed historical imagination—in the power of taking into his mind, at every period, the whole of the situation, and of making the reader do the same—it would not be easy to find his superior among the historians of any country. Certainly no writer on Greece had ever manifested this power; and the consequence is, that the most unexpected new lights are continually thrown even upon familiar facts of Grecian history, not by long discussion and argument, but by merely confronting them with one another.

\[\text{a}^\text{Nor is the narrative deficient in the commoner sources of interest. The apt selection and artistic grouping of the details of battles and sieges, Mr. Grote had found done to his hand by the consummate narrators whom he follows, and in this respect he could do no better than simply to reproduce their recital. There is much more that belongs peculiarly to himself in the series of remarkable characters whom he exhibits before us, not so much (generally speaking) in description or analysis, as in action. In the earlier period, the prominent characters are Themistocles and Aristides: Themistocles, the most sagacious, the most far-sighted, the most judiciously daring, the craftiest, and unfortunately also one of the most unprincipled of politicians; who first saved, then aggrandized, and at last would have sold his country; Aristides, the personification of public and private integrity, the one only Grecian statesman who finds grace before the somewhat pedantically rigid tribunal of the Platonic Socrates.}\]

\[\text{b}^\text{But the figure which most brightly illuminates this division of Mr. Grote’s history is Pericles—“the Thunderer”—“the Olympian Zeus,” as he was called by his libellers, the comic dramatists of Athens.}\]

\[\text{Seldom, if ever, has there been seen in a statesman of any age, such a combination of great qualities as were united in this illustrious man: unrivalled in eloquence; eminent in all the acquirements, talents, and accomplishments of his country; the associate of all those among his contemporaries who were above their age, either in positive knowledge or in freedom from superstition; though an aristocrat by birth and fortune, a thorough democrat in principle and conduct, yet never stooping to even the pardonable arts of courting popularity, but acquiring and maintaining his ascendancy solely by his commanding qualities; never flattering his countrymen save on what was really admirable in them, and which it was for their good to be taught to cherish, but the determined enemy of their faults and follies; ever ready to peril his popularity by}\]
giving disagreeable advice, and when not appreciated, rising up against the injustice done him, with a scornful dignity almost amounting to defiance. Such was Pericles: and that such a man should have been practically first minister of Athens during the greatest part of a long political life, is not so much honourable to him as to the imperial people who were willing to be so led; who, though in fits of temporary irritation and disappointment, excusable in the circumstances, they several times withdrew their favour from him, always hastened to give it back; and over whom, while he lived, no person of talents and virtues inferior to his was able to obtain any mischievous degree of influence. It is impossible to estimate how great a share this one man had in making the Athenians what they were, the greatest people who have yet appeared on this planet. A great man had, in the unbounded publicity of Athenian political life, extraordinary facilities for moulding his country after his own image; and seldom has any people, during a whole generation, enjoyed such a course of education, as forty years of listening to the lofty spirit and practical wisdom of Pericles must have been to the Athenian Demos.

As the next in this gallery of historical portraits, we quote the character of another but a far inferior Athenian statesman, whom Mr. Grote is, we think, the very first to appreciate correctly, and bring before us in the colours and lineaments of life.

Character of Nicias

Though Nikias, son of Nikeratus, had been for some time conspicuous in public life, and is said to have been more than once Strategus along with Perikles, this is the first occasion on which Thucydides introduces him to our notice. He was now one of the Strategi or generals of the commonwealth, and appears to have enjoyed, on the whole, a greater and more constant personal esteem than any citizen of Athens, from the present time down to his death. In wealth and in family, he ranked among the first class of Athenians: in political character, Aristotle placed him, together with Thucydides son of Melesias and Theramenes, above all other names in Athenian history—seemingly even above Perikles. Such a criticism, from Aristotle, deserves respectful attention, though the facts before us completely belie so lofty an estimate. It marks, however, the position occupied by Nikias in Athenian politics, as the principal person of what may be called the oligarchical party, succeeding Kimon and Thucydides, and preceding Theramenes. In looking to the conditions under which this party continued to subsist, we shall see that during the interval between Thucydides (son of Melesias) and Nikias, the democratical forms had acquired such confirmed ascendancy, that it would not have suited the purpose of any politician to betray evidence of positive hostility to them, prior to the Sicilian expedition and the great embarrassment in the foreign relations of Athens which arose out of that disaster. After that change, the Athenian oligarchs became emboldened and aggressive, so that we shall find Theramenes among the chief conspirators in the revolution of the Four Hundred; but Nikias represents the oligarchical party in its previous state of quiescence and torpidity, accommodating itself to a sovereign democracy, and existing in the form of common sentiment rather than of common purposes. And it is a remarkable illustration of the real temper of the Athenian people, that a man of this character, known as an oligarch but not feared as such, and doing his duty sincerely to the democracy, should have remained until his death the most esteemed and
influential man in the city. He was a man of a sort of even mediocrity, in intellect, in education, and in oratory: forward in his military duties, and not only personally courageous in the field, but also competent as a general under ordinary circumstances: assiduous in the discharge of all political duties at home, especially in the post of Strategus or one of the ten generals of the state, to which he was frequently chosen and rechosen. Of the many valuable qualities combined in his predecessor Perikles, the recollection of whom was yet fresh in the Athenian mind, Nikias possessed two, on which, most of all, his influence rested,—though, properly speaking, that influence belongs to the sum total of his character, and not to any special attributes in it. First, he was thoroughly incorruptible as to pecuniary gains,—a quality so rare in Grecian public men of all the cities, that when a man once became notorious for possessing it, he acquired a greater degree of trust than any superiority of intellect could have bestowed upon him: next, he adopted the Periklean view as to the necessity of a conservative or stationary foreign policy for Athens, and of avoiding new acquisitions at a distance, adventurous risks, or provocation to fresh enemies. With this important point of analogy, there were at the same time material differences between them even in regard to foreign policy. Perikles was a conservative, resolute against submitting to loss or abstraction of empire, as well as refraining from aggrandizement. Nikias was in policy faint-hearted, averse to energetic effort for any purpose whatever, and disposed not only to maintain peace, but even to purchase it by considerable sacrifices. Nevertheless, he was the leading champion of the conservative party of his day, always powerful at Athens: and as he was constantly familiar with the details and actual course of public affairs, capable of giving full effect to the cautious and prudential point of view, and enjoying unqualified credit for honest purposes—his value as a permanent counsellor was steadily recognized, even though in particular cases his counsel might not be followed.

Besides these two main points, which Nikias had in common with Perikles, he was perfect in the use of those minor and collateral modes of standing well with the people, which that great man had taken little pains to practise. While Perikles attached himself to Aspasia, whose splendid qualities did not redeem in the eyes of the public either her foreign origin or her unchastity, the domestic habits of Nikias appear to have been strictly conformable to the rules of Athenian decorum. Perikles was surrounded by philosophers, Nikias by prophets—whose advice was necessary both as a consolation to his temperament and as a guide to his intelligence under difficulties: one of them was constantly in his service and confidence; and his conduct appears to have been sensibly affected by the difference of character between one prophet and another, just as the government of Louis XIV and other Catholic princes has been modified by the change of confessors. To a life thus rigidly decorous and ultra-religious—both eminently acceptable to the Athenians—Nikias added the judicious employment of a large fortune with a view to popularity. Those liturgies (or expensive public duties undertaken by rich men each in his turn, throughout other cities of Greece as well as in Athens) which fell to his lot were performed with such splendour, munificence, and good taste, as to procure for him universal encomiums; and so much above his predecessors as to be long remembered and extolled. Most of these liturgies were connected with the religious service of the state; so that Nikias, by his manner of performing them, displayed his zeal for the honour of the gods at the same time that he laid up for himself a store of popularity. Moreover, the remarkable
caution and timidity—not before an enemy, but in reference to his own fellow citizens—which marked his character, rendered him pre-eminently scrupulous as to giving offence or making personal enemies. While his demeanour towards the poorer citizens generally was equal and conciliating, the presents which he made were numerous, both to gain friends and to silence assailants. We are not surprised to hear that various bullies, whom the comic writers turn to scorn, made their profit out of this susceptibility, but most assuredly, Nikias as a public man, though he might occasionally be cheated out of money, was greatly assisted by the reputation which he thus acquired.

[Vol. VI, pp. 385-90.]

We have the more willingly extracted this passage, because, like many others in these volumes, it contains lessons applicable to other times and circumstances than those of Greece; Nicias being a perfect type of one large class of the favourites of public opinion, modern as well as ancient. And the view here incidentally presented of some points in the character and disposition of the Athenian Many, will afford to readers who only know Athens and Greece through the medium of writers like Mitford, some faint idea of how much they have to unlearn.†

In personal contrast as well as in political opposition to Nicias, stands the celebrated Cleon,9 usually taken as the representative of everything hateful that can be ascribed to the character of a successful demagogue, combined with all that is contemptible in political imbecility and presumption. We shall quote the first introduction of this noted character upon the scene, for this among other reasons, that we have seen Mr. Grote accused of being prejudiced in his favour;10 and as, from considerable familiarity with many of Mr. Grote’s authorities, we have in vain attempted to discover in his volumes a single instance of deviation from impartiality, it is but just to him to repel this accusation. It is true that, in his opinion, the devil is not so black as he is painted. Posterity has been unwilling to believe that Cleon could ever be in the right; the outline of his character, supplied by his political and personal enemy Thucydides,11 having been filled up by a literal adoption of the bitter jests of that buffoon of genius Aristophanes,12 although in other cases, such as that of Socrates, we possess certain evidence how remote those jests were from having even so much of truth as is contained in a caricature. The following is Mr. Grote’s discriminating and unprejudiced view of Cleon’s character.

He is described by Thucydides in general terms as a person of the most violent temper and character in Athens—as being dishonest in his calumnies, and virulent in his invective and accusation. . . . The general attributes set forth by Thucydides (apart from Aristophanes, who does not profess to write history) we may well accept—the powerful and violent invective of Kleon, often dishonest—together with his self-confidence and audacity in the public assembly. Men of the middling class, like Kleon and Hyperbolus,13 who persevered in addressing the public assembly and trying to take a leading part in it, against persons of greater family pretension than themselves, were pretty sure to be men of more than usual audacity. Had they not possessed this quality, they would never have surmounted the opposition made to them: we may well believe that they had it to a displeasing excess; and even if they had not, the same
measure of self-assumption which in Alkibiades would be tolerated from his rank and station, would in them pass for insupportable impudence. Unhappily, we have no specimens to enable us to appreciate the invective of Kleon. We cannot determine whether it was more virulent than that of Demosthenes and Aeschines, seventy years afterwards; each of those eminent orators imputing to the other the grossest impudence, calumny, perjury, corruption, loud voice and revolting audacity of manner, in language which Kleon can hardly have surpassed in intensity of vituperation, though he doubtless fell immeasurably short of it in classical finish. Nor can we even tell in what degree Kleon’s denunciations of the veteran Perikles were fiercer than those memorable invectives against the old age of Sir Robert Walpole with which Lord Chatham’s political career opened. The fact of Kleon’s great power of speech, and his capacity of handling public business in a popular manner, is better attested than anything else respecting him, because it depends upon two witnesses, both hostile to him—Thucydides and Aristophanes. The assembly and the dikastery were Kleon’s theatre and holding-ground: for the Athenian people taken collectively in their place of meeting—and the Athenian people taken individually—were not always the same person, and had not the same mode of judgment: Demos sitting in the Pnyx was a different man from Demos at home. The lofty combination of qualities possessed by Perikles exercised ascendancy over both one and the other; but the qualities of Kleon swayed considerably the former without standing high in the esteem of the latter.

[Vol. VI, pp. 332-4.]

The following passage characterizes the real nature of Cleon’s position in the Athenian commonwealth.

To employ terms which are not fully suitable to the Athenian democracy, but which yet bring to view the difference intended to be noted better than any others, Nikias was a Minister or Ministerial man, often actually exercising and always likely to exercise official functions: Kleon was a man of the Opposition, whose province it was to supervise and censure official men for their public conduct. We must divest these words of that sense which they are understood to carry in English political life—a standing Parliamentary majority in favour of one party: Kleon would often carry in the public assembly resolutions, which his opponents Nikias and others of like rank and position—who served in the posts of Strategus, ambassador, and other important offices designated by the general vote—were obliged against their will to execute. While Nikias was thus in what may be called ministerial function, Kleon was not of sufficient importance to attain the same, but was confined to the inferior function of opposition. As an opposition man, fierce and violent in temper, Kleon was extremely formidable to all acting functionaries; and from his influence in the public assembly, he was doubtless the author of many important positive measures, thus going beyond the functions belonging to what is called opposition. But though the most effective speaker in the public assembly, he was not for that reason the most influential person in the democracy: his powers of speech in fact stood out the more prominently, because they were found apart from that station and those qualities which were considered, even at Athens, all but essential to make a man a leader in political life. To understand the political condition of Athens at this time, it has been
necessary to take this comparison between Nikias and Kleon, and to remark, that though the latter might be a more victorious speaker, the former was the more guiding and influential leader; the points gained by Kleon were all noisy and palpable,—sometimes, however, without doubt, of considerable moment,—but the course of affairs was much more under the direction of Nikias.

[Vol. VI, pp. 392-5.]

We cannot help adding Mr. Grote’s very instructive comment on the first and almost only oration of Cleon, the substance of which has been preserved to us.  

His remarks go deep into the inmost essence of demagogy, and may teach some persons to recognize it in forms to which it is usual to apply much more honourable names.

If we are surprised to find a man, whose whole importance resided in his tongue, denouncing so severely the licence and the undue influence of speech in the public assembly, we must recollect that Kleon had the advantage of addressing himself to the intense prevalent sentiment of the moment; that he could therefore pass off the dictates of this sentiment as plain, downright, honest sense and patriotism, while the opponents, speaking against the reigning sentiment and therefore driven to collateral argument, circumlocution, and more or less of manoeuvre, might be represented as mere clever sophists, showing their talents in making the worse appear the better reason—if not actually bribed, at least unprincipled and without any sincere moral conviction. As this is a mode of dealing with questions both of public concern and of private morality, not less common at present than it was in the time of the Peloponnesian war—to seize upon some strong and tolerably widespread sentiment among the public, to treat the dictates of that sentiment as plain common sense and obvious right, and then to shut out all rational estimate of coming good and evil as if it were unholy or immoral, or at best mere uncandid subtlety—we may well notice a case in which Kleon employs it to support a proposition now justly regarded as barbarous.

[Vol. VI, pp. 340-1.]

There are so many topics in Mr. Grote’s volumes which demand notice, that it is impossible to do them anything like justice in the space of a single paper: we shall return to some of them in another article.
GROTE’S HISTORY OF GREECE [4]

SPECTATOR, 10 MAR., 1849, PP. 227-8

This fourth newspaper review by Mill of Grote’s History (see Nos. 304, 368, and 380) is the second of two reviews of Volumes V and VI. It appeared in the “Books” section, headed “Grote’s Greece—Volumes V and VI,” and is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A second notice of the same [i.e., Vols. V and VI of Grote], in the Spectator of 10th March 1849” (MacMinn, p. 70). Two quotations from Grote in this review are also quoted by Mill in his Edinburgh Review notice of 1853, represented by “53” in the variant notes, while one passage was incorporated into the 1859 revision of that notice for D&D, represented by “59” in the variant notes; see No. 380 for the bibliographical details.

one of the most interesting features in the sixth volume of Mr. Grote’s History is the large use which he has made of the speeches in Thucydides. This rich mine of materials had been little if at all worked by any former writer. Mr. Grote considers the substance of these speeches to be authentic, though the form and phraseology are unmistakeably those of the Attic historian. The following is, as nearly as we can translate it, the declaration of Thucydides himself as to their composition. “To remember accurately the very things which were said, was difficult both to myself (as to what I heard delivered) and to my various informants: but I have ascribed to each speaker what seemed to me most appropriate to the occasion, keeping as close as I could to the general opinion of what was said in reality.”

From this we should conclude, that an outline supplied by memory or testimony was filled up from invention. And this opinion is confirmed by the internal evidence. But in whatever proportions the matter of these speeches must be shared between the orators and the historian, no documents which have descended from the ancients, except perhaps the Politics of Aristotle, contain so much of what was thought by the most instructed and able Greeks concerning themselves and their condition. One of the most important of these discourses is the famous Funeral Oration of Pericles; which is full of valuable remarks on the Athenian national character and institutions. Our space does not allow us to quote from the speech at any length, but we must make room for Mr. Grote’s comments on one sentence of it. The text is this—

Our social march is free, not merely in regard to public affairs, but also in regard to tolerance of each other’s diversity of daily pursuits. For we are not angry with our neighbour for what he may do to please himself, nor do we put on those sour looks, which, though they do no positive damage, are not the less sure to offend. On this important testimony to the liberality and tolerance of Athenian social life, Mr. Grote observes as follows—

This portion of the speech of Perikles deserves peculiar attention, because it serves to correct an assertion, often far too indiscriminately made, respecting antiquity as
contrasted with modern societies—an assertion that the ancient societies sacrificed the individual to the state, and that only in modern times has individual agency been left free to the proper extent. This is preëminently true of Sparta: it is also true in a great degree of the ideal societies depicted by Plato and Aristotle; but it is pointedly untrue of the Athenian democracy, nor can we with any confidence predicate it of the major part of the Grecian cities. . . . There is no doubt that he [Perikles] has present to his mind a comparison with the extreme narrowness and rigour of Sparta, and that therefore his assertions of the extent of positive liberty at Athens must be understood as partially qualified by such contrast. But even making allowance for this, the stress which he lays upon the liberty of thought and action at Athens, not merely from excessive restraint of law but also from practical intolerance between man and man, and tyranny of the majority over individual dissenters in taste and pursuit, deserves serious notice, and brings out one of those points in the national character upon which the intellectual development of the time mainly depended. The national temper was indulgent in a high degree to all the varieties of positive impulses: the peculiar promptings in every individual bosom were allowed to manifest themselves and bear fruit, without being suppressed by external opinion or trained into forced conformity with some assumed standard: antipathies against any of them formed no part of the habitual morality of the citizen. While much of the generating causes of human hatred was thus rendered inoperative, and while society was rendered more comfortable, more instructive and more stimulating—all its germs of productive fruitful genius, so rare everywhere, found in such an atmosphere the maximum of encouragement. Within the limits of the law, assuredly as faithfully observed at Athens as anywhere in Greece, individual impulse, taste, and even eccentricity, were accepted with indulgence, instead of being a mark as elsewhere for the intolerance of neighbours or of the public. This remarkable feature in Athenian life will help us in a future chapter to explain the striking career of Sokrates [Chap. lxviii; Vol. VIII, pp. 545-676]; and it presents to us, under another face, a great part of that which the censors of Athens denounced under the name of “democratical licence.” The liberty and diversity of individual life in that city were offensive to Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle—attached either to the monotonous drill of Sparta, or to some other ideal standard, which, though much better than the Spartan in itself, they were disposed to impress upon society with a heavy-handed uniformity. That liberty of individual action, not merely from the over-restraints of law, but from the tyranny of jealous opinion, such as Perikles depicts in Athens, belongs more naturally to a democracy, where there is no select One or Few to receive worship and set the fashion, than to any other form of government. But it is very rare even in democracies: nor can we dissemble the fact that none of the governments of modern times, democratical, aristocratical or monarchical, presents anything like the picture of generous tolerance towards social dissent, and spontaneity of individual taste, which we read in the speech of the Athenian statesman. In all of them, the intolerance of the national opinion cuts down individual character to one out of a few set types, to which every person, or every family, is constrained to adjust itself, and beyond which all exceptions meet either with hatred or with derision. To impose upon men such restraints either of law or of opinion as are requisite for the security and comfort of society, but to encourage rather than repress the free play of individual impulse subject to those limits—is an ideal, which if it was ever approached at Athens, has
certainly never been attained, and has indeed comparatively been little studied or
cared for, in any modern society.\textsuperscript{8}

[Vol. VI, pp. 199-202.]

There have been few things lately written more worthy of being meditated on than
this striking paragraph. \textsuperscript{k}\textsuperscript{The difference here pointed out between the temper of the
Athenian and that of the modern mind, is most closely connected with the wonderful
display of individual genius which made Athens illustrious, and with the comparative
mediocrity of modern times. Originality is not always genius, but genius is always
originality; and a society which looks jealously and distrustfully on original
people—which imposes its common level of opinion, feeling, and conduct, on all its
individual members—may have the satisfaction of thinking itself very moral and
respectable, but it must do without genius. It may have persons of talent, who bring a
larger than usual measure of commonplace ability into the service of the common
notions of the time; but genius, in such a soil, is either fatally stunted in its growth, or
if its native strength forbids this, it usually retires into itself, and dies without a sign.\textsuperscript{k}

The portion of Mr. Grote’s \textit{History} which we are now reviewing comprises the most
brilliant period of the Athenian republic; including the last stage in the growth of her
democratic constitution, and the rise, progress, and fullest development of her
maritime empire. On both these subjects there were deep-rooted prejudices to be
removed; prejudices long fostered by the modern enemies of popular government. Mr.
Grote, without disguising the faults of the Athenian people or institutions, shows the
vast superiority of the latter over all other political institutions known to the age, or
which probably would have been compatible with its circumstances. The following
instructive appreciation of the multitudinous dikasteries, or popular courts of justice,
throws also what to most readers will be a new light on the state of society and
manners in Athens and other cities of Greece.

In appreciating the practical working of these numerous dikasteries at Athens, in
comparison with such justice as might have been expected from individual
magistrates, we have to consider, first, that personal and pecuniary corruption seems
to have been a common vice among the leading men of Athens and Sparta, when
acting individually or in boards of a few members, and not uncommon even with the
kings of Sparta; next, that in the Grecian cities generally, as we know even from the
oligarchical Xenophon, (he particularly excepts Sparta,) the rich and great men were
not only insubordinate to the magistrates, but made a parade of showing that they
cared nothing about them. We know also from the same unsuspected source, that
while the poorer Athenian citizens who served on shipboard were distinguished for
the strictest discipline, the hoplites or middling burghers who formed the infantry
were less obedient, and the rich citizens who served on horseback the most
disobedient of all.\textsuperscript{5} To make rich and powerful criminals effectively amenable to
justice has indeed been found so difficult everywhere, until a recent period of history,
that we should be surprised if it were otherwise in Greece. When we follow the
reckless demeanour of rich men like Kritias, Alkibiades, and Meidias,\textsuperscript{6} even under the
full-grown democracy of Athens, we may be very sure that their predecessors under
the Kleisthenean constitution would have been often too formidable to be punished or
kept down by an individual archon of ordinary firmness, even assuming him to be upright and well-intentioned. Now the dikasteries established by Perikles were inaccessible both to corruption and intimidation: their number, their secret suffrage, and the impossibility of knowing beforehand what individuals would sit in any particular cause, prevented both the one and the other. And besides that the magnitude of their number, extravagant according to our ideas of judicial business, was essential to this tutelary effect, it served further to render the trial solemn and the verdict imposing on the minds of parties and spectators; as we may see by the fact, that in important causes the dikastery was doubled or tripled. Nor was it possible by any other means than numbers to give dignity to an assembly of citizens, of whom many were poor, some old, and all were despised individually by rich accused persons who were brought before them—as Aristophanes and Xenophon, give us plainly to understand. If we except the strict and peculiar educational discipline of Sparta, these numerous dikasteries afforded the only organ which Grecian politics could devise, for getting redress against powerful criminals, public as well as private, and for obtaining a sincere and uncorrupt verdict.

Taking the general working of the dikasteries, we shall find that they are nothing but jury-trial applied on a scale broad, systematic, unaided, and uncontrolled, beyond all other historical experience; and that they therefore exhibit in exaggerated proportions both the excellences and the defects characteristic of the jury system, as compared with decision by trained and professional judges. . . . Both the direct benefits ascribed to jury-trial in insuring pure and even-handed justice, and still more its indirect benefits in improving and educating the citizens generally, might have been set forth yet more emphatically in a laudatory harangue of Perikles about the Athenian dikasteries. If it be true that an Englishman or an American counts more certainly on an impartial and uncorrupt verdict from a jury of his country than from a permanent professional judge, much more would this be the feeling of an ordinary Athenian, when he compared the dikasteries with the archon. . . . As to the effect of jury-trial in diffusing respect to the laws and constitution—in giving to every citizen a personal interest in enforcing the former and maintaining the latter—in imparting a sentiment of dignity to small and poor men through the discharge of a function exalted as well as useful—in calling forth the patriotic sympathies, and exercising the mental capacities of every individual—all these effects were produced in a still higher degree by the dikasteries at Athens; from their greater frequency, numbers, and spontaneity of mental action, without any professional judge upon whom they could throw the responsibility of deciding for them. On the other hand, the imperfections inherent in jury-trial were likewise disclosed in an exaggerated form under the Athenian system. Both juror and dikast represent the average man of the time and of the neighbourhood, exempt indeed from pecuniary corruption or personal fear,—deciding according to what he thinks justice, or to some genuine feeling of equity, mercy, religion, or patriotism, which in reference to the case before him he thinks as good as justice—but not exempt from sympathies, antipathies, and prejudices, all of which act the more powerfully because there is often no consciousness of their presence, and because they even appear essential to his idea of plain and straightforward good sense.

Of the maritime empire of Athens Mr. Grote furnishes an unprejudiced account, and as much of a justification as the case admits of. [Ibid., pp. 390-472; Chap. xlv.] It was originally an equal alliance, growing out of the operations against Xerxes, and intended for the naval defence of Greece, against Persian domination. Of this confederacy (which consisted of the islands, and the Greek cities of the Asiatic and Thracian coasts, recently freed from the dominion of the Persian satraps) Athens was the acknowledged head, but was only primus inter pares, performing the functions of an executive; the supreme regulation of the alliance belonging to a synod of the confederates periodically meeting at Delos. Each of the states contributed either in money or in ships of war towards the common objects of the alliance; the contingent of each having been fixed by Aristides in a manner so equitable as to command universal applause. The steps by which, without any preconceived plan of usurpation on the part of Athens, her originally equal confederates sunk into the condition of dependent or subject-allies, are traced with great clearness by Mr. Grote. When this change had been consummated, each state paid a compulsory annual tribute, in consideration of which Athens undertook the military and naval defence of the tributaries against all enemies. They were not permitted to have any fortifications or ships of war of their own, and their differences with other states they were required to refer to the judicial tribunals of Athens. With their internal institutions or administration Athens did not meddle; not even to establish democracy; for though her own example tended to make democratic principles predominate within the sphere of her influence, many of the subject-allies of Athens were, and continued to be, under oligarchical government. In this the Athenian dominion differed greatly from the subsequent supremacy of Sparta, who not only subverted the democracies and established oligarchies everywhere, but appointed Spartan governors under the name of harmosts, whose yoke was always oppressive and often intolerable. The subjects of Athens had few if any practical grievances, and scarcely pretended to have them: the tribute was a cheap price for complete military and naval protection. Their complaint was, that they were degraded by being deprived of the common privilege of autonomy or city-independence, so indissolubly connected in the Greek mind with all ideas of freedom and collective dignity.

This complaint, whether judged by an abstract standard or by the ideas and sentiments of the time, was well grounded. Yet let it be remarked, that this coveted autonomy was a privilege which most of the states composing the Athenian league were entirely incapable of maintaining by their own strength. Athens found them under the dominion of Persia; when separated from Athens they fell under the far harder yoke of Sparta. Let it be considered also, that it was precisely this narrow spirit of independence, this intolerance on the part of each petty town of permanent connexion with any other, which ultimately caused the ruin of Grecian freedom by the absorption of all Greece into the Macedonian monarchy. Doubtless, the true remedy for the inherent weakness of so divided a state, would have been found in a free and equal confederation. But a federal government was of all things the most alien to Grecian habits. Even in the most pressing danger, when half Greece was overrun and occupied by the troops of Xerxes, the evidence, never before so fully brought out as by Mr. Grote, showed the radical incapacity of these little communities for acting in free voluntary concert. If there was any means by which Grecian independence and liberty could have been made a permanent thing, it would have been by the prolongation for
some generations more of the organization of the larger half of Greece under the supremacy of Athens; a supremacy imposed, indeed, and upheld by force—but the mildest, the most civilizing, and, in its permanent influence on the destinies of human kind, the most brilliant and valuable, of all usurped powers known to history.

That events took another course was the fault of no one so much as of the Athenians themselves, who, intoxicated by success, and having no longer a Pericles to keep them in the path of practical wisdom, were tempted to aggressive enterprises like that on Sicily, both unjust and beyond their strength. The next volume of Mr. Grote will contain the recital of this sad disaster, one of the turning-points in universal history, and one of those portions of it which are richest in epic and dramatic interest.

It is impossible to predict what number of further volumes will be necessary for the completion of Mr. Grote’s design; but no one who reads his work can wish that it were more abridged. It is not a mere summary of events known and admitted, and requiring only to be agreeably laid before the reader. It is an exploration of the sources of Grecian history; an investigation of facts previously unknown or misrepresented; a labour performed once for all; and the book is a storehouse from which future writers may draw their materials, without repeating the same toilsome and operose researches. To be this, and to be also an attractive specimen of narrative, and, more valuable than all, a profound estimate by a philosophical politician of one of the most important periods in the political history of mankind, is a threefold achievement which it has been given to few works, whether called histories or by any other denomination, to realize.
THE ATTEMPT TO EXCLUDE UNBELIEVERS FROM PARLIAMENT

DAILY NEWS, 26 MAR., 1849, P. 4

In a speech on 19 Feb., 1849 (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 102, cols. 906-17), Lord John Russell introduced “A Bill to Alter the Oaths to Be Taken by Members of the Two Houses of Parliament Not Professing the Roman Catholic Religion,” 12 Victoria (23 Feb., 1849), PP, 1849, IV, 419-24. The bill, similar to an unsuccessful one of the year before, was designed to admit Jews to Parliament. It was debated in the Commons on 19 and 23 Feb., 7 May, and 11 June, when it passed second reading, and in the Lords on 26 June, but was not enacted. On 21 Feb., 1849, Mill had written Harriet Taylor, in France for her health, pointing out that Russell, “although he is actually abolishing the old oaths & framing new, still has the meanness to reinsert the words ‘on the true faith of a Christian’ for all persons except Jews, & justifies it by saying that the Constitution ought not avowedly to admit unbelievers into Parliament.” She replied in a letter now lost, and on 17 Mar. he said: “As you suggested I wrote an article on Russell’s piece of meanness in the Jew Bill and have sent it to [Eyre Evans] Crowe [editor of the Daily News] from whom I have not yet any answer—there has been no time hitherto fit for its publication—the time will come when the subject is to come on again in Parlt. But I fear the article, even as ‘from a correspondent’ will be too strong meat for the Daily News, as it declares without mincing the matter, that infidels are perfectly proper persons to be in parliament.” (In fact it appeared as first leader, not as “from a correspondent.”) He continues: “I like the article myself. I have carefully avoided anything disrespectful to Russell personally, or any of the marks, known to me, by which my writing can be recognized.” Four days later he reported again: “Crowe’s answer was ‘I shall be but too happy to print the article. The Jews bill is put off till after Easter, but if you will allow me I will insert it immediately.’ ” Mill adds, in what is now a mysterious as well as unpleasant allusion, “There is nothing like kicking people of the Daily News sort it appears. I answered telling him if he thought it would be of as much use now as about the time when the bill comes on by all means to print it now. It has not yet made its appearance.” (LL, CW, Vol. XIV, pp. 13, 18, and 20.) This first leader, headed “London, Monday, Mar. 26,” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on the attempt to exclude unbelievers from parliament, in the Daily News of 26th March 1849” (MacMinn, p. 71).

the bill of lord john russell for the admission of Jews into parliament, affords by the mode it adopts of effecting that purpose, an example of the rooted aversion of our practical politicians to anything like a principle. If there is a principle which is supposed to be sacred in the eyes of a Russell, it is religious freedom. If there is a
maxim in politics which whigs are understood to cherish, it is that no one should be subjected to civil disabilities on the ground of any opinions which he may entertain in matters of religion. Yet a whig and a Russell, finding the Jews excluded from parliament by the imposition of certain words interpreted as expressing a belief in Christianity proposes to dispense with the words, but to dispense with them for Jews only. For all who do not declare themselves to be Jews, he not only leaves the words as he found them, but actually re-enacts them. He is proposing to abolish the old oaths and to establish new, and in the oaths which he establishes he introduces de novo these very words, granting to Jews a special exemption from their use. He opens the door of parliament just wide enough to allow one particular class of dissenters from Christianity to slip in, and closes it, as far as depends upon him, against all others.

Why is this? If we take his own account of the matter, it is because he does not think it right to announce that sceptics and infidels ought to be admitted into parliament; therefore he declares ineligible, not only sceptics and infidels, but Hindoos, Buddhists, and Mahomedans, none of whom are commonly counted among infidels, and who compose nearly three-fourths of the population of the British dominions. But we will discuss the question as if it concerned only those whom Lord John would have it believed that he actually cares about rendering ineligible.

First, what sort of sceptics and infidels does he really suppose that his oaths will keep out of parliament? Those who take his side of the question usually profess the charitable belief that infidels are persons whom oaths will not bind. It is certain at least that an infidel who can be excluded by such words as those used, “on the true faith of a Christian,” words which rather insinuate than profess a belief in Christianity—equivocating, jesuitical words, which seem chosen on purpose to afford a loophole to the conscience—must be a person more than ordinarily under the influence of honour and moral obligation, and, therefore, more than ordinarily fit to be a member of any assembly where honest men are required; and more than usually undeserving to have any discreditable mark put upon him.

But (it will be said by Lord John Russell, or by somebody for him) the measure will not really keep anybody out. It is not meant to do so. It is only meant as a declaration that certain persons ought to be kept out. It is an admission under protest. It is a national testimony that nobody who disbelieves in Christianity can be a fit person to sit in parliament.

If it be so, it is a testimony to something which every one who has any knowledge of life knows to be not true. We say nothing about Jews, whom this very measure is intended to let in. Were Hume and Gibbon improper persons to sit in parliament? Conservatives, at least, will hardly be of that opinion; for they were both tories; and the sons and daughters of tories to this day get their first notions of English politics from a History written by one of them, and very false notions they are. Liberals, again, would deem them valuable members of parliament for different reasons. It is not possible to imagine an assembly where great questions are to be discussed and important public business transacted, in which no good use could be made of such powers of mind as these men possessed.
It is unnecessary, however, to go back to a past age. The present times are sufficient. We should like to put a question to Lord John Russell. Let him mentally reckon up (if they are not too numerous to be reckoned), among persons now in parliament or in office, or who have been so since he entered into public life, all those whom he either positively knows, or has good ground for believing, to be disbelievers in revelation—many of them in more than revelation. We put it to him as a man of the world. Many good Christians, in their innocence and inexperience, would be astonished and shocked at the supposition we are making, but Lord John must know enough of his time, and of the men of his time, to be more or less a competent judge. We wish that after revolving in his mind the various members of the present or any former House of Commons, whom he has known or believed to be what are usually termed infidels, he would ask himself whether, among all the members composing it, these, taken collectively, were the persons whom, in his sincere opinion, the House of Commons could have best spared? We do not mean that many, or perhaps any, of these persons are Humes and Gibbons, or have ever made any public attack on religion, or are at all likely to avow unbelief; if they did, they would emperil, among many other things, all their chances of re-election. The truth is, that there is generally nothing in their conduct by which they could, as a class, be distinguished from the great majority of believers. This ought not to be: a great difference in the conscientious convictions of human beings ought to make a visible difference of some kind or other in their conduct, but in point of fact it seldom does. Certain it is that neither Lord John Russell, nor any other man of the world, would trust the unbelievers less in any relation of life, or would consider them less eligible for the great majority of public functions, than the average of Christians. On this point we should not fear to take the opinion of any man who has been minister of England in the last thirty years, could we be sure that he would speak his real sentiments.

If Lord John Russell really believed that the words he proposes would exclude from parliament all the sincere unbelievers who are now or may hereafter become members of it, we are convinced that he never would have proposed them. Why, then, has he done so? Because he believes that the exclusion will not exclude, but will be a mere brutum fulmen; and, with the usual indifference of our statesmen to a bad principle, when they do not expect that it will be followed by specific bad consequences, he thinks he may as well make this sacrifice at the shrine of bigotry, if it will gain him an additional vote for letting in Mr. Rothschild. He has yet to learn that a legislature which either introduces or confirms a bad principle does more harm than is compensated by twenty good practical measures involving no principle: for it is by the principles contained in them that institutions educate the national mind, thus producing more effect for good or evil than “laws or kings” by their direct influence can either “cause or cure.” As long as the laws keep up nominal persecution on account of opinion, whether practically operative or not, the seal of bigotry will be upon us; and no letting in of one set of excluded persons after another by the backdoor of the constitution will avail much to make us otherwise.
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

DAILY NEWS, 14 JULY, 1849, P. 4

This article responds to the report “Police. Southwark,” The Times, 6 July, 1849, p. 7 (from which the quotations are taken), concerning the case of Alexander Smith, heard on 5 July before Isaac Onslow Secker (1799-1861), barrister, magistrate at Greenwich and Woolwich. This unheaded fourth leader, the seventh jointly authored by Harriet Taylor and Mill on injustice and cruelty (for background, see No. 303), is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on corporal punishment, in the Daily News of 14th July 1849. A joint production, very little of which was mine.”

(MacMinn, p. 71.)

while, in the popular discussions on criminal law, the idea of punishment is more and more sunk in that of reformatory discipline; while what were once deemed the main ends of penal infliction—retribution to the culprit, and the deterring of future offenders—are well-nigh sinking out of view, and prisons, in the opinion of many well-meaning persons, are regarded as little more than a sort of hospitals for the morally sick, where they are to be cured of their soul’s diseases by mild alternatives; while this twist of the moral sentiment in the direction of shortsighted tenderness is increasingly manifest; in the actual administration of our criminal law, the tide is setting in the contrary direction, towards a revival of the brutal and barbarous practices of the middle ages and of the East. Amidst our talk of reformatory treatment we are returning to the most demoralising, the most brutalising, because the most degrading of punishments, the bastinado. There have been other instances lately of this, but none hitherto that comes up to what we extract from a Southwark police report of Friday last:

Alexander Smith, described as a commission agent, was brought before Mr. Secker, charged with illegally pawning a gold watch, value 20 guineas, the property of James Mills, the master of a West India trader.

It appeared that the complainant formed a casual acquaintance with the prisoner, who prevailed upon him to accompany him to Astley’s to witness the horsemanship. Previously, however, to their entering the theatre, the prisoner suggested the propriety of the complainant leaving a valuable gold watch in the hands of the landlord of a public-house adjacent, where they had partaken of refreshment, adding, that the article would be much safer there than at the theatre. The complainant at once assented to this suggestion, and the watch was accordingly left with the landlord of the house. Before the performance was over, the prisoner made some frivolous excuse, and quitting the theatre proceeded to the public-house and got possession of the complainant’s watch, which it was subsequently ascertained he had pledged at a
pawnbroker’s shop for 10l. Upon the discovery of the theft he promised to redeem the article, or pay the full value, neither of which he had since done; and the complainant, finding that there was no chance of obtaining restitution, gave the prisoner into custody on the charge of illegally pawning the watch.

The prisoner, a well-dressed middle-aged man, said that he had given the complainant his note of hand to pay at the rate of 10s. a week until the debt was paid.

Mr. Secker said that the mild term of “debt” could not be applied to such a fraudulent transaction. The prisoner had acted a most dishonest part in taking advantage of the absence of complainant to obtain possession of his watch.

The complainant admitted having taken a written guarantee from the prisoner, but said he did it for the purpose of strengthening the case against him.

The prisoner asserted that the watch was given him to pawn, which was flatly contradicted by the owner.

Mr. Secker denounced, in strong terms, the conduct of the prisoner, and sentenced him to pay a penalty of 5l. for illegally pawning the watch, besides 12l., the lowest value put upon the watch; and, in default of payment, to be committed for three months; and that, in addition to the above, if the prisoner omitted to pay the above sums within three days of the expiration of his imprisonment, he should be once publicly whipped within the precincts of the gaol.

The prisoner, who heard the latter part of the sentence with astonishment depicted on his countenance, was then removed from the bar.

Well might he be astonished; and his astonishment will be participated, we believe, by the majority of readers. We know that the office of police magistrate is one to which a man is appointed usually because he is fit for nothing else; because, being too stupid to fill any other appointment, he is thought good enough to be the dispenser of law, justice, and moral instruction to those who most need all these. But even a Mr. Secker must, we suppose, have some law to bear him out in such a decision as this. What law? and how has such a law been smuggled through parliament? a law permitting the infliction of the bastinado for a pecuniary fraud—by which, if impartially enforced, half the bankrupts in England would be publicly flogged, and a London magistrate would become a Turkish Cadi. But there is another peculiarity in the case which must be wholly Mr. Secker’s. The flogging, after all, is not to be inflicted for the offence. The punishment of that is a fine of 5l., added to another of 12l., or, “in default of payment,” to be committed for three months. But, after suffering the imprisonment, he is still “to pay the above sums within three days,” and to be flogged if he “omits” to pay them. He is to be flogged therefore, not for the fraud, but for being unable to pay 17l. This is a person to be entrusted with the power of flogging!

But the pranks of police magistrates are not the worst of the political and social vices which this case illustrates. It exemplifies the total absence of true moral feeling which pervades our criminal legislation and all the functionaries who administer it, from the
judges of the Court of Queen’s Bench down to this Mr. Secker. If a brutal punishment can ever be appropriate, it is in the case of a brutal offence. Every day’s police reports contain cases of ruffianly assaults, committed in the mere wantonness of brutality, against creatures whose sole offence is to be inferior in physical strength, oftenest of all against helpless children, or the slaves called wives, whose death, by a long continuance of personal torture, has of late been so frequently brought to light, and without a single exception so leniently passed over, that this has apparently become one of the safe ways of getting rid of those incumbrances. To such ruffians as these the degradation of corporal punishment would be very suitable. It does not make them brutes, it only stamps them as what they are. A coward who beats another because he is the stronger, would perhaps even be benefited by finding himself for once in the hands of a stronger than himself, and tasting of the degradation he has inflicted. But who ever hears of corporal punishment for assault? One or two months’ imprisonment is all we hear of in the most atrocious cases; while, if property is in question—if pounds, shillings, and pence have been tampered with, years of imprisonment, with hard labour (not to mention transportation) are almost the smallest penalty. And this is not peculiarly the fault of the police magistrates, whose power of inflicting punishment for assault is very limited. It is the crime more especially of legislators and of the superior courts. They, it seems, have yet to learn that there is a thing infinitely more important than property—the freedom and sacredness of human personality; that there is an immeasurable distance in point of moral enormity between any the gravest offence which concerns property only, and an act of insulting and degrading violence perpetrated against a human being. Mankind could go on very well, have gone on in time past (as well as they have ever yet gone on), with property very insecure. But subject to blows, or the fear of blows, they can be no other than soulless, terror-stricken slaves, without virtue, without courage, without peace, with nothing they dare call their own. Yet because persons in the upper and middle ranks are not subject to personal outrage, and are subject to have their watches stolen, the punishment of blows is revived, not for those who are guilty of blows, but for middle-aged men who pawn watches. Is this to be endured?

A few weeks ago, the punishment of flogging, in the case of the young man who shot at the Queen, was omitted, it is said, at the special desire of the Queen herself. The forbearance was uncomplimentary to the legislatorial wisdom which had recently enacted that penalty as peculiarly fit for that particular offence: but no one can be surprised by an example of good sense, good taste, and good feeling, given by the Queen. The crime of Hamilton was not of a degraded or brutal kind, though of a wicked and grave kind, deserving, in truth, and requiring, a severer punishment than it received. To refuse so disgusting a tribute as the revival of a brutalising degradation as a punishment for offences against herself, was a worthy lesson to legislators and judges; and it was magnanimity, not like but most unlike a sovereign, to punish so serious an offence only as if it had been directed against the meanest subject. Would that her Majesty would take in hand this vast and vital question of the extinction of personal violence by the best and surest means—the illegalising of corporal punishment, domestic as well as judicial, at any age. We conscientiously believe that more large and lasting good, both present and future, to the moral and social character of the whole people, would be achieved by such an act of legislation, than fifty years of legislative efforts without it would be required to supply.
THE CZAR AND THE HUNGARIAN REFUGEES IN TURKEY [1]

DAILY NEWS, 3 OCT., 1849, P. 2

In 1848, Hungary had revolted against the Austrian Empire, but by May of 1849 Russia had rigorously suppressed the rebellion in the name of the Holy Alliance of 1815 between herself, Austria, and Prussia. During the summer of 1849 public opinion in England rallied against Austria. A crisis arose over the demand by Russia and Austria that Turkey extradite the leaders of the revolution, Kossuth, Bem, and others. The Sultan, Abd-ul-Mejid (1823-61), refused to do so. Mill’s letter, headed as title with subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News,” is described in his bibliography as “A letter signed J.S.M. in the Daily News of 3d October 1849 on the case of the Hungarian refugees in Turkey” (MacMinn, p. 71). (Mill’s evident wish to be identified by his initials was perhaps frustrated by the misprinting of “I.” for “J.”; however, the correct initials appeared in the second letter on the subject, No. 385.)

Sir,—

Many thousands in England, and millions, I will venture to say, in Europe, are waiting anxiously to see whether the noble conduct of the Sultan in refusing to deliver up the defenders of Hungarian liberty to the crowned employers of the scourgers of women, the butchers of Warsaw and Pesth, is to have the support of England or not.

We are told that our enormous naval force is and must be kept up on account of the state of the Continent. If we ever could be called upon to use that force by any occurrence on the Continent, it is now.

Wait not for the support of France. France, in a moment of insanity, has given herself up for four years to the discretion of the relative (by marriage), and servile tool of the Emperor of Russia, by whose help he hopes to be made Emperor of France. But France must follow, if England at once takes the lead.

The Czar ought instantly to be told that the first movement of troops across the frontiers of Turkey in this quarrel will be a signal for the blockading of all his ports in the Baltic and the Black Sea, to be followed, if needful, by the destruction of his naval arsenals.

Any trifle is thought sufficient cause for summoning a public meeting. Shall there be no meeting to save England from the infamy of standing by while men and women, who ought to be carried in triumph through every city in Europe, are torn by main force from the protection of the Musulman prince, who dares defy a power ten times
stronger and ten times more barbarous than his own, rather than deliver up fugitive victims to the slaughterer?

A month ago it would have seemed quite needless that a public demonstration should warn a liberal ministry of such a duty. But since we have a Colonial Secretary and a Prime Minister either so base, or so infantinely weak and credulous, as to be capable, the one of sanctioning, the other of defending, the conduct of More O’Ferrall, it is quite time that the public should rouse itself, and give strength to the only member of the government who stands between us and the Aberdeen policy, between us and a mean complicity with the new “Holy” Alliance.

J.S.M.
This paragraph follows a letter headed “What Is England to Do?” and signed “A Cambridge Man,” which calls on the public to trust the Foreign Minister, Palmerston, in his very cautious and moderate support for the Hungarian refugees (for the context, see No. 384). Mill’s paragraph is introduced by this editorial comment: “Since this letter was in type, another, with the signature of J.S.M., has been forwarded to us, taking a different view of the duty of the public in reference to this question. The writer professes no faith in the conduct or courage of the Ministers (with one exception), and speaks indignantly of the affair at Malta and its recent extenuation. But he adds with much truth:”. The item, which appears in the “Political Examiner,” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter on the same subject and with the same signature [as No. 384] but of which a part only was printed, in the Examiner of 7th October 1849” (MacMinn, p. 72).

but let the public also take its share of blame. If the public cannot trust the Ministers, neither can the Ministers trust the public for support in any energetic and generous course of action in foreign affairs. The Ministers think that the people care for nothing but reducing the taxes and preventing any interruption of trade. Or that if they are capable of being moved by any idea larger than this, it is by the idea of a silly, goody kind of peace. If, six months ago, we had possessed a government with spirit enough to announce as the determination of England, that neither at Rome, nor in Hungary, nor in any other place in Europe, should any foreign intervention be suffered unless England was a party to it—a declaration which, if believed, would have effectually prevented any intervention and any war—could they have expected to be supported by the nation in assuming this attitude? Would not a junction of all the office-seeking parties against them have been suffered by the nation to expel them from power? The official people believe that, though England will bear to be overtaxed on all sorts of idle and dishonest pretexts, no cause is so sacred in her eyes that she would be willing, rather than abandon it, to add a million to the taxes. Let England come forward and declare that this is not true. Let public meetings proclaim that England will go to war with Russia rather than suffer Turkey to be bullied into giving up vanquished fugitives to the executioner; and the fugitives will be saved, and the character of England vindicated, without a chance of war.
In the course of a leading article, 29 Oct., p. 4, on the Catholic Church in French politics, the Daily News incidentally brought in accusations against Etienne Cabet as a swindler; Mill quotes from this article. Cabet, who had associated with Owen when in exile in England 1834-39, announced in 1847 the founding of a communal settlement, Icaria, in America. A group of settlers left in January 1848 and tried to establish themselves in a particularly unsuitable part of Texas, where they were joined by Cabet early in 1849. He took his followers to Nauvoo, the abandoned Mormon settlement in Illinois, a few months later, but the enterprise was a failure. By September he had been charged with defrauding his followers (see The Times, 20 Oct., p. 5). Condemned in his absence to two years in prison, on his return to France in 1851 he was acquitted. The letter is headed as title, with subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News.” It is identified in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter signed D in the Daily News of 30th October 1849 on M. Cabet”

(MacMinn, p. 72).

Sir,—

I have seen with surprise, in your paper of to-day, a leading article which, in the course of a discussion on a totally different subject, and for the mere purpose of illustration, aims a mortal stab at the honour and character of a man now suffering under the persecution of the authorities in his native country—M. Cabet. I have sufficient confidence in your sense of justice to feel convinced that you have only joined in the hue and cry against this ill-treated man from inadvertence, and ignorance of the real facts of the case. No one is surprised that the tory press (whether calling itself liberal or the contrary) and their foreign correspondents, who must be better informed if the editors are not, should think any amount of suppressio veri quite fair, or at least not likely to be found out, when directed against a known socialist. But as you are not to be classed with writers of this description, you will be glad to be informed or reminded of that important part of the truth which has escaped your notice. The judgment against M. Cabet on the charge of escroquerie was pronounced by default, and therefore without a hearing, M. Cabet being at the time necessarily absent, living in the midst of the very people whom he is accused of having defrauded. The judgment, which in the absence of the accused the court had perhaps no alternative but to pass upon him, is of so little practical effect, that notwithstanding the sentence he has the power of returning at any time and standing his trial. But though the case, as it affects M. Cabet, on account of his absence was not tried at all, his friend and co-defendant, M. Krolikowski, who was present, was tried on the same
charge, and acquitted, after having made in behalf of M. Cabet the following protest contained in the *Démocratie Pacifique* of 22nd September last:

Citizen Cabet, whose presence is indispensable in the Icarian colony of Nauvoo (United States), cannot possibly appear unless the court consents to postpone the trial to next April; but I will defend him in every manner. Our cause is common; and there has been so much calumny against the Icarians, and against citizen Cabet in particular, accusing him sometimes of proposing a chimerical undertaking, and sometimes of abandoning his associates, after having invited them to emigrate, that I think it necessary for our defence to publish the unanimous protest of the Icarians established at Nauvoo, which shall be produced before the judges. ²

The following is the document alluded to; it bears 189 signatures of emigrants, male and female:

One of those great iniquities which would suffice to dishonour an age is, perhaps, about to be accomplished in France. Ignoble calumnies attempt to disgrace the name of Cabet, of the Christian philosopher who has consecrated the whole of a long life to the moral education of mankind; the regenerator, the intrepid apostle, who, abandoning country, family, and fortune, prepares, in remote climates, amidst dangers and privations, the happiness of the human race. We, the witnesses and objects of his affection and of his devotedness—we, already enjoying the fruits of his sacrifices and of our own perseverance, protest against accusations as absurd as infamous, the triumph of which would be a new stain on our unfortunate country. ³

These are the feelings entertained towards this “convicted swindler” by his victims, he living in the midst of them—and this is the man whom your article, with a contemptuously pitying reservation in his favour as a sincere fanatic, declares culpable of “falsehood,” of “treachery,” and of attempting “to form a socialist republic, without sagacity, industry, honesty, or truth.” By what authority does your writer thus asperse a man of whose principles the very words he uses show that he knows nothing? The illusion of communists, so far as it is an illusion, consists, on the contrary, in flattering themselves that a socialist community can be founded on “sagacity, industry, honesty, and truth” alone, without the vulgar incentives of private interest.

It need hardly be added, that the English newspapers, which have seldom let a week pass since M. Cabet’s trial without some insulting reference to him as a convicted cheat and impostor, take care never to say that he was condemned unheard, and have carefully kept from their readers the indignant protest of those whom he is pretended to have defrauded and ruined.

D.
André Louis Jules Lechevalier (1800-50) was an economist and journalist, an ardent follower of Victor Considérant and the school of Charles Fourier. On the strength of his experiences in the French colonies, he became Colonial Secretary (1843). His ideas on the emancipation of the blacks were proposed in his *Rapport sur les questions coloniales*, 2 vols. (Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1843-44). On 13 June, 1849, Lechevalier had taken part in protests against armed intervention by French troops in the siege of Rome. The government imposed martial law; the offices of the *Tribune des Peuples*, of which Lechevalier was then an editor, were closed, and three of his fellow editors were arrested. Lechevalier thereupon addressed a letter (21 June, 1849) to the Minister of the Interior, M. Dufaure, which effected the release of the three men but resulted in his own arrest and subsequent trial and conviction by the Court at Versailles (November-December 1849). Anticipating these consequences, Lechevalier, along with others, exiled himself to London in July. It was from London that he wrote his *Déclaration* on 8 Oct., 1849. Lechevalier had the *Déclaration* translated by a friend as *Declaration of Citizen André-Louis-Jules Lechevalier* (London: n.p., 1849), and sent copies to a number of British papers, but, for his quotations in this notice, Mill is evidently using the French version (not located) in his own translation. The notice appears, in square brackets (like the other brief notices) in the “Publications Received” column, headed “*Déclaration du Citoyen André-Louis-Jules Lechevalier junior, accusé, ex-membre du Comité de la Presse et du Comité Socialiste.*” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A few words on M. Jules [Lechevalier’s] letter to [Dufaure] and [his Declaration]; in the Spectator of 8th December 1849” (MacMinn, p. 72).

the manifesto of one of the condemned by default in the late political trial at Versailles; and containing a brief recital of the exertions of a life passed in labouring for the cause of philanthropy and social improvement. M. Jules Lechevalier is known to those who have attended to the course of public discussion in France, as one of the most enlightened and most reasonable of those Reformers who, with great variety of opinions and objects, are confounded under the name of Socialists. To the general public he is best known by his efforts during many years for the abolition of Negro slavery, and for replacing it by an “organization of labour”\(^1\) for which no more favourable practical opportunity could possibly have presented itself, and which if tried in our Colonies would have had a chance of preventing their present difficulties. In this little brochure M. Lechevalier maintains, that “the protest on the 13th of June last was legitimate, legal, and constitutional; that in principle, insurrection would have been legitimate, but” (and of this, whoever has read the evidence on the trial must be
already convinced) “in point of fact no insurrection took place, and none was desired or projected.” It is in itself almost a reductio ad absurdum of the alleged conspiracy, that one who is so essentially a man of peace as M. Jules Lechevalier should have been condemned and sentenced as of the number of its authors and contrivers.
THE CALIFORNIAN CONSTITUTION

DAILY NEWS, 2 JAN., 1850, P. 4

This article quotes a letter from California announcing the results of the convention that had met at Monterey on 4 Sept., 1849, to draw up a constitution for the new state. The constitution was adopted on 13 Oct., and submitted to the people for a vote on 13 Nov. (See Constitution of the State of California 1849 [San Francisco: printed at the Office of the Alta California, 1849].) The first legislature of the new government met on 15 Dec., 1849. This unheaded first leader is described (twice, in identical terms) in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on the California Constitution, in the Daily News of 2nd January 1850” (MacMinn, p. 72).

the last mail from California has brought intelligence possessing a different kind of interest from that which attaches itself to stories of masses of gold picked up in the beds of rivers and speculations on a possible depreciation of currencies by the cheapening of their standard. The Californians have not been solely occupied with “the diggings.” They have found time also to construct a set of institutions. With the active self-help characteristic of the energetic people from whom they are an offshoot, and of whose broad federation they already form a part, this motley assemblage coming together from many quarters, united by no previous tie, and finding on their arrival no constituted government to protect them, proceeded first to organize and enforce a system of voluntary government, with the requisite sanctions, sufficient for their protection, and then nominated a convention, after the usual American manner, to prepare a Republican Constitution. It is worthy of remark how instantaneously any body of American emigrants, as soon as they have formed a settlement, proceed to make a constitution; though European authorities of no small account in their own estimation, are never tired of assuring us that constitutions cannot be made. But while these sages are stoutly denying the possibility of motion, the Americans, one after another, like Diogenes, rise up and walk; and not one stumble has yet occurred to mar the completeness of the practical confutation. Whatever other faults have been found with the Anglo-American constitutions, no one has yet said that they will not work; a fate so often denounced against all constitutions except those which, like the British, “are not made but grow,” or, it should rather be said, come together by the fortuitous concourse of clashing forces. Perhaps the truth is, that the constitutions which will not work are those which are made for the people, while those which do work, such as the American, are made by the people; a fact which is in itself a guarantee that the ideas which they embody are such as the people are already familiar with, and attached to, and are therefore both capable and desirous of making them “work.” It is so with the constitutions which spring into existence in the North American continent at the rate of one in every three or four years, namely, whenever
either a new state is added to the Union, or the population of one of the older states resolves (like that of New York recently) on a general revision of its institutions. All these systems of government have, as might be expected, a family resemblance, but each new one affords in some one or other of its features a significant indication of the direction in which the general mind of America is tending.

The convention at Monterey, comprising about four-fifths of new settlers with Anglo-Saxon or German names, and one-fifth of old Spanish inhabitants (which is probably not an unfair proportion to the population), has concluded its labours; and the product of its deliberations is about to be submitted for approval or rejection to the general suffrages of the inhabitants. This proposed fundamental law of the state comprises many provisions not usually classed under the department of constitutional or political law: it includes, in fact, everything which is considered too important or sacred to be entrusted to the discretion of an ordinary legislature, and which is therefore inscribed in a sort of charter of rights and liberties, not to be altered except with peculiar formalities, and by an assembly chosen for the express purpose.

On the vital question of negro slavery, this constitution is irreprouachable. By an express provision, “neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, unless for the punishment of crimes, shall ever be tolerated in this state.” [P. 4; Art. I, Sect. 18.] California has thus the honour of being the first southern state which has constituted itself free from that curse; and if the example be followed by New Mexico and the other states which will be formed in the newly-acquired territory, the iniquity is doomed. The slave-owners are well aware of this result; they have long ago declared that the question of the extension of slavery is the question of its existence; that once hemmed in within a corner of the confederation, it cannot long survive; that the joint moral and economical effects of closing the new territories to the export of slaves, will be rapidly fatal to the institution. In this point of view, the determined rejection of slavery by the first new state constituted in the territory which was sought and conquered (it is said) mainly for the perpetuation of slavery, is the heaviest blow which that form of tyranny has received in the United States, and is thus no unimportant event in history. In the first draft of the constitution the interdiction of slavery was accompanied by the exclusion of free negroes from settling in the state; but this provision was ultimately rejected by a vote of 31 to 8. Real improvement, however, is a slow process; a considerable remnant of injustice is still left. The negro inhabitant will be free, but not equal; the right of suffrage, otherwise virtually universal, is limited to “every white male:” and though there is a provision, expressed in grudging terms (the result, it is said, of a compromise), which permits the legislature to admit to the suffrage “Indians or the descendants of Indians,” in such “special cases” as two-thirds of the legislative body “may deem just and proper,” there is no such latitude given in favour of negroes. [P. 4; Art. II, Sect. 1.]

On one subject connected with the rights and interests of women, the Californian delegates have afforded an example which legislatures of greater importance in the world must ere long imitate. They have deemed it a fit thing to be not only enacted, but to form a part of the constitution of the state, that women shall have a right to their own property. The laws of most of the American states are on this point less unjust and irrational than those of England and of other countries of Europe. “All property,
both real and personal, of the wife,” say the Californians, “owned or claimed by her before marriage, and that acquired afterwards by gift, devise, or descent, shall be her separate property; and laws shall be passed more clearly defining the rights of the wife, in relation as well to her separate property, as to that held in common with her husband.” [P. 13; Art. XI, Sect. 14.] It must be by an oversight that the wife’s earnings are not included in the property which is to be at her separate disposal. As the words stand, she will have (if the phrase “separate property” is to be understood in its obvious sense) exclusive control over what may devolve on her by any mode of acquisition except her own labour. But even thus, how superior to the law of England—which on this, as on many other subjects, remains very little altered from what it was in those times of barbarism when the wife was literally the slave of the man by whom she had been appropriated. It is a proof of the ineffectual and unpractical character of the law reform movement that the law respecting the property of married women remains in the state it is: a law of which every one feels the injustice in the case of any women in whom he is himself interested; and consequently, parents or relatives who give or bequeath property to women, almost always endeavour to frustrate the law (which, however, they can only do very imperfectly) by the circuitous, expensive, and often unsafe mode of a settlement in trust. Yet, imperfect as is the protection which this contrivance affords to the woman, and serious as are the hazards incurred by it in case of dishonesty or rashness in the trustee, it never occurs to parliament to render all this in a great measure unnecessary by the simple expedient of doing common justice to the woman—by letting what is hers be hers, and not, as it is by “common law,” the husband’s.

Another highly creditable part of the Californian constitution consists of its provisions for education. A superintendent of public instruction, elected by the people, is to be one of the regular officers of the government. [P. 11; Art. IX, Sect. 1.] All lands belonging to the state, and all property of persons dying intestate and without heirs, together with a tax (to be solicited from Congress), of five per cent on all sales of land within the state, belonging to the federal government, are to be formed into a permanent fund for the support of common schools [pp. 11-12; Art. IX, Sect. 2]; and a grant of unappropriated land is to be solicited from Congress for the support of a university [p. 12; Art. IX, Sect. 4]. This is according to the laudable example of the New England States, which, of all communities existing, have made, in proportion to their population, the most munificent provision for general education: and of whose people it has been said, that they would as soon expect to be made to pay individually for the use of the streets, as for that of the common schools.

The Californians have taken precautions against both the burthen of a national debt, and the scandal of repudiation, by prohibiting their legislature from incurring debts or liabilities exceeding in the aggregate 300,000 dollars, “except in case of war, to repel invasion, or suppress insurrection;” or unless expressly “for some specified object or work.” [P. 11; Art. VIII.] In this last case, the law which authorises the work must provide ways and means for paying off the loans, with all interest, within twenty years; and this law must be submitted to the direct suffrages of the people, and is irrepealable until the debt is wholly paid. There will, we think, be few questioners of the justice and policy of this article of the constitution.
There are some other provisions, the policy of which is disputable—such as the entire prohibition of paper money in all its forms, and of all banks, except for the deposit of the precious metals [p. 7; Art. IV, Sect. 34]; and again, the exemption of “a certain portion of the homestead and other property of all heads of families” from “forced sale” by process of law—that is, from the claims of creditors [p. 13; Art. XI, Sect. 15]; a kind of entail, scarcely more defensible than those entails of a more ordinary description which, under the name of “perpetuities,” are prohibited by the constitution. [Ibid., Sect. 16.] By another article, whoever fights a duel, or sends or accepts a challenge, or is concerned as a second or otherwise in the transaction, is to be punished by being deprived of the suffrage, and disqualified from all public offices of profit. [Ibid., Sect. 2.] This looks like a serious intention to put down a practice which in some parts of the United States amounts to an evil of considerable magnitude: and the means used are more likely to be effectual than any others which we have heard proposed, since they attack the offence through motives of the same kind with those which generally prompt it, motives derived from the love of reputation and consideration.

The remaining provisions of the new constitution do not vary materially from the familiar features of representative democracy, as found in the older free states of the Union.
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THE CASE OF MARY ANN PARSONS [1]

DAILY NEWS, 5 FEB., 1850, P. 4

This article, the eighth on injustice and cruelty by Harriet Taylor and Mill (for the background, see No. 303), responds to “Horrible Cruelty,” The Times, 2 Feb., 1850, beginning on p. 8 and continuing in Supplement, p. 1, which describes the coroner’s inquest and subsequent examination before magistrates resulting from the brutal death of Mary Ann Parsons at the hand of Robert Curtis Bird, a farmer, and Sarah Bird, his wife; Mill’s quotations are all from p. 8. The witnesses mentioned are James Morrish, a shoe-maker, and Richard Hooper; the victim’s mother’s name was Grace Parsons. For further comment on the case, see No. 392. This unheaded third leader is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on a case of atrocity near Bideford, in the Daily News of 5th Febry 1850. Very little of this article was mine.”

(MacMinn, p. 72.)

we would earnestly call the attention of our readers to one of the most horrible cases of brutality which have ever disgraced the superficial civilisation of our time and country: we were going to call it the most horrible, but cases approaching to it in atrocity are so incessantly recurring in the police reports, that we hesitate to pronounce even this case unrivalled in those disgraceful annals.

Mary Ann Parsons, a girl of fifteen, said by the master of the workhouse to have been “strong and healthy, although not particularly bright,” was hired as a servant from the workhouse of the Bideford union, by a man and woman named Bird, in September last. On the 5th of January she died, of such an accumulation of wounds, mutilations, and other horrible injuries, that we will not repeat the sickening list as given in the examinations before the magistrates. On the Friday before Christmas-day, the evidence of a man named Morrish shows that he saw her standing in the middle of the room where the prisoners and their four children were; that she was ordered “to go into the slee house, or back house;” that as she “went across the kitchen” he “saw that her neck and shoulders were covered with blood, which appeared to have flowed just before” he “came in;” that about ten minutes afterwards the man Bird “opened the slee door and ordered her to wash the blood off her neck.” Another man named Hooper saw her the day after Christmas day, when she “appeared to be very ill: she could not stand upright.” He “heard her making a horrid noise after she got up stairs: she was crying, and making a ‘wist’ or ‘moaning’ noise as she was going up.” This creature had seen her repeatedly flogged by both the man and woman, and neither he nor the former witness ever interfered even by a word of remonstrance. During the whole three months that she was in the service of these wretches, she appears to have been utterly friendless, un cared for, unenquired after. Her mother, who was an inhabitant of the same workhouse, never once saw her, and was ignorant of her fate.
until made aware of it by the ghastly spectacle which the body presented when in the coffin. The only person who seems to have said anything about the girl after she entered their service, was the master of the workhouse; this man, meeting the woman prisoner, who after a month’s trial had told him that she was an “honest, good, industrious girl,” and hearing on this occasion some complaint, gave his advice to “properly chastise” her. The instrument of torture is said in the report to have excited the horror of the spectators; it was “a strong stick of about a foot in length, to which were fastened eighteen stout sharp leather thongs, about two feet long. This formidable cat was capable of inflicting the most cruel laceration, as bad as the army whip, and worse than the cowhide of the American slave owner.” With this it was that the girl was reduced to the state in which her body appeared. The man Sermon, who gave the brutal recommendation to flog this girl of fifteen, and who admitted that he had “punished children in the workhouse,” though he “never served a child anything like that,” declared that in the army, where he had served, and had frequently seen sentences of flogging executed, the manner in which this poor victim had been treated would not have been considered fair flogging. With how much of this evidence before them does not appear, the coroner’s jury, under the direction of the coroner, found that the girl died “from congestion of the brain, caused by external injuries, but how or by what means such injuries were caused there was no evidence to shew.” Fortunately for justice, the “means,” though mysterious to this “jury of respectable (!) yeomen,” were apparent enough to others. An application having been made to a magistrate, the culprits have most properly been committed to take their trial for murder; and heartily were it to be wished that the wretch who counselled “chastisement,” and the two base slaves who looked on calmly and saw—one of them the brutality itself—both of them its consequences—could be reached as accessories to the crime. From the report it would appear that justice might have been entirely defeated and the monsters might have escaped punishment, but for the clear, distinct, and manly evidence of the surgeon, Mr. Turner. Too many of this gentleman’s profession, in similar cases, give their evidence in softened terms, and profess doubt, from fear of injuring themselves with the lower class of their customers.

Our law, or at least its administration, takes abundant care of property, but the most atrocious personal violence it treats with a leniency amounting to actual license: even when death follows, the offence is generally pronounced to be manslaughter, and the criminal escapes with a year or two’s imprisonment. Yet whether we look to the torments inflicted, or to the depravity indicated in the perpetrators, the crime against Mary Ann Parsons is of far deeper atrocity than that of a Rush, who fires a pistol at a man and kills him. Rush intended death, but they intended torture, and inflicted death by torture. What the law is, and what its administrators thought of such crimes as this poor child has been the victim of, was shown in the case of the notorious Mrs. Brownrigg, who was hanged for murder, and has remained the traditional type of the worst and most odious species of murderers. Brownrigg flogged two of her apprentices to death—exactly what these people have done to this unfortunate servant girl. The question in law was not whether she had premeditated their death: it was enough in law and justice that she had carried diabolical cruelty to the point which caused it.
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THE CASE OF ANNE BIRD

MORNING CHRONICLE, 13 MAR., 1850, P. 5

This article is the ninth on injustice and cruelty by Harriet Taylor and Mill (for the background, see No. 303). It comments on the trial of Anne Bird (b. 1805) for the brutal beating of a two-year-old child, Ellen Welsh, held on 8 Feb. at the Marylebone Police Office, before George Long (1780-1868), magistrate and author. The case had been reported in “Police Intelligence—Friday. Marylebone,” *Morning Chronicle*, 9 Feb., p. 8. This unheaded third leader is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article on the state of the law respecting assault, in the Morning Chron. of 13th March 1850. Very little of this was mine.”

(MacMinn, p. 73.)

much has been said and written, although as yet to very little purpose, on the effect which the progress of society in wealth, numbers, and education produces on the nature and amount of crime. Among many differences of opinion on this much-debated question, there is on one point a very general agreement. However it may be with offences against property, crimes of violence tend, it is generally believed, to diminution. There is nothing in which we seem to have so much the advantage over our fathers as in mildness of manners; and the delinquencies which prevail in the present generation are, according to common opinion, those which have their source in poverty or cupidity, but not in ferocity.

Though we do not deny the truth of this representation as it affects some classes of society and some offences, yet, as a general fact, we are sorry to say that it is not borne out by that authentic register of the manners and habits of the populace—the Police Reports. Far from exhibiting any decrease in crimes of violence, hardly a day passes in which that record does not bear frightful witness to their unabated prevalence. And the crimes which thus abound are, in point of moral turpitude, the worst order of crimes of violence—not the outbursts of offended irascibility against an equal, but the habitual abuse of brute strength, and the indulgence of wanton cruelty. Women and children, or young persons, are usually the sufferers. Cases succeed one another with hardly any intermission, in which men are proved to have killed their wives by brutal maltreatment; every such death being the termination of a series of sufferings, extending through years, against which the vital principle was at last unable longer to bear up. For every such extreme case, we may be assured there are hundreds which stop just short of the infliction of death, or in which death is inflicted, but not ascribed to its true cause. In another very numerous class of cases, a man or a woman is found to have kept an unhappy child for weeks and months in some disgusting domestic dungeon, until it is nearly dead from cold, hunger, and neglect—or to have scourged it day after day, until it is brought into a state which
strikes horror when at last exhibited, and from which in many cases the child never recovers. In other instances a parish apprentice, or a young person hired as a servant from the workhouse, is the miserable victim.

Whoever has sufficiently attended to the proceedings of the Police Courts to have observed the deplorable frequency of these cases, must have been no less forcibly struck with the scandalous impunity of the culprits. Often, even when the victim has died from their maltreatment, they are not sent to trial. If tried, they are, in a majority of cases, acquitted—sometimes in the face of the clearest evidence. Even if found guilty, it is only of manslaughter, and they get off with a year or two of imprisonment. Cases short of death are very seldom tried at all, but are disposed of summarily by the police magistrate. A recent instance at the Marylebone Police-office exemplifies the sort of justice usually administered. The case was one of peculiar enormity, the victim being a child two years old. The culprit, a woman named Anne Bird, was proved to have cruelly maltreated this infant with a whip. The magistrate did what magistrates in such cases usually do; he talked of the extreme atrocity of the case—as if strong words would do away with the effect of weak acts—and then sentenced the woman to the greatest penalty he could summarily inflict—a fine of five pounds, or, in default of payment, two months’ imprisonment. If this woman, under the pressure of poverty, had stolen five shillings, the magistrate would not have failed to commit her for trial, and if found guilty she would probably have been transported. But her offence being brutal cruelty, practised on a creature utterly helpless and unoffending, he did not deem it worth while to try whether a higher court would be of opinion that a case of extraordinary atrocity deserved greater punishment than two months’ imprisonment. At the end of the two months the child, no doubt, will be given back to its torturer; unless before that time, as happened in a similar case not long ago, it dies of the injuries received.

The fault is partly in the administration of the law, but chiefly in the law itself. The whole state of the law on the subject of offences against the person urgently requires revision. Towards offenders against property the law until very lately was ferocious, and even now it does not err on the side of gentleness; but in case of personal violence, short of premeditated murder, it is chargeable with confounding together offences the most widely separated, both in kind and degree of criminality, and with the most excessive and unwarrantable lenity towards all but the lightest. Legislators and judges have bestowed little consideration on the amount of guilt and suffering which lie disguised under the mild and euphonious designation of “common assault.” That gentle phrase stands for nearly every sort of bodily maltreatment of which death or maiming is not obviously the result. There is but that one term to denote the whole range of acts of personal violence, from a quarrel between two strong and equally matched men, one of whom knocks the other down in a fair fight, to that habitual and wanton abuse of muscular strength against the weak and defenceless which makes life a martyrdom. Even if this confounding of the gravest moral distinctions were a mere matter of theory and classification, it would be very far from harmless in its effects on the popular mind; but, carried out as it is, to the full, in daily practice—some of the most detestable actions which one human being can perpetrate against another being punished, when punished at all, with about the amount of penalty which would be due to a simple breach of the peace—it would show a profound ignorance of the effect of
moral agencies on the character not to perceive how deeply depraving must be the influence of such a lesson given from the seat of justice. It cannot be doubted that to this more than to any other single cause is to be attributed the frightful brutality which marks a very large proportion of the poorest class, and no small portion of a class much above the poorest.

Persons who are not conversant, either by their own knowledge or through the proceedings of courts of justice, with the breadth and depth of popular brutality, have very little idea of what is comprehended in the meaning of the words, “domestic tyranny.” This is now the only kind of tyranny which, in the more improved countries of the world, still exists in full vigour. Even in the worst governed countries, of any tolerable degree of civilization, it is now but rarely that Kings or public functionaries have it in their power personally to maltreat any one. The barbarities of which history is full, and which in barbarous countries flourish as rankly as ever, very few persons in a civilized country now suffer from political authorities—millions are liable to them from domestic ones. The great majority of the inhabitants of this and of every country—including nearly the whole of one sex, and all the young of both—are, either by law or by circumstances stronger than the law, subject to some one man’s arbitrary will. Every now and then the public are revolted by some disclosure of unspeakable atrocities committed against some of these helpless dependents—while, for every such case which excites notice, hundreds, most of them as bad, pass off in the police reports entirely unobserved; and for one that finds its way, even for that brief instant, into light, we may be assured that not hundreds but thousands are constantly going on in the safety of complete obscurity. If, through the accidental presence of some better-hearted person than these poor creatures are usually surrounded by, complaint is made to a magistrate, the neighbours—persons living in the same house—almost invariably testify, without either repentance or shame, that the same brutalities had gone on for years in their sight or hearing, without their stirring a finger to prevent them. The sufferers themselves are either unable to complain, from youth or ignorance, or they dare not. They know too surely the consequences of either failing or succeeding in a complaint, when the law, after inflicting just enough punishment to excite the thirst of vengeance, delivers back the victim to the tyrant.

As a matter either of justice or of humanity, these things speak so plain a language as ought to be in no need of commentary. What it is of more importance to insist upon, is their demoralizing effect. Attention has of late been much directed to the overcrowding of the labouring population as a source of moral evils. Let any one consider the degrading moral effect, in the midst of these crowded dwellings, of scenes of physical violence, repeated day after day—the debased, spirit-broken, down-trodden condition of the unfortunate woman, the most constant sufferer from domestic brutality in the poorer classes, unaffectedly believing herself to be out of the protection of the law—the children born and bred in this moral atmosphere—with the unchecked indulgence of the most odious passions, the tyranny of physical force in its coarsest manifestations, constantly exhibited as the most familiar facts of their daily life—can it be wondered if they grow up without any of the ideas and feelings which it is the purpose of moral education to infuse, without any sense of justice or affection, any conception of self-restraint—incapable in their turn of governing their
children by any other means than blows? The law, whose utmost exertions would not be more than enough to withstand this mass of depraving influences, makes so little use of its powers and opportunities, measures out its reproofs and punishments by such a scale, that the culprits believe almost the worst of these brutalities to be venial, and all minor ones to be actually permitted—while the victims regard their suffering and debasement as the regular course of things, which the law sanctions and the world allows; and when not crushed entirely, they seek a wretched compensation by tyrannizing in their turn, when any hapless fellow-creature comes within their power.
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the two preceding volumes of Mr. Grote’s History exhibited the Athenian empire in its ascending and stationary periods. The present publication contains the still more interesting and impressive recital of its decline and fall. Commencing at the temporary suspension of hostilities with the Peloponnesian confederacy, termed the Peace of Nicias, it comprises the tragedy of the Sicilian expedition; the wonderful exertion of energy by which Athens rallied after that unparalleled disaster, and succeeded once more in balancing the whole strength of her enemies, though aided by her revolted allies and by the treasures of the “Great King”; the closing years of the Peloponnesian war, varied by some remarkable passages in the internal history of the Athenian republic; the catastrophe of Aegospotami, the subjugation of Athens by Lysander, the annihilation of her maritime power and dissolution of the democracy. The narrative is continued through the brief despotism of the Thirty Tyrants to the restoration of the Athenian democracy (but not of the Athenian empire) by Thrasybulus and his associates, and the settlement of affairs which followed, so remarkable for its good sense and absence of reactionary violence. In the last two chapters Mr. Grote suspends the political, and takes up the intellectual movement; passing in review the dramatists, the rhetoricians, the sophists, and lastly, the memorable character and career of Socrates, to whom the closing chapter is exclusively dedicated. [Vol. VIII, pp. 434-676; Chaps. lxvii-lxviii.]

Both in stirring incident, and in topics for thought and reflection, these volumes are richer than any of their predecessors; and the execution worthily corresponds to the material. Those who have read Mr. Grote’s former volumes will have observed that he invariably rises with his subject, and is found most adequate to it where its requirements are greatest. The better acquainted any one is with Grecian history, and with the manner in which that history has heretofore been written, the higher will be his estimation of this work. Few books are more calculated to impress the instructed reader both with admiration of the thorough manner in which everything which the
author attempts to do is done, and with surprise that almost everything was left for
him to do. An enumeration of the points of Grecian history on which he has thrown
new light, would comprise almost every one of its important phaenomena, or even of
its interesting incidents. Yet there is not only no ostentation of originality, but the
author’s mind is of the quality most remote from that which catches at glittering
novelties and indulges an intellectual appetite for ingenious hypotheses. If there is
anything which can be confidently predicated of Mr. Grote it is that he is a safe
historian; one who requires, not less, but more, positive evidence than common
inquirers, before adopting a conclusion. His new results are not obtained by divination
or conjecture; but by more diligent study and more acute cross-examination of the
authorities than had ever been applied before, and by that greater power of
interpreting recorded facts which flows from the possession of broader, deeper, and
more many-sided views of human affairs.

With the exception of the last two chapters, the whole of both volumes is continuous
narrative; without admixture of discussion beyond what was required for criticism of
the evidence, or moral appreciation of the facts. During the entire period, the historian
has the benefit of the high contemporary authorities, Thucydides and Xenophon: on
the general march of events there is little trustworthy information except what these
writers afford. The difference between one modern historian and another, as to this
period, is chiefly shown by the manner in which they supply what is not told by
contemporary writers, because not required by contemporary readers—namely, that
basis of permanent facts, of which the passing facts recorded by the historian stand
out as it were on the mere surface. Thucydides, writing for Greeks, related the
incidents which disturbed the stream of Greek life, the battles, conspiracies, and the
like; but what the stream in its natural state consisted of, he did not need to tell his
readers, for they knew it as well as himself. Those familiar facts, however, which to
them would have been superfluous information, are what it most concerns the modern
historian to know. He has to discover them from the incidental hints given by
Thucydides, and from the indications scattered through the mass of Greek literature.
Owing to the insufficiency of the materials, a very imperfect conception is all that can
be obtained; but there is a vast difference between this imperfect conception and none
at all. Now the modern historians of Greece who preceded Mr. Grote, have started
with what it is scarcely injustice to call, no distinct conception whatever of the general
state of things in Greece, the opinions, feelings, personal relations, and actions,
habitual to the persons individual or collective, whom they are writing about; and
hence, when they come to speak of any particular event, they hardly ever understand
what other things it implied, or what impression it must have produced on those who
saw and heard it—for want of a proper understanding of what may be termed “the
situation.” To illustrate our meaning, as well as to show the extent of this deficiency
in former historians of Greece: we do not believe that any one of them has made (for
example) these obvious remarks—that few Greek statesmen or generals were superior
to pecuniary corruption, and that there were still fewer Greeks whose heads were not
turned, and their capacity of rational judgment destroyed, by brilliant success. Yet
even such simple general reflections as these, in the hands of Mr. Grote, help to
render many things intelligible which hitherto have been either unaccounted for or
totally misunderstood. To take another and a less obvious example: the curious
incident of the mutilation of the statues called Hermæ, and the violent excitement at
Athens consequent upon it, are for the first time made comprehensible by Mr. Grote, because he is the first who has mentally realized the effect of such an incident upon the religious feelings of Greeks. [Vol. VII, pp. 227ff., 267ff.] The matter had always been written about as if horror at the mere act of sacrilege had been the only religious sentiment concerned: whereas Mr. Grote points out that it was much rather a religious terror; that, according to the belief of the Athenians, such an insult to the god was certain to draw down his severest wrath upon the whole state, to the extent of utter ruin, unless they could reconcile themselves to him by detecting and rooting out all who were concerned in the impiety. This aspect of the matter both suggests a possible motive on the part of the perpetrators of an act hitherto the most enigmatical in Greek history, and explains the course of subsequent events.

Perhaps the most unmistakeable as well as the most attractive of Mr. Grote’s excellences as a narrator, consists in this ever-present and lively sense of “the situation.” One of the beneficial fruits of this quality is that it makes the history a philosophic one without apparent effort. There is no need of lengthened discussion to connect causes with their effects; the causes and effects are parts of the same picture, and the causes are seen in action before it appears what they are to produce. For example, the reader whose mind is filled with the greatness attained by Athens while her councils were ruled by the commanding intellect and self-restraining prudence of Pericles, might almost anticipate the coming disasters when he finds, in the early chapters of the present volumes, into the hands of what advisers Athens had already fallen. And, mark well, these evil advisers were not the demagogues, but the chiefs of the aristocracy, the richest and most highborn men in the republic—Nicias and Alcibiades. Mr. Grote had already shown grounds for believing that Cleon, and men of his stamp, had been far too severely dealt with by historians; not that they did not frequently deserve censure, but that they were by no means the worst misleaders of the Athenian people. The demagogues were, as he observes, essentially opposition speakers. The conduct of affairs was habitually in the hands of the rich and great, who had by far the largest share of personal influence, and on whose mismanagement there would have been hardly any check, but for the demagogues and their hostile criticism. These opinions receive ample confirmation from the course of affairs, when, there being no longer any lowborn Cleon or Hyperbolus to balance their influence, Nicias and Alcibiades had full scope to ruin the commonwealth. The contrary vices of these two men, both equally fatal, are exemplified in the crowning act of their maladministration; the one having been the principal adviser of the ill-starred expedition to Syracuse, while the other was the main cause of its ruinous failure, by his intellectual and moral incapacity.

One of the most important results of Grecian history, as conceived and written by Mr. Grote, is the triumphant vindication, so far as historical evidence goes, of Democracy. The moral of the history, as related by most modern historians, is that democracy is a detestable kind of government, and that the case of Athens strikingly exemplifies its detestable qualities. Mr. Grote, on the contrary, shows that the Athenian government was of surpassing excellence, its time and circumstances considered; that no other form of society known to the ancients realized anything approaching to an equal measure of practical good government; and that this was mainly owing to the nearer approach which it made to democratic institutions. A democracy in the full sense of
the term it of course was not, since women, slaves, and a multitude of permanent residents of all ranks and classes who were not citizens, were “unknown to the constitution.” But it had many important points in common with democracy. It was a government of unlimited publicity, and freedom of censure and discussion. Public officers were subject to effective responsibility. The tribunals, being multitudinous and appointed by lot, were, like modern juries, generally incorrupt. And there was no distinction in political rights and franchises between poor and rich, lowborn and highborn. That the Athenian institutions on the whole were eminently favourable to progress, is shown by the splendid development of individual intellect during the three or four generations that this form of society lasted. It was reserved for Mr. Grote to show that the conditions also of order were realized in a degree unknown in any other community of the ancient world. Nowhere else in antiquity was respect for law so deep-rooted a principle as at Athens. Constitutional forms, and the salutary checks which the wisdom of Solon, Kleisthenes, and Pericles had provided against the inconsiderate impulses of a multitudinous popular assembly, had the strongest hold on the minds of the Demos; very rarely indeed in Athenian history were those barriers overstepped, even by the most impetuous impulse of popular passion. Nowhere in Greece were life and property so secure against every kind of legal or illegal violence: even those who were not citizens were less exposed to insult and injury than in other ancient states. In all these points the Athenian people were honourably distinguished, not only from the Greek oligarchies, but from their own oligarchical party; who showed during two intervals of ascendency, the periods of the Four Hundred and of the Thirty, of what enormities they were capable; and whoought always to be present to the mind, not merely as the dark background to the picture of the Athenian republic, but as an active power in it: for during the whole of its existence, such men as Critias and his comppeers were prominent in the first ranks of public discussion, and continually filled the high offices of the state.

Among Mr. Grote’s views of Grecian history, the most startling by its apparent novelty will be, we think, his defence of the Sophists. [Vol. VIII, pp. 479-544.] If there is one opinion on Grecian affairs more accredited than another, it is that the sophists ruined the Grecian states by corrupting their morality. This opinion will appear to the reader of Mr. Grote to be one of those baseless fancies which have so long usurped the place of historical knowledge. Mr. Grote denies the fact of the corruption; and honourably acquits the sophists of any corrupting influence. It is not necessary to inform any reader of the Greek authors, that the word sophist was not used by them in its modern sense. That term was the common designation for speculative inquirers generally, and more particularly for instructors of youth; and was applied to Socrates and Plato, as much as to those whom they confuted. The sophists formed no school, had no common doctrines, but speculated in the most conflicting ways on physics and metaphysics; while with respect to morals, those among them who professed to prepare young men for active life, taught the current morality of the age in its best form: the apologue of the Choice of Hercules was the composition of a sophist. It is most unjust to the sophists to adopt, as the verdict of history upon them, the severe judgment of Plato, although from Plato’s point of view they deserved it. He judged them from the superior elevation of a great moral and social reformer: from that height he looked down contemptuously enough, not on them alone, but on statesmen, orators, artists—on the whole practical life of the
period, and all its institutions, popular, oligarchical, or despotic; demanding a
reconstitution of society from its foundations, and a complete renovation of the
human mind. One who had these high aspirations, had naturally little esteem for men
who did not see or aspire to see beyond the common ideas of their age; but, as Mr.
Grote remarks, to accept his judgment of them would be like characterizing the
teachers and politicians of the present time in the words applied to them by Owen or
Fourier. [Vol. VIII, p. 538.] Even Plato, for the most part, puts the immoral doctrines
ascribed to the sophists (such as the doctrine that might makes right) into the mouths
not of sophists, but of ambitious active politicians, like Callicles. Even Plato, for the most part, puts the immoral doctrines ascribed to the sophists (such as the doctrine that might makes right) into the mouths not of sophists, but of ambitious active politicians, like Callicles.

This brings us to the chapter on Socrates; which, after so much that is valuable, is in
our estimation the most instructive chapter in the book. We have not space to
give the briefest analysis of a dissertation so rich in matter, or the smallest specimen
of the delineation of this remarkable character, now brought into clearer light than
ever before—a philosopher inculcating, under a supposed religious impulse, pure
reason and a rigid discipline of the logical faculty. But we invite attention to the
estimate, contained in this chapter, of the peculiarities of the Socratic teaching, and of
the urgent need, at the present and at all times, of such a teacher. Socrates, in morals,
is conceived by Mr. Grote as the parallel of Bacon in physics. He exposed the loose,
vague, confused, and misleading character of the common notions of mankind on the
most familiar subjects. By apt interrogations, forcing the interlocutors to become
conscious of the want of precision in their own ideas, he showed that the words in
popular use on all moral subjects (words which, because they are familiar, all persons
fancy they understand) in reality answer to no distinct and well-defined ideas; and that
the common notions, which those words serve to express, all require to be
reconsidered. This is exactly what Bacon showed to be the case in respect to the
phrases and notions commonly current on physical subjects. It is the fashion of the
present day to decry negative dialectics; as if making men conscious of their
ignorance were not the first step—and an absolutely necessary one—towards inducing
them to acquire knowledge. “Opinio copiae,” says Bacon, “maxima causa inopiae est.”
The war which Bacon made upon confused general ideas, “notiones temere a
rebus abstractas,” was essentially negative, but it constituted the epoch from which,
alone, advancement in positive knowledge became possible. It is to Bacon that we
owe Newton and the modern physical science. In like manner, Socrates, by
convincing men of their ignorance, and pointing out the conditions of knowledge,
originated the positive movement which produced Plato and Aristotle. With them and
their immediate disciples that movement ceased, and has never yet been so effectually
revived as to be permanent. The common notions of the present time on moral and
mental subjects are as incapable of supporting the Socratic cross-examination as those
of his own age: they are, just as much, the wild fruits of the undisciplined
understanding—of the “intellectus sibi permissus,” as Bacon phrases it; rough
generalizations of first impressions, or consecrations of accidental feelings, without
due analysis or mental circumscription. As the direct antagonist of such unsifted
general notions and impressions on moral subjects, Socrates occupies an unique
position in history; and the work which he did requires to be done again, as the indispensable condition of that intellectual renovation, without which the grand moral and social improvements, to which mankind are now beginning to aspire, will be for ever unattainable.
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the case of mary ann parsons, who died a cruel death from maltreatment, at Buckland, near Bideford, in January last, has terminated in a more complete frustration of public justice than, in our worst surmises, we had imagined possible. The criminals, Robert and Sarah Bird, have not been convicted of murder—nor of manslaughter—nor even of a common assault. They have escaped totally unpunished—unpunished, except by public execration, which, it is to be hoped, will cling to them the more closely that they have not expiated their guilt by the retribution which the law appoints for such malefactors, but which in this instance, as in too many others, it has failed to inflict. Let any one who reads the report of the trial which appeared in our paper of yesterday, judge whether there can be the faintest shadow of doubt as to the facts—whether the two prisoners will not carry to their graves the merited designation of acquitted murderers. The worst features of the case, as it appeared against them in the preliminary investigation, were all confirmed, and more than confirmed, by the evidence on the trial. Several witnesses swore to repeated acts of brutal maltreatment. Several others swore to admissions of such acts by the female prisoner, both as respected herself and her husband. The state in which the poor girl’s body was found was sworn to by Mr. Turner, the surgeon who made the post-mortem examination, in these clear and straightforward terms:

On the legs and thighs I saw several wounds, varying in extent, and evidently inflicted by some irregular or rough weapon. It struck me to have been by a birch. There was a bruise on the chest. The face was discoloured, and the forehead, and some abscesses were on the arms and fingers. The skin over the bowels was discoloured. On the left arm there was an abscess, and the skin immediately round it was discoloured, as if it had been bruised some time, perhaps a fortnight. The abscess had burst below the elbow. There was another abscess just forming. The nails of the little and fore finger were gone, apparently some time. The two middle finger nails were also gone, apparently more recently, and in one the bone protruded. On the right arm there was also an abscess that had also burst. On the right hip there was a large slough. On the
posterior part of the hips were several wounds, apparently inflicted some time. They were covered with plaster, and appeared to be old sores. Between the shoulders were two trivial bruises. There was also a mark on the face, from the temple down to the cheek. On removing the scalp I found another bruise on the back of the head, with considerable extravasation of blood diffused between the scalp and the skull.

Then, after stating that he observed congestion of the membranes of the brain, and at the base of the brain extravasation of blood, and that he “found the cause of death in the head,” Mr. Turner continued:

In my judgment, death was the result of the external injuries. I could not form a judgment how that violence had been inflicted. I don’t think the injuries I saw in the head were produced from falls. The condition of the girl must have been extremely reduced before death, and the powers of life weakened. The injuries I observed would have produced an effect on the nervous system, which is connected with the brain.

Another medical witness, Mr. Edge, a surgeon to the hospital at Exeter, “conceives that Mr. Turner is correct in the opinion that he formed, as to the time of death, and the cause.”

After such evidence—unless the testimony was disbelieved, which it was not—it seems incredible that the Judge (Mr. Justice Talfourd) should have charged the jury for an acquittal. Every reader must be astonished at such a course, and must be anxious to know how so extraordinary a judgment came to be pronounced on such a state of facts. The explanation, however, is instructive, by the illustration which it affords of the state either of the law, or of the mind of this Judge—certainly not one of the worst of its administrators. Though there were statements and physical facts sufficient to convince the mind most recalcitrant to evidence, that the death of the girl was the work of the two prisoners, there was not, it seems, legal evidence to bring it home to them. “The case,” in the opinion of the judge, “had failed.” But when we see in what points it was considered to have failed, we cease to wonder—or rather, our astonishment changes its object, and we wonder how there should ever be legal evidence of a murder committed in the manner in which these two culprits caused the death of their victim.

The grounds of acquittal were two; and which of them is the strangest it would not be easy to decide. The first was, that although there was superabundant evidence of brutality by the prisoners sufficient to cause the frightful state of the corpse, it was not proved that anybody struck the particular blow on the head to which the congestion of the brain, said to be the immediate cause of death, was thought to be more especially owing. The second reason was, that even if the blow had been struck by one of the prisoners, there was no evidence “to fix it upon one of these parties more than the other.” But it is by no means clear that, in the opinion of the medical witnesses, the blow on the head was exclusively the fatal injury. Mr. Turner, according to our report, “found the cause of death in the head”—meaning the congestion; but he distinctly said, “In my judgment death was the result of the external injuries.” “The injuries I observed”—being those on the body generally—“would have produced an effect on the nervous system, which is connected with the brain.” The other medical witness...
professed an unqualified agreement in Mr. Turner’s opinion. It would thus appear that neither of these gentlemen ascribed the cerebral congestion to any local injury to the head, but to general injuries, affecting the brain not directly, but indirectly through “the nervous system.” Even assuming, however (what, it is fair to say, some of the reports of the trial appear to bear out), that death was more immediately caused by that particular injury, among the many of which the sufferer bore the hideous marks—that circumstance does not abate one iota from the moral certainty of the prisoners’ guilt. They were proved to have been in the habit of inflicting, up to nearly the time of the girl’s death, cruelties quite equal to the one assumed to have caused it. There was no direct proof that either of them struck that particular blow; but there was not the smallest evidence accounting for it in any other way. It was for them to rebut the presumption raised by their other brutalities. An adequate cause had been shown for any result, however fatal, in their daily treatment of their victim. On them lay the burden of disproving the connection by proving the existence of some other cause for the catastrophe. If a man were found murdered on the highway, his body covered with wounds, some of which only were mortal, the assassins who were proved to have fallen upon him, and to have inflicted some of those wounds, would not be suffered to escape because no one could swear that the particular wounds inflicted by them were the mortal ones. It would be enough that they did wound him, that no other cause of death appeared, and that he died.

With respect to the very nice and scrupulous doubt—as to which of the two prisoners is answerable—it is easily disposed of. Both are answerable. The guilt rests on both, until one of them can get rid of it by throwing it exclusively on the other. If the atrocious acts—some one or all of which destroyed the victim—had been proved only against one of the prisoners, that one would justly have been made responsible for the catastrophe. But those acts were proved against both, and against both equally. Both, therefore, are accountable; just as is the case if a person is found with a gang of robbers at the commission of a crime—it is on himself that the burden rests of proving his non-participation in their guilt.

Under the jurisprudence of Mr. Justice Talfourd, it is virtually proclaimed to such people as Robert and Sarah Bird that there is impunity for murder, on condition of their adopting the commonest precautions. If the person to be murdered is an inmate of their house, and under their power, they must be dull indeed if they cannot effect their purpose without supplying those links of evidence for want of which the death of Mary Ann Parsons goes unpunished. It matters not though the whole neighbourhood testifies to daily cruelties more than adequate to produce death. It matters not that the corpse excites universal horror by its glaring manifestations of those cruelties. They can surely contrive that no one shall be able to swear to the particular wound inflicted on a particular day, or to prove that this wound was given by one of the murderers, that by another—and the victim, who alone knew, is not alive to tell. This is not justice. If it be law, which, in opposition to a judge’s dictum, we do not pretend to decide, it is law which cannot too soon be altered. When the law places any one—and that a person of inferior physical strength—under the power of another, who may be such a creature as these Birds, it exposes the individual to peculiar risks, and ought, therefore, to guard him by peculiar precautions. What is called the ordinary protection of law is not sufficient. The ordinary protection of law is protection to those who can
help themselves—who can in general keep themselves out of harm’s way, or, at least, who can tell their own story. The victims of domestic brutality cannot protect themselves; and there is no protection for them, if, when death ensues, and violence is proved sufficient to cause death, the prosecutors are obliged to produce direct evidence connecting the death with the brutality. It is on the accused that the burden of exculpating themselves should in such cases rest. Death, and maltreatment sufficient to cause death, are the sole facts of which positive evidence ought to be required. Those to whom power over others is given, and who brutally misuse that power, should be thus far held responsible for the safety of those over whom they tyrannise. Otherwise there is no security even for the lives of any of those who have the wretched and disgracefully common lot of being in the power of a brute.2
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only three days have elapsed since we held up to public indignation the frightful details of the Bideford abominations, and the scandal of an acquittal, decisive of Mr. Justice Talfourd’s calibre both as a judge and as a man.1 Already another case has presented itself, fully equal in its atrocious features, and in which, unless the public look well to it, similar impunity will probably be the result.

Our yesterday’s paper contained the Coroner’s inquest on Susan Moir, wife of Alexander Moir, carrying on business as a baker at No. 24, Brydges-street, Covent-garden. “When the sheet,” says our report, “with which the remains were covered was thrown aside, an expression of horror escaped all present, the body, from head to foot, being literally covered with bruises and contused wounds of old and recent date.” The surgeon, Mr. Watkins,2 deposed—“The integuments and muscles of the head were contused in a manner I never saw before—in fact they were a perfect jelly.” The following are the statements of the other witnesses:

The first witness, Mary Ann Bryant, a cousin of the deceased, said that she
called upon her on Saturday last, about half-past one o’clock, when deceased complained of having been very much ill-used by her husband. Deceased begged witness to ask him to allow her to go to bed, as she had been up all the previous night. She said to witness, “You might say to him, let Susan go and lie down.” Witness did ask her husband, as requested, but he refused to allow her to go to bed, and said she must mind the shop. Witness remained with deceased until half-past three o’clock, and during that interval her husband frequently boxed her ears as hard as he could with his open hand, and once, when she got up to serve a customer in the shop, he kicked her behind with great force, because, as he said, she did not move quick enough. He requested witness to examine her head, remarking that he knew he had hurt her. Witness did so, and found her left ear and all that part of the head dreadfully bruised. There were also cuts upon the head, and the hair was matted with congealed blood that had issued from them. Witness told deceased’s husband how much she was injured, but he did not appear to take any notice of it.
About six the same afternoon, on returning to the house,

he asked her whether she had supplied certain customers; and she replied that she had not; upon which he swore at her, and boxed her ears as hard as he could. He then directed her to put some bread in the shop-window; and while she was in the act of doing so she fell insensible on the shop-floor. Witness ran towards her, and saw that the blood was spitting from a wound in her temple. Witness then called out, “Oh, good God, uncle; cousin is in a fit—pick her up.” He replied that he would not. Deceased presently revived a little, and walked with witness into the back parlour. While doing so, she said, “I am in a fit, and a very bad fit. Don’t leave me, for God’s sake—don’t leave me, Mary Ann.” These were the last words she ever uttered. Witness wished to put her to bed, but her husband said she should never go into a bed of his again. Deceased was then standing over a sink; and presently her strength appeared to fail, and she sank down upon the floor with her head resting on the kitchen step.

She never rallied, and died on the following Monday morning.

John Johnson, a journeyman baker in this wretch’s employment, said that on Tuesday night, soon after eleven o’clock,

he heard a great noise overhead, as of two persons quarrelling, and a cry of distress from the deceased woman. The noise was similar to that of one person dragging another across the room, and it continued up to three o’clock to such an extent that witness could not get any sleep. Witness did not hear any words distinctly, but he could tell that his master was speaking in a very ferocious manner. On the Saturday afternoon witness saw his master knock deceased about, and shortly afterwards she fell down insensible. Deceased’s cousin asked witness to assist in raising her, but his master would not allow him. He said, “D—n her, let her get up herself.”

Amelia Meredes, who had lodged in the house for the last two months,

had frequently seen deceased with black eyes in that time; and on Saturday, about five o’clock, during a dreadful noise of quarrelling, she came down stairs into the passage, and while there heard deceased scream out and cry, “Oh, oh! you’ll kill me, you’ll kill me!” Her husband replied, “Yes, I will kill you. I’ll murder you before I have done with you.” Witness also heard deceased’s little boy call out at the same time, “You’ll kill my mother, father.”

It was after such evidence as this that the Coroner’s jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter! And were the ruffian to be tried (as he has been committed) on this verdict, and not on a bill of indictment sent before the grand jury, he would be tried for manslaughter only, and not for murder! We have, however, much satisfaction in perceiving, from the result of the examination which took place at Bow-street yesterday, that public justice will be spared this indescribably outrageous insult; and that, despite the enormous folly and heartlessness of the fifteen “highly respectable” jurymen, the prisoner will be put on his trial for the capital offence.
To prevent justice from being foiled in instances like these ought ever to be the primary object of all who have any power in the case. The parish officers, or any other public authority within whose competence it is to see that the most horrible crimes do not escape unpunished, are under a deep responsibility if they do not, when others fail in their duty, indict such culprits for murder. And when the case is not taken up by those who are most bound to do so, a public subscription ought to enable the relatives or friends of the unfortunate victim to take the proper means of invoking condign punishment on the murderer.

It is necessary that it should be, once for all, understood by juries that to beat a human being to death is not manslaughter, but murder. If it were otherwise, the famous Mrs. Brownrigg was hanged contrary to law. What she was convicted of was a series of brutalities exactly resembling this, and the Bideford case. And she would most assuredly have been acquitted had she been tried before Mr. Justice Talfourd. He would have said that there had been “chastisement of which he did not approve,” but that there was no proof that the death of the victim was caused by the “chastisement.”

In the Brydges-street case it is in evidence that the prisoner actually, and at the very time, said to the unhappy victim that he would murder her; and though this, or any other ruffianly speech under such circumstances, does not amount to proof that the speaker meant the full import of his words, experience shows what interpretation would have been put upon them if the case had been reversed, and if the woman had been charged with killing the man. If the husband had died in circumstances similar to the case of Ann Merrett, and such a speech could have been proved to have been uttered by the wife—no matter under what circumstances of just exasperation—she would not have had a chance to escape a capital conviction.

Is it because juries are composed of husbands in a low rank of life, that men who kill their wives almost invariably escape—wives who kill their husbands, never? How long will such a state of things be permitted to continue?
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Mr. Editor,—

Agreeing cordially with many of the sentiments expressed in your journal of Sunday, May 5, and with much of the tone and spirit of your paper generally, I regret to see one paragraph in which, as it appears to me, you not only give blame where praise is deserved, but countenance erroneous opinions on such important subjects as the direction of charity and the employment of labour. The following is the passage:

In Marylebone, a society of ladies has formed a female school for the purpose, as they state, of instructing the poor in such branches of useful knowledge as are calculated to enable them, in after life, to gain a honest livelihood. So far, excellent. The object is laudable, but is greatly defeated by the very founders of this charitable institution, who, in order to save the money which they should otherwise pay for the making of their apparel, bring that apparel to the school, and get it made free of cost by the children. Thus in the name, and under the guise of charity, they unintentionally inflict a gross injustice, rob honest industry of its fair reward, and drive to the workhouse or to prostitution the industrious and deserving female, who is willing to toil from the rising to the setting sun, and even half the night during the whole week, for a pittance scarcely sufficient to keep body and soul together.

I know nothing of the facts, and assume them to be as here stated. What I object to is the doctrine that, whenever, in return for charitable assistance, the recipients are required to do anything useful, to perform any productive labour which any other
persons might be paid to do, an injustice is done to those other persons, and a wrong to the world at large.

Your objection, if good at all, is good against every possible employment of labour. You cannot employ anybody without enabling it to be said that you prevent yourself from employing somebody else. If it is wrong to employ children, because of taking employment from needlewomen, by the same reasoning to employ one needlewoman, is taking employment from another. If it is wrong to employ children in needlework, instead of employing needlewomen, it must be wrong to teach the children needlework, for the express purpose of enabling them “in after life to gain an honest livelihood” by practising needlework, and so competing with the needlewomen.

You will, perhaps, say that, at all events, the assistance so conferred is no longer charity, but an ordinary commercial transaction. I contend, on the contrary, that charity is much more charity, because much more useful when conferred in this way. The best kind of relief or assistance is that for which, as far as the case admits, a return is required to be made in useful labour. Especially is this the case when the very object in view is to train up children to gain their living by labour. If they are to be taught needlework they must be made to do needlework, and would it be an improvement in their education that it should be useless needlework, as paupers have been employed to dig holes and fill them up again, for fear of displacing other labour?

But there is another aspect of the matter which is of still wider application. You seem to think that if you pay labourers to do nothing at all, or nothing useful, you do not take away employment from any one, but that you do so if you require a return in productive industry. The truth, I apprehend, is the very opposite. It is by what you give to one person that you diminish your means of employing others; not by the work you make him do in return; on the contrary, making him work in return is the only mode by which, while you give to him, you can still have undiminished means of employing others. If what you have given to a labourer comes back in the value of that which he produces, or, what amounts to the same thing, in the saving of an equal sum of money, which you must otherwise have expended at a shop, you have conferred the benefit on him, and yet have as much money in your possession to make purchases, or employ labourers with, as if you had not given him anything. I do not mean to say that this money will find its way to the same shops, or the same labourers, but it will be spent at other shops, or on other labourers; if there is a disadvantage to some people, there is an advantage to others, and no detriment to the labouring class on the whole.

Objections are sometimes made, on similar erroneous grounds, to the introduction of useful labour into prisons—although useful labour is the only production of good prison discipline, and of the reformation of criminals—for want of considering, that since the prisoners must at any rate be supported, whatever they cause to be withdrawn from the support of honest labour is equally withdrawn, whether the prisoners work or not; while, by making them work, the value, or part of it, is got back, and may be used in giving employment to other labourers.
This subject, sir, will amply repay a more attentive consideration than, as it seems to me, the writer of the paragraph in your last Sunday’s paper has yet given to it, and if what I have written should induce him to meditate further on things so closely connected with many of the important questions which come under the notice of journalists, I shall feel that I have been of some use.

D.1
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we have on former occasions pointed out the defective state of the law and of its administration with respect to crimes of personal violence, and we have especially commented on the absence of protection for women and young persons, and for all those who are under the power of others, against domestic brutality. The case on which the Court of Queen’s Bench pronounced judgment yesterday, 1 exceptional as it is in some material respects—more particularly as regards the apparent absence of habitual or deliberate cruelty on the part of the defendant—recalls our attention to this very important subject; and we proceed to offer some further remarks on the general question of the social and legal wrongs affecting the most helpless portion of the community.

It is evident to all who take any pains to read the indications of the feelings of the populace, that they are impressed with the belief of their having a right to inflict almost any amount of corporal violence upon their wife or their children. That any one should claim to interfere with this supposed right, causes them unaffected surprise. Is it not their wife or child? Are they not entitled to do as they will with their own? 2 These phrases are not, to their apprehension, metaphorical. The shoes on their feet, or the cudgel in their hand—the horse or ass that carries their burdens, and that dies a lingering death under their cruelties—the wife and children—all are “theirs,” and all in the same sense. They have the same right, in their own opinion, over their human as over their inanimate property. Doubtless they are aware that they are not at liberty to inflict death; but when they actually do so, and find that they are to be tried for murder, they seem to receive the information with a kind of stolid astonishment; and it may well appear to them anomalous that a creature is given up to their power to be kicked or beaten, at the peril of life, as often as temper or intoxication may prompt—and yet that, on some one day when they have done no worse than they had done hundreds of times before, they are told that they are liable to be hanged. Not that they ever are hanged for these enormities, even though death ensue. If they are tried at all (which in general they are not), the jury are not convinced that they intended death, and they consequently escape with a verdict of manslaughter. This interpretation of the law had the sanction of Mr. Baron Alderson, in the recent case of Alexander
Moir If it be a correct interpretation, the law is, in this matter, grossly inconsistent; for many acts, venial in comparison with Moir’s, are held by law to be murder when death ensues as an unintended consequence. “If one intends,” says Blackstone, “to do another felony, and undesignedly kills a man, this is murder.” If any one kills an officer of justice, or even a private person, who is endeavouring to suppress an affray or to apprehend a felon, it is murder. “It were endless,” continues Blackstone, “to go through all the cases of homicide which have been adjudged either expressly or impliedly malicious,” and which are, therefore, legally regarded as murder. According to Mr. Baron Alderson, a wretch like Moir is less criminal in the eye of the law than a person who, intending only to take the property of another, undesignedly causes death. But surely a man who, though he does not intend to kill, perpetrates such ruffian-like maltreatment that death is a natural consequence, commits an offence that is at least equal in depravity to most cases of murder.

Some good would be done, if, even in this extreme case, it were felt that there is no immunity for domestic ruffianism, and that the law has as much severity for the man who kills those whom he is peculiarly bound to protect, as it has for the one whose victim had no claims on him save those inherent in humanity. But, though even this would be some improvement, much more is required. It would be but a feeble restraint on habitual brutality to make the offender responsible for an extreme consequence which may or may not happen, and which may or may not be capable of being traced to its real cause. The arm of the law should be made to reach the tyranny of bodily strength in every instance in which it comes to light. The atrocious cases now summarily disposed of by magistrates with a forty-shilling fine or two months’ imprisonment, should be tried with judicial solemnity in the courts which try other grave offences, and should be visited with a just gradation of penalties, rising to the highest secondary punishment. Whatever additional legislation is required for this purpose should be provided. Legislation is also needed to disabuse the people of false notions of their legal rights. At present it is the universal belief of the labouring class, that the law permits them to beat their wives—and the wives themselves share the general error. We assume that it is an error. We take for granted, that the old saw, which most people have heard—if it ever was law in the savage times of our ancestors—has long been obsolete. If there be any doubt of this, there is the more reason why there should, without delay, be an authoritative termination to the doubt. There should be a declaratory Act, distinctly setting forth that it is not lawful for a man to strike his wife, any more than to strike his brother or his father. This would be merely doing what was done by the first settlers of New England. The seventeenth century was not remarkable for the mildness of its manners, nor were the Puritans by any means moderate in their notions of family discipline and authority. Their standard of social morals was taken from the Old Testament and the Patriarchs, not from Christ and the Sermon on the Mount. Yet the fundamental regulations of the first Puritan colonists in New England, as we read them in the latest published history of the United States, formally abrogated that provision, or reputed provision, of the common law of England, which permitted men to beat their wives. We hope that it is not too much to expect from the English Legislature now, the same amount of justice and humanity which was shown by its cast-out children two hundred years ago. It seems almost inconceivable that the smallest blow from a man to a man should be by law a
criminal offence, and yet that it should not be—or should not be known to be—unlawful for a man to strike a woman.

There is yet another feature in the law and in its administration, connected with this subject, which, we would fain hope, need only be pointed out to be irrevocably condemned by public opinion. At present, no amount of brutal violence, nor even of deliberate cruelty, although judicially proved, has the legal effect of depriving the criminal of the power which he has misused. A man is convicted and imprisoned for the horrible maltreatment of his wife—and yet, when his imprisonment expires, the victim is again delivered into his hands, to suffer everything which brutality infuriated by revenge, or malignity made more cautious by detection, may inflict. Any words which might be used to characterize such a state of the law could hardly strengthen the impression which ought to be made by the simple knowledge of it. Apart from all that is revolting in the fact itself, and viewing the question in the coldest manner as one of mere legislative expediency, it is impossible to expect that these domestic atrocities should ever attain judicial publicity except by accident, when such are the consequences which the sufferers have to expect from complaining. Accordingly, these cases are hardly ever made known by the injured parties themselves; and if they happen to be brought before a magistrate or a criminal court by some one who casually becomes cognizant of them, the charge continually breaks down from the impossibility of inducing the trembling victim to speak the truth with sufficient plainness to procure a conviction, or to adhere to it when it has been spoken in the first instance.

It is a dictate of common sense—recognised and acted upon by the laws of almost all countries—that legal rights may be either suspended or forfeited for a certain amount of judicially proved misuse. If this is a reasonable and proper provision with regard to legal rights generally, it is so, above all, with respect to the powers which any one is allowed to exercise over the persons of human beings. The law confers every such power on the presumption (however fallacious) that it will be exerted for the good of those over whom it is given, and it cannot be justified except on that presumption. That there should be a slavery in civilized life, from which the most savage maltreatment, judicially proved, cannot liberate the victim, would be scarcely credible, if it were not notoriously true; and such a state of things cannot, we hope, be much longer tolerated, unless existing laws are deemed more sacred than the primary ends for which all laws profess to exist.

This evil might be removed without interfering with existing institutions on any other point, or raising discussion on any more general question. All that would be requisite is a short Act of Parliament, providing that judicial conviction of gross maltreatment should free the victim from the obligation of living with the oppressor, and from all compulsory subjection to his power—leaving him under the same legal obligation as before of affording the sufferer the means of support, if the circumstances of the case require it. We earnestly recommend this subject to the attention of those philanthropists who desire to signalize themselves by an eminently useful contribution to the work of mitigating the sufferings and raising the moral condition of the poor and the dependent.
Edward Vaughan Hyde Kenealy (1819-80) was tried before Lord Campbell for
assaulting his illegitimate six-year-old child, Edward Hyde, on 11 May, 1850. See
“Law Intelligence. Court of Queen’s Bench—Saturday. The Queen v. Kenealy, Esq.,”
Standard, 13 May, 1850, p. 7, from which the quotations are taken. Kenealy, who had
acknowledged the child and taken responsibility for rearing him, was sentenced to
imprisonment for only one month; the punishment was not decreed until 30 May (The
Times, 31 May, p. 7). This article, the fourteenth by Harriet Taylor and Mill on
injustice and cruelty (for background, see No. 303), is the seventh leader in the
“Political Enquirer,” headed as title. It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A
leading article in the Sunday Times of 2nd June 1850, headed ‘Punishment of
Children.’ Very little of this article was mine.”

(MacMinn, p. 75.)

the case of edward kenealy, a man holding the rank of a barrister, who has been
convicted by the Court of Queen’s Bench of an assault on his illegitimate child, a boy
six years old, cannot be allowed to pass without comment. The facts of the case,
disgusting though they be, are such as we are accustomed to see in every day’s
newspaper, and no wonder, while, not police magistrates only, but a Chief Justice,
like Lord Campbell in the present case, treats ferocious personal violence as if it were
the merest peccadillo—a pardonable overstepping of the strict limits of the law,
hardly deserving any moral blame. We shall first quote the evidence of the surgeon:

I saw the child on the day after it was found. I found a mark round the front and sides
of the neck, but not on the back part of the neck. On the front of the throat the skin
had been removed by pressure. Scabbing had taken place in some portion. Others
were undergoing suppuration, that had been produced by pressure, or some substance
rubbing. The whole of the back, from the shoulders to the lower part of the posteriors,
was covered with bruises. They were long in form, as if inflicted by castigation, and
were in different states of inflammation. From the posteriors to the ankles there were
marks of the same castigation. Great violence must have been used. From the
shoulders to the hands there was evidence of the same kind of treatment, and
apparently by the same instrument—by a rod or cane.

The following were Lord Campbell’s remarks:

There must be a verdict of guilty against the defendant. His chastisement of the child,
for some unaccountable reason, had been infinitely beyond moderation. Though there
was no doubt that a parent had a right to correct a child, and that the defendant here
seemed to have had the welfare of the child in view, still, after the evidence of the surgeon, it was clear that he had done what the law did not justify. It was impossible to say that this was moderate chastisement of a child six years old.

It will hardly be believed, after such evidence, and after such an opinion given by himself on the evidence, that Lord Campbell, in his address to the jury, could say—

He rejoiced that the whole truth had come out, and that no serious stain would attach to the character of Mr. Kenealy, who appeared to have taken some care of this child, which was his illegitimate child, and to have bestowed pains upon it in giving it an education. Was not the charge here made out? The defendant, though not the legitimate father of the child, was its parent by the law of nature, and was entitled, under the circumstances of its living with him, to all the authority and rights of a father. Still, in exercising those rights in the way of punishment of the child, he was bound to observe moderation. The jurors would declare whether, with a good conscience, they could say that he had done so; for if not, as immoderate punishment could not be justified in law, he must be found guilty.

Whether because the offender’s station in life was nearer than usual to his own, or from a total absence of moral sense in the mind of the judge, we know not, but his address is almost an apology to the prisoner for convicting him; and he tells the offender—he, the guardian and vindicator of the law, declares to a man who, in his own showing, has broken the law, by such treatment of a child of tender years as the surgeon’s evidence discloses, that “no serious stain would attach to his character,” and this because the poor infant said in his evidence that the prisoner kissed and gave him playthings and toys, and taught him “to spell, and read, and say his prayers,” as if the most brutal parents in anything like Mr. Kenealy’s rank of life did not do such things as these. Lord Campbell would seem to have adopted the doctrine of Mr. Whately, the prisoner’s counsel, who thought it “a thing to be applauded,” in the defendant, “that he did not, like many other people, leave his illegitimate child to poverty and misery.”

Why does not the unbrutal part of the public—the part which does not sympathise with cruelty, rouse itself and demand of the legislature how much longer the flogging of children shall be sanctioned by law? On the flogging of grown-up persons public opinion is made up. That practice, at last, by force of general feeling against the vehement remonstrances of those who had the power of inflicting the brutality, has been almost abolished. But it is assumed, and goes uncontradicted, that a punishment which is brutalising and degrading to grown men is quite fit and proper for helpless infancy; unfit to be inflicted, according to prescribed rules, by men called judges, after solemn inquiry and in the full light of publicity, but, “by the law of nature” (as Lord Campbell says), quite proper to be administered at discretion by men called fathers in the secrecy of their own houses, subject, when some peculiarly atrocious case accidentally comes to light, to a gentle admonition. It is only the other day that the House of Commons decided, after a long debate, that boys might be scourged at the discretion of two magistrates, but that men might not; the distinction, it appeared, between men and boys being the difference between thirteen years and fourteen. It is as possible to govern children without the aid of the lash as grown persons. It is even
much easier; their bad habits, if they have been allowed to acquire any, not being deeply rooted. A parent or teacher who cannot rule without the lash shows as much incapacity as brutality. There is no difference of nature between grown persons and boys, that what is most deeply degrading to the character of the one should not be so to the other. If the boy has no consciousness of his degradation the worse for him: it is a proof that his character is irreclaimably imbued with it. Mr. Whately said that they had all—judge, jury, and counsel—been flogged in their boyhood, and were much the better for it. This merely proves that Mr. Whately’s sense of degradation depends, not on the fact, but on other people’s opinion, and that nothing is revolting to him which is legal and customary. Take any naturally sensitive boy, who has been habitually flogged, and one who has never suffered that indignity, compare them, observe the difference in self-respect, and in all that depends on self-respect, which will mark those two human beings throughout life? On a boy of a dull, hard nature, its effect is to render him ten times harder than he would be without it—to qualify and prepare him for being a bully and a tyrant. He will feel none of that respect for the personality of other human beings which has not been shown towards his own. The object of his respect will be power. He will crouch to power in others, and will have nothing in his own nature to prevent him from trampling on those whom he has power over. If he does not do so, it will be from nothing better than fear of opinion or fear of punishment.
CONSTRAINTS OF COMMUNISM

LEADER, 3 AUG., 1850, P. 447

In the previous issue of the Leader, 27 July, p. 416, over the signature “Ion,” appeared “One of the Consequences Considered,” by George Jacob Holyoake, the paper’s manager. This response, which was Mill’s first contribution to the Leader, appeared in the regular “Open Council” section, which was introduced by the editorial comment: “In this department, as all opinions, however extreme, are allowed an expression, the editor necessarily holds himself responsible for none.” The letter is dated “Aug. 1, 1850,” and headed “Constraints of Communism,” though the entry in Mill’s bibliography says: “A letter signed D. and (improperly) headed ‘Restraints of Communism’ in the Leader of 3d August 1850”

(MacMinn, p. 75).

Sir,—

A correspondent of your last week’s paper, writing in defence of what he calls “associative views,” meaning, I suppose, the organization of industry on the communistic principle, employs himself in combating people who, he says, find fault with communism, because “the harmony and competence likely to result” are supposed to be “so overwhelming that a surfeit of enjoyment is dreaded;” and this absurdity he attributes to “a recent work” called Principles of Political Economy,¹ which, he says, “foreshadowed the inanity and monotony which must supervene when the spur of animal want was conquered and withdrawn.” Your correspondent has misunderstood the argument in the Political Economy. No such notion is there to be found as that “the sharp pangs of hunger” are necessary to prevent life from being inane and monotonous. So far is this from the truth, that the drudgery to which hunger, and the fear of hunger, condemn the great mass of mankind, is the chief cause which makes their lives inane and monotonous. If communism, or what is generally called by that name, would make life a dull routine, it is not because it would make everybody comfortable. When the rich are ennuyés it is not because they are “above the fear of want,” it is generally because they are not “above the fear” of other people’s opinions. They do not cultivate and follow opinions, preferences, or tastes of their own, nor live otherwise than in the manner appointed by the world for persons of their class. Their lives are inane and monotonous because (in short) they are not free, because though able to live as pleases themselves, their minds are bent to an external yoke. Now, it is this bondage which I am afraid of in the coöperative communities. I fear that the yoke of conformity would be made heavier instead of lighter; that people would be compelled to live as it pleased others, not as it pleased themselves; that their lives would be placed under rules, the same for all, prescribed by the majority; and
that there would be no escape, no independence of action left to any one, since all
must be members of one or another community. It is this which, as is contended in the
Political Economy, would make life monotonous; not freedom from want, which is a
good in every sense of the word, and which might be ensured to all who are born,
without obliging them to merge their separate as well as their working existence in a
community. No order of society can be in my estimation desirable unless grounded on
the maxim, that no man or woman is accountable to others for any conduct by which
others are not injured or damaged.

D.
398.

STABILITY OF SOCIETY

LEADER, 17 AUG., 1850, P. 494

Mill here comments on W. Thomas, “Speaking Out,” Leader, 13 July, 1850, pp. 374-5, from which the first set of quotations is taken. This letter to the editor, like No. 397, appeared in the “Open Council” section. It is dated 14 Aug., 1850, and headed as title. The entry in Mill’s bibliography reads: “A letter signed C. and headed ‘Stability of Society’ in the Leader of 17th August 1850” (MacMinn, p. 75).

Sir,—

Your “Open Council,” I presume, is an arena for the discussion, not merely of opinions, but of modes of arguing; and few things require discussion more. Availing myself of this liberty, I will put a few questions to one of your correspondents (signing himself W. Thomas) who is a very active questioner of others, and is much dissatisfied that nobody is willing to be “plain” and “precise.” Mr. Thomas stands up for the indissolubility of the marriage contract for the following plain and precise reason: “The stability of society rests upon the permanence of the marriage tie; loosen that, and society is on a sandbank.” These he thinks threatening words, since he puts them in italics. I ask, what he intends to be understood by them. “The stability of society” is an expression I have often heard before; but I cannot say I have ever been instructed what it meant. Indeed, I have remarked that it is mostly used by people who are not in the habit of attaching any very particular meaning to what they say. If the foundations of a house give way, the house falls, and there is no longer a house. What is it that happens if society falls? And what is this thing called “society” that requires to be protected from falling? Has it anything to do with you, and me, and the remainder of the men and women in the world? Does it mean the men and women themselves? If so, what is meant by the stability of the men and women? If it does not mean the men and women, does it mean anything belonging to them? And if so, what? And what is the precise nature of the mischief to be apprehended in case this something, I know not what, should come upon a “sandbank”? When a ship comes upon a sandbank, I know what happens; the ship breaks to pieces and the passengers are drowned. I want to have it made equally clear to me what would happen if, in consequence of permitting facility of divorce, “society” should, as Mr. Thomas says it will, come upon a sandbank.

I am the more desirous to be enlightened on this matter as I cannot call to mind any great improvement in human affairs, or the eradication of any deep-rooted and long-standing evil, which was not, at the time when it happened, represented as subverting
the foundations of society. The abolition of slavery; what a laying prostrate of the whole fabric of society was there! There was a time when even the boldest speculators were afraid to entertain such an idea. The destruction of the temples and altars of the old divinities, by the introduction of Christianity, was, according to the gravest people, the demolition of society altogether. The Reformation! another dreadful blow to the stability of society. The Revolution of 1688, which expelled God’s anointed and set up the people’s delegate; nay, the Reform Bill, and even Catholic emancipation, all made society crack and totter. Cheap newspapers, teaching the people to read; this last was a thing after which, we were told by many people, society could not much longer exist. A Turk thinks, or used to think (for even Turks are wiser now-a-days), that society would be on a sandbank if women were suffered to walk about the streets with their faces uncovered. Taught by these and many similar examples, I look upon this expression of loosening the foundations of society, unless a person tells in unambiguous terms what he means by it, as a mere bugbear to frighten imbeciles with. The utmost it can mean is, that the thing so characterized would be a great change—of some sort; which change may either be for the better or for the worse. I am one who thinks that not only divorce, but great changes in most matters are needed; and I confidently hope for many more as complete subversions of the foundations of “society” as were made by Christianity, the Reformation, and the enfranchisement of the slave.

I cannot conclude without a word or two on the naïve selfishness of another letter, in the same number of your paper and on the same question, but on the contrary side of it, in favour of Divorce. The writer shows the most unaffected unconsciousness that anybody has an interest in the matter except the man, whom he purposes to liberate from the consequences of an “act of youthful folly or inexperience.” Not a word of the woman, who is in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the chief sufferer, as is inevitable so long as the law gives all the power to the man; and on whose account, far more than even on that of the man, it is necessary that the yoke should be lightened. But this entire ignoring of women, as if their claim to the same rights as the other half of mankind were not even worth mentioning, stares one in the face from every report of a speech, every column of a newspaper. In your paper of the 27th ultimo, there is a long letter signed Homo, claiming the “right of the suffrage” as justly belonging to every man, while there is not one line of his argument which would not be exactly as applicable if “woman” were read instead of “man;” yet the thought never appears to occur to him. In a Conservative this would be intelligible—monopoly, exclusion, privilege, is his general rule; but in one who demands the suffrage on the ground of abstract right, it is an odious dereliction of principle, or an evidence of intellectual incompetence. While the majority of men are excluded, the insult to women of their exclusion as a class is less obvious. But even the present capricious distribution of the franchise has more semblance of justice and rationality than a rule admitting all men to the suffrage and denying it to all women.

C.
RELIGIOUS SCEPTICS

UNPUBLISHED LETTER TO THE WEEKLY DISPATCH [1 FEB., 1851]

The MS draft, Brotherton Library, Leeds, bears a note in Mill’s hand: “left at the
office 1st Feb. 1851.” The “office” was that of the Weekly Dispatch, a Sunday paper,
in which appeared the article to which Mill is objecting, “The Round of the Clerical
Circle,” 26 Jan., p. 49, from which the quotations are taken. Being unpublished, the
letter is not listed in Mill’s bibliography.

Sir,—

I cannot remain quite silent on the unjust and unfounded attacks made by the Dispatch
on those whom it calls by the old-fashioned appellation of sceptics. In the first article
of the number for January 26th, there is a charge against all who hold merely negative
opinions on religion, of being “Epicureans” who “take the world as they find it”—of
“believing in nothing,” being “earnest in nothing,” being “merely a speculative,
disquisitive, logical, thinking machine.” Whoever wrote these accusations, believing
them to be true, is as ignorant of life and the world, and of the opinions of instructed
persons in the present age, as a Church of England parson. I affirm that nearly all the
persons I have known who were, and are, eminently distinguished by a passion for the
good of mankind, hold the opinions respecting religion which your article stigmatizes,
that is, they think that nothing can be known on the subject. The very phrase
“believing nothing” as a synonyme for believing no religious creed, as if nothing were
true or false, right or wrong, except with reference to some theory of creation, is one
of the calumnies of shortsighted and ignorant intolerance. But your writer, like other
heretics, must have a scapegoat, to whom to pass on the slanders thrown upon
themselves, and be able to say to the bigots, It is not I, it is my brother. According to
him, those who pull down one positive religion, if it is to put up another, however
slight and flimsy, are heroes, but if they see no sufficient evidence for any belief as to
the origin and purpose of the world, and will not succumb to the vulgar by professing
any, against them you indorse the accusations of the orthodox. The smallest rag of
dogmatic religion is enough, in the opinion of its professors, to entitle them to call
themselves infinitely higher and worthier than those who profess no dogmatic belief.
But as all my own experience and observation lead me to an exactly opposite
conclusion, I strenuously deny the accusation in the Dispatch, and charge the writer of
it with bearing false witness against his neighbour.¹

J.S.M.
WIFE MURDER

MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 AUG., 1851, P. 4

This is the fifteenth newspaper article on injustice and cruelty by Harriet Taylor Mill and J.S. Mill, who had married in April 1851; for the background, see No. 303. An unheaded second leader, it is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A leading article in the Morning Chronicle of August 28th 1851, on some cases of wife murder. This, like all my newspaper articles on similar subjects, and most of my articles on all subjects, was a joint production with my wife.”

(MacMinn, p. 76.)

in his recent charge to the grand jury at the opening of the Central Criminal Court, the Recorder said—

He was sorry that he could not congratulate them on the lightness of the calendar; for, although it did not contain any charge of murder, yet he was sorry to see that there were several charges of manslaughter, and also a great number of cases of personal violence; and it was very much to be regretted that, in a great majority of the cases, the violence was committed by men upon the persons of those whom they were bound to love and protect—namely, upon their wives.

It is well that Mr. Wortley should have said thus much—little though it was—on this disgraceful subject; and it is to be hoped that the feelings which dictated his brief remarks will still be in operation when, in the course of the next few days, it may become his duty to pass sentence on cases of this description. But he need not have confined his observation to the present sessions; for every sessions, every assizes, afford proof of the lamentable prevalence of this class of crimes, and of the impunity, or next to impunity, with which they are passed by. Within these few days we have recorded, almost simultaneously, four cases of men tried, or committed for trial, on the charge of killing their wives; and among these the case of Edmund Curtis stood conspicuous, both in atrocity and in the flagrant inadequacy of the punishment. The wife, an industrious woman, had passed the day in working as a charwoman, to earn money for the husband. In the evening, according to the testimony of the woman for whom she worked, he spoke to him, desiring him to come home. He refused. She said his place was at home, and he said, “So is yours.” They then both left the room. He was sober. After they left the house—about three minutes after—I heard a violent shriek. I went out, and saw her lying across a low iron railing in my garden. He had hold of her over the left shoulder with his right hand, and was striking her on the head with his clenched fist. When I got out the shriek had ceased. I heard no noise after. I told him he would kill...
her, if he had not done so, and desired him to loose her. He did not do so. I called out
William Kirkland, who pulled him from her, and she fell on her left side on the
ground, apparently lifeless. I told him he had killed her. I called assistance. She was
lifted up and put in a chair. She fetched three sighs and died.3

These were the facts; and now for Mr. Baron Martin and his judgment. He said that
nothing could justify a man in striking a woman; that the prisoner “indulged in a very
violent degree of passion,” but that he could “well believe” that he “did not mean to
kill her;” that “no doubt, when this result occurred,” he was “sincerely sorry for it;”
and that, “considering all the circumstances,” the “justice of the case” would be
satisfied by imprisoning him for six months with hard labour!4 Such are the
judgments which are to protect all the women of the country against domestic
ruffianism; and such is the caprice which presides over the apportionment of penalties
in English criminal justice. The day afterwards, in a case not more atrocious, the
culprit was sentenced by the same judge to transportation for life.5 If Curtis had
killed, in any similar manner, some other man’s wife instead of his own—instead of
the woman whom, as Mr. Wortley said, he was bound to protect—there can be little
doubt that he would have been indicted for murder, and probably hanged. The vow to
protect thus confers a licence to kill.

Two of the cases adverted to in the Recorder’s charge have since come on for trial
before Mr. Justice Wightman.6 In one, the prisoner was acquitted on the ground of
insanity. In the case of Andrew Maclean also, the culprit was acquitted, to the
disgrace both of the jury and of the judge. The report says,

Early in the morning of the 4th of August, the persons lodging in the next room were
disturbed by the cries of the prisoner’s children, and their calling out, “Oh, father, let
mother down.” They got up in consequence, and went into the prisoner’s room, where
they found his wife hanging by the neck from the cupboard, and the prisoner was
sitting upon the bed. The body of the unfortunate woman was quite suspended, and
she was nearly black in the face. Upon the prisoner being told that he was a good-for-
nothing villain for attempting to hang his wife, he replied that he would do it
effectually the next time; and one of the witnesses answered that he would have done
it effectually this time, if his wife had not been cut down. The prisoner was slightly
intoxicated, it appeared, at the time of the occurrence. The prisoner, in his defence,
asserted that his wife had hanged herself.7

The wife was not called as a witness, the reason of which appears from the previous
examination before the magistrate—on which occasion the unfortunate creature,
either from habitual fear or from the expectation that she would be given back into his
power, exculpated the man, stating that she had spoken provokingly to him, and also
that he had hanged her only in jest. Her dread of appearing against him was not
surprising; for what would have been the consequence to her of having given strong
evidence against him, in the event of his acquittal? But her testimony was not needed
to show the state of the case, after proof of such facts as those contained in the above
extract. Yet “Mr. Justice Wightman, in summing up, said that the case was
undoubtedly left in some obscurity by the absence of the wife’s testimony. If she had
been called, she could have proved distinctly how the matter occurred; and in the face
of the prisoner’s declaration that his wife had hung herself, it was for the jury to say whether the other evidence was sufficient to justify them in convicting him of so serious an offence." On this encouragement the jury returned a verdict of not guilty; and consequently the woman is again given in to the power of the man, that he may, as he threatened, “do it effectually the next time.” We scarcely believe that there is an offence in the whole criminal code of which a prisoner would have been acquitted, in the face of such evidence, except that of an attempt at wife-murder.

In default of the judges, it is for the Legislature to apply vigorous measures of repression to this growing evil. The baser part of the populace think that when a legal power is given to them over a living creature—when a person, like a thing, is suffered to be spoken of as their own—as their wife, or their child, or their dog—they are allowed to do what they please with it; and in the eye of the law—if such judgments as the preceding are to be taken as its true interpretation—they are justified in supposing that the worst they can do will be accounted but as a case of slight assault. It is the duty of the Legislature to teach them the contrary. There ought to be severer penalties for killing or ill-treating a wife or child than for killing or ill-treating, in a similar manner, any other person. A greater severity is enjoined by all the motives which ought to regulate the adaptation of punishment to crime. The crime is greater; for it is a violation of more solemn obligations—it is doing the worst injury where there is the most binding duty to cherish and protect. It is also baser—for it is committed upon one who has trusted the culprit, who is in his power, and who is generally without sufficient bodily strength to resist or retaliate. Those who are exposed to these atrocities—the wives and children of the brutal part of the population—have not the means which all other persons possess of guarding themselves against the evil. Other people are but occasionally and rarely liable to ill-treatment; but these are exposed to it at every hour and every moment of their lives. Being thus far more in need than any other persons of the protection of the law, they ought to have it in fuller measure. The domestic tyrant can perpetrate his tyrannies with the utmost facility, and need never wait for an opportunity; and a stronger motive therefore is required, where the brutality exists, to deter from its indulgence. Finally, there is no crime in the whole catalogue of offences in which the single act which incurs the penalty of the law is an index to such an amount of undetected and unpunished wickedness, and to so vast a mass of horrible suffering. Such a spectacle as the final scene of the life of Hester Curtis is unspeakably revolting; but what is the suffering of a few minutes, to the prolonged death which in every such case must have been suffered for years previously, and to the pangs of thousands of women in the power of similar miscreants, who have enough of caution just to stop short of the point which terminates the existence of their victims? There is not to be imagined a position so degraded, or so hopelessly miserable, as that of the women thus at the mercy of ruffians; and it is a deep disgrace to our Government that, in the fifteenth year of the reign of a woman, nothing has yet been done for their relief.
401.

STREET ORGANS

MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 OCT., 1851, P. 6

In this letter Mill is responding to the report of the judgment against an Italian organ player, Jean Zanezzi, by Thomas Henry (1807-76), a Bow Street magistrate: “Police Intelligence—Friday. Bow Street,” Morning Chronicle, 25 Oct., p. 7. The letter, headed as title, with subhead, “To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle,” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter headed ‘Street Organs’ and signed D in the Morning Chronicle of October 28, 1851” (MacMinn, p. 76).

Sir,—

Will you allow me to draw attention to a case of great injustice, reported in Saturday’s papers. An Italian organ player was brought before Mr. Henry, the Bow-street magistrate, charged by a tradesman with having, though desired by the tradesman to leave off, continued to play on his instrument, whereupon the tradesman’s horse, left in charge of a boy, ran away with and damaged his gig. The Italian denied having heard the order to cease playing, and said that he had plied his instrument for six years in the streets of London, and had never before been charged with any offence—a plea which, in the case of English offenders, always carries great weight. It carried none, however, in this instance. The magistrate fined the Italian 40s., besides £10, the amount of the damage; and unless he pays this sum, which doubtless he never in his life possessed, sentenced him to a month’s imprisonment.

I would ask this magistrate—is the business of a street organ player an unlawful occupation? If so, the police are strangely neglectful of their duty in allowing it to be carried on. But if the Italian had a legal right to grind his organ in the streets, was he to leave off playing every time a carriage passed by? Has every man in a gig a right to prohibit this man from gaining his subsistence? As to frightening the horse, it must be uncertain whether this was the particular noise, among all others, at which the horse took fright. And, supposing that it was, the fault was more the owner’s than the organ player’s. Horses which cannot bear London noises ought not to be brought into London streets. If a tradesman in the pursuit of a livelihood drives a gig into the clang and crash of the streets of London, other people are not bound to cease pursuing their livelihood till he has gone by. Whether it would be right or wrong to suppress these people, they ought not to be punished by an ex post facto law. While their occupation is unprohibited, to fine and imprison them for practising it is gross injustice.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
D.
John Chapman (1821-94), physician, bookseller and publisher, now proprietor and editor of the *Westminster Review*, undertook in January 1852 to sell imported American books at a larger discount than that permitted by the group of London publishers who controlled the Booksellers’ Association. As a consequence Chapman was excluded from the Association and undertook a campaign against their monopoly. He appealed to many authors for support, and in the *Westminster* for April 1852 (n.s. I, 511-54) published his article “The Commerce of Literature,” an effective attack on the Association’s policies. The Booksellers met on 8 Apr. and decided to submit their case to a committee headed by Lord Chief Justice Campbell. On 4 May, Chapman was host to a meeting of rebels, particularly authors, presided over by Charles Dickens, and including such well known writers as Francis W. Newman, Wilkie Collins, G.H. Lewes, and Herbert Spencer. Dickens read letters from some who could not attend, including Carlyle, Cobden, Gladstone, and this one from Mill. Resolutions against the monopoly were forwarded to Lord Campbell’s committee, which on 19 May voted unanimously against the Booksellers’ Association and in favour of free trade in books. Mill’s letter, dated “East India House, March 5, 1852,” is printed in *A Report of the Proceedings of a Meeting (Consisting Chiefly of Authors), Held May 4th, at the House of Mr. John Chapman, 142, Strand, for the Purpose of Hastening the Removal of the Trade Restriction on the Commerce of Literature* (London: Chapman, 1852), p. 8. This and No. 403 are described in Mill’s bibliography as “Two Letters on the Rules of the Booksellers’ Association, printed in two pamphlets on that subject circulated in 1852, the one by Mr. John Chapman, bookseller, the other by Messrs. Parker” (MacMinn, p. 76). The MS of Mill’s letter is in the Hollander Collection, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The text below is the printed version, which agrees in substantives with the MS. Both are dated “East India House, March 5, 1852.”

Sir,—

There is no case to which, in my opinion, the principles of free trade are more completely applicable than to the question in dispute between the London Booksellers’ Association, and those who claim a right to sell books at a less profit than that prescribed by the rules of the Association.

Not only in the book trade, but in all others, I conceive that the profits of distributors absorb at present a very undue proportion of the proceeds of industry; and it appears to me impossible to maintain that their contenting themselves with a lower rate of
remuneration would be injurious to the producers. It is self-evident, that whatever part of the profits publishers and retailers are willing to forego, must be gained either by authors or buyers, and if by buyers it would still benefit authors by increasing the sale of books.

I am, Sir, Your obedient servant

J.S. Mill
On 30 Apr., 1852, John William Parker (1792-1870), Mill’s publisher from the time of his *Logic*, had circulated a letter “To Authors, and Others Connected with Literary Property,” which he also sent to *The Times*, in which, saying the publishers and booksellers had had their say, he put this question: “If a retail bookseller, of ascertained credit and respectability, applies to the publisher to purchase any book in which you may be directly or indirectly interested, on the terms at which those books are offered to the trade at large, but with the avowed intention of retailing his purchases at a smaller profit than that provided for between the wholesale rate and the selling price of single copies, do you consider the intention to sell at a low rate of profit a good and sufficient reason why the publisher should refuse to sell the books, which such retailer is ready to purchase and to keep in stock at his own risk?” He gathered the replies in *The Opinions of Certain Authors on the Bookselling Question* and *Additional Letters on the Bookselling Question* (both London: Parker, 1852). Mill’s reply (in the former) is dated “East India House, May 8th, 1852.” See No. 402 for the bibliographic entry describing this letter.

Dear Sir,—

I think that there is no case in which a combination to keep up prices is more injurious than in the sale of books; and I wish success to the booksellers in their resistance to the trade regulations which restrict their liberty of selling books at a low price.

I am, yours, very truly,

J.S. Mill
404.

THE INDIA BILL, I

MORNING CHRONICLE, 5 JULY, 1853, P. 5

The 1833 renewal of the charter of the East India Company, 3 & 4 William IV, c. 85, was due to expire in 1854. On 30 June, after four nights of debate in the Commons, the second reading was approved of “A Bill to Provide for the Government of India,” 16 Victoria (9 June, 1853), PP, 1852-53, III, 181-96 (enacted as 16 & 17 Victoria, c. 95). (For the debate see PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 128, cols. 605-74, 734-78, 814-903, and 977-1074.) The proposals had been introduced on 3 June by Sir Charles Wood, then President of the Board of Control in the Aberdeen administration (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 127, cols. 1092-1169). In his nearly five-hour-long speech Wood (see especially cols. 1147-50) had frequently cited opinions of Mill’s that resemble those here expressed. For further discussion, see No. 405. The article, headed as title (but without the “I”), with the subtitle, “[From a Correspondent],” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “An article headed ‘The India Bill—from a Correspondent’ in the Morning Chronicle of 5th July 1853” (MacMinn, p. 79).

according to the parliamentary maxim that the second reading of a Bill implies the adoption of its principle, the assent of the House of Commons to the second reading of the India Bill has decided the continuance, in some form, of what is called the double government.¹ So far as depends on the House of Commons, the government of a hundred millions of people, who, in almost every point of character and social condition, are unlike and opposed to Europeans, will not be given up to the sole administration of a Secretary of State, having no acquaintance but with European ideas, no experience but of European life, and who is both selected at first, and changed every two or three years, according to the exigencies, not of India, but of English party politics. A voice in the government, and even the decisive voice, must necessarily reside in the Minister; but, unless by the rarest accident, no Minister possesses, when he comes into office, a particle of the special knowledge without which he is unfit to carry on the administration of Indian affairs, and which it is the business of many years to acquire. There is, then, no safety but in associating with the Indian Minister a Board or Council possessing this special knowledge, and sufficiently independent of him to command his deference, and, when necessary, to resist his will.

At present, the Court of Directors is such a council, and that it shall continue to exist is the first point which the vote of the House of Commons has decided. The second is, that in maintaining its existence an attempt shall be made to improve its composition. The maintenance of the Court of Directors, and its improvement, are the leading objects of the Bill. To both, the House has now in principle assented. In what the
improvement shall consist, and by what means it may be effected, remains to be considered in committee.

When two powers are required to act together, either for joint deliberation or mutual check, whatever else may be requisite, this at least is essential—that one of the two authorities shall not be appointed by the other. If it is, there are not two powers, but only one. Yet, by the present Bill, the Crown—that is, the Indian Minister—has the appointment of one-third of the co-ordinate body. This provision is no less inconsistent with the principle of the Bill than with Sir Charles Wood’s declared opinions, and can be defended on no principle. It does not go far enough, if the intention is that the Court of Directors should be simply an instrument of the Indian Minister. It goes too far, if they are intended as a check and restraint upon him. If only an instrument, all authorities should have the choice of their own instruments; the Minister should nominate, not six—not a mere fraction—but the whole eighteen or twenty-four. But if the Court of Directors are to remain, as they have hitherto been, a power in the Indian government, having an opinion and a will of their own, which the Minister may overrule, but cannot pass by—without whose initiative he cannot act, to whose reasons he is compelled to listen, and, if he does not adopt, is bound to answer and confute them—then neither the whole nor any part of the body which is to be a check to his power, ought to hold their offices by his appointment. It would not be borne that the House of Lords should appoint a third of the House of Commons. There are many bad modes of selecting a jury, but the worst of all would be that it should be nominated by the judge; yet the judge would be the fittest person to select the jury, if any man could be allowed to select those who are to check himself. In judicial matters, Englishmen so feel the necessity of a check, and so prize entire independence as the condition of its efficacy, that to make sure of it they place even the ignorance of the jury as a check upon the knowledge of the judge; but this Bill proposes that a Minister should appoint those whose knowledge is to be a check on his ignorance.

It is not Sir C. Wood, nor the Government, that need to be reminded how considerable a check, limited as their power is, the Court of Directors have hitherto been. The body who recalled Lord Ellenborough, who recorded an indignant condemnation of the greatest iniquity in modern Indian history—the seizure of Scinde (the joint act of their two bitterest enemies, Lord Ellenborough and Sir Charles Napier)—who were willing to go to prison rather than sign the spoliation of Oude for the benefit of a set of grasping money-lenders, and by their resistance compelled the Cabinet to investigate the case, and to retract the honestly-intended but ill-considered mandate of the then President of the Board of Control, Lord Glenelg—such a body is a power which no Indian Minister can despise, and whose remonstrances, in any important case, he must think twice before he disregards. These are the glorious pages in the recent history of the Court of Directors; and if actual collisions have not been frequent—if, like other checking bodies, the Directors sacrifice much to keep on harmonious terms with the stronger authority—there is the more reason against adding so great a weight to the side of obsequiousness and subservience as would probably divest the body altogether of the character of a check, and convert it into a screen.

There is no need to go further than Sir C. Wood’s speech, and his correspondence with the Directors, to find the principles which condemn the nomination clause. To
the Directors he says, “We are most anxious to preserve the independence of that body, and its freedom from all undue political influence, on which we believe that its efficiency for executing the high trust reposed in it so essentially depends.” To the House of Commons he said that it had been suggested that the six Directors should be appointed by their colleagues, but that this was objectionable, because, thus appointed, they would be dependent on those who appointed them. —it is proposed that they be appointed by the Minister; is it intended, therefore, that they should be dependent on the Minister? What becomes, then, of the “anxiety to preserve their independence”? How explain this inconsistency between the words of the President of the Board of Control and his acts? Is it that the words express his own opinion—the acts, what he thinks the necessities of his position? There was a clamour without, which seemed formidable, and to which it was thought necessary to make concessions. It was not very obvious what was to be done—therefore what is condemned in principle is adopted in detail, by way of doing something. But it is better to make no change than a change decidedly for the worse. It were better to leave the Court of Directors as it is, than to make a change in its constitution unfitting it for its most important function.

The difficulty of framing a constitution for the Court of Directors is great and serious, and lies in the very nature of things. There is no unexceptionable organ of choice. Nomination could only be by the Minister, or his majority in Parliament; and there are no good materials for a constituency. It is impossible to find any body of electors in England whose interest is identified with the good government of India. The present electors, slightly as they are connected in personal interest with India are as much so as any other constituency which could be framed. Yet many modes of extending the franchise have been suggested, which would be admissible in principle, and might possibly be beneficial in practice. The present electors are a particular class of Indian fundholders; all other holders of Indian debt might be included. All who have served a certain length of time in India, and returned to England, might be added to the constituency. The suffrage might even be extended to all who have lived in India some given number of years. In any case, the choice ought to rest with persons likely to be more or less acquainted with the public repute of candidates who have served in India; and the more numerous body would be less accessible to the corrupt influences which have been so ludicrously exaggerated in speeches and pamphlets, but which, if they were twenty times greater than they are, would be worth no more, as an argument for the changes proposed, than the bribery at Parliamentary elections is worth as an argument for abolishing popular representation, and giving to the Crown the nomination of the House of Commons.

The only practical defect alleged in the present composition of the Court of Directors is, that it does not contain a sufficient number of experienced Indian functionaries; and for this reason, it is to be presumed, the nominees of the Crown are to be selected from Indians exclusively. It will surprise most people to be told that the real tendency of the present constitution of the Court is to make the Indian services engross it entirely. Before the last Charter, the Company was a commercial body, and naturally included among its Directors many commercial men. When its mercantile character ceased, this ceased also. Of the thirty present Directors, seventeen have been elected since 1834; and of these, all but two had served the Company many years,
either in India, in China, or in the naval service—several of them being, by universal admission, among the most eminent of the public officers of their time—while no Indian of eminence who has offered himself, and has chosen to persevere, has failed to be elected. But, it is said, many have been deterred from offering themselves by the “degradation” of the canvass.\textsuperscript{11} It is a new doctrine in England that canvassing is a degradation, especially from members of the House of Commons. Will they vote for prohibiting it at elections, as the Bill proposes that it should be prohibited at the India House?\textsuperscript{12} We may take for granted that what men of such a nice sense of honour as members of Parliament claim to be, find not too insupportable to be gone through once in every few years, cannot be too shocking for the susceptibilities of men who aim at a seat in the direction. The labour and expense of the canvass (though not its degradation) do, we believe, deter some of the fittest men from the one contest as from the other; and we therefore heartily wish success (though with no confident hope) to the attempt made by the Bill to prevent canvassing altogether. If this succeeds, the evil complained of is at an end, and needs no further remedy. But if it be indeed necessary to reserve a certain number of seats for men too diffident, or too dignified, or too little desirous of the office, to stand a popular election, it would be far better that those seats should be filled by the choice of the other Directors, who have a stronger interest than anyone else in whatever sheds lustre on their body. Yet appointment even by the Directors, subject to the veto of the Minister, would be objectionable, being likely in practice to become, as the appointment of the Governor-General now is, appointment by the Minister.\textsuperscript{13}
the clause in the India Bill which diminishes the total number of Directors from 24, or more properly 30, to 18, or (excluding the six Government nominees) to 12, forms no essential part of the measure, and is liable to such serious objections that its omission would not only not impair, but would greatly improve the Bill.\(^1\) A reason has been assigned for the change in the mode of appointment of a portion of the Directors; namely, that some, and, it is affirmed, even a considerable number, of those who are fittest for the office, do not find their way to it in the mode hitherto provided.\(^2\) But, granting that the expedient adopted in the Bill for correcting this defect were the best or the only one that could be invented—supposing it were a conceded, instead of a disputed point, that a certain number of Directors should derive their office from nomination by the Minister, and that these nominated Directors cannot possibly be added, but must necessarily be substituted for an equivalent number of the elected—even then no reason would have been shown for a greater diminution of the elective body than is sufficient to make room for the additional members. But the Bill does more—its destructive operation is threefold as great as its constructive. It abolishes six Directors to replace them by nominees, six to get rid of the rotation system, and six for no reason at all.

We say no reason, because the reason which the case itself would suggest is barred by the emphatic declarations of the Ministers. One who knew nothing of the objects of the Bill but what the Bill itself indicates would be at no loss in assigning a motive for this provision. He would say, The elected Directors are reduced to 12, instead of 18 or 24, in order to give greater power to the six nominees. But Sir Charles Wood, both in his own behalf and on that of his colleagues, distinctly disavows this purpose.\(^3\) It has never been professed by Ministers that the object of introducing nominees into the Court of Directors is to exercise ascendancy over the body by means of them. On the contrary, this is an effect which Ministers, if they thought there was any danger of it, would earnestly deprecate; for it is impossible to affirm more distinctly than they do, that the independence of the Court of Directors, and its freedom from undue political influence, are indispensable conditions of fitness for its duties. The reason which they give for introducing a new mode of appointment, is to admit some persons—they do not say better qualified, but—as well qualified as the best of the present Directors, and
who are unwilling to go through the labour and expense of an election by the proprietors. If six be the number requisite for this purpose, six will suffice for it, whether the number of the remaining Directors be twelve or twenty-four. It is not in the smallest degree necessary to the object that these six should be a third of the whole. On the contrary, as Directors appointed by a Minister are, to say the least, less independent, and more liable to political influence, than those elected by the proprietors, it must, we imagine, be the wish of the Government to attain the specific object of admitting the excluded class, with the least possible diminution of the independence of the body; and, therefore, to take no artificial means of enabling the nominees to exercise greater power in the Court than the same number of persons can do under its present constitution. It is hardly necessary to point out that the proposed diminution in the aggregate number of Directors is entirely at variance with this purpose.

Apart from any question as to the mode of appointing the Court, we are at a loss to imagine on what principle it can be expected that a diminution of its numbers will render it better adapted to its functions. If the Court of Directors, or any other public body, could be purged only of its least efficient members, retaining the most efficient, nobody can deny that it would be improved. But the proposed purgation is indiscriminate. There is no ground for supposing that, in future elections, the able will bear a larger proportion to the incompetent in the smaller than in the more numerous body. The reduction of the total number would in the end subtract as great a proportion from the best as from the inferior members; and, unfortunately, while by the one consequence much would be lost, by the other very little would be gained. If, by the abstraction of eighteen out of thirty, only three superior men should be sacrificed, it would be more than an equivalent for getting rid of fifteen mediocrities. The value of any public body is equal to that of the able men contained in it; a few more or less of the others are of little moment, for they are sure to be numerous enough to outnumber the men of eminence, were it not that, in the long run, mediocrity is always led by talent. The Court of Directors is rather remarkable among public bodies for the small number it contains of decidedly inferior men, and the more than ordinary proportion of men of ability; but those who disparage its merits ought strenuously to oppose any reduction of its numbers, for the fewer able men it habitually contains, the less it can afford to lose any of its chances of obtaining them.

All principle, in the case of a body like the Court of Directors, is in favour of maintaining at least the present number. An executive body should be small, to secure vigour and promptitude of action; but a deliberative body ought to be numerous, that it may include the needful variety of knowledge and experience. The Court of Directors is not an executive Board, but a Council, a sort of Parliament of India; and every department of the Indian services should be represented in that body. It should contain persons from Bengal, from Madras, from Bombay, the North West Provinces, and, hereafter, the Punjaub; engineer officers, military officers, naval officers; persons of fiscal, judicial, and political or diplomatic experience; persons who have administered the zemindaree system, the village system, and the ryotwar system. As now constituted, the Court generally does contain persons of all these classes, and more than one of each; with the reduced number, it is not likely to do so. Besides, the Court is regularly divided into three Committees, each of which superintends and
controls an amount of business corresponding to that of five or six Ministerial departments and public Boards in England. Every despatch sent to India, except in the Secret Department, passes through one of these Committees, and there undergoes a minute examination and criticism; every act sanctioned by the Court of Directors originates in one or other of them. Seven or eight members for each Committee is not too ample a provision, allowing for illness, relaxation, and accident, and supposing the average proportion of the ineffective to be no greater than in the best constituted Board of seven or eight persons which performs any portion of the public business of England.
A RECENT MAGISTERIAL DECISION

MORNING POST, 8 NOV., 1854, P. 3

This article reports on the trial of William Ebbs, an elderly bootmaker, for attempting to cut the throat of his wife, Matilda. Evidence was given by George Ebbs, their son. The case was heard on Friday, 3 Nov., before George Chapple Norton (1800-75), who had been M.P. for Guilford 1826-30, and a stipendiary magistrate at the Lambeth Street Police Court since 1845; however, it was on Saturday, 4 Nov., that Norton discharged the man (see 1197). Mill quotes from the report “Police. Lambeth,” The Times, 6 Nov., 1854, p. 9. The letter, Mill’s only contribution to the Morning Post, is related to the series on domestic cruelty that he wrote with Harriet (see No. 303), though he does not identify it as a joint production. It is dated 6 Nov., 1854, and headed as title, with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter signed M. and headed ‘A recent Magisterial decision’ in the Morning Post of Nov. 8, 1854” (MacMinn, p. 88). The text below is that of the Morning Post, which has been collated with the MS draft in the Mill-Taylor Collection. In the variant notes the manuscript reading is signalled by “MS”.

Sir,—

Will you allow me to call your attention to the extraordinary decision of Mr. Norton, in the case of a man named William Ebbs, on Friday last? This ruffian, after brutally beating his unfortunate wife (then ill of a fever, and with her baby in her arms), deliberately attempted to cut her throat with a razor, which was only prevented by the son, scarcely less brutal than the father, who advised the father not to beat his mother any more, because he had given her enough now! This son, who was himself brought to the police-court for assaulting the officer in order to rescue the father, made, to screen him, the evidently false, and, if true, frivolous excuse, that his mother had given provocation by her ill temper. The fellow, on being remanded for a week, threatened that he would do worse when he went home, or would not go home at all. At the end of the week Mr. Norton releases the man, gives him money (sent for his use by a “benevolent gentleman”), and warns the unfortunate woman not to make “such free use of her tongue in abuse of her husband.”

Is it thus that Parliament intended the new act for the protection of wives to be carried into effect? The man Ebbs, on the showing even of the son who begged him off, had been in the frequent habit of brutally ill-using his wife. After his threatening, and attempting, to cut her throat, she is again given into his power, without his being even required to give security for keeping the peace, which, from his circumstances, he probably could have given. Can it be doubted that only the most atrocious cases come
to light? And is it to be wondered at that even these are not at all diminished in frequency, when the perpetrators may hope for complete impunity, and the victims are entirely insecure of getting any redress? While, failing of redress, their situation, in the absolute power of a vindictive master, is frightful to contemplate.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

M.
According to the provisions of 16 & 17 Victoria, cc. 96 and 97 (1853), to be committed to a lunatic asylum a person did not have to be certified by a Commission of Lunacy (which generally employed a jury) if relatives or friends applied to a magistrate for a reception order; in that case, the person could be committed on the strength of a private hearing and a certificate signed by two people, each “a physician, surgeon, or apothecary.” Mill’s letter, headed as title, with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News,” is described in his bibliography as “A letter signed P. and headed ‘The Laws of Lunacy’ in the Daily News of July 31, 1858” (MacMinn, p. 92).

Sir,—

It has become urgently necessary that public attention should be called to the state of the law on the subject of Lunacy, and the frightful facility with which any persons whom their heirs or connexions desire to put out of the way, may be consigned without trial to a fate more cruel and hopeless than the most rigorous imprisonment.

Recent circumstances have made it a matter of notoriety, that confinement in a madhouse is the easiest means of getting rid of, or bringing to terms, refractory wives. Your paper of Monday contained one instance, on which you have very rightly and ably commented; within the last fortnight the whole country has heard of another; and the number which never see the light does not admit of any probable estimation.

A criminal cannot be sentenced to six months’ imprisonment without the verdict of a jury, preceded by a public investigation and opportunity of defence. But a perfectly innocent person can be fraudulently kidnapped, seized, and carried off to a madhouse on the assertion of any two so-called medical men, who may have scarcely seen the victim whom they dismiss to a condition far worse than the penalty which the law inflicts for proved crime. Convicts are not delivered over to the absolute power of their gaoler; nor can be subjected to the ruffianly treatment revealed by the York inquiry. Convicts can appeal against ill treatment; but to the other unfortunates the ordinary use of speech is virtually denied; their sober statements of fact, still more their passionate protests against injustice, are held to be so many instances of insane delusion. And this fate any two medical men may secretly inflict. Any practitioner may be selected—knaves who will give every certificate desired for the sake of their fee; or weak creatures who will certify to anything affirmed by a gentleman and a man of position; or men who, knowing nothing, either practically or theoretically,
about the signs of insanity, can be made to see with the eyes of their prompter. In a few days the victim perhaps succumbs, and having consented to every demand, is pronounced not mad by a different authority, and restored to real or nominal liberty, with a statement from the successful party that there has been a satisfactory arrangement. I am not speculating as to what has been, but describing what evidently may be.

The obvious remedy is to require the same guarantees before depriving a fellow-creature of liberty on one pretext as on another. The inquiry by a jury, which is now the exception, ought to be the rule; it should be an imperative preliminary to the putting an alleged lunatic in a place of confinement. A jury could be as speedily impanelled in a case of sudden madness as of sudden death; and if any restraint be necessary in the short interval, let it be in the patient’s home. Juries, in such cases, are foolish and credulous enough, and only too willing to treat any conduct as madness which is ever so little out of the common way; but at least the publicity of the inquiry is some protection, and tends to fix attention on any unavowed motive which may actuate the promoters of the proceeding. It would also apprise others of the existence of the alleged lunatic, and the place where he, or she, is confined; and would thus render somewhat more difficult the evasion which it is so easy to practise on the vigilance of the Commissioners at their annual visitation of lunatic asylums. Many other improvements in the law and procedure in these cases are urgently needed, and might easily be suggested; but my object is to indicate the importance of the subject, its growing urgency, and the large scope which it affords for the exertions of intelligent reformers in and out of Parliament. I earnestly intreat you to continue your efforts at rousing public opinion on a matter so vital to the freedom and security of the subject.

P.
March 1863 To July 1873

408.

POLAND

PENNY NEWSMAN, 15 MAR., 1863, P. 9

The Polish uprising of 1830-31 had been followed by a period of repression, during which Poland had been reduced to the status of a Russian province; attempts to extinguish Polish nationality continued under the milder rule, beginning in 1855, of Tsar Alexander II (1818-81). The revolt of January 1863 had as its immediate cause an ordinance conscripting Poles into the Russian army at the arbitrary discretion of the government. By the time of Mill’s letter, a Provisional Government had been formed by the rebels.

On 8 Mar., p. 1, the Penny Newsman, edited by Mill’s friend of forty years, Edwin Chadwick, published “The Polish Insurrection,” which prompted Mill to write to Chadwick on 9 Mar.: “I send a paper on the Polish question, in the form of a letter to the Editor. If you like you can alter the form to that of an article from a correspondent; but on the whole probably it is better as it is. I have signed it with my initials, and have no objection to being known as the author. . . . Proofs would be agreeable if there is time and it is not inconvenient.” The next day he wrote again: “I have returned the proof, corrected, to the Editor. [paragraph] I have no objection to being named in your leader, but I wish only my initials to be put to the letter itself; and I would rather that, in your first sentence, my name was introduced more indirectly. You might say ‘we feel thankful to a correspondent, whose initials sufficiently indicate his name’ or some such words, and you might then go on mentioning me by name as at present. [paragraph] I would rather you did not add the sentence proposed in your letter, because I do not wish to be understood as having peculiar sources of information. Herzen’s and Ogareff’s writings are open to all the world, and the notification by the Insurrectionary Committee to which my letter refers was mentioned by the correspondents of some of the English newspapers. [paragraph] Many thanks for your offer of separate slips, but I do not care to have any.” (LL, CW, Vol. XV, pp. 847, 847-8.) In a long introductory paragraph (pp. 8-9), Chadwick followed Mill’s wishes.

Mill’s letter, headed “(To the Editor of the Penny Newsman),” is his only contribution to that paper. It is described in his bibliography as “A letter on Poland, signed J.S.M. in the Penny Newsman for March 15, 1863”

(MacMinn, p. 94).
Sir,—

The view which you have taken in your last and some previous numbers—or, I should rather say, the view which you appear disposed to take of—Polish and Hungarian affairs, seeming not to be characterised by your usual accuracy of information, you will, I hope, permit a warm friend and admirer of your principles and purposes to endeavour to set right what he regards as a complete misapprehension of the events now taking place in those countries.

You appear to look with suspicion on the great national movements in Poland and in Hungary as being aristocratic movements; not likely to confer any good upon the mass of the population; not provoked by the tyranny under which aristocracy and people alike suffer, but rather by the benefits which the Emperors of Russia and Austria are desirous of conferring upon the people, and which the aristocracy would be glad to intercept.

The true state of the case, both in Poland and in Hungary, is very far from this. I limit myself for the present to Poland, leaving Hungary for, perhaps, a future occasion. In Poland, then, the present insurrection is essentially a popular one. The higher nobility and great landholders have, hitherto, for the most part stood aloof; not from want of sympathy with the movement, but because they regarded it as premature. The Insurrectionary Committee have, in consequence, thought it necessary to issue a general summons to the aristocracy, both in Poland and in exile, threatening that if they do not join the insurrection they shall be deprived of their lands.

Next, as to the benefits which the Emperor designs for the labouring classes, and which you seem to think are a cause of displeasure to the authors of the insurrection. Let me first say, the enfranchisement of serfs is not now the matter in question. There are no serfs in Poland; and there are none in Russia since the 2nd March. Let the Emperor Alexander have all honour for this great triumph of justice. But though there is now no question between the peasantry and their former masters respecting their personal freedom, there is a great and fundamental question still open relating to the land. The peasants maintain that, along with their freedom, they ought to receive, in full ownership, the portion of land which was previously assigned to them to be cultivated by themselves and their families. This claim is resisted by the landowners. From the peculiar character of the agricultural economy of the country, which it would be too long at present to enter into, both sides have much that they can justly urge for their view of the question. The Emperor has decided the point in favour of the landlords. The leaders of the insurrection have decided it in favour of the peasants. The Insurrectionary Committee have entered into a public engagement that the land, which is the subject of dispute, shall be given absolutely (without any payment, present or future) to the peasants who have hitherto tilled it; and that the landowners shall receive compensation at the cost of the State, the only mode by which the burden can be fairly shared between the two parties. Some months before the insurrection broke out, the leaders had already announced to their friends in England, as part of their programme, what they have now pledged themselves in the face of the world to carry into effect.
Thus, if the insurrection were successful, the labouring population of Poland would acquire, without internal conflict or wrong to any one, that proprietorship in the land which the rural population of France gained by the Revolution, and the acquisition of which was an ample return for the sacrifice of a whole generation.

Even if this great benefit to the masses were not, as it is, one of the direct objects of the insurrection, I submit that, in the more backward countries of Europe any revolution, any bursting of the bonds by which all the energies of the people are now cramped and paralyzed, must be an improvement, must be the commencement of a new era. The resurrection of Polish nationality would at least let in the light. It would bestow a free press, freedom of public discussion, representative assemblies, national education. It would let in the ideas of civilised Europe; and not the ideas only, but the industry and capital also; and before these combined influences, the barbarism, which has been prolonged till now chiefly by the benumbing influence of foreign bondage, would rapidly pass away. A foreign tyranny necessarily regards intelligence and education as its greatest dangers. Any national government in the situation of Poland, much more one which is certain to be a free and popular government, will feel its safety and prosperity entirely dependent on the amount of popular intelligence and popular energy which it can array in its defence.

If you would only learn what the Liberals and Democrats of Russia itself think and feel about Poland; if you would inquire what is thought and felt by the editors of the Bell, Mr. Herzen and Mr. Ogareff, who, by their newspaper, clandestinely circulated at St. Petersburg, are already shaking the whole fabric of Russian despotism; if you will ascertain their opinion, you will no longer mistake one of the most unanimous and profoundly popular political manifestations in history for a class movement to perpetuate the domination of an aristocracy. If you would see, on the other hand, a vivid representation of the old type of a haughty aristocrat, sincerely zealous for the dignity and nationality of his country, as identified with his class, but reckless of any amount of cruel oppression inflicted upon the multitude, read the sketch in last week’s Spectator of the principal agent of Russian tyranny over Poland at the present moment, the Marquis Wielopolski.

J.S.M.
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THE CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES

OUR DAILY FARE (PHILADELPHIA), 21 JUNE, 1864, PP. 95-6

*Our Daily Fare* was issued from 8 to 21 June, 1864, in connection with the Great Central Sanitary Fair of that year held in Philadelphia by the United States Sanitary Commission. Established in the spring of 1861, this was a voluntary civilian organization that supplied medical aid, financial relief, and material and spiritual comfort to the soldiers and sailors of the Union forces. Mill’s interest in their work continued: a year later, the *Daily News* (3 Apr., 1865, p. 3), reported from Boston papers that Mill, “who has all along been a good friend of the United States, has directed that whatever copyright may be allowed by the American publishers of his works shall be given to the Sanitary Commission or some similar object of national charity.” The Editorial Committee, to whom the letter here printed is addressed, was chaired by George W. Childs (1829-94), publisher and philanthropist, to whom Mill had earlier written (*LL, CW*, Vol. XV, pp. 729-30). Dated “Avignon, May 25,” and headed, “Written to the Editorial Committee of Our Daily Fare,” this letter is Mill’s only contribution to the paper. It was republished in the *Daily News*, 25 July, p. 5, and the *Penny Newsman*, 31 July, p. 1, and also in the *New York Times*, 10 July, p. 6, and the *National Reformer*, 6 Aug., p. 327. It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter to the Philadelphia Sanitary Paper dated May 25, 1864, reprinted in the Daily News of [July 25] and in the Newsman of July 31, 1864” (MacMinn, p. 95). The variant notes derive from collation with the *Daily News* and *Penny Newsman*, signified in the notes by “DN” and “PN”.

i am sincerely thankful to the Editing Committee for including me among those from whom they have invited a public expression of sympathy with the cause in which the Free States of America are so heroically shedding their best blood.

a The war, justifiable and laudable even if it had continued to be, as it was at first, one of mere resistance to the extension of slavery, is becoming, as it was easy to foresee it would, more and more a war of principle for the complete extirpation of that curse. And in proportion as this has become apparent, the sympathies of nearly all in Europe whose approbation is worth having, are resuming their natural course, and the cause of the North will soon have no enemies, on this side of the Atlantic, but those who prefer any tyranny, however odious, to a triumph of popular government.

b It would be unpardonable, did I omit, on an occasion like this, to express my warmest feelings of admiration for the Sanitary Commission. History has *afforded* no other example—though it is to be hoped that it will hereafter afford many—of so
great a work of usefulness extemporized by the spontaneous self-devotion and organizing genius of a people, altogether independently of the Government.

But while the present struggle has called into brilliant exercise all the high qualities which the institutions of the American Republic have made general among her citizens, it has also laid open—as is the nature of trying times to do—all the weak points in her national habits, and in the working of her institutions. These are doubtless far better known to thoughtful Americans than they are likely to be to any foreigner, and this great historical crisis will be doubly blessed if it directs attention to them. In all states of society the most serious danger is that the national mind should go to sleep on the self-satisfied notion that all is right with it; but the great awakening of the public conscience which is taking place on the one political and social abomination which has done more than all other causes together to demoralize American politics, has probably removed all danger of this sort for one generation at least; and warrants the hope that the American people will not rest satisfied with the great advantages which no other people and no other Government possess in so high a degree; but will resolve that their democracy shall not be behind any nation whatever in those elements of good government which have been thought to find a more congenial soil in other States of society and under other political institutions.

John Stuart Mill
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ENGLAND AND EUROPE

DAILY NEWS, 1 JULY, 1864, P. 5

In February 1864 Austria and Prussia invaded Denmark to take possession of Schleswig and Holstein. The Liberal British cabinet under Palmerston, though sympathetic to the Danish cause, resolved on 28 June not to intervene. Disraeli moved a motion censuring the government for its inaction, which was debated at length on 4, 5, 7, and 8 July in the Commons (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 176, cols. 709-817, 826-930, 952-1073, 1198-1300). Mill’s letter, headed as title, with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News,” is described in his bibliography as “A letter headed ‘England and Europe’, signed J.S.M. in the Daily News of July 1st 1864” (MacMinn, p. 95). It is probably referred to in a letter of 4 July to Chadwick, editor of the Penny Newsman, giving him permission to reprint an article which had appeared in another paper (LL, CW, Vol. XV, p. 946); at any rate it was reprinted in the Penny Newsman, 10 July, p. 7. The text below is that of the Daily News, which has been collated with the Penny Newsman, yielding one substantive variant; in the note the reading of the latter is signalled by “PN”.

Sir,—

Allow me to invite your attention to one of the aspects of the question about to be tried next week between the present Government and the Tories, which does not seem to have received the amount of attention that is its due.

The Government of this country is called to a severe account for conduct which is said to have lowered the country in the estimation of the world. And what has thus impaired the reputation of the country is supposed to be, that it has used strong language when it did not intend to support that language by fighting; that it spoke its mind about the perpetration of a great public iniquity, which it was not willing to go to war to prevent. This is what England lately did in the case of Poland, and what it is reproached with doing in the present case of Denmark.

Now this is simply complaining that England has done what as civilisation advances the more high-principled nations are certain to do more and more; and that it has set the example of a practice which, when it becomes general, will be one of the greatest steps in advance ever made in international proceedings.

In times past nations have scarce ever gone to war unless for their own supposed interest or dignity. It appears to be the general opinion that they ought to persist in thus acting, and I am not going to discuss just now whether, or how far, this opinion is right. But there is one point in which the practice of past times may very properly be
altered, even if the alteration goes no further. In former days, governments, when a
wrong did not affect themselves, did not care enough about the interests of others, or
about wrong merely as such, to put themselves out of their way to incur the ill will of
powerful neighbours by giving to wrong its proper name. The present government,
though not the first, have been among the first, to break through this selfish and
cowardly forbearance. As the British government, and in the name of the British
nation, they have, in the two cases of Poland and of Denmark, given public expression
to the reprobation of a crime, although its consequences did not touch themselves, and
although they were not prepared to brave all the evils and difficulties involved in
arresting the crime by armed interference.

There are those who think this a fit subject for reproach. To me it appears to be the
inauguration of the practice of bringing international and political wrongs under a
moral police, by a demonstration of disinterested disapproval. Not an insignificant
thing in itself; and if the time ever comes when such wrongs will be repressed by a
sharper mode of interference on the part of disinterested bystanders, this milder
method will be the necessary precursor and preparation for it.

But this plan of speaking our mind without backing our expression of "sentiment" by
blows is a new thing in a government, because governments have never yet cared
enough about justice and honesty for their own sake, or been sufficiently indignant
against violations of them, to adopt it. The majority of governments are still in this
condition of moral callousness and indifference, and are not even able to understand
that any government can care about a wrong which is no prejudice to itself. In
consequence, a government which begins the practice of speaking out honestly when
circumstances do not allow it to act chivalrously, must lay its account with incurring,
in the first instance, some loss of what is termed consideration. The consideration of a
government still depends, as that of an individual once did, upon the degree of
readiness ascribed to it to draw its sword whenever any of its sentiments is offended.
If, therefore, it shows any offended feeling, and the sword does not come forth, it is
for a time suspected of being wanting either in sincerity or in spirit. But England is
able, and should be willing, to show that the kind of consideration which is given to a
Drawcansir is a kind that she can do without.

The feeling of the country did not allow the government to go to war for Poland, and
would not, probably, allow it to go to war for Denmark. But this being granted, I hope
there are very few Englishmen who would have preferred that, not intending to fight,
England should have remained silent. I trust that if Poland had been desolated and
Denmark plundered without a word of protest on our part there would have been far
greater dissatisfaction with our government, and a far deeper sense of shame and
national humiliation, than I believe to exist now. As it is, we need not fear any
permanent loss of prestige, even with those with whom the only thing which gives it
is the power and willingness to resort to force. They will soon find out whether the
change which has taken place in us is that we have grown more afraid of war, or only
more prone to denounce and stigmatise great public iniquities, even when the
sacrifices required for stopping their perpetration are greater than it is the duty of a
single power to incur in a quarrel not its own.—I am, &c.,
J.S.M.
ON HARE’S PLAN

SPECTATOR, 29 APR., 1865, P. 467

In his *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* (1859), Thomas Hare (1806-91) put forward a scheme for proportional representation that Mill immediately adopted (see, e.g., *CW*, Vol XIX, pp. 358-70). Hare advanced particular proposals for applying the plan to Metropolitan elections in *On an Organization of the Metropolitan Elections* (London: National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1865), a paper read at the Association’s meeting in London on 10 Apr., 1865, at which Mill spoke (see “Metropolitan Elections,” *Daily News*, 11 Apr., p. 2). The issues were taken up in the article referred to in Mill’s first sentence, “Metropolitan Elections,” *Spectator*, 15 Apr., pp. 405-6. The letter, headed “Mr. John Stuart Mill on Mr. Hare’s Plan,” with subhead, “To the Editor of the ‘Spectator,’ ” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter on Hare’s System in the Spectator of April 29th 1865” (MacMinn, p. 96).

Sir,—

In your paper of Saturday, the 15th, while commenting on the proposal of Mr. Hare for the experimental adoption of his system of representation in the metropolitan constituencies, you give to that system the credit which it deserves of opening the representation of the capital to the eminent men of the whole empire; but you seem to think that it would exclude all others, and that local men, qualified and disposed to attend to the local interests of the constituency, would under that system no longer be elected.

Nothing can more strongly exemplify the need of discussion on the subject than the appearance of such a misconception in a paper like yours; for it seems to me evident that Mr. Hare’s plan could not have the effect which you apprehend, and that of all the objections which have been made to it this is one of the most untenable.

Mr. Hare’s plan would enable every person to be elected for the metropolis who was voted for by a twenty-second part of the whole number of votes given. Is it supposed that not so many as a twenty-second part of the metropolitan electors would desire a local representative? Were this so, it would be a clear proof that local representatives were not needed. But they are needed, and they would consequently be voted for, not by once or twice or three times, but by ten or twelve times the number of the quota. In Mr. Hare’s system, as in the present, the real danger would be lest local feelings and interests should predominate too much. They would certainly fill as great a place in
the representation as they do in the minds of the represented; for Mr. Hare’s system does not swamp the real wishes of any portion of the electors, all other systems do.

The misapprehension is probably occasioned by a momentary forgetfulness of the main difference between Mr. Hare’s mode of election and the existing one. If the result of the poll were to be determined in the present way, by comparative majorities, it would be possible, though not probable, that men of national reputation, known to all, and voted for in every part of the metropolis, might obtain a majority over all the local candidates, each of whom might be known and supported only by the inhabitants of a particular district. But under Mr. Hare’s system, the man of general celebrity could not have an unlimited number of votes counted for him, but a certain number only; when he had obtained that number, he would be returned, and the remainder of his supporters would have their votes counted for some one else. The return of the useful and hardworking local candidate would not depend upon his obtaining more votes, for example, than Mr. Gladstone; he would be sure of his election if he obtained the 2,000 or 5,000 suffrages which might represent a twenty-second part of the total number of votes given. The clubs and political parties whose influence you dread, would be well aware of this, and as it would be their strongest interest that their list should be composed of such names as would conciliate every large section of the constituency, they would be sure to include in it a sufficient number of the most competent local men of their party.

The power which would undoubtedly be exercised by these clubs and managers of parties, is a consideration of greater moment, which deserves and requires a full discussion. Lord Stanley touched on it at the Social Science meeting, not as an objection, but as a difficulty; unfortunately towards the close of the discussion, when time did not admit of its receiving the prominence due to it. My answer would be, that party organization will always be a great power, but that the power is at present greater instead of less than it would be under the proposed system. As things now are, the party which can obtain the numerical majority returns all the members, and nobody else is represented. If neither party is confident of a majority the two parties, by an understanding with one another, can divide the representation without a contest between regular party men of both sides. And these party men, in the majority of cases, are not the best or ablest men of either party, but its landed or moneyed nullities. Under the proposed system, no party, however well organized, could engross all the representation, unless it embraced all the constituency: it could never be represented in a greater proportion than that of its numerical strength, and to thus much it is indisputably entitled. If the opposite party, or if independent electors, anxious only to elect the best man, could make up, not a half, or a third, or a tenth, but a bare twenty-second part of the number of actual voters, they would obtain one, at least, of the twenty-two representatives. Meanwhile the great parties, though they would of course strive for the election of their political friends, would be obliged to select from among their friends those who would do most credit to the proposers. It would not do for them to make up a list of less worthy or less distinguished names than the rival lists. They would have the strongest motives for proposing among party men those who were also something more than party men; who, besides the party support, might have a chance of obtaining by their personal merit votes which would have been refused to them as mere party organs. For the electors who care for things
above party would not then, as now, have only a choice between party candidates; if
the party names proposed did not satisfy them they would have the power of returning
some candidates of their own.

Allow me, Sir, in conclusion, to entreat your more deliberate consideration of this
great subject. Your paper is honourably distinguished from most others by looking
forward to a perhaps distant future, which instead of deprecating, you desire, but
because you are sufficiently interested in it to perceive in what direction its special
difficulties and chances of failure lie, you are anxious to provide it in time with the
appropriate correctives. I have the deepest conviction that no corrective ever yet
thought of for the peculiar inconveniences of a commercial and industrial democracy
approaches in efficacy to the system of Mr. Hare; while it is equally suitable to the
state of things under which we now live, since it would at once assure to that minority
in the constituencies which consists of the operative classes, the share in the
representation which you demand for them, and which they cannot obtain in any other
mode yet proposed except by extruding from the same privilege other large and
important portions of the electoral body.—I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill
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THE WESTMINSTER ELECTION [1]

UNPUBLISHED [CA. 28 APR., 1865]

This item and No. 414 are concerned with the parliamentary election of 1865, in which Mill was a successful candidate. One of the two Westminster seats had become vacant with the retirement of George de Lacy Evans (1787-1870), who had represented the borough 1833-41 and 1846-65; the other was held by Sir John Villiers Shelley (1808-67), like Evans a Liberal, and M.P. since 1852. The first new Liberal candidate for the election of 1865 was Robert Wellesley Grosvenor (1834-1918), a representative of the wealthy Grosvenor family, headed by the Duke of Westminster, whose estates included much of Westminster. On 13 Feb., however, the Liberal electors held a meeting at which they resolved to solicit eminent men to run as their representatives; Mill and Viscount Amberley were suggested (see The Times, 14 Feb., 1865, p. 6). Mill explained his principles in two letters, which were published, to James Beal (1829-91), the Committee Chairman, who had announced to him that he was their choice (see LL, CW, Vol. XVI, pp. 1005-7). He also urged the Committee to persevere in their proposed plan of soliciting names of candidates from the Liberal electors at large. The following MS draft of a letter to be used for this purpose is in Mill’s hand in University College London, attached to a copy of his letter to Chadwick of 28 Apr., 1865 (LL, CW, Vol. XVI, pp. 1038-9). Whether it is of Mill’s own composition, or is a revision of someone else’s is not known. It is not listed in the bibliography of his published writings, and no published version has been found; however, the opinions are those he expressed elsewhere.

“a committee of —” or “The Liberal Committee” (or whatever is its proper designation) having taken into consideration the prospect of a vacancy in the representation of Westminster, have determined, before nominating any candidate to ascertain by a direct appeal to the electors, what candidates they would prefer, and have appointed a Special Committee for carrying this resolution into effect, whose names are adjoined.

You are therefore, as an elector of Westminster, earnestly requested to read and consider the documents herewith submitted, and having done so, to fill up the form hereunto annexed, with the names of the two persons for whom, without any personal solicitation, you would be willing to vote.

The Committee have adopted this mode of proceeding for the following reasons.

1st. To afford to the electors a wider range of choice, and enable them to obtain a better quality of representatives. They do not think it worthy of Westminster to accept the first man, of wealth or aristocratic connexion, who offers himself under the appellation of a Liberal. The largest and most intelligent constituencies in the
Kingdom should aim at being represented by persons of proved capacity for public service, and of a high order of intellect. It is for the electors to select, among such persons, those whom they would most wish to adopt as their candidates, in order that the necessary steps may be taken to give effect to their wishes.

2dly. To avoid the useless and wasteful expenses, by which the choice of the electors is virtually limited to rich men, and seats in parliament are, in effect, made purchaseable by money, for no higher purposes than personal distinction or party convenience.

3dly. To give to every elector an equal opportunity for expressing his opinion, with the least possible trouble and inconvenience, and without the intrusion of paid canvassers, or the exertion of undue influence to obtain the promise of his vote.

The Committee were desirous of bringing before the electors, along with the names now submitted, the greatest number possible of other persons whose character, and proved qualifications, would render them suitable representatives of a place which, like Westminster, has for a century aspired to be represented by the most eminent names in the party of Reform and Progress. But, of the persons known to possess such qualifications as would make them worthy to be elected without personal solicitation and free of expense, some were prevented by other engagements, and some by personal reasons, from consenting to be proposed to the electors. The Committee have been thus precluded from submitting authentic statements of the claims of any other candidates than those herein specified. They do not, however, presume or desire to put any restrictions on your choice, but will gladly receive and record the expression of your preference in favour of any person by whom it would be more agreeable to you to be represented.

After the receipt of replies from a sufficient number of electors, the two persons for whom the greatest number of preferences have been expressed, will be put in nomination at the hustings. It would have been gratifying to the Committee if the friends of the sitting member, and those of the gentleman who first presented himself to supply the vacancy, would have consented to refer the pretensions of their candidates to the same test. This, however, they have refused. It now, therefore, rests with the electors to declare, whether they are so perfectly satisfied with the qualifications of these gentlemen, as to prefer them to the candidates now submitted for your choice, and to all others who could be obtained. The Committee earnestly hope that by returning the paper with the blanks filled up, you will afford them the means of judging whether this is the case with yourself.
ROMILLY’S PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY AND THE BALLOT

READER, 29 APR., 1865, PP. 474-5

Mill’s review is of *Public Responsibility and Vote by Ballot. By an Elector* (London: Ridgway, 1865), by Henry Romilly (1805-84), businessman and magistrate, son of Sir Samuel Romilly and brother of John, 1st Baron Romilly. Romilly included Mill’s review (calling it a “letter,” perhaps because it was signed with Mill’s initials) in the 2nd ed. of his pamphlet, which had the subtitle: *To Which Are Appended, A Letter from John Stuart Mill to the Editor of the Reader, 29 Apr., 1865, and Observations Thereon* (London: Ridgway, 1867). (A copy is in SC, without marks.) Mill’s only contribution to the *Reader*, this notice is in the “Current Literature” section, headed “Public Responsibility and the Ballot,” with the subhead, “Public Responsibility and Vote by Ballot. By an Elector. (Ridgway.) 1865.” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “Review of a pamphlet on the Ballot (by Mr. Henry Romilly) in the Reader of April 29, 1865; afterwards reprinted by Mr. Henry Romilly, in a pamphlet replying to it” (MacMinn, p. 96).

this pamphlet is a defence of the Ballot, or, rather, an answer to the objections to it. The writer is evidently a man of intelligence and knowledge, and accustomed to discussion. It is always fortunate when disputed questions are treated, not in a rhetorical, but in a dialectical spirit. The pamphlet contains incidentally many true and useful thoughts, and some others which excite surprise that the writer can have gone through the process of putting them on paper without perceiving their untenableness. To the present reviewer (who must be understood as speaking for himself only) the discussion appears, as to its main object, a failure.

The arguments for and against the Ballot are so trite and familiar, that the world is excusably tired of them. But in the answers to them there is still room for novelty, and it is in these that the main stress of the practical controversy lies. The author of the pamphlet directs his principal efforts against one of the anti-Ballot arguments, which he is quite right in regarding as the strongest; namely, that the franchise is a trust for the public, and the voter should be responsible to the public for the use made of it.

There are two ways in which a writer might meet this argument. He might admit the moral responsibility of the elector, and the beneficial effect on his mind of fulfilling his trust under the eye and criticism of those who are interested in its right fulfilment; but, he might say, the voters are in such a state of helpless dependence—each of them, so to speak, has a tyrant with eyes so fiercely glaring on him—that since his vote, if
known to his friends and family, will be known to his master, the salutary influences of honour and shame cannot be admitted without letting in, along with them, the more powerful ones of terror. Darkness is the only element in which the voter can be free to do his duty; and we must trust, for a good vote, to such spontaneous feelings of conscience and patriotism as may not need the support of publicity. This would reduce the question to one of fact, on which every one would form his own opinion. He who thinks that the electors, or a large proportion of them, are in this state of compulsory subjection, will probably be a supporter of the Ballot; though, even then, he ought to ask himself whether this slavish dependence is likely to last, whether the whole of the changes now taking place in society do not tend to its diminution, and even extinction. There might be a good case against its being yet time to abolish the Ballot, if we had always had it, and yet no case in favour of introducing, for a temporary purpose, a novelty which, when the time comes for which we ought to be looking, will be mischievous, and which has a decided tendency to unfit men for that coming time.

This, however, in our judgment, is the only line of defence for the Ballot which can ever be, to a certain extent, tenable. The author of the pamphlet has not chosen this mode. He prefers to reject the principle of electoral responsibility altogether. He does not deny the voter to be discharging a duty, for which he is accountable to conscience; on the contrary, a high sense of duty to the public is always present to the author’s mind. But he thinks that responsibility to public opinion will seldom operate with much force; that, when it does, it will as often operate on the wrong side as on the right; and that the voter is more likely to vote well if left to his personal promptings, uninfluenced by praise or blame from anyone. For, “if you place him by the Ballot quite beyond the reach of the improper control of other men, you leave to the elector no intelligible interest except that of the body of which he is a member—his interest as a citizen.” (P. 12.) It would hardly be fair to hold the author to this dictum, to which, we are sure, he could not, on consideration, adhere. Has no elector any private interest but what other people’s bribes or threats create for him? We will not take advantage, against the author, of his own exaggerations. We will give his argument a liberal construction. He means, and in many places says, that in the absence of other motives to an honest vote, we may safely rely on the voter’s interest as a citizen; his share of the public interest.

Now, we venture to say that this motive, in the common course of things, does not operate at all, or only in the slightest possible degree, on the mind either of an elector or of a member of Parliament. When he votes honestly, he is thinking of voting honestly, not of the fraction of a fraction of an interest which he, as an individual, may have in what is beneficial to the public. That minute benefit is not only too insignificant in amount, but too uncertain, too distant, and too hazy, to have any real effect on his mind. His motive, when it is an honourable one, is the desire to do right. We will not term it patriotism or moral principle, in order not to ascribe to the voter’s state of mind a solemnity that does not belong to it. But he votes for a particular man or measure because he thinks it the right thing to do, the proper thing for the good of the country. Once in a thousand times, as in a case of peace and war, or of taking off taxes, the thought may cross him that he shall save a few pounds or shillings in his year’s expenditure if the side he votes for prevails. But these cases are few, and, even
in them, the interested motive is not the prevailing one. It is possible, indeed, that he or his class may have a private interest acting in the same direction with the public interest, as a man who has speculated for a fall in corn has an interest in a good harvest; and this may determine his conduct. But, in that case, it is the private interest that actuates him, not his share of the public interest.

Since, then, the real motive which induces a man to vote honestly is, for the most part, not an interested motive in any form, but a social one, the point to be decided is, whether the social feelings connected with an act, and the sense of social duty in performing it, can be expected to be as powerful when the act is done in secret, and he can neither be admired for disinterested, nor blamed for mean and selfish conduct. But this question is answered as soon as stated. When, in every other act of a man’s life which concerns his duties to others, publicity and criticism ordinarily improve his conduct, it cannot be that voting for a member of Parliament is the single case in which he will act better for being sheltered against all comment.

The author, indeed, says with truth, and it is his strongest point, that public opinion is itself one of the misleading influences. In the first place, the public opinion nearest to the voter may be that of his own class, and may side with, instead of counteracting, the class interest. Besides, the opinion of the general public has its aberrations, too, and its most violent action is apt to be its worst. “At periods of political excitement, the practical sense to an elector of the phrase, ‘Responsibility to public opinion,’ is too often this: Go up to that polling-booth and, at your peril, vote for any candidate but the popular candidate.” (P. 42.) Such cases of physical violence are not what we have here to consider. If voters are liable to be mobbed, and if the state of society, as at Rome in the time of Cicero, is so lawless that the public authorities cannot protect them, cadit quaestio the Ballot is indispensable; though, in that case, even the Ballot is a feeble protection. We are for leaving the voter open to the penalties of opinion, but not to those of brute force. The author overlooks what, under this limitation, is the most important feature of the case; he supposes that, if public opinion acts on the elector at all, it must act by dictating his vote. When it is violently exerted, it does so; but its more ordinary operation consists in making the voter more careful to act up to his own sincere opinion. It operates through the quiet comments of relatives, neighbours, and companions; noting instances of variance between professions and conduct, or in which a selfish private purpose or a personal grudge prevails over public duty. In countries used to free discussion, it is only in times of fierce public contention that a man is really disliked for voting in conformity to the opinion he is known to hold. If he is reproached even by opponents, it is for something paltry in the motive; and, if there is a paltry motive, it is generally no recondite one, but such as the opinion of those who know him can easily detect, and therefore may be able to restrain.

The author deems it a fallacy to distinguish between the election of members of a club and that of members of Parliament, on the ground that the voters in a club have no public duty. [Pp. 4-12.] They have a duty, he says, to the members of the club. This we altogether dispute. A club is a voluntary association, into which people enter for their individual pleasure, and are not accountable to one another. What is there wanted is, that each should declare by his vote what is agreeable to himself; whatever
has then a majority is proved to be agreeable to the majority, and whoever dislikes it can leave the association. But if we were all born members of a club, and had no means, except emigration, of exchanging our club for any other, then, indeed, the voter would really be bound to consult the interests of the other members, the case would be assimilated to that of an election to Parliament, and the Ballot, accordingly, would be objectionable.

There is no room to follow the writer though all his arguments, but we cannot leave unnoticed the answer he makes to the objection that the Ballot would lead to lying. To this he replies, that lies are of very different degrees of criminality; that there are many greater moral delinquencies than “the lie of legitimate self-defence;” [p. 67] that a dishonest vote, given from a selfish motive, is worse; that such a vote ought to be called a falsehood; and that to think so rigorously of the mere breach of verbal truth, and so gently of a grave violation of public duty, is shallow and false morality. In all this we heartily concur; but the fact remains, that the majority of mankind do feel the lie an offence and a degradation, and do not so feel respecting the breach of public duty. We would gladly make them think a dishonest vote as bad as a lie, but it is to be feared we should only succeed in making them think a lie no worse than a dishonest vote. When people have only a few of the moral feelings they ought to have, there is the more danger in weakening those few. This is a truth which many moral saws in general circulation overlook. We are often told, for example, that an equivocation is as bad as a lie. It is well for mankind that everybody is not of this opinion, and that not all who will equivocate will lie. For the temptation to equivocate is often almost irresistible; indeed, the proposition, that everything which can be termed an equivocation is necessarily condemnable, is only true in those cases and those relations in life in which it is a duty to be absolutely open and unreserved. But to confine ourselves to what is really culpable: a person may be a habitual equivocator of a bad kind, he may have no scruple at all in implying what is not true, and yet, if when categorically questioned he shrinks from an express falsehood, this ultimate hold on him makes it still possible for his fellow-creatures to trust his word. Let no one underrate the importance of what mankind would gain if the precise literal meaning of men’s assertions could be kept conformable to fact. There may be much unworthy cunning and treachery notwithstanding, but the difference for all human purposes is immense between him who respects that final barrier and those who overleap it.

Did space permit, we might point out some cases in which the author, though habitually candid, yields to the temptation of caricaturing an opponent’s argument; as in charging a writer (pp. 31-2 and 48) with arguing as if all votes, given under the shelter of the Ballot, would be base or selfish, when the only thing asserted, or needed was that some would. But we prefer to quote a passage which tells strongly against the writer, and in favour of our own case:

A century ago, before the virtuous example of the first William Pitt had made it dishonourable in members of Parliament to hold their votes at the disposal of the dispensers of the public money, it might almost have been a question whether the incontestable advantages of publicity were not too dearly bought at the cost of that mass of political turpitude which it would have been possible, by means of the Ballot, to sweep from within the walls of Parliament.
If, at the time spoken of, our ancestors, to get rid of this mass of turpitude, had introduced the Ballot into the House of Commons, they would have done the exact parallel of what we should do if we adopted it in Parliamentary elections. And ought not the fact that all this profligacy has been got rid of without the Ballot to be a lesson to us for the other case? We see that the progress of the public conscience could and did, in the space of a single generation, correct political immoralities more gross and mischievous than those which now remain, and apparently harder to remove, because affecting the élite, socially speaking, of the nation. Such an example in times when the public conscience was much less alive, and its improvement far less rapid than now, ought to reassure us, to say the least, as to the necessity of the Ballot, and should deter us from putting on the badge of slavery at the very time when a few more steps and a very little additional effort will land us in complete freedom.

J.S.M.
414.

THE WESTMINSTER ELECTION [2]

THE TIMES, 22 JULY, 1865, P. 2

For the background, see No. 412. William Henry Smith (1825-91), head of the well-known bookselling firm, a liberal-conservative, had since entered the race, and Sir John Villiers Shelley had retired; on 12 July Mill and Grosvenor were elected with votes of 4525 and 4534 respectively. Mill’s letter of thanks appeared in other papers on 22 July, including the *Daily News*. Headed “Westminster Election,” the letter (not listed in Mill’s bibliography) is introduced by this note: “The following letter from Mr. J.S. Mill, M.P., to the Liberal electors of Westminster, has been forwarded to us for publication:”. In the *Daily News* it is dated “Blackheath Park, July 21.” The text below is that of *The Times*, which has been collated with the *Daily News*, 22 July, 1865, p. 2; in the variant notes the text of the latter is signalled by “DN”.

Gentlemen,—

The triumphant reassertion of the principle of purity of election in its largest sense, by the selection of a representative in Parliament on public grounds alone, against an unexampled combination of personal and pecuniary influences, is a lasting honour to Westminster and benefit to the popular cause. The victory is wholly yours, not mine, since I only appeared among you in the last stage of the contest to meet the desire expressed for a fuller explanation of my opinions. But the address just issued by the committee\(^1\) seems to demand that I should join with them in hearty and grateful acknowledgments to the Liberal electors generally, and especially to the great number who, by their strenuous and disinterested personal exertions, renewed the lesson so often forgotten, of the power of a high and generous purpose over bodies of citizens accustomed to free political action.

\(^{a}\) Electors! your work is done, and mine has now to be commenced. The unsought confidence which you have placed in me has laid on me an obligation which it would heavily tax powers far superior to mine adequately to fulfil. That I may not fall so far below your hopes as to make you regret your choice, will be my constant and earnest endeavour.

\(^{b}\) I am, \(^{c}\) gentlemen, most sincerely and respectfully yours.\(^{c}\)

J.S. Mill
415.

THE BALLOT

DAILY NEWS, 31 JULY, 1868, P. 5

John Bright (who had been closely allied with Mill on many issues in the House of Commons) gave a speech to his constituents on 24 July, 1868, in which he predicted that the ballot, especially in the large constituencies, would be required “merely as a matter of election machinery.” He went on: “Even Mr. Stuart Mill, who had long objected to the ballot, was becoming a convert, and was of opinion that it might be tried in Ireland” (“Mr. Bright at Birmingham,” The Times, 25 July, p. 12). Mill’s response (not listed in his bibliography) is headed “Mr. Mill on the Ballot” with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News,” and is dated “Blackheath-park, July 29.” It appeared also in the Beehive, 8 Aug., 1868, p. 7, without substantive variants.

Sir,—

As it would appear from the report of Mr. Bright’s eloquent speech at Birmingham that there exists some misapprehension concerning my present opinion on the ballot, I should be obliged by your permitting me to state that my opinion is as decidedly unfavourable to the ballot as it ever was; that I should see its adoption with regret in any part of the United Kingdom; that I spoke against it in a meeting of my constituents on the same evening on which Mr. Bright was speaking at Birmingham; and that I voted against its adoption in Ireland at the division on it this session. —I am, etc.,

J.S. Mill
GLADSTONE FOR GREENWICH

THE TIMES, 22 SEPT., 1868, P. 7

Gladstone having become unpopular in his constituency of South Lancashire because of his position on the Irish Church, he was put forward as a candidate for Greenwich without his solicitation, and in the event elected there, while losing his South Lancashire seat. The committee proposing him called a meeting at Deptford on 16 Sept., inviting Mill and others to speak. (See “Election Intelligence. Greenwich,” The Times, 17 Sept., p. 10.) As Mill explained in a letter to William Cox Bennett on 14 Sept., “Mr. Dickson, whom I understand to be the Secretary for Deptford, wrote to me during your absence, asking me either to attend or to write a letter; and as I was unable to attend, I sent him a letter for the purpose of being read at the meeting, the receipt of which he has acknowledged” (LL, CW, Vol. XVI, p. 1440). The letter, dated “Avignon, August 28,” and headed “Mr. John Stuart Mill and Mr. Gladstone,” is introduced by the following sentence: “The following is the text of the letter from Mr. John Stuart Mill, read at the meeting held at Deptford, on Wednesday evening, to support the election of Mr. Gladstone for the borough of Greenwich.” A shortened version of the letter appeared also in the Daily News, 17 Sept., 1868, p. 3, under the heading “Election Intelligence / Greenwich.” The letter is not listed in Mill’s bibliography.

Dear Sir,—

I am greatly honoured by your invitation to be present at your meeting for promoting the election of Mr. Gladstone for the borough of Greenwich, and should have been very happy to attend it had I been in England. The example which Greenwich is now setting is a valuable one, which we may hope to see more generally followed when the true importance of political action is more justly appreciated, and when politics arouse more of the interest that is justly due to them. The example of electing a public man, without any solicitation on his part, and without any consideration of whether he may also be elected elsewhere, as a tribute to his character, and as an expression of the strength of the feeling in his favour, is happily not new in our political history. It is too natural a thing to do, when people feel as warmly as they often ought to feel, and the unanswerable evidence of public confidence it gives in a great man too obviously must strengthen him and the cause he serves, for the example not to have been set on several occasions (in the cases of Mr. Cobden and Lord Brougham, among others), when political feeling was strong and the merits of the public man conspicuous. It would be much to be regretted if such examples as these were allowed to die out; and Greenwich is doing a public service by reviving them, by strengthening a statesman whose public services have aroused a bitterness which is the best tribute of their value, and by adding to his power to carry through some more
of the many important reforms that must not be long retarded if England is to hold its honourable place among nations.—I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill
BOUVERIE *VERSUS* CHADWICK

THE TIMES, 22 OCT., 1868, P. 3

For the election of 1868, Mill wished to find a seat for his friend Edwin Chadwick; by strongly endorsing him for the borough of Kilmarnock, he incurred the ire of Edward Pleydell Bouverie (1818-89), a Liberal hostile to Gladstone who had represented the borough since 1844. *The Times* of 16 Oct., 1868, p. 10, printed a letter of Bouverie’s to Mill complaining of Mill’s sowing dissension in the Liberal party, as well as Mill’s reply, and Bouverie’s further rejoinder (Mill’s reply is in *LL, CW*, Vol. XVI, pp. 1453-4). The paragraph printed here introduces another reply by Mill (*ibid.*, pp. 1460-4), which is not listed in his bibliography. On the envelope of the MS draft of that reply at Johns Hopkins is written in Mill’s hand “For publication as chiefly Helen’s” (i.e., his step-daughter Helen Taylor’s). The letter is headed “Mr. Mill and Mr. Bouverie,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of The Times,” and is dated “Avignon, Oct. 19.” On the same day the letter appeared in the *Daily News* (p. 5) under the heading “Mr. Mill on the Character of Liberal Candidates. / To the Editor of the Daily News.”

Sir,—

Mr. Bouverie having forwarded to you a correspondence between us, and his last letter having appeared in *The Times* before I had received it, I take the liberty of asking permission to reply to it through *The Times*.—I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill
NEW ENGLAND WOMAN’S SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK TRIBUNE, 27 MAY, 1869, P. 1

This letter was addressed to Julia Ward Howe (1819-1910), reformer and author, the President of the New England Woman’s Suffrage Association, founded in Boston in 1868 chiefly by Lucy Stone (1818-93) and including prominent reformers such as Wendell Phillips. The association, having been unsuccessful in enfranchising women along with negroes in the 15th amendment to the Constitution, was now working for a 16th. The letter, dated “Avignon, April 18, 1869,” is not listed in Mill’s bibliography. It appeared, under the heading “Woman Suffrage / Letter from J. Stuart Mill—the XVIth Constitutional Amendment,” as part of an account beginning, “Boston, May 26. A Public meeting, which was largely attended, was held by the New-England Woman’s Suffrage Association, in Horticultural Hall, today, Julia Ward Howe presiding. Prayer was offered by the Rev. Mrs. P.N. Hannaford. Letters, sympathizing with the movement, were received from Robert Collyer, Anna Dickinson, J. Stuart Mill, George William Curtis, Mrs. E.D. Cheeny, and the Hon. George T. Hoar. The following is the letter of Mr. Mill:”.

Dear Madame,—

I am very much honored by the wish of the New-England Woman’s Suffrage Association that I should be present at their annual meeting, but they have been misinformed as to my having any present intention of visiting America. Should I ever contemplate such a visit, there are no persons on your side of the Atlantic with whom it would give me more pleasure to exchange marks of sympathy than with those who are working so energetically for a cause so dear to me as that of the equal claim of all human beings, independent of sex, to the full rights of citizenship, and freedom of competition, on equal terms, for all social advantages.

I am, etc., very sincerely yours,

J.S. Mill
THE CASE OF WILLIAM SMITH

UNPUBLISHED LETTER TO THE DAILY NEWS [LATE 1869 TO EARLY 1870]

William Smith, police constable, had been tried and punished for striking an Irish labourer and felt-maker, Patrick Mcgovern, in the course of stopping Mcgovern’s assault on his wife Eliza. The case was reported in “The Police Courts. Thames,” Daily News, 25 Dec., 1869, p. 2, from which Mill quotes. For Mill’s efforts to interest the Attorney-General, Sir Robert Porrett Collier, and the editor of the Daily News, Frank Harrison Hill, in Smith’s reinstatement, see LL, CW, Vol. XVII, pp. 1677-9, and 1705-6. A long leader appeared in the Daily News, 18 Jan., 1870, pp. 4-5; one may assume that a fair copy of this unsigned draft (MS, Yale) was sent to the Daily News (which did not print it) as part of Mill’s unsuccessful campaign. The letter, being unpublished, is not in Mill’s bibliography.

Sir,—

I beg you to receive the inclosed £5 as the commencement of a subscription for the benefit of the police constable William Smith, No. 151 K, who as I learn from your paper of Dec. 25 has been sentenced by Mr. Benson, the Thames Police magistrate, to a month’s imprisonment and hard labour for striking with his staff a man who had only knocked down his own wife in the street.

“The assault,” said Mr. Benson, meaning not the man’s assault upon his wife but the constable’s assault upon the man, “was unprovoked, brutal, and unjustifiable” and it has gone forth from the seat of justice to the whole brutal part of the population, that for a man to knock down a woman, provided that woman is his wife, is no “provocation” and that a month’s penal servitude is a proper penalty, not for the ruffian himself but for the appointed guardian of the public peace who interferes with his authorized brutality.

For my own part, it seems to me that the policeman who thinks that men’s wives are within the pale of legal protection and who, astonishing as the idea was to the man himself and to the magistrate, thinks it his duty not to look on passively and see them maltreated, deserves a signal mark of public approbation, which cannot in this instance take a better shape than that of a subscription to compensate him for the suffering and degradation as well as the pecuniary loss inflicted on him by this iniquitous sentence.
At a National Education League meeting, held Friday, 25 Mar., 1870, chaired by Sir Charles Dilke, Mill was the principal speaker (The Times, 26 Mar., p. 5). The meeting was called to protest the power given to School Boards to found denominational schools at public expense, in the Government’s “Bill to Provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales,” 33 Victoria (17 Feb., 1870), PP, 1870, I, 505-42. (In the event, when the Bill became law as 33 & 34 Victoria, c. 75, the powers of the denominations were much curtailed.) The Spectator commented on the issues and Mill’s views in “The Secularists in Full Cry,” 2 Apr., pp. 425-6, from which the quotations are taken. Mill’s letter, not listed in his bibliography, is in the “Letters to the Editor” column, headed “Mr. J.S. Mill and the Education Bill,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of the ‘Spectator.’ ”

Sir,—

Having full belief in your not intending to misrepresent, though (if you will allow me to say so) not equal confidence in the carefulness and accuracy of all your representations, I do not doubt that you will permit me to correct a serious misstatement which pervades the whole of your last Saturday’s comments on the Education meeting at St. James’s Hall. The writer affirms again and again, with sundry uncomplimentary remarks on the inconsistencies and other irrationalities therein implied, that in my speech at that meeting I advocated and asked for the system of the British Schools, which he describes as the merely formal reading of a portion of the Bible “as a kind of grace before meat to secular lessons.” I challenge your writer to point out a single word of my speech which either expresses or implies approval of the “British system,” or of the employment of the Bible in rate-supported schools at all. I referred to the British system only as a proof that the Dissenters do not desire their distinctive doctrines to be taught in schools, and would consequently derive no advantage from the fund which the Bill gives them, where they are the stronger party, of practising this injustice to the detriment of the Established Church.

For myself, though I regard the British system as greatly preferable to the merely denominational, yet, on any other footing than as the less of two evils, I decidedly object to it, as unjust to Catholics, Jews, and the Secularists, and for other reasons.

I am, Sir, &c.,

J.S. Mill
On 31 Oct., 1870, the Russian government issued a declaration repudiating the neutralization of the Black Sea required by the Treaty of Paris of 1856. The declaration, sent by Prince Gortschakoff to Baron Bunnw, was communicated to Earl Granville on 9 Nov. (see “The Treaty of 1856: Prince Gortschakoff’s Note,” The Times, 18 Nov., p. 3). The action caused a war scare in England. Mill sent this letter to The Times through Leonard Courtney (see LL, CW, Vol. XVII, p. 1775), who was a leader writer for The Times, and may have been responsible for leading articles on 16, 17, and 19 November professing the attitudes to which Mill was objecting. In her continuation of Mill’s Autobiography, Helen Taylor says this and the following letter (No. 422) “were called forth by a cry, that arose at that time in a portion of the English press, for plunging England into a war with Russia. They were the first protest that appeared in any well known name against such a war; they called forth others and helped calm down the warlike excitement that was being aroused.” (CW, Vol. I, p. 626.) Mill’s “Treaty Obligations” in December took up the same issues (CW, Vol. XXI, pp. 341-8), as does No. 423. This letter, headed “Mr. Mill on the Treaty of 1856,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of The Times,” is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A letter in the Times of Nov. 19, 1870 on the threatened war with Russia” (MacMinn, p. 99).

Sir,—

Without wishing, at least for the present, to discuss the character of the declaration just made by the Russian Government—a discussion which would raise questions, both moral and political, more intricate and difficult than people seem to be aware of—may I hope from your impartiality that you will allow expression to be given through your columns to the opinion of at least one Englishman, which he believes to be shared by multitudes of his countrymen, that for England to let herself be drawn into war by this provocation or on this account would be nothing less than monstrous.

This is not the doctrine of a partisan of peace at any price. Had we, at the first breaking out of the present hateful war, declared that whichever nation first invaded the territory of the other should have England also for its foe, we should, at an extremely small risk to ourselves, in all human probability have prevented the war, and perhaps given commencement to a new era in the settlement of international differences. To effect this great good to humanity and to public morals, we did not choose to incur a mere chance of being involved in a war, and in my opinion we were
wrong, and have exposed ourselves to the just recriminations of the suffering people—I do not speak of the governments—of Germany and France. Were we now to plunge into a war infinitely more dangerous to ourselves, and for which we are materially speaking totally unprepared, those among us who are the causes of our so doing will, in my judgment, deserve and receive the execration of the people of England.

The honour of England is not concerned either in the protection of Turkey or in the humiliation of Russia. Treaties are not made to be eternal, and before we go to war for the maintenance of one it behoves the nation at least to consider whether it would enter into it afresh at the present day. We should have learnt little, indeed, from the spectacle that has been going on before our eyes during the last four months if we allow our journalists to hurry us into a war under the plea of honour, merely because of the manner or the form in which Russia has thought fit to throw off an obligation the substance of which we all admit we ought to be ready to reconsider.

I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill
Anthony Ashley Cooper, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury, criticized the views of Mill expressed in No. 421, in a letter headed “Lord Shaftesbury on the Russian Note,” *The Times*, 22 Nov., p. 3, from which Mill quotes in this reply, headed “The Treaty of 1856,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of The Times.” It is described in Mill’s bibliography as “A further letter on the same subject [as No. 421] in the Times of Nov. 24, 1870” (MacMinn, p. 99).

Sir,—

The letter in which Lord Shaftesbury, in your paper of Tuesday, the 22d, animadverted upon a letter of mine which you did me the favour to insert, deserves so much respect for its manifestly conscientious feeling, and states the question, besides, so neatly and compactly, that I must address myself to your courtesy for an opportunity of, if possible, setting myself right with him.

The opinion which I maintain concerning treaties is very remote indeed from that which Lord Shaftesbury ascribes to me. He understands me to have said that a country is not bound “to observe” the terms of a treaty “unless they be so convenient that the country would be ready to enter on them afresh.” What I did say is, that a country is not bound to enforce the observance of terms which it has imposed on others, “until it has considered whether it would impose them afresh at the present day.” And if it not only would not, but, according to its present judgment, ought not to impose them afresh, it is not merely not bound to go to war for their enforcement, but would commit a great crime if it did so.

There is a wide difference between affirming that I may break a promise, as soon as it is inconvenient to me to keep it, and maintaining that if another person breaks a promise made to me I am not necessarily bound to shed his blood. I cannot believe that Lord Shaftesbury, with the two doctrines before him, will hold the latter to be “one in principle” with the former.

Let the people of England, then, deliberately consider whether a stipulation denying to a country the legitimate liberty possessed by all other countries, of maintaining military and naval defences on its own coast, is one which they think they have a right permanently to impose. If not, then in however objectionable a manner the claim may be disputed we shall be criminal if we go to war to enforce it.
Having now, as I hope, cleared myself from the very serious charge brought against me by Lord Shaftesbury, allow me to make one more remark.

Treaties are the promises of nations; and in the breach of a treaty, as in that of a private promise, there are all degrees of guilt, from some of the gravest to some of the most venial. The degree of Russia’s guilt in this particular repudiation of treaty is not to be decided off hand. I have no desire to extenuate it, but it is not pertinent to the question. It is sufficient that treaties and other engagements will be broken if they are imposed without limit as to duration. An individual, however, has no power of promising anything beyond the duration of his mortal life; but nations have the wild folly to make, and to exact, engagements for all time. Mankind, happily, are now beginning to find out that anything whatever to which a nation attempts to bind either itself or others in perpetuity, be it a Constitution, a dynasty, an irrevocable law, a particular disposition of public or private property, or whatever else, will assuredly, at some time or other, require to be, and will actually be, shaken off by those to whom it is injurious. The present generation has had sufficiently convincing experience that to this rule treaties are no exception. Lord Shaftesbury warns England, if the Russian doctrine be admitted, to “take good care never to contract another” treaty. The warning I would give is, if we wish to be able successfully to combat the Russian doctrine, to make no more treaties except for terms of years.

I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill
Seeking support for the views expressed in Nos. 421 and 422, Mill sent this letter to The Times as a cover for one from Emile Louis Victor, baron de Laveleye (1822-92), a Belgian political economist for whom he had a high regard. The letter, headed “M. de Laveleye on the Eastern Question,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of The Times,” is not listed in Mill’s bibliography.

Sir,—

I shall be obliged if you will give a place in The Times to the accompanying extract from a private letter written by M. Emile de Laveleye, and showing in what light the war which we are urged to undertake is regarded by one of the most enlightened public writers of the Continent, from the impartial position of a Belgian citizen.

I am, &c.,

J.S. Mill

1
In the *Daily News* of 25 Mar., p. 5, the following notice appeared: “Mr. John Stuart Mill is expected to take the chair, next Wednesday, at the Society of Arts, when Miss Emily Faithfull will read a paper on ‘Women’s work, with special reference to industrial employment.’” Faithfull (1835-95) was the founder of the Victoria Press, which employed women compositors and printed, among other things, the *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*. The address she delivered at the meeting on 29 Mar. was printed as “Woman’s Work, with Special Reference to Industrial Employment,” *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XIX (31 Mar., 1871), 378-83. Mill’s letter (not in his bibliography), is dated only from “Blackheath-park, Kent,” and headed “Mr. Mill and the Society of Arts,” with the subhead, “To the Editor of the Daily News.” A copy also appeared under the heading “The Penalties of Celebrity,” in *The Times*, 27 Mar., p. 12. The text below is that of the *Daily News*, which has been collated with that in *The Times*; in the variant notes the latter is signalled by “TT.”

Sir,—

The assertion which appeared in *your paper* of Saturday, *March 25*, that I am expected to take the chair at a meeting of the Society of Arts next Wednesday is without any foundation. I have no intention of being present at the meeting at all. I am glad to take this opportunity of protesting against a habit which is growing up, of making those misleading statements through the medium of the public press or otherwise. It has gained ground to such a degree as to have become a nuisance to almost every man whose name is well known; placing him under the alternative of making public contradictions of such statements, or of allowing his name to be used for the purpose of exciting false expectations. I shall be obliged by your giving publicity to this, and remain, sir,

your obedient servant,

J.S. Mill¹
ADVICE TO LAND REFORMERS

EXAMINER, 4 JAN., 1873, PP. 1-2

In 1869 Mill was Chairman of the Provisional Committee to establish the Land Tenure Reform Association, and was responsible in large measure for its proposals, published as *Programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association, with an Explanatory Statement by John Stuart Mill* (London: Longmans, et al., 1871); in *CW*, Vol. V, pp. 687-95. The work of the Association, along with the women’s suffrage movement, absorbed most of his energy in his last years, and it is appropriate that his last three newspaper writings should be on land tenure, and that they should appear in the *Examiner*, where the bulk of his journalism appeared. Helen Taylor’s continuation of Mill’s *Autobiography* concludes: “In the autumn and winter [of 1872] he wrote . . . two articles for the *Examiner* (published January 4th and 11th, 1873) on Land Reform” (*CW*, Vol. I, p. 627). In a letter to Cairnes of 8 Jan., 1873, after welcoming Cairnes’ agreement with him on the question of the land held by endowed institutions, Mill remarks that he and his daughter are occasionally sending articles to the *Examiner* now, hoping to help build it up once more as “an organ of opinion allied to our own” (*LL, CW*, Vol. XVII, p. 1933).

This article, in the “Political and Social” section, is headed as title, and is described in his bibliography as “An article headed ‘Advice to Land Reformers’ in the Examiner of 4 January 1873” (MacMinn, p. 101). The article was combined by Helen Taylor with No. 426 and printed in the posthumous fourth volume of *Dissertations and Discussions* (London: Longman, et al., 1875), under the title “Advice to Land Reformers,” pp. 266-77 (in which this article ends at p. 272.31).

now, when the question of the constitution and limits of property in land has fairly come to the front, and a majority of Liberal politicians find it needful to include in their programme some improvement in the existing arrangements on that subject, it is time to consider which among the minor modifications that alone find favour with the more timid or more cautious innovators deserve to be supported by those who desire greater changes, and which are those that should be opposed, either as giving a renewed sanction to wrong principles, or as raising up new private interests hostile to a thorough reform. There are at present two proposals affecting property in land which engage a considerable and increasing amount of public attention: one, the abrogation of the right of primogeniture, and the abolition or great restriction of the power of making settlements of land; the other, that corporations and endowed institutions should be required to sell their lands, and invest the proceeds in the funds or other public securities. The difference between these two projects affords an illustration of the principles which, we think, should guide the judgment of land tenure reformers in matters of this nature. The former of the two is, in our opinion, entitled to their full support; the latter should be strenuously resisted by them.
Before proceeding farther, it is right to explain whom we mean by land tenure reformers. On so new a question there are naturally many shades of opinion. There are some with whose plans we agree, others from whom we differ; we address ourselves equally to both. There are those who aim at what is called the nationalisation of the land; the substitution of collective for individual property in the soil, with reasonable compensation to the landowners. Their doctrine is far from being so irrational as is pretended; they have much to say for themselves. Nor is theirs a wholly untried theory. It has the feudal traditions, and the general practice of the East, on its side. Nevertheless, for reasons which we shall have many opportunities of stating, we are decidedly of opinion that, whatever may possibly be the case in a distant future, this scheme is altogether unsuited to the present time. But, short of this, there are modifications of the rights of landed property of a more or less fundamental character, which have already numerous supporters, and are likely, as we believe, before long to become widely popular. There is the principle asserted by the Land Tenure Reform Association; that, inasmuch as land in a prosperous country brings in a constantly increasing income to its owner, apart from any exertion or expenditure on his part, it may and ought to be subjected to special taxation in virtue of that increase. Again, it is maintained that, inasmuch as the acknowledged end for which land is allowed to be appropriated, is that it may be made more productive, the right of property ought not to extend to that which remains unproductive: and that if large tracts of land are kept in a wild state by their owners, either for purposes of amusement, or because they cannot be let at a rent (though they might amply remunerate a labourer cultivating for himself) the State should resume them, paying only their present value. Again, there might be a limit set to the extent of territory which could be held by a single proprietor. Many other changes might be proposed, more or less extensive, more or less expedient, but all compatible with the maintenance of the institution of landed property in its broad outlines. Now, the reforms which are proposed on the subject of primogeniture, and of entails and settlements, are of a different character. Instead of limiting, they would increase the power over the land of the existing generation of landowners; and accordingly, the supporters of more drastic changes are much divided as to whether these particular measures ought or ought not to be supported.

Among the reasons for getting rid of the law of primogeniture and the existing laws of entail and settlement, the one which we oftenest hear, and which carries most weight with many of the assailants of those laws, is that by keeping land out of the market they detain it in too few hands, and that their abolition would increase the number of landed proprietors. The long and obstinate prejudice which existed against peasant properties, grounded on the densest ignorance of their actual operation in the countries where they prevail, has given way before more correct information. Those who fancied that peasant proprietors must be wretched cultivators because cottier tenants are so, have learnt that some of the best agriculture in the world is to be found where such properties abound: those who thought that peasant proprietorship breeds over-population, and converts a country into a “pauper-warren,” now know that its tendency is rather towards the other extreme. Within a few years, therefore, the existence of peasant properties has come to be regarded by English philanthropists as eminently desirable, and the removal of all obstacles to it has become an aim of advanced politicians; and primogeniture and entail being such obstacles, their abolition is advocated on that ground. But it has come to pass that the same thing
which recommends this measure to one class of land reformers, renders another class worse than indifferent to it. Multiplication of proprietors is not the kind of reform which finds favour with a large section of the more thoroughgoing land reformers. Many of them believe that an addition to the number of private owners of land is but an addition to the number of the enemies of the larger changes which they meditate. They think, and in this they are not mistaken, that the wide diffusion of landed property in some Continental countries, and especially in France, is in these countries the great obstacle to any improvement in the conditions of ownership: and they look with no good will on anything which tends, in ever so small a degree, to approximate, in this respect, the British state of things to the French.

We agree, to a considerable extent, with the general views on which this judgment is grounded; but we do not think that the question of abolishing primogeniture and entail is a case for their application. Whether the creation of a class of peasant-proprietors would be a good thing or a bad, we are of opinion that the reforms in question would not have that effect; while they would produce benefits which, even from the exclusive point of view of the land-reformers, might well outweigh some amount of the inconvenience they apprehend.

To what extent these measures would practically operate in causing land to be brought into the market, it is very difficult at present to foresee; but there is no probability that, of such as might be sold, much would come into the hands of small proprietors. As long as the private wealth of the country and its social condition are what they are, the rich will always outbid the poor in the land market. We are speaking, of course, of rural land, of which alone the possession is an object of desire to the wealthy classes. Land in towns, or so close to them as to be available for streets, might often obtain a higher price in small lots; such lots as would enable prudent and economical working people to become the owners of the houses they live in; which we hold to be an unqualified good: nor is it likely that even the most extreme plans of land reform would disturb such persons in the possession. The land of the country at large outside the towns might possibly come to be shared among a greater number of rich families than at present; but sales by the rich to the rich do not really add to the number of those whose interests and feelings are engaged on the side of landlordism; for the rich who wish to be landlords are already as much wedded to landlord privileges as they would be when they actually became so. Reformers, therefore, either moderate or extreme, need have no fear that the facilitation of the sale of land already appropriated should raise up additional obstacles to their projects.

On the other hand, the measures in question would be attended with no small amount of positive benefit. In the first place, whatever transfers of landed property might really be occasioned by these changes would be in the direction of agricultural improvement. True it is that, according to the present ideas of landed property, landlords are neither required nor expected to do anything for the land; but some landlords are more disposed to do so than others; and the purchasers are almost always a more improving class of landowners than those from whom they purchase. It is the capitalist and man of business who buys; it is the needy and the spendthrift who sell. The whole tendency is thus to improve the cultivation and increase the produce of the country. But there is a still greater benefit than this, and one which is often not
sufficiently appreciated. The principle of the laws of primogeniture and entail is radically wrong; and to get rid of a bad principle, and put a better in its place, is equivalent to a very considerable amount of practical gain. The preference of one child above all the rest, without any superiority of personal claims, is an injustice. The power given to an owner of property to exercise control over it after it has passed into the hands of those to whom it devolves on his death, is, as a rule (with certain obvious exceptions), both an injustice and an absurdity. Moreover, the end for which these institutions are kept up ought to be their sufficient condemnation in the eyes of advanced reformers. The purpose of their existence is to retain the land, not only in the families which now possess it, but in a certain line of succession within those families, from eldest son to eldest son. They are a contrivance for maintaining an aristocratical order in unimpaired territorial wealth from generation to generation, in spite of the faults which its existing members may commit, and at the sacrifice both of justice between the heir and the other children, and of the interest which all the existing members of the family may have in selling the land. The aristocratic spirit, more powerful than the personal interest of each living member of the body, postpones the private wishes of the existing generation to the interest of the order in maintaining an aristocratic monopoly of the land. The possession of the land is the centre round which aristocratic feeling revolves; and the removal of the two props of the monopoly, though its immediate practical effect would probably be small, should be welcome to all who wish to dissolve the connection between landed property and aristocratic institutions.

We think, then, that all land reformers, whatever may be their ulterior views, should unite in supporting the abrogation of the law of primogeniture and the reform of the law of settlement. We must reserve for another article our reasons for thinking quite otherwise of the proposal recently broached (and which has derived importance from the strong advocacy of the Times and from the interpretation put upon a speech of Mr. Goschen) for requiring all corporate bodies and endowed institutions to part with their lands by sale to private individuals.

J.S. Mill
SHOULD PUBLIC BODIES BE REQUIRED TO SELL THEIR LANDS?

EXAMINER, 11 JAN., 1873, PP. 29-30

For the background of Goschen’s proposal and The Times’ support, and for the article’s appearance in Dissertations and Discussions, Vol. IV, pp. 272-7, see No. 425. This leader, in the “Political and Social” section and headed as title, is described in Mill’s bibliography as “An article headed ‘Should public bodies be required to sell their lands?’ in the Examiner of 11th January 1873” (MacMinn, p. 101). This is the final entry in Mill’s bibliography.

A considerable sensation seems to have been excited by the quite unexpected appearance a few weeks ago, in the Times, of two articles strenuously contending that corporate bodies and endowed institutions should no longer be permitted to withhold land from the market, and that the principle of the Mortmain Acts should be so far extended as to compel all such bodies or institutions to sell their lands and invest the proceeds in Government securities. The coincidence of this manifestation by the Times with a speech of Mr. Goschen, some expressions in which were supposed to point to a similar conclusion, has led to a suspicion that the Government is throwing out feelers preparatory to some actual proposal of the kind suggested. And the papers that are bitterly hostile to the present Government, whenever its political and social policy is other than that of keeping things as they are, have not missed the opportunity of upbraiding the Government with making an unworthy concession to the land tenure reformers, who are represented as grasping at the opportunity of attacking landed property at its most easily assailable point.

It is an odd supposition that reformers who are asserted to have, and some of whom really have, for their object the extinguishing of private and hereditary landed property altogether, desire to begin their operations by making a great mass of landed property private and hereditary which was not so before. Nothing could be more opposed to the principles and purposes of thorough-going land tenure reformers of every shade of opinion, than any further conversion of what is still, in some sense, a kind of public property, into private. The point on which they are all agreed, whether they desire anything further or not, is that, at all events, the appropriation of the land of the country by private individuals and families has gone far enough; and that a determined resistance should be made to any further extension of it, either by the stealing, euphemistically termed the inclosure, of commons, or by the alienation of lands held upon trust for public or semi-public objects. Far from allowing any land which is not already private property to become so, the most moderate of these land reformers think that it may possibly be expedient, in districts where land not already
appropriated does not abound, to redeem some part of that which is in private hands, by repurchasing it on account of the State.

Those countries are fortunate, or would be fortunate if decently governed, in which, as in a great part of the East, the land has not been allowed to become the permanent property of individuals, and the State consequently is the sole landlord. So far as the public expenditure is covered by the proceeds of the land, those countries are untaxed; for it is the same thing as being untaxed, to pay to the State only what would have to be paid to private landlords if the land were appropriated. The principle that the land belongs to the Sovereign, and that the expenses of government should be defrayed by it, is recognised in the theory of our own ancient institutions. The nearest thing to an absolute proprietor whom our laws know of is the freeholder, who is a tenant of the Crown; bound originally to personal service, in the field or at the plough, and, when that obligation was remitted, subject to a land tax intended to be equivalent to it. The first claim of the State has been foregone; the second has for two centuries been successfully evaded: but the original wrongdoers have been so long in their graves, and so much of the land has come into the hands of new possessors, who have bought it with their earnings at a price calculated on the unjust exemption, that the resumption of the land without indemnity would be correcting one injustice by another, while, if weighted with due compensation, it would be a measure of very doubtful profit to the State. But, though the State cannot replace itself in the fortunate condition in which it would now have been if it had reserved to itself from the beginning the whole rent of the land, this is no reason why it should go on committing the same mistake, and deprive itself of that natural increase of the rent which the possessors derive from the mere progress of wealth and population, without any exertion or sacrifice of their own. If the Grosvenor, Portman, and Portland estates belonged to the municipality of London, the gigantic incomes of those estates would probably suffice for the whole expense of the local government of the capital. But these gigantic incomes are still swelling; by the growth of London they may again be doubled, in as short a time as they have doubled already: and what have the possessors done, that this increase of wealth, produced by other people’s labour and enterprise, should fall into their mouths as they sleep, instead of being applied to the public necessities of those who created it? It is maintained, therefore, by land reformers, that special taxation may justly be levied upon landed property, up to, though not exceeding, this unearned increase; excess being guarded against by leaving the possessors free to cede their land to the State at the price they could sell it for at the time when the tax is imposed, but no higher price to be claimable on account of any increase of value afterwards, unless proved to have been the effect of improvements made at the landlord’s expense. Now, if the nation would be justified in thus reasserting its claim to the unearned increase of value, even when it has allowed the legal right to that increase to pass into the hands of individuals; how much more ought it to prevent further legal rights of this description from being acquired by those who do not now possess them? The landed estates of public bodies are not family property; the interest that any individual has in them is never more than a life interest, often much less; the increase of value by lapse of time would go to enrich nobody knows whom, and its appropriation by the State would give no one the shadow of a moral title to compensation. But if these lands are sold to individuals,
they become hereditary, and can only be repurchased by the State at their full value as a perpetuity.

Neither would this compulsory sale be attended with any of the advantages in the form of increased production, which would result from facilitating the voluntary sale of land by individual to individual. As long as, by the theory and practice of landed proprietorship, the landlord of an estate is a mere sinecurist quartered on it, improvement by the landlord is an accident dependent on his personal tastes. But he who sells his land, voluntarily or from necessity, is almost always below the average of landlords in disposition and ability to improve; the tendency of the change of proprietors is, therefore, in favour of improvement. But there is no reason to think that public bodies in general are worse than average landlords in any particular; it is matter of common remark that they are less grasping: and, if they do not come up to the most enterprising landlords in what they themselves accomplish, they leave more power of improvement, and more encouragement to it, to their tenants, than the majority of private landlords. It would, therefore, be no gain, but all loss, to reinforce the enemies of the reform of landed tenure by the addition of a new class of wealthy hereditary landholders, quartered upon land which is as yet devoted more or less faithfully to public uses. If public bodies are required to part with their lands, they should part with them to the State, and to that alone.

Whether it is desirable that such bodies should be holders of lands; whether it is wise that their time and attention should be divided between their appointed duties, certain to be enforced with increasing strictness as improvement goes on, and the management of a tenantry, with the duties which, if private property in land continues to exist, are sure to be more and more attached to it,—is a question of the future, which it may be left to the future to decide. We do not think it can be properly decided, until the fermentation now going on in the public mind respecting the constitution of landed property, has subsided into a definite conviction respecting the end to be aimed at and the means of practically drawing nearer to that end. But the time has come for announcing with the utmost decision, and we hope to see land reformers uniting as one body in the demand, that no private appropriation of land, not yet private property, shall hereafter take place under any circumstances or on any pretext.

J.S. Mill
427.

THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY IN LAND

EXAMINER, 19 JULY, 1873, PP. 725-8

This is the last of three articles on land reform (see Nos. 425-6). Not listed in Mill’s bibliography, it appeared posthumously, headed as title, in the “Political and Social” section of the Examiner, Mill having died in Avignon on 7 May, 1873. A footnote to the title reads: “We regret that, owing to unexpected delays, it has not been possible to compare the following paper with the original manuscript of Mr. Mill. This paper was written for the Land Tenure Reform Association.—Ed. Ex.” It appeared as a pamphlet, The Right of Property in Land. Reprinted from the Examiner of July 19, 1873 (London: Dallow, [1873]), and, edited by Helen Taylor, in Dissertations and Discussions, Vol. IV, pp. 288-302. A version printed from the MS (now lost) appeared as Appendix B in The Letters of John Stuart Mill, ed. Hugh S.R. Elliot, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, 1910), Vol. II, pp. 387-95. The text below is that of the Examiner, which has been collated with those of the pamphlet, Dissertations and Discussions, and Elliot. In the variant notes, “E” signals Elliot’s version, and “P” signals the pamphlet and Dissertations and Discussions (which agree in substantives).

Rights of property are of several kinds. There is the property which a person has in things that he himself has made. There is property in what one has received as a recompense for making something for somebody else, or for doing any service to somebody else, among which services must be reckoned that of lending to him what one has made, or honestly come by. There is property in what has been freely given to one, during life or at death, by the person who made it or honestly came by it, whatever may have been the motive of the gift,—personal affection, or because one had some just claim on him, or because he thought one would use it well, or as he would wish it to be used. All these are rights to things which are the produce of labour; and they all resolve themselves into the right of every person to do as he pleases with his own labour, and with the produce or earnings of his labour, either by applying them to his own use, or exchanging them for other things, or bestowing them upon other persons at his own choice.

But there is another kind of property which does not come under any of these descriptions, nor depend upon this principle. This is the ownership which persons are allowed to exercise over things not made by themselves, nor made at all. Such is property in land; including in that term what is under the surface as well as what is upon it. This kind of property, if legitimate, must rest on some other justification than the right of the labourer to what he has created by his labour. The land is not of man’s creation; and for a person to appropriate to himself a mere gift of nature, not made to him in particular, but which belonged as much to all others until he took possession of it, is primum facie an injustice to all the rest. Even if he did not obtain it by usurpation, but by just distribution; even if, at the first foundation of a settlement, the land was
equitably parcelled out among all the settlers (which has sometimes been the case),
there is an apparent wrong to posterity, or at least to all those subsequently born who
do not inherit a share. To make such an institution just, it must be shown to be
conducive \(^{b}\) to \(^{b}\) the general interest, in which this disinherited portion of the
community has its part.

The general verdict of civilised nations \(^{c}\) has \(^{c}\) hitherto been that this justification does
exist. The private appropriation of land has been deemed to be beneficial to those who
do not, as well as to those who do, obtain a share. And in what manner beneficial? Let
us take particular note of this. Beneficial, because the strongest interest which the
community and the human race have in the land is that it should yield the largest
amount of food, and other necessary \(^{d}\) or \(^{d}\) useful things required by the community.
Now, though the land itself it not the work of human beings, its produce is; and to
obtain enough of that produce somebody must exert much labour, and, in order that
this labour may be supported, must expend a considerable amount of the savings of
previous labour. Now we have been taught by experience that the great majority of
mankind will work much harder, and make much greater pecuniary sacrifices for
themselves and their immediate descendants than for the public. In order, therefore, to
give the greatest encouragement to production, it has been thought right that
individuals should have an exclusive property in land, so that they may have the most
possible to gain by making the land as productive as they can, and may be in no
danger of being hindered from doing so by the interference of \(^{e}\) any one \(^{e}\) else. This is
the reason usually assigned for allowing \(\text{the}\) land to be private property, and it is the
best reason that can be given.

Now, when we know the reason of a thing, we know what ought to be its limits. The
limits of the reason ought to be the limits of the thing. The thing itself should stop
where the reason stops. The land not having been made by the owner, nor by any one
to whose rights he has succeeded, and the justification of private ownership \(^{g}\) in \(^{g}\) land
being the interest it gives to the owner in the good cultivation of the land, the rights of
the owner ought not to be stretched \(^{h}\) farther \(^{h}\) than this purpose requires. No rights to
the land should be recognised which do not act as a motive to the person who has
power over it, to make it as productive, or otherwise as useful to mankind, as possible.
Anything beyond this exceeds the reason of the case, and is an injustice to the
remainder of the community.

It cannot be said that landed property, as it exists in the United Kingdom, conforms to
this condition. The legal rights of the landlord much exceed what is necessary to
afford a motive to improvement. They do worse; they tend, in many ways, to obstruct,
and do really obstruct, improvement.

For one thing, the landlord has the right, which he often exercises, of keeping the land
not only unimproved, but uncultivated, in order to maintain an inordinate quantity of
wild animals for what he calls sport. This right, at all events, cannot be defended as a
means of promoting improvement.

Again, if the purpose in allowing private ownership of the land were to provide the
strongest possible motive to its good cultivation, the ownership would be vested in the
actual cultivator. But in England almost all the land of the country is cultivated by
tenant-farmers, who not only are not the proprietors, but, in the majority of cases,
have not even a lease, but may be dispossessed at six months’ notice. If those lands
are well cultivated, it cannot be in consequence of the rights of the landlord. If those
rights have any effect \[\text{at all on cultivation},\] it must be to make it bad, not good. If
farmers with such a tenure cultivate well, it is a proof that property in land is not
necessary for good cultivation.

But \[\text{it will be said},\] if the mere cultivation can be, and is, satisfactorily carried on by
tenants-at-will, it is not so with the great and costly improvements which have
converted so much barren land into fertile. The returns to those improvements are slow; and a temporary holder, even if he has the necessary capital, will not make
them. They can seldom be made, and, in point of fact, seldom are made, by any one
but the proprietor. And, as a certain number of landed proprietors do make such
improvements, the institution of property in land is thought to be sufficiently
vindicated.

Giving all the weight to this consideration which it is entitled to, the claim it gives to
the landlord is not to all the possible proceeds of the land, but to such parts of them
only as are the result of his own improvements, or of improvements made by
predecessors in whose place he stands. Whatever portion of them is due, not to his
labour or outlay, but to the labour and outlay of other people, should belong to those
other people. If the tenant has added anything to the value of the land beyond the
duration of his tenancy, the landlord should be bound to purchase the improvement,
whether permanent or temporary, at its full value. If the nation at large, by their
successful exertions to increase the wealth of the country, have enhanced the value of
the land independently of anything done by the landlord or the tenant, that increase
of value should belong to the nation. That it should do so is not only consistent with
the principles on which landed property confessedly depends for its justification, but
is a consequence of those very principles.

Now, the labours of the nation at large do add daily and yearly to the value of the
land, whether the landlord plays the part of an improver or not. The growth of towns,
the extension of manufactures, the increase of population consequent on increased
employment, create a constantly increasing demand for land both for the habitations
of the people and for the supply of food and the materials of clothing. They also
create a constantly increasing demand for coal, iron, and all the other produce of
mining industry. By this increase of demand the landed proprietors largely profit,
without in any way contributing to it. The income from rural lands has a constant
tendency to increase; that from building lands still more: and with this increase of
their incomes the owners of the land have nothing to do except to receive it.

The Land Tenure Reform Association claim this increase for those who are its real
authors. They do not propose to deprive the landlords of their present rents, nor of
anything which they may hereafter add to those rents by their own improvements. The
future Unearned Increase is what the Association seek to withdraw from them, and
to retain for those to whose labours and sacrifices, from generation to generation, it
will really be due. The means by which it is proposed to accomplish this is Special
Taxation. Over and above the fair share of the landlords in the general taxation of the public, they may justly be required to pay hereafter a special tax, within the limits of the increase which may accrue to their present income from causes independent of themselves.

Against this proposal it is objected that many landholders have bought the lands they hold, and in buying them had in view not only their present rental, but the probability of future increase; of which increase, therefore, it would be unjust to deprive them. But the Association do not propose to deprive them of it without compensation. In the plan of the Association the landlords would have the right reserved to them of parting with their land to the State, immediately or at any future time, at the price for which they could sell it at the time when the plan is adopted. By availing themselves of this option, they would not only get back whatever they had paid for the prospect of future increase, but would obtain the full price for which they could have sold that future prospect at the time when the new system was introduced. They would be left, therefore, in a pecuniary sense, exactly as well off as they were before: while the State would gain the difference between the price of the land at the time and the higher value which, according to all probability, it would afterwards rise to. There would be no transfer of private property to the State, but only an interception by the State of an increase of property, which would otherwise accrue at a future time to private individuals without their giving any value for it; since they would have been reimbursed whatever money they had given, and would even have received the full present value of their expectations.

There is another objection commonly made, which is disposed of by the same answer. It is often said that land, and particularly land in towns, is liable to lose value as well as to gain it. Certain quarters of London cease to be fashionable; and are deserted by their opulent inhabitants; certain towns lose a portion of their trading prosperity when railway communication enables purchasers to supply themselves cheaply from elsewhere. Those cases, however, are the exception, not the rule: and when they occur, what is lost in one quarter is gained in another, and there is the general gain due to the prosperity of the country besides. If some landlords, for exceptional reasons, do not partake in the benefit, neither will they have to pay the tax. They will be exactly where they are now. If it be said that as they took the chance of a diminution they ought to have the counter-balancing chance of an increase, the answer is that the power of giving up the land at its existing price, in which both chances are allowed for, makes the matter even. Indeed, more than even. No one would benefit so much by the proposed measure as those whose land might afterwards fall in value; for they would be able to claim the former price from the State, although they could no longer obtain so much from individuals. By giving up the rise of value, they would obtain an actual State guarantee against a fall. And this would be no loss to the State; for every such fall in one quarter, unless owing to a decline of the general prosperity, implies a corresponding rise somewhere else, of which rise the State would have the benefit.

A third objection is sometimes made. Land, it is said, is not the only article of property which rises in value from the mere effect of the advance of national wealth, independently of anything done by the proprietor. Pictures by the old masters, ancient
sculptures, rare curiosities of all sorts, have the same tendency. If it is not unjust to
deprive the landlord of the unearned increase of the value of his land, by the same rule
the increase of value of Raphael's and Titians might be taken from their fortunate
possessor and appropriated by the State.

Were this true in principle it would lead to no consequences in practice, since the
revenue which could be obtained by even a very high tax on these rare and scattered
possessions would not be worth consideration to a prosperous country. But it is not
ture, even in principle.

Objects of art, however rare or incomparable, differ from land and its contents in this
essential particular, that they are products of labour. Objects of high art are products
not only of labour but of sacrifice. The pains, patience, and care necessary for
producing works which will be competed for by future ages, are far from being those
from which the greatest immediate, and especially the greatest pecuniary, advantage
is reaped by the artist. Such works almost always imply renunciation of a great part of
the gains which might easily have been obtained by hasty and marketable
productions; and often could not be produced at all, unless the few purchasers who are
able to distinguish the immortal from the ephemeral, could feel that they might,
without imprudence, pay a high price for works which would be a fortune to their
descendants. The prospective rise in price of works of art is by no means an unearned
increase: the best productions of genius and skill alone obtain that honour, while the
increasing value of land is indiscriminate. Governments do not think it improper to
disburse considerable sums in order to foster high art and encourage the taste for it
among the public. Much more, then, should they not grudge to the artist what may
come to him spontaneously from the estimate which good judges form of what his
productions will sell for long after he is dead. We grant that in many cases the
increased value does not reach the artist himself; but is an addition, and sometimes an
unlooked-for addition, to the gains of a middleman, who may have bought, at a very
moderate price, works which subsequent accident or fashion suddenly brings into
vogue. This is a contingency to which artists, like all other workmen, are liable; if
they are unable to wait they may be obliged to sell their future chances below the true
value, to somebody who can. But they obtain, on the average, a higher remuneration
for their labour than they could obtain if they had no such chances to sell. And it must
be remembered that, along with his chances of profit, the dealer takes the risk of loss.
Changes in the public taste and judgment may take place either way: if some works
which may have been bought cheap acquire a high value, others for which a high
price has been paid go out of fashion, gradually or even suddenly. If dealers are
exposed to the one chance, they must have the benefit of the other. Were they
deprived of it, their useful function, by which, until replaced by something better,
artists are greatly benefited, could not be carried on.

Neither can it be said, as in the case of land, that receiving the market price of the day
would compensate the holder for the chances of future increase. There is no market
price of such things, and the future increase has no common standard of estimation; it
is a matter of individual judgment; and, even if an average could be struck, it would
not compensate any one for the disappointment of his own expectation. The objection,
therefore, from the supposed parallel case fails in its application: the cases are not really parallel.*

Other objectors say that, if it is allowable to take the unearned increase of the value of land, it must, for the same reasons, be allowable to take for the public the unearned increase of the price of railway shares. But the fallacy is here so transparent as scarcely to require pointing out. In the first place, every penny which is obtained by railway shareholders is not the gift of nature, but the earnings and recompense of human labour and thrift. In the next place, railway shares fall in price as frequently as they rise, which is far from being the case with land. If it be said that the prosperity of the country tends to increase the gains of railway shareholders as well as those of landlords, the same national prosperity leads to the creation of competing railroads, and of new and comparatively unproductive branches, so as to take away from the old shareholders with one hand nearly, if not quite, as much as it bestows on them with the other. The two cases, therefore, differ in the essential point.

We have now, we think, exhausted the objections of principle which are usually made to the detention by the State of the unearned increment of rent. It has, we think, been shown that they are all of them such as a very little consideration of the subject is sufficient to dispel. But, besides these theoretical, there are practical objections, in appearance more formidable, but, as we shall be able to show, quite as inconclusive.

It is alleged that, granting the justice of claiming the unearned increase for the State, there are no means of ascertaining what it is. It would be impossible\(^a\), it is said,\(^a\) to distinguish the increase of rent which arises from the general progress of society, from that which is owing to the skill and outlay of the proprietor: and in intercepting the former there would be perpetual danger of unjustly encroaching upon the latter.

There would be some ground for this objection in a country of peasant proprietors. The improvements made by such a class of landowners consist more in the ungrudging and assiduous application of their own labour and care, and in attention to small gains and petty savings, than in important works, or in the expenditure of money. It would really be very difficult, if not impossible, to determine how much the proprietor and his family had done in any given number of years to improve the productiveness or add to the value of the land.

But it is quite otherwise with the improvements made by rich landlords, like those who own nearly all the soil of the British Islands. What they do for the land is done by outlay of money, through the agency of skilled engineers and superintendents. It is easy to register operations\(^b\), for instance,\(^b\) of thorough drainage, and to ascertain and record, as one of the elements in the case, the cost of those operations. Their effect in adding to the value of the land has a natural measure in the increased rent which a solvent tenant would be willing to pay for it; and the whole of that increase, whether great or small, we would leave to the landlord.

The possibility of a valuation of unexhausted improvements is assumed as a matter of notoriety in all the discussions, now so common, respecting Tenant Right. It is already a custom in many parts of England to compensate an outgoing tenant for these
improvements. What is a custom in many places will soon, it is probable, be made a legal obligation in all; and among the objections made to its imposition by law, we are never told of the impossibility of doing it. But if it is possible to value the effect of temporary improvements, why should it be impossible to value the effect of permanent improvements? A Bill compelling a valuation of both, and giving compensation both alike, has been introduced into the House of Commons by a high agricultural authority, Mr. James Howard, and has met with influential support. 2

Yet if this be possible, the object is completely attained, for there is no other difficulty. The fact of an increase of rent is easily ascertained. There is nothing needed but the trouble and expense of registering the facts. It might be necessary to have a survey of the whole country, ascertaining and recording the conditions of every tenancy, and to renew this operation periodically, say every ten or twenty years. This is not so difficult as the cadastral operations of some continental countries, or the revenue surveys of British India, for these undertake to determine, by special inquiry, what rent each piece of land is capable of yielding. In the proposed survey it would suffice to record what it does yield; allowing the landlord, if he can, to prove that it is under-rented, in which case he ought not to suffer for his past moderation.

It should be understood, also, that no intention is entertained of paring down the increment of rent to the utmost farthing. We assert in principle, the right of taking it all: in practice we have no desire to insist upon the extreme right, at any risk of going beyond it. No doubt, the option allowed to the landlord of giving up the land at its existing value, would secure him against pecuniary wrong; but we should be sorry to trade upon his reluctance to give up an ancestral possession, or one endeared to him by association. We would leave, therefore, an ample margin by way of insurance against mistakes in the institution. We would not insist upon taking the last penny of the unearned increase. But we maintain that within that limit taxation on the land, in addition to the landlord’s share of all other taxes, may justly be, and ought to be, imposed. We contend that a tax on land, not preceding but following the future increase of its value, and increasing with that increase, is a legitimate financial resource; and that it is for the individual landlord, by making an authentic record of what he does for the land, to preserve evidence that its increase of rent is the consequence and rightful reward of his own intelligent improvements.

This is the meaning of the fourth article in the programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association; 3 and the reasons which have now been given are its justification. The more it is considered the more general, we believe, will be the adhesion to it of those whose regard for property is not a superstition but an intelligent conviction, and who do not consider landlords as entitled to pecuniary privilege but only to equal justice.

J.S. Mill
APPENDICES
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CAVAIGNAC’S DEFENCE

EXAMINER, 24 APR., 1831, PP. 266-7

For the context and for the introduction Mill wrote to this translation by him of Godefroy Cavaignac’s speech during his trial, see No. 101. Cavaignac’s father, Jean Baptiste Cavaignac (1762-1829), was a Montagnard during the Convention, which he served on various missions. Proscribed as a regicide, he died in Brussels. In the Examiner the speech appeared in quotation marks, here removed.

my father was one of those who, on the benches of the National Convention, proclaimed the republic in the face of victorious Europe. He defended it in our armies. For this he died in exile, after twelve years of proscription; and, while even the Restoration was forced to leave France in possession of the fruits of that revolution which he had sowed; while it loaded with its favours the men whom the republic had raised, my father and his colleagues suffered alone for the great cause which so many others betrayed; a last homage of their impotent old age, to that country which they had so vigorously defended.

That cause, then, is bound up, gentlemen, with all my feelings as a son; the principles which it embraced are my inheritance. Study has fortified me in the direction which my political ideas so naturally assumed; and now, when I have at length a fit occasion, I hasten to utter a word which others proscribe. I declare, without affectation, as well as without feigning, that in my heart, from conviction, I am a republican.

But it would not have been in me a sufficient reason for adopting my opinions, that a republic seemed to me, in itself, the least imperfect of governments: I have endeavoured to form an estimate of the times, to judge whether a republic is practicable, and I have perceived, not only that it is possible, but that it is inevitable; that all things are moving in that direction; the course of events, the human mind, and outward things. I have perceived, that it is impossible for the movement which now rules the world to end in any thing but in a republic.

This tendency, gentlemen, has long been pointed out. Napoleon acknowledged it; M. de Châteaubriand has more than once proclaimed it, although neither of them can well be suspected of partiality for republican principles. The present government itself has admitted this tendency: it declared itself at first a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions; and, although the union of these words is truly monstrous; although, as has been said, they howl at finding themselves together, it was imagined
that they were seen engraved by the cannon-balls of July on the walls of the Hotel de Ville.

Gentlemen, this futurity, now so near to us, which is perceived even by those who turn away their faces in terror, is the true source of republicanism in those who are capable of reflecting upon it, and who do not embrace it from schoolboy enthusiasm. They cultivate it, for this reason, that every man of sense prepares himself beforehand for a result which he foresees, of which he will be a witness, and which he judges to be infallible. They are not republicans in remembrance of Rome or of Athens, that would be too silly: they are not so on account of the past, but on account of the future.

Now, it is precisely because the future appears to them certain, that they do not conspire. Why should they? If there is a party in France that does not conspire, it is the republican party, for it is convinced that it has only to let things alone. That those should conspire for whom every day is a chance the less; who are obliged to have recourse to their personal energy, to try a toss of the political dice-box, because their age rejects them, because they have no resource but plots, no futurity but what they must stake their heads for, that I can conceive. No doubt, there is at least one party of this sort in France; but the republican party must be mad if they compromised a cause of which the success is infallible, by ineffectual attempts. They must be frantic indeed if they exposed to the justice of kings, heads which may safely rest themselves upon the fortune of the people.

Gentlemen, if that party had chosen to conspire, they had the power. They had the power in the great week, and that under the open sunshine of July, in the public streets. They had the power, and the proof is, that it was thought advisable to negociate with them: my defender can attest it if necessary. Even on the 30th of July several of us, among whom were Guinard and myself, were conducted to the lieutenant-general of the kingdom.

And I declare it openly, we spoke to him with the same freedom which I employ now; we have long professed the opinions which I profess still; and hence all this distrust of our intentions: but (not to mention that it would have been a little too ingenuous) nobody asked him to proclaim a republic. “Consult the nation, it alone has the right to choose its government.” That is what we advised, that is what we think: the sovereignty of the people is the foundation of our principles; and when we are accused of wishing to impose upon the people an order of things which they alone have the right to establish, what is asserted is a falsehood.

Gentlemen, with what we have to wait for, it is easy to wait. Those who know that the future is theirs, can afford to have patience: besides, we are young, and in these days the world moves rapidly: and to express our idea in its completeness, I shall repeat what we have sometimes said to those who thought that more might have been done in July. You will understand the better, how any conspiracy must appear to us the act of simpletons.

A revolution, however admirable, however easy it may have been, is always followed by immense difficulties. Monarchy has taken upon itself the task; so much the worse
for monarchy, and the better for us: if it is unsuccessful this time, all is over with it; and our conviction is, that it cannot be successful; for nations in these days are eaten into by so deep-seated, so inexplicable, so corrosive a disease, there is in society so powerful a principle of dissolution acting upon all the machinery of power, that the machine needs to be entirely renovated; and really, looking at the wants which torment the world, it would seem that even a God would find it easier to reconstruct it altogether than to govern it.

This new combination, we said, satisfies many minds; it is counted upon. General Lafayette has rallied round it, with all the ascendancy of his immense popularity. Let us suffer the experiment to be complete; let us leave the burthen to those who take it; let us allow men and systems to be tried and laid down, one after another, for some time longer. When your turn comes, you will still have enough to do. In the rapid course into which society has been projected, men and systems succeed one another to conduct it to its destination: the last relay is the one which will arrive, and that one is you. We are living in the age of suicide-governments. The monarchy will do our work; it will exhaust itself without your interference; it will conspire for you.

Yes, it is thus, gentlemen, that we understand our position. We do not conspire; we hold ourselves ready. At an epoch when the whole of a people mingle in politics, there are no more conspiracies; that was well enough at a time when the contest was among a few persons, alternately conquerors and conquered; when an entire party was held in the hand of one principal conspirator. In our days, there is no man who has a hand sufficiently large, sufficiently strong. The public streets are the only theatre large enough for those masses, which act at nobody’s will and pleasure, which it is no more possible for any one to raise, than it is to resist them when they have risen.

In the era of revolutions, conspiracies are good for nothing. We know it of old. We conspired for a long time against the Bourbons. What came of it? A mere unavailing protest against foreign usurpation: a break in the line of prescription, sufficient to keep alive the consciousness of a right to resist oppression. With this, the flight of some, the ruin of others, the death of those who have shed upon the scaffold their blood, the purest blood of patriots. Then, one fine day, the people, who did not conspire, threw themselves into the streets, and extemporized in a few hours that deliverance so long sought for.

This is what we have learnt, and what we shall not forget: and the evidence has proved it. Let others, too, remember it, and renounce for the future this bugbear of republican conspiracies. We hope that this trial will put them out of conceit with it. We are not children, and we have a better use to make of our lives than to stake them for what is unavailing. This court has so often resounded with the words, “plot against the safety of the state,” that there are, perhaps, here some echoes to prolong the sound, but none will hereafter be found out of doors. Charlatans will cease to make their profit out of this imaginary evil, and our accuser will have done this service to the country, in default of a better.

The accused have perhaps a right to claim some share in this service. Placed before you, without any celebrated name to join itself to their cause, they have had
confidence in you and in themselves, for you and they are men of honour, who need nobody’s assistance to serve the truth: and if this trial is of use to our country, we find our reward already in the means which it affords us of loudly and openly making answer to our calumniators.

Our blood is not our own,—it belongs to our country—to our country which we love, because it deserves that its children should love it; because it has made them free, because it is great, because it is dear, useful, and formidable, to the rest of the world. It is to the country that we are devoted—devoted, body and soul; not like fanatics, who are intoxicated by a word, but like brave men, who are happy to find something in this world to which it is noble, just, and sweet to consecrate their affections and their lives.

These, gentlemen, are our sentiments, these our principles, for we do not separate the one from the other. And yet we are here, we are in the place where several of our brothers stood to hear their sentence of death pronounced in the name of Louis XVIII. Were I to turn round, and see in the caps of the soldiers who guard us that tri-coloured cockade which we have restored to them, I could not believe my eyes. Were they the Swiss, or the soldiery of the royal guard, I should understand it. Then, we should go back to the time of our dear and ill-fated Bories, and thinking that Charles X still reigned, we should not be astonished that it is wished to make us victims, as Charles X would have done if he had been the conqueror eight months ago.
LETTRE À CHARLES DUVEYRIER

LE GLOBE, 18 APR., 1832, P. 1

For the circumstances and Mill’s bibliographical entries explaining this letter to *Le Globe*, which later appeared in English in the *Monthly Repository*, see No. 158, where the footnotes and variants are recorded. Mill had planned to write a series of letters, but as *Le Globe* ceased publication on 20 Apr., this remains his only contribution to the paper. A letter of 12 Mar., 1832, from Duveyrier (who was in London) to Enfantin was printed in *Le Globe*, 10 Mar., p. 1; it includes this comment: “Je vous ai dit qu’un des plus forts penseurs de Londres, jeune homme connu dans le monde philosophique, se proposait d’entreprendre une série de lettres sur l’état moral et politique de l’Angleterre, surtout dans ses rapports avec la France. Ces lettres ne peuvent être entièrement écrites au point de vue Saint-Simonien; mais l’auteur appelle lui-même les commentaires du *Globe* sur toutes les questions à l’égard desquelles il peut conserver encore un jugement différent du nôtre; et cette discussion, avec une puissance scientifique d’un ordre très élevé, ne peut qu’être d’une grande utilité pour les lecteurs du *Globe*.” This French version (not translated by Mill, and abridged) was headed “Politique. / Angleterre. / (Correspondance particulière.) Lettre à Ch. Duveyrier.”

mon cher duveyrier, vous m’avez demandé de correspondre de temps à autre avec le rédacteur du *Globe*, afin de lui fournir tous les éclaircissements qu’on ne peut attendre que d’un Anglais bien au courant de vos doctrines. J’accepte votre proposition; j’avais déjà songé moi-même à ce travail, et j’aurais probablement réclamé spontanément tôt ou tard la mission honorable à laquelle vous m’appelez aujourd’hui.

Mais avant de commencer cette correspondance, je dois à moi-même et à ceux auxquels elle est destinée, d’exposer plus amplement même que je ne l’ai pu faire dans nos entretiens particuliers, les motifs qui me la font entreprendre. Je le veux d’autant mieux qu’il y a là une instruction réelle à puiser pour les lecteurs du *Globe*. Pour un Saint-Simonien qui désire connaître l’Angleterre, il ne peut être indifférent de savoir quelles sont les considérations qui engagent un Anglais non Saint-Simonien, et même ne s’accordant avec les Saint-Simoniens, d’une manière complète, sur aucun point, quoique sur tous les points il partage à un certain degré leurs opinions; quelles sont, dis-je, les considérations qui engagent cet homme à se mettre en rapport avec la société Saint-Simonienne.

Vous imaginerez peut-être que le motif qui m’anime est un désir de contribuer pour ma part au but que vous poursuivez avec tant de succès et qui est d’amener deux nations possédant chacune tant d’éléments de grandeur et de prospérité, à se comprendre l’une l’autre, à se rendre mutuellement justice, et à se conformer à cette volonté de la providence qui a donné à chacune d’elles un caractère différent, leur a,
par là même, assigné une mission différente, et leur a ainsi commandé de poursuivre le but commun de l’association humaine par des routes séparées quoique non pas contraires. Certes on ne peut se refuser d’attribuer, avec les Saint-Simoniens, à cette combinaison et cette division d’efforts un caractère providentiel. Pour toute intelligence vaste, pour tout homme qui a soif d’une perfectibilité indéfinie, il y a là sujet de se réjouir. Le philosophe y doit trouver une source féconde d’observations sur l’éducation de la race humaine; et c’est là aussi la plus grande garantie offerte au développement simultané de tous les modes de la nature humaine où chacun doit se faire sa place sans comprimer les autres dans leur croissance.

Vous avez raison de penser que j’ai pour ma part cet objet fort à cœur, et que le zèle que vous mettez vous-mêmes à l’accomplir n’est pas un des moindres liens qui existent entre vous et moi. Je sens même parfaitement qu’au point de vue où vous êtes placés, ce doit être là le résultat le plus essentiel que vous vous promettez de ma correspondance. Et cependant, je dois vous le dire, ce motif n’est pas le seul ni même le plus important à mes yeux, de ceux qui m’engagent à choisir le Globe, autant du moins que vous me le permettrez, pour y déposer l’expression de mes opinions et des mes sentiments; il y a pour moi, dis-je, une raison plus puissante de le faire, et la voici: c’est que parmi les lecteurs de ce journal seulement, et nulle part ailleurs, je puis trouver un public capable de comprendre ces opinions et de sympathiser avec ces sentiments; et les membres de votre société offrent la seule réunion de penseurs et d’écrivains avec lesquels il peut être utile, pour le présent, d’entreprendre de les discuter.

Certes il est peu nécessaire de rappeler ici que les Saint-Simoniens sont maintenant la seule association au monde qui soulève systématiquement par la base toutes les grandes questions sociales. Celles-là même qui ont été fixées il y a long-temps sur un terrain que les révolutions n’ont pas encore entièrement bouleversé; celles-là même sur lesquelles les solutions anciennes, quelques affaiblies qu’elles aient pu l’être dans leur influence pratique, n’ont pas cessé de conserver une autorité généralement reconnue. Vous déclarez que toutes les questions sociales doivent être reprises de nouveau, et tandis que, de ce point de vue, vous proposez sur tous les sujets vos propres solutions, vous appelez tous ceux qui ont capacité à faire de même, vous êtes prêts à écouter, désireux de comprendre tous les hommes.

Si en France même cette tentative nous a exposés à tant de fausses interprétations et de haines, il est tout-à-fait impossible qu’aucune réunion d’écrivains pût d’ici à long-temps se lever en Angleterre et entreprendre de vous imiter. En Angleterre il n’y a, quant à présent, aucune place pour les théories générales: à moins toutefois qu’on ne veuille donner ce nom à ces étroites généralisations d’étroites idées qui n’obligent point les esprits même les moins cultivés à sortir de l’horizon rétréci de leur sphère habituelle. Michel Chevalier a souvent présenté dans le Globe cette idée que l’Allemagne a sur toutes les autres nations une supériorité marquée sous le rapport de la science et de l’intelligence, l’Angleterre, sous le rapport de l’industrie, et la France, à raison du développement sympathique de sa population, sous le rapport de la moralité. Ainsi la nation allemande est éminemment spéculative, la nation anglaise est essentiellement pratique, et les Français présentent l’union de ces deux qualités,
puisqu’ils possèdent à un degré égal la faculté de construire des théories générales et de réduire les théories en pratique.

Si donc un homme a quelques idées qu’il regarde comme important de communiquer à un public allemand, c’est une recommandation positive en sa faveur que de les présenter comme portion d’un système plus général fondé sur un ensemble de vues historiques, sur une conception de philosophie, de littérature et de beaux-arts; une pareille marche s’accorderait parfaitement avec la tendance de l’esprit germain. Des vues très étendues, et par cette raison même ne comportant qu’une réalisation à distance et graduée, ont plus de chances de trouver accueil dans cette contrée que celles d’une moindre portée. En France même, si le caractère général et systématique d’une idée n’est pas une cause positive de succès, il n’est pas non plus une cause positive de défaveur; mais en Angleterre c’est tout l’opposé.

Le caractère éminemment pratique des Anglais, ce caractère qui leur donne, en tant qu’hommes d’affaires et industriels, une supériorité incontestable sur toutes les nations de l’Europe, a en même temps pour résultat de les rendre très peu soucieux de tout ce qui ne conduit pas à une pratique instantanée. Les Anglais, même en politique, ne se sont jamais laissé émouvoir par des abstractions; ils ont combattu pour certaines lois spéciales, mais jamais pour un principe de législation. Les doctrines de la souveraineté du peuple et des droits de l’homme n’ont jamais jeté de profondes racines dans ce pays. Il y a eu clameurs publiques pour obtenir certains changements particuliers dans le mode d’élection des membres de la chambre des communes, pour provoquer quelque acte spécial du parlement comme remède à quelque souffrance actuelle, pour faire supprimer quelque taxe particulière, etc. Le public anglais ne pense pas qu’un homme vaille la peine d’être écouté toutes les fois qu’il ne propose pas quelque chose à faire, et même quelque chose à faire immédiatement. Il y a plus, les seules raisons qui puissent en général faire impression sur lui sont celles qui se rattachent aux conséquences directes d’une proposition spéciale.

Celui donc qui désire produire un effet immédiat sur le public anglais doit présenter chaque idée assise autant que possible sur sa propre base, et doit je dirai presque s’efforcer de cacher le lien qui rattache cette idée à une série d’autres idées. Si les lecteurs venaient à soupçonner que cette proposition rentre dans un système, ils en concluraient que celui qui la présente ne la regarde pas comme étant bonne intrinsèquement et par elle-même, mais comme bonne seulement par sa liaison avec des idées chimériques, ou tout au moins avec des principes auxquels, pour me servir d’une expression vraiment anglaise, ils ne sont pas préparés à donner leur assentiment.

Pour vous qui savez que la politique est une science éminemment progressive, et qu’aucune des grandes questions de l’organisation sociale ne peut recevoir sa solution à moins d’être considérée dans ses rapports avec un ensemble de vues qui plongent loin dans le passé et loin dans l’avenir; pour vous il est à peine nécessaire de faire la remarque qu’il doit y avoir dans votre langage beaucoup de choses qui dans le moment actuel ne peuvent aucunement aller au peuple d’Angleterre. Quand on s’adresse à des Anglais il faut avoir soin de ne jamais les entretenir que du pas qui doit être le plus immédiatement franchi, en ayant soin de tenir dans l’ombre tous ceux
qui doivent suivre. Quoique vous ayez à proposer, il faut resserrer votre raisonnement dans les limites les plus étroites; il faut établir l’opportunité de la mesure sur les considérations les plus restreintes possibles, et ne dépenser de vérités générales que ce qui est exactement et absolument indispensable pour arriver à la conclusion particulière dont on a besoin.

Or puisque le peuple anglais demande à être traité de cette manière, il faut bien se prêter à sa volonté, et ceux qui écrivent pour lui doivent prendre le langage le plus capable de l’impressionner. Lors donc que je vois qu’il serait bon que le parlement passât telle ou telle loi demain ou aujourd’hui, et que je crois de mon devoir de contribuer à l’y déterminer, je prendrais à tâche d’exposer au peuple anglais les avantages immédiats qui me paraissent devoir résulter de cette mesure; mais lorsque je désire amener la discussion sur le champ de la science ou de la philosophie, établir quelques principes généraux de politique, ou poser les questions dont la solution doit m’être donnée par d’autres, alors il faut que je m’adresse là où je puis espérer de trouver des lecteurs capables de comprendre et d’aimer de pareilles recherches, et des écrivains capables de s’en occuper.

Je vais à vous comme viennent en Europe les littérateurs et les artistes du pays de l’industrialisme pur des Etats-Unis d’Amérique: comme moi ils doivent chercher ailleurs que dans leur propre patrie une place pour leur vocation. Je conçois qu’en philosophie politique l’initiative appartient à la France dans ce moment, non pas tant à raison du nombre de vérités pratiques dont elle est en possession actuelle, qu’à cause de la hauteur bien plus grande à laquelle la discussion y est parvenue, hauteur dont l’Angleterre est encore éloignée de tout l’intervalle qui existe entre 1789 et 1832. Tout homme donc qui peut contribuer en quelque manière à l’élaboration de principes politiques, doit apporter le tribut de ses idées, quelles qu’elles puissent être, à la France, et entre tous vos compatriotes, à vous en particulier qui, sous presque tous les rapports, avez une si énorme avance.

J’ai encore un autre motif pour me mettre en communication avec les lecteurs du Globe. Tout Anglais que je suis, je crois les comprendre mieux que même aucune classe de mes compatriotes; la raison en est que vous avez des opinions bien déterminées sur tous les sujets qui intéressent vivement l’humanité, et loin d’en garder aucune en réserve, vous les produisez publiquement toutes les fois que l’occasion s’en présente: chez nous au contraire, quelles que soient les opinions d’un homme, jamais il ne les livre au public à moins d’y être naturellement amené par quelque événement du jour. Tout le reste il le garde pour lui, ou le met en réserve pour quelque ouvrage philosophique. Jamais vous ne pourrez dire quelle sorte d’hommes sont ceux que vous voyez lisant le Times ou le Morning-Chronicle, la Revue d’Edimbourg ou le Quarterly Review; tout au plus vous pourrez deviner s’ils sont tories, whigs ou radicaux: souvent même sur ce point vous devinerez mal; combien d’ailleurs cette qualification vous apprend peu des croyances essentielles d’un homme! Vous le savez mieux que personne; mais au contraire qu’un homme lise le Globe, ce fait seul vous révèle en grande partie son caractère, sa manière de penser. Moi en particulier qui depuis long-temps suis lecteur assidu de ce journal aussi bien que de toutes vos publications, je puis dire que je connais les opinions des Saint-Simoniens, que j’entends leur langage, que je sais enfin de quelle manière mes propres idées doivent
être présentées pour trouver accès auprès d’eux. Je n’en pourrais dire autant d’aucune classe de mes compatriotes à laquelle j’essaiera de m’adresser.

A toutes ces raisons pour entrer en correspondance avec vous, permettez-moi d’en ajouter une qui certes à elle seule serait bien suffisante: je veux parler de la haute admiration que je ne puis m’empêcher de ressentir pour le but que vous vous proposez et la manière dont vous y marchez. Lorsque je vois des hommes faire tout ce que font les Saint-Simoniens et sacrifier tout ce qu’ils sacrifient pour une doctrine qui renferme en elle tant de vérité, et qui, bien que je ne puisse l’adopter personnellement, doit, j’en suis convaincu, faire infiniment plus de bien par ce qu’elle a de bon, qu’elle ne peut faire de mal par ce qu’elle a de mauvais; avec ce spectacle devant moi il suffit que de pareils hommes pensent que je puis leur être de quelque utilité, pour que je réponde avec ardeur à leur appel, autant du moins que cette tâche pourra s’accorder avec mes devoirs supérieurs envers ma patrie.

J.
Appendix C

ENFANTIN’S FAREWELL ADDRESS

MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 APR., 1832, P. 1

After the Saint Simonians had given up Le Globe (see No. 158) and their attempts at proselytism as a result of government hostility, their leader Enfantin, with some forty disciples, retired to a semi-monastic existence at Ménilmontant outside Paris. His farewell address, which appeared translated in the Morning Chronicle, headed “St. Simonianism—Parting Address to the Public,” is not mentioned in Mill’s bibliography. However, it is identified as Mill’s translation in a letter to d’Eichthal and Duveyrier: “I did as d’Eichthal wished in regard to Father Enfantin’s parting address: after ascertaining that Black would print it, I translated it for him & it appeared in the Morning Chronicle (it was however very incorrectly printed)” (EL, CW, Vol. XII, p. 109).

i, the father of the new Family—

Before I impose silence on the voice, which every day announces to the world what we are, design that it should tell what I am.

God has given me a mission to call the poor, and women, to a new destiny;

To give admittance into the sacred Family of Man, to all those who have hitherto been excluded from it, or treated only as minors therein;

To realise that Universal Association, which the cries of liberty uttered by all the enslaved classes have been calling for, ever since the beginning of the world.

I have first addressed myself to the poor.

In the name of my Master, Saint Simon, I have announced to them the destruction of all the privileges of birth, by which the industrious are weighed down, and delivered up to the will and pleasure of the idle;

The termination of the wars which decimate them, and water with their blood that earth which is already bathed in their tears, and in the sweat of their brows;

The end of that hostile competition, which brings forth bankruptcy and indigence, crime, and the scaffold.

I spoke these things; but I spoke them in order to be heard, especially by those who ought to be the first to hear; by those who have the power to enfranchise, and who
domineer; who have the power to unite, and who divide; who have the power to purify, and who corrupt.

I spoke to them, and they endeavoured not to listen; but my word has entered into their ears in spite of themselves, and they are now pouring it forth from their lips, though they know it not.

I may, therefore, now leave to them the task of propagating it.

Men of all parties! I have drawn you into a new field of discussion; I leave you there. It is good for you that you should there see each other face to face, and seek in vain for the guide who has led you thither.

I affirm to you, that from this day forward there are no politics for you but that which was taught to us by our Master, and which, for the last seven years, we have unintermittingly proclaimed.

Parliamentary Government, and its bourgeoisie mysticism, are expiring;

Republicanism, and its popular anarchy, are unable to struggle into existence;

Legitimacy, and its privilégiés de château will not be resuscitated.

All social institutions must have for their end the improvement of the condition, moral, physical, and intellectual, of the poorest and most numerous class;

To each, labour according to his vocation, and recompence according to his works.

This is the Charter of Equality and Subordination of the time to come.

This, I say, is henceforth the only politics. For, from the moment when I shall have ceased to place every day under your eyes that Journal, in which, for sixteen months past, I have caused the Charter of the time to come to be engraven in characters ever new; from the moment when The Globe, which I have compelled you to read by giving it to you gratuitously, shall have ceased to appear, each of you will find in himself some fragments of that Paper which he will recite aloud as his own.

Once more, I affirm to you that ours is henceforth the only politics. For the inheritance we leave behind us is an arsenal, where those who wish to destroy will find weapons more potent than all those which they have employed up to this time; and it is also a treasure of strength and riches, when those who wish to preserve and to construct will find materials finer than the finest débris of the past, more solid than the gingerbread patchings-up of our own times.

I have next addressed myself to Woman.

I have called upon her to listen, with good-will and respect, to the man whose life is devoted to the destruction of prostitution;
To receive with kindness and affection the word of the man who also seeks to deliver the world from adultery;

To listen to me and sympathise with me, who have undertaken the sacred task of saving the feeble from oppression, because I am strong, and the strong from fraud, because I am sincere.

Now, there are still many men who consider slaves, servants, and the poor, as their property, and who claim fidelity and devotedness from that living property, in exchange for the imperious protection and the contemptuous patronage which they extend to it. However, the number of these men has been diminished every day by the preaching of Christian paternity.

But, from the daughter of Kings to the daughter of the Pauper, I know not that there exists so much as one woman from whom man does not think himself entitled to exact fidelity, devotedness, obedience, in exchange for the insulting guardianship which his haughty reason and his brute strength deign to grant to the being whom he regards as a child, destitute of strength and destitute of reason.

Had I cause, then, to be astonished, that the call to freedom and equality which I addressed to woman should be stifled by shouts of outrage?—No! I relied more on the effect of the reproaches which would be cast by man upon the liberation of woman, than on the power of my own words.

I leave to woman this inheritance of liberty. I know how great has hitherto been the power of destruction residing in this word liberty, when flung into the midst of slaves, fettered and gagged; but, thanks be to God, the slave in this case is woman: and it is not by disorder and brutality that she achieves her triumphs.

One phasis of my life is now accomplished: I have spoken: I will now act. But I have need for some time of repose and silence.

A numerous family surrounds me, the Apostolate is now founded.

I take forty of my sons with me: I confide to my other children the task of continuing our labours in the world; and I retire.

I retire to the place where my childhood was passed, on one of the heights which overlook Paris: for I wish still to hear and see that cradle of the New World, and I love also to renew the recollections of my past life; they are good and pleasant to look back upon.

He who speaks to you has lived in the midst of you; his life has not been solitary; he has been known to many of you, and among these he is not aware of one who has not loved him: and yet he is now handed over to the laughter and calumny of the world.

His mother gave him a name of good omen—Prosper—because he smiled in coming into the world; God surrounded his young years with pleasures and riches; his brother, a child of poetry, fed him with harmony and light; his infancy and youth were happy,
in the midst of children and young men who cherished his friendship: this man, however, you now overwhelm with sarcasm and outrage.

He has known what your men of science know; he has seen and done what your men of industry do; he has appeared in your meetings and your fêtes, and even on your battle-fields, with his brother-scholars of your Grande Ecole (the Polytechnic School): you all came to him with affection, because you felt that he loved you; you all had confidence in him, because you could read in his heart. And now, because this man takes upon himself in the name of God to moralise your lives, you fling scorn and reproach upon him.

He who has been loved by you will not call you to account for your inconsistencies; he will bide his time and act.

Consider, that one who announces to the world such promises as mine, and who yet, in so short a time, has caused his word to be everywhere re-echoed, cannot be accused of insanity; for his accusers would confess their own madness in having paid so much attention to him. Listen then, once more, before I withdraw from among you.

Your altars are no more, your thrones are shaken, your families are torn by dissension: God, Kings, and love, are no more to be seen in the world. A new religion, a new politics, a new morality, are what I bring you.

The man who dares to speak thus, must be heard, for he has already proved that he could make himself heard.

You have his word; you shall soon have his acting.

But, I repeat to you, I will now rest and hold my peace: for you have need of my silence, that yourselves may speak.

I retire then, with my children—glory to them! who so powerfully aid their father to accomplish the will of God.

My dear Children—This day has been glorious in the world for eighteen centuries: this day died the Divine Liberator of the slave.

To commemorate the anniversary, let our retirement commence this day; and let the last trace of servitude, the condition of a menial, disappear from amongst us.

Enfantin
Appendix D

GEORGE SAND

UNPUBLISHED [AFTER 9 APR., 1848]

For the background to this draft letter (dated on internal evidence), see No. 371, the fuller French version, with its notes.

I am an old admirer of George Sand and was one of the first to give her honour public and private. When all other persons in England abused her as an immoral and indecent writer I and my circle of friends, persons not without influence, were the first to s’écrier against the charges universally made 15 years ago against her writings and to appeal to all who condemned them, from their judgment then to their judgment now, and the event has justified the appeal. How then can I express my astonishment, mortification and grief to find that when a great political crisis of the world has arrived, brought about by the noble [élans] of Paris, Mme G. Sand alone remains behind—not only takes no initiative, puts forth no principles, but in a manner worthy only of a timid and commonplace lady, repudiates the kindly flatteries made to her in your paper.

Her letter to the Réforme protesting against the use of her name in your paper is to me incomprehensible for its fatuity. I can only attribute it to a fear that her literary vanity may be compromised by the connexion of her established reputation with your unestablished—However this may be, the reply to her letter, in your paper, is as superior in dignity and disinterestedness to hers as her literary reputation to yours. I have only now to say for myself and for all women of strong mind and large heart I can only say I wish you all possible success in your undertaking and I only hope you will treat the disavowal of connexion with you by any woman whether George Sand or any other with the silent pity which is the tribute one pays to weakness and timidity.

Une Anglaise.

Sand is like one of our English writing women (I do not know how the case may be in France) who always commence by declaring that they do not intend to advocate the emancipation of women although to the partial emancipation of women gained by more generous spirits it is alone owing that they are able to make their voices heard and to take up that position in society and literary influence which they are afraid to compromise by any attempt to help on the same cause. English literary women have been hitherto particularly distinguished by their little basenesses caused by timidity.

I agree with you in your expressions of admiration of her fine talent, beautiful stories and admirable style but I think you are making a great error and one most injurious to
the cause of women in applying the term philosophe to her. If there be anything characteristic of Sand’s writings it is the presence of imagination and feeling and the absence of thought.

She means to écraser them du haut de sa supériorité which as a thinker or a practical person certainly does not exist. Latterly however I have feared that she was destined, contrary to what I had hoped, to be no otherwise useful to the cause of women (from which the best interests of society can never be separated) than, in the manner in which all eminent women are so, by the mere fact of being women.
Appendix E

DEATH OF FRANCIS PLACE

SPECTATOR, 7 JAN., 1854, P. 13

This obituary, headed “Francis Place” and subheaded “[From a Correspondent],” appears in the “Topics of the Day” section. Though not listed in Mill’s bibliography, it is assigned to him by G.J. Holyoake in his *John Stuart Mill as Some of the Working Classes Knew Him* (London: Trübner, 1873), p. 6, and also in his *Sixty Years of an Agitator’s Life*, 2 vols. (London: Unwin, 1909), Vol. I, p. 216. Holyoake cites no evidence; there is no corroboration elsewhere, and the piece is not characteristic of Mill’s usual style.

Another man of mark has passed from amongst us. Francis Place has departed from the world in which he was so long a stirring mover. Few men have done more of the world’s work with so little external sign. He was ever ready with pen and person to aid the uplifting of humanity, ever ready to fill full of his own knowledge any other men willing to work and to get the credit of it. He was essentially a public man, but his work usually lay behind the curtain as a prompter. He was no orator, but much oratory was of his prompting. He was a man of the last age and of the present, before the French Revolution and since. Born to no inheritance but a clear brain, an iron will, and an indomitable love of freedom, he was one of the few London tradesmen who achieved an ample competence, not merely without truckling, but in spite of the odium and discouragement cast on all Reformers under the old oppressive Tory rule. But more remarkable than all this was the fact, that in the days when “books, plate, and pictures,” were important items in all rich men’s wills, he was the almost solitary tradesman who possessed a library, earned, collected, and paid for by himself, which many public men envied him the possession of, and to which many public men of less energy and purpose were glad to have recourse. The room which held that library was for many years a well-known meeting-place for Members of Parliament to discuss popular questions.

An early member of the London Corresponding Society—an intimate acquaintance of Hardy, Tooke, Richter, and others, in the days when opinion was crime,—never losing any opportunity of promoting freedom—he one day stood in Covent Garden with a friend watching a Westminster Election contested between Whigs and Tories. The brewer candidate brought a dray to the front of the hustings to propitiate “sweet voices.” The beer was staved and ran into the kennels, and the miserable mob threw themselves on their faces and wallowed like swine. Francis Place and his friend left the spot, vowing never to cease their labours till the elections of Westminster were reformed. Just as Cobden and Bright with their friends brought about Corn-law abolition, so did Francis Place and his friend gather round them a nucleus with the motto “Purity of Election.” About that time, Sir Francis Burdett made a speech in public such as a young Greek might have made in Athens. “The man for the People!”
said Francis Place; and Burdett was applied to. He returned for answer, that he had spent twenty thousand pounds in contested elections, and would spend no more. This was precisely what the Westminster electors meant. He was elected triumphantly, and the very shilling was found for him on taking the oath at the bar of the House—so runs the tradition; and from that election dates Reform in Parliament.

There was scarcely any public man on the Liberal or professed Liberal side that was not acquainted with Francis Place. He was the intimate friend of James Mill the historian of India, and of Jeremy Bentham. He was one of the original promoters of and contributors to the Westminster Review. Godwin often came to him. Sir Samuel Romilly and Henry Brougham held him in respect. Campbell the poet would talk to him by the hour of “what was to be done for the Poles.” John Cam Hobhouse was there indoctrinated in popular lore, and Edward Lytton Bulwer matriculated for his first election. Neither Burdett nor Hobhouse nor Bulwer were more than imaginations to Francis Place,—they said they were Reformers, and he took them at their word, and they travelled by his side. When they left the path, he went onwards just the same. People of all classes and conditions who had purposes to serve sought him out. The engineers—the elder Maudslay, the elder Brunel, Galloway, John Hague, and others—would all come to tell him of their new plans, and ask for his council and influence. Mulready the artist used to visit him. Joseph Hume was a constant conferrer; and people from the new Republics ever found him out. He was an authority of much weight amongst working people, whose condition he ever strove to raise; and the unions always sought his help; but he was too sound a political economist ever to give them hopes of success by strikes. He was one of the few men whom Cobbett held in respect when he quarrelled with the Westminster Committees. He was essentially a man of business, the very opposite of Cobbett; and therefore it was not possible for them to agree. If perchance a journal of his life has been preserved and it falls into fitting hands, it will be a remarkable book—a record of the old changing into the new. His industry was extraordinary; his perceptive faculties in the direction of his sympathies, acute; and his reasoning powers strong. In the poetical faculty, which was so strong in Cobbett, he was entirely lacking: he was for the utter exclusion of poetry from the pages of the Westminster Review! This will account for much that appeared hard in his character; though there never existed a man more ready to assist others to rise. Many now holding prominent positions can trace their first move to the help of Francis Place. Great faculties and abilities were ever warmly greeted by him, and he was wholly devoid of either envy or jealousy. He had considerable mechanical aptitude, and would have been a skilful engineer if educated to it. His spirit was ever fresh and buoyant, and at all that spoke of the new or the progressive he seemed to leap alive. Like most self-educated framers of their own fortunes, he had a dislike of hereditary aristocracy, but withal no want of “handsome acknowledgment for merit in a lord.” But he had on the other hand not the slightest taint of the servility not uncommon in the newly-risen. As in similarly-educated men, the spirit of self-assertion was strong in him; a quality traceable chiefly to the ungenerous class spirit which refuses to acknowledge rising merit till the acknowledgment is superfluous—an ordeal that most authors have to undergo to the great risk of their philosophy and manysidedness. He held the manly conviction that he had earned his fellowship in the republic of letters, and thereby was every man’s equal in the nobility of nature. Such men are more common now, and the world thinks
less of them. He had the higher merit of working his own way out of the slough, of achieving property hardly, and education still more hardly, at the time when books were a costly luxury, not to be borrowed, but bought at high prices. He was generous with his money, and generous with his books; letting all who would drink of his fountain of knowledge, thinking it ample payment that he was thus contributing to build up the world’s progress. The faculties that he possessed, had they been worked in a worldly fashion, would have lifted him into what is called a higher position—a greater “success”: but he did not covet it. He loved quiet power for the purpose of promoting good ends, but never sought to attain it by rubbing shoulders with the influential. It is true that he would at times seek out and besiege the influential; but ever for a public purpose. It is to be doubted if he ever asked or received a personal favour in his life. He was the kind of man who in the United States would have become a member of the Legislature; but being in England, he acted only as consulting politician and economist to others.

Francis Place has died, at the ripe age of eighty-two, as he lived, in the full possession of his faculties to the last. Statues have been erected to and honours conferred on many less deserving. His honours will be in the respectful memories of the worthy of all ranks, amidst the large crowd of those who knew him.
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Textual Emendations

in this list, following the page and line numbers, the reading of the copy-text is given first, and then the amended reading in square brackets, with an explanation if required. If there is no explanation, it may be assumed that there is an obvious typographical error, or else that the change is made for sense or for consistency within the item. For a description of changes not here listed, see cxiv-cxv above. “SC” indicates Mill’s library, Somerville College, Oxford. Typographical errors in versions other than the copy-text are ignored.

3.25 apppears [appears]

3.26 language, [language.]

4.3 economists [economist]

4.12 days [days’]

4.16 cent; [cent.;]

4.29 day’s [days’]

4.32 former, [former]

5.5 therefore [therefore,]

6.9 day’s [days’]

6.11 days’ [days]

6.16 the-merchant [the merchant]

7.22 England, [England;]

8.22 principles. Sympathizing [principles, sympathizing]

18.22 furnish-nishing [furnishing]

19.3 war [War]

19.21 reimportation [re-importation]

22.24 Sandeson [Sanderson]

26.14 deprived [derived]
30.12 101 [161] [as in Source]

30.22 well-intention [well-intentioned]

31.29 oc-operating [co-operating]

32.10 opinion, [opinion;]

32.14 Custom House [Custom-house]

32.15 opinion, [opinion;]

33.11 occasion [occasion]

36.13 being [been]

37.8 1739—1740 [1739-1740]

38.6 and thereby [thereby]

38.7 aggravatting [aggravating]

38.16 accounting [accounting]

38.23 effecting [affecting]

45.2 occurred—Suppose [occurred.—Suppose]

48.21 Resurrection Men [Resurrection-Men]

48.37 ceses [cases]

48.37 resurrection men [resurrection-men]

50.23 medical surgical [medical-surgical]

51.20 thnrefore [therefore]

52.28 requisitite [requisite]

52.41 capitaliist [capitalist]

53.1 value which depends [value depends]

53.11 objectionalble [objectionable]

53.23 and les [and let]

55.3 reward the [reward of the]
55.9-10 itself, is that . . . arguments, is also this—if [itself is that, . . . arguments, so also this, if]

55.12 labonrer’s [labourer’s]

55.14 commodities, [commodities.]

55.35 before hand [beforehand]

56.16 whoie [whole]

59.10 circumstances, [circumstances.]

61.29 heterogenous [heterogeneous]

66.34 Hobbs [Hobbes]

68.15 occasionally, the [occasionally. The] [as in Source]

71.31 A. [A]

73.6 sons.” [“sons.”]

81.13 argument [argument’s]

81.15 laborer [labourer]

81.29 laborers [labourers]

81.32 laborers [labourers]

81.37 laborer [labourer]

81.40 laborers [labourers]

83.14 III. You [III.—You]

84.4 over population [over-population]

84.7 rich; the . . . manufacturers are [rich—the . . . manufacturers—are]

84.8 for that of low [for low]

84.10 manufactures [manufacturers]

84.11 knew [know]

84.17 irremedable [irremediable]

84.21 government [government]
84.31 IV. I [IV.—I]

85.1 latter [later]

86.10 can: [can.]

88.17 —“if [—if]

93.10 Crown-office [Crown Office]

94.4 purpose; [purpose,]

96.25 supporting, it [supporting it,]

97.13 H.M. [A.M.] [as in rest of series and JSM’s bibliography]

97.28 Encyclopedia [Encyclopaedia]

97.35 Britain [Britain,] [as in Source]

97.38 proposition [proposition,] [as in Source]

98.23 progression [progression,] [as in Source]

98.34 ill contrived [ill-contrived] [as in Source]

99.3 population [proportion] [as in Source]

99.8 course [course,] [as in Source]

99.28 manhood [mankind] [as in Source]

100.17 porportion [proportion]

102.17 readily [really] [as in Source]

103.17 bailding [building]

104.25 drawer [drawee]

104.33 correct [incorrect]

104.38 being [been]

108.11 starve?” [starve”?]}

109.11 Gentleman [Gentlemen]

110.1 Tyriaean [Tyrtaean]
110.10 wonderful [Wonderful] [to conform to rest of title]

110.14 Canning [Canning,]

115.7 exaggeration; [exaggeration,]

118.29 harmoyante [larmoyante]

124.31 Ministery [Ministry]

128.6 chamber [Chamber]

141.5 de société [de la société]

141.5 1789. [1789,]

145.39-40 authority in power [persons in authority] [erratum noted in next no. of Source]

146.13 poople [people]

148.9 transaction; [transaction”;]

148.17 ‘narrow . . . candidates’ [“narrow . . . candidates”]

148.19 “Your [Your]

148.29-30 really-popular [really popular]

149.28 with us is, [with us, is]

151.30 nation. [nation,]

153.7 king [King]

156.13 between [between]

157.25 mines [vines]

158.3 mines [vines]

159.18 sollicittera [sollicitera] [as in Source]

168.12 matter; [matter,]

171.4 succesful [successful]

171.31 establishmns [establishments]

172.26 doing. [doing,]
that act [that any act]

perceptible to insult the [perceptible to the] [corrected by JSM in SC]

is it [it is]

suffered [supposed] [erratum noted in next no. of Source]

mere [more] [erratum noted in next no. of Source]

set [sort] [erratum noted in next no. of Source]

find acts that they [find out what they] [erratum noted in next no. of Source]

to pretend [pretend]

soeverign [sovereign]

département [département]

from fifty-four [from five to four] [erratum noted in next no. of Source; see
191.n14]

really-popular [really popular]

elector’s [elector’s]

partial to [protected] [erratum noted in next no. of Source, and corrected by
JSM in SC]

Legislature’s [Legislator’s] [corrected by JSM in SC]

other [other,] [as in Source]

which, [which] [as in Source]

necessary [necessary,] [as in Source]

opposition [operation] [as in Source]

man [man,] [as in Source]

would [could] [as in Source]

community [community,] [as in Source]

labourer. [labourer?]

feeling, [feeling]
217.2 to! [to?] [as in Source]

220.31 afterwards have [afterwards to have]

223.34 Ha [Ham]

233.41 is it true, is often [is true, it is often] [corrected by JSM in SC]

234.16 blew [blow] [corrected by JSM in SC]

236.5 follow [follows]

236.19 it is assumed [is assumed] [corrected by JSM in SC]

238.7 Chamber above alone [Chamber alone] [corrected by JSM in SC]

242.21 intellects [intellect]

245.17-18 power in itself, on earth or in hell, [power on earth or in hell itself,] [corrected by JSM in SC]

250.n6 science [science]

254.20 it there [it, there]

263.14 foom [from]

265.24 such a [such a]

266.20 country [country]

268.20 customs, [customs]

270.4 establishment [establishment]

277.23 had had [had led to] [corrected by JSM in SC]

281.3 I do [do I]

282.2 Walsinghams. [Walsinghams,]

282.3 lawyers, [lawyers,]

288.5 Louis [Louis,]

291.32 best constituted [best-constituted]

294.40 πολυτλας [πολύτλας]

298.12 come [come,]
301.28 correspondents [correspondent]

305.2 ascendency [ascendancy]

305.20 which, it [which it] [corrected by JSM in SC]

305.26 pale, because [pale because] [corrected by JSM in SC]

305.39 Now, when [When] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.6-9 that, situate . . . of the rivals . . . him, even . . . chair [that (situate . . . of rivals . . . him even . . . chair,)]] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.11 mankind, the [mankind, and the] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.12 of menacing [for menacing] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.14 low. [low;—] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.20 them; and [them and] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.22 but when [but where] [corrected by JSM in SC]

306.25 indisputedly [undisputedly] [corrected by JSM in SC]

307.2 civilization [civilization]

307.5 irretrievable—except [irretrievable except] [corrected by JSM in SC]

308.29 of, comprehending [of comprehending,] [corrected by JSM in SC]

315.34 church [church,]

321.25 *Punch* [Punch] [punch in Source]

321.28 symbols, [cymbals] [symbols [cymbals],]

324.11 enlarged, minds [enlarged minds]

325.7 that is [is] [as in Source]

325.20 puppet-show man [puppet-showman]

326.26 sacrifice, [sacrifice]

328.5 church [Church]

332.28 chair [Chair]

337.20 deputies [Deputies]
340.4 best [least]
342.18 render, [renders]
344.13 be] [be]
344.35 governent [government]
347.15 resolution [revolution]
349.32 Liberia!) [Liberia!).]
351.11 aide-de-camp [aide-de-camp]
354.12 academies, and of [academies of] [corrected by JSM in SC]
359.20 elegible [eligible]
361.6 enlightenment [enlightenment] [as in Source]
361.19 opened, 600,000 [opened, and 600,000] [as in Source]
361.23 school (Hear, hear.) [school. (Hear, hear.)]
365.20 on [an]
368.15 entire [“entire] [as in Source]
369.4 organized [organize]
377.19 hostility, [hostility]
379.10 jnstice [justice]
379.29 of [of]
382.27 all all [all]
384.25 préfets [préfets]
384.40 pallative [palliative]
386.27 Sèvre [Sèvres]
387.25 despatch [dispatch]
388.8 falsehood [falsehood]
393.12 very [every]
396.16 not, to [not to]

399.19-20 this gradually; and [this. Gradually, and] [JSM altered the lower case g to upper case in SC]

401.29 gentleman [gentlemen]

402.18 been as long [been long] [altered by JSM in SC]

403.23 instituting [substituting] [altered by JSM in SC]

405.26 state [State]

406.25 Lansdown [Lansdowne] [the usual spelling]

413.16 a classification [or classification] [as in Source]

413.22 other, or [other as] [as in Source]

418.17 St. Simonians [Saint Simonians]

419.26-420.9 [We . . . subsistence.] [We . . . subsistence.] [square brackets removed to avoid confusion]

419.n4 so [no]

420.n8 “not [not] [no closing quotation marks, and, in fact, not a quotation]

422.13 months [months’] [as in Source]

422.14 eighteen [fifteen] [altered by JSM in SC]

422.16 M.M. [MM.]

426.36 others [other] [altered by JSM in SC]

433.11 For, [For]

444.23 Michael [Michel] [as in the French and in fact]

449.16 other’s [other]

450.7 who [who,] [as in Logic]

450.33 to other [to draw other] [altered by JSM in SC]

453.16 d’Argout, have [d’Argout has]

456.25 Freedom [freedom]
459.22-460.13 [We . . . part.] [square brackets removed to avoid confusion]

461.4 merville [merveille]

464.11 Medicine [Médecine]

470.24 substituted [substituted]

473.4 Legislation; [Legislation;”] [restyled in this ed.]

474.10 brought [brought]

480.16 fall [falls]

481.30 rire! [rire!”]

483.1 by Government [by the Government]

483.31 subservient [subservient]

484.4 discovers [discovers]

491.13 is it [it is]

492.20 constituted: [constituted.]

504.22 act: [act:—] [as in previous paragraph]

505.27 purpose [purpose]

507.28 strong hold [stronghold]

508.4 Love [Looe] [corrected by JSM in SC]

508.11 him, [him]

508.13 independence. After [independence. After]

508.19 electoral [electoral]

508.19 districts, at [districts. At] [altered by JSM in SC]

520.10 “hero’ [“hero”]

520.25 bar [ban] [altered by JSM in SC]

520.31 history; and [history and] [altered by JSM in SC]
522.13-523.15 [We . . . 56s.] [square brackets removed to avoid confusion]

541.19 revolution [Revolution]

541.21 revolution [Revolution]

542.n15 Marre [Marne] [corrected by JSM in SC]

542.n16 Martin de Douni [Merlin de Douai] [1st error corrected by JSM in SC]

544.5 busy [losing] [corrected by JSM in SC]

545.6 prepared [proposed] [corrected by JSM in SC]

553.29-30 percentage [per centage]

554.13 saved, should [saved, he should]

563.9 land [Land]

563.18 related [selected] [corrected by JSM in SC]

564.9 tax [taxes]

564.32 that where [that the time when] [corrected by JSM in SC]

565.1 was [were]

565.6 wisdom as [wisdom and] [corrected by JSM in SC]

566.34 prepared [proposed] [as in Source]

567.1 “property tax.” [“property” tax.] [as in Source]

567.5 a repugnance [or repugnance] [as in Source]

567.13 if [of] [as in Source]

567.18 It [it]

569.4 the year’s [the last year’s] [altered by JSM in SC]

569.19 colonies, [colonies;] [altered by JSM in SC]

569.37 which [who] [altered by JSM in SC]

570.4 qualification [qualification,] [altered by JSM in SC]

570.11 abide [abides] [altered by JSM in SC]
570.29 budget, [budget:] [altered by JSM in SC]
571.24 this an [this once an] [altered by JSM in SC]
573.12 aüori [autori] [altered by JSM in SC]
574.28 as it admits [it admits] [altered by JSM in SC]
577.31 opinions [opinion] [altered by JSM in SC]
581.1 the Bank [The Bank]
581.25 joint stock [joint-stock]
582.7 lest [least] [altered by JSM in SC to last but least seems required]
582.10 fact [part] [altered by JSM in SC]
584.6 works, [works.]
584.23 together, with [together with]
589.8-9 [township or village] [(township or village)] [JSM’s square brackets altered to avoid confusion]
595.2 backs [back]
596.8-12 [True . . . bread?] [True . . . bread?] [square brackets removed to avoid confusion]
600.15 half measures [half-measures] [as elsewhere in sentence]
605.31 from abuses [from the reform of abuses] [altered by JSM in SC]
605.33 half and half [half-and-half]
614.24 Français [Français.]
619.8 self conceit [self-conceit]
625.30 bills [Bills]
625.31 bill [Bill]
626.17 chancellor’s [Chancellor’s]
626.29 others’ [others,]
627.22 peril. [peril?]
630.27 alderman [aldermen]

635.1 Laws’ [Laws]

647.8-9 to be a Turkish Government [to be so; Turkish Government] [as in Source; in Source all the semi-colons are dashes]

649.34 bad [loud] [corrected by JSM in SC]

653.12 it, [it.]

654.10 So [so] [as in Source]

654.45 equally.’’ [equally.] [restyled in this ed.]

656.23 King’s [Kings’]

658.15 Lafayette, [Lafayette.]

658.17 Barret, [Barrot;] [punctuation altered for sense]

660.2 in, turning [in, and turning] [as in Source]

661.18 Odilon, Barrot, [Odilon Barrot]

662.7 Société . . . l’Homme [Société . . . l’Homme]

665.2 Société . . . l’Homme [Société . . . l’Homme]

665.3 The French [The debate on the French] [corrected by JSM in SC]

666.7 Carrels [Carrel] [corrected by JSM in SC]

667.6 intruded [intended] [corrected by JSM in SC]

667.12 way, [way.]

667.13 mark [wreak] [corrected by JSM in SC]

669.31 Courts’ [Courts]

670.21 Homme, [Homme] [as in 35]

670.34 much-talked of [much-talked-of] [as in 35]

672.16 to far [too far] [correct in 35]

672.32 constitution [institution] [corrected by JSM in SC; correct in 35]

681.8 only, [only.]
683.3 aid-de-camp [aide-de-camp]
683.14 massacreing [massacring]
684.26 Laquette [Laguette] [corrected by JSM in SC]
685.16 Assizes [Assises]
685.17 coadjuter [coadjutor]
693.12 government [government]
699.19 Lous-Philippe [Louis-Philippe]
699.25 convention [convention.]
702.6 restricted [restrictive] [corrected by JSM in SC]
703.3 softness of the April song: [softness. Of the April song.] [corrected by JSM in SC]
703.21 runs [seems] [corrected by JSM in SC]
703.23 a more [and more] [corrected by JSM in SC]
705.1 hot-heated [hot-headed]
707.7 seems [seems,]
707.9 correctional, police [correctional police,]
707.9-10 society des [Société des]
707.19 there to [there shown to]
711.37 alleviation [alleviation]
712.18 The very [the very]
724.32 Angleterre [Angleterre,] [as in Source]
728.20 cultivation [combination] [corrected by JSM in SC]
731.8 inspecters [inspectors] [as in Source]
732.5 school! [school!”]
732.27 thought [though]
735.30 had previously in [had in] [altered by JSM in SC]
Nationale [National]

Nationale de 1834 [National de 1834]

any thing [anything]

Sees, [sees] [as in Source]

stage [stage,] [as in Source]

out, [out] [as in Source]

England. When [England. . . . When] [in Source a dash indicates ellipsis]

say [say,]

Common, [Commons]

pauperized [pauperised]

Wakefield’s [Wakefield]

instance, England [instance, of England]

mercantil [mercantile] [as above; JSM does not elsewhere use the obsolete form]

described [descried] [as in Source]

In [in]

[Murray, 1841.] [[Murray, 1841.] [restyled in this ed.]

resolve [revolve] [as in Source]

London [London’s] [as in Source]

tea-kettle [tea-kettle] [as in Source]

Scroggins’ [Scroggs’] [as in Source]

gas, [gas.] [as in Source]

themselves; [themselves:]

“Our [“ ‘Our] [as in Source; restyled in this ed.]

British freedom [‘British freedom’] [as in Source]

“I [“ ‘I] [as in Source; restyled in this ed.]
809.44 use. [use.”] [as in Source]
809.45 “There’s [“ ‘There’s] [as in Source; restyled in this ed.]
810.4 their [thin] [as in Source]
810.14 French.” [French.’ ”] [as in Source; restyled in this ed.]
810.19 years [years,] [as in Source]
810.23 porch [line space] The [porch [no line space] The] [as in Source]
811.13 “Christian Year” [Christian Year] [as in Source]
812.12 zealot [zealot,]
812.21 estimation [estimation,]
814.22 saint’s [saints’]
814.24 church [Church]
814.30 christian [Christian]
815.23 worl [world]
816.11 recede [secede]
819.10 pound [pounds]
828.19 later; [later;*] [as in Source]
830.38 maters [matters]
832.35 simma [summa]
834.25 understand [understand,]
836.23 American’s [Americans]
844.24 hated [hate]
864.32 if is this [if this]
865.32 guilty [guilt]
877.4 casest [cases,]
888.21 day’s-work [day’s work]
892.6 but his [but because his]
898.31 since the land [since, the land] [as in Source]
920.20 beenfit [benefit]
928.12 lots, be [lot be] [as in Source]
931.7 places [place]
934.27 Lord Lieutenant [Lord-Lieutenant]
934.28 Lord Lieutenant [Lord-Lieutenant]
938.10 a a [a]
943.6 an [our] [as in Source]
943.32 waste lands [waste-lands]
957.38 Monery [Moneng] [as in Source]
970.32 market, [market] [as in Source]
973.33 natinal [national]
976.13 Gugenmas [Gugenmus] [as in Source]
976.14 Hiedelberg [Heidelberg]
976.34 mehlspeisen [Mehlspeisen] [as in Source]
977.14 unexpensive [inexpensive]
977.30 over population [over-population]
978.18 progresive [progressive]
979.9 burtden [burthen]
979.23 may a [may be a]
986.5 Snowden [Snowdon]
987.21 poor-law [poor law]
987.24 poor-law [poor law]
993.8 of of [of]
997.12 civilising [civilizing]

998.14 It, [“It”] [restyled in this ed.]

998.14 Irelandt are insolven [Ireland are insolvent]

998.24 could [would] [as in Source]

1015.14-15 form a [form of a]

1028.17 cap. [c.]

1028.17 9 Vic. [9 & 10 Vic.]

1029.11 so [said]

1032.6 De Freyne [DeFreyne]

1032.17 De Freyne [DeFreyne]

1032.19 De Freyne [DeFreyne]

1035.18 lands? [lands.]

1041.6 collector’s [collectors’] [as in MS and all eds. of PPE]

1057.24 coheirs [co-heirs] [as in PPE]

1063.7 banded [bandied]

1064.18 price [prices] [as in Source]

1064.20 protection [precaution] [as in Source]

1079.33 Frederic [Frederick]

1087.5-6 de Gama [da Gama]

1091.11 of. [of.]

1091.14 News [News,]

1098.32 wanting. [wanting?] 

1106.9 another, [another.]

1108.8 Schiller’s, [Schiller’s]

1113.24 hived [buried] [as in Source]
1114.15 fear, [fear]
1115.1 therefore [therefor] [as in Source]
1128.9 man [man,] [as in Source]
1129.25 intolerance [tolerance] [as in Source and CW, XI, 318]
1132.35 effect [effects] [as in Source and later in sentence]
1136.22 Christian,’ [Christian,”]
1138.28 alteratives [alternatives]
1141.14 and and judges [and judges]
1143.4 I.S.M. [J.S.M.]
1144.4 it. [it,]
1170.26 a honest [an honest]
1171.25 one needle woman [one needlewoman]
1171.28 livelihood [livelihood”]
1172.27 “D.” [D.]
1178.7 secresy [secrecy]
1178.22 Whateley [Whately]
1179.27 ennuyées [ennuyés]
1181.29 think [thinks]
1182.1 for [far]
1187.28 players’ [player’s]
1197.14 ever [fever]
1197.24 to [“to]
1207.25 Drawcausir [Drawcansir]
1232.28 thoroughgoing [thorough-going] [as in 75]
1250.35-6 Then, ing . . . think- / we [Then, we . . . think- / ing] [ing and we were transposed at the beginnings of successive lines]
1253.3 quaut [quant]

1253.18 historiques [historiques,] [comma as in English version]

1253.24 ne [en]

1254.24 possible [possibles]

1254.39 l'industrialisme [l'industrialisme]

1255.19 wiggs [whigs]
Appendix G

Corrections To Mill’S List Of His Published Articles

the following list includes all the places where editorial corrections have been made in the list (British Library of Political and Economic Science, Mill-Taylor Collection, Vol. XXXVI). The page and line numbers are followed by the reading in the manuscript, and then the corrected reading is given in square brackets. In a few cases our reading differs from that of MacMinn.

30.29 letter and [letter on]

42.9 point [pointing]

60.21 Technalities [Technicalities]

80.14 AM. [A.M.]

85.26 AM. [A.M.]

106.15 AB. [A.B.]

111.7 Thee [Free]

116.16 Lamoignen [Lamoignon]

164.10 ex-ministers [ex-ministers”] [restyled in this ed.]

181.3 April April 1831. [April 1831]


205.3 Ballet [Ballot]

209.8 Ballet [Ballot]

212.13 Track [Truck]

216.12 Agriculturists [Agriculturists”]

218.4 Track [Truck]

228.11 Frebry [Febry]

228.10 AB. [A.B.]

307.31 Melle. [Mlle]
310.6 Melle. [Mlle]
310.7 22d, [22d]
318.8 to to [to]
327.26 Whateley [Whately]
329.25 Examiner; [Examiner‟]; [restyled in this ed.]
347.10 Bill” and “the [Bill and the]
347.36 1831. [1831]
397.8 Eviniensis [Erinensis] [as in text and Source]
404.12 Charta [Charter]
411.20 Experiences [Experience]
419.24 from the [from “the] [the closing quotation marks are there, following a space left blank after operatives of, presumably because the scribe could not make out Todmorden]
425.10 AB. [A.B.]
436.7 Flewer’s [Flower’s]
465.4 M. Pambertin’s [Mr. Pemberton’s]
494.21 Mamborough Head” [Flamborough Head] [the scribe here has made a nonsense of what JSM wrote, which may have been account of “The Fisherman at Flamborough Head”]
507.7-8 J. & E. Remilly [J. & E. Romilly]
507.8 H.d. Villiers [Hyde Villiers]
507.8 Huth [Hutt]
522.20-1 observations in [observations on]
533.6 M.H. de Villiers [Mr. Hyde Villiers,]
534.11 Tithes. [Tithes.”] [restyled in this ed.]
543.6-7 “the President’s Message [“The President’s Message”] [restyled in this ed.]
545.22 taxation, [taxation,”] [restyled in this ed.]
549.6 AB. [A.B.]

554.32 Hymn [“Hymn” [restyled in this ed.]

555.29 Monthly [“Monthly” [restyled in this ed.]

561.21 1833. [1833]

562.31 Flouer’s [Flower’s]

597.8 Manifests [Manifesto]

597.8 ” [i.e., ditto marks] [1833] [in the second through fifth, and in the seventh, entries]

597.9 The Review . . . continued [“The Review . . . continued”] [restyled in this ed.]

597.9 Bungham’s [Brougham’s]

597.10 AB [A.B.]

597.11 AB [A.B.]

597.12 November 10th 1833 Conduct [November 10th 1833 “Conduct” [restyled in this ed.]

647.12 Jovian [Ionian]

663.19 Cyclopaedia, vol 1. [Cyclopaedia, vol. 1,]

735.18 A.B, [A.B.,]

748.16 Deutches [Deutches]

753.14 Senin [Senior]

753.15 Sucessors; [Successors”]; [restyled in this ed.]

763.22 Senin’s [Senior’s]

786.3 Grant’s, [Grant’s]

788.1 Politics [Politics”] [restyled in this ed.]

791.19 Milward’s intended notion [Mr. Ward’s intended motion]

797.14 Milesworth’s [Molesworth’s]

801.22 articles [article]
836.34 Torens’ [Torrens’]

882.15 Mathewson [Matthewson]

945.31 article on on [article on] [the repetition results from a partial scribal correction of the error of starting the entry for No. 328 here]

965.7 1846. [1846]

968.5 1846. [1846]

972.5 1846. [1846]

975.14 1846. [1846]

984.8 1846. [1846]

988.6 1846. [1846]

1024.4 fourtieth [fortieth]

1091.26 J.S.M, [J.S.M.]

1091.27 provisional [Provisional] [as in text]

1107.17 Talfurd [Talfourd]

1144.22 Mr. Cabet [M. Cabet]

1146.28 Jules Blank in MS. letter to Blank in MS. and Blank in MS.; [Jules Lechevalier’s] letter to [Dufaure] and [his Declaration];

1147.19-20 [the entry is repeated]

1167.36 of Susan Mori [on Susan Moir]

1188.22 Bookseller’s [Booksellers’]

1197.7 “a [“A]

1198.10 31. [31.]

1201.31 15., [15.]

1204.26 31. [31.]

1212.33 Ballet [Ballot]

1212.34 reprinted by M. [reprinted by Mr.]
1223.23 No. [Nov.]

1224.35 No. 24. [Nov. 24,]
Appendix H

Signatures

The following list gives, in alphabetical order, all the signatures used by Mill in these volumes. The years of Mill’s first and last use are given in parentheses following the relevant item numbers. Many of these, especially the early ones, are evidently chosen as appropriate to the subject and the comment on it; others, including the initials not deriving from Mill’s name, indicate continuity within a series, though sometimes not all the items in a series have the signature, and some initials, used only once, are unexplained. Two of the initials were used by Mill also in periodical articles: “A.” (originally as standing for “Antiquus”) and “S.”, both used in the *London and Westminster Review*, the former more commonly.

A. Nos. 255 (1834), 280, 288, 294, 296 (1843)

A.B. Nos. 33 (1824), 35, 73, 77, 92, 97, 107, 151, 153, 159, 196, 220, 221, 271 (1834) [Two instalments of “The Spirit of the Age,” Nos. 82 and 103, lack this signature, which is affixed to all the others.]

A.M. Nos. 27 (1823), 28, 31, 32 (1824) [Not significant, but interesting, is the typographical error in No. 31, “H.M.”]

Atheist, An No. 4 (1823)

C. No. 398 (1850)

Censor of the Judges, The Nos. 16, 25 (both 1823)

D. Nos. 386 (1849), 394, 397, 401 (1851)

Enemy to Legal Fictions, An No. 30 (1824)

Enemy to Religious Persecution, An No. 3 (1823)

Friend to Caution, A No. 14 (1823) [Mill’s bibliography reads “A Lover of Caution” but see the entry for No. 15; a scribal error may be involved.]

Friend to Responsible Governments, A No. 20 (1823)

Friend to Science, A No. 17 (1823)

Historicus Nos. 291, 292 (both 1842)

J.S. Nos. 34 (1825), 369 (1847)
J.S.M. Nos. 370 (1848), 384, 385 [the editor’s note says the letter bore this signature], 399, 408, 410, 413 (1865)


John Stuart Mill No. 409 (1864)

Lamoignon No. 42 (1828)

Lover of Justice, A No. 15 (1823)

M. Nos. 13 (1823), 372, 406 (1854)

No Lawyer No. 11 (1823)

No Worshipper of Antiquity No. 24 (1823)

Orthographicus No. 365 (1847)

P. No. 407 (1858)

Ph. No. 36 (1827)

Quesnai No. 21 (1823)

S. Nos. 1 (1822), 2, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 57, 61 (1830)

Wickliff Nos. 5, 6, 7 (all 1823)
Appendix I

Newspapers For Which Mill Wrote

in the following alphabetical list, “W” signals a weekly newspaper, “D” a daily one. The years of Mill’s first and last contributions to each paper are given in parentheses following the relevant item numbers. No. 158, which appeared in Le Globe, was also published in English (our copy-text) in the Monthly Repository (the French translation is in App. B), as was No. 255, which was intended for Le National; they are attributed here to the French papers for which they were intended. Also No. 287 appeared (as Mill himself notes) in both the Spectator (from which we take the copy-text) and the Morning Chronicle, and, as explained in the Textual Introduction, three items did not actually appear in newspapers: the total here listed, therefore, is not 427 but 425.
Black Dwarf (W) Nos. 27 (1823), 28, 31, 32 (1824)

British Traveller (D) No. 41 (1828)

Daily News (D) Nos. 373 (1848), 374-7, 382-4, 386, 388, 389, 407, 410, 415, 419 (1869-70)

Examiner (W) Nos. 43 (1830), 44-157, 159-251, 254, 256-64, 266-70, 273, 283, 286, 288, 293, 369, 372, 379, 385, 425-7 (1873)

Le Globe (D) No. 158 (1832)

Globe and Traveller (D) Nos. 8 (1823), 10, 22, 274, 276-82 (1835)

Guide (D) No. 285 (1837)

Lancet (W) No. 26 (1823)

Leader (W) Nos. 397-8 (1850)

Morning Chronicle (D) Nos. 3 (1823), 5, 6, 7, 9, 11-21, 23-5, 29-30, 33-4, 37-40, 42, 252, 265, 271, 275, 289-92, 294, 296-303, 305-64, 366, 390, 392-3, 395, 400-1, 404-5 (1853)

Morning Post (D) No. 406 (1854)

Le National (D) No. 255 (1834; actually appeared in the Monthly Repository)

New Times (D) No. 35 (1827)

New York Tribune (D) No. 418 (1869)

Our Daily Fare (D) No. 409 (1864)

Penny Newsmman (D) No. 408 (1863)

Reader (W) No. 413 (1865)

Reasoner (W) No. 367 (1847)

Republican (W) No. 4 (1823)

Spectator (W) Nos. 287 (1837), 295, 304, 368, 370, 378, 380-1, 387, 391, 411, 420 (1870)

Sun (D) Nos. 253 (1834), 272 (1835)
Sunday Times (W) Nos. 394, 396 (both 1850)
The Times (D) Nos. 36 (1827), 365, 414, 416-17, 421-3 (1870)
Traveller (D) Nos. 1-2 (1822)
True Sun (D) No. 284 (1837)
Voix des Femmes (D) No. 371 (1848)
Weekly Dispatch (W) No. 399 (1851)
Index Of Persons And Works Cited, With Variants And Notes

like most nineteenth-century authors, Mill is cavalier in his approach to sources, sometimes identifying them with insufficient care, and occasionally quoting them inaccurately. This Appendix is intended to help correct these deficiencies, and to serve as an index of names and titles (which are consequently omitted in the Index proper). Included here also are (at the end of the appendix and listed alphabetically by country) references to parliamentary documents and to statutes. The material otherwise is arranged in alphabetical order, with an entry for each person or work reviewed, quoted, or referred to in the text proper and in Appendices A-E (the page numbers in the appendices are given in italic type). Anonymous articles in newspapers are entered in order of date under the title of the particular newspaper. Speeches are listed in chronological order. References to mythical and fictional characters are excluded. The following abbreviations are used: ADB (Allgemeine deutsche Biographie), BU (Biographie universelle), DAB (Dictionary of American Biography), DBF (Dictionnaire de biographie française), DNB (Dictionary of National Biography), DPF (Dictionnaire des parlementaires français), EB (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed.), GDU (Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle), GE (Grande encyclopédie), MEB (Boase, Modern English Biography), PD (Parliamentary Debates), PP (Parliamentary Papers), SC (JSM’s library, Somerville College, Oxford), WWBMP (Who’s Who of British Members of Parliament), WWG (Who Was Who in the Greek World), WWR (Who Was Who in the Roman World).

The entries take the following form:

1. Identification of persons: birth and death dates are followed by a biographical source; if no source is indicated, available details are given in a note.

2. Identification of works: author, title, etc. in the usual bibliographic form.

3. Notes (if required) giving information about JSM’s use of the source, indication if the work is in his library, Somerville College, Oxford, and any other relevant information.

4. Lists of the pages where works are reviewed, quoted, and referred to.

5. In the case of quotations, a list of substantive variants between Mill’s text and his source, in this form: Page and line reference to the present text. Reading in the present text] Reading in the source (page reference in the source).

The list of substantive variants also attempts to place quoted passages in their contexts by giving the beginnings and endings of sentences. The original wording is supplied where Mill has omitted two sentences or less; only the length of other omissions is
given. There being uncertainty about the actual Classical texts used by Mill, the Loeb editions are usually cited.

“A.” See *Morning Chronicle*, 12 Sept., 1825.

Abbott, Charles (Lord Tenterden) (1762-1832; *DNB*). Referred to: 45n

Abd-ul-Mejid (1823-61; *EB*). Referred to: 1142

Acheson, Archibald (Lord Gosford) (1776-1849; *DNB*). Referred to: 927

Adam, Frederick (1781-1853; *DNB*). Referred to: 648-51

Adams, John (1735-1826; *DAB*). Referred to: 254

Adams, John Quincy (1767-1848; *DAB*). Referred to: 254

Adams, Sarah Flower (1805-48; *DNB*). Referred to: 437-8, 660


referred to: 660


quoted: 654

referred to: 654, 660

Adams, William Bridges (1797-1872; *DNB*). Referred to: 575

— “On the Conduct of the Police at the Late Meeting,” *Monthly Repository*, n.s. VII (June 1833), 426-37.

referred to: 575


referred to: 575


referred to: 23

Aeschines (390-314; *WWG*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 1126


note: in SC is *Aesopi Phrygis fabulae graeca et latine* (Basel: Heruagis, 1544).

referred to: 483

Agis IV (fl. ca. 244/41; *WWG*).

note: some of the references at 872 are in a quotation from Grote, who calls him Agis III.

referred to: 872

Aguado, Alexandre Marie, marquis de Las Marismas (1784-1842; *DBF*). Referred to: 560

Alba, Ferdinand Alvarez de Toledo, duque del (1508-82; *BU*). Referred to: 761

Alcibiades (ca. 450-404; *WWG*).

note: the references at 1126 and 1132 are in quotations from Grote, who uses the spelling Alkibiades.

referred to: 1126, 1132, 1160

Alderson, Edward Hall (1787-1857; *DNB*). Referred to: 1173, 1174

Alexander II (of Russia) (1818-81; *EB*). Referred to: 1202

Alexandre.

note: a police agent.

referred to: 390


referred to: 691


referred to: 664, 691
Allent, Pierre Alexandre Joseph (1772-1837; DBF). Referred to: 516

Allier, Joseph (1794-?; DBF). Referred to: 402

Althorp, Lord. See John Charles Spencer.

“Anglicanus.” See The Times, 8 May, 1834.


note: the indirect quotation is from the Gloria (194 in this ed.); the references at 808 and 813 are to the Thirty-nine Articles (9); that at 814 is to the General Rubric (64).

quoted: 165

referred to: 808, 813, 814


note: see also Charles Austin.

referred to: 522-3


note: 3rd ed. reviewed in CW, VI, and this passage quoted.

quoted: 799-800

799.39-800.1 “embarrass the Government”] All parties, those for the Ballot—those for extended Suffrage—those for the Abolition of Church Rates—those for grand plans of Public Education—those for the Appropriation Clause—those for Municipal Institutions in Ireland—those for yielding to Canada a more democratic form of Government than at present exists there, should one and all enter upon the new Session with this conviction thoroughly impressed upon their minds, that there is not one of these questions, no not one, which is not secondary to the great object of maintaining Lord Melbourne’s Cabinet free from every species of embarrassment. (41)


referred to: 606


Anstey, Thomas Chisholm (1816-73; DNB). Referred to: 1021

Arago, Dominique François Jean (1786-1853; DBF). Referred to: 505, 594

— Letter to the Editor, Le National, 15 June, 1833, 1.

referred to: 594

Argenson, Marc René de Voyer d’ (1771-1842; DBF). Referred to: 191, 227, 661, 695, 696

— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (6 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 41.

referred to: 661, 695

Argout, Apollinaire Antoine Maurice, comte d’ (1782-1858; DBF). Referred to: 203, 382, 453, 540, 701

Aristides (d. ca. 467; WWG). Referred to: 1086, 1122, 1133


quoted: 1122

note: the quotation, in a quotation from Grote, is indirect.

quoted: 1126

referred to: 1126


note: the reference at 1132 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1126, 1132

Aristotle (384-322; *WWG*).

note: the references at 872 and 1130 are in quotations from Grote.

referred to: 872, 1130, 1163


note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1124


referred to: 872, 1129, 1130

Arkwright, Richard (1732-92; *DNB*). Referred to: 837, 838

Ashburton, Lord. See Alexander Baring.

Ashley, Lord. See Anthony Ashley Cooper.

Ashwood, Jane.

note: identified in the *Examiner* as a “perfectly respectable woman.”

referred to: 63

Aspasia (fl. 450/445; *WWG*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 1125

Astley, Philip (1742-1814; *DNB*). Referred to: 1139

Athalin, Louis Marie Jean Baptiste, baron (1784-1856; *GDU*). Referred to: 351

*Athenaeum*.

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 1126

Attila (ca. 406-53; *EB*). Referred to: 1107


referred to: 34


referred to: 34

Audry de Puyravault, Pierre François (1773-1852; *DBF*).

note: JSM uses the spelling Puyraveau.

referred to: 517-18, 518, 661, 695, 696

— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (6 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 41-2.

referred to: 661, 695

Augustus, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (63 - 14; *WWR*). Referred to: 293


referred to: 166

Aumale, Henri Eugène Philippe Louis d’Orléans, duc d’ (1822-97; *DBF*). Referred to: 374, 386-7, 421

note: see also Anon., “Corn Laws.”

referred to: 522-3


note: though JSM’s notice is a leading article, it is in effect a review.

reviewed: 1062-6

quoted: 1063, 1064, 1065

1063.29 “over-governing, that] On the other hand, the word is frequently employed (in a sense which imports blame), as if it were synonymous with *over-governing;*—that (221)

1064.3 “if] In fine, if (236)

1064.3 centralization will] centralization, with the causes from which it springs, will (236)

1064.4 bad,” . . . “go] bad, they will go (236)

1064.8 “an over-regulating] A centralized government, according to the same conception, is an over-regulating (236-7)

1064.11 “centralization] Having shown that the mistake with which we are presently concerned has been made by acute writers, we shall show that centralization (237)

1064.12 interference;”] interference; and that the over-meddling of certain centralized governments is not an effect of their centralization, but a consequence of other causes. (237)

1064.18 price] prices (238) [*treated as typographical error in this ed.*]

1064.20 protection] precaution (238) [*treated as typographical error in this ed.*]

1064.22 opinion;”] opinion; the government condescending to that opinion, rather than sharing in the errors on which it is founded. (238)

1064.23 the excessive] In consequence of the progress made by public opinion, and the happy subsidence of revolutionary agitations, the excessive (238)

1065.27 the active] According to a third, the active (255)
the immediate] [paragraph] By the third, the immediate (255)

Austin, Sarah (1793-1867; DNB). Referred to: 729


note: the quotation is in a quotation from Austin’s own translation of Cousin’s work, reviewed in this article.

quoted: 730

730.6-7 “If children,” . . . “provided] If children provided (285)

730.10 duty] duty (285)

—, trans. Characteristics of Goethe. From the German of Falk, Müller, etc. 3 vols. London: Wilson, 1833.

referred to: 472, 1159, 1264


referred to: 729


referred to: 729


referred to: 729


note: see also Cousin, Rapport.

reviewed: 727-32

quoted: 729-30, 730-1, 731, 731-2

729.32 point; how] point. How (ix)

729.36 education, the] education. The (ix)
desideratum] desideratum (ix)

duty] duty (x)

principle.* [footnote omitted] (x)

ought (xi)

advantages. Are] advantages. “Persons,” says the able writer just quoted, “of uncultivated and torpid minds are not aware to what an extent education can raise, enlarge, and stimulate the understanding; in how great a measure it ensures a person’s happiness, and makes him both independent of the world and a safe and peaceable member of society.” Here and there we find an individual to whom strong good sense and a lively curiosity reveal the magnitude of his want; but a man has already got beyond the first rudeness and apathy of ignorance who longs for knowledge. Are (xi)

improvement.” The] improvement, (See pp. 58, 59). The (xiv)

free; and] free, (p. 34.); and (xiv)

Masters] oppressed (pp. 34, 36, 43, 52). Masters (xv)

creed,” &c. . . . [paragraph] It] creed,” &c. [paragraph] It (xv)

Villages. [paragraph] Here] Villages. (See pp. 171, 177.) [paragraph] Here (xvi)

Time] [no paragraph] Time (xviii)

school!”—A] school.” [8-sentence omission] [paragraph] A (xviii-xix)

matter. It] matter, but there is no room for them here. It (xix)

irrevocably] irrecoverably (xx)


Babeuf, François Noël (1760-97; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Baboeuf.

referred to: 673

Bacon, Francis (1561-1626; DNB). Referred to: 282, 285-6, 412, 413-14, 1163

note: this ed. gives the wording cited in the indirect quotation, which is taken from the Brighton Guardian. See also next entry.

quoted: 322-3

322.38-323.1 man was but the minister . . . nature;”] Man, as the minister . . . nature, does and understands as much, as his observations on the order of nature, either with regard to things or the mind, permit him, and neither knows nor is capable of more. (31)


note: this ed., which postdates the quotations, but is used for ease of reference, is in SC; also in SC is 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Ravestein, 1660). See also preceding entry.

quoted: 414, 1163, 1164

referred to: 412

414.36 tabulae inveniendi] Atque licet longe potentissimum futurum sit remedium ad spem imprimendam, quando homines ad particularia, praesertim in Tabulis nostris Inveniendi digesta et disposita (quae partim ad secundam, sed multa magis ad quartam Instaurationis nostra partem pertinent), adducemus; cum hoc ipsum sit non spes tantum, sed tanquam res ipsa: tamen ut omnia clementius fierint, pergendum est in instituto nostro de praeparandis hominum mentibus; cujus praeparationis ista ostensio spei pars est non exigua (199; Bk. I, Axiom xci)

1163.25-6 “Opinio copiae,” . . . “maxima causa inopiae est.”] Atque cum opinio copiae inter maximas causas inopiae sit; quamque ex fiducia praesentium vera auxilia neglegiantur in posterum; ex usa est, et plane ex necessitate, ut ab illis quae adhuc inventa sunt in ipso operis nostri limine (idque relictis ambagibus et non dissimulanter) honoris et admirationis excessus tollatur; utili monito, ne homines eorum aut copiam aut utilitatem in major accipiant aut celebrant. (125)

1163.27 “notiones temere a rebus abstractas,”] Itaque si notiones ipsae (id quod basis rei est) confusae sint et temere a rebus abstractae, nihil in iis quae superstruuntur est firmitudinis. (158; Bk. I, Aph. 14)

1164.1 “intellectus sibi permissus.”] Quod vero attinet ad notiones primas intellectus; nihil est eorum quae intellectus sibi permissus congessit, quin nobis pro suspecto sit, nec ullo modo ratum, nisi novo judicio se stiterit et secundum illud pronuntiatum fuerit. (138)

— “Of Revenge.” In The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall (1625). In Works, VI, 384-5.

quoted: 901
901.9 “wild justice”] Revenge is a kind of wild justice; which the more man’s nature runs to, the more ought law to weed it out. (384)

— Of the Dignity and Advancement of Learning (1605). In Works, IV, 273-V, 119.

quoted: 524

524.25 “immersed in matter”] Next comes another diversity of Method, namely that the method used should be according to the subject-matter which is handled. For there is one method of delivery in the mathematics (which are the most abstracted and simple of knowledges), another in politics (which are the most immersed and compounded). (451-2)

— The Twooke Bookes of Francis Bacon of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning Divine and Humane (1605). In Works, III, 261-491.

quoted: 524

524.25 “immersed in matter”] [paragraph] Another diversity of Methods is according to the subject or matter which is handled; for there is a great difference in delivery of the Mathematics, which are the most abstracted of knowledges, and Policy, which is the most immersed: and howsoever contention hath been moved touching an uniformity of method in multiformity of matter, yet we see how that opinion, besides the weakness of it, hath been of ill desert towards learning, as that which taketh the way to reduce learning to certain empty and barren generalities; being but the very husks and shells of sciences, all the kernel being forced out and expelled with the torture and press of the method; and therefore as I did allow well of particular Topics for invention, so I do allow likewise of particular Methods of tradition. (406)

Bacon, Nicholas (1509-79; DNB). Referred to: 282


note: M.P. for Horsham, Sussex, 1792-93; agent for Grenada where he owned estates employing slave-labour.

referred to: 30

Bailly, Jean Sylvain (1736-93; DBF). Referred to: 141

Bain, Alexander (1818-1903; DNB). Referred to: 1119

reviewed: 1118-20
quoted: 1119-20

1119.19 There are] We may therefore say that there are (6)


1120.7-8 activities. [paragraph] The] activities. [4-sentence omission] [paragraph] The (7)

1120.8 Living is] Living, therefore, is (7)

1120.19 empty and hurtful.] empty or hurtful. (8)

1120.23 That] But that (10)

Baines, Edward (1800-90; DNB). Referred to: 971


referred to: 971

Bankes, George (1788-1856; DNB). Referred to: 281

Banks, Joseph (1743-1820; DNB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 739

Barbé de Marbois, François (1745-1837; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Barbé-Marbois.

referred to: 701

Barère de Vieuzac, Bertrand de (1755-1841; DBF).

note: JSM uses the common spelling Barrère.

referred to: 542

Baring, Alexander (Lord Ashburton) (1774-1848; DNB). Referred to: 159, 343, 830-6

— Speech on Supply—the Budget (19 Apr., 1833; Commons), _PD_. 3rd ser., Vol. 17, cols. 351-9.
referred to: 565

Baring, Francis Thornhill (1796-1866; DNB). Speech on the Budget (30 Apr., 1841; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 57, cols. 1295-1308.

referred to: 805

Barnave, Antoine Pierre Joseph Marie (1761-93; DBF). Referred to: 541, 542

Barnes, Thomas (ca. 1785-1841; DNB). Referred to: 708, 713

Barrault, Pierre Ange Casimir Emile (1799-1896; DBF). Referred to: 403, 509, 676

Barrère. See Barère.

Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873; DBF).

Note: JSM refers to him as Odilon Barrot.

referred to: 181, 191, 192, 208, 224, 226, 227, 275, 341, 505, 658, 661

— Speech on the Patriotic Associations (30 Mar.), Moniteur, 1831, 669-70.

referred to: 299

— Two speeches on the Draft Address to the King (11 and 12 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1360-2, 1367-8.

referred to: 341

— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (4 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 28.

referred to: 661

Barthe, Félix (1795-1863; DBF). Referred to: 191, 511, 701

Bascans, Ferdinand (1801-61; DBF). Referred to: 363, 372, 388, 402

Bastard d'Estang, Dominique de (1783-1844).

Note: a peer from March 1819, he was President of the Chambre Criminelle de Cassation from 1829, and Vice-President of the Chamber of Peers from April 1834 until his death.

referred to: 422

Battlebar, Richard.
note: identified in the *Examiner* as a tradesman, in the *Morning Chronicle* as a stranger to London.

referred to: 63

Baude, Jean Jacques (1792-1862; *DBF*). Referred to: 275


referred to: 275

Bavoux, François Nicolas (1774-1848; *DBF*). Referred to: 191

— Proposition for Diminishing the Taxes on Newspapers (17 Sept.), *Moniteur*, 1830, 1114.

referred to: 191


quoted: 1263

1263.21 “what was to be done for the Poles.”] “No,” he said, “it is more than bodily pain—it is the thought that so many gallant patriots are starving! . . . What is to be done?” and, turning earnestly to his friend, waited for an answer. (III, 110)

Beaufort, Aubrey William (1801-54; *WWBMP*). Speech in Presentation of a Petition on the Dorsetshire Labourers (18 Apr., 1834; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 22, col. 938.

referred to: 705

Beauharnais, Auguste Charles Eugène Napolèon, duc de Leuchtenberg (1810-35; *DBF*). Referred to: 250

Beauharnais, Eugène Rose de (1781-1824; *DBF*). Referred to: 250


referred to: 897

Beccaria, Cesare Bonesana, marchese di (1735-94; *EB*). Referred to: 323


referred to: 323
Becket, Thomas à (ca. 1118-70; DNB). Referred to: 819

Bedford, Mr.

note: a London coroner.

referred to: 917

Beethoven, Ludwig van (1770-1827; EB). Referred to: 563

The Bell (Kolokol).

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 1203

— Letter from the Central National Polish Committee in Warsaw, 1 Oct., 1862, 1205-6.

referred to: 1203

Benoit-Champy, Adrien Théodore (1805-72; DBF). Referred to: 511

Benson, Ralph Augustus (1828-86; MEB).

note: the quotation is taken from the Daily News, 25 Dec., 1869, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1221

Bentham, Jeremy (1748-1832; DNB). Referred to: 48, 323, 448, 467-73, 1263


note: cited for ease of reference. The details of first publication are given under the separate titles.


note: in Works, II, 375-487.

referred to: 241, 469, 473


note: in Works, IX. One volume of a projected three was published in 1827, according to Bowring; no more were published until the complete work appeared in Bowring’s edition, first in 1841 when the edition was appearing in parts, then in 1843 in the
eleven-volume set. The references are to the word “securities” used in the Philosophic Radical sense; that at 102 is in a quotation from James Mill; that at 874 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 40, 62-4, 102, 130, 144, 184-5, 489, 490, 492, 503, 874


note: in Works, III.

referred to: 473


referred to: 64, 470-1, 473


note: in Works, V, 61-186; the reference is inferred.

referred to: 92


note: in Works, I, 221-95.

referred to: 469, 471, 473


referred to: 473

— An Introductory View of the Rationale of Evidence. [London, 1810.]

note: in Works, VI, 1-218. The reference is in a quotation from Chadwick.

referred to: 827


note: in Works, IV, 37-172.

referred to: 473


referred to: 471


note: in *Works*, III, 433-557. The quotations, of the term “sinister interests,” are indirect.

quoted: 154, 194, 277, 326, 695


referred to: 410, 471


note: in SC. In *Works*, VI-VII.

referred to: 470, 473


referred to: 323, 471

— “Swear not at all”: *Containing an Exposure of the Needlessness and Mischievousness, as Well as Anti-Christianity, of the Ceremony of an Oath*. London: Hunter, 1817.


referred to: 12-15, 31-3, 43, 47, 695-6


referred to: 470, 473


note: in *Works*, I, 390-532, as *Rationale of Punishments*, Part II of *Principles of Penal Law*.

referred to: 470, 473


referred to: 470, 473


referred to: 470, 473

Beolchi, Carlo (1796-1867).

note: a participant in the Piedmontese revolutionary movement (1821), he was exiled, and taught Italian in London until 1850, when he returned to Italy.

referred to: 573


reviewed: 573

Bérenger, Alphonse Marie Marcellin Thomas (1785-1866; *DBF*).

note: called Bérenger de la Drôme.

referred to: 530, 531, 658

Bernard, Louis Rose Désiré (1788-1858; *DBF*).

note: called Bernard de Rennes.

referred to: 204

Berry, Charles Ferdinand de Bourbon, duc de (1778-1820; *DBF*).

note: JSM uses the spelling Berri.
referred to: 269, 524

Berry, Marie Caroline Ferdinande Louise de Bourbon, duchesse de (1798-1870; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Berri.

referred to: 461, 464, 474, 573

Berryer, Pierre Antoine (1790-1868; DBF). Referred to: 517

— Interjection during Tocqueville’s Speech on the Address to the King (28 Jan.), Moniteur, 1843, 163.

quoted: 843

Berthollet, Claude Louis, comte (1748-1822; DBF). Referred to: 198

Bertin, Amédée Joseph (1805-?; DBF). Referred to: 1057


quoted: 1057

referred to: 1057-8

1057.10-13 “It . . . period.” [translated from:] [paragraph] C’est seulement depuis la paix que l’agriculture a fait quelques progrès dans l’arrondissement de Fougères: à partir de 1815, le mouvement d’amélioration de son agriculture a toujours été de plus en plus rapide. On peut dire que si, de 1815 à 1825, ce mouvement a été comme 1, il a été comme 3 de 1825 à 1835, et qu’il est comme 6 depuis 1835. (352)

1058.5 “in good farms” [translated from:] Il est impossible de savoir dans quelle proportion la consommation de la viande a augmenté dans les campagnes; on peut seulement dire que, dans les bonnes fermes, la viande de porc est la base de l’alimentation pendant deux à trois jours par semaine, à raison d’un kilogramme, au plus, par semaine et par personne. (315-16)

1058.10-11 “and . . . comfort,.” [translated from:] [paragraph] Si le costume de nos agriculteurs n’est pas beau, il est du moins assez confortable et différent pour chaque saison; ce qui est toujours un signe d’aisance générale. (312)

1058.11 “persons . . . arrondissement.” [translated from:] Les hommes en haillons sont très-rares dans l’arrondissement; les habits de toile et de coton n’y sont pas le vêtement de toute l’année. (312-13)

Bertin, Louis François (1766-1841; DBF).
note: called l’aîné.

referred to: 723

Bertin de Vaux, Louis François, comte (1771-1842; DBF). Referred to: 516, 723

Bertrand, Henri Gratien, comte (1773-1844; DBF). Referred to: 355

Berville, Albin de (1788-1868; DBF).

note: also known as Saint-Albin Berville.

referred to: 1116


quoted: 1116

1116.37 “freedom of philosophical discussion”] [translated from:] Citoyens représentants, la pensée des deux amendements est la même, MM. Combarel de Leyval et Jules Favre, les auteurs de l’un et l’autre amendement, ont voulu protéger contre des attaques, la famille et la propriété; et il est bien entendu que par ce mot attaque, non plus que dans les dispositions ajoutées à l’art. 1er, on n’a entendu prohiber la liberté de discussion, mais simplement les choses qui auraient un caractère aggressif, qui constituerait le caractère d’attaque. (1968)

Bessborough, Lord. See John William Ponsonby.

Bible.

note: the references at 640 are in a quotation from Harriet Martineau.

referred to: 70, 640, 1222

— New Testament. Referred to: 1084

— Old Testament. Referred to: 869, 1174

— Daniel.

note: the quotations are indirect.

quoted: 176, 1098

— Deuteronomy.

note: the quotation at 170 is in a quotation from Ross; the indirect quotation at 172 is in a quotation from the Quarterly Review, via the Morning Chronicle (see also Joshua); the reference at 559 is in a quotation from W.J. Fox.
170.25 ‘even their enemies . . . judges;’] For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies . . . judges. (32:31)

— Ecclesiasticus.

note: the quotation at 589 is indirect.

490.34 “Wisdom cometh . . . leisure.”] The wisdom of a learned man cometh . . . leisure: and he that hath little business shall become wise. (38:24)

— Exodus.

996.6 These . . . Israel!] And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These . . . Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. (31:7-8)

— Ezekiel. Referred to: 1096

— Genesis.

note: the reference, to the Deluge, is in a quotation from Thornton.

996.6 These . . . Israel!] And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These . . . Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. (31:7-8)

— Ezekiel. Referred to: 1096

— Genesis.

note: the reference, to the Deluge, is in a quotation from Thornton.

referred to: 898

— Isaiah.

note: the indirect quotation is in a quotation from the Nation.

quoted: 965

— Job.

note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 295

— John.
note: the quotation is indirect. The reference is to Jesus’ first command, “that ye love one another, as I have loved you” (15:12).

quoted: 908

referred to: 812

— Joshua.

note: the indirect quotation is in a quotation from the Quarterly Review, via the Morning Chronicle.

quoted: 172

— Judges.

note: the reference, in a quotation from W.J. Fox, is to Jephtha, known for the vow that resulted in the sacrifice of his daughter.

referred to: 558

— I Kings. Referred to: 917, 1081


note: the quotations at 310 and 557 are indirect; the reference is to the Sermon on the Mount.

quoted: 310, 557, 1099

referred to: 1174

1099.26 “Physician heal thyself!”] And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernum, do also here in thy country. (4:23)

— Mark. Referred to: 921

— Matthew.

note: the quotations at 972 and 1075 are indirect; for the indirect quotation at 965, which is in a quotation from the Nation, see also Mark, 12:40, and Luke, 20:47; the reference at 1174 is to the Sermon on the Mount.

quoted: 31, 902, 965, 972, 1075, 1096

referred to: 7, 135, 211, 1031, 1067, 1173, 1174
31.7 “Swear . . . all.”] Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear . . . all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. (5:33-5)

902.24-5 “to him that hath shall be given.”] For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. (13:12)

1096.20 “wrath to come,;”] But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? (3:7)

— Proverbs.

note: the quotations at 616 and 1183 are indirect.

quoted: 616, 804, 1183

— Psalms.

note: the quotation at 217 is in a quotation from Senior.

quoted: 217, 418

217.24 “Dwell in . . . fed?”] Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in . . . fed. (37:3)

418.26 “Put . . . princes.”] Put . . . princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. (146:3)

— Romans.

note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 909

— II Samuel. Referred to: 1081

— I Timothy. Referred to: 7

— II Timothy. Referred to: 7

— Titus.

note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 679
referred to: 7

Bignon, Louis Pierre Edouard, baron (1771-1841; DBF). Referred to: 378, 531-2, 532, 665

— Amendment to the Address to the King (3 Dec.), Moniteur, 1832, 2068-9.
referred to: 532

— Speech on Foreign Affairs (7 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 53-4.
referred to: 665

Bird, Anne (b. ca. 1805).
note: a woman of Horace Street, Edgware Road, accused of beating a child.
referred to: 1155

Bird, Robert Curtis (b. ca. 1815).
note: a farmer; accused of causing the death of Mary Anne Parsons.
referred to: 1152, 1153, 1164-7

Bird, Sarah (b. ca. 1815).
note: wife of Robert Curtis Bird.
referred to: 1152, 1153, 1164-7

Bishop, Henry (b. 1792).
note: born in Oxford, he received a B.A. from Oriel College in 1814 and an M.A. in 1816, and was ordained a priest in 1817. He acted an Assistant Commissioner as well as Commissioner for the Poor Law Inquiry, writing a controversial report on Oxford. He seems not to have served in a parish, but to have passed his latter years quietly at 7, Grove Hill, Tunbridge Wells.
referred to: 744, 778

Black, John (1783-1855; DNB).
note: all references to “the Editor of the Morning Chronicle” simply as recipient of letters are excluded.
referred to: 101, 102, 496, 502, 503, 504, 811-15, 815-22, 830

The Black Dwarf.
note: one anonymous article follows.

— “Question of Population” (signed “A Friend to the ‘Lower Classes’ ”), 7 Jan.,
1824, 15-21.

referred to: 95, 96-7

Blacker, William (1775-1855; MEB). Referred to: 927-30, 942

— The Prize Essay, Addressed to the Agricultural Committee of the Royal Dublin
Society. On the Management of Landed Property in Ireland; the Consolidation of
Small Farms, Employment of the Poor, Etc. Etc. Dublin: Curry; Belfast: Archer;
Armagh: M’Waters; London: Rodwell, 1834.

quoted: 927-8, 928, 928-9, 929-30, 1046

referred to: 927-30, 942, 974

927.33 that] I would therefore propose, that (33)

928.2 practicable, [or] where] practicable; likewise, where the interference with the
private rights of individuals seems to be least objectionable; for example, where (34)

928.4 place. In this] place; in this (34)

928.6-8 where . . . proved.] [not in italics] (34)

928.8 proved. Suppose Government to] proved; suppose government to (34)

928.11 an . . . perpetuity] [not in italics] (34)

928.12 conduct. Their own] conduct; their own (34)

928.13 lots, be] lot be (34) [treated as typographical error in this ed.]

928.14 agriculturist.] agriculturist, to be dealt with exactly as I have already
described. (34)

928.19 Government, . . . should] In prosecuting such a plan as this, government
should (34)

928.21 Let . . . industry] [not in italics] (34)

928.21 fruit] fruits (34)

928.21 raise] rouse (34)
928.23-4 above-mentioned. [paragraph] Suppose a] above mentioned. [2-sentence omission] All the details of a measure, like the foregoing, are not to be expected in a treatise like this: but suppose a (35)

928.28 40s. or 50s. advanced] 40s. to 50s. advanced (35)

928.30 America] America (35)

928.31 in the] into the (35-6)

928.32 independent.] independent; and it is evident, that if this plan was carried into effect, government could never suffer loss, on the contrary, a large profit would be derived by the extra rate of interest, and the additional rent produced by the improvement of the land, and the money being only advanced to supply the means of industry, the labour added to it would always afford ample security for its repayment, the land being always benefited much more than the advance made. (36)

928.36 It] [no paragraph] It (35) [this is the opening of the 1st sentence omitted at 928.23-4 above]

928.39 home. . . . I] [ellipsis indicates 1½-page omission] (35-6)

929.1 whatever. In] whatever; and as the removal of each settler from his immediate neighbourhood would leave a space to be filled up by the adjoining population, the benefit of an experiment of this kind, in any one place, would be thereby diffused generally, throughout the kingdom, and no one who has had any experience of the anxiety to obtain land, under a fair and liberal landlord, when it can be done without apprehension of danger, (even where they obtain no lease whatever,) will for a moment apprehend any want of settlers. In (37)

929.3-4 let . . . rent] [not in italics] (37)

929.6 cultivation.] cultivation, and thus the object of giving employment would be accomplished, at the same time exonerating government from having any further trouble in the business. (37)

929.42 I] [no paragraph] But I (7)

929.42 industry] industry (7)

930.1 proofs. . . . The spirit] proofs. [JSM skips back 5 sentences] The effect of a just settlement of the past, and the hopes arising from a fair charge for the future, will have an immediate effect in removing any such despondency, and if to this is added some assistance in the cultivation of their farms, the spirit (7)

930.5 knowledge.] knowledge, for I have tried the experiment, and can bear testimony to the good it produced. (7)

1046.27 if . . . house] [in italics] (23n)
1046.30 subject.”] subject, and I think it will not appear extraordinary, that such should be the case, to any one who reflects that the English farmer of 700 to 800 acres, is a kind of man approaching to what is known by the name of a gentleman farmer in this country. (23n)

Blackstone, William (1723-80; DNB). Referred to: 197


quoted: 393, 1173

referred to: 197, 755

393.32 “the . . . wrong;”] The . . . wrong. (I, 238)

1173.33 “If one intends,” . . . “to] And if one intends to (IV, 201)

1173.34 this is murder.”] this is also murder. (IV, 201)

1173.36 endless,” . . . “to] endless to (IV, 201)

1173.38 malicious,”] malicious: these therefore may suffice as a specimen; and we may take it for a general rule, that all homicide is malicious, and of course amounts to murder, unless where justified by the command or permission of the law; excused on a principle of accident or self-preservation; or alleviated into manslaughter, by being either the involuntary consequence of some act, not strictly lawful, or (if voluntary) occasioned by some sudden and sufficiently violent provocation. (IV, 201)

Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine. Referred to: 175, 691

Blake, William (1774-1852).

note: F.R.S., President of the Geological Society 1815-16, writer on currency.

referred to: 853


referred to: 853

Blanc, Jean Joseph Charles Louis (1811-82; DBF). Referred to: 1100


referred to: 1100, 1146
Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-81; DBF). Referred to: 396, 421, 422

Blomfield, Charles James (1786-1857; DNB). Referred to: 636, 744, 778, 813

— Speech on Labour Rate (3 July, 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 19, col. 67.

referred to: 636

Boeckh, August (1785-1867; GDU).

note: JSM uses the spelling Böckh.

referred to: 448


referred to: 448

Boisguillebert, Pierre le Pesant de (1646-1714; DBF). Referred to: 1048n


note: the reference is in a quotation from Michelet.

referred to: 1048n

Boissy d’Anglas, François Antoine de (1756-1826; DBF). Referred to: 198, 352

Bonaparte, Joseph Napoléon (1768-1844; DBF). Referred to: 250-1


referred to: 250-1

Bonaparte, Napoleon. See Napoleon I (of France).

Boniface VIII (Pope) (ca. 1235-1303; EB). Referred to: 819

Bonnias, Henri (b. 1800; DBF). Referred to: 396, 421, 422

Le Bon Sens. Referred to: 505

Bordeaux, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné de Bourbon, comte de Chambord, duc de (1820-83; DBF). Referred to: 269

Bories, Jean François Louis Clair (1795-1822; DBF).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Godefroi Cavaignac.

referred to: 1250

Bourbon, Louis Henri Joseph, duc de, prince de Condé (1756-1830; DBF). Referred to: 374, 380, 386, 392, 421, 422


note: also in The Times, 21 Dec., 1831, 2.

referred to: 392

Bourbon, Marie Caroline Ferdinande Louise de. See Berry, duchesse de.

Bourbons. See Louis XVIII and Charles X.

Bourdonnaye. See François Régis, comte de Labourdonnaie.

Bourke, Richard (1777-1855; DNB). Referred to: 939-40


note: the indirect quotation is in a quotation from the “Third Report of the Commissioners for Inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland,” 1836, q.v.

quoted: 939-40

Bourmont, Louis August Victor de Ghaisne, comte de (1773-1846; DBF).

Referred to: 127, 474

Bourne, William Sturges (1769-1845; DNB).

note: also known as Sturges-Bourne.

referred to: 744, 778
Boury, Adèle (b. ca. 1813).

note: accused of engineering the pistol plot against Louis Philippe.

referred to: 532, 667

Bouvattier, François (ca. 1772-1856).

note: mayor of the 8th (now 11th) arrondissement 1830-34. JSM uses the spelling Bouvatier.

referred to: 389-90

Bouverie, Edward Pleydell (1818-89; DNB). Referred to: 1220


referred to: 1220

Bouverie, William Pleydell (3rd Earl Radnor) (1779-1869; DNB). Referred to: 210-11

Bouvier-Dumolart, Louis (1780-1855; DBF).

note: the following letters are in chronological order.

referred to: 369, 381-4, 387, 388

— Letter to the Editor (20 Dec., 1831), Constitutionnel, 21 Dec., 1831, 4.

referred to: 381


quoted: 383

referred to: 381, 382, 387

383.1-14 The . . . life.] [translated from:]] Les derniers événemens politiques, qui ont exercé, en général, une si fâcheuse influence sur les affaires commerciales, ont été peu sensibles, je dois le dire, dans la fabrique de Lyon. Le travail n’a pas manqué, grâce à d’immenses commandes faites par les Américains. L’année 1829 est celle de la plus grande activité de la fabrication, qui s’est élevée à près de six cent mille kilogrammes. L’année de la révolution de juillet 1830 à juillet 1831 ne diffère de ce maximum que de quinze mille kilogrammes. Non-seulement tous les ouvriers ont été constamment occupés, mais la durée de leur journée de travail a été beaucoup plus longue, et six mille métiers sont restés oisifs, faute de bras. [paragraph] Dans cette situation, cependant, les ouvriers se plaignaient: ils adressaient leurs respectueuses doléances à l’autorité, ils se réunissaient avec ordre, calme et décence dans une maison.
particulière; ils nommèrent des commissaires pour présenter et soutenir leurs réclamations. L’opinion publique se prononçait pour eux; ils inspiraient un intérêt général, et tous les fabricans honnêtes avouaient que ces malheureux, en travaillant dix heures par jour ne gagnaient pas seulement pour vivre. (1; Letter 1)

Bowen, Charles.

note: a tradesman.

referred to: 1187

Bowring, John (1792-1872; DNB). Referred to: 147-9

— Letter to the Editor, Examiner, 3 Oct., 1830, 627.

note: the letter is reproduced in full in the headnote to No. 49.

quoted: 148

referred to: 148-9

148.17 “narrow . . . candidates”) The Chamber of 1830 consisted of the best men that could be found in the narrow . . . candidates, wherever popular opinion had any—the slightest—preponderance. (627)

Brewster, David (1781-1868; DNB).

note: the reference is to him as the “Reviewer.”

referred to: 171


note: the quotations are in a quotation from the Morning Chronicle, 14 Oct., 1830, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 171-2

Bridle, William.

note: Governor of Ilchester Gaol, 1808-21, who, earlier a member of the Somerset Fencibles, had been Chief Mate of the hulk Retribution.

referred to: 68

Bright, John (1811-88; DNB). Referred to: 1263

referred to: 1218

Brighton Guardian.

note: two anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

— “Literature and Patronage,” 8 June, 1831, 2.

quoted: 321, 321-2, 322, 322-3, 323, 324, 325

referred to: 318-27

321.12 “literary men] Literary men (2)

321.13-14 “a . . . sentiment.”] [paragraph] If the respect for literary men be a . . . sentiment, are there any circumstances remaining to justify it? (2)

321.16 “respect . . . veneration.”] The respect . . . veneration, which their successors had for them has clung to the profession of literature to this day, and it is praised and honored for what it once did not for what it now does. (2)

321.18 men.”] men; but the mine of antiquity has long been exhausted, and all the ore which it contained extracted and put to use. (2)

321.20 “is] [see collation for 321.16]

321.23 Do] [no paragraph] Do (2)

321.25 Punch] punch (2)

321.28 symbols [cymbals],] symbols, (2)

322.27 however, . . . go] however go (2)

322.33-4 “it is . . . death;”] It is . . . death, which, for force and accuracy, have never surpassed. (2)

322.35 “It] [paragraph] It (2)

322.36-7 Trade;” . . . “a . . . produce;”] Trade, in which he advocated, if not with as many felicitous illustrations as subsequent events taught adam smith, yet clearly and forcibly, those principles of Free Trade which have lately, by a want of markets for own [sic] produce, been brought into general favour. (2)

322.37-323.1 “it is upwards . . . that . . . nature;”] [paragraph] It is now upwards . . . “that . . . Nature;” and upwards of 100 since locke repeated and enforced that great
principle in his peculiar form, viz. “that all our knowledge of the extreme world is acquired by means of our senses,” which has now been a popular maxim in England, repeated, parrot-like by thousands of scribblers since the days of that great philosopher and patriot. (2)

323.3-4 “human society, in its . . . flowers;”] Human society, in all its . . . flowers. (2)

324.24 world. Every] world. [3-sentence omission] Every (2)

324.27 world:”] world. (2)

325.2 It] [no paragraph] It (2)

325.5 people’s] People’s (2)

325.5 weaver, for] weaver or (2) [printer’s error in Source]

325.7 there that is] there is (2) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]


note: the quotation is a quotation from No. 109.

quoted: 330

referred to: 329-30

330.16 “with the tribe of dunces.”] Our remarks, however, have touched some people to the quick, and we are called a “perverse person,” classed with the “tribe of dunces,” and our article is described as being of “inconceivable Vandalism.” (2)

Briqueville de Bretteville, Armand François Bon Claude (1785-1844; DBF). Referred to: 355

Brissot, Jacques Pierre (1754-93; DBF). Referred to: 317

*The British Luminary and Weekly Intelligencer.* Referred to: 93

*The British Press.*

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 44

Broglie, Achille Charles Léonce Victor, duc de (1785-1870; DBF).

note: the reference at 698 is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller.*
referred to: 136, 144, 512, 515, 665, 698, 700, 701


referred to: 515


referred to: 515


— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (7 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 54.

referred to: 665

— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (8 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 59-60.

referred to: 665

Brougham, Henry Peter (Lord) (1788-1868; *DNB*).

note: the reference at 201 is to a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, that at 362 is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller*.

referred to: 201, 320, 362, 620, 621, 621-2, 622-8, 628-30, 759, 772-3, 841-4, 947, 1219, 1263


referred to: 201


referred to: 842, 843

— Motion on the Education of the Poor (28 June, 1820; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 2, cols. 49-89.

note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller*.

referred to: 362


referred to: 621
— Speech on Reform in the Courts of Law (29 Apr., 1830; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 24, cols. 243-74.

referred to: 947


referred to: 623


referred to: 622


referred to: 627, 947


referred to: 628-34, 772


referred to: 624


quoted: 842

referred to: 842

842.14 “marvellous ignorance”] Marvellous ignorance! Marvellous ignorance of the whole question! (42)

Brougham, William (2nd Baron) (1795-1886; *MEB*). Referred to: 628

Brown, Henry.

note: an artisan.

referred to: 653
— Saint Monday: A Poem, by the Author of “The Mechanic’s Saturday Night.”
London: Steill, 1833.

referred to: 653

Brown, Sarah (ca. 1827-46).

note: subject of No. 318.

referred to: 916-19

Brown, Thomas (1778-1820; DNB). Referred to: 286

Browne, Denis (ca. 1763-1828).

note: M.P. for Mayo 1801-18, for Kilkenny 1820-26. The reference derives from Wooler, whom Mill follows in spelling his first name “Dennis.”

referred to: 89

Brownrigg, Elizabeth (d. 1767; DNB). Referred to: 1153, 1169-70

Brummell, George Bryan (“Beau”) (1778-1840; DNB). Referred to: 159

Brunel, Marc Isambard (1769-1849; DNB). Referred to: 1263

Bryant, Cornelius.

note: one of the two “resurrection men” convicted in 1823 (the other was William Millard, q.v.).

referred to: 48-50

Bryant, Mary Ann.

note: the quotation of her evidence is from “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir,” Morning Chronicle, 28 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1168

Buckingham, Duke of. See Richard Grenville.


referred to: 639

Buckler-Lethbridge, Thomas (2nd Baronet Lethbridge) (1778-1849).
note: JSM uses the name Lethbridge. M.P. for Somerset 1806-12, 1820-30, and
colonel of the 2nd Somerset militia.

referred to: 281

Bugeaud de la Piconnerie, Thomas Robert, duc d’Isly (1784-1849; DBF). Referred to:
661, 682
— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (6 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 40-1.
referred to: 661

Buller, Charles (1806-48; DNB).

note: the reference at 769 is to his introducing propositions on disputed election
returns, for which see Journals of the House of Commons, LXXXIX (1834), 10 (5
Feb., 1834).

referred to: 508, 636, 769
referred to: 508
— Speech on the Ministerial Plan for the Abolition of Slavery (11 June, 1833;
Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, cols. 575-8.
referred to: 604
— Speech on the East-India Company’s Charter (19 July, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd
ser., Vol. 19, col. 1028.
referred to: 606
— Speech on Employment for Agricultural Labourers (5 Aug., 1833; Commons), PD,
3rd ser., Vol. 20, col. 357.
referred to: 636

Buller, John (1771-1849).

note: M.P. for West Looe 1826-27, patron of the borough.
referred to: 508

Bulletin des lois. See France, Statutes.

Bulwer, Edward George Earle Lytton (later Bulwer-Lytton, later Lord Lytton)
(1803-73; DNB). Referred to: 717-27, 1198, 1263

note: the reference is in a quotation from Chasles.

referred to: 719


referred to: 717-27


note: the reference is in a quotation from Chasles.

referred to: 719


note: the reference is in a quotation from Chasles.

referred to: 719

Bulwer, Rosina Doyle Wheeler (later Bulwer-Lytton and Lady Lytton) (1802-82; *DNB*). Referred to: 1198

Burdett, Francis (1770-1844; *DNB*). Referred to: 211-12, 1263


referred to: 1263

Burke, Edmund (1729-97; *DNB*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 757


note: Vols. III-V formerly in SC.

referred to: 502

— Mr. Burke’s *Three Letters Addressed to a Member of the Present Parliament on the Prospects for Peace with the Regicide Directory of France. Letter II: On the*

quoted: 122

122.38-9 “an insurrection of the talents] Jacobinism is the revolt of the enterprising talents (IV, 424)


quoted: 767

767.31-2 “the shameful parts of the constitution.”] When this child of ours [America] wishes to assimilate to its parent, and to reflect with a true filial resemblance the beauteous countenance of British liberty; are we to turn to them the shameful parts of our constitution? are we to give them our weakness for their strength; our opprobrium for their glory; and the slough of slavery, which we are not able to work off, to serve them for their freedom? (I, 575)

— Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents (1770). In Works, I, 409-505.

note: the quotation at 757 is in a quotation from Senior, who used another ed.; this one used for consistency of reference.

quoted: 757, 865

referred to: 62, 120

757.14 “These] [paragraph] These (447)

757.17 this; but] this. But (447) [JSM follows Senior]

757.22 it be] it will be (447) [JSM follows Senior]

757.25 England. . . . When] England. [44-page omission] When (447, 491) [JSM follows Senior, who indicates the elipsis only by a dash]

757.25 When a] When (491) [JSM follows Senior]

757.26 stability; but] stability. But (491) [JSM follows Senior]

757.27 private humour] private humour (491) [JSM follows Senior]

757.28 quicksand.] a quicksand. (491) [JSM follows Senior]

757.43-4 But . . . neglect] [not in italics] (492) [JSM follows Senior]

757.43 hour, without] hour, and in the self-same assembly, without (492) [JSM follows Senior]
865.38 “credulous morality”] The whole scenery was exactly disposed to captivate those good souls, whose credulous morality is so invaluable a treasure to crafty politicians. (429)

Burn, William.

note: a waggoner, the defendant in the case discussed in No. 329.

referred to: 952-4

Burt, Stephen John.

note: a surgeon, M.R.C.S. 1830, practising at 26 Farringdon Street. His evidence is quoted in “Law Intelligence,” Standard, 13 May, 1850, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1176-7

referred to: 1177

Butler, Richard (Earl of Glengall) (1794-1858).

note: M.P. Tipperary 1818-19; Irish peer from 1829.

referred to: 1114

— Speech on Encumbered Estates (Ireland) Bill (31 July, 1848; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 100, cols. 1028-30.

quoted: 1114

1114.9 “confiscation of all the land of Ireland,”] He considered this Bill nothing more nor less than confiscation; and, by carrying it into operation as it then stood, their Lordships would do that which Mr. O’Connell was, during nearly the whole of his life, attempting to do, namely, effect the repeal of the Union, and confiscate the property of the Protestant landlords of Ireland. (1029-30)


note: in SC.

quoted: 649

649.3-4 . . . a tool / Which knaves . . . fool.] Some hold the one, and some the other; / But, howso’er they make a pother, / The diff’rence was so small, his brain / Outweigh’d his rage but half a grain; / Which made some take him for a tool / That knaves . . . Fool. (I, 7; Pt. 1, Canto 1, ll. 31-6)
Byron, George Gordon (Lord) (1788-1824; DNB). *The Age of Bronze; or, Carmen Seculare et Annum Haud Mirabilis.* London: Hunt, 1823.

referred to: 807

Cabet, Etienne (1788-1856; DBF).

note: some references at 1145 are in quotations from *Démocratie Pacifique.*

referred to: 482, 495, 511, 688, 1145

— Letter to the editor of the *Constitutionnel,* 30 Aug., 1832, 1.

note: see also Garnier-Pagès and Laboissière.

referred to: 511

*The Cabinet Cyclopaedia.* See Dionysius Lardner.

Caesar, Gaius Julius (100-44; WWR). Referred to: 394, 870

Calas, Jean (1698-1762; DBF). Referred to: 126

Calixtus II (Pope) (d. 1124; EB). Referred to: 870

Callicles.

note: a character in Plato’s *Gorgias,* presumably real.

referred to: 1162


note: source of the anecdote about Alexander Pope: “It is remarkable that the expletive Mr. Pope generally used by way of oath, was ‘God mend me!’ One day, in a dispute with a hackney coachman, he used this expression—‘Mend you! says the coachman, it would not be half the trouble to make a new one.’ ” (303.)

quoted: 590

Campbell, George (1719-96; DNB). Referred to: 16

Campbell, John (1779-1861; DNB).


quoted: 1177, 1178
referred to: 591, 592, 624, 636, 1176


referred to: 624

Campbell, Thomas (1777-1844; DNB). Referred to: 1263

Canning, George (1770-1827; DNB). Referred to: 61, 86, 110, 1101, 1102


referred to: 196, 1101


note: this speech is representative of Canning’s views on Reform.

referred to: 1101

— Speech on the Freehold Estates Bill (28 Jan., 1807; Commons), PD, 1st ser., Vol. 8, cols. 857-8.

referred to: 61

Cappellari, Bartolommeo Alberto. See Gregory XVI.

Caracci, Annibale (1560-1609; EB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Sarah Flower [Adams], who uses the spelling Carracci.

referred to: 654

Carbonel, Antoine François (1779-1861; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Carbonnel.

referred to: 227

Carlier, Pierre Charles Joseph (1794-1858; DBF). Referred to: 389

Carlile, Mary Ann (b. 1794).
Note: her petition, for release from Dorchester Gaol, dated 5 Feb., 1823, is given in the speech of Joseph Hume, 26 Mar., q.v.

referred to: 21, 24

Carlile, Richard (1790-1843; DNB).

Note: his petition, complaining of the seizure of his property, is given in the speech of Joseph Hume, 8 May, 1823, q.v.

referred to: 8-9, 21-4

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881; DNB). Referred to: 1095-1100


Note: in SC. The reference is to Mahomet, the subject of Carlyle’s second lecture, as one of his heroes.

referred to: 1097


Note: presentation copy, “To Mrs. Taylor / with kind regards. / T.C.,” in SC.

referred to: 1099

— “Repeal of the Union,” Examiner, 29 Apr., 1848, 275-6.

Note: replied to by No. 372 above.

Quoted: 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099

referred to: 1095-1100

1096.11-13 “the Destinies . . . England a heavier . . . generations”] That the stern Destinies . . . England a terrible job of labour in these centuries, and will inexorably (as their wont is) have it done: a job of labour terrible to look upon, extending superficially to the Indies and the Antipodes over all countries, and in depth, one knows not how deep; for it is not cotton-spinning and commencing merely; it is (as begins to be visible) governing, regulating, which in these days will mean conquering dragons and world-wide chimeras, and climbing as high as the zenith to snatch fire from the gods, and diving as deep as the nadir to fling devils in chains:—and it has been laid upon the poor English people, all this; a heavier . . . generations! (275)

1096.14 “conquering Anarchy:”] Conquering Anarchy; which is not conquerable except by weapons gained in Heaven’s armoury, and used in battles against Orcus;—so that we may say of him that conquers it, as the Italians were wont to say of Dante: Eccouì l’uom ch’è stato all’inferno! (275)
1096.14-15 “England’s . . . Providences,""] The candid Irish Confederation admits that such is really the fact; that England’s work will be effectually stopped by this occupation of her back-parlour; and furthermore that they, the Irish Confederation, mean it so—mean to stop England’s . . . Providences. (275)

1096.17 “flatly . . . universe.”] I grieve to say it; but so the matter is: flatly . . . universe in these current centuries, and not to be ventured upon as an investment by any person whose capital of money, logic, rhetoric, wind-eloquence, influence, courage, strength, old soda-water bottles, or other animal or spiritual possession, is precious to him. (275)

1096.24 “slavery.”] Fruitless futile insurrections, continual sanguinary broils and riots that make his dwelling-place a horror to mankind, mark his progress generation after generation; and if no beneficent hand will chain him into wholesome slavery, and, with whip on back or otherwise, try to tame him, and get some work out of him,—Nature herself, intent to have her world tilled, has no resource but to exterminate him, as she has done the wolves and various other obstinately free creatures before now! (276)

1096.28 “the laws of the universe,”] [see collation for 1096.17]

1096.31 “conquering of anarchy”] [see collation for 1096.14]

1096.38-9 “destinies and divine providences”] [see collation for 1096.14-15]

1098.28 “a doom . . . shudder.”] If Tipperary choose to obstruct England in this terrible enterprise, Tipperary, I can see, will learn better, or meet a doom . . . shudder. (276)

1099.23-4 “world . . . anarchy,”] England’s heavy job of work, inexorably needful to be done, cannot go on at all, unless her back-parlour too belong to herself; with foreign controversies, parliamentary eloquences, with American sympathizers, Parisian émeutiers, Ledru-Rollins, and a world . . . anarchy, parading incessantly through her back-parlour, no nation can go on with any work. (275)

Carrel, Armand (1800-36; DBF).

note: see also “Des correspondances des journaux anglais,” Le National, 31 Oct., 1832, which is probably by Carrel, and the National de 1834.

referred to: 389, 428, 466-7, 481, 510, 525-30, 666, 668, 669, 685, 688, 700, 717, 719, 725, 733, 737, 747


referred to: 428

note: the reference is in a quotation from *Le National.*

referred to: 526

— “Ouverture de la session de 1834,” *National de 1834,* 1 Aug., 1834, 1.

referred to: 747

— “Qu’il faut craindre de rendre les modérés violens en se moquant de la modération,” *Le National,* 31 May, 1832, 1.

referred to: 510


referred to: 747

Carroll, Charles (1737-1832; *DAB*). Referred to: 542

Carroll, George (1811-60).

note: banker, sheriff of London and Middlesex 1837-38, Lord Mayor 1846-47. See also *Morning Chronicle,* 11 Nov., 1846, in which Carroll is quoted.

referred to: 952-4

Castlereagh, Lord. See Robert Stewart.

Cathelineau, Jacques (1759-93; *DBF*). Referred to: 474

Cathelineau, Jacques Joseph (1787-1832; *DBF*). Referred to: 474

Cauchois-Lemaire, Louis François Auguste (1789-1861; *DBF*). Referred to: 428, 505

Cavaignae, Godefroi Louis Eléonore (1801-45; *DBF*). Referred to: 302, 303, 407, 683


note: the quoted part is in JSM’s translation (see App. A).

quoted: 1247-50

referred to: 303, 407

1247.9-1250.38 My . . . ago.] [translated from:] [paragraph] Mon père fut un de ceux qui, dans le sein de la Convention nationale, proclamèrent la république à la face de l’Europe, alors victorieuse. Il la défendit aux armées. C’est pour cela qu’il est mort
dans l’exil après douze années de proscription; et, tandis que la restauration elle-même était forcée de laisser à la France les fruits de cette révolution qu’il avait servie, tandis qu’elle combait de ses faveurs les hommes que la république avait créés, mon père et ses collègues souffraient seuls pour la grande cause que tant d’autres trahissaient; dernier hommage de leur vieillesse impuissante à la patrie que leur jeunesse avait si vigoureusement défendue. Cette cause, Messieurs, se lie donc à tous mes sentiments comme fils; les principes qu’elle embrassait sont mon héritage. L’étude a fortifié cette direction donnée naturellement à mes idées politiques, et, aujourd’hui que l’occasion s’offre enfin à moi, je me hâte de prononcer un mot que d’autres proscrivent; je le déclare sans affectation comme sans feinte, de coeur et de conviction: je suis républicain. Mais il ne m’eût pas suffi, Messieurs, pour adopter mes opinions, que la république me paraît être en soi le moins imparfait des gouvernemens; j’ai tâché de me rendre compte des faits, de voir si elle était praticable, et j’ai compris, non pas seulement qu’elle était possible, mais que tout marchait là, les événemens, les esprits, les choses. J’ai compris qu’il était impossible que le mouvement qui domine aujourd’hui le monde aboutît à rien d’autre que la république. Il y a long-temps, Messieurs, que cette tendance a été signalée. Napoléon l’a reconnue, M. de Châteaubriant l’a proclamée plus d’une fois, quoiqu’ils ne soient ni l’un ni l’autre suspects de partialité pour un système républicain. Que dis-je? le gouvernement actuel l’a admise lui-même, cette tendance; il s’est d’abord déclaré monarchie entourée d’institutions républicaines; et, bien que cette alliance de mots soit vraiment monstrueuse, bien qu’ils hurlent, comme on l’a dit, de se trouver ensemble, on a cru les lire gravés par les balles sur les murs de l’Hôtel-de-Ville. (Sensation marquée.) Messieurs, cet avenir prochain, que ceux-là mêmes aperçoivent qui détournent la tête avec effroi, est la véritable cause des opinions républicaines chez ceux qui veulent les réfléchir et qui ne s’y livrent pas par un enthousiasme de collége. Ils les cultivent par la raison que tout homme de sens se prépare d’avance à un résultat qu’il prévoit, dont il sera le témoin, qu’il juge infaillible. Ils ne sont pas républicains en souvenir de Rome ou d’Athènes, ce serait trop mais; ils ne le sont pas à cause du passé, mais à cause de l’avenir. Or, c’est précisément parce que l’avenir leur paraît certain qu’ils ne conspirent pas. A quoi bon? S’il est un parti en France qui ne conspire pas, c’est le parti républicain, car il est convaincu qu’il n’a qu’à laisser aller les choses. Que ceux-là conspirent pour qui chaque jour est une chance de moins, qui sont obligés d’avoir recours à leur énergie personnelle, de tenter un coup de fortune politique, parce que leur siècle les repousse, parce qu’ils n’ont d’autres ressources que des complots, d’autre avenir que celui qu’ils jouaient contre leurs têtes, je le concevrais. Il y a sans doute au moins un parti comme cela en France; mais le parti républicain serait bien fou, de compromettre une cause dont le succès est immanquable, par des entreprises inutiles. Il faudrait qu’il eût bien la fureur de livrer à la justice des rois des têtes qui peuvent se reposer sur la fortune des peuples. Messieurs, si ce parti avait voulu conspirer, il le pouvait. Il le pouvait dans la grande semaine, et cela à la clarté du soleil de juillet, dans la place publique. Il le pouvait, et la preuve, c’est qu’on a voulu négocier avec lui; mon défenseur l’attesterait au besoin. Même le 30 juillet nous avons été conduits plusieurs, desquels j’étais, ainsi que Guinard, auprès du lieutenant-général du royaume. Et, je le déclare hautement, certes on lui a parlé avec la franchise que j’emploie, on a professé devant lui les opinions que je professe encore; et de là ces défiances dont
nous avons amené l’agent devant vous. Mais, outre que cela eût été par trop ingénu, personne ne lui a demandé de proclamer la république. Consultez la nation; elle seule a le droit de choisir son gouvernement; voilà ce que nous demandions, voilà ce que nous pensons. La souveraineté du peuple est la base de nos principes, et quand on nous accuse de songer à lui imposer un ordre de choses qu’il a seul le droit de constituer, on ment. [paragraph] Messieurs, avec ce que nous attendons il est facile d’attendre. Les partis qui ont de l’avenir ont de la patience; d’ailleurs, nous sommes jeunes, et dans ce temps le monde va vite; et, pour exprimer notre pensée tout entière, je répéterai ce que nous avons dit quelquefois à ceux qui croyaient qu’on n’avait pas fait en juillet tout ce qu’on pouvait: Vous en comprendrez mieux comment toute conspiration nous semblerait une vraie duperie. [paragraph] A une révolution, quelque belle, quelque facile qu’elle ait été, succèdent toujours des difficultés immenses; la monarchie se charge de cette tâche; tant pis pour elle, tant mieux pour nous; si elle ne réussit pas cette fois, c’est fait d’elle; et, dans notre conviction, elle ne peut pas réussir: car les nations sont travaillées aujourd’hui d’un mal si profond, si inexplicable, si corrosif; il y a dans la société un dissolvant si énergique de tous les moyens du pouvoir, que le pouvoir est à refondre tout entier; et, en vérité, à voir les besoins qui tourmentent le monde, il semble qu’un dieu même trouverait plus difficile de le gouverner que de le refaire. (Mouvement marqué d’approbation dans l’auditoire.) [paragraph] Cette nouvelle combinaison, disions-nous, satisfait beaucoup d’esprits, on y compte. Le général Lafayette s’est rallié à elle avec tout l’ascendant de son immense popularité. Laissons l’épreuve s’achever, laissons le fardeau à ceux qui le prennent, laissons user encore les hommes et les systèmes. Quand votre tour viendra, vous aurez encore assez à faire. Dans la marche si rapide où la société est lancée, les hommes et les systèmes se succèdent pour la conduire au but; le dernier relai est celui qui arrive. Eh bien! ce sera vous. Nous vivons dans le siècle des gouvernements suicidés. La monarchie fera nos affaires; elle s’épuisera à votre place, elle conspirera pour vous. [paragraph] Oui, c’est ainsi, Messieurs, que nous comprenons notre position. Nous ne conspirons pas, nous nous tenons prêts. A une époque où les peuples tout entiers se mêlent de politique, on ne conspirie plus; c’était bon du temps que tout se passait entre quelques gens vainqueurs et vaincus tour à tour; quand tout un parti tenait dans la main d’un chef de complot. Aujourd’hui, il n’y a plus d’homme qui ait la main assez large, assez forte; la place publique est seule assez grande pour ces masses qui n’agissent au gré de personne, pour ces masses qu’on ne soulève pas plus qu’on ne leur résiste. [paragraph] Depuis qu’on fait des révolutions, les conjurations sont peu de chose. Eh! Messieurs, nous le savons de reste. Long-temps nous avons conspiré contre les Bourbons. Qu’en est-il arrivé? Que quelques hommes se sont trompés sans doute, qu’on n’a pas laissé prescrire le droit de résistance à l’oppression, qu’on a protesté contre l’invasion légitime; mais voilà tout, et avec cela la fuite des uns, la ruine des autres, la mort de ceux qui ont versé sur l’échafaud leur sang, la plus pur sang des patriotes. Puis un beau jour, ah oui! un beau jour! le peuple, qui ne conspirait pas, le peuple s’est jeté dans les rues, il a improvisé en quelques heures cette délivrance si long-temps poursuivie. [paragraph] Voilà ce que nous avons appris, voilà ce que nous n’oublierons pas, et ces débats le prouvent. Qu’on s’en souvienne aussi, qu’on renonce désormais à tout cet épouvantail de conspirations républicaines. Nous espérons que ce procès en dégoûtera; nous ne sommes pas des enfans, et nous avons un meilleur emploi à faire de notre vie que de la jouer pour des inutilités. Cette salle a retenti tant de fois des mots de complots.
contre la sûreté de l’état, qu’il y a peut-être encore ici des échos pour les grossir; mais au-dehors de cette enceinte ils n’en trouveront plus. Les charlatans cesseront d’exploiter ce mal imaginaire, et c’est un service qu’à défaut d’autres l’accusateur aura rendu au pays. [paragraph] Les accusés ont le droit peut-être de revendiquer quelque part dans ce service. Placés devant vous, sans nom illustré qui se joignit à leur cause, ils ont eu confiance en vous, en eux-mêmes: car vous et eux ce sont gens d’honneur, qui n’ont besoin du secours de personne pour servir la vérité; et si ce procès est utile à notre pays, nous trouvons déjà notre récompense dans le moyen qu’il nous donne de répondre hautement à nos calomnieurs. [13-paragraph omission] Ce sang, il n’est pas à nous; il est à notre pays, à notre pays que nous aimons, parce qu’il est digne que ses enfans l’aient, parce qu’il les a faits libres, parce qu’il est grand, parce qu’il est cher, utile, redoutable au reste du monde. Le pays, voilà à quoi nous sommes dévoués, dévoués corps et âme, non comme des fanatiques qui s’enivrent d’un mot, mais comme des gens de coeur qui sont heureux de trouver quelque chose en ce monde à quoi il soit noble, juste et doux de consacrer ses affections et sa vie. [paragraph] Messieurs, voilà nos sentimens, voilà nos principes: car nous ne les séparons pas. Et pourtant nous sommes ici, nous sommes sur le banc où plusieurs de nos frères ont entendu leur sentence de mort au nom de Louis XVIII. Si je me retournais, et que je visse au bonnet des soldats qui nous gardent cette cocarde tricolore que nous leur avons rendu, Messieurs, je ne pourrais en croire mes yeux. Qu’on amène ici des Suisses, des soldats de la garde royale, et alors je comprendrai; alors nous nous reporterons au temps de notre cher et malheureux Bories; et, pensant que Charles X règne encore, nous ne nous étonnerons pas qu’on ait voulu nous frapper comme l’eût fait Charles X il y a huit mois. (3-4)

Cavaignac, Jean Baptiste, baron de Lalande (1762-1829; DBF).

note: Godefroy Cavaignac’s father; referred to in the speech by his son, q.v.

referred to: 1248

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-57; DBF). Referred to: 1111

Cavendish, William George Spencer (6th Duke of Devonshire) (1790-1858; DNB). Referred to: 159

Cecil, William (Lord Burghley) (1520-98; DNB). Referred to: 282

Le Censeur Européen.

note: see also François Charles Louis Comte and Barthélemy Dunoyer.

referred to: 355, 522, 669

Chadwick, Edwin (1800-90; DNB).

note: the reference at 1201-4 is to the editor of the Penny Newsman. See also “The Polish Insurrection,” Penny Newsman, 8 Mar., 1863; “The Insurrection in Russian
Poland,” *ibid.*, 1 Feb., 1863; “Poland,” *ibid.*, 22 Feb., 1863; and “Poland,” *ibid.*, 1 Mar., 1863.

referred to: 743-4, 778, 822, 1201-4


reviewed: 822-30

quoted: 825, 826, 827-9

825.6 is greater] are greater (369)

825.9 poor] poor’s (369)

825.13-14 Sweden: [*paragraph*] That] Sweden. . . . [*paragraph*] That (369)

825.36-7 avoided. [*paragraph*] That] avoided. . . . [*paragraph*] That (371)

825.40-1 management. [*paragraph*] That] management. . . . [*paragraph*] That (371)

826.40-1 of the supply] of supply (331)

829.1 were] was (176)

Chales. See Chasles.

Chamfort, Sébastien Roch Nicolas (1741-94; *DBF*). Referred to: 525

Chantelauze, Jean Claude Balthazar Victor de (1787-1859; *DBF*).

note: see also Polignac, “Manifesto . . . .”

referred to: 163-8, 177, 215, 223, 225-6, 373

Charlemagne (ca. 742-814; *DBF*). Referred to: 870

Charles II (of England) (1630-85; *DNB*). Referred to: 47

Charles IX (of France) (1550-74; *DBF*). Referred to: 695

Charles X (of France) (1757-1836; *DBF*).
note: many of the references are to “the Bourbons” during the Restoration; the reference at 129 is to him as “a priest-ridden despot”; that at 139 is to the “roi cagot”; the first at 170 is in a quotation from the Standard; the second at 170 and the first at 171, in a quotation from the Morning Chronicle, are to him as a “foolish” monarch and “a priest-ridden old man”; that at 260 is to him as constituting “the executive”; those at 1248 are in a speech by Godefroy Cavaignac.


Charles Felix (Duke of Savoy; King of Sardinia) (1765-1831; GE).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Sismondi.

referred to: 989

Chasles, Philarète Euphémon (1798-1873; DBF).

note: JSM spells his name Chales.

referred to: 717-27


note: the review, in three parts, was of the Paris ed. in English, the French translation by J. Cohen (1833), and d’Haussez’s La Grande Bretagne en 1833 (1833).

quoted: 719-20, 721, 722, 724, 726

referred to: 717-27

719.32 Supposez qu’un] [no paragraph] Mais supposez qu’un (2nd article, 3)

719.35 lui?—Qu’il] lui? [paragraph] —Qu’il (2nd article, 3)

719.36 délire.—Envoyez-y] délire. [paragraph] —Envoyez-y (2nd article, 3)

726.22 pompeuse: la morale . . . bonne,”] pompeuse. [paragraph] La morale . . . bonne. (2nd article, 3)

Chateaubriand, François René, vicomte de (1768-1848; DBF). Referred to: 23, 153, 487, 495, 517, 518

note: the reference is in a quotation from Godefroy Cavaignac, *q.v.*

referred to: 1248

Chateauvieux. See Lullin de Chateauvieux.

Chatham, Lord. See William Pitt (the elder).

Chaubry de Troncenord, Joseph Frédéric (1793-1880; *DBF*). Referred to: 667


quoted: 308

308.30 “our lively neighbours,” [paragraph] Applying this general principle to the question before us, we conceive it impossible to deny, and quite unnecessary to prove, that the advantage is very decidedly on our side, on a comparison with our lively neighbours. (363)


quoted: 308

308.30 “our lively neighbours,” [paragraph] In the first reception they gave to the system of Locke, the French seemed in an extraordinary degree to overlook one great portion of his theory—that which attributes to one entire class of our ideas, another origin beside direct sensation, viz. reflection. But this is quite in the mode of our too lively neighbours. (164)

Chenut, Louis Victor.

note: the *adjoint* of the mayor of Nancy.

referred to: 263

Chevalier, Michel (1806-79; *DBF*). Referred to: 403, 444 (1263), 509, 677


referred to: 444 (1263)

Chillingworth, William (1602-44; *DNB*). Referred to: 16

Christ. See Jesus.

Christopher, Robert Adam (later Hamilton-Nisbet) (1804-77; *WWBMP*). Referred to: 863
— Speech on Repeal of the Corn Laws (10 June, 1845; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 81, cols. 314-18.

referred to: 863

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43; *WWR*). Referred to: 1215


note: Cicero’s *Philosophicorum*, 2 vols. (Leyden: Elzevir, 1642) in SC.

quoted: 175

175.17 *divinus furor*] “Quid vero habet auctoritatis furor iste, quem ‘divinum’ vocatis ut, quae sapiens non videat, ea videat insanus, et is qui humanos sensus amiserit divinos adsecutus sit?” (494; II, 110, 1-4)


note: Cicero’s *Orationum*, 3 vols. (Leyden: Elzevir, 1642) in SC.

quoted: 119

119.25 *bellum internecinum*] Neque porro illa manus copiaeque Catilinae caementis ac testis tectorum meorum se famen suam expleturas putaverunt: sed ut hostium urbes nec omnium hostium, verum eorum, quibuscum acerbum bellum internecivunque suscepimus, non praeda adducti, sed odio solemus exscindere, quod, in quos prospter eortum crudelitatem inflammatae mentes nostrae fuerunt, cum horum etiam tectis et sedibus residere aliquod bellum semper videtur. . . . (206; XXIII, 61)


quoted: 832

832.34-5 *summum jus . . . summa injuria*.] Ex quo illud “Summum ius summa iniuria” factum est iam tritum sermone proverbium. (34; I, x, 33)

note: the same phrase is quoted in both places; Cicero, *Orationum*, 3 vols. (Leyden: Elzevir, 1642), is in SC.

quoted: 489, 1016

489.28 *obtorto collo*] Hic iudices ridere, stomachari atque acerbe ferre patronus, causam sibi eripi et se cetera de illo loco “Respicite, iudices,” non posse dicere: nec quicquam propius est factum, quam ut illum persequeretur et collo obtorto ad subsellia reduceret, ut reliqua posset perorare. (282; 59, 1-6)


referred to: 292

Cimon (ca. 507-450; *WWG*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote, who uses the spelling Kimon.

referred to: 1124


Clare, Richard de (Lord Pembroke and Strigul) (d. 1176; *DNB*). Referred to: 920

Clark, James (1788-1870; *DNB*). Referred to: 877

Claude. See Claude Gelée.

Clay, William (1791-1869; *DNB*). Referred to: 734

Cleisthenes (ca. 565-500; *WWG*).

note: the reference at 1132 is in a quotation from Grote, who uses the spelling Kleisthenes (as does JSM at 1161).

referred to: 1086, 1088, 1132, 1161

Clement V (Pope) (ca. 1264-1314; *DBF*). Referred to: 819


quoted: 1049
Pour démontrer combien les évaluations au moyen desquelles on prétend prouver que l’accroissement de l’indigence suit les progrès industriels méritent peu d’attention, il suffit de leur opposer un fait incontestable et reconnu de tous: l’industrie a fait en France, pendant les quarante dernières années, plus de progrès qu’à aucune autre époque, et les classes de notre population qui n’ont que leur salaire, celles qui, par cette raison, sont le plus exposées à l’indigence, sont aujourd’hui beaucoup mieux pourvues des objets nécessaires à la nourriture, au logement et au vêtement, qu’elles ne l’étaient au commencement du siècle.

Ce fait ne peut être traduit en chiffres, mais il prouve évidemment le contraire de ce que l’on a voulu établir par les données statistiques dont il s’agit, et comme on peut l’appuyer du témoignage de toutes les personnes qui ont souvenir de la première des époques comparées, il est assurément beaucoup plus concluant que des évaluations fondées, en grande partie, sur l’imagination de leurs auteurs.¹ S’il restait des doutes à cet égard, on pourrait facilement les dissiper en consultant les anciens cultivateurs et les anciens ouvriers, ainsi que nous l’avons fait nous-mêmes dans diverses localités, sans rencontrer un seul témoignage contradictoire; on peut invoquer aussi les renseignements recueillis à ce sujet par un observateur exact, déjà cité, M. Villermé (Tableau de l’état physique et moral des ouvriers, tome 2, chap. 1er). (84-5)

Clement, William Innell (d. 1852; DNB). Referred to: 45n

Cleomenes III (d. 219 ; WWG).

note: one of the references at 872 and that at 873 are in a quotation from Grote, who uses the spelling Kleomenēs.

referred to: 872, 873

Cleon (d. 422 ; WWG).

note: some of the references are in quotations from Grote, who uses the spelling Kleon.

referred to: 1126-8, 1160


referred to: 1128

Clifford, Mary (d. 1767).

note: an apprentice flogged to death by Elizabeth Brownrigg, q.v.

referred to: 1153, 1170
Clinton, Henry Pelham Fiennes Pelham (4th Duke of Newcastle) (1785-1851; DNB). Referred to: 211


note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 1173

referred to: 210-11, 1031


note: the letter, dated 18 Sept., 1828, was printed in The Times, 23 Sept., 1828.

referred to: 118-19

Clive, Edward (Earl of Powis) (1754-1839; DNB). Referred to: 507

Clive, Robert Henry (1789-1854; MEB). Referred to: 507

Clouet, Anne Louis Antoine, baron (1781-1862; DBF). Referred to: 474

Cobbett, William (1763-1835; DNB). Referred to: 123, 1264

— “The Petition of the Nobility, Gentry, and Others of the County of Norfolk, in County Meeting Assembled, This 3d Day of January, 1823.” In Cobbett’s Weekly Register, XLV (11 Jan., 1823), 76-82.

note: Cobbett claims the authorship of the Petition. At 762 JSM is quoting from an article in The Times of 12 Dec., 1834, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 567, 762

Cobden, Richard (1804-65; DNB). Referred to: 1219, 1263

— Speech on National Representation (6 July, 1848; Commons), PD, Vol. 100, cols. 181-95.

quoted: 1108

referred to: 1102

1108.6 “good poet but bad politician,”) I am sorry that the subject was introduced here; for we wanted no additional examples to prove to us that a good poet may be a very bad politician. (184)

Coke, Edward (1552-1634; DNB). Referred to: 60, 282


note: the quotation at 469 is indirect.

quoted: 60, 469

60.30 “the perfection of human reason,"

] And therefore if all the reason that is dispersed into so many several heads were united into one, yet could he not make such a Law as the Law of England is, because by many successions of ages it hath been fined and refined by an infinite number of grave and learned men, and by long experience growne to such a perfection, for the government of this Realme, as the old rule may be justly verified of it, Neminem oportet esse sapientiorem legibus: No man (out of his own private reason) ought to be wiser than the Law, which is the perfection of reason. (97; II, 6, 138).

Coke, Thomas William (Earl of Leicester) (1752-1842; DNB). Referred to: 281

Colepeper, John (d. 1660; DNB).

note: JSM uses the spelling Colepepper.

referred to: 281

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor (1772-1834; DNB). Referred to: 318, 320, 323, 1108


quoted: 323

323.23 “ignorance of . . . books”]

] For a crime it is (and the man who hesitates in pronouncing it such, must be ignorant of . . . books, what he himself owes to them in spite of his ignorance) thus to introduce the spirit of vulgar scandal and personal inquietude into the Closet and the Library, environing with evil passions the very Sanctuaries, to which we should flee for refuge from them! (II, 306)


note: in SC.

referred to: 1108
— The Piccolomini; or, The First Part of Wallenstein, a Drama in Five Acts
Translated from the German of Frederick Schiller. London: Longman and Rees, 1800.

note: the first quotation is taken from Talfourd’s speech of 6 July, 1848, q.v.

quoted: 1108

referred to: 1108

1108.11-13 Straightforward flies / The lightning flash, and straight the cannon-ball, /
Shattering that it may reach, and shattering what it reaches.] [no paragraph] Straight
forward goes / The lightning’s path, and straight the fearful path of the cannon-ball.
Direct it flies and rapid, / Shatt’ring that it may reach, and shatt’ring what it reaches.
(22; I, iv, 70-3)

1108.28-9 Winds round . . . property;] My son! the road, the human being travels, /
That, on which BLESSING comes and goes, doth follow / The river’s course, the
valley’s playful windings, / Curves round . . . property! (22-3; I, iv, 74-8)

— Second Lay Sermon [“Blessed are ye that sow beside all waters”] (1817). In On the
Constitution of Church and State, and Lay Sermons (q.v.), 303-430.

referred to: 697


referred to: 1109

Colton, Caleb Charles (“O.P.Q.”) (1780?-1832; DNB). Referred to: 204

— Announcement of Prospectus for Le Bon Sens, Morning Chronicle, 13 July, 1832,
3-4.

referred to: 505


quoted: 365n

365n.4-6 “the . . . without exception . . . (before . . . revolution)] No greater number of
peers has been created than was necessary to secure a majority in favour of the bill,
and the . . . without exception . . . before . . . revolution (2)

— “France. Important Trial before the Chamber of Peers of Count Kergorlay, Ex-Peer

referred to: 204

referred to: 395


Comte, François Charles Louis (1782-1837; *DBF*). Referred to: 283, 355, 510-11, 522, 669


quoted: 692

692.22-4 “Governments . . . exists.” [translated from:] On s’est imaginé que pour avoir la liberté, un peuple n’avait besoin que d’une bonne constitution; c’est une erreur dont il est temps de se désabuser; les lois ni les constitutions ne créent rien, elles déclarent ce qui est, et le garantissent ou le prohbitent selon le besoin. (82)

— Speech in Chamber of Deputies (13 Sept.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 1569.

referred to: 355

Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat, marquis de (1743-94; *DBF*). Referred to: 519


referred to: 519


referred to: 74

Congleton, Baron. See Henry Brooke Parnell.

Connell.

note: a pawnbroker in Cork.

referred to: 46-8

Conseil, Louis Prosper (1796-1834).
note: distinguished lawyer from Nancy, associated with Carrell at *Le National* after the July Revolution.

referred to: 669, 685, 700, 733


referred to: 669

Considérant, Prosper Victor (1808-93; *DBF*). Referred to: 1145

Constant de Rebecque, Benjamin (1767-1830; *DBF*). Referred to: 156, 203, 214, 227, 486-7

— Proposition tendant à rendre libre les professions de libraire et d’imprimeur (11 Sept.), *Moniteur*, 1830, 1072.

referred to: 193, 203

— Speech in the Chamber of Deputies (6 June), *Moniteur*, 1820, 792.

referred to: 156

*Le Constitutionnel.*

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 529, 531, 677


referred to: 269


referred to: 269


referred to: 519


referred to: 668

note: the quotation derives from the Globe and Traveller, 28 Mar., 1834, 2, q.v.

quoted: 698

— “Tribunal de première instance de la Seine,” 15 Apr., 1834, 3-4; 16 Apr., 3-4; 17 Apr., 4.

referred to: 704

Conte, Antoine Joseph Xavier (1773-1850; DBF). Referred to: 643


note: this collection used for ease of reference. The English and French texts are given.

referred to: 699

Cooper, Anthony Ashley (1st Earl of Shaftesbury) (1621-83; DNB). Referred to: 199


note: a letter in answer to JSM’s “The Treaty of 1856 [1],” q.v.

quoted: 1225, 1226

referred to: 1225

1225.8 “to observe” . . . “unless] Mr. Mill is not disposed to observe them, when called in question, unless (3)

1225.19 “one in principle”] Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that all which that Power seeks to abrogate rests on the basis of solemn Treaty; and I tremble to see that so high an authority as Mr. Mill, though widely different in spirit and in style, is, in respect of the binding nature of covenants, at one in principle with the Russian Chancellor. (3)

1226.2 “take . . . another”] If this view be confirmed by public opinion, it will be well that England at least, having got rid of the present Treaty, should take . . . another for any purpose or with any people. (3)

referred to: 19-20

Copley, John Singleton (Baron Lyndhurst) (1772-1863; DNB). Referred to: 282, 947

— Speech on Courts of Local Jurisdiction (9 July, 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 19, cols. 312-29.

referred to: 947-8

Corday, Marie Anne Charlotte de (1768-93; DBF). Referred to: 524

Cormenin, Louis Marie Delahaye, vicomte de (1788-1868; DBF).

note: the reference at 397 is in a quotation from “Erinensis.” See Examiner, [Jan. 1832].

referred to: 191, 227, 397, 522


referred to: 522


referred to: 522


referred to: 405


referred to: 522

— Three Letters on the Civil List [in 4 pts.], Le National, 24 Dec., 1831, 3-4; 29 Dec., 1-3; 31 Dec., 1-2; 4 Jan., 1832, 1.

referred to: 391

Cottenham, Lord. See Charles Pepys.

Coulson, Walter (1794-1860; DNB).

note: the reference at 526 is in a quotation from Le National.
referred to: 213, 526, 528, 744, 778

The Courier.

note: the reference at 527 is in a quotation from Le National. Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 527, 528, 529

— Leading article, 26 Oct., 1832, 3.

note: the reference is in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 527

— “Recommendations of the Poor Law Commissioners,” 24 Feb., 1834, 3.

referred to: 686

— Leading article on the Poor Law Bill, 2 May, 1834, 2.

quoted: 715

715.14 “bashaws,”] But, however this may be, the Pacha never carried tyranny and interference with private concerns further than it is proposed to carry them by this measure. (2)

— Leading article on the New Colony in South Australia, 1 July, 1834, 4.

quoted: 742

742.10-11 “as . . . possible”] But instead of this [giving land grants in proportion to capital] the projectors of the New Colony proceed upon a totally different principle, which is, to render their Colony as . . . possible. (4)

Courier de Méré, Paul Louis (1772-1825; DBF). Referred to: 159, 467


note: first published in the Censeur Européen, 17 July, 1819. This ed is in SC.

referred to: 159

referred to: 467

_Le Courrier Français._

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.


referred to: 248


referred to: 343

— Unheaded leader, 11 Sept., 1831, 1.

referred to: 355


quoted: 368


quoted: 461

461.2-12 After . . . addressed.] [translated from:] Après de grands efforts d’imagination, et presque en désespoir de cause, on est tombé sur le nom de M. Girod de l’Ain, et, ce qui est presque aussi extraordinaire que la découverte, ce nom a fait merveille; il n’est susceptibilité si ombrageuse qui ne soit trouvée en pleine sécurité par l’accession d’un pareil collègue; aussi la décision a-t-elle presque été adoptée. Les choses en étaient là ce matin, et M. Girod de l’Ain sera ministre de l’instruction publique, à moins qu’il n’élève lui-même des difficultés, ce qui n’est pas probable. Puisqu’on était en train de faire un ministère fort, on a eu raison de procéder ainsi; nous ne pouvons nier qu’un cabinet qui offrira la réunion de M. de Montalivet et de M. de Girod de l’Ain ne présente une certaine homogénéité. Si cette nomination peut donner lieu à beaucoup de critiques, elle doit aussi faire naître de vives et sincères félicitations; ces félicitations, c’est à la chambre des députés qu’elles s’adressent. (2)


referred to: 519

Courtenay, Thomas Peregrine (1782-1841; _DNB_). Referred to: 86

Courtenay, William Reginald (Lord Devon) (1807-88; _DNB_). Referred to: 963

Cousin, Victor (1792-1867; _DBF_). Referred to: 516, 521, 589, 727-32

note: the quotation is in a quotation from Roebuck, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 589

referred to: 572, 727-32


Cowper, William (1731-1800; *DNB*). *The Task: A Poem in Six Books, to Which Are Added by the Same Author, An Epistle to Joseph Hill, Esq.; Tirocinium, or a Review of Schools; and The History of John Gilpin.* London: Johnson, 1785, 1-283.

quoted: 296

296.6 War is a] But war’s a (190)

296.7 Kings would not play at; nations] King’s should not play at. Nations (190)

296.8 To extort] T’extort (190)

Crabbe, George (1754-1832; *DNB*). Referred to: 808

Cranmer, Thomas (1489-1556; *DNB*).

note: the reference at 808 is in a quotation from Sterling.

referred to: 463, 808

Creevey, Thomas (1768-1838).


referred to: 93-4

— Speech on Special Juries (28 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, col. 568.

referred to: 93-4

Crespin de la Rachée, Louis (1757-?).

note: a judge in Paris from 1815 until his retirement in 1841.

referred to: 667

Critias (ca. 460-403; *WWG*).
note: the reference at 1132 is in a quotation from Grote, who uses the spelling Kritias.
referred to: 1132, 1162

Croesus (of Lydia) (ruled 560-546; *WWG*). Referred to: 871

Croker, John Wilson (1780-1857; *DNB*). Referred to: 109, 111, 113, 114, 593-5, 1052, 1058


quoted: 1038, 1039, 1040-1, 1042, 1050, 1052

referred to: 1037-9, 1040-6, 1046, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052

1038.18 “in] The law has no limits—though the land has; and in (217)

1038.19 Napoleon will] Napoléon—still in all its power and vigour—will (217)

1039.31-2 “every . . . France,” . . . “the . . . Philippe;”] [paragraph] We have thus
given our readers a summary, very much abridged as to details, but sufficiently
copious in general facts and consequences, of this most curious and important survey
of the agricultural, and to a corresponding extent, of the moral and social state of
France, and we think it cannot be doubted that,—discarding altogether the bias of M.
Mounier, and the more inveterate prejudices of M. Rubichon,—there are on the face
of the unquestionable statistical documents strong reasons for the apprehension with
which we believe every . . . France, and especially, if we are not misinformed, the . . .
Philippe, regards the progressive operation of the subdivision of property. (237)

1040.34 “There] And accordingly, we have in the volumes abundant evidence that
there (216)

1040.35 peasant. . . . 2,600,000] peasant. We have before seen that there are
2,600,000 (216)

1042.35-6 “on . . . inheritance”] But however that may be, it is obvious that under the
unremitting action of the law, the *ten thousand* 690l. incomes of one generation must
become in the next (on . . . inheritance), *thirty thousand* of 230l.; and although there is
at work an antagonist process of reconstruction or accumulation by marriage,
purchase, and collateral inheritance, it is altogether inadequate to stem the dispersing
torrent. (212)

1050.8 “creating a . . . France,”] “In short,” says M. Rubichon in one of his bursts of
indignation, “while England is striving to extirpate the old Irish system, our
government is creating a . . . France.” (230)

1052.5 working classes] [*italics*] (234)
1052.10 meat . . . per] meat per (234)


note: No. 213 is a reply to a paragraph in Croker’s article.

quoted: 593

referred to: 691

593.16 The . . . siege,] ‘The . . . siege’ (484)

593.22 the new] the fourteen new (484)

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658; DNB). Referred to: 906, 961, 1098

Cruikshank, George (1792-1878; DNB). Referred to: 110

Ctesiphon (4th cent. ). Referred to: 597

Cuffey, William (d. 1870).

note: mulatto London tailor, son of a West Indian slave. He was arrested in August 1848 for leading the Chartist demonstration, and sentenced to transportation for life.

referred to: 1102


note: the quotation is in a quotation from Croker, who takes it from Mounier.

quoted: 1052

Curtis, Edmund (b. 1822).

note: a labourer. The quotation is from the testimony of Jane Anne Wilkes in “Assize Intelligence. Crown Court,” Morning Chronicle, 15 Aug., 1851, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1184, 1186

referred to: 1184-6

Curtis, Hester.

note: a charwoman.

referred to: 1184-6
Curtis, Patrick (1740-1832; *DNB*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 755

Cuvier, Georges Léopold Nicolas Frédéric, baron (1769-1832; *DBF*). Referred to: 364-5, 365n, 462-4

Dacier, Bon Joseph, baron (1742-1833; *DBF*). Referred to: 521

*The Daily News*.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 1089


referred to: 1092-3


referred to: 1092-3


quoted: 1145

referred to: 1144-6

1145.30-1 “falsehood,” . . . “treachery,” . . . “to] M. Cabet, however, never practised a greater deception than that which sent the Roman expedition; nor was he guilty of greater falsehood, greater treachery, or a larger amount of human misery. [paragraph] Indeed between the communism of M. Cabet, and the catholicism of General Oudinot, we cannot see any wonderous difference; except that the one is idiotic and the other brutal; the one a nefarious attempt to establish bigots and tyranny by the sword; the other a foolish enterprise to (4)


referred to: 1198

— Leading article on the Law of Lunacy, 28 July, 1858, 4.

referred to: 1198

quoted: 1221
referred to: 1221-2

1221.29-31 “The assault,” . . . “was . . . unjustifiable”] The assault was . . . unjustifiable. (2)

1221.33 “provocation”] The defendant [William Smith] immediately afterwards came up, and, without uttering a word, and without the slightest provocation of any kind, struck him [Macgovern] on the temple with his truncheon, and felled him to the ground. (2)


referred to: 1227

Daniell, John Frederick (1790-1845; DNB). Referred to: 415


referred to: 415

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-94; DBF). Referred to: 542

Darius (of Persia, called the Great) (521-486 ; WWG). Referred to: 394

Darius II (of Persia) (ca. 424-405 ; WWG). Referred to: 1158


referred to: 156

Daunou, Pierre Claude François (1761-1840; DBF). Referred to: 156, 385, 520

— Speech Presenting the Report of the Education Committee to the National Convention (19 Oct.), Moniteur, 1795, 128 and 130-1.

referred to: 385, 520


referred to: 262

David, Félicien (1810-76; DBF). Referred to: 676

Davies, Edward (1756-1831; DNB). Referred to: 318
— *Celtic Researches, on the Origin, Traditions, and Language of the Ancient Britons; with Some Introductory Sketches, on Primitive Society.* London: Booth, 1804.

referred to: 318

Davy, Humphry (1778-1829; *DNB*). Referred to: 286, 343

Dawson, George Robert (1790-1856; *MEB*). Referred to: 111, 112, 113

*Débats.* See *Journal des Débats.*

*La Décade Philosophique, Littéraire et Politique.* Referred to: 525

Decazes, Elie, duc (1780-1860; *DBF*). Referred to: 136, 199, 379

*Déclaration des droits de l’homme et du citoyen, avec des commentaires par le citoyen Laponneraye.* [Paris:] La Société des Droits de l’Homme, [1833].

quoted: 672

referred to: 661, 672

672.20-1 “The right . . . law.” [translated from:] VI. La propriété est le droit qu’a chaque citoyen de jouir et de disposer à son gré de la portion de bien qui lui est garanti par la loi. (3)

Decourdemanche, Alphonse (1797-1871; *DBF*). Referred to: 411


referred to: 411

Defoe, Daniel (1659?-1731; *DNB*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Brighton Guardian*, where the name is spelled De Foe.

referred to: 321

De Freyne, Arthur French (Baron) (1795-1856; *MEB*). Referred to: 1029, 1032-3

— Memorial to the Board of Works.

note: the source of JSM’s quotation has not been located.

quoted: 1029
referred to: 1032

Delaborde. See Laborde.

Delapalme, Emile (1793-1868; DBF). Referred to: 657

— Speech (21 Dec.), Moniteur, 1833, 2481.

referred to: 657

Delasalle. See Lasalle.

Delessert, Jules Paul Benjamin (1773-1847; DBF). Referred to: 658

Demangeat, Joseph Georges (1787-1866; DBF). Referred to: 517

La Démocratie Pacifique.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— “Protestation de la colonie icarienne à Nauvoo,” 22 Sept., 1849, 3.

quoted: 1145

referred to: 1145

1145.18-26 One . . . country.] [translated from:] Une de ces grandes iniquités, qui suffirait pour déshonorer un siècle, va peut-être s’accomplir en France. D’ignobles calomnies veulent flétrir le nom de Cabet, du philosophe chrétien qui a consacré toute une longue vie à l’éducation morale des peuples; du régénérateur, de l’intrépide apôtre qui, abandonnant patrie, famille et fortune, prépare, en de lointains climats, au milieu des dangers et des privations, le bonheur de l’humanité. [paragraph] Nous, témoins et objets de son amour et de son dévouement, nous, jouissant déjà du fruit et de ses sacrifices et de notre persévérance, nous protestons contre des accusations aussi absurdes qu’infâmes, dont le triomphe serait une nouvelle honte pour notre infortunée Patrie. (3)

Demosthenes (384-322 ; WWG).

note: the reference at 1126 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 292, 597, 868, 1126


referred to: 597

— De falsa legatione. Ibid., 246-472.
referred to: 292


referred to: 823

Denman, Thomas (1779-1854; DNB). Referred to: 24, 267-8

— Speech on the Petition of Richard Carlile (8 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 116-17.

quoted: 24

24.5 “had they been] Had the judges been (116)


referred to: 175

Descartes, René (1596-1650; DBF).

note: the reference is to his physics, as presented in Principia philosophiae (1644).

referred to: 239-40

Destutt de Tracy, Alexandre César Victor Charles, comte (1781-1864; DBF).

note: JSM refers to him as de Tracy.

referred to: 165, 227

— Speeches on the Budget of 1832 (25 and 27 Jan.), Moniteur, 1832, 260 and 279.

referred to: 405

Destutt de Tracy, Antoine Louis Claude, comte (1754-1836; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Destutt-Tracy.

referred to: 521


Deutches Leben, Kunst, und Poesie. Nos. I and II.

reviewed: 748-9
referred to: 746


referred to: 1156-7

Devon, Lord. See William Reginald Courtenay.

Devonshire, Duke of. See William George Spencer Cavendish.

Dickson, James.

note: a Deptford resident, secretary of the committee to elect Gladstone for Greenwich in 1868. The Times gives his name as Dixon.

referred to: 1219

Diocletian (Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus) (d. 313; WWR).

note: JSM uses the spelling Dioclesian. The reference is mistaken; see Maximianus I.

referred to: 690

Diogenes (the Cynic) (400-323 ; WWG). Referred to: 1148


note: the reference is to Diogenes (the Cynic), q.v.

referred to: 1148

Dionysius I (of Syracuse) (ca. 430-367 ; WWG). Referred to: 868


referred to: 1102

Dixon, William Hepworth (1821-79; DNB). Referred to: 1089


note: subsequent “batches” follow, listed chronologically.

quoted: 1089
referred to: 1089

quoted: 1089, 1090

referred to: 1089

1089.27 “looseness, . . . in criminal . . . and a . . . round] Their looseness . . . in the criminal . . . and the . . . around (3)

1089.28 indulgences.”] indulgencies, are their bane; but, unfortunately, these qualities are hardly sufficient to separate them from much of the literature of the day, which aspires to different rank, and proposes to itself a higher kind of audience. (3)

1089.29 “a chaos of corruption,”] Far from that: the whole mass of this low literature is a chaos of corruption. (3)

1090.1 Martin] [no paragraph] Martin (3)

1090.3-4 readers . . . his] readers—his (3)

1090.5 capable, and this] capable. And this (3)


referred to: 1089


referred to: 1089


referred to: 1089


note: M.P. Dumfries Burghs 1812-32.

referred to: 28, 29

— Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 454-6.
note: as JSM’s source for his quotations has not been located, the PD version is used for ease of reference. The quotation at 28 is attributed by JSM to Marryatt, but reflects Douglas’s remarks; that at 29 is not found in any of the speeches in PD, but may reflect Douglas’s closing remarks.

quoted: 28, 29

referred to: 29

Dresser, Richard (1801-46).

note: an accountant, the deceased patient of Dr. James Ellis.

referred to: 875-7

Drinkwater, William.

note: a boy.

referred to: 1187

Drummond, Henry (1786-1860; DNB). Referred to: 327


referred to: 229


note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 1009


note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 831

831.2-3 war is the game of kings.] Mistake me not, I count not War a Wrong: / War is the Trade of Kings, that fight for Empire; / And better be a Lyon, than a Sheep. (19; II, ii)

*Dublin Evening Post*.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— Leading article on Irish Land Reform, 1 Dec., 1846, 2.
Du Bouchage, Gabriel de Gratet, vicomte (1777-1872; *DBF*). Referred to: 199

DuBoys, Jean Jacques (1768-1845; *DBF*). Referred to: 667

Duchâtel, Charles Tanneguy, comte (1803-67; *DBF*). Referred to: 701-2

Dulong, François Charles (1792-1834; *DBF*). Referred to: 682-3, 684

Dumas, Gabriel Mathieu (1753-1837; *DBF*).

Note: JSM calls him Mathieu-Dumas.

referred to: 227

Du Molart. See Bouvier-Dumolart.

Dumont, Pierre Etienne Louis (1759-1829; *DBF*). Referred to: 470, 473

Dundas, Henry (1st Viscount Melville) (1742-1811; *DNB*). Referred to: 481

Dunoyer, Barthélemy Charles Pierre Joseph (1786-1862; *DBF*). Referred to: 522, 669

Dupin, Amandine Aurore Lucie, baronne Dudevant ("George Sand") (1804-76; *GDU*). Referred to: 1094-5


referred to: 1094-5

Dupin, André Marie Jean Jacques (1783-1865; *DBF*). Referred to: 159-60, 345, 496, 511, 515, 521, 524, 530, 531, 532, 658, 746

Dupin, Charles Pierre François, baron (1784-1873; *DBF*). Referred to: 345, 370, 375, 378, 424

— Speeches on Transit and Warehousing (8 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2339 and 2341.

referred to: 375

Dupont de Bussac, Jacques François (1803-73; *DBF*). Referred to: 657-8

Dupont de l’Eure, Jacques Charles (1767-1855; *DBF*). Referred to: 153, 181, 211, 224, 226, 227, 378, 658, 684

Duport, Adrien (1758-98; *DBF*). Referred to: 155, 541, 542

Durham, Lord. See John George Lambton.
Duval, Jean Maurice, baron (1778-1861; DBF). Referred to: 435, 518, 519

Duveyrier, Charles (1803-66; DBF). Referred to: 403, 442-7 (1251-5), 509

Dyer.

note: a magistrate.

referred to: 79

Eady, Dr.

note: a notorious quack.

referred to: 232

Ebbs, George.

note: son of William Ebbs.

referred to: 1197

Ebbs, Matilda.

note: wife of William Ebbs.

referred to: 1197

Ebbs, William.

note: a boot and shoe maker.

referred to: 1197


referred to: 537

Edge, John.

note: a surgeon at Exeter hospital; for the quotation, see “Assize Intelligence,” Morning Chronicle. 25 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1165

referred to: 1166

Edinburgh Review. Referred to: 446, 575, 923
Edward II (of England) (1284-1327; DNB). Referred to: 280
Edward III (of England) (1312-77; DNB). Referred to: 87-8
Elio, Francisco Javier (1767-1822; GDU). Referred to: 41-2

note: JSM uses the spelling St. Germain’s.
referred to: 508

Eliot, John (1592-1632; DNB).

note: JSM uses the spelling Elliot.
referred to: 281

Elizabeth I (of England) (1533-1603; DNB).

note: the reference at 873, to the Poor Law of Elizabeth, is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 873, 1073

Ellenborough, Lord. See Edward Law, and Howell, State Trials.

Elliot, John. See John Eliot.

Elliott, Ebenezer (1781-1849; DNB). Referred to: 595


referred to: 595


referred to: 595

Ellis, Charles Rose (1771-1845; DNB). Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 451-4.

note: JSM’s source for the quotation has not been located; the PD version is used for ease of reference.
quoted: 28
referred to: 26-7, 29
28.28-9 “mercantile . . . Indies, contributed] The House could not forget how much
the large mercantile . . . Indies had contributed (453)

Ellis, James (ca. 1802-81).

note: M.D. and practitioner of hydropathy, author of *Pain: Its Alleviation, Suspension,
and Cure* (1871).

referred to: 875-7

Emery, Michel Particelli d’ (1596-1650; *DBF*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Michelet.

referred to: 1048n

Empson, William (1791-1852; *DNB*). Referred to: 574-5

— “Illustrations of Political Economy: Mrs. Marcet—Miss Martineau,” *Edinburgh

referred to: 574-5

Enfantin, Augustin (1793-1827; *DBF*).

note: the reference is in a speech by his brother, Barthélemy Enfantin.

referred to: 1258

Enfantin, Barthélemy Prosper (1796-1864; *DBF*). Referred to: 403, 509, 676, 690

— Letter to Hoart, Bruneau, Rogé, and Massol (22 Sept., 1833). In *Oeuvres de Saint-
Simon et d’Enfantin précédées de deux notices historiques et publiées par les

note: this ed. used because the 1st ed. includes only Saint Simon’s writings.

referred to: 690

*Englishman’s Magazine*.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— “Extraordinary Case of the Royal Associates of the Royal Society of Literature,” I
(June 1831), 263-7.

quoted: 318, 325

325.39 “encouragement to literature”] Many more reasons than we can at present notice, have been assigned for the fact [that England now ranks below Continental nations in science and knowledge], but among the principal are the flagrant mismanagement of sundry public institutions, and the remarkable apathy of the government to the great cause of literature, and to the encouragement of its most successful and assiduous cultivators. (263)


referred to: 110

“Erinensis.” See Examiner, [Jan. 1832].

Etienne, Charles Guillaume (1777-1845; DBF). Referred to: 530, 531, 532, 658

Euclid (fl. ca. 300; WWG). Referred to: 242

Evans, George de Lacy (1787-1870; DNB). Referred to: 1212

Evans, William Bertram (ca. 1801-50).

note: M.P. for Leominster 1831-32.

referred to: 552

— Speech (16 Aug., 1832; Commons). Reported in The Times, 17 Aug., 1832, 2.

referred to: 552

The Examiner.

note: edited by Albany Fonblanque (q.v.). Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 304


referred to: 43


referred to: 192

— Letter to the Editor (signed “W.M.J.”), 26 Dec., 1830, 820-1.
note: the letter appears in full in the text of No. 70.

quoted: 219, 220-1


referred to: 380

— Letter to the Editor (signed “Erinensis”), [Jan. 1832].

note: the letter was not published by the Examiner (except for the quotations JSM uses in his article of 22 Jan., 1832) and is otherwise unknown.

quoted: 397

— Letter to the Editor (signed “The Female Operatives of Todmorden”; 2 Feb., 1832), 26 Feb., 1832, 131.

referred to: 419-20


referred to: 459

— “A Plan for Admitting Foreign Corn” (letter to the editor; signed “W.P.G.”), 18 Nov., 1832, 739.

note: No. 184 is a comment on this plan.

referred to: 522-3


referred to: 665


note: probably by Fonblanque; a “Notice” of JSM’s “Lord Durham and His Assailants.”

referred to: 801


note: probably by Fonblanque; a response to JSM’s “Lord Durham and His Assailants.”
referred to: 801


referred to: 1092-3

Extracts from the Information Received by His Majesty’s Commissioners, as to the Administration and Operation of the Poor-Laws. London: Fellowes, 1833.

referred to: 634-5, 712, 789-90


note: the reference, which paraphrases Grote, is general; this ed. cited merely for the title.

referred to: 870

Faure, Joseph Désiré Félix (1780-1859; DBF). Referred to: 441

Favre, Jules Gabriel Claude (1809-80; DBF). Referred to: 1116


referred to: 1116

Fay, Jeanne Louise Baron, dite Léontine (1810-76; DBF).

note: later acted under her married name, Joly.

referred to: 307-8, 310-11, 465

Featherstonhaugh, George William (1780-1866; MEB). Referred to: 833

Ferdinand VII (of Spain) (1784-1833; EB). Referred to: 39, 126

Feuchères, Sophie Dawes, baronne de (1795-1841; DBF). Referred to: 392, 421


note: in SC.

referred to: 44-5

— *The History of the Life of the Late Mr. Jonathan Wild, the Great* (1743). In *Works,* IV.
note: in SC. The work, separately paginated, occupies the second half of Vol. IV.

referred to: 665

— The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling (1749). In Works, VI-IX.

note: in SC, where the quoted passage is underlined in pencil, as is the conclusion of the sentence (which JSM does not quote), “I am . . . correction.”

quoted: 115

115.4-7 “that . . . not.”] [paragraph] Just as he arrived at Mr. Allworthy’s outward gate, he met the constable and company, with Molly in their possession, whom they were conducting to that . . . which lesson, if they do not learn, I am afraid, they very rarely learn any other good lesson, or improve their morals, at the house of correction. (VI, 191-2; IV, xi)

— Tom Thumb: A Tragedy (1730). In Works, II, i-58.

note: published under the pseudonym of H. Scriblerus Secundus. In SC.

quoted: 608

608.12-13 “They made the giants first, and then they killed them.”] [Lord Grizzle] I tell you, Madam, it was all a trick, / He made the giants first, and then he kill’d them; / As fox-hunters bring foxes to the wood, / And then with hounds they drive them out again. (II, 24; I, v, 32-5)

Fiévée, Joseph (1767-1839; DBF). Referred to: 188n


quoted: 159, 188, 245, 384

referred to: 187-8

159.17-18 “Tant . . . vivans,” . . . “il] Ces réflexions m’ont quelquefois rendu cruel, mais seulement par la pensée, car je me suis amusé quelquefois à tuer, par la pensée, tous les hommes en place, et je voyois de suite accourir de quoi les remplacer: je tuois encore ceux-ci, et, de suite, il s’en présentoit d’autres que je tuois encore, jusqu’à ce qu’il n’y eût plus personne en France; dans le système donné, tant . . . vivans, il (I, iii, 22)

188.4 Une] 5°. D’avoir une (III, xiv, 35-6)

188.18 “Certes] [paragraph] Certes (III, xiv, 36)
245.15-16 “Les supériorités morales,” . . . “finiront par s’entendre;”] Je suis persuadé que tous ceux qui paient et ne sont pas payés finiront par s’entendre, et que les supériorités morales reprendront leur ascendant. (III, xiii, 136n)

384.35-6 “Je . . . quelquefois Napoléon.] Je . . . quelquefois Buonaparte, (I, iii, 16)

Fitzjames, Edouard, duc de (1776-1838; DBF).

note: JSM uses the spelling Fitz-James.

referred to: 487, 495, 517

Fitzwilliam, Charles William Wentworth (Lord) (1786-1857; DNB). Referred to: 620

— Speech on the Corn Laws (30 Apr., 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 17, cols. 752-5.

referred to: 620

Flachat, Christophe Stéphane Mony (1810-84; DBF).

note: also known as Mony-Flachat.

referred to: 677

Flower, Eliza (1803-46; DNB). Referred to: 331-3, 436-8, 554-5, 563, 661, 703

— Hymn of the Polish Exiles by the Siberian Sea; Composed by the Author of “Musical Illustrations of the Waverley Novels,” “Songs of the Seasons,” &c. The Words from “The Charmed Sea, a Tale,” by Harriet Martineau. London: Novello and Fox, 1833.

reviewed: 554-5

quoted: 555

555.8 again,”] again! (4)

— Mignon’s Song; or, A Foreign Sky Above by the Author of the Musical Illustrations of the Waverley Novels, &c. London: Novello, [1833].

note: the British Library copy has an inked date of 1838 for the entry in the Stationer’s Hall, but JSM’s review (in which he says the work is published by Novello) is in April 1833.

reviewed: 562-3

quoted: 563
Musical Illustrations of the Waverly [sic] Novels. Dedicated (by permission) to Sir Walter Scott. London: Novello, [1831].

reviewed: 331-3

quoted: 333

referred to: 436, 437, 438, 554-5, 563, 661, 703


reviewed: 702-3, 759-60

referred to: 660-1

Songs of the Seasons. By the Author of the Musical Illustrations of the Waverley Novels. London: Novello, 1832.

reviewed: 436-8

referred to: 554-5, 703

437.23-5 Rose . . . leaves, / Spring . . . thee; / Rose . . . leaves,] Rose . . . leaves! / Rose . . . leaves! / Spring . . . thee.—

437.27-8 Rose, rose! open thy leaves, / And fill with sweet breath the ripening eves.] Open thy leaves, / Open thy leaves, / And fill with sweet sweet breath, / With sweet breath the ripening eves / With sweet sweet breath / Open thy leaves, Open thy leaves!

437.34 And cover with leaves the sleeping lake.] And cover with leaves / And cover with leaves the lake, the sleeping lake, / The sleeping lake, Lily awake!


When Thou Wert Here. Ballad. Composed by the Author of the Musical Illustrations of the Waverley Novels, &c. London: Novello, [1833].

note: the British Library copy is not dated [i.e., blank below “Ent. Stat. Hall”], but JSM reviewed it in April 1833. On the title page is written “Words by Miss S.F. Adams.”

reviewed: 563

Flower, Sarah. See Sarah Flower Adams.

Fonblanque, Albany (1793-1872; DNB).
note: see also all anonymous articles in the Examiner.


note: reprinted in his England under Seven Administrations, 3 vols. (London: Bentley, 1837), III, 71-8, where the quotation is at 74.

quoted: 791

Fonblanque, John Samuel Martin de Grenier. See John Ayrton Paris.

Fontana-Ravio, Gregorio.

note: Italian patriot, originally a follower of Buonarroti, in 1833 a Saint-Simonian lecturer in London; see also Prati.

referred to: 675, 676, 679, 689-90


reviewed: 674-80


quoted: 1089, 1090

referred to: 1089


note: the quotation is of a passage from Dixon’s articles in the Daily News, q.v.

quoted: 1090

referred to: 1089

Foscolo, Ugo (1778-1827; EB). Referred to: 573

Foster, Thomas Campbell (1813-82; DNB). Referred to: 887, 888

note: the term “indolent Celt,” used at 899 and 909, is a paraphrase rather than a direct quotation.

referred to: 887, 888, 891, 899, 909, 981

— *Letters on the Condition of the People of Ireland.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1845.

referred to: 887

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837; *DBF*).

note: the reference at 1100 is to Fourierism.

referred to: 1100, 1162

Fournel, Marie Jérôme Henri (1799-1876; *DBF*). Referred to: 676

Fox, William Johnson (1786-1864; *DNB*). Referred to: 555-6, 556, 559, 561, 574, 595, 652, 655, 659, 702, 760


quoted: 652

652.2 To the Working] THIS VOLUME IS INSCRIBED / TO THE WORKING


referred to: 659


referred to: 574


referred to: 574


quoted: 655-6


quoted: 557, 558, 559

referred to: 556-9, 561-2
557.8-9 “of being] Poor Hetty’s primeval calamity was that of being (165)

557.27 To] [no paragraph] To (166)

557.27-8 and must proceed with children by] and with children must proceed by (166)

557.29 better.] better; for by neglecting timely correction, they will contract a stubbornness and obstinacy which are hardly ever after conquered, and never without using such severity as would be as painful to me as to the child. (167)

558.3 “the spirit . . . frame;”] The spirit . . . frame; but it must have been sadly chilled and sorely pained. (170)

558.8-10 “a costly . . . unavoidable,”] Here was a costly . . . unavoidable. (170)

558.17 grovelling,” . . . “a] grovelling, a (172)

558.23 “effectually . . . down”] Had not her will been effectually . . . down by the process which has been described, she must have seen the fallacy of its being a duty to make a profession of everlasting love from which her nature recoiled. (174)

558.33 grave.—And] grave. [paragraph] And (174)

558.37 “she] She (176)

559.1 “it cannot] The substance of their wretchedness was simply this: they made a religious contract to pass the remainder of their lives with persons who turned out to be so uncongenial that the only alternative was the irregular suspension of the performance of the contract, or a state of endurance which cannot (170-1)

Foy, Maximilien Sébastien Auguste Arthur Louis Fernand, comte (1815-71; DBF). Referred to: 365, 380, 467, 560

Foy, Sébastien Maximilien, comte (1775-1825; DBF). Referred to: 365, 380, 467, 486-7, 560

Francis IV (Duke of Modena) (1779-1846; GDU). Referred to: 289

Francis Joseph I (of Austria) (1830-1916; EB). Referred to: 1202

Fraser’s Magazine. Referred to: 691

Frederick II (of Prussia; “the Great”) (1712-86; EB). Referred to: 1079

Frederick William (Elector of Brandenburg; “the Great Elector”) (1620-88; EB). Referred to: 1079

Frederick William III (of Prussia) (1770-1840; EB). Referred to: 897, 1079-80, 1080-1
Frederick William IV (of Prussia) (1795-1861; EB). Referred to: 1079-82

— Speech at the Opening of the Diet (11 Apr., 1847), in *Morning Chronicle*, 16 Apr., 1847, 5.

referred to: 1079-82

Freeling, Francis (1764-1836; DNB). Referred to: 645

*The Freeman's Journal.* See *The Public Register.*

Freire, Manuel (1765-1834).

note: Spanish general, hero of the wars of liberation against France, in 1820 *ad interim* Governor of Cadiz.

referred to: 42

*Der Freisinnige: Freiburger politische Blätter.* Referred to: 748


quoted: 1029

1029.2-5 “on Monday, would apply . . . £150,000.”] ”Would on Monday apply . . . 150,000l., so that this year they were secure of an expenditure of more than twice the amount of value of the barony. (3)

Fréville. See Villot de Fréville.

“A Friend to the ‘Lower Classes.’ ” See *Black Dwarf*, 7 Jan., 1824.

“G.J.G.” See *Morning Chronicle*, 26 Dec., 1823.

*Galignani's Messenger.*

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 526

— Unheaded article, 24 Oct., 1832, 4.

note: the quotation, which is in a quotation from *Le National’s* article on Ireland, is indirect.

quoted: 526
Galileo Galilei (1564-1642; EB). Referred to: 328

Gallois, Thomas Alexandre Marie Esprit François de Paule (1783-1840; DBF). Referred to: 429

Galloway, Alexander.

note: engineer with large works at Smithfield, sometime Chairman of the Association of Master Manufacturers. An active Radical, he was Assistant Secretary of the London Corresponding Society (1798). In 1835 he was a Common Councillor in London.

referred to: 1263

“Gallus.” See Republican, 29 Nov., 1822.

Galt, John (1779-1839; DNB). Referred to: 529

Gama, Vasco da (1469?-1524; EB). Referred to: 1087

Garat, Dominique Joseph, comte (1749-1833; DBF). Referred to: 520

Garnier, Joseph Heinrich (ca. 1800-55).

note: a native of Baden, he taught modern languages at Freiburg and was Paris correspondent for liberal German papers (1829) before being exiled early in 1834. He worked as a journalist and translator in London, returning to Baden in 1848.

referred to: 746, 748-9


referred to: 749


referred to: 748

Garnier-Pagès, Etienne Joseph Louis (1801-41; DBF). Referred to: 482, 495, 511

— Letter to the Editor, Constitutionnel, 30 Aug., 1832, 1.

note: see also Cabet and Laboissière.

referred to: 511

Gaudin, Martin Michel Charles, duc de Gaète (1756-1841; DBF). Referred to: 701

referred to: 247

Gawler, Henry (1766-1852).

note: a lawyer of Lincoln’s Inn, he worked on delimiting the new parliamentary constituencies as well as on the Poor Law inquiry. He was the brother of the better-known John Bellenden Ker, botanist.

referred to: 744, 778

La Gazette de France.

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 152


quoted: 124

124.25 point de concessions, point de réaction

[paragraph] La devise des hommes d’État que la confiance du Roi vient d’appeler au pouvoir est comme nous l’avons déjà dit: Plus de concessions, mais point de réaction. (2)

Gazette des Tribunaux.

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 511

Gelée, Claude (called Lorrain) (1600-82; DBF). Referred to: 332

Geoffroy, Michel Auguste (1805-?).

note: prosecuted and condemned under martial law in June 1832.

referred to: 487, 495

George IV (of England) (1762-1830; DNB). Referred to: 281, 319

— Speech from the Throne (4 Feb., 1830; Lords), PD, n.s., Vol. 22, cols. 1-4.

referred to: 621
Gérando, Joseph Marie, baron de (1772-1842; DBF). Referred to: 521

Gérard, Maurice Etienne (1773-1852; DBF). Referred to: 203, 516, 743

Gervais de Caen, François Guillaume (1803-67; DBF). Referred to: 396, 421, 422, 733

Gibbon, Edward (1737-94; DNB). Referred to: 1136, 1137

Ginguené, Pierre Louis (1748-1816; DBF). Referred to: 525

Girod de l’Ain, Louis Gaspard Amédée (1781-1847; DBF).

note: the references at 461 are in a quotation from the Courrier Français.

referred to: 190, 460, 461

Gisquet, Henri Joseph (1792-1866; GDU). Proclamation to the Inhabitants of Paris (2 Apr.), Moniteur, 1832, 953.

referred to: 441

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-98; DNB). Referred to: 1209, 1219-20

Glenelg, Lord. See Charles Grant.

Glengall, Lord. See Richard Butler.

Le Globe.

note: the reference at 1257 is in a speech of Enfantin’s. Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 442 (1251), 443 (1252), 444 (1253), 446-7 (1255), 677, 696, 1257

— Leading article, 13 Aug., 1830, 1.

referred to: 134, 148

— Leading article on the Chamber of Deputies, 17 Aug., 1830, 1-2.

referred to: 274


quoted: 696

referred to: 696n
696.20 *la comédie de quinze ans.* Détrompez-vous, pairs, députés, magistrats, simples citoyens, nous avons tous joué une comédie de quinze ans. (1)

— “La comédie de quinze ans,” 22 Apr., 1831, 1.

*note:* see article of 24 Nov., 1830.

*quoted:* 696

*The Globe and Traveller.*

*note:* edited by Walter Coulson (*q.v.*). The references at 526 are in a quotation from *Le National.* Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

*referred to:* 213, 526, 528, 1008, 1009, 1030, 1033

— “Liberty of the Subject,” 30 Sept., 1823, 2.

*referred to:* 79

— Leading article on the Russian Threat to India, 10 Apr., 1828, 2.

*quoted:* 665-6

665.22 reasonably be] reasonably pray to be (2)

— Leading article on the Truck System, 16 Dec., 1830, 2.

*referred to:* 213

— Leading article on Patronage of Authors, 16 June, 1831, 2-3.

*referred to:* 331


*referred to:* 356


*quoted:* 360-2

360.24 M. de Montalivet passed] *no paragraph* He passed (2)

361.19 opened, 600,000] opened, and 600,000 (2) *treated as printer’s error in this ed.*

361.22 allowed (hear, hear), and] allowed. (Hear, hear), and (2)

note: see also Montalivet, speech of 24 Oct., 1831.

quoted: 360, 362

360.6 “moral] It is unnecessary to dwell upon the great change which must be produced in a few years on the mass of the population of France by an organized system which will afford to all moral (2)

360.7 instruction, according . . . parents:] instruction (according . . . parents), (2)

362.4 enabled, . . . to] enabled to (2)

362.10 benefit. Allowing] benefit. [4-sentence omission including the passage quoted at 360.6-10 above] Allowing (2)

362.19 voluntarily] voluntary (2) [printer’s error in Source]

— Leading article on French Affairs, 24 Nov., 1831, 2.

quoted: 365n

365n.4 “the] The (2)

— Leading article on French Affairs, 23 Oct., 1832, 2.

note: the reference derives from a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526


note: the reference is in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526

— Leading article on French Affairs, 29 Oct., 1832, 2.

note: the reference derives from a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526

— Leading article on French Affairs, 28 Mar., 1834, 2.

quoted: 698

referred to: 698

— “Poor Laws, British and Foreign, from Senior’s Statement of Provisions for the Poor, etc.,” 22 June, 1835, 1-2.

referred to: 776


referred to: 778

— Leading articles on the House of Lords, 29 and 30 Sept., 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 Oct., 1835, all on 2.

referred to: 779-82, 782-5

— Leading article on the House of Lords, 9 Oct., 1835, 2.

referred to: 785


quoted: 917

referred to: 917

917.5 him. Her] him. At first she conducted herself with sufficient propriety, but latterly abandoned herself to dissipated habits, frequenting the night wine vaults in the vicinity of the theatres. Her (4)

917.6 “proved] Several witnesses proved (4)

— Leading article on Relief in Ireland, 15 Dec., 1846, 2.

quoted: 1008, 1008-9

referred to: 1008-11

1008.20 “would] He [O’Brien] has said that £10,000,000 must be spent in effecting this operation; and we cannot find that either he, or any one else, has shewn that this large advance of the national capital would (2)

1008.23 “boldness] We admired, for our part, his [the Morning Chronicle author’s, i.e., JSM’s] boldness (2)

1008.27 We] [no paragraph] We (2) [the passage follows immediately that just quoted]

1008.33 view; and M.] views. And M. (2)
1009.2 shown] “shewn,” (2)

1009.3 assumed] assumed (2)

— Leading article on Ireland, 22 Dec., 1846, 2.

note: the Globe and Traveller, an evening paper, here replied to JSM’s leader (No. 346) of the morning of the same day; JSM alters the passage in quoting it.

quoted: 1016

referred to: 1016

1016.9-14 “catching . . . proprietors.”] What we object to, or rather what we regard as an Irish Utopia, is the project of planting, at a single stroke, multitudes of destitute peasantry, who have no idea of any but the rudest mode of existence, gratuitously, on lands reclaimed at the public expense. . . . We did and do doubt whether you can catch up out of the depths of destitution, and convert, with the touch of an administrative Harlequin’s wand, into thriving proprietors, masses whose utmost ambition hitherto has been to vegetate on potatoes. (2)

— Leading article on Waste Lands in Ireland, 5 Jan., 1847, 2.

note: a reply to No. 352.

quoted: 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033

referred to: 1030-3

1030.14-15 “extremely . . . opinion”] [paragraph] We should be extremely . . . opinion put forward by the Chronicle yesterday—that so much of the forthcoming plan of the government for the relief of Ireland as concerns “the reclamation of waste land,” is “in danger of being defeated, and the whole question exclusively prejudged, through the operation of the Treasury Minute communicated to the Board of Works in Mr. Trevelyan’s letter of the 15th of last month.” (2)

1030.29-30 “an . . . value”] The owner also has, as we think, an . . . value to the waste as to the cultivated portion of his estate; and that whether he draw the capital so employed from resources of his own, or from those of one willing to lend it to him. (2)

1031.22-5 “if . . . system,”] That if . . . system, is certainly one reason why the government should do the work. (2)

1031.26 “vile system.”] On the other hand, it is to be remembered, that the vile system objected to did not originate with, and is not now willingly continued by, any of that class of Irish landlords who are likely now voluntarily to sink capital in the improvement of their estates. (2)
Assuming, as the Chronicle does, that he is right in his estimate, his (2)
return. We should like to know how much of the “cultivated” land of Ireland, or of England either, would yield such a return. Not much, we suspect. Now (2)

If [ellipsis indicates the next sentence quoted; i.e., JSM reverses the “If he is wrong” and “If he is right” sentences] (2)

ever.” and, so far, the case against the Treasury seems to fall to the ground. If [for the ellipsis, see preceding entry] (2)

now (2)

We presume it [the government] is sufficiently alive to the . . . and to the . . . country, to prefer, in all cases, leaving them to private hands where private hands can be got to do the work required. (2) [cf. the entry under the next article for 1033.28]

vile” . . . “is . . . estates.” [see collation for 1031.26 above]

— Leading article on Waste Lands in Ireland, 6 Jan., 1847, 2.

note: a reply to No. 353.

quoted: 1033, 1035

referred to: 1033, 1035

That there . . . them.”] That there . . . them. (2)

For instance, we are of opinion, as we said yesterday, that if the reclamation of waste lands by the government be made a part of the government scheme, it will only be introduced “to make good the deficiencies of the owners”—that it will be entered upon as a necessary evil, and with a full sense of “the peculiar value of individual agency, and the danger and difficulty attending all official interference, however well contrived, with either the agriculture or the commerce of the country.” (2) [cf. the entry in the preceding article for 1034.8-10]

— Leading article in answer to the Morning Chronicle, 7 Jan., 1847, 2.

referred to: 1037, 1038

Godefroy IV, de Bouillon (1060-1100; DBF). Referred to: 258

Goderich, Lord. See Frederick John Robinson, Earl of Ripon.

Godwin, William (1756-1836; DNB). Referred to: 1263

quoted: 1102

referred to: 231, 338, 455, 598, 644

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832; *EB*).

note: at 426 JSM uses the spelling Göthe, at 563 Goëthe.

referred to: 426, 563


note: in SC. The two songs, “Nur wer die Sehnsucht kennt” and “Kennst du das Land,” appear at XIX, 67 (Bk. IV, Chap. xi), and XVIII, 233 (Bk. III, Chap. i) respectively.

quoted: 563

563.12-16 A . . . away!] [translated from:] Seh ich ans Firmament / Nach jener Seite / Ach! der mich liebt und kennt / Ist in der Weite. (XIX, 67; ll. 5-8)

Goldsmith, Oliver (1728-74; *DNB*). Referred to: 332

— *The Deserted Village, a Poem*. London: Griffin, 1770.

quoted: 887

referred to: 1006

887.19 “stout peasantry?”] But a bold peasantry, their country’s pride, / When once destroyed, can never be supplied. (4; ll. 55-6)


note: the reference is to Mr. Jenkinson, a character in the novel.

referred to: 1070

Gooch, Thomas Sherlock (1767-1851).

note: M.P. for Suffolk 1806-30, Chairman of Suffolk Quarter Sessions until 1843.

referred to: 110, 281
Good, John Mason (1764-1827; DNB). Letter to J.C. Hippisley, 7 June, 1823. In John Cox Hippisley (1748-1825; DNB). Prison Labour, Etc.: Correspondence and Communications Addressed to His Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, Concerning the Introduction of Tread-Mills into Prisons, with Other Matters Connected with the Subject of Prison Discipline. London: Nicol, 1823, 23-66.

quoted: 68

referred to: 67-8

68.10 position . . . work] [in italics] (32)

68.18 labour; and] labour! and (32)

68.20 work.] work; thus confirming a remark I long since took the liberty of making to you, I mean that, when an organ is directed to any kind of labour, for which it is not naturally intended, no perseverance will ever give it facility of action, or take off the original distress. (32-3)

Gordon, George Hamilton (Lord Aberdeen) (1784-1860; DNB). Referred to: 1143

— Speech on Foreign Affairs (20 July, 1849; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 107, cols. 690-705.

referred to: 1143

Goschen, George Joachim (Viscount) (1831-1907; DNB). Referred to: 1231, 1232

— Speech at the Colston Dinner, Bristol (13 Nov., 1872). In “Colston’s Day in Bristol,” The Times, 14 Nov., 1872, 10.

referred to: 1228, 1231, 1232

Gosford, Lord. See Archibald Acheson.

Goss and Co.

note: a frequent advertiser of mail-order cures in newspapers.

referred to: 565

Gouger, Robert (1802-46).

note: Secretary of National Colonization Society, subsequently Colonial Secretary and then Colonial Treasurer of South Australia; returned to England in 1844. See also Edward Gibbon Wakefield, A Letter from Sydney.

referred to: 272, 734
Goulburn, Henry (1784-1856; DNB). Referred to: 111, 112, 113, 268

Gournay, Vincent de (1712-59; GDU). Referred to: 155

Gracchus, Gaius Sempronius (153-122; WWR).

note: the reference is to the Gracchi.

referred to: 664

Gracchus, Tiberius Sempronius (163-133; WWR).

note: the reference is to the Gracchi.

referred to: 664


note: the reference, which paraphrases Grote, is general; this ed. cited merely for the title.

referred to: 870

Graham, James Robert George (1792-1861; DNB). Referred to: 639, 641, 642, 655, 762

— Speech on Impressment (15 Aug., 1833; Commons), PD. 3rd ser., Vol. 20, cols. 676-84.

note: the reference at 641 is to Graham’s quotation of William Pitt’s (Lord Chatham’s) use of Milton’s phrase (see CW, VI, 178).

referred to: 600, 639, 641, 655

Grandville, Aristide Locquet de (1791-1853; DBF). Referred to: 517

Grant, Charles (Lord Glenelg) (1778-1866; DNB). Referred to: 1191

Grant, Horace (1800-59).


referred to: 787

— Arithmetic for Young Children. London: Knight, 1835.
reviewed: 785-7

— *Exercises for the Improvement of the Senses, for Young Children*. London: Knight, 1835.

reviewed: 785-7


quoted: 236

236.25 “proprietors of Parliament,”] The proprietors of boroughs have taken that right [of cities and towns to return members to Parliament] away; they have made public right private property; they have left indeed to the town the name of the return, and have imposed on the town the hardship and insult of their own nomination. (III, 334)

Grégoire, Henri, abbé (1750-1831; *DBF*). Referred to: 317

Gregory VII (Pope) (ca. 1020-85; *EB*).

note: JSM refers to him as Hildebrand.

referred to: 819

Gregory XVI (Pope) (1765-1846; *EB*). Referred to: 423, 429

Gregory, John (1724-73; *DNB*). *A Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man, with Those of the Animal World*. London: Dodsley, 1765.

note: the title is illustrative only.

referred to: 110-11


referred to: 608


referred to: 765-6
1161.16 “unknown to the constitution.”] What was it but to lift a right hon. gentleman into a situation wholly unknown to our constitution; a situation from which he could not be driven or moved till he chose voluntarily to abdicate his dictatorship? (1229)

Grey, Charles (2nd Earl) (1764-1845; DNB). Referred to: 320, 508, 588, 620, 1103


note: the quotation at 588 is not exact.

quoted: 588, 800

588.14 “Representation, not Nomination.”] Your Lordships must, I am sure, answer this question in the negative, when you consider that under the form and name, but without anything of the reality, of an election, persons are returned to the House of Commons under the false and insulting title of Representative of the people, while they are, in fact, the mere nominees of peers, or of wealthy persons, who pretend that they have now converted a public trust into their own private property, and that they have a right to use it for their own individual benefit, and without any reference to the interests of the people. (936)

Grey, Henry George (Lord Howick, later 3rd Earl Grey) (1802-94; DNB). Referred to: 271, 1142

— Speech on Church Temporalities (Ireland) (17 July, 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 19, col. 720.

note: the phrase derives from Macbeth.

quoted: 608

608.24-5 “all sound and fury, signifying nothing;”] Earl Grey said, he would not be driven, by all the “sound and fury” of the noble Duke, to enter into a premature discussion. (720)

Grey, Henry George (Lord Howick, later 3rd Earl Grey) (1802-94; DNB). Referred to: 271, 1142

— Speech on Emigration (22 Feb., 1831; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 2, cols. 875-906.

referred to: 271

— Speech on the Dorsetshire Labourers (18 Apr., 1834; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 22, cols. 940-4.
These . . . place.] [not in italics] (943)

him . . . a] him, however, a (943)

lesson. It was a] lesson from that which the hon. Member had learnt. They taught him, that unless such illegal societies were checked in time, they were likely to grow into power; and then would come what had come in France, a (943)

whatever] whichever (943)

— Speech on the Ballot (2 June, 1835; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 28, cols. 425-9.

Griffin, Daniel (ca. 1801-63).

Irish surgeon, brother of writer Gerald Griffin. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons 1822, he was physician to County Limerick Infirmary, Consultant Physician to the Limerick Lying-in Hospital, and author of several books and articles.


In summing up the data contained in the foregoing statements, it would appear that Ireland altogether contains 6,290,000 acres of unimproved and comparatively waste land; of which 1,425,000 acres might . . . crops; 2,330,000 acres might be drained for coarse . . . cattle; and 2,535,000 acres would appear to be unsuitable for improvement, inasmuch as it would not repay the expense of effective draining. (52)
964.3 “offer] Many parts of this tract offer (51)

Grosvenor, Robert (Marquis of Westminster) (1767-1845; DNB). Referred to: 613, 614

Grosvenor, Robert Wellesley (1834-1918; WWBMP). Referred to: 1212

Grote, George (1794-1871; DNB). Referred to: 734, 867-75, 1084-8, 1121-8, 1128-34, 1157-64


note: the review at 867-75 is of Vols. I-II; that at 1084-8 is of Vols. III-IV; those at 1121-8 and 1128-34 are of Vols. V-VI; that at 1157-64 is of Vols. VII-VIII. The references at 1084 and 1086 are to Vols. I-II; that at 1121 is to Vols. I-IV; that at 1157 is to Vols. V-VI.

reviewed: 867-75, 1084-8, 1121-8, 1128-34, 1157-64


872.13 that city] the city (II, 527)

873.1 of inequality] of all inequality (II, 528)

873.9 Kleomenês and] Kleomenès,¹ [footnote omitted] and (II, 529

873.29 “the . . . times,”] THE . . . TIMES [title of Pt. II, Chap. ii] (II, 311-56)

874.11-12 city communities;] city-communities:¹ [footnote omitted] (II, 299)

874.37 rocks,] rocks,¹ [footnote omitted] (II, 300)


1123.34 Perikles,] Pericles.¹ [footnote omitted] (VI, 386)

1124.25 circumstances:] circumstances:¹ [footnote omitted] (VI, 387)

1124.31 it. First,] it: First, (VI, 387)

1124.40 aggrandizement. Nikias] aggrandizement: Nikias (VI, 388)

1125.17 another,] another,¹ [footnote omitted] (VI, 389)

1126.18 He] [no paragraph] He (VI, 332)
accusation. . . . The accusation. ¹ [footnote omitted] [text:] Aristophanes, in his comedy of the Knights, reproduces these features with others new and distinct, as well as with exaggerated details comic, satirical, and contemptuous. His comedy depicts Kleon in the point of view in which he would appear to the knights of Athens—a leather-dresser, smelling of the tan-yard—a low-born brawler, terrifying opponents by the violence of his criminations, the loudness of his voice, the impudence of his gestures—moreover, as venal in his politics—threatening men with accusations and then receiving money to withdraw them—a robber of the public treasury—persecuting merit as well as rank—and courting the favour of the assembly by the basest and most guilty cajolery. The (VI, 332)

opened. . . . The] The talent for invective possessed by Kleon, employed first against Periklês, would be counted as great impudence by the partisans of that illustrious statesman, as well as by impartial and judicious citizens; but among the numerous enemies of Periklês, it would be applauded as a burst of patriotic indignation, and would procure for the orator that extraneous support at first which would sustain him until he acquired his personal hold on the public assembly.¹ [footnote omitted] [text:] [paragraph] By what degrees or through what causes that hold was gradually increased, we do not know; but at the time when the question of Mitylênê came on for discussion, it had grown into a sort of ascendency which Thucydidês describes by saying that Kleon was “at that time by far the most persuasive speaker in the eyes of the people.” The (VI, 333-4)

home.] home² [footnote omitted] (VI, 334)

To] [no paragraph] To (VI, 392)

execute. . . . While] execute. [ellipsis indicates 7-sentence omission] [paragraph] While (VI, 393-4)

opposition. . . . As] opposition: we shall see in the coming chapter how he became as it were promoted, partly by his own superior penetration, partly by the dishonest artifice and misjudgement of Nikias and other opponents, in the affair of Sphakteria. [2-sentence omission] As (VI, 394-5)

most] more (VI, 395)

If] [no paragraph] If (VI, 340)

“Our] And our (VI, 193)

looks,] looks³ [footnote omitted] (VI, 193)

This] [no paragraph] This (VI, 199)

cities. . . . There] cities. [paragraph] I shall hereafter return to this point when I reach the times of the great speculative philosophers: in the mean time I cannot pass over this speech of Periklês without briefly noticing the inference which it suggests, to
negative the supposed exorbitant interference of the state with individual liberty, as a
general fact among the ancient Greek republics. There (VI, 199-200)

1130.27 Xenophon,] Xenophon,¹ [footnote omitted] (VI, 201)
1130.41 them,] them¹. [footnote omitted] (V, 512)
1130.42 source,] source², [footnote omitted] (V, 512)
1131.6 Alkibiades,] Alkibiades¹, [footnote omitted] (V, 513)
1131.9 firmness,] firmness², [footnote omitted] (V, 513)
1131.15 effect,] effect¹ — [footnote omitted] (V, 515)
1131.15 further] farther (V, 515)
1131.17 numbers] numbers¹, [footnote omitted] (V, 516)
1131.20 understand,] understand². [footnote omitted] (V, 516)
1131.28 judges. . . . Both the] judges. [ellipsis indicates 3½-page omission]
Accordingly, when we read these encomiums in modern authors, we shall find that
both the (V, 517-21)
1132.35 archon. . . . As] archon. The juror hears and judges under full persuasion that
he himself individually stands in need of the same protection or redress invoked by
others: so also did the dikast. As (V, 522)
1133.1 them. On] them¹. [footnote omitted] [paragraph] On (V, 522-3)

“Guard, Théodore de la.” See Nathaniel Ward.

Guernon-Ranville, Martial Côme Annibal Perpétue Magloire, comte de (1787-1866; 
DBF).

note: see also Polignac, “Manifesto . . .”

referred to: 127, 163-8, 177, 215, 223, 225-6, 373

— Discours d’installation comme procureur-général de Lyon (26 Oct.), Moniteur,
1829, 1805-6.

referred to: 127

Gugenmus, Stefan (1740-78; ADB).

note: the reference derives from Rau.
referred to: 976

Guido Reni (1575-1642; EB). Referred to: 332

Guillemot, Hercule Gilbert Marie.

note: gérant of the Messager des Chambres in 1834.

referred to: 733

Guillon, Marie Nicolas Sylvestre, abbé (1760-1847; GDU). Referred to: 317

Guinard, Auguste Joseph (1799-1874; GDU).

note: the reference at 1248 is in a speech by Godefroy Cavaignac.

referred to: 302, 303, 683, 1248


note: in SC.

referred to: 513


note: in SC.

referred to: 513


note: in SC.

referred to: 513


referred to: 513

note: the speech as given in the *Moniteur* is the version by Guizot, the Minister of the Interior, in the Chamber of Deputies; the *Moniteur* of 15 Sept., 1893, in mentioning Broglie’s speech of the same day in the Peers, refers to Guizot’s for the text.

referred to: 144


referred to: 204


referred to: 519

Guizot, Marguerite Andrée Elise (née Dillon) (1804-33; *GDU*). Referred to: 160

“H.” See *The Times*, 6 Apr., 1847.

Hague, John.

note: an engineer.

referred to: 1263

Hale, Matthew (1609-76; *DNB*). Referred to: 71


quoted: 7

7.1 “Christianity is part and parcel . . . England.”] For to say, religion is a cheat, is to dissolve all those obligations whereby civil societies are preserved, and that Christianity is parcel . . . England; and therefore to reproach the Christian religion is to speak in subversion of the law. (189)

Hall, Basil (1788-1844; *DNB*).

note: the references are to him (mistakenly) as the *Quarterly* reviewer; the article was by Charles Ross, *q.v*.

referred to: 168, 169, 172, 172-80

Hall, Robert (1764-1831; *DNB*). Referred to: 16


referred to: 280
Halliday, Charles (b. 1822).

note: a travelling hawker.

referred to: 1184-5

Halliday, Elizabeth (d. 1851).

note: wife of Charles Halliday.

referred to: 1184

Hamilton, William (b. ca. 1826).

note: in some reports called John; an Irish bricklayer’s mate who fired a pistol at Queen Victoria.

referred to: 1141

Hampden, John (1594-1643; DNB). Referred to: 281

Hardenberg, Karl August von, Prince (1750-1822; EB). Referred to: 728, 1080-1


note: first published in this ed.

referred to: 1081

Hardouin (b. ca. 1789).

note: prosecutor in Cavaignac’s trial; a judge in Paris in 1831.

referred to: 302, 407

Hardy, Thomas (1752-1832; DNB). Referred to: 1262


note: the reference, which paraphrases Grote, is general; this ed. cited merely for the title.

referred to: 870
Hare, Thomas (1806-91; *DNB*). Referred to: 1208


note: a paper read at the Association’s meeting in London on 10 April, 1865. JSM took part in the discussion, as reported in *The Times*, 11 Apr., 1865, 10.

referred to: 1208


note: in SC.

referred to: 1208

Harrington, James (1611-77; *DNB*). Referred to: 394

Harring, Harro Paul (1798-1870; *ADB*). Referred to: 749


referred to: 749

Hawes, Benjamin (1797-1862; *DNB*). Speech on the Poor Law Amendment Bill (9 May, 1834; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 23, col. 838.

referred to: 715

— Speech on Italian Refugees (1 Aug., 1849; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 107, col. 1161.

referred to: 1142

Hawkins, John Heywood (1802-77; *MEB*). Referred to: 509


referred to: 509

referred to: 509


note: the quotations are all of the term “the spirit of the age,” which JSM used as the title for the series of articles: Nos. 73, 77, 82, 92, 97, 103, and 107; probably derives from Ernst Moritz Arndt’s *Der Geist der Zeit* (1805), referred to by Hazlitt in the *Examiner*, 1 Dec., 1816, 759. Hazlitt used the term in “The Drama. No. IV,” *London Magazine* (Apr. 1820), 433, but JSM probably was struck by the title of the work here cited (in which there is an account of Bentham).

quoted: 228, 238, 252, 278, 289, 304, 312, 598

Heber, Reginald (1783-1826; DNB). Referred to: 356

Heine, Christian Johann Heinrich (1797-1856; EB). Referred to: 748


referred to: 748

Henley, Lord. See Robert Henley Eden.

Henri IV (of France) (1553-1610; GDU).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Young. See also Lacretelle.

referred to: 958

Henry VIII (of England) (1491-1547; DNB). Referred to: 817, 818, 1073

Henry, Thomas (1807-76; DNB). Referred to: 1187

Hérault de Séchelles, Marie Jean (1760-94; GDU). Referred to: 317

Herbert, Sidney (1810-61; DNB). Speech on National Representation (6 July, 1848; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 100, cols. 213-17.

referred to: 1102

Herder, Johann Gottfried von (1744-1803; EB). Referred to: 448

Herhan, Louis Etienne (1768-1853; GDU). Referred to: 745

Herodotus (ca. 484-420; WWG). Referred to: 869, 1121

referred to: 1087

Herries, John Charles (1778-1855; *DNB*). Referred to: 112, 268

Herschel, Caroline Lucretia (1750-1848; *DNB*). Referred to: 795

Herschel, John Frederick William (1792-1871; *DNB*). Referred to: 250n, 284, 286, 795


note: Vol. XIV of Dionysius Lardner’s *The Cabinet Cyclopaedia*.

reviewed: 284-7

quoted: 287

referred to: 250n

Herschel, William (1738-1822; *DNB*).

note: Herschel presented the results of his researches in a series of papers read to the Royal Society and published in the Society’s *Philosophical Transactions* from 1780 to 1818.

referred to: 795

Hertford, Lord. See Seymour-Conway.

Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-70).

note: see *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*.

referred to: 1203

Hesiod (ca. 700; *WWG*). Referred to: 869, 871

“He!b!em!nicus.” See *Morning Chronicle*, 3 Jan., 1824.

Hicks, James (d. 1858).

note: a surgeon.

referred to: 876

Hickson, William Edward (1803-70; *DNB*). Referred to: 404

note: published anonymously.

reviewed: 404-5

Hildebrand. See Gregory VII (Pope).


referred to: 1174

Hipparchus (d. 514 ; *WWG*). Referred to: 1085-6

Hippias (d. 490 ?; *WWG*). Referred to: 1085-6

Hippisley. See John Mason Good.


note: the first printed edition of the legendary twelfth-century chronicle of Charlemagne’s reign. See also Turpin.

referred to: 870

Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679; *DNB*). Referred to: 66, 394


note: in SC. The reference at 74 is in a quotation from Mackintosh.

referred to: 66, 74

Hobhouse, John Cam (Baron Broughton de Gyfford) (1786-1869; *DNB*). Referred to: 399, 1263

Hoche, Louis Lazare (1768-97; *GDU*). Referred to: 616

note: the reference, which paraphrases Grote, is general; this ed. cited for the title. JSM, following Grote, spells it “Hollinshead.”

referred to: 870

Holyoake, George Jacob (1817-1906; DNB). Referred to: 1082-4, 1179


quoted: 1179

1179.13 associative views] Associative views are hourly being realised in detail, and not less remarkable is their progress in idea. (416)

1179.15-17 “the . . . result” . . . “so . . . dreaded;”] Better than that, they are felt to be practical; but the . . . result are felt, or assumed to be so . . . dreaded. (416)

1179.17-19 “a recent work” . . . “foreshadowed . . . withdrawn.”] That recent work on Political Economy, which was first to admit the feasibility of associative views, yet foreshadowed . . . withdrawn. (416)

1179.21-8 “the sharp . . . hunger” . . . “above . . . want,”] [paragraph] Is it true that men once above . . . want, and out of the sphere of competition entirely, come to feel a distaste of life and sigh for the days of salubrious excitement, when their hand was against every man’s and the sharp . . . hunger spurred them to action? (416)


note: JSM uses the spelling Kaimes.

referred to: 32

Homer (ca. 700; WWG).

note: the reference at 875 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 158, 869, 871, 875, 1085


note: this ed. used for ease of reference. A 2-vol. Greek ed. of the Iliad and Odyssey (Oxford, 1800) is in SC. The reference at 875 is in a quotation from Grote.

quoted: 1099

referred to: 158, 875

note: this ed. used for ease of reference. In SC is a 2-vol. Greek ed. of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (Oxford, 1800). The epithet at 294 is frequently applied to Ulysses by Homer; the reference at 875 is in a quotation from Grote.

quoted: 294

referred to: 875, 1056

Hook, Theodore Edward (1788-1841; *DNB*).

note: the reference is to *John Bull*, the paper he edited in 1830.

referred to: 134

Hooper, Richard.

note: a witness from Buckland Brewers in the Parsons/Bird case. The quotation is taken from *The Times*, 2 Feb., 1840, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 1152

referred to: 1152

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8; *WWR*). Referred to: 275


note: this ed. used for ease of reference. In SC is Horace, *Opera* (Glasgow: Mundell, 1796).

quoted: 431, 1075

431.6 *nonum . . . annum,*] si quid tamen olim / scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris / et patris et nostras, nonunque . . . annum, / membranis intus positis: delere licebit / quod non edideris; nescit vox missa reverti. (482; 386-90)

1075.16 “the *nodus* was not *dignus vindice,*”] nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus / inciderit, nec quarta loqui persona laboret. (466; 191-2)


note: this ed. used for ease of reference.

quoted: 275
275.23 *impavidum ferient ruinae.*] Iustum et tenacem propositi virum / non civium
arbor prava iubentium, / non vultus instantis tyranni / mente quatit solida necque
Auster, / dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae, / nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis; / si
fractus in labatur orbis, / in pavidi ferient ruinae. (178; III, iii, 108)

275.23 tenax propositi] [see entry for 275.23]

— *Satires.* In *Satires, Epistles, and Ars poetica,* 4-244.

quoted: 1192

1192.9 *Mutato . . . te*] Mutato . . . te / Fabula narratur. (8-10; I, i, 69-70)

Horne, William (1774-1860; *DNB*).


referred to: 591, 592

Horne, Francis (1778-1817; *DNB*), and Nicholas Vansittart. *Resolutions Proposed to
the House of Commons, on the Report of the Committee Appointed to Inquire into the
High Price of Bullion. Also the Several Divisions Which Took Place in Consequence
of the Same. To Which Is Added, a List of Publications Occasioned by the Report of
the Committee.* London: Hatchard, 1811.

referred to: 853

Horton, Robert John Wilmot (1784-1841).

note: M.P. for Newcastle under Lyme 1818-30; Under Secretary for War and the
Colonies 1821-28.

referred to: 736

— Speech on Emigration (17 Apr., 1828; Commons), *PD,* n.s., Vol. 18, cols.
1547-57.

referred to: 736

— Speech on the New South Wales Bill (18 Apr., 1828; Commons), *PD,* n.s., Vol.
18, col. 1567.

referred to: 736

Houel.

note: wounded in Paris by Poncelet on the night of 1-2 Feb., 1832.

referred to: 407
Howard, James (1821-89; DNB). Referred to: 1242

Howard, John (1726-90; DNB). Referred to: 419

Howe, Julia Ward (1819-1910; DAB). Referred to: 1221

Howe, Richard (Earl) (1726-99; DNB). Referred to: 419


note: the reference is to the definition by Edward Law, Lord Ellenborough, of libel as “any thing which hurts the feelings of any body.” Ellenborough’s statement formed part of his summing up in the case of the King v. Cobbett, 24 May, 1804, in which he said: “Upon the subject of libel, it may be as well for me to observe, before I enter upon the question, there is no impunity to any person publishing any thing injurious to the feelings and happiness of an individual, or prejudicial to the general interests of the state.” (Vol. XXIX, col. 49).

quoted: 92


note: the citation is merely illustrative.

referred to: 47

Howick, Lord. See Henry George Grey.

Howitt, William (1792-1879; DNB). Referred to: 968, 971


quoted: 969, 969-70, 970, 970-1

referred to: 968, 985

969.4 The peasants] In Germany the peasants (40)

969.6-7 multitude. . . . The] multitude; and wherever you go, instead of the great halls, the vast parks, and the broad lands of the nobility and gentry, as in England, you see the perpetual evidences of an agrarian system. The exceptions to this, which I shall afterwards point out, are the exceptions, they are not the rule. The (40)
969.9-10 they . . . world.] [not in italics] (41)

969.14 They labour early] [no paragraph] They labour busily, early (41)


969.16 trees, commonly] trees, as we have seen, commonly (41)

969.20-1 his . . . greater.] [not in italics] (41)

969.36 bauer] [not in italics] (42)

969.37 in the] in his (42)

969.39 no man] no proud man (42)

970.2 one.] one; and he knows that when he dies, he shall not be buried between the vile boards of a pauper’s coffin, threatening to fall asunder before they reach the grave, nor be consigned to the knife of the surgeon; but his children will lay him by his fathers, and plant the rose, the carnation, and the cross on his grave—Zum Andenken des frommer Vaters—to the memory of the good father—and will live the same active and independent life, on his native soil, or seek it in America or Australia. (42)

970.7 of the] of that (44)

970.9 do. They] do. Of their in-door employments we shall speak elsewhere. They (44)

970.19 In] [no paragraph] In (50)

970.26 buckwheat,] buckwheat,* [footnote omitted] (50)

970.29 tap] top (50)

970.31 anew; their] anew. Their (50)

970.32-3 foals, and] foals, most of them prisoners, and (50)

970.33 after; their] after. Their (50)

970.40 “The peasant] Yet the peasant (27)

Howley, William (1766-1848; DNB).

note: the reference derives from a leader in the Morning Chronicle of 5 Jan., 1842.

referred to: 821
— Speech on the Bill of Pains and Penalties against Her Majesty (7 Nov., 1820; Lords), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 3, col. 1711.

quoted: 393

393.32 “the . . . wrong;”] It was a maxim of the constitution of this country that the . . . wrong. (1711)


quoted: 117, 945

117.29 “new lights;”] Lastly, those that dare even in their Pulpits, mock, and cry out against new lights, yea and others that in their conferences and disputes inveigh against any that shall speak of a further revelation of light in the Gospel of Christ, whats [sic] this but a might opposing of the power of godliness? (67)

Hughes, William Lewis (Lord Dinorben) (1767-1852).


referred to: 72


referred to: 72, 74


quoted: 156, 180, 309

Humann, Jean Georges (1780-1842; *GDU*). Referred to: 378, 410

Humblot-Conté, Arnould (1776-1845; *DPF*). Referred to: 189

Hume, David (1711-76; *DNB*). Referred to: 471, 1136, 1137


note: in SC.

referred to: 1083

note: the reference at 72-3 is illustrative. An 1826 ed. (Talboys and Wheler) formerly in SC.

quoted: 264

referred to: 72-3, 1137

264.14 “waiters upon Providence,”] This maxim is not peculiar to the people of that age; but what may be esteemed peculiar to them is, that there prevailed a hypocritical phrase for expressing so prudential a conduct: It was called a waiting upon Providence. (VII, 227)


note: in SC.

referred to: 471

Hume, Joseph (1777-1855; DNB). Referred to: 21-4, 268, 508, 617, 1102, 1263

— Speech Presenting the Petition of Mary Ann Carlile (26 Mar., 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 8, cols. 709-16.

referred to: 21

— Speech Presenting the Petition of Richard Carlile (8 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 114-15.

quoted: 22

referred to: 22-4

22.13 “he was . . . England,”] But, up to this day he would say, that Mr. Carlile was . . . England. (114)

22.13 “his religious] Mr. Carlile’s religious (114)

22.14 but that that] but that (114)

— Speech on Special Juries in Presenting a Petition by John Hunt (28 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 563-7.

referred to: 93
— Speech on the Truck System (14 Dec., 1830; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 1, cols. 1139-52.

referred to: 212, 213


note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 790

— Speech on Reform of the Church of Ireland (14 Mar., 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 16, cols. 661-2.

note: one of the speeches by radical members who opposed the proposal to tax the present incumbents.

referred to: 605


note: with Buller and O’Connell, Hume opposed Clause 89 of the East India Bill.

referred to: 606

— Speech Bringing in a Motion on National Representation (20 June, 1848; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 99, cols. 879-906.

referred to: 1101-4, 1107

Huskisson, William (1770-1830; *DNB*). Referred to: 29, 104-5, 110, 111, 112, 113, 140-1


referred to: 140


referred to: 141


referred to: 853
— Speech on Resumption of Cash Payments (11 June, 1822; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 7, cols. 897-925.

referred to: 34

— Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 463-7.

note: unlike JSM’s quotations from other speeches in this debate, this one conforms to the *PD* version.

quoted: 29

29.21 “If it] That the West-Indian was an owner of slaves was not his fault, but his misfortune; and, if it (464)

29.23 him [the slaveholder] of] him of (465)

Hutt, William (1801-82; *DNB*). Referred to: 509

Hyde, Edward (b. 1844).

note: illegitimate son of Edward Kenealy; his evidence is quoted in “Law Intelligence,” *Standard*, 13 May, 1850, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 1176-7

referred to: 1176-8

Hyde de Neuville, Jean Guillaume, baron (1776-1857; *GDU*). Referred to: 157-8, 487, 495, 517

Hyperbolus (d. 411; *WWG*).

note: the reference at 1126 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1126, 1160

Im-Thurn, Eduard (1813-77).

note: see *Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse*.

referred to: 1054


quoted: 1016
referred to: 1054

1016.2 superhuman] [translated from:] [paragraph] Ausser dem fast übermenschlichen Fleisse der Landbauer war bis zu Ende des vorigen Jahrhunderts an der ganzen Landwirthschaft nichts zu rühmen. (53)

Infantado, Pedro Alcántara de Toledo, duque del (1773-1841; BU). Referred to: 42


quoted: 984, 985, 985-6, 986, 1010

referred to: 984-7, 988

984.16-17 Argovie,” . . . farming] Argovie, farming (I, 25)

984.18 peasants run] peasants (for all proprietors who are not noble are called peasants), run (I, 26)

984.19 acres; many] acres; and good land is considered to yield 10 per cent. profit. Many (I, 26)

984.37-8 in . . . unrivalled.] [not in italics] (I, 32)

985.4 When] [no paragraph] When (I, 32)

985.22 powder; every] powder. Every (I, 33)

985.33 In] [no paragraph] In (I, 109)

985.33 as the] as in the (I, 109)

985.36 eats. . . . In] eats. [ellipsis indicates 2½-paragraph omission] In (I, 109)

985.36 In] [paragraph] In (I, 110)

985.40 circumstances. . . Generally] circumstances. He consumes whatever part of the produce of his dairy is needed at home; and he sells the surplus, chiefly the cheese, which he keeps till the arrival of the travelling merchant, who buys it for exportation. Generally (I, 110)

985.42 wine. . . . Flax] [ellipsis indicates 7-sentence omission]

985.42 Flax is] In enumerating the articles which the Grison of the Engadine is supplied with from his own property, I omitted to mention flax, which is (I, 111)

986.2 tailor. The] tailor: the latter vocation is invariably exercised by the females of the house. [2-page omission] The (I, 111-13)
986.4 found. There] found. [33-page omission] There (I, 113-46)

986.13-14 “might . . . affluent;”] The canton is rich, but it might . . . affluent. (I, 257)

986.21 The] [no paragraph] The (I, 161)

986.23-4 The daily] [JSM turns to previous page] This was no holiday; but the daily (I, 160)

986.24 custom in many of] custom here, and in many other of (I, 160)

986.25 church. Nor] church. [JSM omits 3 sentences, including the one quoted at 986.21] Nor (I, 160-1)

986.27 church. . . . If] [ellipsis indicates 30-page omission] (I, 161-91)

986.31 holidays,”] holidays, we have a still more satisfactory explanation of the enigma I have mentioned. (I, 191)

986.33 “remarked] In this neighbourhood, I remarked (I, 190)

1010.20 He] [no paragraph] He (II, 285)

1010.23 them. He] them. His wife, he said, had been the belle of the village, and she made as good a wife as if she had never had an admirer. He (II, 285)

Ireton, Henry (1611-51; DNB). Referred to: 282


referred to: 229

Isambert, François André (1792-1857; GDU). Referred to: 191, 215, 227


referred to: 262

Jackson, Andrew (1767-1845; DAB). Referred to: 236, 543, 794

— “The President’s Message” (9 Dec., 1830), The Times, 4 Jan., 1831, 1-2.

referred to: 236

— “The President’s Message” [4 Dec., 1832], The Times, 2 Jan., 1833, 3.

quoted: 543
referred to: 543-5

543.19 “protection”] [the word is used several times] Those who take an enlarged view of the condition of our country must be satisfied that the policy of protection must be ultimately limited to those articles of domestic manufacture which are indispensable to our safety in time of war. (3)

543.20 “American system”] But beyond this object we have already seen the operation of the system productive of discontent. (3)

Jacotot, Joseph (1770-1840; *GDU*). Referred to: 786-7
— *Enseignement universel, langue maternelle*. Dijon: Lagier, 1823.

referred to: 786

Jacquinot-Godard, Simon Edme Paul (1779-1858; *GDU*). Referred to: 396

Jagot, Grégoire Marie (1751-1838; *GDU*). Referred to: 317

James II (of England) (1633-1701; *DNB*). Referred to: 132, 1181

Jamieson, John (1759-1838; *DNB*). Referred to: 318

referred to: 318

Jars, Antoine Gabriel (1774-1857; *GDU*). Referred to: 345, 387

Jaubert, Hippolyte François, comte (1798-1874; *DPF*). Referred to: 380

referred to: 380

Jefferson, Thomas (1743-1826; *DAB*).

note: the reference at 669 is to his correspondence as translated by Conseil, *q.v.*

referred to: 174, 669

referred to: 179
Jenkinson, Robert Banks (Lord Liverpool) (1770-1828; *DNB*). Referred to: 582, 607, 623


referred to: 607

Jesus.

note: the reference at 1174 is to the Sermon on the Mount.

referred to: 31, 257, 812, 817, 1174

*John Bull.* Referred to: 134

Johnson, John.


quoted: 1169


quoted: 1138

1138.8-9 “laws or kings” . . . “cause or cure.”] How small of all that human hearts endure, / That part which kings or laws can cause or cure. (I, 275)


referred to: 110

Johnson, William.

note: a police informer.

referred to: 60

Johnstone, George (b. 1812).

note: captain of the *Tory.*

referred to: 865-6
Jollivet, Thomas Marie Adolphe (1799-1848; DPF). Speeches on the Budget of 1832 (24 Jan.), Moniteur, 1832, 244 and 247-8.

referred to: 405


note: the reference is in a quotation from the Globe and Traveller.

referred to: 362

Jorant, Jean Baptiste.

note: procureur du roi of the Meurthe.

referred to: 251

Jouffroy, Théodore Simon (1796-1842; GDU). Referred to: 522

Le Journal de Paris.

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 134, 148

Le Journal de St. Petersburgh. Referred to: 698

Le Journal des Débats.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 152, 516, 529, 723


referred to: 662

— Leading article on Juries, 10 Nov., 1833, 1.

referred to: 666

— Leading article on Verifying Elections, 7 Aug., 1834, 1.

referred to: 746

Le Journal du Commerce. Referred to: 204
Junius Redivivus. See William Bridges Adams.

Jusseraud, Jean Francisque (1797-1863; DPF). Referred to: 1054

— *Statistique agricole de la commune de Vensat (Puy-de-Dôme): Mémoire pour
servir à une description de l’agriculture de la Limagne d’Auvergne.* Clermont: Perol,
1843.

note: JSM quotes the passage from Passy, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 1054-5

Juvenal (ca. 60-140; *WWR*). *Satires.* In *Juvenal and Persius* (Latin and English).

note: this ed. used for ease of reference. Two eds. (London, 1744 and 1835) formerly
in SC.

quoted: 119, 488

119.5 *sic volo sic jubeo*] “nil fecerit, esto: / hoc volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione
voluntas.” (100; VI, 222-3)

488.28-9 *Quis . . . querentes?*] loripedem rectus derideat, Aethiopem albus; / quis . . .
querentes? (18; II, 23-4)

Kames, Lord. See Henry Home.

Kane, Robert John (1809-90; *DNB*). Referred to: 1112-15

— “The Large or Small Farm Question Considered in Regard to the Present
Circumstances of Ireland,” *Agricultural and Industrial Journal of the Royal
Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland,* I (July 1848), 147-71.

quoted: 1113, 1114, 1114-15, 1115

referred to: 1112-15

1113.9-11 “will always,” . . . “produce . . . farm;”] For these reasons, there will never
be on a large farm the same universal economy of space and utilization of the soil that
characterizes the garden system of culture of a small farm; and therefore the small
farm will always produce . . . farm. (165)

1113.13 “a] [paragraph] Yet there is among that class a (166)

1113.14 “If the] The same capital has been supposed invested by the small farmer,
and the same interest allowed; and if the (165)
1113.16 of a capital of from 80l. to 90l. on . . . acres’] of so much capital, about £84, on . . . acres will be by no means beyond their capability. (165)

1113.17-18 “There exists,” . . . “amongst] Without attempting to deny, or even to underrate the vast misery which the failures of the last two years have caused, peculiarly in that class, it may fairly be asserted, that there exists amongst (165)

1113.19 justify. . . . They] justify. Their former condition of social slavery still hangs round them with its fears, its narrowness of mind, its want of independence, its ignorance, and want of enterprise. They (165)

1113.19 should] would (165) [the preceding clause reads should in Kane]

1113.24 hived] buried (165) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]

1113.25 names.”] names, which Mr. Tidd Pratt has very properly regarded as a piece of peculiarly Irish idiocy, and cut off from recovery by his statute. (165)

1114.21 The landlord [he says] has to learn] [no paragraph] But the landlord has also a great deal to learn; he must learn (167)

1114.24 also. The] also. Tenants were slaves when landlords were robbers; but the professional occupations of both classes have changed within the last six centuries, and now the landlord is a man who has land to hire out, and the tenant is a man who consents to pay so much for the use of it. If the landlord demands to use the tenant as a political instrument, he cannot expect him also to pay his rent, or at least to pay as much rent; the tenant’s vote should in all fairness count against so many shillings per acre. The (168)

1114.30 times. Even] times. [10-sentence omission] Even (168-9)

1114.39 A] [no paragraph] A (148)

1115.3 law.] law; exactly as the cloth-seller or the cabinetmaker put upon the articles they sell the highest value they can persuade the purchaser to give. (149)

1115.31 “it] 1. [The first of his conclusions] That it (169)

Keble, John (1792-1866; DNB).

note: some of the references are to the “Oxford theologians”; see also Newman and Pusey.

referred to: 811-15, 815-22


note: the reference is in a quotation from Sterling.
referred to: 811

Kenealy, Edward Vaughan Hyde (1819-80; DNB). Referred to: 1173, 1176-7

Kepler, Johann (1571-1630; EB). Referred to: 414

Kergorlay, Louis Florian Paul, comte de (1769-1856; GDU). Referred to: 204


referred to: 204

Kersausie, Joachim René Théophile Guillard de (1798-1874; GDU). Referred to: 657

Kesner, Charles Jean Rodolphe (b. 1778).

note: Treasury employee from 1800; became Caissier Général du Trésor in 1821.

referred to: 409-10

Kimon. See Cimon.

King, Peter (7th Baron) (1776-1833; DNB). Thoughts on the Restriction of Payments in Specie at the Banks of England and Ireland. London: Cadell and Davies, et al., 1803.

referred to: 853

Kirkland, William.

note: the reference is in the testimony of Jane Anne Wilkes in the trial of Edmund Curtis; Kirkland evidently worked in the White Lion public house, St. Mary’s, near Gloucester, kept by Henry Wilkes, Jane’s husband.

referred to: 1184

Kleisthenes. See Cleisthenes.

Kleomenes I. See Cleomenes I.

Kleon. See Cleon.

Knatchbull, Edward (1781-1849; DNB). Referred to: 281

Knight-Bruce, James Lewis (1791-1866; DNB).

note: for the collation see The Times, 23 Dec., 1846.
quoted: 1021
referred to: 1020-3

Knonau, Meyer von. See Meyer von Knonau.

Knox, John (ca. 1513-72; DNB). Referred to: 819

Krolikowski, Louis (1807-55).

note: Polish army officer in exile in Paris, a close friend and collaborator of Etienne Cabet and, in the latter’s absence, editor of the Populaire.
referred to: 1145

— Letter to the editor (20 Sept., 1849), Démocratie Pacifique, 22 Sept., 1849, 3.
quoted: 1145

1145.8-15 Citizen . . . judges.] [translated from:] Le citoyen Cabet, dont la présence est indispensable dans la colonie icarienne de Nauvoo (Etats-Unis d’Amérique), ne pourra pas comparaître, à moins que le tribunal ne consente à renvoyer son jugement au mois d’avril; mais je me défendrai de toute manière. Notre cause est commune; et l’on a tant calomnié les Icariens et le citoyen Cabet en particulier, en l’accusant tantôt de proposer une entreprise chimérique, tantôt d’abandonner ses frères après les avoir poussés à l’émigration, que je crois nécessaire à notre défense de publier la protestation unanime des Icariens établis à Nauvoo, qui sera produite devant les juges.
(3)

La Barre, Jean François Lefebre, chevalier de (1747-66; GDU). Referred to: 126

Laboissière, Paul Joseph Xavier Tramier de (1799-1860; GDU). Referred to: 482, 495, 511

— Letter to the Editor, Constitutionnel, 30 Aug., 1832, 1.

note: see also Cabet and Garnier-Pagès.
referred to: 511

Laborde, Alexandre Louis Joseph, comte de (1773-1842; GDU). Referred to: 521


note: written on behalf of Ponsonby.
quoted: 1027
referred to: 902, 934, 935, 1027-8

1027.26 “presentment sessions,”] 1. The Presentment Sessions will estimate the sum which it may be necessary to raise off the barony for the purpose of affording employment. (5)

Labourdonnaye, François Régis, comte de (1767-1839; GDU).

note: JSM uses the spelling la Bourdonnaye.

referred to: 127


note: this ed. incorporates the section cited.

referred to: 1048-9

Lachmann, Karl Konrad Friedrich Wilhelm (1793-1851; EB). Referred to: 871


note: the reference is in a quotation from Young.

referred to: 958

Lacuée de Cessac, Jean Gérard, comte (1752-1841; GDU). Referred to: 521

Lafayette, Marie Joseph Gilbert du Motier, marquis de (1757-1834; GDU).

note: the reference at 1249 is in a quotation from Godefroi Cavaignac.

referred to: 141, 152, 153, 165, 178, 224, 226, 227, 248, 542, 658, 716-17, 1249


note: the reference at 1248 is in a speech by Cavaignac. This ed. used for ease of reference.

referred to: 395, 1248

— Speech Explaining His Resignation as Commander of the National Guard (27 Dec.), Moniteur, 1830, 1829-30.
referred to: 226

referred to: 300

quoted: 298, 341
298.39-40 *des hommes furieux de modération.* [paragraph] On nous parle beaucoup, Messieurs, de *modération et de juste milieu*, j’ai moi-même des amis qui sont non-seulement imprégnés, mais furieux de modération. (358)

Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844; *GDU*).

note: JSM sometimes uses the spelling Lafitte.

referred to: 181, 190, 203, 207, 208, 288, 378, 402, 460, 466, 483, 505, 524, 560, 570
— Speech in the Chamber of Deputies (5 June), *Moniteur*, 1820, 785.

referred to: 156
— Speech Introducing His Motion on the Tax Bill (15 Nov.), *Moniteur*, 1830, 1475-6.

referred to: 203
— Speech in the Chamber of Deputies (26 Nov.), *Moniteur*, 1830, 1572.

referred to: 207

referred to: 270
— Speech on the Budget of 1832 (23 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 244.

referred to: 402

referred to: 570
Lafontaine, Joseph Pierre (1792-1858; *DPF*). Referred to: 456

Laguette-Mornay, Jules Frédéric Auguste Amédée, baron (1780-1845; *DPF*). Referred to: 378, 684

referred to: 378

Lainé, Joseph Henri Joachim, vicomte de (1767-1835; *GDU*). Referred to: 199

Laing, Samuel (1780-1868; *DNB*). Referred to: 971


note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller*.

referred to: 1008


referred to: 971

Lally, Thomas Arthur, comte de (1702-66; *GDU*). Referred to: 376

Lamarque, Jean Maximilien (1770-1832; *GE*). Referred to: 247, 355, 473, 510, 683

— Speech on War (15 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 109-10.

referred to: 247

Lamartine, Alphonse de (1790-1869; *GDU*). Referred to: 1092

— Réponse à une députation de gardes du commerce réclamant au sujet du décret qui suspend la contrainte par corps (11 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1848, 597.

referred to: 1092

Lamb, Caroline (Lady) (1785-1828; *DNB*). Referred to: 43-4, 63

Lamb, William (Lord Melbourne) (1779-1848; *DNB*).

note: the references at 758 and 765 are in quotations from Senior.

referred to: 43-5, 63, 701, 758, 765, 818

Lambert, Charles Joseph (1804-64; *GDU*). Referred to: 676

Lambton, John George (Lord Durham) (1792-1840; *DNB*). Referred to: 759

note: referred to by JSM as the “Ordinance of Banishment”; enacted in 2 Victoria, c. 1 (Lower Canada) (28 June, 1838).

referred to: 801

Lameth, Alexandre Théodore Victor, baron de (1760-1829; GDU). Referred to: 155, 541, 542

Lameth, Charles Malo François, comte de (1757-1832; GDU). Referred to: 182-3, 541-2

— Speech (10 Mar.), Moniteur, 1832, 712.

referred to: 542

Lamoignon, Nicolas de (1648-1724; GDU). Referred to: 120

Lamy, Armand François (1781-1839; DPF). Referred to: 594

— Speech Presenting the Report on the Bill to Fortify the Capital (22 Apr.), Moniteur, 1833, 1151.

referred to: 594

Lancaster, Joseph (1778-1838; DNB).

note: the reference at 360-1, in a quotation from Montalivet, is to the Lancasterian method of education; that at 456 to the schools in France.

referred to: 360-1, 456

Landrian, chevalier de.

note: sub-prefect in Meurthe.

referred to: 263

Lang, Mrs.

note: the servant of Lady Caroline Lamb, also known as Miss Drummond.

referred to: 43-5, 63

Lansdowne, Lord. See Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice.

Laplace, Pierre Simon, marquis de (1749-1827; GDU). Referred to: 198, 242
Laporte, Pierre François (1799-1841).

note: originally Delaporte; actor and producer of French and Italian theatre in London.

referred to: 307

Larabit, Marie Denis (1792-1876; GDU). Referred to: 355

Lardner, Dionysius (1793-1859; DNB). Referred to: 663

Lardner, Nathaniel (1684-1768; DNB). Referred to: 16

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, Frédéric Gaëtan, marquis de (1779-1863; GDU). Referred to: 262

— Speech on the Municipal Government Bill (1 Feb.), Moniteur, 1831, 223.

referred to: 262

Lasalle, Jean Baptiste, abbé de (1651-1719; GDU).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Las Cases, Emmanuel Augustin Dieudonné Marin Joseph, comte de (1766-1842; GDU). Referred to: 355


note: the reference is in a speech by Cavaignac.

referred to: 1248

Latimer, Hugh (1485?-1555; DNB). Referred to: 463

Laud, William (1573-1645; DNB). Referred to: 14

Laurence, Justin (1794-1863; DPF). Referred to: 352

Laveleye, Emile Louis Victor, baron de (1822-92; GDU). Referred to: 1226

Lavoisier, Antoine Laurent (1743-94; GDU). Referred to: 324

Law, Edward (1st Baron Ellenborough) (1750-1818; DNB).

note: see also Howell, State Trials.
Law, Edward (Earl of Ellenborough) (1790-1871). Referred to: 115, 119
referred to: 601

Law Magazine; or, Quarterly Review of Jurisprudence.

note: one anonymous article follows.
— “Events of the Quarter,” V (Jan. and Apr. 1831), 520-6.
referred to: 318n

The Leader.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

quoted: 1181

1181.37-8 “an act . . . inexperience.”] It may be a question as to how far it is wise, as society is now constituted, to recast the social laws that at all events secure the material sustenance of children, however much their moral and spiritual welfare may be endangered by the stormy atmosphere that too often surrounds them; but, surely, it can be no question with any whose experience has dived at all below the surface, that many a “really noble-minded person,” is weighed down to the earth, his energies crippled, his soul withered, his life saddened and made void, by the chain that one act . . . inexperience bound around him for ever. (375)


note: the quotation is of the title.

quoted: 1182

Lechevalier, André Louis Jules (1800-50; GDU). Referred to: 1146-7

quoted: 1147

referred to: 1146-7
1147.3-4 “the protest . . . June last . . . constitutional;] The Protest . . . June, 1849, . . . constitutional. (4)

1147.4-7 that in principle, insurrection . . . legitimate, but” . . . “in point of fact no insurrection took place, and none was desired or projected.”] The insurrection . . . legitimate. In point of fact, it did not take place. It was neither devised nor prepared. (5)


referred to: 1146

Leclaire, Edme Jean (1801-72).

note: reformer, industrialist, and writer on agricultural and industrial issues.

referred to: 1093


note: the article consists of translations from Leclaire’s pamphlet, Des améliorations qu’il serait possible d’apporter dans le sort des ouvriers peintres en bâtiments, suivies des règlements d’administration et de répartition des bénéfices que produit le travail.

referred to: 1093

Ledieu, Louis François Joseph (b. 1791).

note: a journalist arrested during the Lamarque troubles; a contributor to La Tribune.

referred to: 495

Le Marchant, Denis (1795-1874; DNB). Referred to: 597, 600, 610, 614, 619, 620, 627, 637


reviewed: 597-607, 608-17

quoted: 627

referred to: 618-22, 622-8, 628-34, 634-8, 643-6

627.3 appeal.”] appeal; particularly when it is considered that the questions brought before the Privy Council are generally questions involving some of the most abstruse points of foreign law: questions, in which the interests of millions of people (as in the case of India) are involved. (63-4)
Lennard, Thomas Barrett (1788-1856; *MEB*). Speech on the Petition of Richard Carlile (8 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, col. 116.

quoted: 24

24.1 “that] It appeared to him that (116)

24.2-3 banishment, as was contemplated, had still continued through] banishment, had contrived, through (116)

Lennox, comte (1795-1836; *GDU*). Referred to: 417

Lennox, Charles Gordon (5th Duke of Richmond) (1791-1860; *DNB*). Referred to: 636, 637

— Speech on Employment for Agricultural Labourers (13 June, 1833; Lords), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, cols. 664-71.

referred to: 636


referred to: 600

Leopold I (of Belgium) (1790-1865; *EB*). Referred to: 699

Lepeletier de Saint-Fargeau, Louis Michel (1760-93; *GDU*).

note: JSM uses the spelling Lepelletier.

referred to: 155

Leroux, Pierre (1798-1871; *GDU*). Referred to: 677


referred to: 905

Lethbridge. See Buckler-Lethbridge.


note: a captain in the artillery.

quoted: 302
302.13-17 “There . . . infamy.”] [translated from:] Je dirai en terminant qu’il y avait à cette époque deux sortes d’individus qui se mêlaient des événemens: les uns très méticuleux, s’alarmant au moindre bruit, et dont le type se trouve au théâtre des Variétés (M. Cagnard); les autres disposés à jouer la vie et la liberté de leurs concitoyens contre un ruban et une place; mais ils n’en retireront sans doubt que la honte et l’infamie. (3)

Leveson-Gower, George Granville (1st Duke of Sutherland) (1758-1833; DNB). Referred to: 588

Lewin, Charlotte (1796-1875).

note: sister of Harriet Lewin Grote, she married her cousin, Thomas Lewin, in 1834; author of On the Cultivation of Music (1838).

referred to: 494


referred to: 494-5

Lewis, George Cornewall (1806-63; DNB). Referred to: 447-52

— An Examination of Some Passages in Dr. Whately’s Elements of Logic. Oxford: Parker; London: Murray, 1829.

referred to: 448


referred to: 183


reviewed: 447-52

Lewis, Thomas Frankland (1780-1855; DNB). Referred to: 743-4, 776

The Limerick Chronicle. See Morning Chronicle, 15 Dec., 1846.

Lionne, Pierre.

note: managing editor of the Mouvement, and subsequently of La Tribune; prosecuted for press offences.

referred to: 428, 571

571.24 *une chambre prostituée,*] [paragraph] O le bon billet de La Châtre que nous donne là cette Chambre prostituée! (1)

*The Literary Gazette; and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, &c.*

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 679

Littleton, Edward John (1st Baron Hatherton) (1791-1863; *DNB*). Referred to: 212

Liverpool, Lord. See Robert Banks Jenkinson.

*Le livre rouge, ou Liste des pensions secrètes sur le trésor public, contenant les noms et qualités des pensionnaires, l’état de leurs services, et des observations sur les motifs qui leur ont mérité leur traitement.* [Paris:] Imprimerie royale, 1790.

referred to: 139

Lloyd, John Horatio (1798-1884; *MEB*). Referred to: 508

Locke, John (1632-1704; *DNB*). Referred to: 244, 286


note: in SC.

referred to: 244

Lockhart, John Gibson (1794-1854; *DNB*). Referred to: 173

*London Gazette.*

note: one anonymous article follows.


note: postponing Her Majesty’s Drawing-Room from 25 to 27 March; see also Victoria, “A Proclamation,” *ibid.*

referred to: 1074
London Review. Referred to: 769

Lononderry, Lord. See Robert Stewart.

Long, George (1780-1868; DNB). Referred to: 1155

Long, John St. John (1798-1834; DNB). Referred to: 232

Lonsdale, Lord. See William Lowther.

Louis IX (St. Louis, of France) (1214-70; GDU). Referred to: 520

Louis XIV (of France) (1638-1715; GDU).

note: the reference at 1125 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 394, 1048, 1125

Louis XV (of France) (1710-74; GDU).

note: the unidentified quotation is in a quotation from Senior.

quoted: 757

referred to: 394


note: this edict, of November 1764, banishing the Jesuits, was still in effect at the period of which JSM is writing.

referred to: 125

Louis XVI (of France) (1754-93; GDU). Referred to: 317, 376, 421, 479, 673

Louis XVIII (of France) (1755-1824; GDU).

note: many of the references are to “the Bourbons”; that at 171 is in a quotation from Casimir Périer; that at 260 is to him as constituting “the executive”; those at 1249 and 1250 are in a quotation from Godefroy Cavaignac.

referred to: 124, 125, 131, 135, 171, 197, 198, 260, 288, 352, 402, 418, 505, 515, 520, 525, 542, 571, 669, 691, 694, 696n, 1249, 1250

Louis Philippe (of France) (1773-1850; GDU).

note: the reference at 139 is to the *roi citoyen*; that at 368 is in a quotation from *The Times*; that at 747 is in a quotation from *Le Temps*; those at 1039 and 1052 are in quotations from Croker; that at 1250 is in a speech by Cavaignac.

— Adresse du roi (20 Apr.), Moniteur, 1831, 855.

referred to: 303


referred to: 524, 531, 532

— Discours du trône (23 Dec.), Moniteur, 1833, 2487.

referred to: 656, 661, 665

— Discours du trône (31 July), Moniteur, 1834, 1619.

referred to: 746, 747


— Letter to the duc de Bourbon (20 Aug., 1829), Le National, 10 Dec., 1831, 4.

note: also in The Times, 21 Dec., 1831, 2.

referred to: 392

— Proclamation du duc d’Orléans (31 July), Moniteur, 1830, 833.

note: accepting the office of Lieutenant-General; the remark had been quoted in the proclamation of the deputies gathered in Paris on 31 July (ibid., 1830, 829).

quoted: 453

453.10 charte-vérité,] La Charte sera désormais une vérité. (833)

— Proclamation du roi (15 Aug.), Moniteur, 1830, 907.

quoted: 297

297.12 L’ordre public] Liberté, ordre public, telle est la devise que la garde nationale de Paris porte sur ses drapeaux;—qui se soit aussi le spectacle qu’offre la France à l’Europe. (907).

referred to: 747

— Réponse du roi à une adresse de la ville de Gaillac (29 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 205.

referred to: 263

Louis, Joseph Dominique, baron (1755-1837; *EB*). Referred to: 288, 384

— Speech on Presenting the Budget of 1832 (19 Aug.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 1431-3.

referred to: 346, 480

Lowth, Robert (1710-87; *DNB*). Referred to: 16

Lowther, William (Lord Lonsdale) (1787-1872; *DNB*). Referred to: 112


referred to: 855, 856

Lucchesi-Palli, Anne Marie Rosalie (b. 1833).

note: daughter of the duchesse de Berry, she died in infancy.

referred to: 573

Lucchesi-Palli, Hector, comte de (1806-64; *GDU*). Referred to: 573

Ludlow, John Malcolm Forbes (1821-1911; *DNB*). “‘Labour and the Poor,’” *Fraser’s Magazine*, 41 (Jan. 1850), 1-18.

referred to: 1156-7

Lullin de Chateauvieux, Jacob Frédéric (1772-1841). Referred to: 1041


referred to: 1041, 1042, 1046, 1050

Lushington, Edmund Henry (1766-1839; *MEB*). Referred to: 93-4

Luther, Martin (1483-1546; *EB*). Referred to: 813, 819, 821

Lycurgus (fl. 650; *WWG*).
note: one of the references at 872 and that at 873 are in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 871, 872, 873, 1085

Lyndhurst, Lord. See John Copley.

Lysander (d. 395; *WWG*). Referred to: 1158

Lytton, Lady. See Rosina Bulwer.

Lytton, Lord. See Edward Bulwer.


quoted: 330

330.3-4 “only . . . reflect the . . . time have become . . . who were] They are only . . . reflect a . . . time be . . . who lie (3)


quoted: 1053

1053.4 “France] The truth is that France (I, 855)

1053.7 imported;” . . . “was] imported; and had the duty been allowed to continue at this reasonable rate it could not have been justly objected to. But in 1822 the duty of 3 fr. was (I, 855-6)

1053.7 francs] fr.! (I, 856)

1053.8 importation”] importation of cattle, and been productive of many mischievous results. (I, 856)


note: the exact words have not been found, but the sense is very close; the idea is expressed identically in McCulloch’s *Principles of Political Economy*, q.v.

quoted: 720

950.25 “pauper-warren.” Should it [the system] be supported in its present vigour for another half-century, *la grande nation* will certainly be the greatest pauper warren in Europe; and will, along with Ireland, have the honor of furnishing hewers of wood and drawers of water for all the other countries of the world. (369)

— “Evidence.” In “Fourth Report from the Select Committee Appointed to Inquire into the State of Ireland, More Particularly with Reference to the Circumstances Which May have Led to Disturbances in That Part of the United Kingdom,” *PP*, 1825, VIII, 807-38.

referred to: 103, 105


referred to: 851, 855, 856


note: the exact words have not been found, but the sense is very close; the idea is expressed identically in McCulloch’s *Discourse, q.v.*

quoted: 720


referred to: 855, 856

McEntaggart.

note: edited the *Courier* from late 1829 to early 1830.

referred to: 529

Macgovern, Eliza.

note: the wife of the plaintiff in the Smith case, No. 419.

referred to: 1221

Macgovern, Patrick.

quoted: 1221

referred to: 1221


referred to: 980

Mackintosh, James (1765-1832; *DNB*). Referred to: 512


note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 1148


note: JSM’s precise references, here and elsewhere, are to this ed.

quoted: 39-40, 74

39.37 “entangled] That Minister [Neckar], probably upright, and not illiberal, but narrow, pusillanimous, and entangled (30)

39.37 detail] detail* [3-sentence footnote omitted] (30)

39.38 they have] he had (30)

39.38 possess] possessed (30)

40.1 affairs:’”] affairs. (30)

74.12 nonsense.] nonsense! (120n)

Maclean, Andrew (b. ca. 1814).

note: a journeyman tailor. The quotation is from “Central Criminal Court,” *Morning Chronicle*, 23 Aug., 1851, *q.v.*

quoted: 1185
referred to: 1184-5


referred to: 229


referred to: 229

MacNeven, William James (1763-1841; DNB). Referred to: 105

Maginn, William (1793-1842: DNB). Referred to: 708


quoted: 631, 633


note: the reference, in a quotation from Grote, is to the Great Charter (Magna Carta).

referred to: 873

Mahomet (570-632 ; EB). Referred to: 1097

Maillefer, Pierre Martin (ca. 1799- ?).

note: a member of the Aide-toi Society, and associated with the Courrier Français, he signed the protest of the journalists against the regime of Charles X in July 1830, but his name was omitted from the list (Le National, 25 Jan., 1831, 2). JSM probably made his acquaintance in August 1830 (see CW, XII, 63) and arranged for him to be a correspondent of the Examiner. He is so identified in JSM’s SC copy. Maillefer contributed seven letters in 1831: 23 Jan., 55-6; 20 Feb., 122-3; 20 Mar., 184-5; 10 Apr., 231-2; 29 May, 343-4; 19 June, 391; 11 Sept., 583; four of them are mentioned by JSM (see Nos. 79, 96, 101, and 119). In this year he moved to Douai, establishing a branch of Aide-toi and becoming editor of the Libéral, the latter duty possibly explaining the fact that he made no further contributions to the Examiner. Two years later, in 1833, he took over the editorship of the Peuple Souverain of Marseilles and made it into the leading republican journal in the South. The newspaper was suspended after the events of April 1834. Maillefer was arrested, became both a defendant in “the Monster Trial,” and one of the members of the Lyons committee of defence (see dossier in Archives Nationales, CC 584, liasse 2).
referred to: 246, 288, 301, 347

— “Foreign Intelligence. (From our own Correspondent)” (14 Mar., 1831), Examiner, 20 Mar., 1831, 184-5.

referred to: 288

— “Foreign Intelligence. (From the Correspondent of the Examiner)” (2 Apr., 1831), Examiner, 10 Apr., 1831, 231-2.

referred to: 301

— “Foreign Intelligence. France. (From our own Correspondent.)” (31 Aug., 1831), Examiner, 11 Sept., 1831, 583.

note: the article is not signed, but he was the Paris correspondent.

referred to: 347

Maison, Nicholas Joseph, marquis (1771-1840; GDU). Referred to: 182

Maitland, Thomas (1759-1824; DNB). Referred to: 649, 650

Mallet, Edouard (1805-56; GE). Referred to: 828


note: the quotations are in and the references derive from a quotation from Chadwick, “Report,” q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 827, 828, 829

referred to: 828-9

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834; DNB).

note: the references at 989 and 1070 are in a quotation from Scrope.

referred to: 318, 989, 1070


note: see also the ed. of 1803, below. The quotation is of the phrase “check to population,” used repeatedly.
quoted: 88


note: see also the 1st ed., above. The reference at 98 is in a quotation from James Mill; that at 99n is in a footnote by Wooler.

quoted: 88

referred to: 96, 98


note: the reference is illustrative.

referred to: 58

— The Measure of Value Stated and Illustrated, with an Application of It to the Alterations in the Value of the English Currency since 1790. London: Murray, 1823.

reviewed: 51-60

quoted: 54, 55-6, 56, 57, 57-8, 58, 59

54.20 labour.] labour; and as no other object whatever can represent a given quantity of labour, it is obvious that labour stands quite alone in this respect, and that it is the quantity of labour which a commodity will command, and not the quantity of any other commodity, which can represent the conditions of its supply, or its natural value.* [footnote omitted] (17-18)

55.40 If] But if (30)

57.23 “1. On] On (54)

57.23 rents,” . . . “such] rents, such (54)

57.25 value] value (54)

57.27 agriculture.”] agriculture; and on the same principle that, if titles do not fall mainly on the labourer, the acknowledged diminution in the corn rents of the landlord, occasioned by tithes, cannot be balanced by an increase of their value, and that, consequently, tithes must fall mainly on the landlord. (54-5)

57.36 “2. If tithes] [see entry for 57.27 above]
57.38 and consequently] [see entry for 57.27 above]

58.7 “that] [paragraph] On the subject of labour would determine, that (55)

58.10 the work] the quantity of work (55)

58.11 labour] labour* [footnote omitted] (55)

58.30 If the] [paragraph] On the subject of the accumulation of capital it would show that if the (57)

59.7-8 them . . . profits] them, profits (59)

59.22 On the] [paragraph] On the (56)

59.22 it . . . would] it would (56)

59.27 profits] profits* [footnote omitted] (57)

59.40 “we must have] We must therefore have (58)


referred to: 893


note: the reference is illustrative.

referred to: 58

Manners, John James Robert (Lord; later 7th Duke of Rutland) (1818-1906; DNB). Referred to: 926, 1067

— Speech on the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill (15 Mar., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 90, cols. 1385-91.

referred to: 1072

Manuel, Jacques Antoine (1775-1827; GDU). Referred to: 125-6, 486-7

— Speech in the Chamber of Deputies (5 June), Moniteur, 1820, 784-5.

referred to: 156

note: speech which caused him to be ejected from the Chamber of Deputies.

referred to: 125-6

Manzoni, Alessandro (1784-1873; GDU). Referred to: 573

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-93; GDU). Referred to: 524

Marchal, Pierre François (1785-1864; DPF). Referred to: 262


referred to: 262

Margot, François (1796- ?).

note: prosecuted and sentenced under martial law in June 1832.

referred to: 487, 495

Maria Louisa (Duchess of Parma) (1791-1847; GDU). Referred to: 289


quoted: 1193

1193.20 “degradation”] The hon. Member [Mr. Bright] declared that no gentleman of standing would condescend to the degradation of a canvass. (1000)

Marmont, Auguste de, duc de Raguse (1774-1852; GDU). Referred to: 166

Marrast, Armand (1801-52; GDU). Referred to: 362, 402

— “Situation grave,” La Tribune, 9 Sept., 1831.

note: the article was written for, but (by reason of censorship) not published in this issue of La Tribune; it appeared in the Révolution de 1830.

referred to: 363

Marryatt, Joseph (1758-1824; MEB). Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 459-61.

note: PD gives his forename as James. JSM’s source for his quotations has not been located; the PD version is used for ease of reference. For the first quotation at 28, attributed to him by JSM, see William Douglas.

quoted: 26, 27, 28
— Speech on the Labour Rate (5 Aug., 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, col. 359.

quoted: 636, 637

636.22 “temporary palliative,”] The Bill was, however, to be defended only as a temporary palliative to an evil to which he should hope to see a more general and permanent remedy applied. (359)

Martignac, Jean Baptiste Sylvère Gay, vicomte de (1778-1832; *GDU*). Referred to: 134, 153, 189, 203, 456, 516, 569

Martin, Nicolas Ferdinand Marie Louis Joseph (1790-1847; *GU*).

note: called Martin du Nord.

referred to: 747

Martin, Samuel (1801-83; *DNB*).


quoted: 1184

Martineau, Harriet (1802-76; *DNB*). Referred to: 554, 575, 638-9


referred to: 554


referred to: 574


reviewed: 638-42

quoted: 639-41

639.9 entered] re-entered (104)


referred to: 561-2

Martínez de la Rosa, Francisco de Paula (1789-1862; *EB*). Referred to: 40-1

Marvell, Andrew (1621-78; *DNB*).

note: JSM uses the spelling “Marvel.”

referred to: 494, 596

Mary II (of England) (1662-94; *DNB*). Referred to: 132

Masse.

note: the young man attached to Adèle Boury, *q.v.*

referred to: 532

Mathieu-Dumas. See Dumas.

Matthewson, John Thomas (b. 1823).

note: a private soldier in the 7th Regiment of Hussars.

referred to: 882-5

Matthias, Thomas James (1754-1835; *DNB*). Referred to: 318


referred to: 318

Maudslay, Henry (1771-1831; *DNB*). Referred to: 1263

Mauguin, François (1785-1854; *DPF*). Referred to: 192, 337, 352, 661


referred to: 162

— Speech on War (15 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 111.

referred to: 248


referred to: 299
referred to: 363

— Speech (19 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2440.
referred to: 389

— Speeches on the Budget of 1832 (26 and 27 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 268-70 and 281-2.
referred to: 405

— Speech on the Draft Address to the King (3 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 24.
referred to: 661

Maupillé, Léon. See Amédée Bertin.

Maximianus I (M. Aurelius Valerius Maximianus) (ca. 240-310; *WWR*).

note: JSM’s reference at this point to Diocletian is mistaken; Maximianus’ career is described.
referred to: 690

Mayhew, Ellen.

note: a witness in the MacLean case. The reference is in a quotation from the *Morning Chronicle*, 23 Aug., 1851, q.v.
referred to: 1185

Mehemet Ali. See Mohammed.

Meidias (fl. 347; *WWG*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 1132

Melbourne, Lord. See William Lamb.

Melesias.

note: father of the Thucydides who opposed Pericles. The reference is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 1124
Menotti, Ciro (1798-1831; GDU). Referred to: 429

Meredes, Amelia.

note: the quotation of her evidence is from “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir,” Morning Chronicle, 28 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1167-9

Mérilhou, Joseph (1788-1856; GDU). Referred to: 181, 283, 288

Merle, Gibbons (ca. 1796-1855).

note: the reference at 526 is in a quotation from Le National. Merle seems also to have edited the Courrier in the early 1830s. Obituary in Gentleman’s Magazine.

referred to: 526, 529


note: the reference derives from a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526


note: the reference derives from a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526

Merlin de Douai, Philippe Antoine, comte (1754-1838; GDU). Referred to: 520, 542n

Merrett, Anne (b. 1819).

note: convicted of poisoning her husband.

referred to: 1170

Merville. See Vallet de Merville.

Messager des Chambres. Referred to: 153


note: see Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse.

referred to: 1054
Michel, Louis Chrysostome (1798-1853; GDU).

note: known as Michel de Bourges.

referred to: 657-8


quoted: 1048n

1048n.5-6 moment” . . . “où] moment où (7)

1048n.9 journaliers. . . . Je] journaliers. Par quels incroyables efforts purent-ils, à travers les guerres et les banqueroutes du grand roi, du régent, garder ou reprendre les terres que nous avons vu plus haut se trouver dans leurs mains au dix-huitième siècle, c’est ce qu’on ne peut pas s’expliquer. [paragraph] Je (8)

1048n.12 réimprimé . . . Economistes.] [drawn from an omitted 4-sentence footnote to Boisguillebert]

Mie, Auguste (1801-85; DPF). Referred to: 705, 745

Miguel (of Portugal) (1802-66; EB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 527

Mill, James (1773-1836; DNB). Referred to: 97, 101, 102, 1263

referred to: 433


note: the article (sometimes identified as “Colonies”) first appeared in a fascicle in February 1818; it was reprinted in *Essays* (London: printed Innes, [1825]), where the passage appears (in revised form) on 9-12.

quoted: 97-100

referred to: 97

97.34 It should] In the first place, it should (260)

98.34 As] [paragraph] As (260)

99.3 population] proportion (260) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]

99.10 number] number (260)

99.10 proportion] proportion (260)

99.28-9 manhood. [paragraph] It] mankind might be made. [3-sentence omission] [paragraph] It (261) [manhood treated as printer’s error for mankind in this ed.]

100.25-6 inquire. It] inquire. [paragraph] It (261)


referred to: 3-6

— “Government” (1820). In *Supplement,* IV, 419-505.

note: the article first appeared in a fascicle in September 1820; it was reprinted in his *Essays* (1825). The references are to the word “securities” used in the Philosophic Radical sense; that at 101 is in a quotation from James Mill’s “Periodical Literature—*Edinburgh Review*”; that at 874 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 40, 62-4, 64-6, 101, 130, 144, 184-5, 489, 490, 492, 503, 874

note: this ed. conforms more closely to JSM’s quotation than either the 1st or the 3rd. The 3rd ed. (6 vols., 1826) is in SC. The reference at 206 is to the passage quoted at 195.

quoted: 195
referred to: 195, 206

note: first published (signed “F.F.”) in a fascicle in July 1821; republished in his Essays (1825).
referred to: 12
quoted: 101-2
referred to: 101-2
101.38 of securities] of the securities (222)
102.2 readily] really (222) [treated as a typographical error in this ed.]
— “Prisons and Prison Discipline” (1823). In Supplement, VI, 385-95.
note: the article first appeared in a fascicle in April 1823.
referred to: 67-70

note: No. 109.
referred to: 329
note: No. 63.
referred to: 209
note: No. 299.
referred to: 856
note: No. 300.
referred to: 856

note: No. 392.
referred to: 1168

referred to: 1093

note: No. 311.
referred to: 904, 905, 907, 1011

note: No. 312.
referred to: 927

note: No. 316.
referred to: 942, 983, 1011

note: No. 317.
referred to: 973, 974

note: No. 321.
referred to: 942, 983

note: No. 324.
referred to: 938
note: No. 330.

referred to: 968
note: No. 337.

referred to: 999
note: No. 339.

referred to: 988, 1011
note: No. 341.

referred to: 1004
note: No. 346.

referred to: 1016
note: No. 349.

referred to: 1025
note: No. 352.

referred to: 1030
note: No. 353.

note: the reference derives from Romilly’s criticism.

referred to: 1216


referred to: 580n-1n


note: No. 1.

referred to: 5


note: No. 112.

referred to: 436

— “Flower’s Songs of the Months [1],” *Examiner*, 20 Apr., 1834, 244.

note: No. 248.

referred to: 760


note: No. 234.

quoted: 689

referred to: 689

689.23 “was . . . one;”] He was . . . one; and after considerable personal inquiry, we have not been able to ascertain that he ever was an acknowledged member of the St. Simonian body, or is known personally to any one of the remarkable men from whom St. Simonism derived its celebrity. (68)


note: No. 5.

referred to: 13
note: No. 6.
referred to: 17

note: No. 7.
referred to: 10, 15

note: No. 76.
referred to: 208

note: No. 132.
referred to: 392

note: No. 133.
referred to: 390

note: No. 134.
referred to: 390

note: No. 135.
referred to: 397

note: No. 140.
referred to: 690-1

note: No. 180.
referred to: 690-1

note: No. 236.
referred to: 684

note: No. 247.
referred to: 745

note: No. 262.
referred to: 735

note: No. 268.
referred to: 747

note: No. 381; the reference is anticipatory.
referred to: 1128

note: No. 280.
referred to: 782

note: No. 281.
referred to: 782

note: No. 11.
referred to: 43

referred to: 1220
note: No. 219; the reference is prospective.

referred to: 622
quoted: 801
801.28 “The penalty] But if they are to be banished, there must be a penalty for returning from banishment; and the penalty (510)
801.32 it;”] it. (510)
note: No. 106; the reference at 308 is prospective.

referred to: 308, 465
note: No. 217; the reference at 607 is prospective.

referred to: 607, 647
note: No. 261; the reference is prospective.

referred to: 734
note: No. 174.

referred to: 496
note: the reference derives from Holyoake.

referred to: 1179

note: No. 361.

referred to: 1070
— “Puseyism [1],” *Morning Chronicle*, 1 Jan., 1842, 3.

note: No. 291.

referred to: 815

note: No. 292.

referred to: 815

note: No. 356.

referred to: 1046

note: No. 358; the reference is prospective.

referred to: 1051

note: No. 27.

quoted: 86

referred to: 85-90

86.16 “I wish the people to be comfortable under any system, good or bad;” I do wish men to be comfortable, whether under a bad system or a good one. (752)

86.17-18 *something more* for the people] for the people *something more* (752)

note: No. 28.

referred to: 95


note: No. 218; the reference is prospective.

referred to: 617


referred to: 1218


referred to: 1222


note: No. 73.

referred to: 238, 316


note: No. 82.

referred to: 245, 289


note: No. 92.

referred to: 258, 289


note: No. 97.

referred to: 253, 282, 304


note: No. 421.
Treaties are not made to be eternal, and before we go to war for the maintenance of one it behoves the nation at least to consider whether it would enter into it afresh . . .


note: No. 67.


note: No. 60.

Millard, William.

note: known as the “King of the Resurrection-Men,” he had been a servant to Sir Ashley Cooper, and Conservator of the Museum and attendant to the Dissecting Room of the Anatomical School at St. Thomas’s Hospital.

referred to: 48-50

Miller (b. ca. 1789).

note: an avocat-général in Paris in 1831.

referred to: 302, 407

Millingen, James (1774-1845; DNB). Referred to: 318

Mills, James.

note: master of a West India trading ship. The reference is in a quotation from The Times of 6 July, 1849.

referred to: 1139

Miltiades (ca. 540-489 ; WWG). Referred to: 1084

Milton, John (1608-74; DNB).

note: the reference at 558 is in a quotation from W.J. Fox.
referred to: 332, 394, 558, 596


note: this ed. in SC, now lacking Vol. I. The reference at 558 is in a quotation from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 558, 679


note: the quotation at 1128, in a quotation from Grote, is indirect.

quoted: 316, 587, 642, 1086, 1128

316.25 “fit audience,” . . . “though few,”] Half yet remains unsung, but narrower bound / Within the visible Diurnal Sphere; / Standing on Earth, not rapt above the Pole, / More safe I sing with mortal voice, unchang’d / To hoarse or mute, though fall’n on evil days, / On evil days though fall’n, and evil tongues; / In darkness, and with dangers compass’d round, / And solitude; yet not alone, while thou / Visit’st my slumbers Nightly, or when Morn / Purples the East: still govern thou my Song, / Urania, and fit audience find, though few. (180, VII, 21-31)

587.34-5 “choice and prime”] This said, he sate; and expectation held / His look suspense, awaiting who appear’d / To second or oppose, or undertake / The perilous attempt: but all sate mute, / Pondering the danger with deep thoughts; and each / In others count’nance read his own dismay / Astonisht: None among the choice and prime / Of those Heav’n-warring Champions could be found / So hardy as to profer or accept / Alone the dreadful voyage; till at last / Satan, whom now transcendent glory rais’d / Above his fellows, with Monarchal pride / Conscious of highest worth, unmov’d thus spake. . . . (40; II, 417-29)

642.1 “the tyrant’s plea:”] [paragraph] So spake the Fiend, and with necessity, / The Tyrants plea, excus’d his devilish deeds. (97; IV, 393-4)

1086.22 “this great argument”] What in me is dark / Illumine, what is low raise and support; / That to the heighth of this great Argument / I may assert Eternal Providence, / And justifie the ways of God to men. (2; I, 22-6)

1128.16 making the . . . reason] But all was false and hollow; though his tongue / Dropt manna, and could make the . . . reason, to perplex and dash / Maturest counsels. (31; II, 110-13)

438.22 “will not willingly be let die.”] But much latelier in the private academies of Italy, whither I was favoured to resort, perceiving that some trifles which I had in memory, composed at under twenty or thereabout, (for the manner is, that every one must give some proof of his wit and reading there) met with acceptance above what was looked for; and other things, which I had shifted in scarcity of books and conveniences to patch up amongst them, were received with written encomiums, which the Italian is not forward to bestow on men of this side the Alps; I began thus far to assent both to them and divers of my friends here at home, and not less to an inward prompting which now grew daily upon me, that by labour and intense study, (which I take to be my portion in this life) joined with the strong propensity of nature, I might perhaps leave something so written to after times, as they should not willingly let it die. (119)

Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, comte de (1749-91; DPF). Referred to: 141, 214, 541


referred to: 1049

Mirabeau, Victor Riqueti, marquis de (1715-89; GDU).

note: see also Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, comte de Mirabeau.

referred to: 1049


Mitford, William (1744-1827; DNB). Referred to: 292, 868


note: this ed. formerly in SC. Vols. I-VIII were published in 1818; Vols. IX-X in 1820. The reference at 867-8 is also to the 1st ed., published between 1784 and 1818 in 5 vols., Vol. I, by Murray and Robson; Vols. II-V by Cadell, et al.

referred to: 292, 867-8, 869, 1125

Mohammed (or Mehemet) Ali (1769-1849; EB). Referred to: 676

Moir.

note: the son of the Moirs; the quotation is from Meredes’s evidence in “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir;” Morning Chronicle, 28 Mar., 1850.
Moir, Alexander.

note: a baker; the quotations are from Johnson’s and Meredes’s evidence in “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir,” *Morning Chronicle*, 28 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1169

referred to: 1168-70, 1173

Moir, George (1800-70; *DNB*). “Prussia; or, The Progress of Rational Reform,” *Blackwood’s Magazine*, XXXIV (July 1833), 55-71.

referred to: 728

Moir, Susan (d. 1850).

note: wife of Alexander Moir; the quotations are in quotations of Bryant’s and Meredes’s evidence in “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir,” *Morning Chronicle*, 28 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1168, 1169

referred to: 1168-70

Molé, Mathieu Louis, comte (1781-1855; *GDU*). Referred to: 199

Molesworth, William (1810-55; *DNB*). Referred to: 770, 801


quoted: 250

250.1-2 “[La . . . la danse . . . danse!]” Maistre de Musique. La . . . la Musique . . . Musique. . . ./ Maistre à Dancer.—La Musique & la Dance. . . . La Musique & la Dance, c’est là tout ce qu’il faut. (13; i, ii)

Mollinger, David (d. 1787).

note: administrator of a large estate in Monsheim; the reference derives from Rau.

referred to: 976

*Le Moniteur Universel* [*Moniteur*].

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.
referred to: 517
— “Convention” (3 July), 1815, 765.

referred to: 376
— Unheaded leading article, 5 Jan., 1827, 2.

quoted: 126

126.13 “une loi d’amour,”] [paragraph] La loi présentée veut être une loi de justice et d’amour; et non un acte arbitraire et une mesure de haine: elle veut être répressive et ne veut pas être tyrannique: elle est réclamée par les intérêts les plus sacrés de la religion et de la morale, par les besoins les plus intimes de la famille et de la société. (2)

— Unheaded article, 15 July, 1831, 1215.

quoted: 372-3

referred to: 389
— Telegram of 6 July, 1831, 1269.

quoted: 387

387.26-8 “Paris . . . themselves.”] [translated from:] Paris est parfaitement tranquille. Les élections s’y annoncent, comme dans d’autres localités, sous des augures très-favorables; des majorités considérables se sont prononcées. (1269)


referred to: 372
— Report on Re-establishment of Order in Lyons (7 Dec.), 1831, 2327.

referred to: 372

referred to: 505
— Trial of Pierre Antoine Berryer (15-17 Oct.), 1832, 1839, 1845-6, 1849-50, and 1851-3.

referred to: 517
— Adresse en réponse au discours du trône (4 Dec.), 1832, 2073.
referred to: 532
— Proclamations of the Provisional Government Banning the Assembly of Peers (24 Feb.), 1848, 499.

referred to: 1092
— Decree of the Provisional Government Abolishing Hereditary Titles (29 Feb.), 1848, 519.

referred to: 1092
— Decree of the Provisional Government Lowering the Hours of Labour (2 Mar.), 1848, 529.

referred to: 1092
— Proclamation of the Provisional Government Providing for a Constituent Assembly (5 Mar.), 1848, 549.

Le Moniteur du Commerce.

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 667
Montalivet, Marthe Camille Bachasson, comte de (1801-80; GDU).

note: the reference at 461 is in a quotation from the Courrier Français.

referred to: 181, 208, 460, 461

note: the speech was translated in summary in “French Papers,” Globe and Traveller, 27 Oct., 1831, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 360-2
— Speech on Deputies’ Civil List (4 Jan.), Moniteur, 1832, 42.

quoted: 392

392.23 “subjects of the King:"

translated from: Il faut, disais-je, que le luxe qui fait la prospérité des peuples civilisés ne soit pas bannit de l’habitation du Roi de France,
car il le serait bientôt de celle de ses sujets. . . . (Explosion de murmures aux extrémités. Violente interruption.) (42)

Montbel, Guillaume Isidore, comte de (1787-1861; GDU). Referred to: 127


note: in SC.
referred to: 120

*The Monthly Repository and Review of Theology.*

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically; see also W.J. Fox.
reviewed: 555-9, 561-2, 574-5, 595, 651-6, 659-61
referred to: 702, 703, 760

quoted: 562

quoted: 562

note: the quotation, in the *Examiner*, occasioned No. 220.
quoted: 596n
referred to: 595, 596n

— “Church Reform, Considered as a National and Not a Sectarian Question,” n.s. VII (Dec. 1833), 805-13.
note: probably by W.J. Fox.
referred to: 655

note: probably by W.J. Fox.
quoted: 652, 653-4
referred to: 653

653.28 We [no paragraph] We (837)

— “The Case of the Dissenters,” n.s. VIII (Jan. 1834), 63-70.

note: probably by W.J. Fox.

quoted: 659-60

660.22 answer [not in italics] (63)

Monti, Vincenzo (1754-1828; GDU). Referred to: 573

Montlosier, François Dominique Reynaud, comte de (1755-1838; GDU). Referred to: 125, 516, 542

Mony-Flachat. See Flachat.

Moore, Mary Anne.

note: wife of Robert Moore.

referred to: 1184

Moore, Robert Thomas (b. 1811).

note: charged with the attempted murder of his wife, Mary Anne Moore.

referred to: 1184

More, Thomas (1478-1535; DNB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from the Brighton Guardian.

referred to: 322, 323, 463


note: De optimo reipublicae statu, deque nova insula Utopia (Glasgow: Foulis, 1754), Vol. II, is in SC. The reference is in a quotation from the Brighton Guardian.

referred to: 322

Morier, David Richard (1784-1877; DNB). Referred to: 775

The Morning Chronicle.
note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically. See also John Black and
Caleb Colton.

referred to: 204, 370, 446, 496, 497, 499, 502, 504, 830, 836, 842

— “Worcester, July 18th (Last Day.) Before Mr. Justice Park. Forgery,” 22 July,
1823, 4.

referred to: 30-3


referred to: 42


referred to: 43


referred to: 46


referred to: 48


referred to: 60


referred to: 60

— “Revision of the Magistracy” (letter to the editor; signed “A True Friend of
Morality and Social Order”), 22 Sept., 1823, 4.

referred to: 62

— “Liberty of the Subject” (letter to the editor; signed “Vindex”; 20 Oct., 1823), 23
Oct., 1823, 4.

referred to: 75

— “Pleadings” (signed “G.J.G. Gray’s Inn”), 26 Dec., 1823, 4.

referred to: 95

— “Pleadings” (signed “Hibernicus”), 3 Jan., 1824, 3.
referred to: 95
— Unheaded leader on Periodical Literature, 16 Dec., 1824, 2.
referred to: 101-2
— Leading article on Irish Absentee Landlords, 7 Sept., 1825, 2.
referred to: 103-6
— “Absenteeism” (letter; signed “A.”), 12 Sept., 1825, 4.
referred to: 103-6
— Leading article on Irish Absentee Landlords, 14 Sept., 1825, 2.
referred to: 103-6
— Article on the Fall of the Bourbons, 14 Oct., 1830, 3.
quoted: 169, 170-1, 171-2
169.21 The writer . . . honestly] The writer honestly (3)
169.24 the . . . power] [not in italics] (3)
169.27 if . . . purpose] [not in italics] (3)
171.28 “Of] [no paragraph] “Of (3)
171.43 he to whom] he whom (3) [typographical error in Source]
— Leading article on the Budget, 12 Feb., 1831, 4.
referred to: 267
referred to: 356
— Leading article, 3 June, 1831, 2.
quoted: 325
325.39 “encouragement to literature.”] After all, it is not an easy matter to say how far a State like England should afford encouragement to Literature and Science. (2)
— Leading article on French Language, 9 Jan., 1832, 2-3.
referred to: 395
— “France” (7 Mar.), 10 Mar., 1832, 1.
referred to: 429
referred to: 429
— Leading article on Pledges, 10 July, 1832, 2-3.
referred to: 496, 499-504
— Leading article on South Australia, 9 July, 1834, 3.
quoted: 739
referred to: 738
739.2-3 “On this subject,” . . . “we . . . doubts.] Now on this subject we . . . doubts. (3)
739.3-4 we suspect [we suspect] (3)
— Leading article on Unity among the Reformers, 2 Jan., 1835, 2.
note: quotes extensively from Senior’s On National Property (reviewed by JSM in No. 272).
referred to: 763
— Leading article on the Oxford Professorship of Poetry, 3 Dec., 1841, 2.
referred to: 811-15, 816

note: a letter to the editor in answer to a leading article in the Morning Chronicle of 3 Dec., 1841, supporting the Evangelical Garbett against the Puseyite Williams for the Professorship.
referred to: 811-12
— “Puseyism” (signed “Miso-Jesuit”), 23 Dec., 1841, 3.

note: a letter to the editor in response to that of “A Philo-Puseyite,” Morning Chronicle, 18 Dec., 1841, q.v.
referred to: 812

note: see also his first letter, above, 18 Dec., 1841.

quoted: 814

referred to: 811-12

814.21-3 “predilection . . . days,” . . . “revolting.”] I cannot deny that there is something revolting to my reason in the Puseyite predilection . . . days, and the other puerilities of the old church. (3)


note: a letter to the editor in reply to the second letter by “A Philo-Puseyite,” Morning Chronicle, 24 Dec., 1841, q.v.

referred to: 812

— Leading article on the Puseyites, 5 Jan., 1842, 2.

note: in reply to “Historicus,” i.e., JSM, in No. 291.

referred to: 815-16, 821

— Leading article on the Puseyites, 13 Jan., 1842, 2.

note: commenting on JSM’s second “Historicus” letter, ibid. (No. 292).

referred to: 822

— Leading article on the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, 3 Oct., 1842, 3.

referred to: 831, 833, 835-6


referred to: 865-6

— “Central Criminal Court—Friday. Trial of Captain Johnstone,” 7 Feb., 1846, 7.

referred to: 865-6


referred to: 875

referred to: 875

— “Central Criminal Court,” 22 June, 1846, 7.

referred to: 875

— “State of Ireland” (letter to the editor; signed “N.”), 21 Oct., 1846, 5.

quoted: 904, 907

referred to: 904-6

904.29-30 “openly . . . spoliation,”] The Morning Chronicle of the 14th contains an article upon the condition of Ireland, in which, as it seems to me, openly . . . spoliation is recommended to be applied to the landowners of Ireland. (5)

904.30-4 “glibly . . . tenant.”] It is a very easy thing to advise glibly . . . tenant; but I confess I hardly expected to find in the Morning Chronicle a recommendation so worthy of the French revolutionary assemblies, and which strikes so manifestly at the root of social order. (5)

907.27 “do] [paragraph] You do (5)

907.30 give to themselves] give themselves (5)


quoted: 952

referred to: 952-4

952.25 “with] [paragraph] William Burn was charged by Mr. Gilbert, of the Minories, with (7)

952.28 prisoner] brute (7)

952.29 down. The] down. [paragraph] The (7)

952.31 that he had a large] that the fellow had a very large (7)

952.31-2 family,” . . . “You] family, and that the infliction would inevitably fall upon the heads of his wife and children. [paragraph] The Lord Mayor (to the defendant): You (7)

952.32 highest] weightiest (7)

952.35 “thanked] [paragraph] The defendant thanked (7)
— “Waterford County Meeting,” 17 Nov., 1846, 6.
referred to: 959

referred to: 964

quoted: 960, 961

960.5 We are] [paragraph] “ ‘That to prevent a result which must prove in the end altogether destructive to the landed interest in Ireland, we are (6)

960.34 reclamation (?) of] reclamation of (6)

960.36-961.23 commissioners.” . . . “And that[,] commissioners; and that (6)

961.24 instance,” . . . “on] instance, or, on (6)

referred to: 972

referred to: 978

referred to: 978

referred to: 992


note: quoted from Limerick Chronicle, 12 Dec., 1846, 2. The Limerick Chronicle was unavailable for collation.

quoted: 1000


note: also published in PP, 1847, LVI, 365.

quoted: 1028
referred to: 1027-30, 1030, 1033-4

1028.13-14 loans . . . estates [not in italics] (3)

1028.15 reclaiming waste lands [not in italics] (3)

1028.15-16 my . . . proprietors [not in italics] (3)

1028.17 1st and 2d] 1 and 2 (3)

1028.20 act. . . . Their] Act. This latter condition is necessary in order to protect the interests of those who are to succeed the person in actual possession, from having their future property subjected to a charge for unsubstantial and improvident improvements. [paragraph] Their (3)

— Leading article on the New Prussian Constitution, 10 Feb., 1847, 5.

referred to: 1080


referred to: 1155


quoted: 1164-5, 1165, 1166, 1170

referred to: 1164

1165.2-3 abscesses were on] abscesses on (7)

1165.3 bowels was] bowels were (7)

1165.4 it was discoloured] it discoloured (7)

1165.8 burst. On] Burst. The body was then turned. On (7)

1165.11 bruises. There] bruises. [5-sentence omission] There (7)


1166.3 “to] It was very true that they might suspect it was given by one or other of the prisoners; but in the absence of all proof he could not direct them that there was evidence to (7)

1166.6-7 “found . . . head”) I found the cause of death in the head. (7)

1166.7-8 death . . . injuries] [not in italics]
1170.4 “chastisement . . . approve.”] She was seen to receive, chastisement . . . approve, but which, taken singly by itself, might have excited little regard. (7)


quoted: 1168, 1169

1168.9 “When the sheet,” . . . “with] When the sheet with (2)

1168.10 escaped all] escaped from all (2)

1168.14 jelly.”] jelly (sensation). (2)

1168.17 called] She called (2)

1168.18 Deceased] While his back was turned deceased (2)

1168.25 enough. He] enough. [2-sentence omission] Witness mentioned the deceased’s complaint of ill-usage to her husband, and he

1168.31 he] Her husband had just returned home from delivering some bread, and he (2)

1168.34-5 spirting from] spirting out from (2)

1169.4 he] John Johnson, a journeyman baker, in the employ of Mr. Moir, said that on the night of Tuesday last his master called him as usual at eleven o’clock, shortly after which he (2)

1169.8 ferocious] “ferocious” (2)

1169.10-11 “D—n her,] “D—her! (2)

1169.13 had] She had (2)

1169.15 me, you’ll] me. You’ll (2)


referred to: 1169


note: report of the Curtis trial before Samuel Martin. The quotations are from the evidence of Jane Anne Wilkes and the judgment of Martin.

quoted: 1184

1184.15 spoke] She spoke (8)
1184.15 said his . . . home,] said, “His place . . . home;” (8)

1184.16 room. He] room. It was then twenty minutes before seven He was not particularly angry. He (8)

1184.18-19 over the left shoulder with his right hand, and] by the shoulder and (8)

1184.23 in a] on a (8)

1184.26-7 “indulged . . . passion,”] The facts show that you indulged . . . passion. (8)

1184.27-8 “well believe” . . . “did . . . her;”] Some sharp words took place between you and your wife, and I can very well believe that you did . . . her (8)

1184.28-9 “no doubt . . . occurred,” . . . “sincerely . . . it;”] No doubt . . . occurred, you were sincerely . . . it. (8)

1184.29-30 “considering . . . circumstances,” . . . “justice . . . case”] It think, in considering . . . circumstances, I shall satisfy the justice . . . case by sentencing you to be imprisoned for six calendar months, and kept to hard labour. (8)


note: report of the Halliday case, heard before Martin.

referred to: 1184, 1185


note: reports the charge of the Recorder, Wortley, to the Grand Jury.

quoted: 1183

referred to: 1185

1183.28 on] upon (7)

— “Central Criminal Court—Friday,” 23 Aug., 1851, 7-8.

note: the Moore and Mackan cases before Wightman are here reported on 7 and 8 respectively.

quoted: 1185

1185.12 Early in] [paragraph] It appeared that the prisoner and his wife lodged in a house in Dacre-street, Westminster, and early in (8)

1185.15 the cupboard] a cupboard (8)
face. Upon] face, and on her being cut down it was a quarter of an hour before she recovered or was able to speak. Upon (8)

occurrence. The] occurrence. [paragraph] Mr. O’Brien [prosecuting], in answer to a question by the Court, said he did not propose to call the wife as a witness. [paragraph] The (8)

had hanged] hung (8)


referred to: 1187

The Morning Herald.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

― Leading article on the Lyons Disturbances, 28 Nov., 1831, 2.

referred to: 369n


note: the account is taken from the Coventry Herald, reporting a meeting on 24 Nov.

referred to: 369n

The Morning Post.

note: the reference at 811 is in a quotation from Sterling. Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 134, 811

― Unheaded item of French News, 4 Sept., 1830, 2.

referred to: 149

― “Private Correspondence. Letter from our Correspondent at Paris” (13 Nov.), 19 Nov., 1830, 3.

referred to: 192

Morrish, James.

note: a witness in the Parsons/Bird case; a shoemaker of Buckland Brewer. The quotation is taken from The Times, 1 Feb., 1850, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1152
referred to: 1152, 1153

Mounier, L.

note: nephew of Maurice Rubichon.

referred to: 1037-9, 1040-5


note: JSM consistently refers to the work as Rubichon’s. The quotation at 1050 is in a quotation from Croker (q.v.); those at 1055 are taken from Mounier and Rubichon’s quotations from a Report to the Municipal Council of Paris in 1841.

quoted: 1041, 1050, 1052, 1055

referred to: 1037-9, 1040-5, 1046-51, 1051-8

1041.25-7 “It . . . foncière.”] [translated from:] [paragraph] On croirait difficilement, qu’il y a en France plus de quatre millions de propriétaires tellement pauvre qu’ils ne paient que 5 francs 95 centimes de contribution foncière, si, d’un autre côté, on ne savait, qu’il y a des dispositions légales, qui permettent de se soustraire à la contribution par la déclaration d’un abandon perpétuel qui doit être fait à la mairie et dont l’acte ne donne lieu qu’à un simple droit d’enregistrement de 2 francs; disposions souvent exécutées, et que le préfet du département des Basses-Alpes, a rappelées dans une circulaire du 30 septembre 1824, adressée à de malheureux cultivateurs, réduits à abandonner leurs biens par suite de la demande de l’impôt. (I, 102)

1050.8 “creating a new Ireland in France,”] L’Angleterre, étant séparée de l’Irlande par la mer, n’a pas été gênée dans ses mouvements, mais la nouvelle Irlande que la France s’est créée s’étend sur toute sa superficie, et menace sérieusement l’existence de tous les propriétaires qui habitent les campagnes. (I, 297-8)

1052.4-6 “This . . . Europe.”] [translated from:] Ce fait s’explique par la révolution qui s’est opérée dans la population ouvrière, puisque la capitale est devenue la ville la plus industrielle de l’Europe. (II, 158)

1055.25-6 “there . . . number,”] [translated from:] Il y a progrès dans ces origines, en poids, en graisse, et dans quelques-unes en nombre. (II, 188)

1055.28-9 “what . . . Nièvre.”] [translated from:] Ce qui est une détérioration dans les gras pâturages du Calvados, est une amélioration sur les petites herbes de l’Allier et de la Nièvre. (II, 189)

Le Mouvement.
note: the reference is to the newspaper that supported the stand of Le National; it merged with La Tribune in March 1832. See also Lionne.

referred to: 428

Mozart, Johannes Chrysostomus Wolfgangus Theophilus (Wolfgang Amadeus) (1756-91; *EB*). Referred to: 333

Mudge, Richard Zachariah (1790-1854; *DNB*). Referred to: 833


referred to: 448

Mueller, Karl Otfried (1797-1840; *EB*). Referred to: 1087


referred to: 448, 1087

Mueller, Wilhelm (1794-1827; *EB*). Referred to: 871

Mulready, William (1786-1863; *DNB*). Referred to: 1264

Murray, George (1772-1846; *DNB*). Referred to: 110, 113, 735

Murray, John (1778-1843; *DNB*). Referred to: 806

Murray, John (1808-92; *DNB*). Referred to: 806

Murray, Lindley (1745-1826; *DNB*). *English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners; with an Appendix, Containing Rules and Observations for Promoting Perspicuity in Speaking and Writing.* York: Wilson, et al., 1795.

referred to: 110


referred to: 110, 113
Murray, William David (Lord Stormont, later Earl of Mansfield) (1806-93; *MEB*).
Speech on the Ministerial Plan of Parliamentary Reform (2 Mar., 1831; Commons),

note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 790


Napier, Charles James (1782-1853; *DNB*). Referred to: 615, 647-51, 1191


reviewed: 647-51

quoted: 651

referred to: 615

Napier, Macvey (1776-1847; *DNB*). Referred to: 12

Napier, William Francis Patrick (1785-1860; *DNB*). Referred to: 647


referred to: 647

Napoleon I (of France) (1768-1821; *GDU*).

note: the first reference at 154 is to him as a “low-minded adventurer”; that at 251 is to him as an object of “admiration and regret”; that at 520 is to “a despot”; those at 247, 251, 338, 364, and 417 are to Bonapartists; one of those at 384 is in a quotation from Fiévée; that at 484 is to Napoleonists; that at 505 is in a quotation from *La Tribune*; those at 1247-8 are in a quotation from Cavaignac.


— Déclaration au peuple français (22 June), *Moniteur*, 1815, 715.

referred to: 482

note: this ed. cited for ease of reference.

quoted: 614

614.23-4 “Le mot impossible . . . n’est pas Français.”] “Ce n’est pas possible,” m’écrivez-vous: cela n’est pas français. (479)

— Proclamation to the Imperial Guard and the Army (1 Mar.), Moniteur, 1815, 323-4.

quoted: 199

referred to: 132

199.12 rien appris] [paragraph] Depuis le peu de mois que les Bourbons règnent, ils vous ont convaincus qu’ils n’ont rien oublié ni rien appris. (323)

Napoleon II (of France) (François Joseph Charles Napoléon Bonaparte, duc de Reichstadt) (1811-32; GDU). Referred to: 22, 251, 482

Napoleon III (of France) (1808-73; GDU).

note: the reference is to the period when (as Louis Napoleon) he was President of France.

referred to: 1142

The Nation.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 922, 965-7

— “Every Man His Own Landlord,” 24 Oct., 1846, 40.

note: a leading article. In it JSM’s articles on Ireland in the Morning Chronicle are praised as written “by one who (a rare thing in an English journalist treating of Ireland) plainly knows what he is writing about, and touches it boldly as well as skilfully.”

quoted: 922

922.18 See the] But see the (40)

922.21 select committee,] “Select Committee,” (40)

922.29 public works’ commissioners] “Public Works Commissioners” (40)

note: a leading article, which mentions JSM’s commendation of the Nation in No. 319.

quoted: 965-6, 967

965.32 about Ireland.] upon Irish affairs (88)

965.35 other. . . . So] other—little suspecting that whatever antagonism there is between them, he, the English statesman, with his ignorant quackery, is mainly the cause of it. So (88)

965.38 fatherless? Are not] fatherless—are not (88)

967.17 That] [no paragraph] That (88)

967.19 board] “Board” (88)

967.23 hands. And] hands. [paragraph] And (88)

967.24-5 to make . . . tenants] [not in italics] (88)

967.26-7 obligatory . . . grants] [not in italics] (88)

967.27 grants. They can] grants: they can (88)

967.29 proceeds. . . . All] proceeds, which will surely be better than mortgaging ten years’ rates to provide work which creates no fund to pay its own expenses. [paragraph] All (88)

967.31-4 under. . . . [paragraph] A commission] under—a commission (88)

Le National.

note: edited by Armand Carrel (q.v.). The reference at 747 is in a quotation from Le Temps. Anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 389, 481, 510, 525-30, 666, 667, 668, 669, 685, 700, 745, 747

— Verdict of the Tribunal of Correctional Police, 15 Sept., 1830, 4.

quoted: 142

142.16-33 Considering . . . costs.] [translated from:] A l’égard des treize autres prévenus, qui déclarent eux-mêmes avoir été commissaires d’une réunion, barrière du Maine, le 3 septembre, [paragraph] Attendu qu’il est résulté, de l’instruction et des débats que cette réunion n’avait pas de but positivement déterminé jusqu’à l’arrivée et à l’intervention des autorités civiles et militaires; [paragraph] Que c’est à l’arrivée de ces autorités que les membres de la réunion ont nommé des commissaires, et qu’un arrêté a été pris par lequel ils se sont engagés et ont engagé les autres ouvriers à ne pas
travailler dans les ateliers où se trouvaient des presses mécaniques; [paragraph] Que si par cette détermination la réunion a pris le caractère d’une coalition illégale, et a dès-lors constitué matériellement le délit prévu par les articles 415 et 416 du Code pénal, il est en même temps constant, d’après le débat, et particulièrement d’après les explications données à l’audience par les autorités civiles et militaires présentes à la délibération du 3 septembre, que les commissaires n’ont agi que dans le but de maintenir l’ordre, et sous les yeux mêmes des autorités; [paragraph] Que si des additions paraissent avoir été faites à l’arrêté depuis l’instant où il avait été délibéré, cela semble être la suite d’une méprise des membres de la réunion sur l’étendue de leurs droits; [paragraph] Que les travaux ont repris presque aussitôt, et que les commissaires, éclairés sur la nature de leur droit, ont invité leurs confrères à les reprendre sans délai; [paragraph] Que si l’ensemble de ces circonstances ne détruit pas l’existence matérielle du délit, elles sont du moins exclusives de toute intention criminelle, intention qui est la base des délits réprimés par la loi; [paragraph] Le tribunal renvoie les prévenus susdits de la prévention, sans dépens. (4)

— Leading article, 24 Sept., 1830, 1-2.

referred to: 146

— “Adresse de la ville de Nancy au roi” (2 Jan., 1831), 17 Jan., 1831, 4.

referred to: 248, 251, 263


referred to: 372

— “Compte rendu par 41 membres de la chambre des députés à leurs commettans,” 28 May, 1832, 1-2.

referred to: 466, 483

— “Banquet allemand à Paris,” 28 May, 1832, 3.

quoted: 467


note: the article is probably by Carrel.

quoted: 525-7

referred to: 527, 528
Les journaux anglais ont une méthode très commode de traiter les affaires de France. Les rédacteurs paraissent ne pas se donner la peine d’étudier ou même de lire des organes de l’opinion dans ce pays. Les seuls journaux parisiens qui arrivent à Londres sont ceux dont l’existence est déjà ancienne. Les hommes sages de Londres affectent de mépriser nos journaux et semblent s’imaginer que les Français sont trop légers, trop peu raisonnables pour être jugés dans leurs propres affaires. Même comme narrateurs de faits, nous sommes tout à fait dédaignés par nos confrères insulaires. Leur coutume est d’avoir ici un correspondant, aux récits et à l’opinion solitaire duquel ils accordent une confiance implicite. Tant que ces correspondans n’ont débité que des contradictions et des absurdités, nous n’y avons fait aucune attention; mais comme ils ont montré une animosité spéciale contre le National, nous devons au moins demander que le rédacteur qui nous traite avec tant d’impolitesse prenne la peine de s’informer qui nous sommes. [paragraph] Pendant long-temps, le correspondant parisien du Globe de Londres a dirigé contre nous de violentes attaques; une semaine ne se passe pas sans qu’il nous lance l’épigramme obligée; et souvent l’éditeur de Londres, sans même daigner jeter les yeux sur son antagoniste, la répète de son chef. Nous avons été d’abord surpris, nous l’avouons, de ce manque de loyauté et de politesse dans un journal qui n’est dépourvu ni de libéralisme ni de lumières. Mais le Globe est essentiellement doctrinaire; il a jusqu’au pédantisme de cette coterie, et comme nous sommes naturellement honorés de la haine de cette race amphibie d’écrivains politiques, il était tout simple que leurs confrères d’Angleterre, à demi torys, à demi whigs, suivissent cet exemple: aussi ce n’est pas de l’animosité que nous nous plaignons, mais de la déloyauté. En voici un exemple: [paragraph] La semaine dernière, il a paru dans nos colonnes un article concernant l’état de l’Irlande et le progrès que la question du rappel de l’union fait dans ce pays. Pour appuyer notre assertion, nous disions qu’il était sûrs de ce progrès et du succès final de la proposition. Nous raisonnions ainsi, non parce que M. Shiel possède assez d’influence personnelle pour déterminer la mesure, mais parce que c’est un homme essentiellement modéré, prudent, ennemi des extrêmes, et n’y arrivant que lorsqu’il est impossible ou impolitique de tarder plus long-temps, c’est-à-dire quand ces extrêmes commencent à prévaloir. Nous avons proclamé la conversion de M. Shiel comme un signe et non comme une cause de la grande mesure de la séparation législative de l’Angleterre et de l’Irlande; cette conclusion peut ne pas plaire au Globe, organe de M. Stanley, mais il n’aurait point méprisé l’argument s’il en avait pris connaissance. [paragraph] Le Galignani’s Messenger avait réduit l’article du National à ce peu de mots, que le rappel devait se faire, parce que M. Shiel s’y était converti. [paragraph] Là-dessus le Globe, qui, ce semble, lit le Galignani’s et non le National, cite la version donnée par le premier de l’opinion du dernier, puis il ajoute à sa citation une remarque dédaigneuse. [paragraph] Ce n’est là qu’un exemple entre mille de la déloyauté et de la légèreté avec lesquelles toutes les affaires françaises sont traitées dans les feuilles du juste-milieu de Londres, tandis que leurs confrères d’ici prêchent la possibilité d’une alliance anglaise. Ces jours derniers, un autre journal, le Courier, observait qu’il était fort à regretter que des troupes françaises fussent entrées au service de don Pedro, parce que leur présence dans l’armée constitutionnelle ne servait qu’à exaspérer les miguelistes. Voilà l’oraison funèbre que ce journal publie sur ce brave bataillon français presque anéanti pour la défense d’Oporto! [paragraph] De nos plaintes.
contre les journaux d’Angleterre soi-disant libéraux, nous excepterons cependant le
Times, dont les colonnes sont ouvertes à des correspondants de toutes les opinions sur
les affaires de France. L’un d’eux, évidemment Français et qui s’avoue tel, se montre
prodigue de louanges envers les doctrinaires; mais le langage de la bonne compagnie
ne lui est pas étranger. Seul aussi le Times paraît connaître les journaux français, et,
quoique son esprit anglican et égoïste soit dans le fait opposé au nôtre, très souvent il
le rachète par des accès de générosité dont nous devons lui tenir compte.

— Leading article, 14 Mar., 1833, 2.
referred to: 667-8

— Unheaded article on the Pistol Plot Trial, 14 Mar., 1833, 2-4.
referred to: 667-8

— Unheaded article on Le National’s Sentence, 21 Mar., 1833, 2.
referred to: 668

Le National de 1834.

note: one anonymous article follows.
referred to: 666, 668, 669, 685, 700, 733, 745, 747

— Notice of Summons, 10 Jan., 1834, 2.
referred to: 669

Naudet, Joseph (1786-1878; GDU). Referred to: 521

Naudin.

note: the presiding judge at the trial of Paulin.
referred to: 511

Nero (37-68; EB). Referred to: 694

Newcastle, Duke of. See Henry Pelham Clinton.

Newman, John Henry (1801-90; DNB).

note: some of the references are to the “Oxford theologians,” “Puseyites,” and
“Newmanites.” See also Keble and Pusey.
referred to: 811-15, 815-22
— *The Arians of the Fourth Century, Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church, between 325 & 381.* London: Rivington, 1833.

referred to: 814

— *The Church of the Fathers.* London: Rivington, 1840.

note: reprinted from the *British Magazine*, 1833-36.

referred to: 814


referred to: 814


referred to: 814

*The New Times.*

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 106, 116

— Leading article on the New London Bridge, 24 Sept., 1828, 2.

referred to: 114-15

Newton, Isaac (1642-1727; *DNB*).

note: the references at 11 and one at 424 are to the “Newtonian system”; that at 172 is in a quotation from Brewster; one of those at 414 is to the “Newtonian theory.”

referred to: 11, 172, 239-40, 286, 323, 414, 415, 424, 1163


note: the so-called “Jesuit’s edition” (Geneva: Barrillot, 1739-42), in SC.

referred to: 323

Ney, Joseph Napoléon, prince de la Moskowa (1803-57; *GDU*). Referred to: 365, 380

Ney, Michel, due d’Elchingen, prince de la Moskowa (1769-1815; *GDU*). Referred to: 365, 376, 380
Niboyet, Eugénie (1797-1883; GDU). Referred to: 1094

— “Candidature de George Sand,” Voix des Femmes, 6 Apr., 1848, 1.
referred to: 1094

— Comment on George Sand, Voix des Femmes, 10 Apr., 1848, 2.
referred to: 1094

Niceratus (fl. 5th c.).

note: the reference (to him as father of Nicias) is in a quotation from Grote, who uses the spelling Nikeratus.
referred to: 1123

Nichol, John Pringle (1804-59; DNB). Referred to: 795

reviewed: 794-6
quoted: 795-6

795.23 Call] [no paragraph] Call (8)

796.5 eye; and most] eye. And most (10)

796.14 is infinite.] is—infinite. (10)

796.41 described] described (13) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]

Nicholas I (of Russia) (1796-1855; EB). Referred to: 698, 965, 1141-3, 1143-4

Nicholls, George (1781-1865; DNB). Referred to: 743-4, 776

— “Report of George Nicholls, Esq., to His Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, on Poor Laws, Ireland” (15 Nov., 1836), PP, 1837, LI, 201-39.
referred to: 899

Nicias (d. 413; WWG).

note: the references at 1123-5, 1126, and 1127-8 are in quotations from Grote, who uses the spelling Nikias; that at 1158 is to the “Peace of Nicias.”
referred to: 1123-5, 1126, 1127-8, 1158, 1160-1
Niebuhr, Barthold Georg (1776-1831; EB). Referred to: 1086


note: the first ed. was published as Römische Geschichte, Pts. I & II (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1811-12); a German ed., 3 vols. (Berlin: Reimer, 1827-32—Vol. II is of the 1836 ed.), is in SC, as are the two vols. of lectures, ed. Schmitz (London: Taylor and Walton, 1844), that complete Niebuhr’s History.

referred to: 663, 869, 1086

Nikeratus. See Niceratus.

Nikias. See Nicias.


note: the evidence was taken on 8 May, 1827.

quoted: 938-40

Nogaret, Guillaume de (d. 1303; GDU). Referred to: 819


referred to: 855, 856

— Remarks upon Some Prevalent Errors, with Respect to Currency and Banking, and Suggestions to the Legislature and the Public as to the Improvement of the Monetary System. London: Richardson, 1838.

referred to: 850, 855, 856

North, Arabella.

note: sister of Dudley North the elder.

referred to: 1020-3

North, Arabella Frances (b. 1836).

note: daughter of Sarah and Dudley North.
referred to: 1020-3

North, Dudley (1641-91; DNB). Referred to: 322

— *Discourses upon Trade; Principally Directed to the Cases of the Interest, Coynage, Clipping, Increase of Money*. London: Basset, 1691.

note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Brighton Guardian*.

referred to: 322, 323

North, Dudley (the elder) (d. 1845).

note: a Lieutenant, killed in an accident.

referred to: 1020-3

North, Dudley (the younger) (b. 1840).

note: son of Sarah and Dudley North.

referred to: 1020-3

North, Helen Margaret (b. 1842).

note: daughter of Sarah and Dudley North.

referred to: 1020-3

North, Sarah (the elder).

note: widow of Dudley North.

referred to: 1020-3

North, Sarah (the younger) (b. 1839).

note: daughter of Sarah and Dudley North.

referred to: 1020-3

*The Northern Whig*.

note: one anonymous article follows.


quoted: 1007-8

1007.36 right] right (2)
1007.37 out-door support] [in italics] (2)

1007.37 necessary. . . . Surely it] necessary. On this most serious subject we had intended to make some remarks, for which we have not now room. But, surely it (2)


Norton, George Chapple (1800-75; MEB). Referred to: 1196-7

— Judgment on William Ebbs’s case.

note: for the collation, see The Times, 6 Nov., 1854.

quoted: 1197

referred to: 1197


referred to: 913

“O.P.Q.” See Charles Caleb Colton.

O’Brien, William Smith (1803-64; DNB). Referred to: 981


quoted: 981-3, 985

referred to: 981-3

981.10-11 “ribald vituperation now] Notwithstanding the national antipathies which have been generated in Ireland by protracted misgovernment of every description, I am persuaded that if such a calamity as that which we have suffered had visited England, not one man could have been found amongst us so ungenerous as to make it the occasion for ribald vituperation such as is now (7)

981.18 “importunate mendicants”] We cannot disguise from ourselves that the landlords and people of Ireland, where they advance a national claim, are regarded in England as little else than importunate mendicants. (7)

981.35 “approach] I write, however, not for the purpose of stimulating national animosities, but in order to persuade you to approach (7)

982.1 “we” . . . “owe] This primary duty having been accomplished, so far at least as depends upon us, we owe (7)
982.3-4 providing . . . produce.”) [not in italics] (7)

982.25 “As] [no paragraph] As (7)

982.25 vacant” . . . “some] vacant, some (7)

983.1 “inclined] I am inclined (7)

983.5-6 “It is useless,” . . . to] [paragraph] It is useless to (7)

985.27 “so] I am not so (7)

985.28 neighbours,” . . . “If you] neighbours; but, if you (7)


note: the quotation is in a quotation from the Globe and Traveller, 15 Dec., 1846, 2.

quoted: 1009

referred to: 1009, 1010

1009.1-2 “without] “I [O’Brien] have shewn that by investing a portion of the national capital in the purchase of land, for the purpose of establishing home colonies, and of creating a class of peasant proprietors, at least fifty thousand families might be enabled, without . . . public, to find a comfortable livelihood upon lands which are now tenanted by the grouse and by the snipe, or which at best yield only a scanty herbage to a few half-starved cattle.” (3)

The Observer. Referred to: 45n

O’Connell, Daniel (1775-1847; DNB). Referred to: 994, 996, 1032


note: the same phrase is quoted in both places.

quoted: 602, 609

602.24 shave-beggar] My wretched country is the scene of the political education of our statesmen, and the noble Lord is the shave-beggar of the day for Ireland. (651)

— Speech on Reform of the Church of Ireland (14 Mar., 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 16, col. 664.

note: one of the speeches by radical members who opposed the proposal to tax the present incumbent.
referred to: 605, 606

— Speech on the East-India Company’s Charter (19 July, 1833; Commons), 


note: with Buller and Hume, O’Connell opposed Clause 89 of the East India Bill.

referred to: 606

— Speech on National Education (30 July, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, cols. 169-70.

referred to: 730

Odilon-Barrot. See Barrot.

O’Donnell, Robert.

note: the non-commissioned officer to whom Matthewson (q.v.) spoke abusively.

referred to: 882-5

O’Ferrall, Richard More (1797-1880; DNB). Referred to: 1142

Ogareff, Nikolai Platonovich (1813-77).

note: see Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History.

referred to: 1203

O’Neill, Con Bácach (Lord Tyrone) (1484?-1559?; DNB). Referred to: 961

Ord, William (1781-1855; MEB). Referred to: 509

Ord, William Henry (1803-38; WWBMP). Referred to: 509

Orléans, Ferdinand Philippe Louis Charles Henri, duc d’ (1810-42; GDU). Referred to: 152, 372


referred to: 72-3

Osborne, Ralph Bernal (1811-82; WWBMP). Speech on the Labouring Poor (Ireland) Bill (1 Feb., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 622-35.
referred to: 1059

— Speech on Russian Invasion of Hungary (21 July, 1849; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 107, cols. 786-91.

referred to: 1143


quoted: 1072

1072.29-30 “sit by the fire till the praties are done,”] Is it supposed that they [Irish labourers] were to have slept, as it were, in a species of indolent torpor from potato to potato, as they phrase it—enjoying the paradise described in one of their own songs, and a striking sketch of the national character— / “The finest of fun / That there’s under the sun, / Is to sit by the fire till the praties is done”?

Otho (or Otto; of Greece) (1815-67; *EB*). Referred to: 611

Ouseley, William (1767-1842; *DNB*). Referred to: 318

— *The Oriental Collections: Consisting of Original Essays and Dissertations, Translations and Miscellaneous Papers; Illustrating the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences, and Literature, of Asia*. London: Cadell and Davies, 1797-1800.

referred to: 318


referred to: 318

Overstone, Lord. See Samuel Loyd.

Owen, Robert (1771-1858; *DNB*). Referred to: 22, 671, 678, 1162


referred to: 678

Pagès, Jean Pierre (1784-1866; *GDU*). Speech on the Budget of 1832 (24 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 249-50.

referred to: 405
Paine, Thomas (1737-1809; *DNB*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Brighton Guardian*.

referred to: 321

Pajol, Claude Pierre, comte (1772-1844; *GDU*). Referred to: 510, 511


referred to: 510, 511

Paley, William (1743-1805; *DNB*). Referred to: 16

Palmer, John Horsley (1779-1858; *MEB*). Referred to: 701


Parant, Narcisse (1794-1842; *DPF*). Referred to: 680-1


quoted: 69

69.7 “A man] The punishment too is one of the most unequal in its operation that can be conceived; a man (151)

Park, James Alan (1763-1838; *DNB*).

note: his statement is recorded in *Morning Chronicle*, 22 July, 1823, 4.

referred to: 30, 33

The Parliamentary History and Review.

note: for the history of this publication see *CW*, VI, 616.

referred to: 523


note: we are grateful to the editors of the *Wellesley Index* for the attribution.

referred to: 580n-1n

referred to: 612

Parsons, Grace.

note: mother of Mary Ann Parsons.

referred to: 1152

Parsons, Mary Ann (1835-50).

note: the victim of brutal mistreatment in 1850.

referred to: 1152-3, 1164-7

Pasquier, Etienne Denis, duc (1767-1862; GDU). Referred to: 198-9

— Speech on Behalf of the Chamber of Peers to Louis Philippe (7 Aug.), Moniteur, 1830, 864.

quoted: 139

139.27 roi citoyen] Votre haute raison, vos penchans, le souvenir de votre vie entière nous promettent un Roi citoyen. (864)

Passy, Hippolyte Philibert (1793-1880; GDU). Referred to: 1056


note: the quotation is a translation of the title. The article was offprinted as a pamphlet.

quoted: 1056

referred to: 1043n, 1056-7


quoted: 1054-5

referred to: 1045, 1055

1054.23-1055.3 In . . . soil.] [translated from:] Dans la commune de Vensat, qui comprend 1,612 hectares divisés en 4,600 parcelles appartenant à 591 propriétaires, la territoire exploité se compose de 1,466 hectares. Or, en 1790, 17 fermes en occupaient les deux tiers, en 20 autres le reste. Depuis lors, les cultures se sont morcelées, et maintenant leur petitesse est extrême. Quelle à été l’influence du changement sur la quantité des animaux? Une augmentation considérable. En 1790, la commune ne
possédait qu’environ 300 bêtes à cornis, et de 1,800 à 2,000 bêtes à laine; aujourd’hui, elle compte 676 des premières, et 533 seulement des secondes. Ainsi, pour remplacer 1,300 moutons, elle a acquis 376 boeufs et vaches, et, tout compensé, la somme des engrais s’est accrue dans la proportion de 490 à 729, ou de plus de 48 p. %. Et encore est-il à remarquer que, plus forts et mieux nourris à présent, les animaux contribuent bien davantage à entretenir la fertilité des terres. (119)

Pastoret, Claude Emmanuel Joseph Pierre, marquis de (1756-1839; GDU). Referred to: 521

Paulin, J.B. Alexandre (1793-1859; GDU). Referred to: 372, 388, 428, 510, 666, 668


referred to: 666

Payne, William John (1822-84; MEB). Referred to: 877

Pedro IV (of Portugal) (1798-1834; EB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 527

Peel, Robert (1788-1850; DNB).

note: one of the references at 755 and those at 756, 758, and 766 are in quotations from Senior; that at 836 is in the title of Torrens, A Letter (q.v.). See also under PP, “Copy of a Letter . . .” (18 Jan., 1823).

referred to: 18, 68, 112, 621, 753, 755, 756, 758, 761, 766, 818, 832, 836, 845, 846, 859, 895-6, 1059, 1060, 1100, 1102


note: the “Tamworth Manifesto.” The quotation is in a quotation from Senior.

quoted: 764

referred to: 755

764.26 “final . . . question.”] [paragraph] With respect to the Reform Bill itself, I will repeat now the declaration which I made when I entered the House of Commons as a Member of the Reformed Parliament, that I consider the Reform Bill a final . . . question—a settlement which no friend to the peace and welfare of this country would attempt to disturb, either by direct or by insidious means. (7-8)
— Speech on Supply—the Budget (19 Apr., 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 17, cols. 342-6.

referred to: 565

— Speech on the Irish Registration Bill (15 Apr., 1844; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 74, cols. 4-5.

referred to: 845, 846

— Speech on the Repeal of the Corn Laws (27 Jan., 1846; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 83, cols. 239-85.

note: in this speech Peel outlined his proposal for repeal of the Corn Laws. See “A Bill to Amend the Laws Relating to the Importation of Corn,” and the enacted statute, 9 & 10 Victoria, c. 22.

referred to: 860

— Speech on the Labouring Poor (Ireland) Bill (2 Feb., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 758-64.

referred to: 1059

Pemberton, Charles Reece (1790-1840; DNB). Referred to: 464-6


referred to: 575, 595, 655, 660

Pembroke, Lord. See Richard de Clare.

Pennefather, Richard (1773-1859; DNB).

note: JSM uses the spelling Pennyfather.

referred to: 46-8

Penny Magazine. Referred to: 505

The Penny Newsmen.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

— “The Insurrection in Russian Poland,” 1 Feb., 1863, 8.

note: the article is probably by Edwin Chadwick, the editor.
referred to: 1201
— “Poland,” 22 Feb., 1863, 2.

note: the article is probably by Edwin Chadwick, the editor.

referred to: 1201
— “Poland,” 1 Mar., 1863, 9.

note: the article is probably by Edwin Chadwick, the editor.

referred to: 1201

note: the article is almost certainly by Edwin Chadwick, the editor.

referred to: 1201

*The People’s Charter; Being the Outline of an Act to Provide for the Just Representation of the People of Great Britain in the Common’s House of Parliament.*


referred to: 1107

Pépin, Pierre Théodore Florentin (1806-?).

note: prosecuted under martial law in June 1832.

referred to: 487

Pepys, Charles Christopher (Lord Cottenham) (1781-1851; *DNB*). Referred to: 948, 1023

Percy, Hugh (3rd Duke of Northumberland) (1785-1847; *DNB*). Referred to: 343, 588

Péreire, Jacob Emile (1800-75; *GDU*). Referred to: 411


referred to: 411

Pericles (d. 429; *WWG*).
note: the reference at 1122 and one at 1123 derive from Grote; one at 1123, those at 1124-5 and 1127, one at 1129, and those at 1130 and 1132 are in quotations from Grote, who uses the spelling Perikles. For his Funeral Oration see Thucydides.

referred to: 868, 1086, 1122-5, 1127, 1129, 1130, 1132, 1134, 1160-1

Périer, Casimir Pierre (1777-1832; DPF).

note: the reference at 397 is in a quotation from “Erinensis.” See Examiner, [Jan. 1832].


— Speech on Being Elected President of the Council of Ministers (18 Mar.), Moniteur, 1831, 566-7.

note: the same phrase is quoted in both places.

quoted: 417-18, 481

417.27 l’ordre légal] C’est d’ordre légal et de pouvoir que la société a besoin; car c’est faut d’ordre et de pouvoir qu’elle se laisse gagner par la défiance, source unique des embarras et des périls du moment. (566)

— Speech (26 July), Moniteur, 1831, 1270.

referred to: 388

— Speech Introducing a Bill to Abolish the Hereditary Peerage (27 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1477-8.

quoted: 343

referred to: 341-5

343.31-2 “les illustrations nationales;”] Nous trouverions dans les extinctions plus rapidement opérées au sein d’une chambre viagère, et qui permettraient d’y appeler, à chaque génération, un plus grand nombre de notabilités, le moyen de suppléer à la garantie de l’héredité par celle des illustrations, toujours certaines de prendre leurs places sur des sièges plus souvent disponibles. (1478)

— Speech on the Events in Lyons (17 Dec.), Moniteur [Supplement to No. 352], 1831, 2422-4.

quoted: 418

referred to: 381
418.1-2 “Liberty,” . . . “is the despotism of the law.”] [translated from:] Il faut apprendre aux peuples qui prétendent à l’honneur d’être libres, que la liberté c’est le despotisme de la loi! (2423)


referred to: 390

— Speech on the Budget (13 Mar.), Moniteur, 1832, 741.

quoted: 428

428.22-3 “esprit de vertige,” . . . “jalousie des supériorités sociales,”] [paragraph] Qu’il me soit permis de faire encore une réflexion sur le système d’économie que l’on voudrait faire adopter à la chambre, en cherchant à l’entraîner par un sentiment qui domine quelques parties de la société, par un sentiment de jalousie sociale. . . . (Murmures et réclamations aux extrémités.) [paragraph] Nous ne devons pas nous le dissimuler, Messieurs, il existe dans le pays une sorte de malaise, une sorte d’esprit de vertige. . . . (Nouvelle interruption aux extrémités.) (741) [ellipses in original]


referred to: 435, 518

Persil, Jean Charles (1785-1870; GDU). Referred to: 204, 407, 511, 666, 701, 706

— Speech before the Cour royale de Paris (4 Nov.), Moniteur, 1833, 2284-6.

referred to: 666, 701

— Speech introducing the projet de loi relative au détenteurs d’armes et de munitions de guerre (15 Apr.), Moniteur, 1834, 929.

referred to: 706

Peter (the Hermit) (1050?-1115?; EB). Referred to: 258

Petty-Fitzmaurice, Henry (3rd Marquis of Lansdowne) (1780-1863; DNB). Referred to: 636


referred to: 406

— Speech on Employment for Agricultural Labourers (13 June, 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, cols. 675-7.
note: the phrase “temporary measure,” is also used by Lord Althorp on 5 Aug., 1833 (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, col. 357); the phrase JSM quotes is used by Joseph Marryatt (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, col. 359).

referred to: 636

Peyronnet, Pierre Denis, comte de (1778-1854; GDU).

note: see also Polignac, “Manifesto . . . .”

quoted: 126

referred to: 127, 163-8, 177, 215, 223, 225-6, 373


note: many subsequent editions.

referred to: 950

Philip II (of Macedon) (ca. 382-336; WWG). Referred to: 868

Philippe IV (of France) (1268-1314; GDU).

note: known as Philippe le Bel.

referred to: 819

Philips, George Richard (1789-1883; MEB). Referred to: 93-4

— Speech on Special Juries (28 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 567-8.

referred to: 93-4


referred to: 239-40

— *Protest against the Prevailing Principles of Natural Philosophy, with the Developement of a Common-Sense System.* London: Sherwood, [1830].

referred to: 239-40

Phillpotts, Henry (1778-1869; DNB).
note: JSM uses the spelling “Philpotts.”
referred to: 813


Pidgeon, Thomas.

note: a cattle dealer, whose acquittal on a charge of forgery is reported in the *Morning Chronicle*, 22 July, 1823, 4.
referred to: 30

Pillet, René Martin (1762-1816; *GDU*). *L’Angleterre vue à Londres et dans ses provinces, pendant un séjour de dix années, dont six comme prisonnier de guerre.* Paris: Eymery, 1815.
referred to: 1039

Pinard, Marie Oscar (1801-67; *GDU*). Referred to: 657-8

Pindemonte, Ippolito (1753-1828; *GDU*). Referred to: 573

Pisistratus (fl. ca. 560 , d. 527 ; *WWG*). Referred to: 871, 1085

Pitt, William (the elder; 1st Earl of Chatham) (1708-78; *DNB*).
note: the reference at 1216 is in a quotation from Romilly.
referred to: 641, 1216


note: the reference, in a quotation from Grote, is to Pitt’s invectives against Walpole.
referred to: 1127


note: the reference derives from James Graham’s speech of 15 Aug., 1833, *q.v.*
referred to: 641

Pitt, William (the younger) (1759-1806; *DNB*). Referred to: 406, 480, 512, 643
Pittacus (ca. 650-570; *WWG*). Referred to: 1086

Place, Francis (1771-1854; *DNB*). Referred to: 1262-5


referred to: 1264


reviewed: 91-4

Plato (427-347; *WWG*).

note: the reference at 1130 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 869, 1130, 1162-3


note: the reference at 1122 derives from Grote.

referred to: 256, 1122, 1128, 1162


referred to: 292


note: the reference at 1130 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 678, 1130


note: the quotation is indirect.

quoted: 982

quoted: 1016

1016.2 *instar omnium.*] hi mercantes id a conterminis vehunt per maria vasta ratibus quas neque gubernacula regant neque remi impellant vel trahant vela, non ratio ulla adiuvet: omnium instar ibi sunt homo tantum et audacia. (IV, 62-4; XII, 87)

Plumptre, John Pemberton (1791-1864; *MEB*). Speech on the Address to Her Majesty (21 Jan., 1847; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 203-4.

referred to: 1074


referred to: 1002


note: the reference at 394 is to the *Life of Caesar*; that at 497 is to the *Life of Pompey*; that at 1124 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 342, 394, 497, 716-17, 872, 1122, 1124

Polignac, Jules Auguste Armand Marie, prince de (1780-1847; *GDU*). Referred to: 123, 124, 135, 136, 137, 139, 148, 162, 163-8, 177, 183, 215, 223, 225, 225-6, 288, 373, 457, 483

Poncelet, Louis (b. ca. 1803).


referred to: 407

Pons de l’Hérault, André (1772-1853; *GDU*). Referred to: 263

Ponsonby, John William (Lord Bessborough) (1781-1847; *DNB*).

note: JSM uses the spelling Besborough.

referred to: 900, 902, 932, 934, 935

— “Proclamation.” See Labouchere, Letter.
Pontécoulant, Louis Gustave de Doulcet, comte de (1764-1853; GDU). Referred to: 198, 542

Pope, Alexander (1688-1744; DNB). Referred to: 590, 808


note: in SC.

quoted: 596

596.12 What then? is . . . bread?] What then? Is . . . Bread? (III, 135; IV, 150)


quoted: 574

574.21-2 the difference] Yet more; the diff’rence (III, 178; I, 31)

*Le Populaire*. Referred to: 688

Portalis, Auguste, baron (1801-55; GDU). Referred to: 375

— Proposition ayant pour but d’abroger, comme contraire à la Charte du 7 août 1830, la loi du 18 novembre 1814, relative à la célébration forcée des dimanches et des fêtes (6 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2319.

note: see also his Proposition of 11 Feb., 1832, below.

referred to: 375

— Proposition tendant à abroger, comme contraire à la Charte du 7 août 1830, la loi du 19 janvier relative au deuil public du 21 janvier (6 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2319.

note: presented on 6 Dec., approved by the Chamber of Deputies on 23 Dec. (*ibid.*, 2472-3), rejected by the Chamber of Peers on 3 Mar. (*ibid.*, 1832, 642-3).

referred to: 375-6, 421, 479

— Proposition ayant pour but d’abroger, comme contraire à la Charte du 7 août 1830, la loi du 18 novembre relative au travail des fêtes et dimanches (11 Feb.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 425.

referred to: 375, 418

Portalis, Joseph Marie, comte (1778-58; GDU). Referred to: 199
Potter, John Phillips (1793-1861).

note: clergyman and writer, student of Greek philosophy.

referred to: 660


referred to: 660

Pozzo di Borgo, Carlo Andrea, count (1764-1842; EB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from the Globe and Traveller.

referred to: 698

Praed, Winthrop Mackworth (1802-39; DNB). Referred to: 337


note: in PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 6, cols. 568-70.

quoted: 337

337.4 “His historical] [no paragraph] Nevertheless, he was inclined to support it, because his historical (4)

Prati, Gioacchino (1790-1863).

note: patriotic Italian physician, author, and Carbonaro. Exiled from Italy in 1821 for conspiracy against the Austrians, he came to England in 1823 and was converted to Saint-Simonianism in 1830-31. The quotations are from an unlocated letter. See also Fontana-Rava.

quoted: 689, 690

referred to: 675, 676, 679, 689-91

La Presse. Referred to: 1093

Priestley, Joseph (1733-1804; DNB).

note: the reference derives from an article by James Martineau.

referred to: 561-2
Prieur de la Marne, Pierre Louis (1756-1827; \textit{GDU}). Referred to: 542n

Prodicus (ca. 470/60-early 4th cent.; \textit{WWG}).

\textit{note:} the reference, in a quotation from Grote, is to the sophist, whose essay “On Heracles” is given in Xenophon’s \textit{Memorabilia, q.v.}

referred to: 1162


referred to: 1228-9, 1234, 1238, 1241n, 1243


\textit{note:} in SC is Xenophon, \textit{Opera,} ed. Hutchinson (Glasgow: Foulis, 1768). The reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1132

Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus; fl. 2nd cent.; \textit{WWR}). Referred to: 11, 424

\textit{The Public Register; or, The Freeman’s Journal.}

\textit{note:} one anonymous article follows.


\textit{note:} a leading article. In this same issue, p. 3, is reprinted JSM’s No. 312, to which reference is made in the leader.

\textit{quoted:} 908, 910

908.11 A] [\textit{no paragraph}] A (2)

908.19-20 \textit{We . . . family} [\textit{not in italics}] (2)

908.21-2 \textit{then . . . on} [\textit{not in italics}] (2)


Pupikofer, Johann Adam (1797-1882).

\textit{note:} see \textit{Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse.}

referred to: 1054

note: JSM mistakenly attributes the passage to Strohmeier, author of the volume on Soleure.

quoted: 1054

1054.10-12 “a third . . . before” [translated from:] Denselben Erfolg hat die Vertheilung der ehemaligen grossen Lehenhöfe in mehre kleinere eigenthümliche Bauerngüter. Es ist gar nicht selten, dass ein Drittheil oder Viertheil eines solchen Hofes nun eben so viel Getreide liefert und eben so viel Stück Vieh unterhält als vormals der ganze Hof. (72)

Puranas. Referred to: 869

Pusey, Edward Bouverie (1800-82; DNB).

note: most of the references are to the “Oxford theologians,” “Puseyites,” and “Newmanites” See also Keble and Newman.

referred to: 811-15, 815-22

Pym, John (1584-1643; DNB). Referred to: 282

Quarterly Review. Referred to: 169, 173, 248, 446, 593, 691, 762, 806

Queipo de Llano Ruiz de Saravia, José María, conde de Toreno (1786-1843; EB). Referred to: 40

Quélen, Hyacinthe Louis, comte de (1778-1839; GDU). Referred to: 269, 317

Quesnay, François (1674-1774; GDU).

note: JSM uses the spelling Quesnai.

referred to: 66


referred to: 450-1

La Quotidienne. Referred to: 152, 177

Randor, Lord. See William Pleydell Bouverie.
Rambuteau, Claude Philibert de Barthelot, comte de (1781-1869; GDU). Referred to: 345

Raphael (Raphael Sanzio) (1483-1520; EB). Referred to: 324, 1240


Raspail, François Vincent (1794-1878; GDU). Referred to: 396, 421, 422, 656, 657

Rau, Karl David Heinrich (1792-1870; EB). Referred to: 968, 971, 975-7


note: the work is in three vols., but the third is in two parts, separately paginated and issued in 1832 and 1837.

referred to: 968


quoted: 975, 976, 977

referred to: 968, 971, 975-7

975.18 unmistakeably . . . harm. [translated from:] [paragraph] Nächst Klima und Boden ist die Arbeit zu berühren, von welcher im Allgemeinen nur gesagt werden kann, dass sie unverkennbar mit einem hohen grade von Fleiss und Geschicklichkeit verrichtet wird. Die Unverdrossenheit den Landleute, die man das ganze Jahr und den ganzen Tag in Thätigkeit sieht, und die darum nicht müßig gehen, weil sie die Arbeiten gut eintheilen, und zu jeder Zeit eine passende Beschäftigung wissen, ist eben so anerkannt, als ihr Eifer in der Benutzung aller sich darbietenden Umstände, in der Ergreifung des dargebotenen Neuen, woferne es sich nützlich erweist, ja in der Ausspähung sich, dass der Bauer der hiesigen Gegen viel über sein Geschäft nachgedacht hat, er weiss ründe anzugeben für sein Verfahren, wenn sie auch nicht statthaft seyn sollten, er weiss die Zahlenverhältnisse so bestimmt mitzuteilen, als sie, beim Mangel geordneter Aufzeichnung, im Gedächtnis behalten werden können, er richtet sich in der Wahl der Früchte nach den Preisen, er achtet auf allgemeine Zeitscheinungen, von denen er Nutzen oder Schaden zu erkennen glaubt. (15-16)

976.33-4 “Forty . . . puddings” [translated from:] Die Kost kann auch auf 10 Kr. angeschlagen werden, da sie heutiges Tages bedeutend besser ist, als vor ungefähr 40 Jahren, wo das Gesinde weniger Fleisch und Mehlspeisen, keinen Käse zum Brote u. dgl. erhielt. (20)

977.22-5 “Such . . . wages,” . . . “which . . . increased.” [translated from:] Bekanntlich ist eine solche Erhöhung des Lohnes, die man nicht nach dem Geldbetrage, sondern nach der Menge von nothwendigen und nützlichen Gütern
bemessen muss, welche der Arbeitsmann sich verschaffen kann, ein Zeichen, dass die vorhandene Capitalmasse sich vermehrt hat, auch muss jeder Unbefangene es für wohltätig halten, wenn die Taglöhner, die der Gefahr des Berarmens am meisten blosgestellt sind, die von einer Theurung; einem häuslichern Unglück am meisten betroffen werden, reichlicher leben, ihre Kinder besser pflegen und eher einen Nothpfennig zurücklegen können. (18)


referred to: 897

Réal, Félix (1792-1864; DPF). Referred to: 530

The Reasoner and Herald of Progress. Referred to: 1082-4

Reasons for a Legislative Measure (Similar to That Lately Proposed by Sir J.C. Hobhouse) to Limit and Regulate the Hours during Which Young Persons May Be Employed to Labour in Flax-Spinning Mills throughout Scotland.

note: this “paper” (as JSM calls it) was sent to the Examiner; a copy has not been located.

referred to: 399

La Réforme.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— Unheaded leader on Press Law, 12 Aug., 1848, 1.

referred to: 1117

Reichstadt, duc de. See Napoleon II.

Reinhart, Charles Frédéric, comte (1761-1837; GDU).

note: JSM uses the spelling Reinhardt.

referred to: 521

Rémusat, François Marie Charles, comte de (1797-1875; GDU). Referred to: 401

— Speech on the Budget (20 Jan.), Moniteur, 1832, 209.

quoted: 401
401.23-5 “It . . . money:”) [translated from:] Il en coûte de renoncer, soit à la chimère, soit au charlatanisme des économies. [JSM moves to top of following column] L’impôt est un très-bon placement. (Vives réclamations aux extrémités.) Oui, Messieurs, l’impôt est un très-bon placement (Nouveau mouvement); car, au prix de l’impôt, on achète des biens inexprimables, la sécurité, la liberté, la grandeur du pays. (209)

Renouard, Augustin Charles (1794-1878; GDU). Referred to: 238

— Speech in Introducing Loi relative à la composition des cours d’assises (8 Jan.), Moniteur, 1831, 49.

referred to: 238


referred to: 243

The Republican.

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 8

— Letter to the Editor (signed “Gallus”), 29 Nov., 1822, 835-42.

referred to: 8

La Revue Encyclopédique. Referred to: 677

La Revue Française.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— “De la politique de la France,” VII (Jan. 1829), 244-69.

quoted: 224

Reynaud, Jean (1806-63; GDU). Referred to: 677

Reynolds, Susannah Frances.
note: wife of George William McArthur Reynolds (1814-79), Chartist, publisher, popular novelist, and editor of “Reynolds’s Miscellany,” for which this was published. She also wrote *Wealth and Poverty* (London: Dicks, 1848).

referred to: 1089

— *Gretna Green; or, All for Love*. London: Dicks, 1848.

referred to: 1089

Ricardo, David (1772-1823; *DNB*). Referred to: 323


referred to: 853


note: the reference at 3 is in Chap. i, Sect. 3 in the 3rd ed. (1821), 18-20.

referred to: 3, 53


referred to: 853

— Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 457-9.

referred to: 25, 26

— Speech on Free Discussion (1 July, 1823), *PD*, n.s., Vol. 9, cols. 1386-91, 1399.

referred to: 33


referred to: 11

Richard II (of England) (1367-1400; *DNB*). Referred to: 280


Richter, John (d. 1830).
note: Radical, arrested in May 1794 with other members of the London Corresponding Society; active in Westminster politics and in the West London Lancasterian Association; a master manufacturer.

referred to: 1262

Ridley, Nicholas (1500-55; DNB). Referred to: 463

Rigg, Mary.

note: a witness in the MacLean case. The reference is in a quotation from the *Morning Chronicle*, 23 Aug., 1851, *q.v.*

referred to: 1185

Rigg, Thomas.

note: a witness in the MacLean case. The reference is in a quotation from the *Morning Chronicle*, 23 Aug., 1851, *q.v.*

referred to: 1185

Rigny, Henri Gauthier, comte de (1782-1835; GDU). Referred to: 288, 700

— Speech on the Supplementary Credit for the Navy (26 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 717.

referred to: 699

Ripon, Lord. See Frederick John Robinson.

Rivier, Vincent (1771-1838).

note: notary at and mayor of Grenoble.

referred to: 441

Robertson, Alexander (d. 1856).


referred to: 27

— Speech on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), *PD*, n.s. Vol. 9, cols. 456-7.

note: JSM’s source for the quotation has not been located; the *PD* version is used for ease of reference.

quoted: 27
referred to: 27

27.28 “the consumers of this country would be materially injured.”] It was not for the interest of the consumer that the present system should be changed, and it would be worse for India herself. (456)

Robertson, William (1721-93; DNB). Referred to: 292


note: this ed. cited (although it postdates the reference) as it is in SC.

quoted: 292

292.20-1 “that attachment to ancient forms, and aversion to innovation, which are the unfailing characteristics of popular assemblies.”] The Spaniards considering Joanna as possessed of the sole right to the crown, and no example of a son’s having enjoyed the title of king during the life of his parents occurring in their history, the Cortes discovered all that scrupulous respect for ancient forms, and that aversion to innovation, which are conspicuous in popular assemblies. (III, 379)

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-94; GDU). Referred to: 418, 478-9, 501, 662, 672, 673


note: for the collation, see *Déclaration des droits de l’homme* (1833).

quoted: 672

referred to: 672

— Speech introducing the Décret sur les fêtes décadaires (18 floréal, an II [7 May, 1794]), *Moniteur*, 8 May, 1794, 928-32.

referred to: 478-9

Robinson, David (d. 1849).

note: a journalist.

referred to: 229


referred to: 229
Robinson, Frederick John (Viscount Goderich, later 1st Earl of Ripon) (1782-1859; DNB). Referred to: 620, 650-1, 735

— Speech on the Bank Charter Amendment Bill (14 Apr., 1826; Commons), PD, n.s., Vol. 15, cols. 238-40.

referred to: 607

— Speech on the Corn Laws (14 May, 1833; Lords), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 17, cols. 1179-89.

referred to: 620

Roche, Achille (1801-34; GDU). Referred to: 428

Roche, Eugenius (1786-1829; DNB). Referred to: 529


referred to: 397

Rodrigues, Benjamin Olinde (1794-1851; GDU). Referred to: 403, 509, 676

Roebuck, John Arthur (1801-79; DNB). Referred to: 770


note: the review is a laudatory notice, with copious extracts.

reviewed: 769-74

quoted: 770, 771-2, 772, 773, 773-4

771.22 The] [no paragraph] The (54)

772.11 Much] [no paragraph] From the incomplete list of these matters here given, it must be evident, that much (58)

773.12 feeling. The] feeling.* [footnote omitted] The (70)

773.40 Much] [no paragraph] Much (72)

— Resolution on National Education (30 July, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, cols. 139-66.

589.14 “without] Speaking of these two nations, with respect to their systems of education, Professor Cousin pointedly observes—“I consider France and Prussia the two most enlightened countries in Europe—the most advanced in letters and science—the two most truly civilized, without (147)

— Speech on the Labouring Poor (Ireland) Bill (1 Feb., 1847; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 644-54.

note: the references are not precise quotations from the speech, but rather generalizations of the sentiments expressed.

referred to: 1059, 1060

Roederer, Pierre Louis, comte (1754-1835; *GDU*). Referred to: 520, 542

Roger, Jacques François, baron de (1787-1849; *GDU*). Referred to: 417

Rogers.

note: a magistrate.

referred to: 75, 76, 79

Rohan, Charles Alain Gabriel de, prince de Guéméné, duc de Montbazon (1764-1836; *GDU*). Referred to: 374

Rohan, Jules Armand Louis de, prince de Guéméné (1768-1836; *GDU*). Referred to: 374

Rohan, Victor Louis Mériaudec de, prince de Guéméné, comte de Saint-Pol (1766-1846; *GDU*). Referred to: 374

Romilly, Edward (1804-70; *MEB*). Referred to: 507

Romilly, Henry (1805-84).

note: Liverpool businessman and magistrate, fourth son of Sir Samuel Romilly, *q.v.*

referred to: 1212-17


reviewed: 1212-17

quoted: 1214, 1215, 1216

1214.1 “if] I maintain that if (12)
1215.39-40 “the . . . self-defence;”] There is the lie of vanity, and the lie of malevolence, and the lie of cowardice, and the lie of selfishness, and the . . . self-defence. (67)

Romilly, John (Baron) (1802-74; DNB). Referred to: 507

Romilly, Samuel (1757-1818; DNB). Referred to: 323, 507, 1263


referred to: 323

Roscoe, William (1743-1831; DNB). Referred to: 318

— *The Life of Lorenzo de Medici, Called the Magnificent.* Liverpool: printed M'Creery, 1795.

referred to: 318


referred to: 318

Rose, Joseph.

note: a baker.

referred to: 60


note: the quotations at 169, 170, and 170-1 are in quotations from the *Morning Chronicle,* 14 Oct., 1830, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 169, 170, 170-1, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180

referred to: 168-72, 172-80

172.25 “stern suspicion,”] In the meantime we must be permitted to think, that though it was the clear duty of the British government to acknowledge any prince invested with the sovereignty, or seeming sovereignty, of France, the body of the British nation have done themselves honour, by regarding with stern suspicion the recent progress of events in that country. (596)
Now, if they go on well—if they do establish a government at once free and firm—if they can, in practice, enjoy a free press, without its running into licentiousness—and all this, without erecting among themselves a wealthy, hereditary aristocracy and a . . . establishment,—we shall freely admit ourselves to have been grievously mistaken;—that we have been accustomed to do the French people gross injustice;—nay, that our whole system of political faith has been wrong, and that the age of miracles is come again. (595-6)

In France the royal house was isolated; there was no aristocracy worthy of the name—there was no church heartily allied with the crown on the one hand, and with the people on the other—there existed no influences intermediate between the monarch and the mob; and wherever this is the case, any serious difference of opinion between these two powers, instead of reaching through deliberate discussion some conciliatory compromise, is sure to be reduced at once to blows, and the immediate issue is necessarily either a despotism established, or a dynasty overthrown. (594-5)

The re-establishment . . . France:” . . . conscientiously”] [see 169 above]

As to the other great absent element of national strength and security—a church establishment, we must confess we never indulged in the anticipation of witnessing anything worthy of such a name in France. (595)

July, however, we (565)

They prate about democratic principles—Their object has . . . is, a cunning oligarchy of stockbrokers and newspaper editors, abhorring every source of authority but the purse and the pen; at once deluding the . . . equality, and defying it (593-4)

The meetings, and dinners, and subscriptions, set on foot by our old established disturbers of public peace, have . . . respectable. (596)

Rossetti, Gabrieli (1783-1854; MEB). Referred to: 573

Rothschild, Lionel Nathan de (1808-79; DNB). Referred to: 1138

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-78; GDU). Referred to: 320, 675
— Discours sur l’origine et les fondements de l’inégalité parmi les hommes. Amsterdam: Rey, 1755.

referred to: 1117


note: in SC.

referred to: 120

— Julie, ou La nouvelle Héloïse (1760). In Oeuvres complètes, VIII-X.

referred to: 320

Rousseau de Saint-Aignan, Louis Marie (1767-1837; DPF). Referred to: 519

Roussin, Albin Reine, baron (1781-1854; GDU). Referred to: 701

Routh, Matthew.

note: a Corporal in the 7th Hussars. For the collation, see The Times, 30 Sept., 1846.

quoted: 884

referred to: 884

Roy, Antoine, comte (1764-1847; GDU). Referred to: 157-8, 199

— Speech on Salverte’s Proposition (3 Feb.), Moniteur, 1832, 345.

referred to: 409

Royer-Collard, Pierre Paul (1763-1845; GDU). Referred to: 522

Rubichon, Maurice (1766-1849; GDU).

note: see also Mounier.

referred to: 1038, 1039, 1048, 1049, 1051

Rumigny, Marie Théodore Gueilly, comte de (1789-1860; GDU). Referred to: 683

Rush, James Blomfield (d. 1849).

note: executed for murder; see DNB under Jermy.

referred to: 1153
Russell, John (Lord) (1792-1878; DNB). Referred to: 276, 776, 911, 920, 923, 937, 938, 1059, 1071, 1072, 1075, 1099, 1100, 1135-8, 1142


referred to: 1142

— Speech in Introducing the Ministerial Plan of Parliamentary Reform (1 Mar., 1831; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 2, cols. 1061-89.

note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 790

— Speech on Duration of Parliaments (23 July, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 19, cols. 1123-8.

referred to: 600

— Speech on the Address in Answer to the Queen’s Speech (20 Nov., 1837; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 39, cols. 65-73.

referred to: 798-9, 1102

— Speech on the Corn Laws (7 May, 1841; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 58, col. 16.

referred to: 805

— Speech on the State of Ireland (25 Jan., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 426-52.

note: the references at 1027, 1030, and 1033 are anticipatory.

referred to: 1027, 1030, 1033, 1058, 1061-2, 1072

— Speech on the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill (12 Mar., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 90, cols. 1244-61.

note: the same phrase is quoted on both pages.

quoted: 1071, 1075

1071.24 “What else have you to propose?”] But what I say to you is this: we see a vast number of people in the greatest state of destitution in Ireland; and I have been told by gentlemen connected with Ireland, that the state of destitution in Ireland, though it has been greatly aggravated by the failure of the potato crop, is not unusual or accidental in Ireland; and when we see this destitution, if it is not to be provided for by out-door relief when the workhouse is full, what objection would you offer to my plan in the House of Commons, or what other plan would you propose? (1251)

referred to: 1101-2

— Speech Introducing the Parliamentary Oaths Bill (19 Feb., 1849; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 102, cols. 906-17.

referred to: 1135-8


note: the reference is in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 217

Saint-Cricq, Pierre Laurent Barthélemy, comte de (1772-1854; *DPF*). Referred to: 270, 370, 435


referred to: 157

— Speech on the Corn Bill (23 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 852.

referred to: 435

St. Dunstan (Archbishop of Canterbury) (924/5-88; *DNB*). Referred to: 72-3

St. Germain’s, Lord. See Edward Granville Eliot.


referred to: 1002

St. Lawrence, William Ulick Tristram (Earl of Howth) (1827-1909; *WWBMP*).

note: for the quotation, see “Court-Martial at Hounslow,” *The Times*, 30 Sept., 1846.

quoted: 884

referred to: 884-5

St. Paul (d. 62; *EB*). Referred to: 1084
Saint Simon, Claude Henri, comte de (1760-1825; GDU).

note: many of the references are to St. Simonism and the St. Simonians; three of those at 719 and 722 are in a quotation from Chales; that at 1257 is in a speech of Enfantin’s.

referred to: 403, 417, 418, 442-7 (1251-5), 448, 509, 671, 674-80, 689-91, 696, 719, 722, 1257


note: the title-page attributes the exposition from which the quotation and reference derive to Armand Bazard (1791-1832). The reference is in a quotation from a review in the Monthly Repository, probably written by W.J. Fox.

quoted: 863

referred to: 653

863.7-8 A chacun selon ses oeuvres.] [paragraph] Oui, tous nos théoriciens politiques ont les yeux tournés vers le passé, ceux même, ceux surtout qui se prétendent dignes de l’avenir; et lorsque nous leur annonçons que le règne du travail arrive, que celui de l’oisiveté est fini, ils nous traitent de rêveurs; ils nous disent que le fils a toujours hérité de son père, comme un paien aurait dit que l’homme libre avait toujours eu des esclaves; mais l’humanité l’a proclamé par Jésus: plus d’esclavage! par Saint-Simon elle s’écrie: A chacun selon sa capacité, à chaque capacité selon ses oeuvres, plus d’héritage! (XLI, 41)

Salverte, Anne Joseph Eusèbe Baconnière de (1771-1839; GDU). Referred to: 227

— Motion to Transfer the Remains of Great Men to the Pantheon, Moniteur, 21 Dec., 1831, 2441-2.

referred to: 419

— Proposition relative à la révision de l’article 23 de la charte constitutionnelle (9 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1327.

referred to: 339

— Proposition pour la reprise à une autre session des travaux législatifs non terminés dans la session précédente (7 Dec.), Moniteur, 1831, 2327.

referred to: 376, 386, 391, 409, 479, 571, 583

Sand, George. See Amandine Aurore Lucie Dupin.

note: the unnumbered forty pages of the preface have been assigned small roman numerals in the collation.

quoted: 22, 23

22.24-7 “An unbeliever . . . awed . . . the law . . . conscience . . . integrity . . . child of God . . . the law . . . concupiscence . . . hypocrisie] Particular actions then, are not good evidences either way: as wherein both an unbeliever, awed . . . the law . . . Conscience . . . integrity . . . Childe of God . . . the law . . . concupiscence . . . Hypocrisie (342)

23.9 “Neither,” . . . “will] Neither will (xxxviii)

23.12 jeer, but] jeer. But (xxxviii)


San Miguel y Valledor, Evaristo (1785-1862).

note: leftist Spanish military leader who came to power after suppressing the army revolt of 7 July, 1822, fought against the French invasion of 1823, and lived abroad after being defeated.

referred to: 41, 42

Sarrut, Germain Marie (1800-83; *GDU*). Referred to: 402

Say, Jean Baptiste Léon (1767-1832; *DPF*). Referred to: 323, 522, 524-5

Scheffer, Arnold (b. ca. 1797-1853).

note: a radical journalist, one of the French Carbonari, an artist, and a friend of the Grotes.

referred to: 668-9, 669

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805; *EB*). Referred to: 1108, 1109

note: in SC. The quotation is from Coleridge’s translation (q.v. for the collation) as quoted by Talfourd in his speech of 6 July, 1848, q.v.

quoted: 1108

referred to: 1108

Schlosser, Friedrich Christoph (1776-1861; EB). *Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Cultur*. 3 pts. Frankfurt am Main: Varrentrapp, 1826-34.

referred to: 663-4

Schonen, Auguste Jean Marie, baron de (1782-1849; DPF). Referred to: 379, 658

Schröder-Devrient, Wilhelmine (1804-60; EB). Referred to: 465

*The Scotsman.*

note: one anonymous article follows.


referred to: 183

Scott, Walter (1771-1832; DNB).

note: the references at 331-3 and 436-8 are to the Waverley novels, as musically illustrated by Eliza Flower, q.v.

referred to: 331-3, 343, 436-8, 760


quoted: 556

referred to: 333

556.28-9 “ower true tale”) By many readers this may be deemed overstrained, romantic, and composed by the wild imagination of an author, desirous of gratifying the popular appetite for the horrible; but those who are read in the private family history of Scotland during the period in which the scene is laid, will readily discover, through the disguise of borrowed names and added incidents, the leading particulars of an ower true tale. (III, 100-11)

referred to: 332


referred to: 332

— A Legend of Montrose. In Tales of My Landlord, 3rd ser., III (132-333), IV.

referred to: 332


referred to: 332


quoted: 647

647.16 “And] [paragraph] And (277)

647.20 Provost.”] Provost! (277)

— Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Constable; London: Longman, et al., 1814.

referred to: 333


referred to: 333

Scrope, George Julius Poulett (1797-1876; DNB). Referred to: 248, 249, 250, 736, 911-3, 923-6, 928, 942-5, 991, 1004-7, 1066-8, 1069-73


referred to: 923, 926


quoted: 1013
referred to: 1013-15

1013.5 proposal is, . . . that] proposal, therefore, is, that (54)

1013.10 offered . . . sale] [not in italics] (55)

1013.10 or] or (55)

1013.11 expenses. I] expenses. [paragraph] I (55)

1013.13 industrious landowners.] [in small caps] (55)

1013.24 of Cork] at Cork (56)

1013.25 number. The] number. [paragraph] The (56)

1013.30 repaying] reaping (56) [treated as typographical error in this ed.]

1013.30 fruits. . . . No] [ellipsis indicates 6-sentence omission] (57)


quoted: 911

referred to: 911


referred to: 999


note: replied to by JSM in No. 341, q.v.

quoted: 991, 992, 993

referred to: 991-3, 1004

991.12 “to] [paragraph] Your leading article of Monday contains a sort of challenge
to the advocates of the former proposal [to “enlarge” the Irish poor law], to (6)

991.13 wasteful system] wasteful and (as you style it) demoralizing system (6)

992.7-9 “A methodical . . . works,” . . . “drainage . . . reclamations, home . . . refuge,”] [paragraph] 2. In the second place, the hurried and ill-digested system of employment on the roads now afforded to the able-bodied by presentments, hastily thrown in and passed at the baronial sessions, under the influence of panic, and something very like mob-law, in no respect resembles the methodical . . . works which would be prepared at leisure under a well-arranged and well-administered
The public works such a system would principally set on foot would be, not the “lowering of harmless hills,” or “making roads to lead no where,” but chiefly great works of drainage . . . reclamations (your own pet project), home . . . refuge, &c. (6)

But, moreover, I have never looked to public works for affording employment to more than the surplus labour which private parties, especially the landed proprietors, would not, or could not, employ in the improvement and cultivation of their estates, under the stimulus of a rate to be levied on them if they did not do so, facilities being given them by government loans over-riding . . . incumbrances. (6)

— Letter to the Editor (14 Dec., 1846), Morning Chronicle, 18 Dec., 1846, 3.

My proposal is that in order to civilise Ireland, to inspire the poorer classes with a respect for the law, to put a stop to their universal . . . law and to the crime it engenders (a spirit which has been proved to have its root in the necessity of keeping up a system of terror in order to maintain their only means of existence), it is essential to secure them from (3)

This concession is equally necessary to enable the law to put an . . . poor-rate, with the disadvantages of being paid by the wrong parties—the poor instead of the rich—and also of covering the whole country with filth, disease, wretchedness, and imposture, as with a leprosy. (3)

— Letter to the Editor (17 Mar., 1847), Morning Chronicle, 19 Mar., 1847, 6.

We have heard all that [about “annihilating the laws of physical nature”] before, in the Malthusian theory,—a theory of which Mr. Jenkinson’s cosmogony was the precise prototype. [paragraph] Depend upon it, that theory is exploded for ever. (6)

referred to: 911, 923, 942-5, 978-9, 991-2


referred to: 248-50

— “Poor-Laws in Ireland” (letter to the editor; 5 Nov., 1846), Morning Chronicle, 9 Nov., 1846, 6.

quoted: 942, 943

referred to: 942-5

942.16 “the English”] I mean the extension to that country [Ireland] of the main principles of the English Poor-law, which gives to the wealthy classes a deep and direct interest in the condition of their poorer fellow subjects, and to the latter the assurance that they are not wholly uncared for by the institutions of their country, but provided with assistance and support in their extreme need. (6)

943.5 “necessary] On the contrary, I proposed it last year, and have always looked to it, as a necessary (6)

943.6 an improved] our improved (6) [treated as typographical error in this ed.]

943.6 poor-law.”] poor-law, since it would relieve the most over-peopled districts from the pressure of that portion of their population, which the landowners and other rate-payers, even under the stimulus of a poor-law, might find it difficult to employ, and provide exactly that very system of public works of a productive character which ought to form an essential element in any poor-law adapted to the circumstances of Ireland. (6)

943.7-8 “far from . . . between” . . . “are] Far from . . . between the two schemes, they are (6)

943.9 one another;”] each other. (6)

943.9 “a vain] [paragraph] Perhaps these considerations may save us the pain of seeing a Liberal organ of such high character as the Morning Chronicle lend its efforts to maintain a vain (6)

943.35-6 “would . . . poor-law.”] [paragraph] Is it not then clear that the accompaniment of a large scheme of waste lands reclamation would . . . poor-law? (6)

referred to: 893

— Speech on the New Colony (30 June, 1834). Reported in “South Australian Association for Emigration,” _The Times_, 1 July, 1834, 4.

note: in addition to Torrens (q.v.), George Grote and Robert Owen, _inter alia_, spoke at the meeting of the South Australian Association at Exeter Hall.

referred to: 736

— Speech in Moving a Bill on Waste Lands (Ireland), (28 Apr., 1846; Commons), _PD_, 3rd ser., Vol. 85, cols. 1198-1206.

referred to: 911


note: see also his letter of 24 Oct., 1846.

quoted: 911, 912

referred to: 911-13, 923

911.11 to purchase] of purchase (5)

911.31 “the] Lastly, the (5)

911.31 locating] locating (5)

911.31 some hundred thousand] [in italics] (5)

911.32 lands of their own] [in italics] (5)


note: see also his letter of 20 Oct., 1846.

referred to: 923

Sébastiani, François Horace Bastien, comte (1772-1851; _GDU_). Referred to: 203, 351, 700


referred to: 250

Secker, Isaac Onslow (1799-1861; _MEB_).
note: the references, in or arising from a quotation from The Times of 6 July, 1849, include Secker’s judgment in the case of Alexander Smith.

referred to: 1139-41


note: the attribution is thus queried in the Wellesley Index.

referred to: 691

Ségur, Philippe Paul, comte de (1780-1873; GDU). Referred to: 365

Selden, John (1584-1654; DNB). Referred to: 282

Senior, Nassau William (1790-1864; DNB). Referred to: 216, 218, 327, 744, 766, 775, 776, 778, 923, 930

— A Letter to Lord Howick, on a Legal Provision for the Irish Poor; Commutation of Tithes, and a Provision for the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy. London: Murray, 1831.

referred to: 775

— “Letter to Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the Third Report from the Commissioners for Inquiry into the Condition of the Poor in Ireland” (14 Apr., 1836), PP, 1837, LI, 244-52.

referred to: 993


reviewed: 753-9

quoted: 753, 754-5, 755-6, 756-8

753.24 title-page,” . . . “may] title-page may (3)

754.12 Some deny] [paragraph] Of those who are guilty of this error [of confusing the right to deal with the income with the right to waste the fee simple], some deny (15)

756.17 receive, from] receive, and from (49)

757.5 inconveniences] inconveniencies (51)

757.46 spirit.”] spirit.”* [footnote:] *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents.—Burke’s Works, Vol. II. Pp. 265-326. (55)
758.11-12 with reference not] not with reference (56)

reviewed: 763-7
quoted: 764-5, 765-6, 766-7

764.15 If the] If, on the other hand, the (66)


765.22 when these] when all these (69)

765.26 When] [no paragraph] When (52)

765.32 more] mere (52)

766.28 R.] Robert (56)

766.32 mental] intellectual (56)

766.33 reluctance] resistance (56)

referred to: 923, 930

reviewed: 774-6
quoted: 775

775.31 “in] It will be observed that in no country, except, perhaps, the Canton of Berne, has compulsory relief produced evils resembling, either in intensity or in extent, those which we have experienced; and that in (84)

— *Three Lectures on the Rate of Wages.* London: Murray, 1830.
quoted: 216-18
referred to: 218

218.10 will] will (xiv)
Sermon, Thomas.

note: master of the Bideford workhouse in Devon. The quotation is taken from *The Times*, 2 Feb., 1850, *q.v.* for the collation.

quoted: 1152

Settele, Giuseppe (d. 1841).

note: an admirer of Copernicus and Galileo, he was temporarily in disfavour with the Holy Office, but defended himself ably and continued teaching at the Sapienza until his death.

referred to: 11

Seymour-Conway, Francis Charles (3rd Marquis of Hertford) (1777-1842; *DNB*). Referred to: 112

Shaftesbury, Lord. See Anthony Ashley Cooper.

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616; *DNB*).

note: at 426 JSM uses the spelling Shakspeare.

referred to: 426, 464-6


referred to: 827

— *Coriolanus*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 1392-1440.

quoted: 1263

1263.3 “sweet voices.”] Most sweet voices! (1412; II, iii, 112)


note: the quotations at 176 and 393 are indirect.

quoted: 176, 325, 393, 1080

referred to: 466

325.15 “heard of in his philosophy.”] There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, / Than are dreamt of in your philosophy. (1151; I, v, 165-6)

note: the quotations are indirect.

quoted: 792, 942, 970


note: the quotation at 89 derives from Wooler.

quoted: 89, 577

89.27-8 *fat paunches make lean pates* I am resolved, ‘tis but a three years’ fast: / The mind shall banquet, though the body pine; / Fat paunches have lean pates; and dainty bits / Make rich the ribs, but bankrout quite the wits. (179; I, i, 24-7)

577.38 “in the favour of him that receives it.”"] A jest’s prosperity lies in the ear / Of him that hears it, never in the tongue / Of him that makes it; then if sickly ears, / Deaf’d with the clamors of their own dear groans, / Will hear your idle scorns, continue then, / And I will have you and that fault withal; / But if they will not, throw away that spirit, / And I shall find you empty of that fault, / Right joyful of your reformation. (211; V, ii, 861-9)

— Macbeth. In The Riverside Shakespeare, 1306-42.

note: the quotation at 169 is indirect; the reference at 466 is to the character Macbeth.

quoted: 169, 462, 608

referred to: 466

462.11 He] She (1337; V, v, 17)

608.24-5 “all sound and fury, signifying nothing;”"] It is a tale / Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, / Signifying nothing. (1337; V, v, 26-8)

— Measure for Measure. In The Riverside Shakespeare, 545-86.

note: parts of the same passage are quoted in each place.

quoted: 528, 602, 764

528.1 “fantastic . . . heaven”"] Merciful heaven, / Thou rather with thy sharp and sulphurous bolt / Splits the unwedgeable and gnarled oak / Than the soft myrtle; but man, proud man, / Dress’d in a little brief authority, / Most ignorant of what he’s most assur’d / (His glassy essence), like an angry ape / Plays such fantastic . . . heaven / As makes the angels weep; who, with our spleens, / Would all themselves laugh mortal. (561; II, ii, 114-23)

602.22-3 “strange tricks” . . . “heaven”” [see collation for 528.1 above]
764.2 “little brief authority” [see collation for 528.1 above]

— The Merchant of Venice. In The Riverside Shakespeare, 250-85.

note: the reference is to the character Shylock.

referred to: 466

— Othello. In The Riverside Shakespeare, 1198-1248.

note: the quotation at 1113 is indirect.

quoted: 297, 1113

297.15 “lame and impotent conclusion”] Oh most lame and impotent conclusion.
(1213; II, i, 161)

— The Tempest. In The Riverside Shakespeare, 1606-38.

note: the reference, in a quotation from W.J. Fox, is to Caliban and Miranda.

referred to: 558

Shaw-Lefevre, John George (1797-1879; DNB). Referred to: 743-4, 776

Sheil, Richard Lalor (1791-1851; DNB).

note: the references are in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 526

Shelley, John Villiers (1808-67; MEB). Referred to: 1212

Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1792-1822; DNB). Referred to: 1023

Short, Bob [pseud.] Twelve Short Standing Rules, for Ladies [and Gentlemen] with Short Memories, at the Game of Whist. Salisbury: Fowler, 1801.

note: a card with twelve rules on each side.

referred to: 109


referred to: 109

referred to: 109

*Le Siècle.*

note: one anonymous article follows.

— Unheaded leader, 29 Dec., 1846, 2.

referred to: 1043

Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph, comte (1748-1836; *GDU*). Referred to: 141, 520, 542

Siméon, Joseph Jérôme, comte (1749-1842; *GDU*). Referred to: 199

Simon, Edouard Thomas (1740-1818; *GDU*). Referred to: 317


referred to: 606

Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonardo Simonde de (1773-1842; *GDU*).

note: the reference at 1008 is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller*.

referred to: 951, 988-91, 1008, 1011


quoted: 988, 990

referred to: 951, 1011

988.19-37 It . . . peasantry. [translated from:] C’est surtout la Suisse qu’il faut parcourir, qu’il faut étudier, pour juger du bonheur des paysans propriétaires. C’est la Suisse qu’il faut apprendre à connaître pour se convaincre que l’agriculture pratiquée par ceux-là même qui en recueillent les fruits suffit pour procurer une grande aisance à une population très nombreuse; une grande indépendance de caractère, fruit de l’indépendance des situations; un grand commerce de consommation, conséquence du bien-être de tous les habitants, même dans un pays dont le climat est rude, dont le sol est médiocrement fertile, et où les gelées tardives et l’inconstance des saisons détruisent souvent l’espoir du laboureur. Soit qu’on parcoure le riant Emmenthal, ou qu’on s’enfonce dans les vallées les plus reculées du canton de Berne, on ne saurait voir sans admiration, sans attendrissement, ces maisons de bois du moindre paysan, si vastes, si bien closes, si bien construites, si couvertes de sculpture. Dans l’intérieur, de grands corridors dégagent chaque chambre de la nombreuse famille; chaque chambre n’a qu’un lit, et il est abondamment pourvu de rideaux, de couvertures, et du linge le plus blanc; des meubles soignés l’entourent; les armoires sont remplies de linge, la laiterie est vaste, aérée, et d’une netteté exquise; sous le même toit on trouve de
grands approvisionnements de blé, de viande salée, de fromage et de bois; dans les étables on voit le bétail le mieux soigné et le plus beau de l'Europe; le jardin est planté de fleurs, les hommes comme les femmes sont chaudement et proprement habillés, les dernières conservent avec orgueil leur antique costume; tous portent sur leur visage l'empreinte de la vigueur et de la santé, ils frappent par cette beauté de traits qui devient le caractère d'une race, lorsque pendant plusieurs générations elle n'a souffert ni du vice ni du besoin. Que d’autres nations vantent leur opulence, la Suisse pourra toujours leur opposer avec orgueil ses paysans. (I, 171-3)

990.23-44 The peasant . . . idle. . . . Of . . . richest. [translated from:] Le paysan propriétaire est de tous les cultivateurs celui qui tire le plus de parti du sol; parceque c’est celui qui songe le plus à l’avenir, tout comme celui qui a été le plus éclairé par l’expérience; c’est encore lui qui met le mieux à profit le travail humain, parceque répartissant ses occupations entre tous les membres de sa famille, il en réserve pour tous les jours de l’année, de manière à ce qu’il n’y ait de chômage pour personne: de tous les cultivateurs il est le plus heureux, et en même temps, sur un espace donné, la terre ne nourrit bien, sans s’épuiser, et n’occupe jamais tant d’habitans que lorsqu’ils sont propriétaires; enfin de tous les cultivateurs le paysan propriétaire est celui qui donne le plus d’encouragement au commerce et à l’industrie, parcequ’il est le plus riche. (I, 173)

990.28 idle. . . . He [ellipsis indicates return to two pages preceding] (I, 173, 171)

990.28-40 He . . . market! [translated from:] Loin de craindre pour l’avenir, il le voit s’embellir dans son espérance; car il met à profit pour ses enfans, pour les siècles qui viendront, chacun des instans que ne requiert pas de lui le travail de l’année. Il lui a suffi de donner peu de momens de travail pour mettre en terre le noyau qui dans cent ans sera un grand arbre, pour creuser l’aqueduc qui séchera à jamais son champ, pour former le conduit qui lui amènera une source d’eau vive, pour améliorer par des soins souvent répétés mais dérobés sur ses instans perdus, toutes les espèces d’animaux et de végétaux dont il s’entoure. Son petit patrimoine est une vraie caisse d’épargnes, toujours prête à recevoir tous ses petits profits, à utiliser tous ses momens de loisir. La puissance toujours agissante de la nature les féconde, et les lui rend au centuple. Le paysan a vivement le sentiment de ce bonheur attaché à la condition de propriétaire. Aussi est-il toujours empressé de la terre à tout prix. Il la paie plus qu’elle ne vaut, plus qu’elle ne lui rendra peur-être; mais combien n’a-t-il pas raison d’estimer à un haut prix l’avantage de placer désormais toujours avantageusement son travail, sans être obligé de l’offrir au rabais; de trouver toujours au besoin son pain, sans être obligé de le payer à l’enchère. (I, 171)

990.40 market! . . . Of [ellipsis indicates 1½-page omission] (I, 171, 173)


quoted: 988-9, 989
988.40-989.10 When . . . indigence. [translated from:] Quand on traverse la Suisse presqu’entièree, plusieurs provinces de France, d’Italie, et d’Allemagne, il n’est pas besoin de demander, en regardant chaque partie de terre, si elle appartient à un cultivateur propriétaire ou à un fermier. Les soins bien entendus, les jouissances préparées au laboureur, la parure que la campagne a reçue de ses mains, indiquent bien vite le premier. Il est vrai qu’un gouvernement oppressif peut détruire l’aisance et abrutir l’intelligence que devait donner la propriété, que l’impôt peut enlever le plus net du produit des champs, que l’insolence des agens du pouvoir peut troubler la sécurité des paysans, que l’impossibilité d’obtenir justice contre un puissant voisin peut jeter le découragement dans l’âme, et que, dans le beau pays qui a été rendu à l’administration du Roi de Sardaigne, un propriétaire porte aussi bien qu’un journalier l’uniforme de la misère. (I, 168-9)

989.13-15 “It . . . vain,” . . . “to . . . evil.” [translated from:] On a beau se conformer à une seule des règles de l’économie politique, elle ne peut pas opérer le bien à elle seule; du moins elle diminue le mal. (I, 169)

990.3-20 In . . . population. [translated from:] Dans les pays qui ont conservé l’exploitation patriarcale, la population s’accroît régulièrement et rapidement, jusqu’à ce qu’elle ait atteint ses limites naturelles: c’est-à-dire, que les héritages continuent à se diviser et à se subdiviser entre plusieurs fils, tant qu’avec une augmentation de travail, chaque famille peut tirer un égal revenu d’une moindre portion de terre. Le père qui possédait une vaste étendue de pâturages, les partage entre ses fils, pour que ceux-ci en fassent des champs et des prés; ces fils les partagent encore, pour exclure le système des jachères: chaque perfectionnement de la science rurale permet une nouvelle division de la propriété; mais il ne faut pas craindre que le propriétaire élève ses enfans pour en faire des mendians; il sait au juste l’héritage qu’il peut leur laisser; il sait que la loi le partagera également entre eux; il voit le terme où ce partage les ferait descendre du rang qu’il a occupé lui-même, et un juste orgueil de famille, qui se retrouve dans le paysan comme dans le gentilhomme, l’arrête avant qu’il appelle à la vie des enfans au sort desquels il ne pourrait pas pourvoir. S’ils naissent cependant, du moins ils ne se marient pas, ou ils choisissent eux-mêmes, entre plusieurs frères, celui qui continuera la famille. On ne voit point, dans les cantons suisses, les patrimoines des paysans se subdiviser jamais de manière à les faire descendre au-dessous d’une honnête aisance, quoique l’habitude du service étranger, en ouvrant aux enfans une carrière inconnue et incalculable, excite quelquefois une population surabondante. (I, 170-1)

Slater, Abraham (b. 1765).

note: a pauper admitted to Risborough Union workhouse in 1843, who worked there as a male nurse.

referred to: 925

Smart, Benjamin Humphrey (?1786-1872; DNB). Referred to: 425-7, 429-35

reviewed: 425-7, 429-35
quoted: 432, 433

432.4 Let [no paragraph] Let (7)

432.4 infant. That] infant: that (7)

432.19 give] give (8)

432.25 . . . Collectively, that] [no paragraph] In this manner, words, individually, cease to be signs of our perceptions or conceptions, and stand (individually) for what are properly called notions*, [footnote omitted] that is, for what the mind knows;—collectively, That (10)

433.15-20 That the . . . language. . . . We are . . . sentence. . . . As to [no paragraph] From the definitions and general reasoning in Grammar;—from the theories laid down in Logic;—and the basis on which the rules and practice of Rhetoric are presumed to stand, this principle seems to be taken for granted, that the . . . language; contrivances adopted at first on the spur of the occasion, the shifts and expedients to which a person is driven, when not being able to lay bare his mind at once according to his consciousness, he tries, by putting such signs together as were used for former occasions and therefore known as regards them, to form an expression, which, as a whole, will be a new one, and meet the purpose in hand. True indeed it is, that these very contrivances become, in their more refined use, the great instruments of human reason by which all improvement, all extensive knowledge, is obtained; but we are . . . sentence. If it is commissioned to write the whole by the reference immediate or mediate which all the other words are to bear to it, and to signify that they are a sentence, that is, the sign of a purposed communication, then it is the verb:—if it has not this power, (namely, of uniting the other words into a sentence,) and yet is capable, in all other respects, of standing as an independent sign, (this sign not being the sign of a purposed communication) then it is a substantive:—if it is the implied adjunct of a substantive, it is an adjective or an article,—if of a verb, an adverb:—if we know it to be a word, which, in a sentence, is fitted to precede a substantive, (or words taken substantively) in order to connect such substantive with what goes before, then it is a preposition:—and if it goes before, or mingles in a sentence, in order to connect it with another sentence, then it is a conjunction. These are the only real differences of the parts of speech:—as to (38-40)

Smith, Adam (1723-90; DNB). Referred to: 323


note: in SC.
755.1 “abhors perpetuities,”] The common law of England, indeed, is said to abhor perpetuities, and they are accordingly more restricted there than in any other European monarchy; though even England is not altogether without them. (II, 85; Bk. III, Chap. ii)

Smith, Alexander.

note: a commission agent. The references are in a quotation from The Times, 6 July, 1849.

referred to: 1139-41

Smith, John (1767-1842; MEB). Referred to: 790

— Speech on the Ministerial Plan of Parliamentary Reform (4 Mar., 1831; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 3, cols. 33-5.

note: the indirect quotation is in a quotation from Wakefield.

quoted: 790

Smith, William.

note: police constable No. 151K, defendant in the case discussed in No. 419.

referred to: 1221


referred to: 45


referred to: 243

Socrates (469-399; WWG).

note: the references at 873 and 1130 are in quotations from Grote, who uses the spelling Sokrates.

referred to: 425, 873, 1122, 1130, 1162-4

Solomons, Isaac (b. 1787).

note: a notorious fence and swindler.
referred to: 488

Solon (ca. 638-559; *WWG*). Referred to: 342, 1085, 1086, 1088, 1161

Souchet.


referred to: 389, 390


note: quoted in a speech on 21 Dec. by Périer in the Chamber of Deputies.

referred to: 389-90

Soult, Nicolas Jean de Dieu (Marshal of France) (1769-1851; *GDU*).

note: the reference at 593 is in a quotation from Croker.


— Speech on the Budget (13 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 742.

quoted: 429

429.1 *On . . . vie!*) La chambre décidera ce qu’elle jugera convenable; mais quant au traitement de maréchal de France, je déclare qu’on . . . vie. (742)


note: the first recorded use of the term *tabula rasa* (or *rasa tabula*). The sermon was reprinted as *A Sermon on Genesis 1.27*.

quoted: 540, 1098


referred to: 275


referred to: 229

*The Spectator.*
note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 997-1000


referred to: 116


quoted: 226

226.11 “boys”] The boys of the Polytechnic School have since been shut up within the walls of their college, by Soult, who as Minister of War is head of the establishment. (2)


referred to: 387, 392


referred to: 387, 392


note: in the “Topics of the Day” section.

quoted: 998

referred to: 997-1000

998.2 poor-law. . . . Landholders cannot] poor law; for the present law to establish houses of refuge here and there about the country is a mere mockery of the name. [paragraph] It is notorious as a matter both of reproach against landlords in Ireland and of complaint on their parts, that the greater portion of their interest in their estates is already confiscated to the money-lender. The residue has proved quite insufficient to meet the present emergency; landholders cannot (1187)

998.4-5 works.” . . . [paragraph] The] works,”—in other words, the landlords of Ireland, as a body, are totally bankrupt, and in their insolvency their business is carried on with money supplied by the British nation. [2-sentence omission] [paragraph] The (1187)

998.9 make-believe. . . . It] [ellipsis indicates 4-sentence omission] (1187)

998.14-15 lump. . . . [paragraph] It] lump. Whether or not such is to be the result, time will tell; but it is evidently an attempt which persons of the landlord class contemplate. [paragraph] It (1187)
998.21 The] [no paragraph] The (1187)

998.24 could] would (1187) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]


quoted: 1001, 1002, 1003

1001.33 “spoliation,”] [the word does not appear in the letter, though the implication does]

1001.33-4 “interference . . . property,” [quoted in full in following entry]

1001.34 “shaking . . . society,”] That waste lands should be improved, the poor employed and fed, and the country thereby vastly benefited, is no doubt most desirable: but the cost of so doing must be taken into account; and would not the risk if not the certainty of shaking . . . society by any direct interference with the rights of property be an evil infinitely greater than the benefit aimed at, or than the delay incident to awaiting the influence of self-interest upon individuals? (1189-90)

1001.39 “fixity of tenure”] Nay, some go so far as to speak of fixity of tenure; proposing thereby that a portion of the farmers or cottiers now in occupation of the land as tenants at will, should by some legislative act be secured in possession, with or without the will of the present owners, and be made to all intents and purposes proprietors of the soil, subject or not to some small quit-rent, never to be increased. (1189)

1002.8-9 “What,” . . . “does . . . mean? Is” [paragraph] Now, Sir, I would ask, purely for information sake—information which I am sure would be grateful to your readers, and which few are better qualified to afford than yourself—“what does . . . mean?” Is (1189)

1002.11 consent? Surely that . . . intended.”] consent?—surely that . . . intended; but if not, what else is meant? (1189)

1002.27 *pretium affectionis* . . . “the . . . rights,”] It is not the money revenue alone, which he may have mortgaged or forfeited, that the proprietor of land may claim in such a case, but the . . . rights—the *pretium affectionis* which he sets upon his property, if in a condition to insist upon it; and Government, in dealing with any proprietor, whether for waste or cultivated land, is bound to satisfy him before taking any part of his land to give to others. (1190)

1003.16 Habits] [no paragraph] Habits (1190)

1003.17 now] [now] (1190)
1003.19 it. . . In [ellipsis indicates 4-sentence omission, in which the leaders in the Morning Chronicle are attacked] (1190)

1003.25 danger. Such improvement] danger: such improvement (1190)


referred to: 1075-8


quoted: 1092, 1092-3, 1093

referred to: 1091-3

1092.3 “going] [paragraph] Where the Provisional Government lays itself open to censure, and, as it were, incurs condemnation ipso facto, is in going (237)

1092.7 titles.”] titles; an act anticipating the office of the constituent body. (237)

1092.12 “they] They (237)

1092.13 appreciate”] appreciate until we have them developed in the discussions of the promised council of the nation, and criticism is a kind of intervention, the more impertinent in that it rests on imperfect knowledge. (237)

1092.27 “probably] Another resignation is talked of—that of M. Lamartine; who probably (237)

1092.28 politics”] politics. (237)

1092.32-1093.1 “a leading journal.”] While the omnibus men are “striking” for higher pay, a leading journal has organized a community of property in its own office between masters and men; of course subjecting the men, who have hitherto counted on regular wages, to the vicissitudes of profit and loss—of loss in a speculation which no longer offers the premium of large individual profits for concentrated activity of management. (237)


referred to: 1204


referred to: 1208-10

But this we do say, that to suppose the very people who are now fighting not for sectarian education, but for the permission to have the Bible taught by the regular schoolmasters of all rate-paid schools where the School Boards assent, in the way suggested in Dean Lake’s admirable letter to Tuesday’s Times, will be willing to acquiesce a year hence in the utterly insane and unmeaning compromise of having a chapter of the Bible read aloud without note or comment as . . . lessons, is to give them credit for being infinitely more stupid, formal, and purposeless than they really are. (425)

In the first place, if he says what he means, let him not ask, as he does, for the British School system,—for every one of his objections applies, as he well knows, just as much to the homeopathic dose of formal Bible-reading and hymn-singing with which Lord Russell and he demand that the school shall open, as to the more honest and earnest religious lesson which we want to see given. (425)

Spence, Thomas (1750-1814; DNB). Referred to: 709


referred to: 709

Spencer, John Charles (Lord Althorp, later Earl Spencer) (1782-1845; DNB).

note: many of the references at 597-607, 608-17, 618-22, 623, 631, 633, 635-8, and 643-6 are to the Althorp (Reform) Ministry.


— Interjection on the Renewal of the Bank Charter (31 May, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, col. 188.

referred to: 592

— “Letter to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England” (6 Aug., 1833), PP, 1833, XXIII, 293.

referred to: 592

— Resolution on Supply—Sugar Duties (6 Mar., 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 16, cols. 324-5.

referred to: 611
— Speech on the Truck System (14 Dec., 1830; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 1, cols. 1164-5.

referred to: 213


referred to: 268, 548, 612


referred to: 265


referred to: 540n

— Speech on Sinecures (14 Feb., 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 15, col. 674.

referred to: 600, 645, 646


referred to: 564-6, 612


referred to: 613, 614, 646

— Speech on Irish Church Temporalities (18 June, 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, cols. 984-5.

referred to: 600, 645

— Speech on Newspapers—the Post Office (28 June, 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 18, cols. 1303-4.

referred to: 644


referred to: 607
— Speech on the Bank Charter (3 July, 1833; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 19, cols. 82-3.
referred to: 581

referred to: 636

referred to: 646

referred to: 646

— Speech in Presenting a Bill to Amend the Poor Laws (England) (17 Apr., 1834; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 22, cols. 874-89.

note: the quotation (a paraphrase) is in a quotation from Walter.

quoted: 711

referred to: 711

711.5 “improving and well regulating it,”] They could see how the system, improved and well-regulated, had worked in those parishes; they could see the advantages which had been there derived from it, and they were thus enabled to refer to experiments already made, to guide them elsewhere in the work of reformation. (879)

Sphaerus (of Borsythenes; ca. 285/265-ca. 221; *WWG*).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 873

Spohr, Louis (Ludwig) (1784-1859; *EB*). Referred to: 563

Spring-Rice, Thomas (Baron Monteagle) (1790-1866; *DNB*). Referred to: 734

Staël-Holstein, Anne Louise Germaine Necker, baronne de (1766-1817; *GDU*). Referred to: 136

*The Standard.*
note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 195, 205, 209, 764

— Leading article, 14 Oct., 1830, 2.

quoted: 170

— Leading article on the Ballot, 21 Oct., 1830, 3.

referred to: 195


referred to: 195

— Leading article on France, 8 Nov., 1830, 3.

referred to: 192

— Leading article on France, 9 Nov., 1830, 4.

referred to: 192

— Leading article on the Ballot, 30 Nov., 1830, 2.

referred to: 205-6, 209

— Leading article on the Ballot, 8 Dec., 1830, 2.

quoted: 210

210.27 At [no paragraph] At (2)

— Leading article on the Ballot, 11 Dec., 1830, 2.

referred to: 209

— Leading article on the President’s Message, 4 Jan., 1831, 2.

referred to: 236

— Telegraphic Dispatch from Marseilles, 3 May, 1832, 3.

referred to: 461

— “Foreign Intelligence (from our Private Correspondent),” 16 Dec., 1833, 2.

referred to: 662
— Leading article on the Reformers, 2 Jan., 1835, 2.
referred to: 762

referred to: 762

— Leading article on Party Names, 12 Jan., 1835, 2.

note: the quotation is in a quotation from Senior.
quoted: 764
referred to: 764

764.18 “although before] We are aware that before (2)

764.20-2 Crown, the Reform Bill,” . . . “has . . . the power] crown; but this was only in appearance. [Senior goes back to the preceding sentence] We do not use the word [revolution] as a hard word, for revolution may be a good thing, as well as a bad thing; but an essential change, in the theory of the constitution, must be revolutionary; and, by the theory of the constitution to which the Reform Bill has brought us back, the power (2)

764.22-4 the . . . proceedings] [not in italics] (2)

764.22 advisers as] advisers is as (2)

764.24 proceedings—the reciprocal independence of the three branches of the Legislature.] proceedings. [8-sentence omission] Every constitutional lawyer, every political writer, indeed, distinctly denied that such a power legally exists in the House of Commons, for to such a denial it certainly amounts, to say that the three branches of the legislature are reciprocally independent. (2)


quoted: 1176-7, 1177, 1178
referred to: 1176-8

1177.1 castigation] castigations (7)

1177.7 There] [no paragraph] There (7)

1177.12 child six] child of six (7)

1177.16 He] [no paragraph] He (7)
1177.16-17 no . . . Kenealy] [not in italics] (7)

1177.32 “to] He taught me to (7)

1177.33 his] my (7)

1177.36 “a thing to be applauded,”] This, at least, was conduct to be applauded. (7)

1177.36-7 “that he . . . misery.”] When he came away, he . . . misery, but brought him over to this country to educate him and put him forward in life. (7)

— Leading article on Land Tenure Reform, 25 Nov., 1872, 4.

referred to: 1232

Stanley, Edward George Geoffrey Smith (14th Earl of Derby) (1799-1869; DNB).

note: the reference at 526 is in an indirect quotation from Carrel quoted in Le National; that at 756 is in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 526, 602, 609, 735, 756

— Speech on Tithes (Ireland) (14 Feb., 1832; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 10, col. 322.

quoted: 609

609.5 “extinction of tithes.”] The attention of Ministers was certainly directed to secure a maintenance for the Protestant clergy; but another object to which their attention was also directed, was the extinction of the present system of tithes. (col. 322)

— Speech on Tithes (Ireland) (8 Mar., 1832; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 10, cols. 1366-8.

quoted: 609

609.8-9 “enforce respect for the law.”] Were they to be met in a time like that with the announcement, that the executive authority had not power to enforce the law? (col. 1367)

— Speech on the Ministerial Proposition for the Emancipation of Slavery (14 May, 1833; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 17, cols. 1193-1231.

referred to: 602

referred to: 1209

*La statistique de la France, publiée par le ministre de l'agriculture et du commerce.* Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1840.

referred to: 1039


Note: The references are to University oaths.

referred to: 14, 32, 33, 43

Stein, Heinrich Friedrich Karl, Baron von (1757-1831; *EB*). Referred to: 728


Note: The reference is to the catch-phrase “measures not men,” which was associated with William Petty (Lord Shelburn) and Edmund Burke, *q.v.*

referred to: 62

Sterling, John (1806-44; *DNB*). *The Election: A Poem, in Seven Books.* London: Murray, 1841.

Reviewed: 806-11

Quoted: 807, 808, 808-9, 809-10, 810-11, 820

808.41 Too [*no paragraph*] Too (8)

809.1-2 *And . . . thought.* [*not in italics*] (8)

809.15 “Our [*no paragraph*] Our (67)

809.43-4 *And . . . use.*” [*not in italics*] (68)

809.44-5 use.” . . . [*paragraph*] “There’s [*no paragraph*] use. [*skip back 3 pages*] [*no paragraph*] “There’s (67, 64) [*line space added in this ed.*]

809.46 I’m . . . corn.] [*not in italics*] (64)

810.3-4 *And . . . mounseer.* [*not in italics*] (64)

810.6 *But . . . all?* [*not in italics*] (64)

810.8 *But . . . food* [*not in italics*] (64)
810.10 They . . . themselves] [not in italics] (64)

820.16-17 . . . Discreetly teaching . . . use?] discreetly teaching . . . use.” (68)

Steuart, Henry Seton (1759-1836; DNB). *The Planter’s Guide; or, A Practical Essay on the Best Method of Giving Immediate Effect to Wood, by the Removal of Large Trees and Underwood; Being an Attempt to Place the Art on Fixed Principles, and to Apply It to General Purposes, Useful and Ornamental; Chiefly Intended for the Climate of Scotland*. Edinburgh: Blackwood; London: Cadell, 1828.

note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 739

Stewart, Robert (Lord Castlereagh) (1769-1822; DNB). Referred to: 645, 683

Stewart, William.

note: the principal proprietor of the *Courier* in 1830.

referred to: 529

Stormont, Lord. See W.D. Murray.

Strafford, Lord. See Thomas Wentworth.

Street, Thomas George.

note: editor of the *Courier* 1811-17 and 1828.

referred to: 529

Strohmeier, Urs Peter (1805-45).

note: see *Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse*.

referred to: 1054


referred to: 1054

Strongbow. See Richard de Clare.

Stuart-Wortley, James Archibald.
note: the quotation is taken from “Assize Intelligence. Central Criminal Court,”
Morning Chronicle, 19 Aug., 1851, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1183

referred to: 1185

Stuart-Wortley-Mackenzie, James Archibald (Lord Wharncliffe) (1776-1845; DNB).
Referred to: 281

Sturt, Charles (1795-1869; DNB). Referred to. 739

Sue, Eugène Marie Joseph (1804-57; DPF). Referred to: 1089-91

referred to: 1091


note: the first reference, in a quotation from Dixon, is to the English translations,
under the title Martin the Foundling, three of which appeared in 1847.

referred to: 1090, 1091

referred to: 1091


note: appeared in English as The Mysteries of Paris (London Dugdale, 1844, and
many subsequent eds.).

referred to: 1090

Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus) (b. ca. 70 ; WWR). Praeter Caesarum libros

quoted: 908

908.28 Sic . . . vobis] Sic . . . vobis nidificatis aves. (67n)

Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw (Baron St. Leonards) (1781-1875; DNB). Referred to:
282

Sumner, John Bird (1780-1862; DNB). Referred to: 744, 778
Sunday Times.

note: one anonymous article follows.

— “Questionable Charity,” 5 May, 1850, 2.

quoted: 1171

referred to: 1170-2

1171.8 but is] but it is (2)

Sutherland, 1st Duke of. See George Granville Leveson-Gower.

Swabey, Maurice (1785-1864; MEB). Referred to: 63, 75, 76, 79


referred to: 947


referred to: 607


note: we are grateful to the editors of the Wellesley Index for the attribution.

referred to: 580n-1n

Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine. Referred to: 580n-1n

Talfourd, Thomas Noon (1795-1854; DNB).

note: for the quotations, see “Assize Intelligence,” Morning Chronicle, 25 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1165, 1166, 1170

referred to: 1108, 1165, 1167, 1168

— Speech Introducing a Bill on the Custody of Infants (25 Apr., 1839; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 47, cols. 549-52.

referred to: 918
— Speech on National Representation (6 July, 1848; Commons), *PD*, Vol. 100, cols. 170-81.

note: the quotation is of Coleridge’s translation (*q.v.* for the collation) of Schiller’s *Piccolomini* (from *Wallenstein*).

quoted: 1108

referred to: 1108, 1109

Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de, prince de Bénévent (1754-1838, *GDU*). Referred to: 155, 495-6, 519, 520, 542


referred to: 519

Tardieu, Nicolas André Esprit (1790-1843).

note: lawyer, and mayor of Nancy, September 1830 to November 1831.

referred to: 263

Taylor, Jeremy (1613-67; *DNB*). Referred to: 16, 394

Temple, Henry John (3rd Viscount Palmerston) (1784-1865; *DNB*). Referred to: 619, 620, 774, 830

— Speech on Poland (28 June, 1832; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 13, cols. 1131-3.

note: the reference is in a quotation from the *Globe and Traveller*.

referred to: 698


referred to: 619-20


referred to: 1143


referred to: 1206
— Speech on the Affairs of Poland, Question (6 July, 1863; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 172, col. 253.

referred to: 1206


note: one anonymous article follows.


quoted: 747-8

747.24-748.8 The . . . deplore.] [translated from:] [paragraph] Le *National*, traîné depuis près de deux ans de tribunaux en tribunaux par arrêt d’une justice exceptionnelle, a été rendu enfin au jugement du pays dans la séance de la cour d’assises de ce jour [paragraph] Le délit imputé au *National* par le ministère public était une attaque directe à la personne du roi, à propos du discours d’ouverture des chambres. Il a plaidé sa non-culpabilité en se fondant sur ce que l’intervention personnelle et connue du roi dans le gouvernement, le dispensait des ménagemens qui commandés par la loi envers le monarque, quand il se tient strictement à couvert sous la fiction constitutionnelle. [paragraph] Pour la dixième fois le pays, par l’organe des jurés, a consacré cette doctrine et absous les hardiesses de la presse, sans doute pour faire ressortir d’une manière éclatante sa désapprobation d’un oubli des principes que déplorent tous les jours les vrais amis de la constitution et de la monarchie. (1)

Tennant, Charles (1796-1873; *MEB*). Referred to: 272

— *A Letter from Mr. Charles Tennant to Sir George Murray, on Systematic Colonization.* London: Ridgway, 1830.

referred to: 272-3


referred to: 272-3

Tenterden, Lord. See Charles Abbott.

Teste, Jean Baptiste (1780-1852; *GDU*). Referred to: 532


note: the quotation is in a quotation from Thornton, *q.v.* for the collation.
Themistocles (ca. 527-460; *WWG*). Referred to: 174, 1122

Thenard, Louis Jacques, baron (1777-1857; *GDU*). Referred to: 516

Theramenes (d. 404; *WWG*).

note: the references are in a quotation from Grote.

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877; *GDU*). Referred to: 496, 512, 515, 701


note: the title page of Vols. I and II has the subtitle, “accompagnée d’une historie de la révolution de 1355, ou des états-généraux sous le roi Jean,” and authorship is assigned to Thiers and Félix Bodin; this joint scheme was abandoned with the publication of Vol. III.

referred to: 515

Thirlwall, Connop (1797-1875; *DNB*). Referred to: 868


referred to: 867, 868-9

*Thirty-nine Articles*. See *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*.

Thistlewood, Arthur (1770-1820; *DNB*). Referred to: 45n


note: he wrote other letters to the *Leader* in 1850 (see pp. 12 and 155).

quoted: 1180, 1181

1180.25 “plain”] They all shirk me because I demand a *plain* answer. (374)

1180.26 “precise.”] We bluster a good deal, but we are not precise. (374)

1180.27-8 “The . . . sandbank.”] *The . . . sand bank!* (374)
Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett (Baron Sydenham) (1799-1841; *DNB*). Referred to: 348, 636


referred to: 636


quoted: 921

921.8 “azure main,”] *When Britain first, at heaven’s command, / Arose from out the azure main, / This was the charter of the land, / And guardian Angels sung this strain. / “Rule Britannia, rule the waves; / Britons never will be slaves.”* (42, II)

Thornton, William Thomas (1813-80; *DNB*). Referred to: 899, 927


note: in SC.

quoted: 898-9

referred to: 911, 927, 940, 942, 962, 963

898.27 “Two] [no paragraph] Two (429)

898.34 created There are] created “Many of ’em has passed months in jail for that,” said the describer’s informant, “for it appears that certain gentlemen in the neighbourhood looked upon the titles of these new colonists with some jealousy, and would have been glad to depose them, but there were some better philosophers among the surrounding gentry, who advised that, instead of discouraging the settlers, it would be best to help them, and the consequence has been, that there are (430) [see next entry]

898.36 plenty. Now] plenty.”* [footnote:] Irish Sketch Book, vol. i. p. 46 [text:] [paragraph] Now (430) [Thornton is quoting William Makepeace Thackeray, *The Irish Sketch-Book*, I, 46, where “Many . . . that,” is in quotation marks; the words “for . . . plenty,” are Thackeray’s]

Thouret, Jacques Guillaume (1746-94; *GDU*). Referred to: 155

Thouret, Vincent Ferrare François Antony (1807-71; *GDU*). Referred to: 363, 396, 421, 422
Thouvenel, Pierre Sébastien Barthélemy (1782-1831; DPF). Referred to: 262, 684
— Speech on the Municipal Government Bill (31 Jan.), Moniteur, 1831, 227-8
referred to: 262

Thrasybulus (fl. ca. 400; WWG). Referred to: 1158
Thucydides (ca. 460-399; WWG). Referred to: 869, 1087, 1121, 1159

note: an 8-vol. Greek ed. of Thucydides (Glasgow, Foulis, 1759) and a 2-vol. Latin ed. (Leipzig, 1790-1804) were formerly in SC. The reference at 1123, one of those at 1126, and that at 1127 are in quotations from Grote. Cleon’s speech on the Mytilian Revolt (referred to at 1128) appears in Thucydides, II, 58-70 (III, xxxvii-xl). Pericles’ Funeral Oration (referred to at 1129) appears in Thucydides, I, 318-40 (II, xxxv-xlvi).

quoted: 1129
referred to: 292, 1123, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129

Thucydides (son of Melesias) (d. ca. 420; WWG).

note: the reference at 1124 is in a quotation from Grote.
referred to: 1123, 1124

Thurn, Eduard im. See Im-Thurn.

Thurtell, John (1794-1824; DNB). Referred to: 77-9

Tillotson, John (1630-94; DNB). Referred to: 16

The Times.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically. The reference at 527 is in a quotation from Le National, that at 653 is in a quotation from the Monthly Repository, that at 723 derives from Bulwer.
referred to: 106, 130, 182, 183, 195, 225, 236, 237, 320, 335-6, 346, 407, 419, 422, 446, 466, 483-4, 500, 515, 527, 529, 530, 566, 567, 568, 653, 723, 762, 881, 885, 886, 887, 888, 930, 931, 981, 1232
— “Police; Queen-Square,” 11 Aug., 1823, 3.
referred to: 43
— “Police; Queen-Square,” 15 Aug., 1823, 3.
referred to: 43

referred to: 75

referred to: 107

— Leading article on the Corn Bill, 28 May, 1827, 2
quoted: 106, 107

106.33-4 “those . . . and political economists.”] How much greater intelligence and consistency has been indicated by what might be called the British public—the real English people—upon the corn question, than by those . . . and the political economists. (2)

107.1-3 The poor farmers, . . . have . . . we above] The truth is, that the poor farmers have . . . we have above (2)

107.11-15 We are . . . unrestricted . . . tending.] We will not now say that it is to be considered as but a temporary measure, but we must hope that it is only one stage in a journey. As our manufactures improve, and our population increases,—that is, as more corn is consumed,—the importation prices may be lowered; for we are . . . unrestricted . . . tending. (2)

referred to: 108-9

— Leading article, 11 Aug., 1829, 2.
referred to: 183

— Leading article, 13 Aug., 1829, 2.
referred to: 183

— Leading article on France, 14 Aug, 1829, 2.
referred to: 156, 180, 309

— Leading article, 19 Aug., 1829, 2.
referred to: 183
— Article on the Ballot, 8 Mar., 1830, 4. 
referred to: 195

— Leading article on France, 17 June, 1830, 2. 
referred to: 123, 225

— Article on the Ballot, 12 July, 1830, 4. 
referred to: 195

— Leading article, 4 Aug., 1830, 2. 
quoted: 183

183.11 “vagabonds”] As for the King and the Duke of Angouleme, if they escape the guillotine, it is much more than such vagabonds deserve; but still we are not sorry to hear that their escape is to be permitted, or to be connived at. (2)

— Article on the Ballot, 30 Aug., 1830, 7. 
referred to: 195

— Leading article on France, 13 Sept., 1830, 2. 
quoted: 149-50, 151

referred to: 130

151.3 “sovereignty of the people.”] It is apprehended, therefore, that the party which clamours for a dissolution and a new election wish to realize more completely their doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, by urging the new Deputies to abolish the Peers and to place further restrictions on the already feeble executive. (2)

— Untitled reply to a Letter on Mr. Huskisson, 22 Sept., 1830, 3. 
quoted: 140-1

140.27-8 speech,” . . . “Mr.] speech Mr. (3)

140.31 Jacobin club] Jacobin Club (3)

— Article on the Ballot, 23 Oct., 1830, 2. 
referred to: 195

— Leading article, 4 Nov., 1830, 2.
referred to: 183
— Article on French Affairs, 10 Nov., 1830, 3.

referred to: 182-3
— Leading article on France, 17 Nov., 1830, 2.

referred to: 192
— Private Correspondence from Paris, 24 Dec., 1830, 3.

quoted: 226

226.11 “boys”] The state of this city up to the time I close this letter, is disturbed the National Guards are incessantly under arms, groups of workmen run about crying for the blood of the ex-Ministers: Polytechnic boys, and students, are again said to be with these groups, but I have not seen such allies, though I have observed several of the crowds, and heard from many of the students that the imputation against them is false. (3)

— Leading article on French Affairs, 29 Dec., 1830, 2.

quoted: 226

226.12 “lads”] Now they [the Liberals under the Bourbon dynasty] are so discredited with the multitude, that the lads of the Polytechnic School protest against the imputation of their thanks, “because they speak not the voice of France.” (2)

— Leading article on President Jackson’s Message, 5 Jan., 1831, 2.

quoted: 236

236.21 “why should no attempt be made to civilize them?”] Might not the wretched Indians have been taught, and reclaimed to civilization? (2)

— Leading article on the Budget, 12 Feb., 1831, 3.

referred to: 267
— Leading article on French Affairs, 25 Feb., 1831, 2.

referred to: 275
— Leading article on French Affairs, 11 May, 1831, 2.

referred to: 308-9
— “Pension List,” 2 June, 1831, 2.
referred to: 319-20
— Leading article on Literary Pensions, 3 June, 1831, 2.
referred to: 320
— Leading article on French Affairs, 19 Aug., 1831, 3.
referred to: 335-6
referred to: 346
— Leading article on the Insurrection at Lyons, 2 Dec., 1831, 2.
quoted: 368

368.3 It [no paragraph] It (2)
368.3 has] had (2)
368.9 and mayors] and the mayors (2)

— “Tribunal of First Instance. Suit for Annulling the Will of the Duke of Bourbon,”

note: contains in translation the letters of Louis Philippe and the duc de Bourbon.
referred to: 387, 392
— “Tribunal of First Instance. Suit for Annulling the Will of the Duke of Bourbon,”
27 Dec., 1831, 3.
referred to: 387
— “Suit to Annul the Will of the Late Duke of Bourbon,” 28 Dec., 1831, 3.
referred to: 387
— Letter from Paris Correspondent (3 Jan., 1832), 6 Jan., 1832, 3.
referred to: 395, 407
— Leading article on French Affairs, 17 Jan., 1832, 2.
quoted: 396
“fellows,”] Five or six fellows, belonging to the Society of the Friends of the People, and declaring themselves republicans, were brought to trial for seditious libels. (2)

— Leading article on Persecutions of the Press in France, 6 Feb., 1832, 4.
referred to: 409

— Leading article on French Affairs, 15 Feb., 1832, 2.
referred to: 418

— “Private Correspondence, from a Correspondent” (27 Feb.), 1 Mar., 1832, 4.
quoted: 422

422.13 “Some months’ imprisonment,”] The Court of Cassation has this day confirmed the judgment of the Court of Assizes, which sentenced the friends of the people lately tried and acquitted to several months’ imprisonment for insolence. (4)

— “Private Correspondence, from a Correspondent” (28 Feb.), 2 Mar., 1832, 1.
referred to: 422

— Leading article on the French Expedition to Italy, 6 Mar., 1832, 5.
referred to: 423

— Express from Paris, 5 Apr., 1832, 2.
referred to: 439

— Leading article on the Laffitte Manifesto, 1 June, 1832, 2.
quoted: 466

466.24 “English interests,”] The additional information communicated on these points can be of no importance to the English reader, as they do not materially affect English interests. (2)

— Extraordinary Express from Paris, 7 June, 1832, 2.
quoted: 484

484.7 detested] The present Government of France has so weak a hold of the national love or respect, that though it has nothing to apprehend from the assaults of Chouans, headed by the crack-brained Duchess of Bern, it has every thing to fear from a people, who at once detest its policy and despise its imbecility. (2)
— “Telegraphic Despatch from Paris of the 6th of June, Half-Past 7 A.M.,” and “Despatch of the Same Day at 12 o’clock,” 8 June, 1832, 1.

note: from the French Minister of the Interior to the Prefect of the North and the Mayor of Calais.

referred to: 474

— Leading article on France, 9 June, 1832, 4.

quoted: 483

483.10 “endeavour] Above all things, His Majesty should endeavour (4)

— Leading article on Pledges, 11 July, 1832, 2.

referred to: 500

— Leading article on the Saint Simonians, 31 Aug., 1832, 2.

quoted: 510

510.3 “ducking in a horse-pond”] We then recommend ducking them in a horse-pond as the best mode of noticing their doctrines and counteracting their harangues about community of property and community of women. (2)


referred to: 515


note: the reference is in a quotation from Le National.

referred to: 527

— Leading article, 8 Dec., 1832, 4.

note: the reference at 656 is in a quotation from the Monthly Repository.

referred to: 607, 656, 761

— Leading article on Property Tax, 2 May, 1833, 2.

quoted: 566-7, 567

referred to: 566-8

566.31 The object] Undoubtedly, the object (2)
referred to: 591, 592

referred to: 631

referred to: 629

— Leading article on the Saint-Simonians, 8 Nov., 1833, 2.
quoted: 677

677.5-7 “community of goods and community of women, in other words, universal . . . plunder.”] We have announced in a former paper that the grand mysteries of this anti-social redemption are, community of women and community of goods—that is, universal . . . plunder. (2)

— “Private Correspondence” (Paris, 1 Nov.; signed “Y.”), 11 Nov., 1833, 1.
referred to: 662

— Leading article on Turkey, 1 Jan., 1834, 2.
referred to: 658-9

— Leading article on Turkey, 2 Jan., 1834, 2.
referred to: 658-9

— Leading article on Foreign Policy, 17 Jan., 1834, 4.
quoted: 665

665.9-10 “low Radicals”] Yes, the Tories began the fight against reform by anticipating all manner of mishiefs as the result of it; and now that the battle has gone against them, they seek to realize their own predictions—or to throw upon them some varnish of credibility—by affirming of reform that it is actually as bad as they had foretold, or worse; that there is, as the Duke of Wellington asserted at the outset, an impossibility of carrying on the King’s Government with an enlarged constituency and a reformed Parliament, that there is no sense of national dignity or honour left in the electors or their representatives, and that Russia and her retainers may insult, and outrage, and trample on this great nation as she likes; for that neither Parliament nor people will suffer the King of England to avenge indignity or to repel aggression; that peace on any terms will be insisted on; that no duty or principle of self-defence will be admitted; but that Mr. Joseph Hume and the low Radicals will strike the flag of
England throughout the world, and let foreign tyrants ride rough-shod over us with impunity. (4)

— “Recommendations of the Poor Law Commissioners,” 24 Feb., 1834, 5.

referred to: 686

— Leading article on the Poor Law Commissioners’ Report, 25 Feb., 1834, 2.

referred to: 686, 687


note: the report is taken from the Journal de St. Petersburgh, 11 Mar.

referred to: 698

— Leading article on the Poor Laws, 5 May, 1834, 4.

quoted: 715

715.15 “star chamber.”] Did any set of men in this country ever before usurp powers so extensive, so uncontrollable, as those with which it is proposed to invest these commissioners,—always excepting the judges of the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission? (4)

— Leading article on the Poor Laws, 8 May, 1834, 5.

quoted: 713

713.8-9 “and . . . peculation,”] We showed [yesterday] that the amount of the tax thus forcibly abstracted from the pockets of the people would be more than equal to the execution of these purposes; and we exposed the sneaking misrepresentation of us and of this part of the measure to which a morning cotemporary had lent itself, probably at the instigation of some person who hopes to be a commissioner, an assistant-commissioner, or, it may be, secretary to the commission, and who, in his avidity for place, and . . . peculation, has been urged from dirty misrepresentation to flat, positive, and unblushing falsehood. (5)

— “Poor Law Report—Emigration” (signed “Anglicanus”), 8 May, 1834, 6.

referred to: 735


quoted: 708

referred to: 708
— Leading article on the South Australian Association, 2 July, 1834, 4-5.
referred to: 736

— Leading article, 12 Dec., 1834, 2.
quoted: 762

762.22 “equitable adjustment”] Is it not true that an “equitable adjustment”—that an attack on “accumulated” capital—that a “separation of church and state,” and that a dissolution of the empire, under the name of “repeal of the union,” have every one been adopted by bodies of the bad or misled among the King’s subjects, each as an infallible panacea for its own especial and correlative grievance? (2)

— Leading article, 26 Dec., 1834, 2.
referred to: 762

referred to: 762

— Leading article on the Trial of Captain Johnstone, 7 Feb., 1846, 4.
quoted: 866

866.2-3 “a . . . all,”] His [Johnstone’s] defence is rested solely on the unaccountableness of his conduct, on the fashionable idea, that a . . . all. (4)

866.34 “the contest] The contest (4)

866.35 “we] We (4)


note: the quotation is of Charles Waterworth’s evidence in the Ellis case.
quoted: 876
referred to: 876-7

876.15-16 “hardly . . . a healthier liver in his life.”] The liver was not congested, although Mr. Hicks thought so, but I can say I hardly . . . a more healthy liver in my life. (6)

— Leading article on the Irish Poor Law, 19 Aug., 1846, 4.
referred to: 881, 885, 887
— Leading article on Poor Laws, 1 Sept., 1846, 4.

referred to: 886, 930

— “Court-Martial at Hounslow,” 30 Sept., 1846, 3.

note: the first quotation is of the questions of William St. Laurence (q.v.), the second is of the evidence of Matthew Routh, q.v.

quoted: 884

884.4-5 “applied to the commanding officer”] The Court.—Did you apply to the commanding-officer to have any of the witnesses detained? / Prisoner.—No, I did not; I thought the sergeant would tell the truth. (3)

884.14-16 “was . . . place,” . . . “by his manner the prisoner] Was on guard at Hampton-court on the 20th inst.; was standing near the front gate, when the sergeant of the guard (O’Donnell) came in, the prisoner was on sentry at the Trophy-gate; he turned around and spoke to the sergeant, but he (witness) was . . . place between them. By his manner, prisoner (3)


referred to: 917

— Leading article on Irish Poor Laws, 27 Oct., 1846, 4.

referred to: 930

— Leading article on Poulett Scrope and the Edinburgh Review, 27 Oct., 1846, 4

referred to: 923, 926

— Letter from Irish Correspondent (18 Nov., 1846), 20 Nov., 1846, 5.

referred to: 1019


referred to: 978

— “In the Matter of the Petition of Arabella Frances North and Others—Habeas Corpus,” 23 Dec., 1846, 7-8.

quoted: 1021, 1022-3, 1023

1021.9-10 “to have access to them for two hours daily”] The custody of the infants in the meantime shall be with Mrs. Wilson (Mr. Wilson consenting), Mrs. Frederick North, and Miss Arabella North, at Hastings: Mrs. Dudley North to have access to
them daily for two hours, but in the presence of one or more of those parties, and all
topics of religion to be avoided at such interviews. (8)

1021.38 the question] all question (8)

1021.38 do.] avow. (8)

1021.38-40 That . . . especially . . . guardian] [all in roman] (8)

1021.39-40 be guardian] be the guardian (8)

1023.2 ought, . . . are of . . . able] ought to be taught, and in which they ought, . . .
rabbage at are able (8)

— “‘Sanatory’ v. ‘Sanitary’” (letter to the editor; signed “H.”), The Times, 6 Apr.,
1847, 3.

note: No. 365 is a response to this letter.

quoted: 1078

referred to: 1078-9

1078.31-2 “vigorously resisted at] [paragraph] Surely, if the purity of our language
be worth preserving at all, a solecism like this cannot be too vigorously resisted,
where only it can be overcome, at (3)


referred to: 1111


referred to: 1111

— Leading article on France, 19 July, 1848, 4-5.

referred to: 1111

— Leading article on France, 7 Aug., 1848, 4.

referred to: 1110


referred to: 1110, 1111

— “Alleged Attempt to Assassinate the Queen,” 21 May, 1849, 5.
referred to: 1141

referred to: 1141

quoted: 1139, 1140

1139.23 transaction The transaction; the (7)


note: the account is taken from the Western Times. The quotations are of evidence in
the case.

quoted: 1152, 1153

referred to: 1151-3, 1164-7

1152.2 “strong . . . bright,”] She was then, according to the testimony of the master,
“strong . . . bright, and had never been ill whilst in the union.” (8, Sermon’s
testimony)

1152.9 “to . . . slee . . . house,”] Master was standing by some side shelves, and made
a meaning (motion) for the girl to . . . “slee” . . . house. (8, Morrish’s testimony)

1152.10-11 “went . . . kitchen” he “saw . . . flewed . . . before” . . . “came in;”] When
deceased went . . . kitchen I saw . . . flown . . . before I came in. (8; Morrish’s
testimony)

1152.12 “opened the slee] About 10 minutes afterwards master opened the “slee” (8,
Morrish’s testimony)

1152.14 “appeared] The day after Christmas-day I saw her, and she appeared (8;
Hooper’s testimony)

1152.15-16 “heard . . . stairs: she . . ‘wist’ or ‘moaning’ noise] The day after
Christmas-day I heard . . stairs. She . . “wist” noise (8, Hooper’s testimony)

1152.26 “honest . . girl,”] About a month afterwards, her mistress, Mrs. Parsons,
[sic] called at the workhouse for the shoes, when she told the master that her servant
was an “honest . . girl.” (8; Sermon’s testimony)

1152.27 “properly chastise”] And in reply to some remark by Mrs. Bird, which he
says he did not exactly recollect, he added, “You ought properly to chastise her, and if
she continues to behave badly return her to the house.” (8; Sermon’s testimony)
1152.28 “a [paragraph] The spectators were horrified at this stage of the proceedings by the production of the instrument of punishment; it was a (8)

1152.32 owner,”] owner, and would certainly not be used on a girl by any person possessed of the common feelings of humanity. (8)

1152.35-6 “punished . . . workhouse,” . . . “never . . . that,”] I have punished . . . workhouse, but never . . . that (8, Sermon’s testimony)

1152.40 “from . . . brain, caused] What evidence was given before the jury, which consisted, the North Devon Journal says, of respectable yeomen in the neighbourhood, we have not heard; but under the direction of the coroner they found an open verdict, “That death occurred from . . . brain, induced (8)


referred to: 1166


referred to: 1167


quoted: 1197

1197.24 “benevolent gentleman”] [paragraph] Mr. Norton expressed a hope that he would strictly keep his word, and that some benevolent gentleman, who did not wish his name made public, had forwarded some money for his use, and he (Mr. Norton) hoped he would apply it as it was intended,—to a proper purpose. (9)

1197.24-5 “such free . . . in abuse . . . husband”] His worship also cautioned the wife not to make such a free use of her tongue in the abuse of her husband, and discharged the accused. (9)


referred to: 1198

— Leading article on the Treatment of Lunatics, 28 July, 1858, 9.

referred to: 1198

— “Foreign Intelligence: France. (From Our Own Correspondent.)” (24 Feb., 1863), 25 Feb., 1863, 9.

referred to: 1202
— Advertisement by J.S. Mill’s Committee (17 July, 1865), 18 July, 1865, 8.
referred to: 1217

— “Election Intelligence. Greenwich,” 17 Sept., 1868, 10
referred to: 1219

referred to: 1223-4, 1225-6

— Leading article on Mortmain, 22 Nov., 1872, 7
referred to: 1228, 1231, 1232

— Leading article on Corporate Property in Land, 29 Nov., 1872, 7.
referred to: 1228, 1231, 1232

Timoleon (ca. 411-339; WWG). Referred to: 868

Titian (Tiziano Vecelli) (1477-1576; EB). Referred to: 1240

Tocqueville, Alexis Charles Henri Clérel de (1805-59; GDU). Referred to: 841-4

note: the indirect quotation is in a quotation from Grote. This ed in SC.
quoted: 1130

— Letter to Lord Brougham (10 Feb., 1843), Morning Chronicle, 16 Feb., 1843, 5.
referred to: 842, 843, 844

— Speech on the Address to the King (28 Jan.), Moniteur, 1843, 162-4.
quoted: 842, 843
referred to: 842, 843-4

842.27 et de 1833] et 1833 (163)

842.28 une nation] [not in italics] (163)
843.16 “des criminels d’une nation” [paragraph] D’abord ils [the treaties] donnent à la force armée d’une nation le droit exorbitant d’arrêter les criminels d’une autre nation, et où cela? (163)

Todd, Henry John (1763-1845; DNB). Referred to: 318


note: physician and medical writer.

reviewed: 411-16

quoted: 413, 414, 415

413.14 process, the] process, the (37)

413.16 exclusion, a] exclusion, or (37) [treated as printer’s error in this ed.]

413.20 other, or] other as (37)

414.36 tabulae inveniendi,] Of a New Method of Induction, Performed by Tabulae Inveniendi (title of Chap. i)

415.23 “translating circumstances into signs.”] This process, the translation of circumstances into signs, (the principle of which is founded on the conjunction of circumstances,) was performed in the following manner. (24)

415.24 “induction by classification”] The Method of Induction by Classification consists of the following processes: (54) [section heading]

Toller, J.H.

note: a deputy coroner.

referred to: 1152

Tooke, John Horne (1736-1812; DNB).

note: the reference at 321 is in a quotation from the Brighton Guardian.

referred to: 321, 1262


referred to: 433

referred to: 856-9

— Thoughts and Details on the High and Low Prices of the Last Thirty Years. 4 pts. London: Murray, 1823.

note: the Parts were issued and paginated separately.

reviewed: 18-20 (Pt. I), 34-9 (Pts. II, III, and IV)

quoted: 38

38.29 “Thus . . . although] Thus, although (Pt. IV, 8)

38.35 place.”] place* [footnote omitted] (Pt. IV, 9)

38.37 “period] And the general remark resulting from it is, that after a glut has been once fully established, it requires a period (Pt, IV, 9).

Toreno, Count. See Queipo de Llano.

Torrens, Robert (1780-1864; DNB). Referred to: 3, 736, 836-41


referred to: 840


referred to: 3, 5-6


referred to: 855, 856


reviewed: 836-41

quoted: 837, 838, 840
The superior advantages which have hitherto rendered the produce of a given quantity of English labour, more valuable than the produce of the same quantity of foreign labour, and which have consequently enabled the English to command higher wages than the continental operative, are, mechanical (10)

“Wheat-fed (37)

— “Political Economy Club,” Traveller, 2 Dec., 1822, 3.

quoted: 4

referred to: 3-5, 6

4.8 “Let” Let (3)

— Speech on the New Colony (30 June, 1834). Reported in “South Australian Association for Emigration,” The Times, 1 July, 1834, 4.

note: see also Scrope, Speech of 30 June, 1834.

referred to: 736

Tournier, François.

note: a witness in the trial of Berryer.

referred to: 517

Tracy. See Alexandre Destutt de Tracy.

Traill, James (1794-1873; MEB). Referred to: 744, 778

Trevelyan, Charles Edward (1807-86; DNB). Referred to: 1027

— Letter to the Commissioners of Public Works (15 Dec., 1846), Morning Chronicle, 21 Dec., 1846, 3.

referred to: 1027

The Trial of George Jacob Holyoake, on an Indictment for Blasphemy, before Mr. Justice Erskine, and a Common Jury, at Gloucester, August the 15th, 1842. From Notes Specially Taken by Mr. Hunt. London: Anti-persecution Union, 1842.

referred to: 1082

Le Tribunat. Referred to: 525
La Tribune.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 363, 402, 486, 505, 571, 666, 705, 745

referred to: 134, 148

— Leading article, 14 July, 1830, 1-2.
referred to: 134, 148

referred to: 372

referred to: 389

— “Cour d’assises de la Seine,” 1 Dec., 1831, 3-6.
referred to: 389

— “Cour d’assises de la Seine,” 2 Dec., 1831, 5-8.
referred to: 389

referred to: 396

La Tribune Politique et Littéraire.

note: anonymous articles follow, listed chronologically.

referred to: 519

— Leading article, 30 Jan., 1834, 1.
referred to: 682-3

Troneller.

note: the president of one of the sections of an electoral college in Lyons.
referred to: 387


Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, baron de l’Aulne (1727-81, *GDU*).

note: the reference at 74 is in a quotation from Mackintosh.

referred to: 74, 110, 155

Turner, Charles.

note: official assignee in Liverpool Court of Bankruptcy; husband of Mary Jane Turner.

referred to: 1198

Turner, Charles Colville.


quoted: 1164-5

referred to: 1164, 1165

Turner, Mary Jane.

note: subject of an inquiry at York Castle; wife of Charles Turner.

referred to: 1198

Turner, Sharon (1768-1847; *DNB*). Referred to: 318


referred to: 318

Turpin (Archbishop of Reims; d. ca. 800; *GDU*).

note: once considered to be the author of the *Historia de vita Caroli Magni et Rolandi*, a legendary chronicle of Charlemagne’s reign, *q.v.*

referred to: 870

note: the reference is general; this ed. is cited merely for the title.

referred to: 870

Tyler, John (1790-1862; *DAB*). Referred to: 833

Tyrone, Lord. See Con Bacach O’Neill.


referred to: 110

*The Unitarian Chronicle and Companion to the Monthly Repository.* Referred to: 556

Valdés y Florez, Cayetano (1767-1835; *GDU*). Referred to: 42

Vallet de Merville, Stanislas Michel François (1767-1833).

note: the prefect of the Department of the Meurthe.

referred to: 251, 263

Vansittart, Nicholas (1st Baron Bexley) (1766-1851; *DNB*).

note: see also Leonard Horner.

referred to: 270

Vauban, Sébastien le Prestre, marquis de (1633-1707; *GDU*). Referred to: 1048

— *Projet d’une dixme royale.* N.p.: n.p., 1707.

referred to: 1048

Victoria (of England) (1819-1901; *DNB*). Referred to: 798, 1141, 1186


note: see also “Lord Chamberlain’s-Office,” *ibid.* The quotations are all from the same long sentence.

quoted: 1073, 1074

1073.12-13 “public . . . humiliation,”] We, taking into Our most serious consideration the heavy judgments with which Almighty God is pleased to visit the iniquities of this land, by a grievous scarcity and dearth of divers articles of sustenance and necessaries of life, and, trusting in the mercy of Almighty God, that, notwithstanding the sore punishment which He hath laid upon Us, and upon Our people, He will, if We turn to
Him in due contrition and penitence of heart, withdraw His afflicting hand, have, therefore, resolved, and do, with the advice of Our Privy Council, hereby command, that a public Fast and Humiliation be observed throughout those parts of Our United Kingdom called England and Ireland, on Wednesday the twenty-fourth day of March instant, that so both We and Our people may humble Ourselves before Almighty God, in order to obtain pardon of Our sins, and may, in the most devout and solemn manner, send up Our prayers and supplications to the Divine Majesty, for the removal of those heavy judgments which Our manifold sins and provocations have most justly deserved, and under which We at this present time labour; and We do strictly charge and command, that the said public Fast be reverently and devoutly observed by all Our loving subjects in England and Ireland, as they tender the favour of Almighty God, and would avoid His wrath and indignation, and upon pain of such punishment as may be justly inflicted upon all such as contemn and neglect the performance of so religious and necessary a duty. (1025).

1073.13-15 “the heavy . . . life.”] [see collation above]
1073.19-20 “who . . . duty”] [see collation above]
1073.21 “wrath and indignation”] [see collation above]
1074.1-2 “punishment . . . performance”] [see collation above]
1074.24 “humiliation.”] [see collation above]
1074.29 “manifold . . . provocations”] [see collation above]
1074.30 “sore punishment,”] [see collation above]
1074.31 “contrition . . . heart”] [see collation above]
1074.32 “humble”] [see collation above]
1074.33 “withdraw . . . hand,”] [see collation above]
— Speech from the Throne (1 Feb., 1844), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 72, cols. 1-5.
referred to: 845

Vignert, Jean Jacques (1806-70; DPF). Referred to: 657
— Speech before the Cour d’assises de la Seine (19 Dec.), Moniteur, 1833, 2473.
quoted: 657
referred to: 657
657.23 un tas de valets.] Non, je proteste contre toute défense, vous n’êtes pas mes juges, vous êtes un tas de valets d’un Roi usurpateur. (2473)

Note: The quotation is indirect.

Quoted: 542

Villèle, Jean Baptiste Séraphin Joseph, comte de (1773-1854; GDU). Referred to: 125-6, 137, 153, 191, 199, 367, 407, 462-3

Villemain, Abel François (1790-1870; GDU). Referred to: 516


Note: The reference is in a quotation from Clément.

Referred to: 1049


Referred to: 1207

Villiers, Thomas Hyde (1801-32; DNB). Referred to: 508, 533

— Speech on the Truck System (14 Dec., 1830; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 1, cols. 1159-63.

Referred to: 213

Villot de Fréville, Jean Baptiste Maximilien, baron (1773-1847; DPF). Referred to: 516

Vilnot.

Note: The avocat-général at the trial of Berryer.

Referred to: 517


Vivien, Alexandre François (1799-1854; GDU). Referred to: 372, 388

*La Voix des Femmes.* Referred to: 1094-5

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet (1694-1778; GDU). Referred to: 323, 528

note: in SC, where the relevant passages are marked in pencil, perhaps by JSM.

referred to: 528

— *Commentaire sur le livre Des délits et des peines* (1766). In *Oeuvres complètes*, XXVI, 207-60.

referred to: 323


referred to: 323

— *Précis du siècle de Louis XV* (1752). In *Oeuvres complètes*, XIX

referred to: 323


referred to: 323

Voss, Otto Karl Friedrich von (1755-1823; *ADB*). Referred to: 1081

“W.M.J.” See *Examiner*, 26 Dec., 1830.

“W.P.G.” See *Examiner*, 18 Nov., 1832.

Wachez, Charles Boromée (1782-?).

note: prosecuted under French martial law in June 1832.

referred to: 487

Wachsmuth, Ernst Wilhelm Gottlieb (1787-1866; *ADB*). *Die ältere Geschichte der römischen Staates untersucht*. Halle, Reugerschen Buchhandlung, 1819.

referred to: 663


note: both references are inferred.

referred to: 117, 139
Wakefield, Edward Gibbon (1796-1862, DNB). Referred to: 544, 734, 739, 788, 790, 792, 840, 914


note: published anonymously The quotation is inferentially attributed, the reference at 742n is in a quotation from another of Wakefield’s works.

quoted: 671

referred to: 734, 742n, 788, 790, 792

671.20 “uneasy,”] After these comes the middle or uneasy class (80)


referred to: 788, 789

— *The Hangman and the Judge; or, A Letter from Jack Ketch to Mr. Justice Alderson; Revised by the Ordinary of Newgate, and Edited by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, Esq.* London: Wilson, [1833].

referred to: 788


note: the reference is to Gouger’s ideas, which are given in this pamphlet.

referred to: 272-3


referred to: 749-50

— *The New British Provinces of South Australia, or, A Description of the Country, Illustrated by Charts and Views; with an Account of the Principles, Objects, Plan, and Prospects of the Colony*. London: Knight, 1834.

reviewed: 738-42

quoted: 739-40, 740, 741-2
referred to: 789, 790

— Plan of a Company to Be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia, Purchasing Land Therein, and Preparing the Land So Purchased for the Reception of Immigrants. London: Ridgway, 1831.

note: published anonymously.

referred to: 544, 789, 840, 914

— Popular Politics. London: Knight, 1837.

reviewed: 787-91

quoted: 788, 789

788.4 “Extracts] Consisting of Extracts (Contents page)

789.25 “they make] They [the rural rich] make (7)

790.16 At] [no paragraph] At (70)

790.28 opinions.] opinions*. [footnote:] *Mr. John Smith, the banker, of London: (71)

790.32 having examined] having carefully examined (71)


note: published anonymously.

referred to: 544, 789, 840, 914


note: published anonymously.

referred to: 544, 789, 840, 914


note: published anonymously.

referred to: 544, 789-90, 840, 914

referred to: 789

Walpole, Robert (1st Earl of Orford) (1676-1745; DNB).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1127


note: the reference is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 790

Walsingham, Francis (ca. 1530-90; DNB). Referred to: 282

Walter, John (1776-1847; DNB). Referred to: 707-13


quoted: 709, 710-11, 711, 712, 713

referred to: 707-13

709.31 “It is] [paragraph] That is the general outline of the plan, respecting which I must remark, that it is (5)

710.41 workhouses!] workhouses? (9)

710.42 built . . . A] built, either in our country, or in any of those mentioned. A (9)

711.3 impossible The] impossible: the (9)

711.5-6 system instead of “improving and well regulating it,” as has been done in these 100 parishes? Why] system; old Poor-laws, at least in principle, “improved (as his Lordship states) and well regulated” and therefore, being thus improved and well regulated, had worked well—had depauperised whole districts that had been previously pauperised. Why (10)

712.16 “evidence] Looking at the evidence (37)

712.18 generates:’] generates, and which, under any alteration, it must continue to generate, so long as it congregates crowds of able-bodied persons within the same walls; I cannot advise the practice of accumulating the poor when out of employment, and, therefore, most open to temptation, in large masses, in places where they have not the power of choosing their associates, and from which they have not the liberty of removing, even to escape contamination. (37)
I conceive that abundant sources of parochial labour might be found, both for men and women; and that with proper superintendance this may be done, without immuring all persons, without discrimination, within the walls of a workhouse. (37)

It has hitherto been the boast . . . theory—that it worked . . . ill; but here is a . . . merely, the invention and discovery of theorists, of speculators knowing but little . . . Englishmen; and those of whom they do know the usages, living chiefly in London and other great towns. (21)

Such a change, I will venture to say, never . . . conquest. (21)

On all these accounts, and a variety of others to which I have alluded in the course of the correspondence laid before you, I shall give the measure all the opposition I am able; but above all, I deprecate so fearful a change as will be effected or attempted, all over the country—a change . . . consequences. (22)

I think portions of the measure pregnant with evil; I think it a change . . . itself: I think it calculated to produce a revolution . . . people; providing inadequately for its ostensible objects, and productive of consequences . . . dismay. (23)

Warburton, Henry (1784-1858; DNB). Referred to: 507

Warburton, William (1698-1779; DNB). Referred to: 16


quoted: 24

Ward, Henry George (1797-1860; DNB). Referred to: 764, 793

— The First Step to a Poor Law for Ireland. London: Ridgway, 1837.

referred to: 793

— Notice of Motion re Sale of Colonial Lands (31 Jan., 1837; Commons) Reported in The Times, 1 Feb., 1837, 3.

referred to: 792, 793

— Speech in Moving a Motion on the Disestablishment of the Irish Church (27 May, 1834; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 23, cols. 1368-96.

referred to: 764

referred to: 362


note: the quotation is in a quotation from “W.M.J.,” see *Examiner*, 26 Dec., 1830.

quoted: 220

220.12 “Fiat . . . Coelum;”] It is lesse to say *Statuatum veritas, ruat Regnum*, than *Fiat Coelum*, but there is no such danger in either of them (13).

Warren, Robert.

note: a firm that advertised frequently in newspapers.

referred to: 565

Washington, George (1732-99; *DAB*). Referred to: 716

Waterworth, Charles (d. 1864).

note: surgeon practising in the Kent Road in 1846.

referred to: 876

Watkins, Joshua (d. 1871).

note: member of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1822, practised at 11 Chandos St. until his death in 1871. The surgeon in the Moir case, his comment is quoted in “The Inquest on Mrs. Moir,” *Morning Chronicle*, 28 Mar., 1850.

quoted: 1168

Watson, Mary Ann.

note: Andrew Maclean’s common-law wife.

referred to: 1184-5

Watson, Richard (1737-1816; *DNB*). Referred to: 16

Watt, James (1736-1819; *DNB*). Referred to: 837, 838

Watts, John (b. 1747).
note: a respectable individual sentenced to prison.

referred to: 79

Webster, Daniel (1782-1852; DAB). Referred to: 830-6

_The Weekly Dispatch_.

note: one anonymous article follows.


quoted. 1182

1182.27-8 “Epicureans” who “take . . . it”] Shame, fear, a suspicion that nothing is certain and nothing true, may deter them from outwardly professing another change of opinion—because, when men at last arrive at the “Everlasting No,” they become Epicureans and take . . . it, regarding all solutions of the mystery of life as equally untrustworthy, and not therefore worth making any sacrifices for. (49)

1182.28-9 “believing in nothing,” being “earnest in nothing,” being “merely . . . machine.”] The one throws off the popular faith because he believes in nothing, is earnest in nothing—is merely . . . machine. (49)

Wellesley, Arthur (1st Duke of Wellington) (1769-1852; DNB).

note: the reference at 758 is in a quotation from Senior; that at 790 is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 109, 110, 111, 112, 182, 204, 258, 508, 601, 643, 755, 758, 790


note: this ed. cited for ease of reference.

referred to: 756

— Letter to Dr. Curtis (11 Dec., 1828), _The Times_, 26 Dec., 1828, 2.

note: the reference is in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 755


referred to: 117
— Speech on Flogging in the Army (11 Aug., 1846; Lords), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 88, cols. 600-2.

referred to: 882, 1177-8


Welsh, Ellen (b. ca. 1848).

note: a young child brutally beaten by Anne Bird.

referred to: 1155

Wentworth, Thomas (Earl of Strafford) (1593-1641; *DNB*). Referred to: 281, 920

Wesley, John (1703-91; *DNB*).

note: the reference at 559 is in a quotation from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 556, 559, 821


quoted: 24

24.21 “no] I believe no (38)

Wesley, Mehetabel (1697-1751).

note: poet, sister of John Wesley (*q.v.*). She married a plumber, William Wright, and had several children, all of whom died in infancy. The references are in or derive from quotations from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 556-9, 561

Wesley, Samuel (1662-1735; *DNB*).

note: some of the references are in quotations from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 557-9

Wesley, Susannah (1669/70-1742).

note: wife of Samuel Wesley: mother of nineteen children, including Mehetabel and John Some of the references are in or derive from quotations from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 557-9
Western, Charles Callis (Baron) (1767-1844; DNB). *Observations on the Speech of the Right Hon. W. Huskisson, in the House of Commons, Tuesday, the 11th of June, 1822, on Mr. Western’s Motion Concerning the Resumption of Cash Payments, Published March 20th, 1823.* London: Ridgway, et al., 1823.

note: the reference is illustrative.

referred to: 34

Westmeath, Lord. See George Nugent


*Westminster Review.*

note: one anonymous article follows.

referred to: 1263

— “Present State of France,” XVII (July 1832), 211-41.

referred to: 504-5


Whately, Richard (1787-1863; DNB). Referred to: 327-9, 356, 434-5, 913, 938.


referred to: 356, 434


referred to: 356, 434


reviewed. 327-9

referred to: 356, 434


referred to: 434

quoted: 738-9

738.37-739.1 “We suspect this statement to be exaggerated,”] [paragraph] To meet a multitude of plain arguments—if not unanswerable, at least hitherto unanswered,—and these, based on a mass of the most unimpeachable testimony, some drawn from official documents, and the rest from the statements of men whose opportunities of knowing are indisputable, and whose bias, if they had any, was in an opposite direction—to meet all this by the bare assertion of “We” (i.e. some unknown individual) not that he knows, or is convinced, but that he suspects exaggeration—would have been on most subjects regarded as perfectly ridiculous. (8)

Whately, William (1795-1862; MEB).

note: the quotation is from “Law Intelligence,” Standard, 13 May, 1850.

quoted: 1177

referred to: 1177-8

White.

note: a magistrate.

referred to: 43-6, 63

White, Frederick John (1819-46).

note: a soldier who was flogged to death; Matthewson (q.v.) was a witness.

referred to: 882

Whitmore, William Wolryche (1787-1858; MEB) Referred to: 734

— Speech in Introducing a Motion on East and West India Sugars (22 May, 1823; Commons), PD, n.s. Vol. 9, cols. 444-56.

referred to: 25, 28

Whyte, John James (1806-89; MEB). Referred to: 882-4

Wielopolski, Alexander (1803-77; EB). Referred to: 1204

Wightman, William (1784-1863; DNB).

note: the quotation of his judgment in the Maclean case is taken from “Central Criminal Court—Friday,” Morning Chronicle, 23 Aug., 1851, q.v.
quoted: 1185

referred to: 1184

Wilkes, Jane Anne.


quoted: 1183

William I (of the Netherlands) (1772-1844; *EB*). Referred to: 524, 835

William III (of England) (1650-1702; *DNB*).

note: the reference at 280 derives from Hallam.

referred to: 280, 1181

William IV (of England) (1765-1837; *DNB*).

note: the references at 758 and 764-5 are in quotations from Senior.

referred to: 288, 319, 395, 700, 710, 758, 764-5, 798

Williams, Isaac (1802-65; *DNB*). Referred to: 821

Williams, William (1789-1865; *MEB*). Letter to the Editor (26 June, 1832), *The Times*, 28 June, 1832, 6.

quoted: 490, 491

490.9-10 “act . . . or resign his seat,”] The truth, however, as recorded in your paper of the day before, is this,—that my set pledged the candidate to these things,—1st, an abolition of tithes: 2d, a repeal of the assessed taxes; 3d, a repeal of the malt and soap tax; 4th, a revision of the corn bill; 5th, an abolition of all sinecures and unmerited pensions; 6th, a repeal of the septennial act, 7th, to act . . . or to resign his seat at their request. (6)

Wilson, Mrs.

note: mother of Dudley North the elder; remarried.

referred to: 1020

Wilson, John.
note: a friend of JSM’s, secretary to the Factory Commission in 1833, an Assistant Factory Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner to the Poor Law Inquiry, editor of the *Globe and Traveller* (ca. 1834-?), and a writer.

referred to: 663


note: part of the History series in Dionysius Lardner’s *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*. The British Library catalogue attributes this anonymous work to Robert Bell (1800-67), journalist and author, editor of the *Atlas* and later of the *Monthly Chronicle*, which he helped Bulwer Lytton and Lardner to establish; however, there seems no reason to doubt that JSM is correct in attributing the work to Wilson, as he does both in his bibliography and in his list of *Examiner* articles in SC; Wilson was a close friend of his in these years.

reviewed: 663-4


quoted: 631

631.30 “stake in the country,”] With a view to police, a most important consideration in the establishment of the force in question, nothing could be more desirable than that those entrusted with arms and subject so little to any military control, should be persons of some substance and stake in the country. (897)

Wodehouse, Edmond (1784-1855; *MEB*). Speech on the Corn Laws—Mr. Villiers’s Motion (22 Feb., 1842; Commons), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 60, cols. 846-50.

note: the quotations, all of the same phrase, are merely illustrative.

quoted: 859, 860, 862

859.27 “peculiar burdens”] A great deal had been said about the peculiar burdens which the land supported, and he was ready to admit, that he asked for protection on no other grounds than on that single one (848)

Wolf, Christian Wilhelm Friedrich August (1759-1824; *EB*). *Prolegomena ad Homerum, sive de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma varusque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi*. Halle: Libraria Orphanotrophei, 1795

referred to: 871

Wood, Charles (1800-85; *DNB*). Referred to: 1190-2

— Letter to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the East India Company (1 June, 1853), *PP*, 1852-53, LXIX, 84-5.
1192.3-6 “We are . . . preserve the . . . depends.”] Whilst we are of opinion that, by some alteration in the constitution of the Court of Directors, it may be rendered a still more fitting instrument for conducting the government of our Indian empire, we are . . . preserve unimpaired the . . . depends. (84)

— Speech on the Labouring Poor (Ireland) Bill (1 Feb., 1847; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 89, cols. 675-90.

note: the speech was reported in The Times, 2 Feb., 1847, 4.

1061.38 arterial drainage] Then there is the proposal with respect to general drainage, or, to use the new term, arterial drainage, under the superintendence of the Board of Works, which, in many cases, proprietors could not execute for themselves (687-8)

— Speech Introducing the Government of India Bill (3 June, 1853; Commons), PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 127, cols. 1092-1169.

Wooler, Thomas Jonathan (1786?-1853; DNB). Referred to: 80, 95


96.5 “if it] I dislike the remedy you propose for checking population, with reference to the particular means; but if it (909)

96.19 “whether] If a sufficiency of food can be produced for the maintenance of the human species, to any extent to which experience has afforded us reason to conclude the numbers of the species may be carried for some few centuries forward, the whole question, with me, is at an end, and I should not think it either wise or politic to waste any time on considerations as to whether (905)

“It is] But Mr. Brougham did not tell Mr. Courtenay this; nor would it ever be
told to men of gentle blood; it is (776)

“you would] You say you would (777)

no] No (782)

labourer] labourers (782)

proved . . . well fed] shewn . . . well fed (778)

“a great] But there is besides a great (782)

different laws . . . nature: and that you] different laws . . . nature. You (782)

“heartless,”] It is difficult to believe that M. Malthus did not secretly reason to
himself in this manner [i.e., arguing that safety for the rich lay in keeping down the
strength of numbers of the poor]; from the very heartless style of his general
reasoning; but it must be confessed, that better men have adopted his conclusions.
(781)

— “Further Inquiry into the Principles of Population,” Black Dwarf, 4 Feb., 1824,
143-9.

referred to: 97

— “Inquiry into the Principles of Population, No. 1,” Black Dwarf, 12 Nov., 1823,
661-3.

quoted: 85

referred to: 82, 84-5

“We] That we dissent from Malthus, and his practical followers, we need hardly
premise; for, on various occasions, we have contended that population has never
pressed against the means of subsistence; and we (661)

— “Inquiry into the Principles of Population, No. 2,” Black Dwarf, 19 Nov., 1823,
693-706.

quoted: 82, 83

referred to: 80-5

system;] system;—and under a good one, no mischief will be felt from a
redundancy of population. (705)

“Wages] Thus, wages (701)
“Practical Endeavours to Apply the System of Mr. Malthus, in Checking Population,” *Black Dwarf*, 17 Sept., 1823, 404-11.

quoted: 84-5

84.41 I] we (405)

84.42 Providence] that Providence (405)

84.42 plentiful a] beautiful a (405)

85.1 creatures:] creatures:—or if any steps were to be taken, it would be surely the better way, to drive those from the table, who would not be content with their share, than to prevent those from sitting down to the feast of life, who have received the invitation of their common Creator. (405)

Wordsworth, William (1770-1850; *DNB*). Referred to: 941


note: in SC.

quoted: 941

941.15 a] Towards the head of these Dales was found a (63)

941.15 agriculturists, proprietors] Agriculturists, among whom the plough of each man was confined to the maintenance of his own family, or to the occasional accommodation of his neighbour.* [footnote omitted] [Mill skips back 11 pages] They had, as I have said, their rural chapel, and of course their minister, in clothing or in manner of life, in no respect differing from themselves, except on the Sabbath-day; this was the sole distinguished individual among them; every thing else, person and possession, exhibited a perfect equality, a community of shepherds and agriculturists, proprietors (63-4, 52-3)

941.16 cultivated. . . . Among] [see collation for 941.15 above] (63, 63)

941.25 blood. . . . Corn] blood;—and venerable was the transition, when a curious traveller, descending from the heart of the mountains, had come to some ancient manorial residence in the more open parts of the Vales, which, through the rights attached to its proprietor, connected the almost visionary mountain Republic he had been contemplating with the substantial frame of society as existing in the laws and constitution of a mighty empire. [ellipsis indicates a skip back of 14 pages] Corn (65, 51)

941.25 vales sufficient] vales (through which no carriage-road had been made) sufficient (51)
941.26 no more. The] and no more: notwithstanding the union of several tenements, the possessions of each inhabitant still being small, in the same field was seen an intermixture of different crops; and the plough was interrupted by little rocks, mostly overgrown with wood, or by spongy places, which the tillers of the soil had neither leisure nor capital to convert into firm land. The (52)


note: in SC.

quoted: 728

728.24 . . . Tempers with] 'Tis not in battles that from youth we train / The Governor who must be wise and good, / And temper with (III, 130)

Wright, William.

note: a dissolute plumber, Mehetabel Wesley’s husband Some of the references are in or derive from quotations from W.J. Fox.

referred to: 558, 559


quoted: 754

754.11 “spoliation”] That appeared to him complete spoliation, which tended to the destruction of all property. (1156)

Xenophon (ca. 430-ca. 355 ; WWG).

note: see also Pseudo-Xenophon.

referred to: 1130, 1131, 1159


note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 1131-2


note: the reference at 1130 is in a quotation from Grote, that at 1162 is to the “Choice of Hercules” (Prodicus’ essay, “On Heracles,” as given by Xenophon, II, i, 21-34).
referred to: 1130, 1162

Xerxes (of Persia) (d. 465; WWG). Referred to: 868, 1134

“Y.” See The Times, 11 Nov., 1833.

Young, Arthur (1741-1820; DNB). Referred to: 956-8, 968


note: the parts are separately paginated. The quotation is in a quotation from “Third Report of the Commissioners for Inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland,” PP, 1836, q.v.

quoted: 939

referred to: 963

939.21-2 is . . . the] [not in italics] (Pt. II, 48)

939.22 dominions:] dominions; for so I am persuaded the improvement of mountain land to be (Pt. II, 48)

— Travels during the Years 1787, 1788, and 1789; Undertaken More Particularly with a View of Ascertaining the Cultivations, Wealth, Resources, and National Prosperity of the Kingdom of France (1792). 2nd ed. 2 vols. London and Bury St. Edmunds: Richardson, 1794.

note: in SC.

quoted: 957, 957-8, 958, 1004, 1061

referred to: 968, 985, 1018, 1049

957.3 Between] [no paragraph] Between (I, 88)

957.8 Leaving] [no paragraph] Leaving (I, 50)

957.13 it: they] it They (I, 50)

957.21 terraces. From] terraces Much watering at St. Laurence The scenery very interesting to a farmer. From (I, 51)

957.25-7 Give . . . desert.] [not in italics] (I, 51)

957.29 Came to] Take the road to Moneng, and come presently to (I, 56)
957.30 comfortable] comfortable (I, 56)

957.31 hedges] edges (I, 56) [printer’s error in Source]

957.35 another. There] another. The men are all dressed with red caps, like the highlanders of Scotland. There (I, 56)

957.35-6 There . . . equal] [not in italics] (I, 56)

957.37-8 It . . . proprietors] [not in italics] (I, 56)

958.1 country. Each] country, each (I, 56)

958.1 the fowl] The fowl (I, 56)

958.7 Saw] Except these, and a very few other instances, I saw (I, 412)

958.7 in small] on small (I, 412)

958.7 except . . . industry] [not in italics] (I, 412)

1004.6-8 “rock,” . . . “and . . . garden,” . . . “he . . . desert.”] [see quotation at 957.25-7]

1061.26-7 “magic of property,” . . . “sands into gold.”] [see quotation at 957.5]

Zanezzi, Jean.

note: Italian street-organ player in London.

referred to: 1187

Zeno (of Elea) (b. 490 ; WWG).

note: the reference is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 873

BRITAIN

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS


referred to: 643

referred to: 928, 939


referred to: 928


note: the reference at 1029 is in a quotation from De Freyne.

referred to: 928, 1029


note: the reference at 1029 is in a quotation from De Freyne.

referred to: 928, 1029


referred to: 350


referred to: 835

“Report from the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the State of Ilchester Gaol” (8 Feb., 1822), PP, 1822, XI, 277-311.

referred to: 68

“Copy of a Letter, Addressed, by Mr. Secretary Peel’s Directions, to the Visiting Magistrates of the Several Gaols and Houses of Correction, Where Tread Wheels Have Been Established” (18 Jan., 1823). In “Tread Wheels. Copies of All Communications Made to, or Received by the Secretary of State for the Home
Department, Respecting the Use of Tread Wheels, in Gaols or Houses of Correction”

note: the letter is at 308; the responses (from nineteen English counties, and from
Edinburgh) at 309-23.

referred to: 68

“Correspondence with Foreign Powers Relative to the Slave Trade. The United
States,” Journals of the House of Commons, 1823, LXXIII, 707-11.

note: the reference is to the unratified American treaty. In fact, negotiations between
Great Britain and the United States in the period referred to by Brougham did not
reach the treaty stage.

referred to: 843

“Copies of Communications between the First Lord of the Treasury and the
Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of
England, Relating to an Alteration in the Exclusive Privileges Enjoyed by the Bank of

referred to: 582, 607

“A Bill to Permit, until 1st May, 1828, Certain Corn, Meal, and Flour to be Entered

note: enacted as 7 & 8 George IV, c. 57 (1827).

referred to: 107

“A Bill for the More Easy Recovery of Small Debts in the County Courts of England
and Wales, and for Extending the Jurisdiction Thereof,” 9 George IV (13 June, 1828),

note: not enacted.

referred to: 115

“First Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Practice and

referred to: 621

“Eighteenth Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the Collection and
Management of the Revenue Arising in Ireland and Great Britain: Post Office

referred to: 643, 644-5
“First Report Made to His Majesty by the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Law of England Respecting Real Property” (20 May, 1829), *PP*, 1829, X, 1-82.

referred to: 621


note: this is the version as amended by the Committee Not enacted.

referred to: 947

“Report of the Select Committee on the State of the Poor in Ireland; Being a Summary of the First, Second and Third Reports of Evidence Taken before That Committee: Together with an Appendix of Accounts and Papers,” *PP*, 1830, VII, 1-1039.

note: the quotations are in quotations from “Third Report of the Commissioners for Inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland” (1836), *q.v.*; that at 939-40 is indirect.

quoted: 939, 939-40, 940

referred to: 939, 940

939.27 “There] It appears that “there (44)

940.12-14 work,” . . . can] work can (45)

940.15 and improvement] and an improvement (45)

940.18 or are suited] or suited (45)

940.20-1 may yeomanry] [not in italics] (45)


note: not enacted.

referred to: 625


note: not enacted.

referred to: 627
“A Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Laws Prohibiting the Payment of Wages in Goods, or Otherwise than in the Current Coin of the Realm,” 1 William IV (16 Dec., 1830), PP, 1830-31, II, 559-71.

note: the reference at 220 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830. Enacted as 1 & 2 William IV, c. 37 (1831).

referred to: 212-13, 220

“A Bill to Facilitate Voluntary Emigration to His Majesty’s Possessions Abroad,” 1 William IV (22 Feb., 1831), PP, 1830-31, I, 463-75.

note: not enacted.

referred to: 270-3


note: referred to by JSM as “Lord John Russell’s Bill” at 276. Only those references specific to this Bill are here given. See also the Bills with the same title of 25 June and 12 Dec., 1831, and the statute as enacted, 2 & 3 William IV, c. 45, the First Reform Act. The reference at 790 is in a quotation from Wakefield.

referred to: 261, 276-7, 283-4, 288, 508, 696, 790, 1101, 1103


note: for the proposed amendments, see ibid., 47-216. The references at 316, 324, and 326-7 are prospective. Only the references specific to this Bill are here given. See also the Bills with the same title of 14 Mar. and 12 Dec., 1831, and the statute as enacted, 2 & 3 William IV, c. 45, the First Reform Act.

referred to: 316, 324, 326-7, 348, 358, 1101, 1103


note: not enacted.

referred to: 625


note: not enacted.
referred to: 348


Note: this series used for ease of reference. The English and French texts are given. The treaty is also in *PP*, 1831-32, XLVIII, 369ff. It was ratified 16 Dec., 1831. The references are in, or derive from, a quotation from Tocqueville.

referred to: 842

“A Bill to Amend the Representation of the People in England and Wales,” 2 William IV (12 Dec., 1831), *PP*, 1831-32, III, 1-54

Note: enacted as 2 & 3 William IV, c. 45 (the First Reform Act, *q.v.*). For the proposed amendments, see *ibid.*, 55-192. Only those references specific to this Bill are here given. See also the Bills with the same title of 14 Mar. and 25 June, 1831.

referred to: 488, 499, 514, 799, 800, 846, 1101, 1103


Note: not enacted.

referred to: 601


referred to: 577

“Copy of an Award of the King of the Netherlands, upon the Disputed Points of Boundary under the Fifth Article of the Treaty of Ghent, between Great Britain and the United States of America,” *PP*, 1831-32, XXXII, 241-53.

referred to: 834, 835

“Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, for the Year Ended 5th January, 1833,” *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 20, App., i-xxxiv.

referred to: 617


Note: the reference is to the Ten Hours’ Bill. Not enacted.
referred to: 601


note: not enacted.

referred to: 605


note: this series used for ease of reference. The English and French texts are given. The treaty is also in PP, 1833, XLIII, 177ff. The references are in, or derive from, a quotation from Tocqueville.

referred to: 842-4


note: not enacted.

referred to: 627, 629, 947


note: enacted as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 42.

referred to: 625


note: enacted (amended) as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 37 (1833).

referred to: 605


note: brought in by William Brougham; not enacted.

referred to: 627-8
“Resolutions Proposed by Lord Viscount Althorp, in the Committee on the Bank Charter” (31 May, 1833), PP, 1833, XXIII, 299-300.

referred to: 576-83, 590, 591

“Report from the Select Committee on the Sale of Beer, with Minutes of Evidence” (21 June, 1833), PP, 1833, XV, 1-260.

referred to: 637


note: enacted as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 37 (1833).

referred to: 605


note: enacted (amended) as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 85.

referred to: 606

“First Report of the Central Board of His Majesty’s Commissioners Appointed to Collect Information in the Manufacturing Districts, as to the Employment of Children in Factories, and as to the Propriety and Means of Curtailing the Hours of Their Labour; with Minutes of Evidence, and Reports by the District Commissioners,” 3 William IV (28 June, 1833), PP, 1833, XX, 1-1125.

referred to: 634


note: enacted as 3 & 4 William IV, c 98.

referred to: 576-83, 590-2, 601


note: enacted (amended) as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 94 (1833).

referred to: 624

note: not enacted.

referred to: 626


note: the reference is to the Labour Rate Bill, not enacted.

referred to: 634, 636


note: enacted as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 103 (1833).

referred to: 601, 633-4

“Copy of the Letter Addressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Commissioners for Inquiring into the Poor Laws, Dated 23rd February Last; and of the Answer Returned by the Commissioners” (5 Aug., 1833), *PP*, 1833, XXXII, 342-6.

quoted: 635, 637

referred to: 603, 636

635.30 Under] But under (345)

637.4 the] A fourth objection to the Labour-rate system is the (345)


referred to: 617


note: not enacted.

referred to: 637

note: enacted as 3 & 4 William IV, c. 94 (1833).

referred to: 624

“Report from the Select Committee on Municipal Corporations; with the Minutes of Evidence Taken before Them,” PP, 1833, XIII, 1-399.

referred to: 585, 589


referred to: 591


note: for the amendments and proposed amendments see ibid., 291-445. Enacted as 4 & 5 William IV, c 76 (1834).

referred to: 707-13, 713-16, 735, 743, 777

“First Report from His Majesty’s Commissioners on Criminal Law” (24 June, 1834), PP, 1834, XXVI, 117-77.

referred to: 621

“Report from the Select Committee Appointed to Examine the Papers Respecting Sinecure Offices Presented to the House on the 26th February Last, Intituled, ‘Returns Explaining the Nature, Tenure, and Emoluments of All Sinecure Offices within the United Kingdom,’ ” PP, 1834, VI, 339-572.

referred to: 646


referred to: 538, 686, 686-7, 744, 774-6, 776, 778, 887, 945, 987

“Copy of the Correspondence between the Commissioners for the Affairs of India and the Court of Directors of the East India Company, in the Years 1832 and 1833, Relative to the Claim of Certain Bankers on the King of Oude,” PP, 1834, XLIV, 101-40.
referred to: 1191


referred to: 631, 770

“Second Report from the Select Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Amount of Advances Made by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland,” PP, 1835, XX, 191-6.

note: the reference is in a quotation from an anonymous article in The Nation, 24 Oct., 1846, q.v.

referred to: 922


referred to: 776-8

“Report from the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies; Together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix” (1 Aug., 1836), PP, 1836, XI, 499-765.

referred to: 793


note: three quotations at 939-40 are from “Report of the Select Committee on the State of the Poor in Ireland” (1830), q.v.

quoted: 938, 939, 939-40, 940

referred to: 913, 938

938.24-5 “Having,” . . “improvements] [paragraph] Having then improvements (17)

939.14 “to make] [paragraph] We recommend that the Board of Improvement shall be authorized to appoint Commissioners, from time to time, to make (18)

939.27 There] “It appears that there (18)

939.33 “states that] “That gentleman states, that (18)

940.12-14 work,” . . can] work can (18)

940.20-1 may . . . yeomanry] [not in italics] (18)

note: Chadwick’s *Report on the Sanitary Condition* arose out of this and the “Fifth Report” (1839), q.v.

referred to: 822

“A Bill to Amend the Law Relating to the Custody of Infants,” 2 Victoria (25 Apr., 1839), PP, 1839, II, 559-63.

note: enacted as 2 & 3 Victoria, c. 54.

referred to: 918


note: Chadwick’s *Report on the Sanitary Condition* arose out of this and the “Fourth Report” (1838), q.v.

referred to: 822


referred to: 833, 834


referred to: 750

“A Bill to Amend the Laws for the Importation of Corn,” 5 Victoria (4 Mar., 1842), PP, 1842, I, 563-89.

note: enacted as 5 & 6 Victoria, Sess. 2, c. 14 (1842).

referred to: 805


referred to: 830-6

referred to: 822, 829


note: enacted as 7 & 8 Victoria, c. 32 (1844).

referred to: 845, 852


referred to: 890, 963


note: enacted as 9 & 10 Victoria, c. 22.

referred to: 860


note: not enacted. The reference at 1007-8 is in a quotation from an anonymous article in the *Northern Whig*, 15 Dec., 1846, q.v.

referred to: 881-2, 912, 1007-8


note: not enacted.

referred to: 911, 912-13, 942-5

“Report from the Select Committee on Andover Union; Together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index” (20 Aug., 1846), *PP*, 1846, V, Pts. 1 and 2.

referred to: 924

“Treasury Minute” (1 Dec., 1846), *PP*, 1847, LVI, 365.

note: published in the *Morning Chronicle*, 21 Dec., 1846, q.v. for the collation.

quoted: 1028

referred to: 1026-9, 1030, 1033, 1034
“Return of the Total Population of Great Britain in 1831 and 1841, Also of the
Number of Adult Males Employed in Agriculture at Those Periods Respectively, as
Stated in the Reports of the Census Commissioners,” *Sessional Papers of the House
of Lords*, 1846, XIX, 1-2.

referred to: 863


note: enacted as 10 Victoria, c. 31.

referred to: 1058, 1066-9, 1069-73, 1076, 1077

“A Bill to Facilitate the Improvement of Landed Property in Ireland by the Owners
Thereof, and Thereby to Afford Employment to the Labouring Classes,” 10 Victoria
(8 Feb., 1847), *PP*, 1847, II, 137-64.

note: enacted as 10 Victoria, c. 32.

referred to: 1068-9

“An Account of Loans Advanced by the Imperial Treasury for Public Works in
Ireland:—Similar Account for England and Scotland:—Remittances from the British
and Irish Exchequers; and Totals of Relief of Taxation to Great Britain and Ireland
Respectively, in Each Year since 1800,” *PP*, 1847, LIV, 91-282.

referred to: 1098


note: the bill as amended by the House of Lords appears at 233-6. Enacted as 11
Victoria, c. 12.

referred to: 1117-18

“A Bill for the Establishment of the ‘Farmers’ Estate Society of Ireland,’ ” 11 & 12

note: enacted as 11 & 12 Victoria, c. 153 (Local Act).

referred to: 1113

“A Bill to Alter the Oaths to Be Taken by Members of the Two Houses of Parliament
Not Professing the Roman Catholic Religion,” 12 Victoria (23 Feb., 1849), *PP*, 1849,
IV, 419-24.
note: introduced by Lord John Russell in a speech on 19 Feb., 1849, q.v. It was not enacted.

quoted: 1136

referred to: 1135-9

1136.22 “on the . . . Christian,”] I A.B. swear, that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and that I will maintain the succession of the Crown, as established by an Act, intituled, “An Act for the Further Limitation of the Crown, and Better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,” and that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, Person, State, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, authority, or power within this realm; and that I will defend, to the utmost of my power, the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws; and I do make this recognition, declaration and promise heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the . . . Christian. (419-20)


note: not enacted.

referred to: 1178

“Report of G.A. à Beckett, Esq., to the Poor Law Board, on the Operation of the Laws of Settlement and Removal of the Poor in the Counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, and Essex, and in the Reading Union in Berkshire.” In “Reports to the Poor Law Board, on the Laws of Settlement, and Removal of the Poor,” PP, 1850, XXVII, 229-90.

referred to: 1156-7


note: enacted as 16 & 17 Victoria, c. 95.

referred to: 1190-4, 1194-6

“General Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, for the Re-establishment of Peace. With Three Conventions Annexed Thereto,” PP, 1856, LXI, 1-34.

referred to: 1223-4, 1224-6, 1226

“Proclamation of the National Committee” (22 Jan., 1863). In “Correspondence of the British Government Respecting the Insurrection in Poland, Part I,” PP, 1863, LXXV, 40-1.
referred to: 1203

“A Bill to Provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales,” 33 Victoria (17 Feb., 1870), PP, 1870, I, 505-42.

note: enacted as 33 & 34 Victoria, c. 75.

referred to: 1222-3


note: not enacted.

referred to: 1242

STATUTES

23 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 1. Every Person Able in Body under the Age of Sixty Years. Not Having to Live On, Being Required, Shall Be Bound to Serve Him That Doth Require Him, or Else Committed to Gaol, until He Find Surety to Serve (1349)

referred to: 87

23 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 2. If a Workman or Servant Depart from Service before the Time Agreed upon, He Shall Be Imprisoned (1349).

referred to: 87

23 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 3. The Old Wages, and No More, Shall Be Given to Servants (1349).

referred to: 87

23 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 5. If Any Artificer or Workman Take More Wages than Were Wont to Be Paid, He Shall Be Committed to the Gaol (1349).

referred to: 87

23 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 8. He That Taketh More Wages than Is Accustomedly Given, Shall Pay the Surplusage to the Town Where He Dwelleth, towards a Payment to the King of a Tenth and Fifteenth Granted to Him (1349).

referred to: 87


referred to: 87

referred to: 87


referred to: 87

25 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 4. Shoes, &c. Shall Be Sold as in the 20th Year of King Edward the 3d. Artificers Sworn to Use Their Crafts as They Did in the 20th Year of the Same King (1350).

referred to: 87

25 Edward III, Stat. 1, c. 5. The Several Punishments of Persons Offending against This Statute (1350).

referred to: 87

12 Richard II, c. 3. No Servant Shall Depart from One Hundred to Another, without a Testimonial under the King’s Seal, on Pain of Being Set in the Stocks (1388).

referred to: 87

12 Richard II, c. 4. The Several Penalties for Giving or Taking More Wages than Is Limited by Statute (1388).

referred to: 87

12 Richard II, c. 7. The Punishment of Beggars Able to Serve, and a Provision for Impotent Beggars (1388).

referred to: 87

4 Henry IV, c. 4. The King Will Grant No Lands, &c. but to Such as Shall Deserve Them. The Punishment of Those Who Shall Make Any Demand without Desert (1402).

note: the quotation is in a quotation from Senior. The phrase ex mero motu (“of his own will”), of which mero motu regis is another version, was first used for grants of land under this act.

quoted: 756, 764

note: also revived by 35 Elizabeth, c. 7 (q.v.) to replace the death penalties established by 1 Edward VI, c. 3, and 14 Elizabeth, c. 5 (q.v.), and to restore whipping and the stocks as punishments for those leaving their homes and work.

referred to: 87

27 Henry VIII, c. 20. For Tithes to Be Paid throughout This Realm (1535).

note: the reference at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 221, 534-40, 816-17

32 Henry VIII, c. 7. For the True Payment of Tithes and Offerings (1540).

note: the reference at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 221, 534-40, 816-17

32 Henry VIII, c. 42. For Barbers and Surgeons (1540).

note: superseded by 25 George II, c. 37 (1752), q.v.

referred to: 48

33 Henry VIII, c. 20. An Act for Due Process to Be Had in Highe Treason in Cases of Lunacy or Madness (1541).

note: s. 1 describes how, whenever a case of treason by a peer arises, the court of the Lord High Steward is convened and a peer made Lord High Steward “for the occasion only.” JSM uses the expression pro hâc vice to describe the State’s general power to intervene on specific occasions, here in cases of extraordinary poverty in Ireland.

referred to: 187, 943

1 Edward VI, c. 3. An Act for the Punishing of Vagabonds, and for the Relief of the Poor and Impotent Persons (1547).

note: repealed by 3 & 4 Edward VI, c. 16 (q.v.), which revived 22 Henry VIII, c. 12 (q.v.).

referred to: 87

2 & 3 Edward VI, c. 13. An Act for Payment of Tithes (1548).
note: the reference at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”, see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 221, 534-40, 816-17

3 & 4 Edward VI, c. 16. An Act Touching the Punishment of Vagabonds and Other Idle Persons (1549).

note: repealed 1 Edward VI, c. 3 (q.v.) and revived 22 Henry VIII, c. 12 (q.v.)

referred to: 87

1 Elizabeth I, c. 1. An Act to Restore to the Crown the Ancient Jurisdiction over the Estate Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, and Abolishing All Foreign Powers Repugnant to the Same (1558).

referred to: 47

14 Elizabeth I, c. 5. An Act for the Punishment of Vagabonds, and for the Relief of the Poor and Impotent (1572).

note: repealed by 35 Elizabeth, c. 7 (q.v.), which revived 22 Henry VIII, c. 12 (q.v.)

referred to: 87


note: repealed 14 Elizabeth, c. 5 (q.v.), and revived 22 Henry VIII, c. 12 (q.v.)

referred to: 87

43 Elizabeth I, c. 2. An Act for the Reliefe of the Poore (1601).

note: see also 4 & 5 William IV, c. 76. The references at 216 and 218 are in a quotation from Senior; that at 873 is in a quotation from Grote.

referred to: 216, 218, 587, 634-8, 673, 685-6, 708, 775, 863, 873, 881, 931, 943, 944, 993, 1006, 1068


quoted: 1073

1073.19-20 “who contemn and neglect the performance of so religious and necessary a duty”] All which His Maiestie doth expressly charge and command, shall bee reverently and devoutly performed by all His loving Subjects, as they tender the favour of Almighty God, and would avoid his iust indignation against this Land, and
upon paine of such punishments, as His Maiesty can iustly inflict upon all such as shall conterme or neglecd so religious a Worke. (2)

16 Charles I, c. 11. A Repeal of a Branch of a Statute Primo Elizabethae, concerning Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical (1640).

referred to: 47


note: one of the Navigation Laws.

referred to: 28


referred to: 1233

13 & 14 Charles II, c. 12. An Act for the Better Relief of the Poor of This Kingdom (1662).

note: the references at 216 and 218 are in a quotation from Senior; that at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 216, 218, 221, 778

15 Charles II, c. 7. An Act for the Encouragement of Trade (1663).

note: one of the Navigation Laws.

referred to: 28


referred to: 938


referred to: 116-17, 587

31 Charles II, c. 2. An Act for the Better Securing the Liberty of the Subject, and for the Prevention of Imprisonments beyond the Seas (27 May, 1679).

note: the Habeas Corpus Act.
referred to: 417

1 William and Mary, Sess. 2, c. 2. An Act for Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and Settling the Succession of the Crown (1688).

referred to: 133

3 William and Mary, c. 2. An Act for the Abrogating the Oath of Supremacy in Ireland, and Appointing Other Oaths (1691).

note: the first of the penal laws imposed on Ireland in the eighteenth century. The remainder were enacted by the Irish parliament, *q.v.* under Ireland.

referred to: 1097

4 William and Mary, c. 1. An Act for Granting to Their Majesties an Aid of Four Shillings in the Pound for One Year, for Carrying on a Vigorous War against France (1692).

referred to: 1233

5 & 6 William and Mary, c. 20. An Act for Granting to Their Majesties Several Rates and Duties upon Tunnage of Ships and Vessels, and upon Beer, Ale, and Other Liquors, for Securing Certain Recompences and Advantages in the Said Act Mentioned, to Such Persons as Shall Voluntarily Advance the Sum of Fifteen Hundred Thousand Pounds, towards the Carrying on the War against France (1694).


referred to: 575-6, 845

7 & 8 William III, c. 20. An Act for Granting to His Majesty an Additional Duty upon All French Goods and Merchandize (1696).

referred to: 32


referred to: 1232

8 & 9 William III, c. 22. An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties upon Malt, Mum, Sweets, Cyder and Perry, as Well towards Carrying on the War against France, as for the Necessary Occasions of His Majesty’s Household, and Other Occasions (1697).

note: the original Malt Tax.

referred to: 859-62
10 & 11 William III, c. 10. An Act to Prevent the Exportation of Wooll out of the Kingdom of Ireland and England into Foreign Parts; and for the Encouragement of the Woollen Manufactures in the Kingdom of England (1699).

note: expanded by 5 George II, c. 21, q.v.

referred to: 1097


referred to: 133

7 Anne, c. 7. An Act for Enlarging the Capital Stock of the Bank of England, and for Raising a Further Supply to Her Majesty, for the Service of the Year One Thousand Seven Hundred and Nine (1708).

referred to: 848


note: one of the laws referred to which restricted Irish commerce in the eighteenth century.

referred to: 1097

10 Anne, c. 19. An Act for Laying Several Duties upon All Sope and Paper Made in Great Britain, or Imported into the Same; and upon Chequered and Striped Linens Imported; and upon Certain Silks, Callicoes, Linens, and Stuffs, Printed, Painted, or Stained; and upon Several Kinds of Stampt Vellum, Parchment, and Paper; and upon Certain Printed Papers, Pamphlets, and Advertisements; for Raising the Sum of Eighteen Hundred Thousand Pounds by Way of Lottery towards Her Majesty’s Supply and for Licensing an Additional Number of Hackney Chairs; and for Charging Certain Stocks of Cards and Dice; and for Better Securing Her Majesty’s Duties to Arise in the Office for the Stampt Duties by Licences for Marriages and Otherwise; and for Relief of Persons Who Have Not Claimed Their Lottery Tickets in Due Time, or Have Lost Exchequer Bills, or Lottery Tickets; and for Borrowing Money upon Stock (Part of the Capital of the South Sea Company) for the Use of the Publick (1711).

note: all the references are to the “taxes on knowledge”; some of those at 546 and 564-6 are also to taxes on soap.

referred to: 268, 499, 529, 546, 564-6, 645, 781

12 Anne, Second Session, c. 16. An Act to Reduce the Rate of Interest, without Any Prejudice to Parliamentary Securities (1713).
note: cited in *Statutes of the Realm* as 13 Anne, c. 15 (1714). The reference is to the Usury Laws, of which this was the most significant.

referred to: 583


note: the Septennial Act.

referred to: 492, 493, 504

9 George I, c. 7. An Act for Amending the Laws Relating to the Settlement, Imployement and Relief of the Poor (1722).

note: the references are in a quotation from Senior.

referred to: 216, 218

11 George I, c. 7. An Act for Rating Such Unrated Goods and Merchandizes as Are Usually Imported into This Kingdom (1724).

note: one of the laws referred to which restricted Irish commerce in the eighteenth century.

referred to: 1097

11 George I, c. 8. An Act for Continuing the Duties upon Malt, Mum, Cyder and Perry, . . . and for Explaining a Late Act in Relation to Stampt-Duties on News-papers . . . (1724).

referred to: 268, 499, 529, 546, 547, 564-6, 645, 781

3 George II, c. 25. An Act for the Better Regulation of Juries (1730).

referred to: 92

5 George II, c. 21. An Additional Act for the Encouragement of the Woollen Manufactures of This Kingdom, by the More Effectual Preventing the Unlawful Exportation of the Woollen Manufactures of the Kingdom of Ireland to Foreign Parts (1732).

note: expanded 10 & 11 William III, c. 10, q.v.

referred to: 1097

9 George II, c. 36. An Act to Restrain the Disposition of Lands, Whereby the Same Become Unalienable (1736).
referred to: 1232

19 George II, c. 12. An Act for Granting to His Majesty Several Rates and Duties upon Glass, and upon Spiritous Liquors (1746).

referred to: 1097

22 George II, c. 46. An Act to Continue Several Laws for Preventing Exactions of the Occupiers of Locks and Wears upon the River Thames Westward . . . and for Allowing Quakers to Make Affirmation in Cases Where an Oath Is or Shall Be Required (1749).

referred to: 15, 31


referred to: 48


referred to: 617

19 George III, c. 56. An Act for Altering, Amending, and Enforcing, So Much of an Act, Made in the Seventeenth Year of the Reign of His Present Majesty, Intituled, An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties on Licences to Be Taken out by All Persons Acting as Auctioneers (1779).

referred to: 43, 564

22 George III, c. 48. An Act for Charging a Duty on Persons Whose Property Shall Be Insured against Loss by Fire (1782).

referred to: 546, 564, 566

23 George III, c. 49. An Act for Repealing an Act Made in the Twenty-second Year of His Present Majesty, Intituled, An Act for Charging a Stamp-duty upon Inland Bills of Exchange, Promissory Notes, or Other Notes (1783).

note: repealing 22 George III, c. 33.

referred to: 546

26 George III, c. 31. An Act for Vesting Certain Sums in Commissioners, at the End of Every Quarter of a Year, to Be by Them Applied to the Reduction of the National Debt (1786).

referred to: 406, 766
28 George III, c. 26. An Act for Granting to His Majesty a Certain Sum of Money out of the Consolidated Fund; and for Applying Certain Monies Therein Mentioned for the Service of the Year One Thousand Seven Hundred and Eighty-Eight, and for Further Appropriating the Supplies Granted in This Session of Parliament (1788).

referred to: 265

31 George III, c. 25. An Act for Repealing the Duties Now Charged on Bills of Exchange, Promissory Notes, and Other Notes, Drafts, and Orders, and on Receipts; and for Granting Other Duties in Lieu Thereof (1791).

referred to: 580

34 George III, c. 15. An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Additional Duties on Bricks and Tiles Made in or Imported into Great Britain (28 Mar., 1794).

referred to: 565, 566

35 George III, c. 63. An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Stamp Duties on Sea Insurance (29 May, 1795).

note: amended by 9 George IV, c. 49 (1828).

referred to: 546, 565, 566

37 George III, c. 45. An Act for Confirming and Continuing, for a Limited Time, the Restriction Contained in the Minute of Council of the 26th February, 1797, on Payments of Cash by the Bank (3 May, 1797).

referred to: 18, 852

37 George III, c. 91. An Act to Continue, for a Limited Time, an Act, Made in This Present Session of Parliament, Intituled An Act for Confirming and Continuing, for a Limited Time, the Restriction Contained in the Minute of Council of the 26th February, 1797, on Payments of Cash by the Bank under Certain Regulations and Restrictions (22 June, 1797).

referred to: 18, 852

38 George III, c. 60. An Act for Making Perpetual, Subject to Redemption and Purchase in the Manner Therein Stated, the Several Sums of Money Now Charged in Great Britain as a Land Tax for One Year, from the 25th Day of March 1798 (21 June, 1798).

note: the reference at 567 is in a quotation from The Times.

referred to: 265, 549, 567

note: the reference at 567 is in a quotation from The Times.

referred to: 265, 549, 567


referred to: 575-6, 576, 582


referred to: 142

43 George III, c. 108. An Act to Promote the Building, Repairing, or Otherwise Providing of Churches and Chapels, and of Houses for the Residence of Ministers, and the Providing of Church Yards or Glebes (27 July, 1803).

referred to: 1232

48 George III, c. 22. An Act for Making Perpetual Several Laws Relating to Permitting the Exportation of Tobacco-Pipe-Clay from Great Britain to the British Sugar Colonies in the West Indies; the Importation of Salt from Europe into Quebec in America; and the Prohibiting of Foreign-wrought Silks and Velvets (21 Mar., 1808).

referred to: 369

48 George III, c. 55. An Act for Repealing the Duties of Assessed Taxes, and Granting New Duties in Lieu Thereof, and Certain Additional Duties to Be Consolidated Therewith (1 June, 1808).

referred to: 546, 564-6, 613, 864

49 George III, c. 102. An Act to Appoint Commissioners to Inquire and Examine, until the Fifth Day of August 1811, into the Nature and Extent of the Several Bogs in Ireland, and the Practicability of Draining and Cultivating Them, and the Best Means of Effecting the Same (15 June, 1809).

referred to: 928
54 George III, c. 52. An Act to Revive and Continue, during the Continuance of Any Act Imposing Any Restriction on the Governor and Company of the Bank of England with Respect to Payments in Cash, an Act of the Fifty Second Year of His Present Majesty (4 May, 1814).

referred to: 852


note: the reference at 218 is in a quotation from Senior, that at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 115, 116, 218, 221, 370, 400, 547, 587, 645, 781, 792, 809-10, 829, 839-40, 841, 1263

55 George III, c. 184. An Act for Repealing the Stamp Duties on Deeds, Law Proceedings, and Other Written or Printed Instruments, and the Duties on Fire Insurances and on Legacies and Successions to Personal Estate upon Intestacies (11 July, 1815).

referred to: 539, 546

55 George III, c. 185. An Act for Repealing the Stamp Office Duties on Advertisements, Almanacks, Newspapers, Gold and Silver Plate, Stage Coaches, and Licences for Keeping Stage Coaches (11 July, 1815).

referred to: 268, 499, 529, 546, 564-6, 645, 781

56 George III, c. 65. An Act to Explain and Amend the Acts for Granting Duties on the Profits Arising from Property, Professions, Trades and Offices, so Far as Extend to the Due Assessment and Collection of the Duties for Past Years (22 June, 1816).

referred to: 265, 549


referred to: 142


referred to: 116-17, 587

58 George III, c. 34. An Act to Repeal the Several Bounties on the Exportation of Refined Sugar from Any Part of the United Kingdom (23 May, 1818).
referred to: 348

59 George III, c. 49. An Act to Continue the Restrictions Contained in Several Acts on Payments in Cash by the Bank of England, until the 1st May 1823, and to Provide for the Gradual Resumption of Such Payments; and to Permit the Exportation of Gold and Silver (2 July, 1819).

note: known as Peel’s Act.

referred to: 18, 852-3

60 George III & 1 George IV, c. 1. An Act to Prevent the Training of Persons to the Use of Arms, and to the Practice of Military Evolutions and Exercise (11 Dec., 1819).

note: the first of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 683

60 George III & 1 George IV, c. 2. An Act to Authorise Justices of the Peace, in Certain Disturbed Counties, to Seize and Detain Arms Collected or Kept for Purposes Dangerous to the Public Peace; to Continue in Force until the Twenty Fifth Day of March 1822 (18 Dec., 1819).

note: the second of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 683

60 George III & 1 George IV, c. 4. An Act to Prevent Delay in the Administration of Justice in Cases of Misdemeanour (23 Dec., 1819).

note: the third of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 683

60 George III & 1 George IV, c. 6. An Act for More Effectually Preventing Seditious Meetings and Assemblies; to Continue in Force until the End of the Session of Parliament Next after Five Years from the Passing of the Act (24 Dec., 1819).

note: the fourth of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 683


note: the fifth of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 683
60 George III & 1 George IV, c. 9. An Act to Subject Certain Publications to the Duties of Stamps upon Newspapers, and to Make Other Regulations for Restraining the Abuses Arising from the Publication of Blasphemous and Seditious Libels (30 Dec., 1819).

note: the sixth of the “Six Acts.” The reference at 24 is in a quotation from Lennard.

referred to: 24, 268, 499, 529, 546, 564-6, 645, 683, 781

1 George IV, c. 8. An Act to Allow a Drawback on Goods, Wares and Merchandise Imported into Any British Colony or Plantation in America, on the Exportation Thereof to Any Foreign Country to Which They May Be Legally Exported (22 June, 1820).

note: the references are to Custom House oaths.

referred to: 14, 31-3, 43

1 & 2 George IV, c. 106. An Act to Continue, until the First Day of July One Thousand Eight Hundred and Twenty Four, Several Acts of His Late Majesty, Respecting the Duties of Customs Payable on Merchandize Imported into Great Britain and Ireland from Any Place within the Limits of the East India Company’s Charter (10 July, 1821).

referred to: 25

3 George IV, c. 34. An Act for the Employment of the Poor in Certain Districts of Ireland (24 May, 1822).

referred to: 881


referred to: 75-6

3 George IV, c. 44. An Act to Regulate the Trade between His Majesty’s Possessions in America and the West Indies, and Other Places in America and the West Indies (24 June, 1822).

referred to: 28

3 George IV, c. 55. An Act for the More Effectual Administration of the Office of a Justice of the Peace in and near the Metropolis, and for the More Effectual Prevention of Depredations on the River Thames and Its Vicinity, for Seven Years (5 July, 1822).

referred to: 75-6
3 George IV, c. 60. An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Importation of Corn (15 July, 1822).

note: the reference at 218 is in a quotation from Senior; that at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 115, 116, 218, 221, 370, 400, 547, 587, 645, 781, 792, 809-10, 829, 839-40, 841, 1263

3 George IV, c. 84. An Act to Authorize Certain Temporary Advances of Money, for the Relief of the Distresses Existing in Ireland (26 July, 1822).

referred to: 881

3 George IV, c. 106. An Act to Continue for One Year So Much of an Act of the Last Session of Parliament, as Increases the Duties Payable on Sugar Imported from the East Indies (5 Aug., 1822).

referred to: 25

3 George IV, c. 112. An Act to Authorize the Further Advance of Money out of the Consolidated Fund, for the Completion of Works of a Public Nature, and for the Encouragement of the Fisheries in Ireland (5 Aug., 1822).

referred to: 881

5 George IV, c. 21. An Act to Reduce the Duties on Importation of Raw and Thrown Silk, and to Repeal the Prohibition on the Importation of Silk Manufactures, and to Grant Certain Duties Thereon (12 Apr., 1824).

referred to: 105, 369


referred to: 76, 623

5 George IV, c. 47. An Act to Alter the Laws Relating to the Duties on the Importation, and the Prohibitions on the Exportation of Wool, and of Hare and Coney Skins (3 June, 1824).

referred to: 105

5 George IV, c. 95. An Act to Repeal the Laws Relative to the Combination of Workmen; and for Other Purposes Therein Mentioned (21 June, 1824).

referred to: 142
6 George IV, c. 68. An Act to Regulate the Conveyance of Printed Votes and
Proceedings in Parliament, and Printed Newspapers, by Packet Boats between Great
Britain and Ireland, and the British Colonies, and Also in the United Kingdom (22
June, 1825).

quoted: 645

645.4-5 “compensation for loss of the privilege . . . colonies?”] And Whereas the
Emoluments arising from the Privilege . . . Colonies, now enjoyed by certain Officers
in the Office of His Majesty’s Postmaster General, by virtue of the said in part recited
Act of the Fourth Year of the Reign of His late Majesty King George the Third and
the Powers therein contained, will be reduced by the Operation and Effect of this Act:
And Whereas it is just and reasonable that a compensation should be made to the said
Officers as a Recompence for the Loss of such Privileges. . . . (Sect. 9)

6 George IV, c. 105. An Act to Repeal the Several Laws Relating to the Customs (5
July, 1825).

referred to: 105

6 George IV, c. 107. An Act for the General Regulation of the Customs (5 July,
1825).

referred to: 105


referred to: 564

7 George IV, c. 6. An Act to Limit, and after a Certain Period to Prohibit, the Issuing
of Promissory Notes under a Limited Sum in England (22 Mar., 1826).

referred to: 219

7 George IV, c. 46. An Act for the Better Regulating Copartnerships of Certain
Bankers in England (26 May, 1826).

referred to: 581-2, 590, 849

7 & 8 George IV, c. 27. An Act for Repealing Various Statutes in England Relative to
the Benefit of Clergy, and to Larceny and Other Offences Connected Therewith, and
to Malicious Injuries to Property, and to Remedies against the Hundred (21 June,
1827).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 116-17, 587, 621
7 & 8 George IV, c. 28. An Act for Further Improving the Administration of Justice in Criminal Cases in England (21 June, 1827).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 621

7 & 8 George IV, c. 29. An Act for Consolidating and Amending the Laws in England Relative to Larceny and Other Offices Connected Therewith (21 June, 1827).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 621

7 & 8 George IV, c. 30. An Act for Consolidating and Amending the Laws in England Relative to Malicious Injuries to Property (21 June, 1827).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 621

7 & 8 George IV, c. 31. An Act for Consolidating and Amending the Laws in England Relative to Remedies against the Hundred (21 June, 1827).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 621

7 & 8 George IV, c. 56. An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Customs (2 July, 1827).

referred to: 547

7 & 8 George IV, c. 57. An Act to Permit, until 1st May, 1828, Certain Corn, Meal, and Flour to Be Entered for Home Consumption (2 July, 1827).

note: the reference at 218 is in a quotation from Senior; that at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”, see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 107, 115, 116, 218, 221, 370, 400, 547, 587, 645, 781, 792, 809-10, 829, 839-40, 841, 1263

7 & 8 George IV, c. 68. An Act for the Management and Improvement of the Land Revenues of the Crown in Ireland, and for Other Purposes Relating Thereto (2 July, 1827).

note: see also 10 George IV, c. 50.

referred to: 960, 964
9 George IV, c. 17. An Act for Repealing So Much of Several Acts as Imposes the Necessity of Receiving the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper as a Qualification for Certain Offices and Employments (9 May, 1828).

note: the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (13 Charles II, Stat. 2, c. 1; 25 Charles II, c. 2; and 16 George II, c. 30).

referred to: 821

9 George IV, c. 31. An Act for Consolidating and Amending the Statutes in England Relative to Offences against Property (27 June, 1828).

note: one of Peel’s law reforms.

referred to: 621

9 George IV, c. 44. An Act to Provide for the Execution, throughout the United Kingdom, of the Several Laws of Excise Relating to Licenses (15 July, 1828).

referred to: 546


referred to: 541, 566

9 George IV, c. 49. An Act to Amend the Laws in Force Relating to the Stamp Duties on Sea Insurance (15 July, 1828).

referred to: 546, 565, 566

9 George IV, c. 60. An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Importation of Corn (15 July, 1828).

note: the reference at 218 is in a quotation from Senior; that at 221 is in a quotation from “W.M.J.”; see Examiner, 26 Dec., 1830.

referred to: 115, 116, 218, 221, 266, 370, 400, 523, 534-40, 547, 587, 619, 620, 645, 781, 792, 804, 809-10, 829, 839-40, 841, 1263


referred to: 116-17, 587

10 George IV, c. 7. An Act for the Relief of His Majesty’s Roman Catholic Subjects (13 Apr., 1829).
note: the Catholic Emancipation Act.

referred to: 486, 821, 1181


note: see also 7 & 8 George IV, c. 68.

referred to: 960, 964


referred to: 114-16

11 George IV & 1 William IV, c. 17. An Act to Alter and Amend an Act of the Seventh and Eighth Years of His Present Majesty, for Consolidating and Amending the Laws of Excise on Malt Made in the United Kingdom, and for Amending the Laws Relating to Brewers in Ireland, and the Malt Allowance on Spirits in Scotland and Ireland (29 May, 1830).

note: the Malt Tax.

referred to: 564, 859-62

11 George IV & 1 William IV, c. 72. An Act to Allow, before the Fifth Day of July One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty-One, Sugar to Be Delivered out of Warehouse to Be Refined (23 July, 1830).

referred to: 348

1 & 2 William IV, c. 4. An Act to Abolish Certain Oaths and Affirmations, Taken and Made in the Customs and Excise Departments of His Majesty's Revenue, and to Substitute Declarations in Lieu Thereof (30 July, 1831).

referred to: 695

1 & 2 William IV, c. 16. An Act to Discontinue or Alter the Duties of Customs upon Coals, Slates, Cotton Wool, Barillo, and Wax (23 Aug., 1831).

referred to: 541, 547

1 & 2 William IV, c. 32. An Act to Amend the Laws in England Relative to Game (5 Oct., 1831).

referred to. 587

note: the reference at 1028 (to Sect. 32) is in a quotation from the Treasury Minute of 1 Dec., 1846. Amended by 9 & 10 Victoria, c. 1, q.v.

referred to: 881, 1028

1 & 2 William IV, c. 37. An Act to Prohibit the Payment, in Certain Trades, of Wages in Goods, or Otherwise than in the Current Coin of the Realm (15 Oct., 1831).

note: Mr. Littleton’s bill.

referred to: 212-13


referred to: 399

1 & 2 William IV, c. 56. An Act to Establish a Court in Bankruptcy (20 Oct., 1831).

referred to: 622


referred to: 588

2 William IV, c. 34. An Act Consolidating and Amending the Laws against Offences Relating to the Coin (23 May, 1832).

note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622


note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622

2 & 3 William IV, c. 45. An Act to Amend the Representation of the People in England and Wales (7 June, 1832).

note. the references at 764-5 are in a quotation from Senior.
referred to: 261, 276-7, 283, 288, 316, 324, 327, 348, 358, 485, 488, 489, 493, 499, 508, 512, 514, 534, 598, 620-2, 764-5, 767, 768, 790, 797, 798, 799, 800, 1103, 1181

2 & 3 William IV, c. 51. An Act to Regulate the Practice and the Fees in the Vice-Admiralty Courts Abroad, and to Obviate Doubts as to Their Jurisdiction (23 June, 1832).

note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622


note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to. 622

2 & 3 William IV, c. 84. An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Customs (3 Aug., 1832).

referred to: 541, 547, 565

2 & 3 William IV, c. 92. An Act for Transferring the Powers of the High Court of Delegates, Both in Ecclesiastical and Maritime Causes, to His Majesty in Council (7 Aug., 1832).

referred to: 623

2 & 3 William IV, c. 107. An Act for Regulating for Three Years, and from Thence until the End of the Then Next Session of Parliament, the Care and Treatment of Insane Persons in England (11 Aug., 1832).

referred to: 622


referred to: 623

2 & 3 William IV, c. 111. An Act to Abolish Certain Sinecure Offices Connected with the Court of Chancery, and to Make Provision for the Lord High Chancellor on His Retirement from Office (15 Aug., 1832).

referred to: 623

note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622

2 & 3 William IV, c. 121. An Act to Enable His Majesty to Carry into Effect a Convention Made between His Majesty and the King of the French and Emperor of All the Russias, and the King of Bavaria (16 Aug., 1832).

Referred to: 611


note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622


referred to: 608

3 William IV, c. 10. An Act to Reduce the Duty Payable on Cotton Wool Imported into the United Kingdom (17 May, 1833).

referred to: 565

3 William IV, c. 11. An Act for Repealing the Duties and Drawbacks of Excise on Tiles (17 May, 1833).

referred to: 565

3 & 4 William IV, c. 23. An Act to Reduce the Stamp Duties on Advertisements and on Certain Sea Insurances; to Repeal the Stamp Duties on Pamphlets, and on Receipts for Sums under Five Pounds; and to Exempt Insurances on Farming Stock from Stamp Duties (28 June, 1833).

referred to: 565


referred to: 622

referred to: 601, 604-6, 608, 821

3 & 4 William IV, c. 41. An Act for the Better Administration of Justice in His Majesty’s Privy Council (14 Aug., 1833).

note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 623, 626-7


referred to: 625


note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622


note: one of Brougham’s law reforms.

referred to: 622

3 & 4 William IV, c. 73. An Act for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the British Colonies (28 Aug., 1833).

referred to: 601, 602-4, 610, 611, 642, 980

3 & 4 William IV, c. 84. An Act to Provide for the Performance of the Duties of Certain Offices Connected with the Court of Chancery Which Have Been Abolished (28 Aug., 1833).

referred to: 623-4

3 & 4 William IV, c. 85. An Act for Effecting an Arrangement with the East India Company, and for the Better Government of His Majesty’s Indian Territories (28 Aug., 1833).
referred to: 601, 606, 611, 1193


referred to: 601


referred to: 624


referred to: 575-83, 590-2, 601, 607, 611, 845, 846, 849-50, 859


referred to: 623


referred to: 608, 609, 610, 966-7


referred to: 611


referred to: 601, 633-4, 730


referred to: 708-12, 743, 775, 776, 777, 886, 887, 888, 917, 924, 925-6, 930, 931, 942, 943, 944, 945, 987, 1006

4 & 5 William IV, c. 95. An Act to Empower His Majesty to Erect South Australia into a British Province or Provinces, and to Provide for the Colonization and Government Thereof (15 Aug., 1834).
referred to: 789

5 & 6 William IV, c. 59. An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Several Laws Relating to the Cruel and Improper Treatment of Animals, and the Mischiefs Arising from the Driving of Cattle, and to Make Other Provisions in Regard Thereto (9 Sept., 1835).

referred to: 953


referred to: 949


referred to: 863

1 & 2 Victoria, c. 56. An Act for the More Effectual Relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland (3 July, 1838).

referred to: 885, 887, 911, 930, 931, 943, 944, 945

2 & 3 Victoria, c. 1. An Act to Amend an Act of the First and Second Year of Her Present Majesty, for the More Effectual Relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland (15 Mar., 1839).

note: see also 1 & 2 Victoria, c. 56, and 6 & 7 Victoria, c. 92.

referred to: 881, 885, 911, 930, 931, 943, 944, 945

2 & 3 Victoria, c. 3. An Act to Authorize the Immediate Distribution of a Portion of the Fund Applicable to the Relief of Persons Entitled to Certain Arrears of the Tithe Compositions under an Act of the Last Session of Parliament (27 Mar., 1839).

referred to: 881


referred to: 881

2 & 3 Victoria, c. 54. An Act to Amend the Law Relating to the Custody of Infants (17 Aug., 1839).

referred to: 918

referred to: 860, 862

5 & 6 Victoria, c. 35. An Act Granting to Her Majesty Duties on Profits Arising from Property, Professions, Trades, and Offices (22 June, 1842).

referred to: 860, 862, 864, 1076

5 & 6 Victoria, c. 57. An Act to Continue until the Thirty-first Day of July One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-seven, and to the End of the Then Next Session of Parliament, the Poor Law Commission; and for the Further Amendment of the Laws Relating to the Poor in England (30 July, 1842).

referred to: 925


note: see also 1 & 2 Victoria, c. 56, and 2 & 3 Victoria, c. 1.

referred to: 885, 911, 930, 931, 943, 944, 945


note: the reference is prospective.

referred to: 845

8 & 9 Victoria, c. 4. An Act to Continue for Three Years the Duties on Profits Arising from Property, Professions, Trades, and Offices (5 Apr., 1845).

referred to: 1076


referred to: 1074


note: the reference at 1028 (to Sect. 6) is in a quotation from a Treasury Minute Amending 1 & 2 William IV, c. 33, q.v.

referred to: 932, 935-6, 1028
9 & 10 Victoria, c. 4. An Act to Amend the Acts for Promoting the Drainage of Lands, and Improvement of Navigation and Water Power in Connexion with Such Drainage, in Ireland; and to Afford Facilities for Increased Employment for the Labouring Classes in Works of Drainage during the Present Year (5 Mar., 1846).

referred to: 932

9 & 10 Victoria, c. 22. An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Importation of Corn (26 June, 1846).

referred to: 860, 946, 966, 1263


referred to: 945-6, 948-9


note: the reference at 991 is in a quotation from Scrope.

referred to: 932, 991


referred to: 932, 935-6


referred to: 932, 935-6

10 Victoria, c. 31. An Act to Make Further Provision for the Relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland (8 June, 1847).

note: all the references but the last are to the bill of 25 Jan., 1847 (q.v.), which this statute enacted.

referred to: 1058, 1066-9, 1069-73, 1076, 1077, 1098


note: the bill (q.v.) was brought in on 7 Apr., 1848.

referred to: 1117-18
11 & 12 Victoria, c. 95. An Act to Empower the Lord Lieutenant or Other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland to Apprehend, and Detain until the First Day of March One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-Nine, Such Persons, as He or They Shall Suspect of Conspiring against her Majesty’s Person and Government (25 July, 1848).

referred to: 1114


note: the reference is to the bill of 25 July, 1848, q.v.

referred to: 1113


referred to: 1197

16 & 17 Victoria, c. 95. An Act to Provide for the Government of India (20 Aug., 1853).

note: references are to the bill of 9 June, 1853, q.v.

referred to: 1190-4, 1194-6

33 & 34 Victoria, c. 75. An Act to Provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales (9 Aug., 1870).

referred to: 1222

FRANCE

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

Projet de loi sur les successions et les substitutions (5 Feb.), Moniteur, 1826, 168.

referred to: 126

Projet de loi sur la police de la presse (27 Dec.), Moniteur, 1826, 1730.

note: presented to the Deputies on 29 Dec., 1826. Withdrawn by an ordinance, 17 Apr. (ibid., 1827, 615).

referred to: 126

Projet de loi sur les communes (9 Feb.), Moniteur, 1829, 178-81.
referred to: 189

Rapport au roi (25 July), Moniteur, 1830, 813-14.

Note: prepared for Charles X by the Polignac ministry (and so referred to as “Rapport au roi”) as the justification for the ordinances of 25 July that brought down the Bourbon monarchy.

referred to: 177

Projet de loi sur l’organisation communale (31 Aug.), Moniteur, 1830, 1007.

Note: presented by Humblot-Conté (q.v.) See also Loi sur l’organisation municipale (21 Mar., 1831).

referred to: 189, 207-8, 211, 215, 237

Proposition tendant à rendre libre les professions de libraire et d’imprimeur, 11 Sept., 1830. See Benjamin Constant de Rebecque.

Projet d’adresse au roi (8 Oct.), Moniteur, 1830, 1274-6 and 1278-82.

referred to: 164, 373

Projet de loi qui doit fixer la dotation de la couronne et la liste civile (14 Dec.), Moniteur, 1830, 1733.

referred to: 223, 386

Projet de loi relatif à l’amortissement (17 Jan.), Moniteur, 1831, 119.

referred to: 247

Projet de loi relatif à la répression de délits commis par la voie des représentations théâtrales (19 Jan.), Moniteur, 1831, 131-2.

referred to: 251

Projet de loi sur l’instruction primaire (20 Jan.), Moniteur, 1831, 136.

referred to: 215, 251

Rapport de la commission chargée d’examiner le projet de loi sur les élections à la chambre des députés (22 Feb.), Moniteur, 1831, 373-8.

referred to: 274

Proposition relative à la révision de l’article 23 de la charte constitutionnelle, 9 Aug., 1831. See Anne Joseph Eusèbe Baconnière de Salverte.
Proposition relative à la loi du divorce (11 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1352.

note: presented by Auguste Jean Marie, baron de Schonen, to the Chamber of Deputies on the 11th, but not discussed until the 18th (ibid., 1426-7); it passed the Chamber of Deputies on 14 Dec. (ibid., 1290-6), but was rejected by the Chamber of Peers on 28 Mar. (ibid., 1832, 897-900).

referred to: 379, 439, 479

Adresse de la chambre des députés au roi (16 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1405.


referred to: 340

Projet de loi sur le transit et les entrepôts (20 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1438-40.

referred to: 374-5, 378, 478

Proposition tendant à restituer aux titulaires les grades et décorations accordés pendant les cent-jours (24 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1456.

note: presented by Boissy-d’Anglas (q.v.) on 24 Aug., it was amended by the Peers on 14-15 Oct. (ibid., 1863-8, 1870-2). On 21 Nov. the government reported the King’s refusal to sanction it, and presented an alternative bill (ibid., 2193-4).

referred to: 352, 367

Projet de loi destiné à remplacer l’article 23 de la charte constitutionnelle (27 Aug.), Moniteur, 1831, 1478.

note: the bill to abolish the hereditary peerage.


Projet de loi sur la liberté individuelle (3 Sept.), Moniteur, 1831, 1504-5.

referred to: 417

Rapport de la commission chargée d’examiner le projet de loi sur le recrutement de l’armée (12 Sept.), Moniteur, 1831, 1561-3.

referred to: 354

Pétition . . . demandant que les cendres de Napoléon soient réclamés pour être déposés sous la colonne de la place Vendôme (13 Sept.), Moniteur, 1831, 1568.

referred to: 354
referred to: 353-4, 385, 391, 476, 477

referred to: 353, 476, 477

Projet de loi sur les attributions départementales (16 Sept.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 1599-1600.
referred to: 353, 476, 477

referred to: 346, 354

referred to: 359, 370, 377, 384-5, 391, 477

referred to: 360, 385, 391, 476, 477

Projet de loi relatif aux expropriations pour cause d’utilité publique (3 Nov.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2041.
referred to: 476, 477

Projet de loi concernant les entrepôts dans l’intérieur et aux frontières (11 Nov.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2110-11.
referred to: 378, 478

Proposition . . . relative à la célébration forcée des dimanches et des fêtes, 6 Dec., 1831. See Auguste Portalis.

Proposition . . . relative au deuil public du 21 janvier, 6 Dec., 1831. See Auguste Portalis.

Proposition pour la reprise à une autre session des travaux législatifs non terminés dans la session précédente, 7 Dec., 1831. See Anne Joseph Eusèbe Baconnière de Salverte.

Projet de loi relatif au régime législatif des colonies (16 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2410.
referred to: 476, 477

Projet de loi portant modification au tarif général des douanes (17 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2426.

referred to: 363, 476

Rapport de la commission chargée d’examiner le projet de loi sur la liste civile (29 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1831, 2542-7.

referred to. 386, 391, 392


referred to: 476-7

Projet de loi sur l’avancement dans l’armée navale (19 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 194.

referred to: 476-7

Proposition . . . relative au travail des fêtes et dimanches, 11 Feb., 1832. See Auguste Portalis.

Rapport de la commission chargée d’examiner le projet de loi sur les céréales (5 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1832, Supplément, i-x.

referred to: 424

Adresse en réponse au discours du trône (4 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2073.

referred to: 532

Projet de loi sur les douanes (5 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2084-5.

referred to: 533, 540

Projet de loi sur l’organisation municipale (8 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2113-14.

note: withdrawn by an ordinance of 11 Apr., 1833; see *ibid.*, 1027.

referred to: 531

Projet de loi sur l’organisation départementale (8 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2114.

referred to: 569-70

Projet de loi sur les attributions communales (8 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2114-16.

referred to: 531, 572
Projet de loi sur le conseil-général et les conseils d’arrondissement du département de la Seine, et sur la municipalité de la ville de Paris (8 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2116-17.

referred to: 531, 680

Projet de loi relatif à l’état de siège (10 Dec.), *Moniteur*, 1832, 2118-19.

referred to: 531, 534, 571


referred to: 531


note: reintroduced (29 Apr., 1833), ibid., 1200.

referred to: 569


referred to: 531, 571

Projet de loi sur les fortifications de la capitale (3 Apr.), *Moniteur*, 1833, 946.

referred to: 593-4

Rapport de la commission chargée d’examiner le projet de loi sur les fortifications de la capitale (22 Apr.), *Moniteur*, 1833, 1149-52.

referred to: 593-4

Projet de loi relatif à la fixation du budget des dépenses de l’exercice 1834 (29 Apr.), *Moniteur*, 1833, 1204.

referred to: 572

Projet de loi relatif à la fixation du budget des recettes de l’exercice 1835 (9 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 78.

referred to: 684

Projet de loi relatif à la fixation du budget des dépenses de l’exercice 1835 (9 Jan.), *Moniteur*, 1834, 146.

referred to: 684
Projet de loi relatif à l’exécution du traité signé le 4 juillet 1831 entre la France et les Etats-Unis (13 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 93.

referred to: 699

Proposition . . . relative à l’abolition des majorats et des substitutions (14 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 112.

referred to: 680

Projet de loi sur les crieurs publiques (24 Jan.), Moniteur, 1834, 154.

referred to: 683, 684, 685

Projet de loi tendant à accorder un crédit supplémentaire pour 1834, au ministère de la guerre (3 Feb.), Moniteur, 1834, 213-14.

referred to: 684

Projet de loi sur les associations (25 Feb.), Moniteur, 1834, 418.

referred to: 685, 688, 689, 699

Projet de loi relatif aux détenteurs d’armes et de munitions de guerre (15 Apr.), Moniteur, 1834, 929-30.

referred to: 705, 706, 732

Projet de loi relatif à un crédit extraordinaire sur l’exercice 1834 (15 Apr.), Moniteur, 1834, 930.

referred to: 705, 706, 732

Projet de loi pour un crédit additionnel au budget du ministère de guerre pour 1835 (15 Apr.), Moniteur, 1834, 930.

referred to: 705, 706, 732


referred to: 746, 747

Projet de loi relatif au traité du 4 janvier 1831 avec les Etats-Unis (9 Apr.), Moniteur, 1835, 794.

referred to: 699

Projet de décret sur l’instruction primaire (30 June), Moniteur, 1848, 1537-8.
referred to: 1105

STATUTES

Decree of National Assembly Abolishing Provincial Assemblies (untitled) (26 Oct.), Moniteur, 1789, 319.

referred to: 186

Decree of National Assembly Dividing France into 83 Departments (untitled) (15 Jan.), Moniteur, 1790, 64.

referred to: 186

Décrets sur l’avancement militaire (20 Sept.), Moniteur, 1790, 1095.

referred to: 616


note: the reference is in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Loi concernant la police de sûreté, la justice criminelle, et l’établissement des jurés (29 Sept., 1791). In Lois, et actes du gouvernement (1806), IV, 244-87.

referred to: 707

Decree on Public Safety, Moniteur, 1 June, 1792, 635, and 14 Aug., 1792, 953.

referred to: 418

Declaration of the National Convention Abolishing Royalty (21 Sept.), Moniteur, 1792, 1130.

note: the reference is in a speech by Godefroi Cavaignac, q.v.

referred to: 1247

Acte constitutionnel de la république (24 June), Moniteur, 1793, 765-6.

referred to: 501, 672

Decree of 31 July, 1793 (untitled), Moniteur, 1793, 914.

referred to: 418
Decree Concerning Education (untitled) (5 brumaire, an II; 26 Oct.), *Moniteur*, 1793, 150-1.

note: the decree, never carried out, is mentioned in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Decree Concerning Education (untitled) (9 brumaire, an II; 30 Oct.), *Moniteur*, 1793, 167.

note: the decree, never carried out, is mentioned in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Decree Concerning Education (untitled) (4 ventôse, an II; 22 Feb.), *Moniteur*, 1794, 632.

note: the decree, never carried out, is mentioned in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Décret sur les fêtes décadaires (18 floréal, an II; 7 May), *Moniteur*, 1794, 932.

referred to: 478-9


note: the decree, never carried out, is mentioned in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 360

Décret relatif aux pères et mères des émigrés (12 floréal, an III; 1 May), *Moniteur*, 1795, 929-30.

referred to: 418


referred to: 418


referred to: 482

Constitution de la république française, proposée au peuple français par la convention nationale. Paris: Imprimerie de la république, an III [1795].
note: the Directorial Constitution.

referred to: 385, 519


note: the Bulletins in this series are individually paged.

referred to: 385, 520


referred to: 518


referred to: 186, 260, 352, 385, 476, 681


referred to: 215


referred to: 186, 260, 352, 385


referred to: 154, 520


referred to: 154

note: the law was passed on, and so referred to as that of, 10 May.

referred to: 154-5


referred to: 681


referred to: 699

Code Napoléon (1803-04), Bull. 154 bis, No. 2653 bis (3 Sept., 1807), Bulletin des lois de l’empire français, 4th ser., Numéros bis.

note: separately paginated, 1-383, with index, 1-80. The “Bulletins bis” are not included in their numerical places in the annual volumes, but are gathered, for each period, in a separate volume. The Code, known until 1807 as the Code civil des Français, was decreed and promulgated in parts between March 1803 and March 1804. One of the references at 1038 is in a quotation from Croker.

referred to: 157, 379, 380, 681, 950, 1037-8, 1047


referred to: 700


referred to: 699


referred to: 699


referred to: 699

referred to: 154-5


note: separately paginated, 1-151, with index, 17-52. The “Bulletins bis” are not included in their numerical places in the annual volumes, but are gathered, for each period, in a separate volume. The Code was enacted in a series of laws (not in this case numbered), dated as above.

referred to: 657, 666, 700

Code pénal, Bull. 277 bis, Nos. 1-7 (12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20 Feb., 1810), *Bulletin des lois de l’empire français*, 4th ser., Numéros bis

note: separately paginated, 1-120, without index. The “Bulletins bis” are not included in their numerical places in the annual volumes, but are gathered, for each period, in a separate volume. The Code was enacted in a series of laws, dated as above.

referred to: 142, 164, 185, 373, 374, 418, 511, 688


referred to: 482


referred to: 481-2


note: the reference at 171 is in a quotation from Ross.

quoted: 482


referred to: 215, 235, 439


referred to: 193, 705


referred to: 376, 421, 479


note: the reference is in a quotation from Montalivet.

referred to: 361


note: established the Sinking Fund.

referred to: 402, 405-6, 428, 570, 572


referred to: 379


referred to: 200, 380


referred to: 137


referred to: 137

referred to: 137


referred to: 131


referred to: 137


referred to: 125, 139


referred to: 370, 477, 533


referred to: 137


referred to: 131


referred to: 137

Loi relative à la répression et à la poursuite des délits commis par la voie de la presse ou par tout autre moyen de publication, Bull. 514, No. 12390 (25 Mar., 1822), *Bulletin des lois du royaume de France*, 7th ser., XIV, 249-55.

referred to: 137


referred to: 126


referred to: 367


referred to: 131


referred to: 157


referred to: 533


referred to: 131, 480

Ordonnance du roi qui licencie la garde nationale de Paris (29 Apr.), *Moniteur*, 1827, 697.

note: this ordinance is not included in the *Bulletin des lois du royaume de France*, 8th ser.

referred to: 125-6


referred to: 163

referred to: 127


referred to: 372, 388, 428


referred to: 275, 297, 518


referred to: 275, 297, 518


referred to: 275, 297, 518


referred to: 275, 297, 518


note: the reference at 361 is in a quotation from Montalivet.


referred to: 215, 235, 355


referred to: 212

Ordonnance du roi relative au retrait de la loi sur l’instruction primaire (23 Feb.), Moniteur, 1831, 382.

referred to: 215


referred to: 211, 238


referred to: 223, 349


referred to: 189, 207-8, 211, 215, 237, 261, 270, 352, 353, 385, 476, 572


referred to: 177, 214, 226


referred to: 270


referred to: 203, 251

Loi sur les contributions extraordinaires de l’exercice 1831, la contribution des majorats, la retenue sur les pensions et traitemens, les crédits extraordinaires, les dépenses départementales, l’enregistrement des mutations concernant les communes, départemens et établissemens publics, le transit des marchandises et le tarif des

referred to: 480


referred to: 270, 732


referred to: 378


note: the law to abolish the hereditary peerage.

referred to: 341, 346, 354, 357, 358, 359, 363, 364, 364-5, 379, 381, 390, 424, 457, 475, 479


referred to: 374-5, 378, 478


referred to: 367


referred to: 378, 478

referred to: 386, 391, 392, 395, 475


referred to: 354, 364, 478


referred to: 478, 479


referred to: 364, 478


referred to: 359, 377, 384-5, 424, 435, 439, 477


referred to: 390-1, 478


referred to: 478


referred to: 346, 378, 391, 402, 405-6, 410, 411, 417, 421, 424, 435, 441, 474, 475, 479, 480, 584, 732


referred to: 346, 378, 391, 402, 405-6, 410, 411, 424, 435, 441, 452, 475, 479, 584, 732

referred to: 474


referred to: 441, 477


referred to: 449, 477


referred to: 351, 372, 374, 478


referred to: 481


referred to: 481


note: the reference at 593 is in a quotation from Croker.

referred to: 481, 483, 495, 515, 524, 532, 593, 706


referred to: 495

referred to: 516


referred to: 519-21


referred to: 570

Règlement relatif à la reprise des travaux législatifs interrompus par la clôture des sessions (31 Dec., 1832), *Moniteur*, 1 Jan, 1833, 5-6.

referred to: 571, 583


referred to: 479


referred to: 570


referred to: 424, 570, 584, 732


referred to: 424, 570, 584, 732


referred to: 680


referred to: 705, 706, 732


referred to: 705, 706, 732


referred to: 732


referred to: 705, 706, 732


referred to: 732


referred to: 743


referred to: 743


Arrêté du gouvernement provisoire qui interdit aux membres de la chambre des pairs à se réunir (24 Feb.), *Moniteur*, 1848, 499.


Décret qui abolit tous les anciens titres de noblesse (29 Feb.), *Moniteur*, 1848, 519.

Décret qui diminue d’une heure, la journée de travail, et abolit le *marchandage* (2 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1848, 529.

Décret qui convoque les assemblées électorales pour élire les représentants du peuple à l’assemblée nationale (5 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1848, 549.


note: see also the decree of 9 Aug., 1848.
translated from: Art. 1er. Toute attaque par l’un des moyens énoncés en l’article 1er de la loi du 17 mai 1819, contre les droits et l’autorité de l’Assemblée nationale, contre les droits et l’autorité que les membres du Pouvoir exécutif tiennent des décrets de l’Assemblée, contre les institutions républicaines et la Constitution, contre le principe de la souveraineté du Peuple et du suffrage universel, sera puni d’un emprisonnement de trois mois à cinq ans, et d’une amende de trois cents francs à six mille francs. [Art. 2 omitted] [Art.] 3. L’attaque par l’un de ces moyens contre la liberté des cultes, le principe de la propriété et les droits de la famille, sera punie d’un emprisonnement d’un mois à trois ans, et d’une amende de cent francs à quatre mille francs. (204-5)

translated from: Art. 4. Quiconque, par l’un des moyens énoncés en l’article 1er de la loi du 17 mai 1819, aura excité à la haine ou au mépris du Gouvernement de la République, sera puni d’un emprisonnement d’un mois à quatre ans, et d’une amende de cent cinquante francs à cinq mille francs. (205)

translated from: Art. 5. L’outrage fait publiquement d’une manière quelconque, à raison de leurs fonctions ou de leur qualité, soit à un ou plusieurs membres de l’Assemblée nationale, soit à un ministre de l’un des cultes que reçoivent un salaire de l’Etat, sera puni d’un emprisonnement de quinze jours à deux ans, et d’une amende de cent francs à quatre mille francs. (205)

translated from: Art. 4 [paragraph] La présente disposition ne peut porter atteinte au droit de discussion et de censure des actes du Pouvoir exécutif et des ministres (205)

any attack.”] [see collation for 1116.11-16 above]

GERMANY

Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preussischen Staaten (5 Feb., 1794).

note: the reference at 361 is in a quotation from Montalivet; that at 729-30 is in a quotation from Sarah Austin.

referred to: 361, 572, 729-30


note: one of Stein’s reforms.

note: one of Stein’s reforms.


note: one of Stein’s reforms.


note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.


note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.


note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.

Gesetz über die Verpflichtung zum Kriegsdienste, No. 245 (3 Sept., 1814). *Gesetz-Sammlung . . . 1814*, 79-82.

note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.

note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.

referred to: 728

Allerhöchste Kabinetsorder wegen eines festzusetzenden Präklusions-Termins für die gestempelten Tresorscheine und die unverzinslichen, auf die Vermögens- und Einkommen-Steuer ausgestellten Anweisungen, No. 602 (30 May, 1820). Gesetz-Sammlung . . . 1820, 72-80.

note: one of Hardenberg’s reforms.

referred to: 728


referred to: 589

Gesetz wegen Anordnung der Provinzialstände für die Mark Brandenburg und das Markgraffthum Niederlausitz, No. 811 (1 July, 1823). In Gesetz-Sammlung . . . 1823, 130-8.

referred to: 589


referred to: 589

Gesetz wegen Anordnung der Provinzialstände im Herzogthum Pommern und Fürstenthum Rügen, No. 813 (1 July, 1823). In Gesetz-Sammlung . . . 1823, 146-52.

referred to: 589


note: this confirms the decree of Mar. 1841.

referred to: 1081
IRELAND


referred to: 1097


referred to: 1097


referred to: 1097

2 Anne, c. 5. An Act to Make It High Treason in This Kingdom to Impeach the Succession of the Crown, as Limited by Several Acts of Parliament (1703).

referred to: 1097

2 Anne, c. 6. An Act to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery (1703).

referred to: 1097


note: the reference is to 10 William III, c. 13 (1698).

referred to: 1097

8 Anne, c. 3. An Act for Explaining and Amending an Act Intituled, An Act to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery (1709).

note: the reference is to 2 Anne, c. 6 (1703).

referred to: 1097

2 George I, c. 10. An Act to Restrain Papists from Being High or Petty Constables, and for the Better Regulating the Parish Watches (1715).

referred to: 1097

6 George I, c. 10. An Act for the Better Regulating the Parish Watches, and Amending the High Ways in This Kingdom, and for Preventing the Misapplication of Publick Money (1719).

referred to: 1097
1 George II, c. 9. An Act for the Further Regulating the Election of Members of Parliament, and Preventing the Irregular Proceedings of Sheriffs and Other Officers in Electing and Returning Such Members (1727).

referred to: 1097

9 George II, c. 3. An Act for the Better Regulating of Juries (1775).

referred to: 1097

15 & 16 George III, c. 21. An Act to Prevent and Punish Tumultuous Risings of Persons within This Kingdom, and for Other Purposes Therein Mentioned (1776).

referred to: 1097

**SPAIN**


referred to: 41


referred to: 41


referred to: 41


referred to: 41


referred to: 41

**UNITED STATES**

The Body of Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony in New England. Enacted by the General Court, 1641 (Dec. 1641).
referred to: 1174


note: broadside. Known as the Declaration of Independence.

referred to: 542


referred to: 1150

22nd Congress, Sess. 1, c. 227. An Act to Alter and Amend the Several Acts Imposing Duties on Imports (14 July, 1832).

referred to: 541


referred to: 1148


referred to: 1150


referred to: 543


referred to: 1150


quoted: 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151

referred to: 1147-51
Neither (4; Art. I, Sect. 18)

Every white male citizen of the United States, and every white male citizen of Mexico, who shall have elected to become a citizen of the United States, under the treaty of peace, exchanged and ratified at Queretaro, on the 30th day of May, 1848, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of the State six months next preceding the election, and the county or district in which he claims his vote thirty days, shall be entitled to vote at all elections which are now or hereafter may be authorized by law: Provided, that nothing herein contained, shall be construed to prevent the Legislature, by a two-thirds concurrent vote, from admitting to the right of suffrage, Indians . . . Indians, in such special cases as such a proportion of the legislative body may . . . proper. (4; Art. II, Sect. 1)

All . . . wife, owned (13; Art. XI, Sect. 14)

The Legislature shall not in any manner create any debt or debts, liability or liabilities which shall singly, or in the aggregate, with any previous debts or liabilities, exceed the sum of three hundred thousand dollars, except . . . insurrection, unless the same shall be authorised by some law, for some single object or work, to be distinctly specified therein, which law shall provide ways and means, exclusive of loans, for the payment of the interest of such debt or liability, as it falls due, and also pay and discharge the principal of such debt or liability within twenty years from the time of the contracting thereof, and shall be irrepealable until the principal and interest thereon shall be paid and discharged; but no such law shall take effect until, at a general election, it shall have been submitted to the people, and have received a majority of all the votes cast for and against it at such an election; and all money raised by authority of such law, shall be applied only to the specific object therein stated, or to the payment of the debt thereby created, and such law shall be published in at least one Newspaper in each judicial district, if one be published therein, throughout the state, for three months next preceding the election at which it is submitted to the people (11; Art. VIII)

The legislature shall protect by law, from forced sale, a certain . . . families. (13; Art. XI, Sect. 15)

No perpetuities shall be allowed, except for eleemosynary purposes. (13, Art. XI, Sect. 16)


Libraries, normally as part of a bookseller’s or publisher’s shop, were clustered in the area of Bond St.: for example, E.S. Ebers and Co., 27 Old Bond St.; John Mitchell, 33 Old Bond St.; Eliza Andrews, 167 New Bond St.; Saunders and Otley, 50 Conduit St.; Edward Bull, 19 Holles St.; and Edward Churton, 26 Holles St.


The reference may include Sue’s *Mathilde: Mémoires d’une jeune femme*, 6 vols. (Paris: Gosselin, 1841), and *Le juif errant*, 10 vols. (Paris: Paulin, 1844-45). Mill refers to the latter, as well as to *Martin, l’enfant trouvé*, in a letter of 1848 to Sue accompanying a gift of his *Principles (EL, CW, Vol. XIII, p. 736).*

To the letter is appended in square brackets a note by John Forster: “We think the charge of our contemporary much too sweeping, but we cannot admit that the imputation of licentiousness, in the instance of *Martin*, is groundless. There are scenes in it of wanton sensuality or grossness; but there are many other writings of Eugène Sue that we have read with unmixed admiration.—Ed. Ex.”

By two Proclamations on 24 Feb., the Provisional Government had forbidden the Peers to meet (*Moniteur*, 1848, p. 499); on 29 Feb., a Decree abolished titles (*ibid.*, p. 519).

By a Decree on 2 Mar. (*ibid.*, p. 529), the hours of labour were reduced by one; this decree was confirmed for Paris on 3 Mar., and as applying to women as well as men on the 9th (*ibid.*, pp. 536 and 581).

See Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869), writer and statesman, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government, “Réponse à une députation de gardes du commerce réclamant au sujet du décret qui suspend la contrainte par corps” (11 Mar.), *Moniteur*, 1848, p. 597.

By a Proclamation of 5 Mar. (*ibid.*, p. 549).


Edme Jean Leclaire (1801-72), the “Father of Profit-Sharing,” a Parisian house-painter and decorator, who in 1842 began admitting his workmen to share in his profits. The reference to the *Edinburgh Review* is to Mill’s own article of April 1845,

[7] To the letter is appended in square brackets a note by the editor, Robert Stephen Rintoul: “Our correspondent convicts us of two instances of carelessness, which we will not attempt to palliate. Of course we knew of the distinction between the titular nobility of France and the unhereditary Peerage; but we did not sufficiently mark it in writing. With respect to the arrangement in the office of La Presse, our correspondent describes it correctly. In the general arguments above we cannot so readily concur. We still hold that the Provisional Government has committed acts more than provisional. Every needless tampering with permanent institutions is of that character—the abolition of titles, for instance. The alienation of Crown lands and effects is more than provisional, and could not press so urgently as not to brook a month’s delay. The attempt at swamping the National Guard is another instance. Although in the strict letter the laws relating to labour are liable to repeal, it was going beyond the province of a temporary Government to interfere in them so widely and with so manifest an animus. We wish the inevitable experiment of a Republic to have fair play, and should view its success with interest; but we do not think that its leaders evince sufficient power of control to insure success.—Ed.”

[1] In the manuscript a phrase that appears to read “par amusement” is interlined, but the intention is unclear.


[1] Though wrath is certainly promised in Ezekiel (see Chap. 7), the warning is directed to the “generation of vipers” in Matthew, 3:7.


[3] Mahomet (570-632), the founder of Islam, was the subject of the second lecture in Carlyle’s On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History (London: Fraser, 1841), first delivered in a series of lectures that Mill had attended.

[4] There was no penal “code” in the strict sense, but a long list of Acts, beginning with the British statute 3 William and Mary, c. 2 (1691), and continued in such Acts of the Irish parliament as 7 William III, c. 5 (1695), 10 William II, cc. 8, 13 (1698), 2 Anne, cc. 5, 6 (1703), 6 Anne, c. 6 (1707), 8 Anne, c. 3 (1709), 2 George I, c. 10 (1715), 6 George I, c. 10 (1719), 1 George II, c. 9 (1727), 9 George II, c. 3 (1735), and 15 & 16 George III, c. 21 (1776). The general intent is expressed in the title of the last cited: An Act to Prevent and Punish Tumultuous Risings of Persons within This Kingdom, and for Other Purposes Therein Mentioned.
The many acts include 10 & 11 William III, c. 10 (1699), wool; 9 Anne, c. 12 (1710), hops; 11 George I, c. 7 (1724), drugs, rags, apples, and pictures; 5 George II, c. 21 (1732), wool again; and 19 George II, c. 12 (1746), glass, liquors, and salt.

Assiento, a trading agreement (Spanish asiento, contract), applied to those made by Spain with other nations for the supplying of Negro slaves to America; for example and especially, the Asiento Treaty of Utrecht (1713) authorized the British to bring annually, for thirty years, 4800 slaves from her African colonies to America.

For the origin of the term, see No. 191, n5.


10 Victoria, c. 31 (1847).

Daniel, 5:27.

Cromwell was greatly admired by Carlyle, who in 1845 edited his Letters and Speeches.


In Past and Present (London: Chapman and Hall, 1843), Carlyle made a resonant and challenging plea for leadership to heal the ever-worsening social ills of England.

Fears aroused by the mass demonstration of Chartists at Kennington Common on 10 Apr., 1848, proved in the event to be unwarranted, although briefly beforehand London was virtually under martial law. The “Public Order Memorial” had been proposed to commemorate the work of the Special Constables in restraining the Chartists, but on 6 May, the day after Mill wrote his letter, the Committee appointed to act on the Memorial voted to drop the project. The “unextinguishable laughter” was that of the gods in Homer, Iliad, Vol. I, p. 48 (I, 599).

Jean Joseph Charles Louis Blanc (1811-82), a socialist member of the Provisional Government, author of Organisation du travail (Paris: Prévot, [1839]), at this time presided over the first assembly of Workers’ Delegates at the Palais du Luxembourg to inquire into the problems of labour; he was a proponent of the “ateliers nationaux” that much attracted Mill.

The socialist movement named for its founder, François Marie Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Utopian co-operator whose “phalanstères” earlier attracted the attention of Carlyle and Mill.

To Mill’s letter is appended in square brackets the following note by John Forster: “Mr. Carlyle’s dissertation did not exclude what is urged by ‘M.’ It did not extend to that part of the subject which is here discussed. The reader will find, below, a portion of a second communication from Mr. Carlyle which we had received before ‘M.’s’ letter reached us.—Ed. Ex.” This note is immediately followed by Carlyle’s
“Legislation for Ireland” (signed “C.,” as was “Repeal of the Union”), in which the new Poor Law Act is praised as providing at least an opportunity to make the landlord active in reform. Carlyle also calls for a Special Commission to deal summarily with the problems, seeing ahead the “rapids of Niagara” that will permit of no “oaring or steering.”

[1] Russell spoke on 20 June in opposition to Hume’s motion (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 99, cols. 915-33). The views of George Canning that Mill found similar to Russell’s may be seen in Speech of the Right Hon. George Canning, to His Constituents at Liverpool, March 18, 1820 (London: Murray, 1820). See also No. 61, n1.

[2] Following the failed Chartist demonstration (see No. 372), William Cuffey (d. 1870), a London tailor, son of a West Indian slave, a leader of the Chartists, was among those arrested in August for sedition. In September he was tried and sentenced to transportation for life.

[3] For the phrase, see No. 73, n4.


[6] Sidney Herbert (1810-61), Peel’s Secretary at War, Speech on National Representation (6 July), ibid., cols. 213-17, esp. 213, where he is taunting Lord John Russell for pronouncing the reforms of 1832 “final” in his speech of 20 Nov., 1837.

[7] Grey was supported in bringing in the Reform Bill by Radicals such as Hobhouse, free-traders such as Thompson, moderate reformers such as Brougham, Whig aristocrats such as Palmerston and Lansdowne, and others of various political views, including even Charles Gordon Lennox, Duke of Richmond, a Tory member of Grey’s cabinet.

[1] Projet de décret sur l’instruction primaire (30 June), Moniteur, 1848, pp. 1537-8; it was withdrawn on 4 Jan., 1849.

[2] Revolutionary activity among the peasants in Austria and its territories, evident from 1846, came to a head after the February revolution in France deposed Louis Philippe. Prince Metternich (1773-1859), long a dominant force in Austrian and European diplomacy, was forced to resign office on 13 Mar., 1848, and took up exile in England; Hungary and Bohemia were promised liberal constitutions.

[3] Attila (ca. 406-53), “the scourge of God,” King of the Huns and conqueror of much of Europe, in 447 reached the walls of Constantinople, where he forced Theodosius II to accept a tripling of the yearly tribute. The population of Constantinople was addicted to the pleasures of the Hippodrome, the “circus” for races, sports, executions, and popular politics.

See Cobden’s speech of 6 July, col. 184.


Coleridge, *The Piccolomini*, pp. 22-3 (I, iv, 77-8).


On the Constitution of Church and State, p. 56.


Leading article, *The Times*, 19 July, pp. 4-5.

The figure of thirty acres is in the preamble to “A Bill for the Establishment of the ‘Farmers’ Estate Society of Ireland,’” 11 & 12 Victoria (25 July, 1848), *PP*, 1847-48, II, 397-412, enacted on 31 Aug., 1848, as 11 & 12 Victoria, c. 153 (Local Act).

Cf. Shakespeare, *Othello*, II, i, 161; in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 1213 (one of Mill’s favourite tags).

11 & 12 Victoria, c. 95, which had been enacted on 25 July, 1848.


For the substituted terms, compare Arts. 1, 2, and 4 of this decree with Arts. 2-5 of Bull. 155, No. 356 (9 Sept., 1835).
E.g., in the speeches on 10 Aug. by Jules Favre (1809-80), Secretary-General of the Ministry of the Interior in the Provisional Government, and by Albin de Berville (1788-1868), avocat général under the Provisional Government (Moniteur, 1848, both on p. 1968).

Rousseau, Discours sur l’origine et les fondements de l’inégalité parmi les hommes (Amsterdam: Rey, 1755). The comment is in Réforme, 12 Aug., 1848, p. 1.

For details, see No. 376.

In reporting the bill on 1 Aug. to the National Assembly, Berville said that it, like its companion, the Décret relatif aux cautionnements des journaux et écrits périodiques (Bull. 60, No. 616 [9 Aug., 1848]), was “transitoire” (Moniteur, 1848, p. 1847).

For earlier discussion, see No. 29; the law had not changed in the intervening quarter-century.


1125[quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” D&D, II (1859); in CW, XI, 333-6]

See Plato, Gorgias, p. 526 (526b).

The

middle period


contemporaries

-59

Nicias (d. 413), Athenian general and statesman; his career is sketched in the following quotation.

-59


Cimon (507-450), a rival of Themistocles whom he replaced as ruler of Athens, ca. 470; he also came into conflict with Pericles and was ostracized in 459.

An oligarchical revolution in 411 established the Council of Four Hundred, which lasted only a year; Theramenes was involved both in its establishment and its overthrow.

Aspasia, a courtesan born either in Miletus or Megara, became Pericles’ mistress after he divorced his wife in 445. She is represented as an advisor to Pericles, a teacher of rhetoric, and an instructor of Socrates.

Cleon (d. 422), Athenian statesman and a relentless enemy of Sparta, pictured by his enemies Thucydides and Aristophanes as an unprincipled demagogue—as Grote and Mill indicate—was killed at the defeat of Amphipolis.

In the anonymous review of Grote’s Volumes V and VI, *Athenaeum*, 10 Feb., 1849, p. 137.


Hyperbolus (d. 411), another Athenian demagogue, banished by Nicias and Alcibiades.

Alcibiades (ca. 450-404), wealthy Athenian general and politician, notorious for strange behaviour and debauchery.

Aeschines (390-314), philosopher, friend of Socrates, author of orations and dialogues.

For the invective by William Pitt, Lord Chatham, against Robert Walpole (1676-1745), 1st Earl of Orford, the Whig statesman who was in effect the first British Prime Minister, 1715-17 and 1721-42, see, e.g., Pitt’s Speech on the Motion to Remove Walpole (13 Feb., 1741), in *Cobbett’s Parliamentary History of England*, Vol. XI, cols. 1359-64.

The Pnyx was a hill in Athens, site of the *ecclesia* or assembly of citizens; for the personification of the Athenian citizen as Demos, see Aristophanes, *The Knights*, p. 194 (752-5).
Cleon’s Speech on the Mytilean Revolt, his only preserved speech, is reported in Thucydides, Vol. II, pp. 58-70 (III, xxxvii-xl).

The estimate of the sophist rhetoricians’ power derives from Plato, Gorgias, p. 292 (456e-457e); the phrase describing it, from Milton, Paradise Lost (II, 111-12), in Poetical Works, p. 31.


[a-a] quoted also in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” Edinburgh Review, XCVIII (Oct. 1853); in CW, XI, 318

[b-b] Source And our

c-c tastes and

d-d does

e-e are offensive, though they do no positive damage


[g-g] quoted also in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” Edinburgh Review, XCVIII (Oct. 1853); in CW, XI, 319-20

[h-h] The


[i-i] pursuits

[j-j] Source farther


[k-k] quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” D&D, II (1859); in CW, XI, 320-1

Critias (ca. 460-403), an oligarchical politician who headed “The Thirty”; Meidias (fl. 347), an opponent of Demosthenes.

Aristophanes, *The Wasps*, pp. 456 and 462 (515-17 and 570-2). For Xenophon, see n5.

The name of Russell had been associated with religious and civil liberty since the time of William Russell (1639-83), “the patriot,” one of the first Whigs, who had been executed for supposed treason against the Stuarts. Lord John Russell, of the sixth generation in descent, was author of *The Life of William Lord Russell* (London: Longman, 1819).


Both Hume and Edward Gibbon (1737-94), the historian, would have been excluded from Parliament by the terms of this Bill on the grounds of religious scepticism. Gibbon in fact served as M.P. 1774-80 and 1781-83.


Baron Lionel Nathan Rothschild (1808-79), banker and philanthropist, elected Whig M.P. for the city of London in 1847 and repeatedly thereafter, but barred, as a Jew, from taking a seat in Parliament until 1858 after the passing in that year of 21 & 22 Victoria, c. 48.


A very popular theatrical equestrian establishment, originally called Astley’s Royal Amphitheatre, established in 1798 by Philip Astley (1742-1814).

A pistol (charged only with powder) was fired at Queen Victoria on 19 May, 1849, by William (or John?) Hamilton, an Irish bricklayer’s mate (b. ca. 1826), who was tried at the Central Criminal Court on 14 June, when he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to transportation for seven years. It was reported at the trial that the Queen expressly desired that he not be punished by flogging. See *The Times*, 21 May, p. 5, and 15 June, p. 7. For Harriet Taylor’s energetic and decided comments on this matter, in a letter of 10 July to Mill that undoubtedly prompted this article, see Hayek, *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor*, pp. 159-60.

Louis Napoléon (1808-73), nephew of Bonaparte, a *bête noire* to Mill, had become President of France in December 1848 and, after a *coup d’état* in December 1851, was to become Emperor in December 1852. His relationship to Czar Nicholas I of Russia was distant: Princess Mathilde, daughter of Jerome Bonaparte, had once been engaged to Louis Napoléon and served as his hostess for some years before his marriage; she was a third cousin of the Czar.
Henry George Grey was Colonial Secretary 1846-52; the Prime Minister was Lord John Russell. The conduct of Richard More O’Ferrall (1797-1880), who in July 1849, as Governor of Malta, had refused to permit refugees to land, was sanctioned by the Colonial Office in a speech of 1 Aug., 1849, by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Benjamin Hawes (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 107, col. 1161); it was defended by Russell in a letter of 5 Sept. to Joseph Hume (printed in the Examiner, 22 Sept., p. 602), which also mentions Grey’s approbation.

Lord Palmerston objected, in a speech of 21 July (PD, 3rd ser., Vol. 107, cols. 807-15), to the proposals of George Hamilton Gordon (1784-1860), 4th Earl of Aberdeen, to renew relations with the Powers who had always been Britain’s allies and to approve Russia’s intervention as “necessary,” in a speech of 20 July (ibid., cols. 690-705). The Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, formed in 1815 to ensure Christian co-operation and brotherhood and eventually joined by most of Europe except for England, had prompted the Czar’s intervention in Hungary. The prospect of a new Holy Alliance was raised in the Commons by Ralph Bernal Osborne on 21 July (ibid., col. 788).

Mill must have repeated in the missing part of this letter the views with which he concludes No. 384 (q.v.) about Palmerston (the exception), and Grey and Russell.

Louis Krolikowski (1807-55), Polish army officer in exile in Paris, a close friend and collaborator of Cabet and, in the latter’s absence, editor of the Populaire.

Letter to the editor (20 Sept., 1849), Démocratie Pacifique, 22 Sept., p. 3. A Fourierist daily (1843-49) edited by Prosper Victor Considérant (1808-93), the journal signalled its rejection of violent revolution by including “Pacifique” in its title.

“Protestation de la colonie icarienne à Nauvoo,” ibid.

See No. 372, n15, for the source of the phrase.

Déclaration, pp. 4-5.

When told there was no such thing as motion, Diogenes (400-323 ), the Cynic philosopher, got up and walked about. See Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers (Greek and English), trans. R.D. Hicks, 2 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1963), Vol. II, p. 40 (VI, 39).


The revision of 1846 resulted in Constitution of the State of New York, as Adopted in Convention, Oct. 9, 1846 (New York: Burnton, 1846).

On marriage a wife became sous couverture, thus losing her legal existence independent of her husband, and consequently was inter alia unable to exercise in her own name any rights connected with property.

Thomas Sermon.

J.H. Toller, the deputy coroner for the district.

Charles Colville Turner.

James Blomfield Rush was hanged on 14 Apr., 1849, for the murder on 28 Nov., 1848, of Isaac Jermy (1789-1848), Recorder of Norwich, and his son.

Elizabeth Brownrigg, a midwife in London, was hanged on 14 Sept., 1767, for the murder of an apprentice, Mary Clifford. She was known to have beaten her other two apprentices, but was tried for the death of Clifford.

9 George IV, c. 31 (1828), made common assault for the first time a criminal misdemeanour punishable on summary conviction before a magistrate on complaint of the victim (Sect. 27); the punishment was limited to a fine of not more than £5. Only for non-payment of fine could the convicted assailant be jailed for a maximum of two months (Sect. 27). In serious cases, the Crown was permitted to proceed by indictment and a longer punishment could be imposed (Sect. 29). Prosecution resulted in the loss of other criminal or civil remedies by the plaintiff.


I.e., Darius II of Persia (reigned 424-405 ); each of the rulers of Persia was referred to as “the Great King.”

Lysander (d. 395 ), Spartan naval commander, destroyed the Athenian fleet at Aegospotami in 405 , and captured Athens the next year.

A group of oligarchs, Critias being the chief member, the Thirty Tyrants gained power in Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War in 404 , but were ousted after a civil war in 403 by democrats, led by Thrasybulus, the naval commander.

These pillars, set at street corners in Athens, with a bust of Hermes above and a phallus below, were mutilated in the night shortly before the beginning of the Sicilian expedition of 415-413

[a-a][quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” D&D, II (1859); in CW, XI, 331-2]
[b]59 [paragraph]
[c-c]59 seventh volume
[d-d][quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” *D&D*, II (1859); in *CW*, XI, 327-8]
[e-e]59 a
[f-f][quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” *D&D*, II (1859); in *CW*, XI, 329]
[g-g]59 his hero Socrates
[h-h][quoted in “Grote’s History of Greece [II],” *D&D*, II (1859); in *CW*, XI, 309n-10n]
[i-i]59
[j-j]59 with
[2] The Birds were subsequently rearrested and charged with assault. They were convicted on 5 Aug., 1850, in the Crown Court at Exeter. (See “Summer Assizes. Western Circuit. Exeter, Monday, August 5,” *The Times*, 7 Aug., pp. 7-8.)


[4] After a postponement on 11 Apr. (The Times, 12 Apr., p. 7), Alexander Moir was tried at the Central Criminal Court on 9 May, 1850, convicted of aggravated manslaughter, and sentenced to transportation for life (The Times, 10 May, p. 7).


[6] His expressions were used in the Bird case (see No. 392), reported in “Assize Intelligence. Western Circuit,” Morning Chronicle, 25 Mar., 1850, p. 7.

[7] Anne Merrett (b. 1819) was convicted of poisoning her husband James with arsenic, and condemned to death (see “Central Criminal Court, March 8,” The Times, 9 Mar., 1850, p. 7).

[1] The letter is followed by a lengthy editorial comment expressing admiration for the “character, style, and tone” of Mill’s letter, but dissenting totally from the views of “pauper and free labour” expressed in it.

[1] The case of Edward Kenealy; see No. 396.


[5] Mill may be referring to the commonly held belief that it was legal for a man to beat his wife with a stick no thicker than his thumb.


That is, Mill’s *Principles of Political Economy* (1848), of which the 2nd ed. (1849) contained a more favourable discussion of communism. (See *CW*, Vol. III, pp. 975-87.) Holyoake had earlier reprinted in his periodical, the *Reasoner*, V (1848), 50-4 and 60-9, under the title “Theories of Private Property and Communism,” portions of Book II, Chap. i, of the 1st ed. of the *Principles* (the chapter here in question). In the *Leader* of 10 Aug., p. 465, Holyoake further discussed the points raised by Mill.

I.e., expelled James II and enthroned William III.


See in the *Morning Chronicle* the cases of Edmund Curtis, charged with the manslaughter of his wife Hester, and sentenced to imprisonment for six months with hard labour (“Assize Intelligence. Crown Court,” 15 Aug., 1851, pp. 7-8); of Charles Halliday, charged with the murder of his wife Elizabeth, found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to transportation for life (“Assize Intelligence. Crown Court,” 16 Aug., p. 7); of Andrew MacLean (b. ca. 1814), a journeyman tailor, charged with but acquitted of the murder of his common-law wife, Mary Ann Watson (“Central Criminal Court—Friday,” 23 Aug., pp. 7-8); and of Robert Thomas Moore, charged with the attempted murder of his wife, Mary Anne, and found not guilty by reason of insanity (*ibid.*).


Samuel Martin (1801-83), Baron of the Court of Exchequer from 1850, *ibid.*

Charles Halliday (see n2).

William Wightman (1784-1863), judge at the Court of Queen’s Bench from 1841, heard the cases of Moore and MacLean (see n2).

Morning Chronicle, 23 Aug., p. 8. There were two children, aged eight (Lizzy) and three years. The witnesses were Mary Rigg and her husband Thomas, and Ellen Mayhew.
The tradesman was Charles Bowen; William Drinkwater failed to hold the horse. 

I.e., by the Board of Control (representing the British Government) and the Court of Directors (representing the East India Company).

See Sects. 2, 3, 5.

See nn6 and 7.

Edward Law, 1st Earl of Ellenborough, Governor-General of India (1841-44), was recalled because of his high-handed policies, particularly in the annexation in 1842 of Scinde, by an army under the command of Charles Napier.

Charles Grant, the younger (1778-1866), Baron Glenelg, was President of the Board of Control, 1830-34, when the charter of the East India Co. was altered by 3 & 4 William IV, c. 85, to vest the Company’s property in the Crown. In 1832, the Board had obtained a mandamus from the Court of King’s Bench to compel the Directors’ compliance in issuing a despatch pressuring the Government of Oude to reimburse a group of bankers. The Board did not persist in the face of the Directors’ continued opposition. For the claims on the King of Oude, see “Copy of the Correspondence between the Commissioners for the Affairs of India and the Court of Directors of the East India Company,” PP, 1834, XLIV, 101-40.

Wood, Letter to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the East India Company (1 June, 1853), PP, 1852-53, LXIX, 84.

Wood, speech of 3 June, cols. 1153-4.

Horace, Satires, I, i, 69; in Satires, Epistles, Ars poetica, p. 8.

The Directors were elected by those members of the Court of Proprietors (shareholders) who had held at least £1000 of stock for a year.

Sect. 5 called for service of the Crown or the Company in India for ten years. (“Indian” refers to residence, not ethnicity.)


By Sect. 13.

By the effect of Sects. 58 and 60 of 3 & 4 William IV, c. 85 (1833).

See Sect. 2 of “A Bill to Provide for the Government of India” (9 June, 1853).

See Charles Wood, speech of 3 June, 1853, col. 1154; and, for the modes of appointment, No. 404, nn9 and 11.

[4] Under the first of these systems, the Zemindars collected the peasants’ rents, and paid them to the government, taking a commission. The British introduced into the North-West Provinces the village system, whereby the government made an engagement (stipulating individual amounts), with the village as a whole, which was responsible for the payments. Under the ryotwar system the tax was paid directly by the ryot, the actual occupier or tenant of the soil.

[5] Each of the three Committees of the Court of Directors (Finance and Home; Revenue, Judicial, and Legislative; and Political and Military) controlled a Department. The Secret Committee, which had existed since the seventeenth century to deal with sensitive political issues, was made official in 1784; composed of the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, and a senior director, it sent secret dispatches (some of which it originated) to India, and acted as a kind of “cabinet council.”

[a-a] MS Morton [JSM’s error]

[b-b] MS Saturday [see the headnote]

[c-c] MS Morton

[1] 16 & 17 Victoria, c. 30 (1853), designed to protect women and children against aggravated assaults.

[d-d] MS and

[e-e] MS redress—while

[1] The case of Mary Jane Turner, wife of Charles Turner, official assignee in the Liverpool Court of Bankruptcy, was reported in the Daily News on 26 July, p. 3; the leader Mill refers to appeared on 28 July, p. 4. She had recently been the subject of an inquiry at York Castle before F. Barlow, one of the Masters in Lunacy. See also “Commission of Lunacy,” The Times, 27 July, p. 5, and a leader on the treatment of lunatics, ibid., 28 July, p. 9.

[2] Mill is referring to the notorious case of Lady Rosina Doyle Wheeler Bulwer-Lytton (1804-82), Lady Lytton, separated wife of Edward Bulwer-Lytton. Since their legal separation in 1836, she had published many attacks on him and instituted a number of legal actions against him. On 8 June, 1858, having travelled overnight from Taunton to Hertford for the purpose, she had appeared at a public meeting held to nominate Bulwer-Lytton for office and launched an embarrassing public attack on him. After withdrawing from the meeting, he proceeded to arrange for a medical examination of his wife’s mental condition. Later in the month, on 22 June, she was confined in a private asylum at Brentford; then, on 17 July, after gaining permission to leave, she departed for the continent, accompanied by her son. The London newspapers were rather slow in taking up the case from the provincial press, but once they did so, devoted a good deal of space to the scandal. For representative examples of the newspaper coverage, see The Times, 6 July, p. 9; 14 July, p. 9; 19 July, p. 12;
and 19 Aug., p. 8; cf. the *Daily Telegraph*, 14 July, p. 4; 15 July, p. 4; and the *Morning Chronicle*, 13 July, p. 5.


[4] Although given personal liberty by the proclamation of March 1861, the Russian serfs were, during a transitional two-year period that had just expired, obliged to perform their traditional duties to their masters. After March 1863, household serfs were to be entirely free, while those on the land entered a “temporarily-obligated” state while they paid for their holdings.

[5] The announcement to their friends was in the form of a letter from the Central National Polish Committee in Warsaw (*Bell*, 1 Oct., 1862, pp. 1205-6); the public pledge may be found in “Proclamation of the National Committee” (22 Jan., 1863), in “Correspondence of the British Government Respecting the Insurrection in Poland,” *PP*, 1863, LXXV, 40-1.

[6] The *Bell (Kolokol)* was a Russian language journal published in London and Geneva under the editorship of Alexander Ivanovich Herzen (1812-70), in exile in London, of whose writing Mill had known at least since 1859 (see *LL, CW*, Vol. XV, p. 607). Nikolai Platonovich Ogarev or Ogareff (1813-77) was a life-long friend of Herzen, and like him an early Saint-Simonian. In exile from 1856, he lived mostly in London and Geneva, and collaborated with Herzen. Mill had written to him in November 1862 (*ibid.*, pp. 805-6).


[a]PN [no paragraph]

[b]PN [no paragraph]

[c-c]DN,PN offered

[d]PN [no paragraph]

[e]DN,PN it

[f-f]DN,PN possesses

[g-g]DN,PN
For the Polish rebellion, see No. 408. For examples, first of the strong language and then of the unwillingness, see Temple, Speech on the Affairs of Poland (27 Feb., 1863), *PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 169, cols. 932-9; and Speech on the Affairs of Poland, Question (6 July, 1863), *ibid.*, Vol. 172, col. 253.

PN sentiments

Drawcansir, a braggart and swashbuckler in George Villiers’s *The Rehearsal* (London: Dring, 1672), who was given to striking against all sides in a battle.

William Ewart Gladstone (1809-98), M.P. since 1832, who was to lead the Liberals in the House of Commons during the parliament of 1865-68, when Mill supported him.

Edward Henry Stanley (1826-93), Speech at the Meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (10 Apr., 1865), *Daily News*, 11 Apr., p. 2.

The opponent was Mill himself, whose argument in *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861) was attacked (for the passage, see *CW*, Vol. XIX, pp. 488-95). Romilly’s other targets were Sydney Smith and Lord Palmerston.

Advertisement by Mill’s Committee (dated 17 July), *The Times*, 18 July, p. 8. The statement from Mill’s Committee was signed by Charles Westerton, Chairman, J.S. Storr, Treasurer, and James Beal, Honorary Secretary.

Electors,

DN [no paragraph]

Electors,

DN [no paragraph]

Electors,

DN etc.

In his speech of 24 July, at an election meeting in the Pimlico Rooms, Warwick Street, Mill is reported to have said “that he had been in favour of the ballot, but was not in favour of it now” (*The Times*, 25 July, p. 5). His vote against the ballot’s adoption in Ireland came on an amendment to the Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill on 18 June, 1868 (*PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 192, cols. 1801-5).

In 1847 Richard Cobden was chosen to stand for the West Riding of Yorkshire, without his knowledge, as well as for his former borough of Stockport; Henry Brougham, after he brought forward a motion against slavery in 1830, was put forward in Yorkshire, as well as in his former constituency of Knaresborough.

Ralph Augustus Benson (1828-86), barrister.

In the schools of the British and Foreign School Society (founded by and often called by the name of Joseph Lancaster) the scriptural readings were not part of the lessons.

[3] The letter is followed by a square-bracketed note: “We are exceedingly sorry to have misrepresented Mr. Mill, and of course absolutely withdraw the statement. We cannot, however, admit that our blunder was anyone’s fault but Mr. Mill’s, at least if the Times’ report of his speech is correct. In that he is stated to have said, ‘The system deliberately chosen by the Dissenters is that of the British Schools, where religious teaching is limited to reading the Bible without note or comment.’ Thereafter the whole tenor of the speech appeared to be supporting the demand of the Dissenters, and not a word was reported criticizing that demand as itself involving the very injustice of which Mr. Mill complained in the Government proposals, or stating, as we suppose he now states, that he would be satisfied with nothing but a purely secular system. We are not sorry to have drawn from him that avowal.—Ed. Spectator.” In fact The Times correctly reported the sentence quoted (it appears substantively thus in Mill’s autograph MS); the issue lies in its interpretation.


[1] Mill does not quote himself exactly; see No. 421.

[1] Laveleye, in the letter that follows Mill’s introduction, deplores any action that might involve Britain in a war with Prussia and the United States and throw the Slavonians, who are naturally against Russian encroachment, into Russia’s arms by espousing the Turks; destroy Austria by aligning her Slav subjects with Russia against Turkey; involve the United States by enfringing the rights of neutrals; thwart the natural tendency of a United Germany to combine with Austria to prevent the Danube’s becoming a Russian river; and inflict the miseries of war on the working classes of the whole world.

[a-a] TT some journals

[b-b] TT the 25th of March

[1] The letter is followed by a square-bracketed editorial note: “The statement of which Mr. Mill complains came to us with the apparent authority of the Society of Arts.”


[2] See Speech at the Colston Dinner, Bristol (13 Nov., 1872), The Times, 14 Nov., p. 10, by George Joachim Goschen (1831-1907), liberal politician, President of the Poor-Law Board (1870) and First Lord of the Admiralty (1871); and The Times’ leaders on the subject, 22 Nov., p. 7, and 29 Nov., p. 7.


[5] This is not one of the formal proposals of the Association.

[6] For the phrase, see No. 328, n2.


[1] The Mortmain Acts include 7 & 8 William III, c. 37 (1696), 9 George II, c. 36 (1736), and 43 George III, c. 108 (1803).


[3] Feudal tenures were finally abolished by 12 Charles II, c. 24 (1660), and a land tax, as part of the property tax, was imposed by 4 William and Mary, c. 1 (1692). Mill says the claim was “evaded” presumably because the land was rated at its valuation in the reign of Edward I, rather than at a rental value, which would have gradually increased. In 1798 Pitt allowed for the redemption of the land tax by a lump payment, and subsequently the annual revenue from land was even lower.

[4] Estates whose commercial value was enormously increased by the expansion of fashionable London westwards.


[a] E,P most

[b-b] P in

[c-c] E hath

[d-d] E and

[e-e] E anybody

[f-f] E

[g-g] E,P of

[h-h] E,P further

[i-f] E on cultivation at all

[j-f] P (it will be said)

[k-k] E these
In so far as there does exist any parallelism, its consequences should be accepted. The right of property in things which, being unique, belong, in some sense, to the whole human race, assuredly ought not to be absolute. If a half-insane millionaire took it into his head to buy up the pictures of the great masters for the purpose of destroying them, the State ought to stop his proceedings, if not to punish him for the mischief he had already done. It may hereafter be thought right to require that those who possess such treasures should either open their galleries to public view, or at least lend the contents from time to time for the purpose of exhibition; and should allow to artists, under reasonable restrictions, regular access to them for the purpose of reproduction or of study. With regard to other possessions of public interest, such as architectural remains and historical monuments generally, they ought to be, if not acquired by the State, placed under State protection. The pretence of right to destroy them, or to make any change which would impair their historical interest, ought not for a moment to be listened to. The preservation of such monuments is one of the articles in the programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association. Had it been conceded fifty years ago, many interesting relics of antiquity would have been still in
existence which are now irreparably lost. [See *Programme of the Land Tenure Association*, Art. 10, p. 5 (CW, Vol. V, p. 695).]

[a-a]E,P (it is said)

[b-b]E,P (for instance)

[c-c]E,P improvements; what

[d-e]E effects

[e-e]E,P for

[2]“A Bill for the Improvement of the Relations between Landlord and Tenant,” 36 Victoria (13 Feb., 1873), *PP*, 1873, II, 269-84, introduced by James Howard (1821-89), Liberal M.P. for Bedford, manufacturer of agricultural implements and author of works on agriculture; it was withdrawn before its Second Reading (*PD*, 3rd ser., Vol. 216, cols. 1644-5).

[f-f]E uttermost

[g-g]E,P valuation

[h-h]E mention


[4] For the origin of this description, see No. 137, n2.

[5] Jean François Louis Clair Bories (1795-1822), a soldier of liberal views, was imprisoned in 1821 for demoralizing members of his regiment and, with twenty-four others, was accused of participating in a plot to overthrow the government. After an attempt to escape, he and three other sergeants were executed on 21 Sept., 1822.


[1] Left blank in manuscript; “élan” in the French version.
Here in the manuscript a blank space that would permit two words to be written is followed by a cancelled false start: “I fear that contrary”. This passage is not in the French version.

A society founded in 1792 by, *inter alia*, Thomas Hardy (1752-1832), a radical tradesman, to correspond with French Revolutionary leaders, and to urge reform of the British Parliament. It also corresponded with other British reform societies, and organized a convention in Edinburgh in 1793. Hardy was arrested in 1794 for high treason, but acquitted. John Horne Tooke and John Richter (d. 1830), another Westminster Radical activist, both committed to the Tower in 1794, were prominent members.


John Bright (1811-88), close ally of Richard Cobden in promoting free trade.

Speech to the Middlesex Freeholders’ Club, reported in *The Times*, 6 Feb., 1807, p. 3.

Thomas Campbell (1777-1844), author of *The Pleasures of Hope* (1799), collaborator with Bentham and James Mill in the founding of the University of London, had founded in 1832 the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to keep the Polish question before the British public. For the quotation, see William Beattie, *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, 3 vols. (London: Moxon, 1849), Vol. III, p. 110.

Henry Maudslay (1771-1831), inventor, constructed block-making machinery for Marc Isambard Brunel (1769-1849), F.R.S., also an inventor, who constructed a tunnel under the Thames; Alexander Galloway (fl. 1798-1835), machine maker and member of the London Corresponding Society, who became one of the leading engineering employers in London. John Hague has not been further identified.

William Mulready (1786-1863), Irish genre painter and book illustrator.

As the author probably knew, there was such a journal, though it remained unpublished until edited by Mary Thale as *The Autobiography of Francis Place* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).