

J.S. Mill and London

Bruce Kinzer

*I*n one of the essays making up his “Spirit of the Age” series of 1831, J.S. Mill observes without elaboration that a man “may learn in a morning’s walk through London more of the history of England during the nineteenth century than all the professed histories in existence will tell him concerning the other eighteen.”¹ The statement startles, not only in its sweep but in its virtual singularity. Nowhere else in his expansive corpus, so far I can determine, does the subject of London as a central point of reference prompt a similar claim. London, indeed, seldom figures as a subject in Mill’s writings, and he never revisited the theme he briskly sets forth in his “Spirit of the Age” essay. The comment offered in 1831 might imply an acute self-awareness regarding the ways the author’s experience of the capital shaped his understanding of the age in which he lived. Yet there is not much in what he says elsewhere that attests to such self-awareness. Mill himself did not fully grasp the profound effect his metropolitan setting had on his reading of nineteenth-century England. Although it would be crudely reductive to argue that his London-centered existence was principally responsible for how he perceived the rapidly changing society of his time, it did markedly affect his thinking on a range of consequential matters. A story could be told of Mill’s place in the history of London (his parliamentary representation of Westminster, for example, and his introduction in the House of Commons of a bill for the reform of metropolitan government). But this is no part of my purpose, which is to examine the place of London in Mill’s history.

Few eminent Victorians wore such an exclusive London imprint as did Mill. He was schooled by his father, who considered his son’s education essentially complete by the time he reached university age.

Remaining at home, young Mill spoke not in the Cambridge or Oxford Unions, but in the London Debating Society. Decades later he would speak in the House of Commons as one of Westminster's two MPs. India House, the Leadenhall Street headquarters of the East India Company, was his place of employment from 1823 to 1858. He lived with his family, in Westminster or Kensington, until his marriage to Harriet Taylor in 1851. The couple then occupied a house in Blackheath Park. After Harriet Taylor Mill's death in 1858, J.S. Mill divided his time between Blackheath and Avignon, where his late wife had been buried. Mill knew parts of France better than he knew any place in England outside the capital. Such a severely limited exposure to British life outside London was unusual even for those who can reasonably be considered metropolitan intellectuals. Thomas Macaulay and Matthew Arnold, to cite just two prominent examples, had a decidedly more varied experience. Macaulay matriculated at Trinity College Cambridge and served as MP for Leeds and later for Edinburgh. Arnold was a pupil at Rugby, where his father was Headmaster, and then went up to Balliol College Oxford. In his early years as an Inspector of Schools his duties required him to spend a good deal of time in central England. Comparing Mill with Richard Cobden and John Bright, the chief spokesmen of the Manchester School of nineteenth-century radicalism, yields a similar result. During his childhood and adolescence Cobden lived in Sussex, Hampshire, Surrey, and Barnet. Most of his adult years were spent in Manchester and London, and he served as MP for Stockport and then Rochdale. Bright was raised in Rochdale, and became MP for Manchester and later for Birmingham. Cobden and Bright, along with Mill, had reason to follow with interest the political development of William Gladstone, who had associations with Scotland, Liverpool, Oxford, London, Flintshire, and South Lancashire. Such comparisons throw into sharp relief Mill's overwhelmingly metropolitan identity.

This identity infiltrated sundry elements of Mill's thought and activity, including his conception of the British economy. Viewed retrospectively, what is commonly called the Industrial Revolution had its

most transformative impact on the British economy in the several decades after 1830, during which Mill himself gradually acquired an immense measure of intellectual authority. His massive treatise on the *Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy* appeared in 1848. The *Principles* aside, his *Essays on Economics and Society*, which span five decades, fill two large volumes (4-5) in the Toronto edition of his *Collected Works*. Donald Winch, a notable historian of economic thought thoroughly familiar with Mill's treatment of economic problems, points out his "comparative lack of interest in the details of urban industrial life, of machine and factory production."² Mill's London world, the hub of England's vibrant commercial economy, stood well removed from the vivid changes taking place over large swathes of the Midlands and the North. (Summer sojourns with his family in Devonshire and Surrey during Mill's youth would have done nothing to enhance his knowledge of industrial England.) Although London remained the single most significant manufacturing center in the country, the bulk of the vast array of goods produced in the nation's capital were fashioned by hand-tools in modest-sized workshops. (This is not to gainsay the fact, underscored by Martin Daunt, that "The scale of the largest industrial concerns in London could rival anything in the northern towns, where the mills were simply more visible."³) London's pivotal importance to the nation's economic health stemmed principally from its axial role as a global emporium and focal point of international finance and insurance. At the time Mill wrote the *Principles of Political Economy*, foreign trade, shipping, insurance, and financial services accounted for a larger proportion of Britain's wealth than did the manufacturing output concentrated in regions further north. Mill's London was the place where these invaluable non-manufacturing assets converged.

Mill held unorthodox views on the division of labor and machinery questions, views consistent with the organization of production prevalent in London. Arguing against Adam Smith's emphasis on the gains in efficiency emanating from labor specialization, Mill avowed the superiority of craft production. "Many of the higher descriptions of

artisans have to perform a great multiplicity of operations with a variety of tools.” He conceded that these artisans “do not execute each of these with the rapidity with which a factory workman performs a single operation; but they are, except in a merely manual sense, more skillful labourers, and in all senses whatever more energetic.”⁴ He voiced skepticism regarding economies of scale, asserting that the productivity gains ensuing from the use of machinery in large enterprises might well be neutralized by an attendant loss in employment and wages.⁵ Taking a gloomy view of machinery’s effects on the quality of life of the laboring classes, Mill considered it doubtful “if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day’s toil of any human being. They have enabled a greater population to live the same life of drudgery and imprisonment, and an increased number of manufacturers and others to make fortunes.”⁶ Mill’s London domicile might not have been the principal determinant of such attitudes; it surely had something to do with the conclusions he reached on these significant subjects.

This setting also had a bearing on Mill’s recantation of the wages-fund doctrine, a renunciation Samuel Hollander says “constitutes one of the most difficult problems in the history of economics.”⁷ The history of economics must be left to others; Mill’s history is the crux of this investigation. The May and June 1869 issues of the *Fortnightly Review* carried Mill’s two-part article “Thornton on Labour and Its Claims” (the *Fortnightly*, its name notwithstanding, was a monthly).⁸ Prompted by the publication of W.T. Thornton’s *On Labour, its Wrongful and Rightful Claims, its Actual Present and Possible Future* (published by Macmillan in 1869), Mill’s article repudiated a fundamental tenet of economic theory he had himself previously treated as a given. Reduced to its simplest form, the wages-fund doctrine stipulated that at the beginning of a production cycle a fixed fund determined the amount that could be spent on labor. Dividing the amount of capital by the number of laborers yielded the average money wage. An artificial increase in wages arising from trade union demands would inevitably diminish the accumulation of capital and therefore run down the demand for labor. Thornton denied the existence of a predetermined wages

fund and maintained that combinations, among employers and workers alike, could have a marked impact on wage rates.⁹ It was not Thornton's arguments that brought about Mill's recantation. The latter had his own reasons for concluding that the power of trade unions could "be so exercised as to obtain for the laboring classes collectively, both a larger share and a larger positive amount of the produce of labour."¹⁰

The analytical contortions Mill performed to arrive at the conclusion he aimed to reach are not my concern.¹¹ It is the connection between Mill's London world and the motives giving rise to the recantation that matters here. In the second half of the 1860s Mill experienced an intense phase of political activism. His parliamentary career happened during several of these years, and he remained politically engaged in the few years remaining to him following his defeat at the 1868 general election. Some of Mill's preoccupations in this period brought him into direct contact with leading figures in the world of metropolitan trade unionism—George Howell, W.R. Cremer, and George Odger—men whose moral earnestness, skills, knowledge, and intelligence deeply impressed Mill. The years of the late 1860s found the trade union movement in considerable peril. The movement's reputation was blackened by acts of gross intimidation carried out by Sheffield unionists against recalcitrant members and some non-trade unionists in autumn 1866. The Sheffield outrages led to the appointment of a royal commission tasked with examining the standing of trade unions in English society. In 1867 a judgment in the Court of Queen's Bench deemed trade union bodies "in restraint of trade" and deprived them of the right to sue for retrieval of funds taken by unscrupulous union officials. The majority report issued by the royal commission recognized the existence of unionism as an accomplished fact but condemned a range of practices respectable union leaders considered necessary for the effective functioning of their organizations. On the difficulties confronting trade unionism in the latter half of the 1860s Mill cast a sympathetic eye.

Members of the executive of the London Trades Council played a key role in the agitation for manhood suffrage spearheaded by the Reform

League (its secretary was George Howell). Mill's involvement in the cause of advancing the political claims of the working classes has been well documented.¹² Although he wanted adult suffrage and public voting rather than the manhood suffrage and secret ballot favored by the League, Mill nonetheless invested a good deal of political capital in the campaign for working-class enfranchisement. In July 1865 he stated in a letter to Howell that "the general promotion of the Reform cause is the main point at present, and [...] advanced reformers, without suppressing their opinions on points on which they may still differ, should act together as one in the common cause."¹³ Rather than trying to distance himself from the cause in the immediate wake of the Hyde Park riots of July 1866, Mill defended the League in the House of Commons and later donated five pounds in support of those arrested by the police.¹⁴ He addressed a Reform League meeting held at the Agricultural Hall at the end of that month.¹⁵ In early 1867 he took part in a deputation that sought to persuade the Tory home secretary to appoint a working man to the royal commission on trade unions.¹⁶ A few months later Mill subscribed to a Reform League fund dedicated to mobilizing for advanced liberal causes the working-class urban householders enfranchised by the Reform Act of 1867.¹⁷ He played an important part in the successful resistance to the 1867 Royal Parks Bill, a measure directed at restricting the holding of political meetings and demonstrations in royal parks.¹⁸ At the 1868 general election he donated money to the campaigns of both George Howell and George Odger.¹⁹ In early November of that year he told a correspondent that the "Liberal party will have cause to repent of not having adopted the best leaders of the working men and helped them to seats."²⁰

The London political world in which Mill immersed himself in the second half of the 1860s powerfully influenced his recantation of the wages-fund theory. The publication of Thornton's book was the occasion, not the cause of Mill's apostasy. Evelyn Forget has persuasively argued that Mill's decision to issue a formal recantation was shaped by his desire to draw the greatest possible attention to a statement whose central purpose was to legitimate the claims of trade unions.²¹ In the words of Jeff Lipkes,

"cool logic, and commitment, dictated Mill's decision."²² The London context of Mill's flurry of political activity during the second half of the 1860s played a critical role in both the formation of the commitment and the expression Mill gave to it in 1869.

Be it his renunciation of the wages-fund doctrine or his views on the division of labor and the machinery question, Mill positioned himself at some distance from the ground occupied by most entrepreneurs. The most politically active among the latter typically practiced a brand of radicalism unlike that which Mill espoused. G.R. Searle, historian of entrepreneurial radicalism, notes that the radical coterie with whom Mill associated in the 1830s tended to enjoy incomes impervious to "the crude play of market forces."²³ The financial security Mill knew as a valued employee of the East India Company had no analogue among owners of enterprises whose fortunes fluctuated in response to the vicissitudes of the market. Richard Cobden, a Manchester manufacturer, emerged as the most capable champion of entrepreneurial radicalism. (In 1845 Cobden himself experienced insolvency.) Like Cobden, Mill had few good words to say for the English aristocracy. Although a pronounced anti-oligarchical bias informed the politics of both men, Mill's frame of reference differed markedly from Cobden's and the northern men of business who constituted the leadership of the Anti-Corn Law League. Mill, an avid supporter of free trade, denounced the Corn Laws in essays composed years before the founding of the League.²⁴ Even so, he had no formal connection with the powerful extra-parliamentary movement master-minded by Cobden. Mill instead embraced political journalism as the means he thought best fitted to his talents and the ends he wished to pursue. In 1834 he declared that "Nobody denies that the newspapers govern the country,"²⁵ a claim far more likely to spring from an ambitious radical propagandist resident in London than from a provincial man of business. Not long after, Mill became the editor of the *London and Westminster Review*. The periodical's name and the mental cast of its editor could not have been more perfectly aligned. Mill's political hero at the time he took up the editorship of the *London and Westminster* was the radical French

journalist Armand Carrel, extolled by Mill as “at once the Achilles and Ulysses of the democratic party” in France.²⁶

As befit such a democrat, Carrel called for “an extension of the suffrage” in France.²⁷ In the 1830s Mill and his fellow Philosophic Radicals urged the adoption of household suffrage in Britain. The prospect of an expanded electorate alarmed Cobden, for whom the political struggle that mattered pitted the middle classes against the aristocracy. The manufacturers of the North of England, Cobden believed, formed the political vanguard of the middle classes. Entrepreneurial radicalism, as conceived by Mill and his metropolitan colleagues, expressed the sectional interests of the northern manufacturers. On the issue of the Corn Law, these sectional interests happened to correspond with the universal interest (“universal” provided one discounted, as one should, the sinister interest of the English aristocracy). On other issues, suffrage included, this was not the case. The Philosophic Radicals saw themselves as above all sectional and class interests. Their notion of the political contest had “the people” squaring off against the aristocracy. Most metropolitan radicals, philosophic and otherwise, rejected Cobden’s position on the essential character of political conflict in early-Victorian England. Mill instructed League activists on the end to which their political energies should be directed in his 1839 essay “Reorganization of the Reform Party.” Asserting that only “a further Parliamentary Reform” could bring about repeal of the Corn Laws, Mill argued that the 1832 Reform Act had “left almost unabated the master-evil, the preponderance of the Corn Law interest.” Merchants and manufacturers, he insisted, “will have to learn what the working classes have already learnt”; this being “that they must combine to agitate, not against the Corn Laws, but against the source of the Corn Laws, as well as every other grievance—the vicious constitution of the legislature.”²⁸

Most of the men of business with whom Cobden kept company worried less about defects in the legislature than about the vicious constitution of the working classes. Manchester, which in the late 1830s and early 1840s was writhing in the grip of the worst trade and industrial

depression of the nineteenth century, was the sort of place where acrimony between masters and men made cross-class cooperation well-nigh impossible. The metropolitan strains with which Mill was familiar had other sources and were of a different kind. The savage brand of class animosity evident in the North had no London counterpart.

Nor was there a London counterpart to the forceful and concentrated Nonconformist presence in a number of towns in the Midlands and the North. Well-acquainted though Mill was with the rational Dissent of London Unitarianism, he had no personal experience of the Nonconformist communities that constituted the bulk of Protestant Dissent in England. Of the 2,878,543 Nonconformists attending an English chapel on 30 March 1851, Unitarians accounted for barely more than 34,000.²⁹ Fifteen years before the religious census of 1851 a quarrel with the Evangelical wing of Nonconformity caused the Unitarians to secede from the United Committee of Dissenting Deputies. Michael Watts, a prominent historian of Protestant Dissent, observes that "the humane, civilized, and sophisticated versions of Christianity offered by the Unitarians and Quakers" failed "to attract a mass following," whereas "the Evangelical version of Christianity" won "wholesale conversions among superstitious and unsophisticated communities." The highest rates of Nonconformist support, he further notes, were found in "areas with high rates of illiteracy" (as measured by the "Mean proportion of men and women signing marriage registers with a mark, 1838-41"). Conversely, those regions recording the highest literacy rates "were areas where Nonconformity was particularly weak." London had the highest literacy rate in the country. The percentage of its population attending a Dissenting chapel on 30 March 1851 has been estimated at a mere 8.9.³⁰ Mill's London domicile, coupled with the character of his upbringing, meant that he had a shallow understanding of Nonconformity.

Cobden, while not himself given to expressions of religious enthusiasm, sought to harness the moral and religious fervor of Nonconformity to the free trade cause. In 1841 he organized a meeting of seven hundred Dissenting ministers in Manchester to trumpet forth the

“politics of the Gospel.” Boyd Hilton points out that the Anti-Corn Law agitation was “defiantly provincial and Nonconformist in tone.”³¹

London’s brand of radicalism was decidedly secular in tone. Miles Taylor, an authority on mid-nineteenth-century radicalism, goes so far as to say that “the progressive ethos of London politics induced a lack of judgement and tact when it came to dealing with the religious life of the rest of the country.”³² The secular bent of the metropolis assisted the triumphant candidacy of George Grote in the City of London at the 1832 election. A disciple of Bentham and James Mill (the latter especially), Grote would be the most intellectually capable exponent of Philosophic Radicalism in the Parliaments of the 1830s. Benthamites, be they in Parliament or not, invested a lot of energy in the cause of secular education. Both Grote and James Mill played a pivotal role in the founding of University College London, England’s first secular institution of higher learning. John Arthur Roebuck, another Philosophic Radical elected in 1832, called for the creation of a state-supported system of national primary education in a powerful Commons’ speech delivered soon after his election.³³ Roebuck, William Thomas tells us, “had acquired a taste for oratory in the London Debating Society.”³⁴ In the *Autobiography* Mill says of Roebuck that “it is his title to permanent remembrance, that [...] he originated [...] the parliamentary movement for National Education.”³⁵ Religious strife was the principal impediment to establishing a system of universal elementary education. Philosophic Radicals and Protestant Dissenters alike deplored Anglican hegemony in the educational sphere. The former, however, were secularists in a way the latter were not.

Dissenters, in the main, favored a non-denominationalist (or non-sectarian) solution to the issue of religious instruction in tax-payer supported schools. This commonly meant confining religious instruction to the teaching and reading of the Bible. Cobden, like Mill, wanted to see a major expansion in the provision of primary education. In October 1850 he attended a conference that saw the name of the Lancaster Public School Association changed to that of the National Public School Association. At this meeting Cobden argued that the kind of education advocated by the

Association should be denoted "non-sectarian" rather than "secular," the latter term initially having been proposed. He won his point.³⁶ Incensed by this change in nomenclature, Mill lamented "that an enterprise of so much promise should have been inaugurated by an act of truckling and compromise." He castigated the Association for letting "itself be persuaded by Mr. Cobden, aided by some dissenting ministers, to sacrifice its distinctive flag, and instead of calling itself an Association for secular education should have sheltered its timidity under the ambiguous designation of *unsectarian*." Mill held that "Education provided by the public must be education for all, and to be education for all it must be purely secular."³⁷ Cobden's milieu was one in which the influence of "dissenting ministers" and their congregations could prove of cardinal importance. The associational culture with which Mill was familiar assigned no particular significance to the influence of Protestant Nonconformity.

The sentiments Mill expressed in 1850 persisted. The denominationalist slant of the Education Bill introduced by Gladstone's government in 1870 provoked stiff opposition from both Mill and Nonconformists. Mill spoke out against the Bill at a meeting in St. James's Hall in March of that year. Contrasting the position of Nonconformists with that of the Established Church, he noted that the former "do not desire their distinctive doctrines to be taught in schools [...]. The system deliberately chosen by the Dissenters [...] is limited to reading the Bible without note or comment."³⁸ This observation led the *Spectator* to identify Mill's perspective on religious instruction with that of the Nonconformists.³⁹ Mill acted with dispatch to set the record straight. In a 9 April Letter to the Editor, Mill stated that although he regarded the non-denominationalist approach of the Nonconformists as "greatly preferable to the merely denominationalist, 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."⁴⁰ Mill's English world was a London world. In this domain secularist attitudes, together with religious indifference, predominated.

Absence of Christian belief was no disqualification for service at India House, where a store of East India Company business was carried out by both Mills, father and son. London, in size and wealth the world's premier city in the nineteenth century, was the capital of an empire. Before 1858 much of the responsibility for governing the Indian subcontinent, by far the most populous portion of the British Empire, rested with the East India Company. Many provincial radicals in early and mid-Victorian England, Cobden and Bright among them, objected to empire on economic, political, and moral grounds. Respecting colonies, the Utilitarians were of two minds (perhaps more). Both Bentham and James Mill held that colonies were without economic value to the parent state. Yet the interventionist thrust of Utilitarian thought could justify attempts to reform societies that appeared to lack the indigenous means to advance in the scale of civilization. James Mill, if not Bentham, certainly understood India to fit this description, and considered the East India Company a fit instrument for giving the subcontinent enlightened government.⁴¹ In 1861 J.S. Mill blithely noted the increasingly common phenomenon of "backward populations" being "either held in direct subjection by the more advanced, or to be under their complete political ascendancy." This being so, "there are in this age of the world few more important problems than how to organize this rule, so as to make it a good instead of an evil to the subject people, providing them with the best attainable government, and with conditions most favourable to future permanent improvement."⁴² Mill trusted that British power—moral, commercial, financial, diplomatic, naval, and imperial—could serve salutary purposes and noble ends. His decades of service at India House helped shape this conviction.

The metropolitan space Mill inhabited had something to do with his concern for maintaining British prestige in the world. Great Britain, he asserted in *Representative Government*, was "the Power which, of all in existence, best understands liberty—and whatever may have been its errors in the past, has attained more of conscience and moral principle in its dealings with foreigners, than any other great nation seems either to

conceive as possible, or recognise as desirable." For this reason, "adding" to Britain's "moral influence, and weight in the councils of the world," was "specially valuable."⁴³ Underpinning British power and prestige was the financial might of the City of London, where stood India House (until its demolition in 1862), the Bank of England, the Stock Exchange, and the Royal Exchange. In 1851 *Knight's Cyclopaedia of London* suggested that the neighborhood around Threadneedle Street, which housed the Bank of England, had probably been "the most opulent part of Roman London. A greater power than the Roman, a power of which the masters of the old world had no conception, now reigns supreme on this very spot."⁴⁴ The City's financial primacy, along with the warehouses and dockyards of east London, helped sustain the greatest maritime power the world had ever known. As Athens (which meant far more to Mill than Rome) was to Greece, so Britain (or London writ large) was to the world. In a speech given in the House of Commons in August 1867, Mill decried the 1856 Declaration of Paris, by which Britain had renounced the right to seize the property of enemies carried in neutral ships. He deemed Britain's endorsement of this principle "a national blunder."⁴⁵ The "age of improvement" had seen the triumph of free trade; nearly all radicals and liberals, even most Whigs, had embraced the maxim that "free ships make free goods." Mill utterly rejected this notion, arguing that "every power should fight with its natural weapons," and that "it is for the interests of the world that the naval Powers should not be weakened, for whatever is taken from them is given to the great military Powers, and it is from these alone that the freedom and independence of nations has anything to fear."⁴⁶

Many of those who disagreed with Mill regarding the rights of non-belligerent trading nations during wartime were by no means indifferent to the projection of British power and preservation of British prestige. Few such men, however, could have been so exclusively the product of a particular kind of metropolitan "education" as was Mill, whose India House career began when he was seventeen. Over the course of the next thirty-five years he became a mainstay of imperial administration. Mill's morning walks, from which he reckoned so much could be learned about "the history

of England in the nineteenth century,” told him plenty about the fruits of maritime supremacy. An abundance of metropolitan experience informed Mill’s judgment that international constraints on the exercise of British naval power undermined his country’s benign global influence.

This naval power was essential to the security of Britain’s settlement colonies, in which Mill took a keen interest.⁴⁷ In the 1830s he became an avid proponent of Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s scheme of systematic colonization.⁴⁸ Wakefield and Mill argued that such colonization could ease the pressure of population in Britain, where fertile land was scarce relative to the large pool of capital and labor. In the colonies land was abundant, while capital and labor were lacking. Wakefield urged that the price of land in the colonies be set high enough to ensure that most settlers would need to live by wage labor for a number of years before accumulating the capital necessary to purchase a holding. Proceeds from the sale of land, Wakefield stipulated, should be used to pay for emigration from Britain of young men and women (families especially) possessing traits conducive to the colony’s social, economic, political, cultural, and moral growth.⁴⁹ Wakefield and Mill saw the building of infrastructure and the formation of towns as signs of a healthy modern society. A widely scattered population, Mill said, could not enjoy “the advantages of commerce, of markets, of separation of employments, and combination of labour.” A concentration of population “greatly accelerates the attainment of prosperity, and enlarges the fund which may be drawn upon for further emigration.”⁵⁰ Mill and a number of his fellow Philosophic Radicals joined Wakefield’s South Australia Association and dubbed themselves “Colonial Reformers.” These reformers, in the words of Duncan Bell, believed that “Metropolitan concentration, not the frontier virtues of agrarian republicanism, offered the greatest moral and political promise.”⁵¹

Like Mill, Wakefield was a Londoner (indeed, he forged his ideas for systematic colonization while serving a three-year sentence in Newgate for abducting a fifteen-year-old heiress). The South Australia Association he founded was a metropolitan venture in impetus, membership, and finance. The London familiar to Wakefield and Mill vividly illustrated the ill effects

of population pressure; it also spectacularly manifested the material and creative achievements of an advanced commercial civilization. Mill held that intellectual distinction and metropolitan culture went hand in hand. In an essay written in 1836, he observed that "the illustrious men of letters in France and England [...] nearly all have spent their best years in the capital, and their works have been written in and for London and Paris." The mettle they needed to "trust to their own inspirations, either in thought or language, as well as the modesty which has saved them from [...] the misfortune of being too easily pleased with their own performances—have been learned in the literary metropolis of the nation, and in contact with the direct influence of its leading minds."⁵² It would be a stretch to characterize Wakefield as an "illustrious man of letters," and those who knew him would not have thought "modesty" among his chief attributes. However this may be, Mill saw genius in Wakefield's bold scheme, a genius that displayed a metropolitan watermark.

Evidence of genius at Oxford or Cambridge during the 1830s escaped Mill's detection. Among the many things James Mill bequeathed his eldest son was a virulent bias against the ancient universities, institutions father and son alike deemed unfriendly to the formation of strong minds fiercely committed to the search for truth. A passage from J.S. Mill's essay "Civilization" (1836) encapsulates the essence of his scathing indictment of Oxford and Cambridge: "if they could make churchmen, they cared not to make religious men; [...] if they could make Tories, whether they made patriots was indifferent to them; [...] if they could prevent heresy, they cared not if the price paid were stupidity—this constitutes the peculiar baseness of those bodies."⁵³ (Mill took no notice of the apparent superiority of Oxford to Cambridge in the making of such men. Five past presidents of the Cambridge Union—Charles Austin, Charles Buller, Edward Strutt, Eyton Tooke, and Charles Villiers—were among the young men who looked to James Mill for authoritative political guidance in the second half of the 1820s. Two others of like mind, Edward Romilly and Thomas Hyde Villiers, had been secretaries of the Cambridge Union.)⁵⁴ Finding much to value in Coleridge's ideal of the "clerisy," J.S. Mill considered Oxford and

Cambridge unfit to stock its ranks. Social and religious exclusivity; a narrow and uninspiring curriculum; a culpable indifference to the right purposes of endowed institutions of higher learning—such a nasty brew could not nourish the nation’s political, intellectual, and moral life. Anchored in London, Mill had no knowledge of the internal stirrings of reform being felt at the ancient universities during the 1830s.

Mill would change his mind about Oxford and Cambridge, but only because he was given reason to think they had become something different from what he thought them to be in the 1830s. In a segment added to the draft of his *Autobiography* in 1861, Mill invoked “a revival of speculation, speculation too of a free kind, in many quarters, and above all (where at one time I should have least expected it) in the Universities.”⁵⁵ Six years later, in his *Inaugural Address Delivered to the University of St. Andrews*, he said of England’s ancient universities “that whereas they formerly seemed to exist mainly for the repression of individual thought, and the chaining up of the individual intellect and conscience, they are now the great foci of free and manly enquiry, to the higher and professional classes, south of the Tweed.”⁵⁶ Over the course of the 1840s, ’50s, and ’60s, Mill’s *System of Logic* (1843) and *Principles of Political Economy* (1848) won the rapt attention of a generation of readers at Oxford and Cambridge: men such as Leslie Stephen, Henry Sidgwick, and A.J. Balfour affirmed Mill’s unrivaled sway. Stephen says that his Cambridge circle read Mill’s books “as we might treatises of physical or mathematical science, and judged them as we might judge Newton’s *Principia* without reference to the personality of the author.”⁵⁷ Shortly after Mill’s death Sidgwick told a correspondent, C.H. Pearson: “I should say that from about 1860-65 or thereabouts he ruled England in the region of thought as very few men ever did: I do not expect to see anything like it again.”⁵⁸ Balfour, who matriculated at Trinity College Cambridge between 1866 and 1869, recalled that “Mill possessed at that time an authority in the English Universities [...] comparable to that wielded forty years earlier by Hegel in Germany and in the Middle Ages by Aristotle.”⁵⁹ The decades following the 1830s saw university reformers working to expand the curriculum and

professoriate, reduce the number of non-teaching fellowships, open the doors to Dissenters, and create a system of voluntary local examinations designed to furnish England with a nationally recognized standard of secondary education. Mill understood that change of a welcome sort was taking place at the ancient universities, institutions that had proved productive ground for the growth of his own influence.

Yet one is struck by how little interest he showed in Oxford and Cambridge. In 1867 he declined an invitation to sit on a parliamentary select committee considering further reforms at the ancient universities, saying that others "would be more useful on the Committee."⁶⁰ University men visited Mill at his home in Blackheath. At no point in his mature years did he undertake the short journey from London to either Oxford or Cambridge (Charles Austin paraded the young Mill's prodigious intellectual talents before his friends in the Cambridge Union in the early 1820s). Mill's abiding concern to promote "the authority of the instructed" did not encompass a serious engagement with the institutions chiefly responsible for training the nation's intellectual élite. Mill's English intellectual world did not extend beyond the environs of the nation's capital.

Causes that did powerfully engage Mill in the last years of his life had a metropolitan cast. These included the preservation of common land, land reform more generally, and the campaign for women's suffrage. The Commons Preservation Society, whose purpose was to protect open spaces near London from enclosure and development, was founded in 1865.⁶¹ Mill ardently embraced the cause. In January 1866 he told the Society's Secretary, Arthur Lankester, that he had, throughout his life, "been strongly impressed with the importance of preserving as much as possible of such free space for healthful exercise, & for the enjoyment of natural beauty as the growth of population and cultivation has still left to us." Echoing sentiments voiced in the *Principles of Political Economy*,⁶² Mill deemed the wish "to engross the whole surface of the earth in the mere production of the greatest possible quantity of food & the materials of manufacture [...] to be founded on a mischievously narrow conception of the requirements of human nature."⁶³

The origins of Mill's environmentalism plainly subsume far more than the mere fact of his being a Londoner.⁶⁴ Even so, the extraordinary growth of the metropolis unquestionably heightened his awareness of the aesthetic costs arising from the impact of commercial development on the natural environment. Such development made war on "the spontaneous activity of nature," threatened the survival of undomesticated "quadrupeds or birds," took aim at "every hedgerow or superfluous tree," and would leave no "place where a wild shrub or flower could grow without being eradicated." Mill considered solitude a vital human need: "solitude in the presence of natural beauty and grandeur, is the cradle of thoughts and aspirations which are not only good for the individual, but which society could ill do without."⁶⁵ Access to such solitude by residents of the capital was endangered by manor lords who threatened to encroach upon open spaces such as Berkhamsted Common, Bostall Heath, Epping Forest, Hampstead Heath, Plumstead Common, and Wimbledon Common. The Commons Preservation Society strove to protect this access, a mission Mill heartily endorsed.

Mill did more than endorse the mission of the Land Tenure Reform Association. He was the principal architect of this mission, and became the Chair of the Association's Provisional Committee, formed in 1869. The Association's *Programme* was published by Longman in 1871, shortly before the holding of the organization's first public meeting.⁶⁶ Included with this document was "*an Explanatory Statement by John Stuart Mill.*" Of the ten articles that constituted the Association's *Programme*, by far the most radical was the fourth, which called for the taxation of the unearned increment of land rent (the increase in rental value spawned by social and demographic change rather than by any effort or expenditure made by the owner). Proprietors who found this prospect unpalatable would be given the option of selling their land to the state at market value.⁶⁷ Like Mill's environmental advocacy, as reflected in his support of the Commons Preservation Society, so too his embrace of land reform was rooted in moral, political, and economic soil unconnected with metropolitan terrain. This terrain, however, significantly influenced Mill's proposal to tax the unearned increment. In an article published in the

Examiner in January 1873, he said that if the municipality of London owned the Grosvenor, Portman, and Portland estates, the income generated by this property "would probably suffice for the whole expense of the local government of the capital." The massive incomes from these estates, he specified, "are still swelling." London's growth meant they would double again, "in as short a time as they have doubled already." He went on to ask: "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?"⁶⁸ Mill's espousal of the public's right to claim for itself a portion of the unearned increase in land value further illustrates London's impact on his radicalism.

No cause meant more to Mill in his last years than did women's suffrage. He played an integral part in the founding of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage in the summer of 1867.⁶⁹ In May of that year Mill had introduced a motion in the House of Commons that sought to remove from the Reform Bill the words signifying an electoral franchise limited to males.⁷⁰ In his *Autobiography* Mill says that this initiative "was by far the most important, perhaps the only really important public service I performed in the capacity of a Member of Parliament."⁷¹ In taking this action, Mill, in the words of Ann Robson, "gave the movement a national focus."⁷² Yet it was not long before internal discord threatened to undermine the movement's unity. The friction had a marked regional dimension. The Manchester Society for Women's Suffrage, established in January 1867, adhered to the national movement in November of that year (thereby following Edinburgh's example). Refusing to accept direction from London, the Manchester group, led by Lydia Becker and Jacob Bright, undertook in 1871 to enhance its own influence at London's expense by forming a Central Committee for the entire movement. Although representatives of the London Society would have a presence within the Central Committee, they would be in no position to dominate. Mill strenuously opposed what he saw as a power play by the Manchester wing of the movement. He wanted London's Executive Committee to

reject the idea of sending delegates to Manchester. Failing this, he wished the London Committee to state that it could not comply with “a measure that would swamp the London Committee in a Central Committee of provincials [...] except by a vote of the London Society.” Mill held that such an approach “would embarrass the enemy very much as their object is, quietly to supersede the London Committee, and not to raise a public discussion.”⁷³ Complicating the problem was a fundamental disagreement between Mill and Manchester leaders over the relation between the campaign for women’s suffrage and the agitation for repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. These statutes (passed in 1864, 1866, and 1869) provided for the compulsory medical examination of prostitutes in eighteen garrison or dockyard towns. Although Mill favored repeal of the Acts, he adamantly opposed linking the movement for women’s suffrage in any way with the Contagious Diseases agitation, fearing such an association would seriously harm the cause he had made his own. Many Manchester suffrage advocates supported a commingling of the two.

Most striking in Mill’s reaction to the Manchester enterprise is the disdain he reveals for the “provincials” responsible for launching it. Derisory comments pepper his correspondence during this time. Manchester sought to seize from the metropolis “the authority acquired by the prudence and good taste of the London Committee.” Such authority, once obtained, would be used “for rash folly.”⁷⁴ Referring to the Contagious Diseases agitation in a letter of September 1871, Mill observed that it “would never have become the objectionable thing many feel it, had it been carried on by people who had more knowledge of the world, and more consideration for the feelings of others. These same people would soon contrive to make the agitation for the suffrage vulgar and ridiculous.”⁷⁵ A month later he wrote that dealing with “the Manchester School” requires the use of “blunt language [...] for they can understand no other, and take the reticence of good breeding or kind feeling for signs of weakness of purpose.”⁷⁶ Opponents of the London Committee “will not scruple to take unfair advantage”; its defenders “must always bear in mind that it takes frank people a long time to see through the devices of those who are not frank.”⁷⁷

It was the London Committee that had "by its calm and judicious conduct [...] given dignity and influence to the movement for Women's Suffrage in this country."⁷⁸ In May 1872, following the defeat in the House of Commons of Jacob Bright's bill for women's suffrage, Mill attributed the "check which the Women's Movement is now sustaining" to its identification "with the Bright and Becker set." As for their mixing together the franchise campaign with the agitation against the Contagious Diseases Acts, this was "but one example of the total want equally of good taste and good sense with which they conduct the proceedings."⁷⁹

The good sense of metropolitan radicalism and the vulgarity of radicalism's provincial varieties—this theme ramified well beyond the internecine quarrel between the London and Manchester branches of the women's suffrage movement. John Bright, Jacob's brother, was, in the words of Asa Briggs, "the most important figure in the history of mid-Victorian radicalism."⁸⁰ Mill and Bright saw eye to eye on the American Civil War, on the need to prosecute the Jamaican officials, Governor Eyre especially, responsible for their grave abuse of authority in 1865, and on the injustice of a coercive response to Irish unrest. Although Bright spent the last thirty-three years of his life representing Birmingham in the House of Commons, it was Manchester that forged his politics. A political moralist and an orator of great power, Bright had no aptitude for coming to grips with the nitty-gritty of serious political business (the issue of franchise reform excepted). As John Vincent has said of Bright, "On the few occasions when he set out to master a question, he became overwhelmed with the illusion of knowledge."⁸¹ While recognizing Bright's importance, Mill had scant regard for his intellect or discretion. In December 1859 Mill wrote to his friend Edwin Chadwick in connection with Thomas Hare's scheme of personal representation, which Mill considered the ideal means of coupling the widest possible political participation with a high level of political competence.⁸² Mill assured Chadwick that the latter would himself "be in Parliament directly" if Hare's plan were adopted. He went on to say that Hare's proposal was "in the best sense of the word, Conservative, as well as, also in the best sense,

liberal and democratic.” Its only “natural opponents,” in Mill’s view, were “such people as Bright, the mere demagogue and courtier of the majority.”⁸³ (This disparagement of Bright came before the American Civil War, the Jamaica controversy, and the furor raised by the Fenian threat. Although the two men fought on the same side in these battles, Mill never warmed to Bright. More than a trace of prejudice informs Mill’s 1859 belittling of Bright, a principled reformer who had lost his Manchester seat in 1857 owing to his outspoken and decidedly unpopular opposition to the Crimean War.) To Mill’s way of thinking, John Bright, like his brother Jacob, practiced a vulgar brand of politics. Mill’s metropolitan bias influenced this judgment.

In his essay “Centralisation” (1862) Mill asserts that “Enlightened English opinion was never more hostile than now to the actual management of local affairs by central authority. The centralisation which it approves of is that of knowledge and experience, rather than of power.”⁸⁴ In the metropolis alone did the kind of knowledge and experience Mill had in mind exist in a concentrated form. Surely this fact is pertinent to Mill’s proposal for a Legislative Commission, as set forth in *Considerations on Representative Government*.⁸⁵ The members of this Commission would be chosen by the Crown, their term of service being five years (renewable), unless removed by Parliament. The chief duty Mill assigns the Legislative Commission is the framing of laws, a task for which Parliament had demonstrated its utter unfitness. The request that a specific law be drafted would come from the representative assembly. Three options would be open to the assembly upon receiving the legislation asked for: its passage, rejection, or return to the Commission for further consideration. It would not itself have the authority to amend the measure crafted by the Commissioners. Mill of course refrains from saying that metropolitan men possessing the relevant knowledge and experience would dominate the Legislative Commission. Yet it was someone such as Chadwick, Benthamite and long-time resident of the capital, member of several royal commissions, secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners from 1834 to 1847 and a member of the General Board of Health from 1848 to 1854, who personified the traits Mill wanted in his Legislative

Commissioners. (Mill failed to see the damage Chadwick's defects of character often did himself and the aims he wished to promote.) The provincial contribution to this body, unlike the representative assembly, would be meager. The pool of talent from which most of its members would be drawn would be a metropolitan pool.

J.S. Mill was a quintessentially metropolitan intellectual. Many aspects of his thought and activity carried the mark of his London identity. The force of its influence was something of which Mill himself was largely unaware. We want to know Mill better than he knew himself. Being mindful of his London-rootedness is one way of furthering this end.

Kenyon College

Notes

This article originated as a much shorter essay that appeared in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 3 May 2013. The abbreviation CW refers to John Stuart Mill, *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, 33 Volumes, ed. John M. Robson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963-1991).

¹ CW 22:230.

² Donald Winch, "Review Essay: Mill as Romantic Idealist," *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 26 (December 2004): 551.

³ Martin Daunton, "London and the World," in *London World City 1800-1840*, ed. Celina Fox (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1992), 36.

⁴ CW 2:126.

⁵ CW 2:135.

⁶ CW 3:756-57.

⁷ Samuel Hollander, *The Economics of John Stuart Mill*, 2 Vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), vol. 1, 409.

⁸ CW 5:631-68.

⁹ The fact is that Thornton had more to say on the wages fund in a *Fortnightly Review* article of May 1867, "What Determines the Price of Labour or Rate of Wages," than he did in his book *On Labour*.

¹⁰ CW 5:646.

¹¹ The literature on the subject is substantial. Major examples include Pedro Schwartz, *The New Political Economy of J.S. Mill* (London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 1972), 90-101; Robert B. Ekelund, "A Short-run Classical Model of Capital and Wages: Mill's Recantation of the Wages Fund," *Oxford Economic Papers* 28 (March 1976), 66-85; E.G. West and R.W. Hafer, "J.S. Mill, Unions, and the Wages Fund Recantation: A Reinterpretation," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 92 (November 1978), 603-19; Hollander, *Economics of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. 1, 409-17; Eugenio Biagini, "British Trade Unions and Popular Political Economy, 1860-1880," *Historical Journal* 30 (December 1987), 811-40; Evelyn Forget, "J.S. Mill and the Tory School: The Rhetorical Value of the Recantation," *History of Political Economy* 24 (March 1992), 31-59; Oskar Kurer, "Mill's Recantation of the Wages Fund Doctrine: Was Mill Right after All?" *History of Political Economy* 30 (September 1998), 515-36; Jeff Lipkes, *Politics, Religion and Classical Political Economy in Britain: John Stuart Mill and His Followers* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 46-57.

¹² See Bruce L. Kinzer, Ann P. Robson, and John M. Robson, *A Moralist In and Out of Parliament: John Stuart Mill at Westminster, 1865-1868* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), especially Chapter 3, 92-98.

¹³ CW 17:2010-11.

¹⁴ See CW 28:99-100 and CW 16:1186.

¹⁵ See CW 1:278 and CW 28:103-4.

¹⁶ See CW 16:1242-43 and CW 28:133-34.

¹⁷ CW 16:1191-92.

¹⁸ CW 28:215-17.

¹⁹ John R. Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-1868* (London: Constable, 1966), 159.

²⁰ CW 16:1479.

²¹ Forget, "J.S. Mill and the Tory School."

²² Lipkes, *Politics, Religion and Classical Political Economy in Britain*, 56.

²³ G.R. Searle, *Entrepreneurial Politics in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 2.

²⁴ CW 4:45-70 and 141-59.

²⁵ CW 6:163.

²⁶ See "Armand Carrel," CW 20:167-215. The words quoted appear at 211; and Mill's letter to Thomas Carlyle of 25 November 1833, CW 12:194-96.

²⁷ CW 20:209.

²⁸ CW 6:476.

²⁹ See Table II in Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters, Volume II: The Expansion of Evangelical Nonconformity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 28.

³⁰ For all these details see Watts, *The Dissenters, Volume II*, 100-102.

³¹ Boyd Hilton, *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People? England 1783-1846* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 503.

³² Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism 1847-1860* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 76.

³³ *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Ser., Vol. 20, Cols. 139-66 (30 July 1833).

³⁴ William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals: Nine Studies in Theory and Practice, 1817-1841* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 210.

³⁵ CW 1:203.

³⁶ See "Conference at the Mechanics Institution on Secular Education," *The Times*, 31 October 1850, 5.

³⁷ CW 28:3 and 4.

³⁸ CW 29:383.

³⁹ See "The Secularists in Full Cry," *Spectator*, 2 April 1870, 425-26.

⁴⁰ CW 25:1222-23.

⁴¹ The central importance of the Utilitarian legacy in India is the subject of Eric Stokes' classic study *The English Utilitarians in India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959); for significant differences between Bentham and the Mills on this matter, see the essays by F. Rosen and Allison Dube in *J.S. Mill's Encounter with India*, ed. Martin I. Moir, Douglas M. Peers, and Lynn Zastoupil (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 18-33 and 34-52.

⁴² CW 19:568.

⁴³ CW 19:565.

⁴⁴ Charles Knight, *Knight's Cyclopaedia*, 1851 (London: Charles Knight, 1851), 640.

⁴⁵ CW 28:221.

⁴⁶ CW 28:223.

⁴⁷ For an excellent examination of Mill's interest in this subject, see Duncan Bell, "John Stuart Mill on Colonies," *Political Theory*, 38 (February 2010), 34-64; for another highly valuable discussion of the topic, see Georgios Varouxakis, *Liberty Abroad: J.S. Mill on International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 125-40.

⁴⁸ For Mill's journalistic support of Wakefield's South Australian project, see CW 23:733-34, 735-37, and 738-42.

⁴⁹ Wakefield promoted these ideas in a series of pamphlets published between 1830 and 1834.

⁵⁰ CW 3:965.

⁵¹ Bell, "John Stuart Mill on Colonies," 41.

⁵² CW 18:101.

⁵³ CW 18:142.

⁵⁴ I owe these particulars to a footnote that appears in Joseph Hamburger's *Intellectuals in Politics. John Stuart Mill and the Philosophic Radicals* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965), 11n; for Hamburger's source, see Percy Cradock, *Recollections of the Cambridge Union 1815-1939* (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1953), 169-70.

⁵⁵ CW 1:233.

⁵⁶ CW 21:250.

⁵⁷ Leslie Stephen, *Some Early Impressions* (London: Hogarth Press, 1924), 71.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists. Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 178.

⁵⁹ Arthur James Balfour, *Theism and Humanism* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), 138.

⁶⁰ CW 16:1279.

⁶¹ For insightful scholarly commentary on the Society's work, see John Ranlett, "'Checking Nature's Desecration': Late-Victorian Environmental Organization," *Victorian Studies* 26 (Winter 1983), 197-222; Ben Cowell, "The Commons Preservation Society and the Campaign for Berkhamsted Common, 1866-70," *Rural History* 13 (October 2002), 145-61; and Desmond Fitz-Gibbon, *Marketable Values: Inventing the Property Market in Modern Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018), 165-69; for an illuminating monograph on Victorian environmentalism, see James Winter, *Secure from Rash Assault. Sustaining the Victorian Environment* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999).

⁶² CW 3:756.

⁶³ CW 16:1340-41.

⁶⁴ For an incisive commentary on Mill's environmentalism, see Donald Winch, "Wild Natural Being and the Religion of Humanity: Mill's 'Green' Credentials," in *John Stuart Mill—Thought and Influence*, ed. Georgios Varouxakis and Paul Kelly (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 57-66.

⁶⁵ CW 3:756.

⁶⁶ For Mill's letter to Longman requesting publication of the *Programme*, see CW 17:1808-9.

⁶⁷ CW 5:690. Other reforms advocated by the Association included the removal of impediments to the selling and buying of land, the elimination of primogeniture, the curtailment of strict settlement, the fostering of cooperative agricultural initiatives and peasant proprietorships on land obtained by the state, and the preservation of common land and conservation by the state of land of exceptional beauty. See CW 5:687-95.

⁶⁸ CW 25:1233-34.

⁶⁹ Mill's involvement is traced in Ann P. Robson's article "Helen Taylor and the Founding of the National Society for Women's Suffrage," *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (April 1973), 1-22.

⁷⁰ For this motion and Mill's powerful speech in its support, see CW 28:151-62.

⁷¹ CW 1:285.

⁷² See Ann Robson's chapter "Women's Suffrage" in Kinzer, Robson, and Robson, *A Moralist In and Out of Parliament*, 113-48; the quoted phrase appears at 148.

⁷³ CW 17:1818.

⁷⁴ CW 17:1834.

⁷⁵ CW 17:1835.

⁷⁶ CW 17:1842.

⁷⁷ CW 17:1843.

⁷⁸ CW 17:1846.

⁷⁹ CW 17:1895.

⁸⁰ Asa Briggs, *Victorian People* (1955) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 197.

⁸¹ Vincent, *Formation of the Liberal Party*, 165.

⁸² Hare's scheme of personal representation provided for voters to mark their ballots in order of preference. The number of valid ballots cast would then be divided by the number of seats in the House of Commons to determine the quota necessary for election. If a candidate received more than the necessary quota, his surplus votes would be distributed among the second choices and so on until all the seats were filled. A candidate not reaching the quota from ballots recorded in his own constituency could also draw upon ballots from other constituencies that showed preferences for him. Thus national as well as local constituencies would, in effect, elect candidates.

⁸³ CW 15:654-55.

⁸⁴ CW 19:607.

⁸⁵ See Chapter V of *Considerations on Representative Government*, titled "Of the Proper Functions of Representative Bodies," in CW 19:422-34, especially 430-32.

