

# THE MILL NEWS LETTER

JOHN M. ROBSON, editor

Published by University of Toronto Press  
in association with Victoria College



*Please address communications to the Editor, Victoria College, University of Toronto, Toronto, 5, Canada*

Volume IV, Number 1

Fall, 1968

My apologies to all, and especially to librarians, for the non-appearance of Volume III, Number 2 (Spring, 1968). There was no such number, and the material scheduled for it appears in this number, which, as a result, is somewhat swollen. My particular apologies to those whose interesting contributions will be published later than I would wish.

In this issue the lead article is an unusually valuable addition to our knowledge of Mill's reputation and influence; in it James Scanlan (Philosophy, Kansas) makes available to us his detailed knowledge of an area that has been a blank till now: Mill's works in Russian translation, and Russian works about Mill. Pedro Schwartz y Giron, of the University of Madrid, takes up the questions posed in the article in the last issue by Messrs. Fredman and Gordon on Mill's Socialism; a further contribution to the discussion, by William Hughes of the University of Guelph, will appear in a subsequent issue. Some readers have expressed interest in biographical material, and in this issue Anna J. Mill opens a window into Mill's early adult life; in the next number she will guide us through the revealed scene by giving an account of Mill's relations with Henry Cole.

The rest of this number is given over to recent and forthcoming publications, work in progress, brief summaries of recent theses, the Bibliography of works on Mill (M, N, O), reviews, and a short discussion of a fragment of a Mill letter in the possession of F.A. von Hayek.

Please remember that all suggestions, announcements, offprints, and especially short essays and notes, make this editor's life a happy one.

\* \* \* \* \*

## JOHN STUART MILL IN RUSSIA: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

James P. Scanlan,  
University of Kansas

Russia discovered John Stuart Mill in the 1860s. During that decade most of Mill's works were translated into Russian and his influence became widespread, extending to a number of the most renowned Russian thinkers of the nineteenth century.

That Mill was not discovered earlier is hardly surprising. Russia's ruler from 1825 to 1855, Nicholas I, was bent on suppressing all manifestations of liberalism in his autocratic, Orthodox empire, and to that end he all but isolated Russia from the noxious intellectual currents flowing from the West. Censorship was severe; importation of foreign books was strictly limited, and their publication in Russian translation almost non-existent. Only three books by Western philosophers--two by Schelling and one by Carl Carus--were published in Russia during the entire thirty-year reign of the "Tsar-Disciplinarian."

When Alexander II ascended the throne in 1855, the atmosphere changed markedly. Censorship was eased (for a time); new presses and journals appeared; foreign works were imported and published in Russian editions in far greater quantities. At the same time a school of social radicalism was growing in Russia. Its doyens--Nicholas Chernyshevsky, Peter Lavrov, and others, highly educated men who knew the major European languages--looked abroad for inspiration, and one of the thinkers who interested them was Mill. For many of them Mill proved insufficiently revolutionary; they preferred Proudhon and, later, Marx. Yet it was these Russian radicals who translated and edited Mill's writings for their fellow countrymen in the 1860s, and who, in the face of increasing controls on literature as Alexander's liberalism cooled, popularized Mill's ideas in Russian society.

The first of Mill's works to be translated and the work that had the most enduring influence in Russia was Principles of Political Economy. The translator, Nicholas Chernyshevsky, was the radicals' chief spokesman in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties. He had no exalted opinion of Mill, but he found the Principles a convenient foil for expounding his own economic views. In 1860 he published a translation of Book I of the Principles, with extensive commentaries (8), and in 1861 a series of articles entitled "Essays on Political Economy (According to Mill)," in which he gave lengthy critical expositions of the remaining Books (30). What Chernyshevsky added to Mill amounted to a clear case for socialism. "The translator," a contemporary observed, "by the notes and commentaries which he appends to the translation, seeks to transform Mill into Proudhon."<sup>1</sup> The work gained great vogue in radical circles, both in Russia and abroad. Karl Marx studied Russian in order to read it, and concluded that Chernyshevsky had "thrown the light of a master mind" on "the bankruptcy of bourgeois political economy."<sup>2</sup>

In the end, however, it was Mill's text rather than Chernyshevsky's

commentaries that had broader impact on Russian thought in the nineteenth century. A complete translation of the Principles by Chernyshevsky, but without his notes (the censors prohibited them), was published in 1865 (9); when the notes were reintroduced in 1874, they were severely abbreviated (10). A generation of Russian economists was reared on a largely unadulterated Mill. The Tsarist government feared the book even in that form: in 1884 Alexander III ordered libraries to remove Chernyshevsky's translation from circulation and prohibited its reprinting. But there is no evidence that this measure diminished the book's authority in Russia. In the later 1880s and 1890s, when economic questions were vigorously debated by Russian Marxists and their opponents, Mill's Principles was read on all sides.<sup>3</sup> New translations, acceptable to the censors, appeared in 1895 (11) and 1897 (12). In 1896 the Russian Marxist economist Michael Tugan-Baranovsky, known internationally for his work in the theory of cycles, gave this estimate of Mill's impact in Russia: "Mill has had enormous influence on Russian economic literature; the majority of our general courses in political economy borrow their general plan of exposition and many details from him. Mill's methodological views are likewise adopted by the majority of our economists and jurists."<sup>4</sup> Understandably a number of the more substantial studies of Mill by Russian scholars--particularly the works of Bunge (28), Rozhdestvensky (46), and Tugan-Baranovsky (53)--focus on Mill the economist.

Another work which long affected the Russian intellectual scene beginning in the 'sixties was Mill's A System of Logic. The Logic was championed in Russia by Peter Lavrov, a mathematician who was philosophically the most sophisticated of the radicals and who later, in exile, became an important figure in the Russian and international socialist movements. Lavrov, at first more moderate politically than Chernyshevsky, had praised Mill as a social thinker as early as 1859; Lavrov's articles on philosophical questions, such as "An Outline of the Theory of Individuality" (37), did much to acquaint the Russian public with Mill's ideas in the early 'sixties. In 1865-1867 Lavrov edited and annotated the first Russian translation of the Logic (19), and thereafter the work was widely read and admired in Russia. Lavrov's edition was republished in 1878, and other editions (20,21) followed in succeeding years, the last in 1914.

Together with Mill's Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, published in Russian in 1869 (3), and Auguste Comte and Positivism, translated in 1867 (4) and republished in 1897 (5), A System of Logic carried the message of Mill's empiricism to Russian readers with considerable effect. These works, above all the Logic, are widely regarded by historians of Russian thought as a major source of a "positivist" mood which flourished in Russia in the 'sixties and 'seventies, and of which Mill was considered the foremost evangelist--the thinker who, in Tugan-Baranovsky's words, "more than anyone else helped the spread throughout the civilized world of a right understanding of the spirit of contemporary science, based on the study of nature."<sup>5</sup> Chernyshevsky, Lavrov, Dmitry Pisarev, Nicholas Mikhailovsky and others all expressed this positivist mood in greater or lesser degree. Furthermore the reading of Mill's works in logic and

epistemology constituted at least a stage in the intellectual development of many Russian philosophers (such as Vladimir Solovyov and the Princes Sergey and Yevgeny Trubetskoy) who ended far from positivism.<sup>6</sup> These works also provoked a number of critical responses from Russian scholars, including major technical studies by the logician Michael Karinsky (35,36).

More difficult to assess is the impact on Russian intellectual life of Mill's works in ethics and politics. Considerations on Representative Government and Dissertations and Discussions were both published in Russian translation in the 1860s (16,17); but they were never reprinted, and there is little discussion of them in Russian books or journals. Censorship may have been responsible for this silence. Utilitarianism, also translated in the 'sixties (22), was reprinted only once, in 1882 (23). The Russian radical generation of the 'sixties and later was strongly drawn toward utilitarianism as a moral outlook, but there is little evidence that Mill's book was a major source of this attraction. Chernyshevsky's Anthropological Principle in Philosophy, one of the most forthright utilitarian documents in the Russian literature, was written in 1860, the year before Mill published Utilitarianism. Only in the case of The Subjection of Women and On Liberty is there clear evidence of lively Russian interest.

The emancipation of women was a cause that strongly agitated the Russian radicals of the day. Russian readers were acquainted with Mill's views on the subject as early as 1860 through an article by M.L. Mikhailov in Chernyshevsky's journal, Sovremennik (40). The cause was further propagandized throughout the 'sixties by Nicholas Mikhailovsky, a major critic and social theorist who at the time came closer than any other Russian to being a full disciple of Mill in social philosophy. When The Subjection of Women appeared in London in 1869, it was immediately published in two Russian editions (6,15), one with a glowing preface by Mikhailovsky. Other editions followed in 1870, 1896, and 1906. Mill's position was sufficiently prominent on the Russian scene to generate strong attacks, including a critique by the renowned conservative Nicholas Strakhov (49).

The history of On Liberty in Russia is ironically indicative of the obstacles to the spread of Mill's ideas erected by Russian censorship, Communist as well as Tsarist. The Russian public heard of the book in 1859, the year it was published, through a smuggled Russian-language journal, Kolokol, edited in London by the distinguished exile and socialist patriarch Alexander Herzen (Gertsen) (32). Herzen admired the book and quoted it often in succeeding years. In the early 'sixties On Liberty was mentioned and quoted frequently by Russian thinkers in the homeland as well, particularly by Lavrov and Dmitry Pisarev, the firebrand critic who was to succeed Chernyshevsky as guide of the ultra-radicals, or "nihilists" as they came to be called. The book was published in a Russian translation, dedicated to Herzen, in Leipzig in 1861 (13).

Not until 1864 was On Liberty published in Russia (14), and then only with difficulty and with many passages excluded. The censor at first categorically rejected the manuscript. It was, he complained, "an idolization of reason as the supreme judge of all matters, divine as well as human"; worse, it preached "an application of the

Protestant principle of free choice...to all regions of knowledge and to every aspect of individual and social life." Later, however, this ban was overturned by a higher authority, the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee. The Committee approved the work for publication with omissions, "taking into consideration," as its report stated, "that Mill's work is to be printed in Ekonomist, a specialized scholarly monthly not widely distributed among the public."<sup>8</sup>

Subsequently On Liberty, still with omissions, was published in two more accessible editions (22,23), the last in 1882. But censorship would not permit sympathetic discussion of the book's arguments in the public press. The only significant studies of On Liberty available in Russian editions are the essay by Henry Buckle (27) and James Fitzjames Stephen's Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (48). And from 1882 to the present, no new edition of On Liberty has appeared. Current Soviet reference works, if they mention the book at all, do not acknowledge that a Russian translation ever existed. The article on Mill in the recent Soviet Philosophical Encyclopedia (50), for example, though it lists early translations of some of Mill's other works, lists no Russian version of On Liberty.

The last of Mill's works to be translated was the Autobiography, published in a heavily censored edition in the year after his death (1) and republished in 1896 (2). Three Essays on Religion and Chapters on Socialism have never been published in Russia, although a critical study of Mill's religious views by a Russian Orthodox priest was published in 1881 (33).

Since the turn of the century Mill's influence in Russia has steadily declined, and in the Soviet period has reached a seemingly permanent nadir. In fifty years of Soviet rule none of Mill's writings has been published in Russia (except Book I of the Principles, incidentally, in editions of Chernyshevsky's works). Nor have serious studies of any aspects of Mill's thought been produced. Since Stalin's death in 1953 new translations of works by other Western thinkers--Kant, Hume, Locke, Rousseau, and many more--have appeared in Russia, some in multi-volume sets. But no work by Mill is available today in a Russian bookstore.

Soviet rejection of Mill stems in part from the low opinion of him consistently entertained by Marx and his Russian apostles. Marx disposed of Mill with a well-remembered thrust: "On the level plain, simple mounds look like hills; and the imbecile flatness of the present bourgeoisie is to be measured by the altitude of its great intellects."<sup>9</sup> Lenin considered Mill a second-rate, derivative thinker and bourgeois apologist. These estimates have been echoed throughout the Soviet period. The current Soviet history of philosophy (31), for example, calls Mill a "bourgeois ideologue" whose empiricism is "crude," his logic "inconsistent," his philosophical views in general "limited," and his treatment of liberty "nothing more than a demand, masked by liberal phraseology, for liberty for the bourgeoisie to exploit the proletariat." Suppression of Mill's works by Soviet authorities may also be attributable, however, to an accurate appraisal of the disturbing impulses which those "bourgeois" defences of liberty might arouse in the Communist proletariat.

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup>Mikhail Lemke, Politicheskiye protsessy v Rossii 1860-kh gg. (Political Trials in Russia in the 1860s), (Moscow, 1923), 381-2.

<sup>2</sup>Karl Marx, Capital (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1919), I, 19.

<sup>3</sup>N.M. Chernyshevskaya, Letopis' zhizni i deyatel'nost' N.G. Chernyshevskovo (Chronicle of the Life and Activity of N.G. Chernyshevsky), (Moscow, 1953, 552.

<sup>4</sup>M. Tugan-Baranovsky, "Mill", Dzhon-Styuart ("Mill, John Stuart"), in Entsiklopedichesky slovar' (St. Petersburg, 1896), 37, 308.

<sup>5</sup>Quoted in Richard Kindersley, The First Russian Revisionists (Oxford, 1962), 56. Cf. N.O. Lossky, History of Russian Philosophy (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1952), 65ff; T.G. Masaryk, The Spirit of Russia, tr. Eden and Cedar Paul (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1961), I, 149; II, 3, 9-10, 71, 73, 102, 188; Nicolas Berdyaev, The Russian Idea (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962), 112ff.

<sup>6</sup>Lossky, op. cit., 82, 150.

<sup>7</sup>Quoted in A.V. Nikitenko, Dnevnik (Diary), (Moscow, 1955), II, 628-9).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 629.

<sup>9</sup>Marx, op. cit., I, 568.

RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS OF MILL'S WORKS

The following bibliography, hopefully complete as concerns Russian translations of Mill's works, is surely far from complete in its listing of Russian works on Mill, since it is not based on a systematic search of nineteenth-century Russian journals. But it includes all titles encountered in major Russian reference works, in the Library of Congress Cyrillic Union Catalogue, and in the New York Public Library's Dictionary Catalogue of the Slavonic Collection.

- (1) Avtobiografiya Dzhona Styuarta Millya (The Autobiography of John Stuart Mill). Translated from the English under the editorship of G. Ye. Blagosvetlov. St. Petersburg: V. Pushkov, 1874. 332 pp.
- (2) Avtobiografiya (istoriya moyey zhizni i ubezhdeni) (Autobiography [A History of My Life and Convictions]). Moscow: Khizhnoye delo, 1896. 280 pp.
- (3) Obzor filosofii sera Vil'yama Gamil'tona (An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy). St. Petersburg, 1869.
- (4) "Ogyust Kont i pozitivizm" ("Auguste Comte and Positivism"), in Ogyust Kont i polozhitel'naya filosofiya, izlozheniye i issledovaniye (Auguste Comte and Positive Philosophy: Exposition and Investigation). Translated under the editorship of N. Neklyudov and N. Tiblen. St. Petersburg, 1867. 370 pp. (Contains Mill's essay and an essay by George Henry Lewes.)
- (5) Ogyust Kont i pozitivizm (Auguste Comte and Positivism). Translated and edited by N.N. Spiridonov. Moscow: I.N. Kushnerev, 1897. 331 pp.

- (6) O podchinenii zhenshchiny (On the Subjection of Women). Translated from the English under the editorship of and with a preface by G. Ye. Blagosvetlov. Istoricheskiye zhenkiye tipy. Stat'ya Ioganna Sherra (Historical Types of Women. An Article by Johan Scherr). Translated from the German. St. Petersburg: A. Marigerovsky, 1869. 304 pp.
- (7) O podchinenii zhenshchiny (On the Subjection of Women). St. Petersburg, 1896. 121 pp.
- (8) Osnovaniya politicheskoy ekonomii s nekotorymi iz ikh primeneni k obshchestvennoy filosofii (Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy). Translated by N. Chernyshevsky and supplemented with notes by the translator. Vol. I. St. Petersburg: K. Vul'f, 1860. 426 pp. (Reprinted in collected editions of Chernyshevsky's works in 1905, 1937, and 1949.)
- (9) Osnovaniya politicheskoy ekonomii s nekotorymi iz ikh primeneni k obshchestvennoy filosofii. Pervoye polnoye izdaniye v dvukh tomakh (Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy. First Complete Edition in Two Volumes.) Two volumes in one. St. Petersburg: A.N. Pypin, 1865. (Chernyshevsky's complete translation of the Principles.)
- (10) Osnovaniya politicheskoy ekonomii s nekotorymi iz ikh primeneni k obshchestvennoy filosofii (Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy). Second complete edition, supplemented according to the latest English edition. 2 vols. St. Petersburg: M.M. Stasyulevich, 1874.
- (11) Osnovaniya politicheskoy ekonomii s nekotorymi iz ikh prilozheni k obshchestvennoy filosofii (Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy). Translated and with an introduction by Alexander Miklashevsky. Moscow: K.T. Soldatenkov, 1895. Lxxiv, 342 pp. (Translated from the abbreviated French text published in the Petite Bibliothèque Economique Française et Etrangère.)
- (12) Osnovaniya politicheskoy ekonomii s nekotorymi primeneniymi k obshchestvennoy filosofii (Principles of Political Economy with Some Applications to Social Philosophy). Translated by Ye. I. Ostrogradskaya under the editorship of O.I. Ostrogradsky. Kiev, 1897. xvii, 866 pp.
- (13) O svobode (On Liberty). Leipzig, 1861.
- (14) "O svobode" (On Liberty), translated by A. Longinov, in Ekonomist (The Economist), 1864.
- (15) Podchinyonnost' zhenshchiny (The Subjection of Women). Translated from the English with a preface by N. Mikhailovsky and with appended letters from Auguste Comte to J.S. Mill on the woman question. St. Petersburg: S.V. Zvonarev, 1869. (A second edition was published in 1870, and another in 1906.)
- (16) Rassuzhdeniya i issledovaniya politicheskkiye, filosofskkiye, i istoricheskkiye (Dissertations and Discussions: Political, Philosophical, and Historical). Parts I-III. St. Petersburg, 1864-1865.
- (17) Razmyshleniya o predstavitel'nom pravlenii (Considerations on Representative Government). St. Petersburg, 1863. 360 pp.

- (18) "Rech' Dzhona Styuarta Millya ob universitetskom vospitani" ("John Stuart Mill's Speech on University Education"), in Edward Livingston Youmans, Noveysheye obrazovaniye, yevo istinnyye tseli i trebovaniya (Modern Education, Its True Aims and Requirements). Translated from the English. St. Petersburg, 1867.
- (19) Sistema logiki (A System of Logic). Translated from the fifth, supplemented London edition by F. Rezener. 2 vols. St. Petersburg: M.O. Vul'f, 1865-1867. (Contains a preface and notes by Peter Lavrov. A second edition was published in 1878.)
- (20) Sistema logiki sillogisticheskoy i induktivnoy (A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive). Translated from the English. Moscow: I.N. Kushnarev, 1897-1898.
- (21) Sistema logiki sillogisticheskoy i induktivnoy. Vlozheniye printsipov dokazatel'stva v svyazi s metodami nauchnovo issledovaniya. (A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive. Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific Investigation). Translated under the editorship of V.N. Ivanovsky. Second, newly revised edition. Moscow, 1914. ~~1901~~, 880 pp. (The first edition of this translation was apparently published in Moscow in 1900.)
- (22) Utilitarianizm. O svobode (Utilitarianism. On Liberty). Translated from the English by A.N. Nevedomsky. St. Petersburg: A Golobarov, 1866-1869. 412 pp.
- (23) Utilitarizm. O svobode (Utilitarianism. On Liberty). Translated from the English by A.N. Nevedomsky. Supplemented with an essay on Mill's life and activity by Ye. Konradi. Second edition. St. Petersburg: A.M. Kotomin, 1882. cxxxv, 387 pp.

#### RUSSIAN WORKS ON MILL

- (24) Antonovich, Maksim Alekseyevich. "Dobrosovestnyye mysliteli i nedobrosovestnyye zhurnalisty," ("Conscientious Thinkers and Unconscientious Journalists"), in Sovremennik (The Contemporary), 1865, No. 2. (A critical analysis of the 1865 Russian edition of Mill's Principles of Political Economy.)
- (25) Bogomolov, A. Anglo-amerikanskaya burzhuaznaya filosofiya (Anglo-American Bourgeois Philosophy). Moscow, 1964, 30-7.
- (26) Brandes, G. "Dzhon Styuart Mill'" ("John Stuart Mill"), in Severny vestnik (Northern Herald), 1887, Vol. 8, Part 2, 32-47.
- (27) Buckle, Henry Thomas. Etyudy (Essays). Translated from the English under the editorship of P.N. Tkachov. St. Petersburg: Yu. Lukanin, 1867. 239 pp.
- (28) Bunge, Nikolay Khristianovich. "Styuart Mill', kak ekonomist" ("Stuart Mill as an Economist"), in Zhurnal ministerstva narodnovo prosveshcheniya (Journal of the Ministry of Public Education), 1868, Part 140, 1-100. (Reprinted in his Ocherki politicheskoy-ekonomicheskoy literatury [Essays in the Literature of Political Economy] in 1895.)
- (29) Chernyshevsky, Nikolay Gavrilovich. Dopolneniya i primechaniya



- na pervuyu knigu politicheskoy ekonomii Dzhona Styuarta Millya (Supplements and Notes to the First Book of John Stuart Mill's Political Economy). Geneva: M. Elpiden, 1869. 276 pp.
- (30) ----- "Ocherki iz politicheskoy ekonomii (po Millyu)" ("Essays on Political Economy [According to Mill]"), in Sovremennik (The Contemporary), 1861, No. 6, 477-549; No. 7, 119-84; No. 8, 397-443; No. 9, 183-254; No. 10, pp. 519-75; No. 12, pp. 521-97. (Reprinted in collected editions of Chernyshevsky's works in Geneva in 1870 and in Russia in 1905, 1935-1937, and 1949.)
- (31) Dynnik, M.A., et al, eds. Istoriya filosofii (History of Philosophy). Moscow, 1957, II, 208-10.
- (32) Gertsen, Aleksandr Ivanovich. "Dzhon-Styuart Mill' i yevo kniga 'On Liberty'" ("John Stuart Mill and His Book 'On Liberty'"), in Kolokol (The Bell), April 15, 1859. (Also printed in Polyarnaya zvezda [The North Star], Bk. V, 1859, and in Herzen's memoirs, translated into English by Constance Garnett as My Past and Thoughts, 6 vols., London, 1924-1927.)
- (33) Gorodtsev, Pavel Dmitriyevich. Pozitivizm i khristianstvo. Religiozno-filosofskiya vozzreniya Dzhona Styuarta Millya i ikh otnosheniye k khristianstvu. (Positivism and Christianity. The Religio-Philosophical Views of John Stuart Mill and Their Relation to Christianity). St. Petersburg: S. Dobrod'yev, 1881. ix, 262 pp.
- (34) I.N. "Vozrazheniya na ekonomicheskoye ucheniye Dzhona Styuarta Millya" ("Objections to the Economic Doctrine of John Stuart Mill"), in Slovo (Word), 1879, No. 7, 139-78; No. 8, pp. 75-120.
- (35) Karinsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, Klassifikatsiya vyvodov (A Classification of Inferences). St. Petersburg, 1880.
- (36) ----- Raznoglasiye v shkole novovo empirizma po voprosu ob istinakh samoochevidnakh (The Discord in the Modern Empiricist School on the Question of Self-Evident Truths). Moscow, 1914. (Originally published serially from 1901 to 1914 in Zhurnal ministerstva narodnovo prosveshcheniya [Journal of the Ministry of Public Education].)
- (37) Lavrov, Pyotr Lavrovich. "Ocherk teorii lichnosti" ("An Outline of the Theory of Individuality"), in Otechestvennyye zapiski (Annals of the Fatherland), 1859, No. 11, 207-42; No. 12, pp. 555-610.
- (38) ----- "Zadachi pozitivizma i ikh resheniye" ("The Problems of Positivism and Their Solution"), in Sovremennoye obozreniye (Contemporary Review), 1868, No. 5, 117-54. (A review of Auguste Comte and Positivism.)
- (39) Lesevich, Vladimir Viktorovich. "Dzhon Styuart Mill'" ("John Stuart Mill"), in Sobraniye sochineni V.V. Lesevicha (Collected Works of V.V. Lesevich), Moscow, 1915, II, 41-80.
- (40) Mikhailov, Mikhail Larionovich. "Dzh. St. Mill' o emansipatsii zhenshchin" ("J.S. Mill on the Emancipation of Women"), in Sovremennik (The Contemporary), 1860, No. 11.
- (41) Mikhailovsky, Nikolay Konstantinovich. Sochineniya N.K. Mikhailovskovo (Works of N.K. Mikhailovsky). St. Petersburg: B.M. Vol'f, 1896, II, 551-66. (A review of Mill's Principles of

- Political Economy and Autobiography originally published in Otechestvennyye zapiski [Annals of the Fatherland] in January, 1874.)
- (42) "Mneniya Boklya o sochineniyakh Millya" ("Buckle's Opinions of Mill's Works"), in Otechestvennyye zapiski (Annals of the Fatherland), 1865, I, 117-38; II, 716-41.
- (43) "Mysli Dzhona-Styuarta Millya o pozitivnoy filosofii Ogyusta Konta" ("John Stuart Mill's Thoughts on the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte"), in Otechestvennyye zapiski (Annals of the Fatherland), 1865, VII, 304-17; IX, 156-72.
- (44) Polozhitel'naya logika Dzh. St. Millya, yevo osnovnyye nachala i nauchnaya postanovka (The Positive Logic of J.S. Mill, Its Basic Principles and Scientific Formulation). St. Petersburg: A.L. Trunov, 1897. 162 pp.
- (45) Rossel', Yuri Andreyevich. "Dzhon Styuart Mill' i yevo shkola" "John Stuart Mill and His School"), in Vestnik Yevropy (Herald of Europe), 1874, Vol. 221, 5-33, 473-511; Vol. 222, 132-68, 667-706; Vol. 223, 654-84; Vol. 224, 672-719.
- (46) Rozhdestvensky, M.N. O znachenii Dzhona Styuarta Millya v ryadu sovremennykh ekonomistov (On the Significance of John Stuart Mill in the Ranks of Contemporary Economists). St. Petersburg: Ye. Prats, 1867. 97 pp.
- (47) Rutkovsky, Leonid Vasil'yevich. "Kritika metodov induktivno dokazatel'stva" ("A Critique of Methods of Inductive Proof"), in Zhurnal ministerstva narodnoy osvещения (Journal of the Ministry of Public Education), 1899, Nos. 6, 7.
- (48) Stephen, James Fitzjames. Svoboda, ravenstvo, i bratstvo (Liberty, Equality, Fraternity). Translated from the English by M. Muromtsev. St. Petersburg: A. Benke, 1907. xxiv, 314 pp.
- (49) Strakhov, Nikolay Nikolayevich. Zhensky vopros. Razbor sochineniya Dzhona Styuarta Millya "O podchinenii zhenshchiny" (The Woman Question. An Analysis of John Stuart Mill's Work, "On the Subjection of Women"). St. Petersburg, 1871. 43 pp.
- (50) Tabanets, P. "Mill', Dzhon Styuart" ("Mill, John Stuart"), in Filosofskaya entsiklopediya (Philosophical Encyclopedia), Moscow, 1964, III, 442-3.
- (51) Taine, Hippolyte. "Sovremennaya angliyskaya filosofiya. Dzhon Styuart Mill' i yevo sistema logiki" ("Contemporary English Philosophy. John Stuart Mill and His System of Logic"), in Vremya (Time), 1861, III, 356-93.
- (52) Trakhtenberg, O.V. Ocherki po istorii filosofii i sotsiologii Anglii XIX veka (Essays in the History of Philosophy and Sociology in England in the Nineteenth Century). Moscow, 1959.
- (53) Tugan-Baranovsky, Mikhail Ivanovich. Dzhon-Styuart Mill'. Yevo zhizn' i uchono-literaturnaya deyatel'nost' (John Stuart Mill. His Life and His Scholarly and Literary Activity). St. Petersburg, 1892. 88 pp.
- (54) ----- "Mill', Dzhon-Styuart" ("Mill, John Stuart"), in Entsiklopedichesky slovar' (Encyclopedic Dictionary), edited by F.A. Brockhaus and I.A. Yefron. St. Petersburg, 1896, XXXVII, 306-8.
- (55) Vladislavlev, M. "Dzhon Styuart Mill'" ("John Stuart Mill"), in

Zhurnal ministerstva narodnovo prosveshcheniya (Journal of the Ministry of Public Education), 1874, Vol. 175, 112-51.

- (56) V. Ye. "Zhizn' Dzhona Styuarta Millya" ("The Life of John Stuart Mill"), in Severny vestnik (Northern Herald), 1889, III, 195-222; IV, 129-48; V, 73-101.
- (57) Zenger, S. Dzh. St. Mill', yevo shizn' i proizvedeniya (J.S. Mill, His Life and Works). Translated from the German by L. Ivanova under the editorship of Ye. Maksimova. St. Petersburg, 1903. 225 pp.

\* \* \* \* \*

## JOHN STUART MILL AND SOCIALISM

Pedro Schwartz

University of Madrid

My comment on the note by L.E. Fredman and B.L.J. Gordon will do little to stir up controversy in the News Letter, for I agree with them about Mill's social philosophy: Mill, in my opinion, was no socialist; he ought to be considered as a radical individualist.

My only disagreement with Messrs. Fredman & Gordon concerns some of the arguments they put forward to defend their thesis. The full force of their case cannot be seen unless one takes a biographical point of view, that is, unless the evolution of Mill's opinions on socialism along the years is described in detail. This is a method used by Lord Robbins, in Lecture V of his Theory of Economic Policy in English Classical Political Economy (1953), who for the first time systematically compared the first three editions of the Principles and the posthumous "Chapters on Socialism," in order to trace the waxing and waning of Mill's sympathies towards socialism. I have used the same approach at greater length in my La nueva economía política de J.S. Mill.

Failing such a biographical approach (which space forbids), the following comments may be of use. Three main reasons are given by Messrs. Fredman & Gordon to prove that Mill was no socialist: "his adherence to Malthusian population theory; individuality as the touchstone for social judgment; his belief in the power and necessity of education."<sup>1</sup>

The argument based on Mill's Malthusianism is the weakest of the three. It is true that in his youth he used the Malthusian argument against some socialists, namely in a speech at the London Cooperation Society against Owen's system,<sup>2</sup> and that in the first two editions of the Principles he restated his fears that the equality of remuneration in the Owenite Parallelograms would prove an incentive to population growth. But in the third edition (1852) he turned his argument around, and said that "Communism," as he called the system of Owen, "is precisely the state of things in which opinion might be expected to declare itself with greatest intensity against this kind of selfish

intemperance. Any augmentation of numbers which diminished the comfort...of the mass, would then cause (which now it does not) immediate and unmistakeable inconvenience to every individual in the association."<sup>3</sup> Mill came to see the control of population as a condition for the good life in any kind of society. That in some cases he admitted that a socialist system might fall into the Malthusian trap, shows he did not think socialism would solve all problems of itself; neither, he admitted, did the property system. This is no proof that he was no socialist, only that he did not believe in Utopia.

The second argument (individuality), as presented in the note under consideration, should be divided in two. After all, one of the contributions of Mill was the distinction of the principle of free trade from that of individual liberty, on the basis that restrictions of trade "affect only that part of conduct which society is competent to restrain."<sup>4</sup> So there is, on the one hand, the argument that Mill was not a socialist because he believed in a "circle around every individual human being which no government...ought to be permitted to overstep;"<sup>5</sup> and on the other, because he thought that the system of economic freedom, suitably modified, could work well.

Clearly, any socialist system favourably considered by Mill would have to be irreproachable on the score of individual freedom; this is why the chapter on "Property" must be considered together with that on the "Futurity of the Working Classes," if a balanced view of the question is to be attained. Yet Mill was not happy with the existing system from the point of view of liberty, and it is surely not the whole truth to say that the "lingering thought" of the "tyranny of prevailing opinion and taste" which could "emerge in an egalitarian society...and the willingness of some contemporary reformers to advocate violent solutions led him to write...On Liberty."<sup>6</sup> This essay was written in concern for the social pressures brought to bear on the individual in the Victorian Age. It was a tract for the times, not an antisocialist pamphlet.

Just as clearly (and this is the argument I would stress) competition would have to be a feature of any social system which Mill was willing to defend. And this is why his chapters on laissez-faire in the Principles must always be kept in mind when speaking of Mill and socialism. Obviously Mill could not accept State socialism or revolutionary socialism, as a glance to the posthumous "Chapters" will show,<sup>7</sup> but, further, a socialist society built on his specifications would have to be a market economy.

The third argument contains a great deal of truth, though it implicitly misrepresents pre-Marxian socialism. Indeed Mill's insistence on education and the culture of the individual implies some lack of confidence in institutional reform. Mill himself saw this quite clearly in the case of John Austin, who (one reads in the Autobiography) in the 1830s was beginning to turn "less militant and polemic" because "he attached much less importance than formerly to outward changes; unless accompanied by a better cultivation of the inward nature."<sup>8</sup> However, it was the socialists who usually put too much weight on education, especially the Fourierists. Mill noticed this part of their teaching, though he pointed out that in consistency they ought to have paid more attention to the education of the moral

conscience.<sup>9</sup>

Once this is said, I should insist that the thesis that Mill was no socialist can be established quite solidly.

To begin with, the arguments usually given to present Mill as a socialist must be rejected. The first is that Mill, in the Autobiography, said he was a socialist; the second, that he regarded socialism as the final result of historical evolution; the third, that he wished to see the property system transformed mainly through cooperation; and the fourth, that socialists in Great Britain have found inspiration in his work. Let me review them in turn.

"If Mill said he was a socialist why not say so too?" I remember Professor Robson telling me at a time when I too thought Mill was a socialist. I interpret the famous passage in the Autobiography differently now. Said Mill: "we were now much less democrats than I had been...: but our ideal of ultimate improvement would class us decidedly under the general designation of Socialists."<sup>10</sup> Two words must be stressed in this passage: "now" and "general." Mill, I contend, was referring to his and his wife's beliefs at the time when he published the third edition of the Principles (1852), where his sympathies towards socialist opinions reached their peak. He included, I hold, the word "general" because, even at that point, he found himself in disagreement with all existing socialist schools, and at most concurred with them only in some of the remedies they proposed for social evils, especially one, cooperation.

It might be retorted that, though he thought socialist schemes unfeasible in the present, he did not condemn socialism, "regarded as an ultimate result of human progress."<sup>11</sup> The use of the future in Mill's treatment of socialist ideas was highly ambiguous, both in the second and in the third editions. He at once meant that he wished to suspend judgment until the results of socialist experiments became known, and that the progress of humanity and betterment of human nature would remove some of the difficulties of socialism. Even so he did not pronounce himself in favour of the superiority of the socialist over the property system, for, he added, this was "a question which must be left, as it safely may, to the people of that time to decide."<sup>12</sup>

Yet he was not satisfied with the existing system, and he proposed various radical reforms, such as taxing of the unearned increment of land rent, modifying the inheritance laws, and extending cooperation (the latter a feature of the programme of many socialists). However this does not make him cross the borderline. His reforms of the property system were deduced from the principle that each individual ought to enjoy only the results of his own effort and abstinence. And when he introduced his defence of cooperation in the 1852 edition, he added a section in defence of competition.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, the Fabians, especially, claimed Mill as a precursor. One of the main reasons for the misinterpretation of Mill's thought is the habit of seeing the evolution of the intellectual left in Great Britain as happening in one single line of descent: the Philosophical Radicals were succeeded by Mill, who was superseded by the Fabians, who were followed by the ideologues of the Welfare State. This simplifies matters too much. Mill belongs not to the mainstream of

the British left, but to the dwindling current of radical individualists, though thinkers of a more collectivist cast of mind have learnt and will learn much from him.<sup>14</sup>

To end my comments, which I have tried to make as pugnacious as possible, on a note of defiance, I would stake my thesis on a fact and on an interpretation. The fact is that Mill, in the third edition of the Principles, concluded in favour of property and competition; he ended the recast chapter on property with the assertion "that the object to be principally aimed at in the present stage of human improvement, is not the subversion of the system of individual property, but the improvement of it, and the full participation of every member of the community in its benefits."<sup>15</sup> The interpretation is by R. Gonnard, who in his Histoire des doctrines économiques (1921) said, "ce que Mill accepte de socialiste, il ne l'accepte donc jamais que par individualisme, et parcequ'il y voit un moyen de réaliser plus complètement l'individuation, de rendre chaque individu plus complètement responsable de sa destinée."<sup>16</sup>

Whether the fact be true and the interpretation correct is for other readers of the News Letter to say.

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup>L.E. Fredman and B.L.J. Gordon, "John Stuart Mill and Socialism," Mill News Letter, III, 1 (Fall, 1967), 4.

<sup>2</sup>H.J. Laski, ed., "J.S. Mill. Two Speeches on Population," Journal of Adult Education, IV (Oct., 1929), 38-61. Cf. Autobiography, ed. Laski (London, 1924), 104-6.

<sup>3</sup>Collected Works, II, 206. Cf. ibid., III, Appendix A, 980.

<sup>4</sup>On Liberty, in Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government (Everyman ed.), 150.

<sup>5</sup>Principles, in Collected Works, III, 938.

<sup>6</sup>Fredman and Gordon, 5. The passage has been rearranged for purposes of quotation.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Mill to George Brandes (4/3/72) in Letters, ed. Elliot (London, 1910), II, 334.

<sup>8</sup>Autobiography, ed. Laski, 150.

<sup>9</sup>Mill to Harriet Taylor (c. 31/3/49): "As to their system, & general mode of thought there is a great question at the root of it which must be settled before one can get a step further. Admitting the omnipotence of education, is not the very pivot & turning point of that education a moral sense...a feeling that one ought to do, & to wish for, what is for the greatest good of all concerned." Collected Works, III, Appendix G, 1031.

<sup>10</sup>This is the reading of the Early Draft (the phrase as quoted is dated by Professor Stillinger as written around 1854; see his "Introduction" to the Early Draft, 5-11). The final version contained an additional clause: "We were now much less democrats than I had been...: but our ideal of ultimate improvement went far beyond Democracy, and would class us decidedly under the general designation of Socialists." Autobiography, ed. Laski, 195-6.

<sup>11</sup>"Preface to the 3rd Edition" (1852) of the Principles, Collected Works, II, xciii.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., III, 794-6. Cf. F.A. von Hayek, John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor (London, 1951), 202.

<sup>14</sup>See Lord Robbins' reflections on Mill's contrast between the theory of protection and the theory of self-dependence, in Collected Works, IV, xxvi.

<sup>15</sup>Collected Works, II, 214.

<sup>16</sup>Paris, 1943 ed., 404-5.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ANOTHER OF J.S. MILL'S RETICENCES

(or, Like Dionysus, no Oarsman. The Frogs, 204)

Anna J. Mill

In the course of their walking tour in Hampshire, West Sussex and the Isle of Wight in the summer of 1832, Mill and his companion Henry Cole dedicated July 31st to a visit to Beaulieu Abbey and the river scenery of that neighbourhood. "After dinner," writes Mill in his Journal of the tour (the full text of which is in the course of preparation for Vol. I of the Collected Works), "we went out on the river in a boat, which enabled us to see somewhat more of the winding course of the river; and the mode I should recommend of seeing Beaulieu is to come to it by water quite from the river's mouth, attending however to the time of the tide [*italics mine*, AJM] for there is scarcely any water here when the tide is out, and before we left Beaulieu the lake which we had admired [at high tide] had wholly disappeared...We returned to Lymington by the road."

In his Journal, Cole is rather more expansive. "The clear transparency of the water, together with its smoothness enticed us, into a boat, which in our wisdom, or rather I in my wisdom for J.M. tacitly assented thereto, supposed we could easily navigate. The stream was just beginning to flow down and we proceeded glibly enough--and much further than I deemed right, but my companion who seemed to have no just notions of the probable difficulty of our return continued expressing his desire to descend lower. From our boat we certainly obtained many points of view which somewhat repaid us for our trouble and it is a matter incumbent on all who wish to estimate the beauties of Beaulieu to get into a boat for that purpose, but it must be recollected that a waterman should form one of the party. We in our boat floated down, nearly within view of Buckler's Hard before we deemed it meet to return and then we essayed our ascent up the stream. Difficult indeed was our task and slow, most slow was our progress. Mill was but a tyro in rowing and in addition to the inequality with which he applied his force he so frequently just but skimmed the surface of the water, whereby the pulling on my part, shoved the boat first on one side then on the other of the River. The Man of whom we had engaged the boat inferring from our absence that nothing less than a casting-

away, upon a mud bank could have been our fate, came down in a small boat and found us tugging away with great vigour in the very midst of the current making way perhaps at a rate sufficient to have enabled us to reach Beaulieu in about three hours, if the water had continued sufficiently deep but this it [sic] would not have been the case. We were extricated from our difficulty by engaging the the [sic] Man to row us back, which he did as far as the state of the tide would allow, and then having landed us we walked back to the place of starting.... We returned home to Lymington by the high road...well animated with our water adventure...."

\* \* \* \* \*

Recent Publications.

- Alexander, Edward, ed. John Stuart Mill: Literary Essays. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.
- Austin, Jean. "Pleasure and Happiness," Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 51-62. ("John Stuart Mill Number.") [Considers JSM in relation to Aristotle concerning pleasure & virtue as constituents of happiness.]
- Billings, John R. "J.S. Mill's Defense of Utilitarianism." Ph.D. Dissertation, Syracuse, 1967 (see Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 1466A-7A).
- Confrey, Eugene A. "The Appearance of Inconsistency in J.S. Mill's Reconciliation of Liberty and Equality." Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale, 1963 (see Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 1468A).
- Halliday, R.J. "Some Recent Interpretations of John Stuart Mill," Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 1-17. ("John Stuart Mill Number.") [Criticism mainly of Cowling and Rees.]
- Heiman, George. "The Political Thought of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and John Stuart Mill." Ph.D. Dissertation, Toronto, 1967 (see Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 1484A).
- Hollander, Samuel. "The Role of the State in Vocational Training: The Classical Economists' View," Southern Economic Journal, 34 (April, 1968), 513-25. [Discusses, inter alia, JSM's views on education.]
- Jones, Iva G. "Trollope, Carlyle, and Mill on the Negro: An Episode in the History of Ideas," Journal of Negro History, 52 (1967), 185-99.
- Louch, A.R. "Sins and Crimes," Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 38-50. ("John Stuart Mill Number.") [Uses JSM to discuss legal and moral problems relating to sexual problems.]
- Magid, Henry M. (ed.) On the Logic of the Moral Sciences. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.
- Margolis, Joseph. "Mill's Utilitarianism Again," Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 45 (Aug., 1967), 179-84. [Concise argument that, whatever the status of JSM's "proof" of the principle of utility, he in fact held that desirability is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition of goodness.]
- Martin, Rex. "Collingwood's Critique of the Concept of Human Nature." Dissertation, Columbia, 1967. [Chap. iv, "The Science of Human



- Nature," deals with JSM's "Logic of the Moral Sciences" and its relation to Collingwood's ideas; summary in the next number of the News Letter.]
- Munson, James R. "The Science of Science: A Critical Examination of John Stuart Mill's Philosophy of Science." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia, 1967 (see Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 1851A).
- Dr. Yoshio Nagai (College of Liberal Arts, Kanazawa University, Japan) has translated Mill's "Chapters on Socialism" into Japanese in an edition published December, 1967.
- Robson, John M. The Improvement of Mankind: The Social and Political Thought of John Stuart Mill. Toronto: University of Toronto Press [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul], 1968.
- "Mill and Arnold; Liberty and Culture--Friends or Enemies" in Gerald McCaughey and Maurice Legris, eds. Of Several Branches: Essays from the Humanities Association Bulletin. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968, 125-42. (Reprinted from Humanities Association Bulletin, 1961.)
- Ross, Sydney. "Sir John Herschel's Marginal Notes on Mill's On Liberty, 1859," Journal of the History of Ideas, 29 (Jan.-March, 1968), 123-30.
- Schwartz, Pedro. La nueva economía política de J.S. Mill. Madrid: Tecnos, S.A., 1968.
- Spence, G.W. "John Stuart Mill, an Imperialist with a Philosophy of History," Cambridge Review, 89A (19 April, 1968), 380-2.
- "John Stuart Mill on Sociology and 'the Art of Life.'" Dissertation, Cambridge, 1968. [Abstract given below.]
- "The Psychology behind J.S. Mill's 'Proof,'" Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 18-28. ("John Stuart Mill Number.") [Uses, inter alia, JSM's notes to his father's Analysis.]
- Ten, C.L. "Mill on Self-Regarding Actions," Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 29-37. ("John Stuart Mill Number.")

#### Forthcoming Works.

- H.J. McCloskey's "Mill's Liberalism," which appeared in the Philosophical Quarterly in 1963, is to be republished in a volume of articles on political thought being edited by Isaac Kramnick (Brandeis) for Prentice-Hall.
- Ernest Sosa (Philosophy, Brown) and James Smith (Philosophy, Washington) are editing an anthology on Mill's utilitarianism that will include the text of Utilitarianism and several critical essays, as part of the Studies in Philosophical Criticism series, edited by A. Sesonske, and published by Wadsworth.

#### Work in Progress.

- Nicholas Capaldi of the Department of Philosophy, Queens College, City University of New York, is preparing an annotated edition of On Liberty for the Washington Square Press (publication, 1969), and would welcome any information or questions about "peculiarly opaque statements" in the text.
- John Griffin (Business and Economics, Marist College, Poughkeepsie,

N.Y.) is writing a doctoral dissertation for New York University on Mill's economic thought, with special reference to the question of governmental intervention.

N.B. de Marchi (Economic History, Australian National University, Canberra) is working on a dissertation on Mill and the development of English economic thought, 1848-1890.

David E. Martin (Economics & Commerce, Hull) is writing a doctoral dissertation for Hull on JSM's attitude to peasant proprietorships, and the background (from about 1790) from which JSM's ideas emerged.

H.J. McCloskey (Philosophy, Melbourne) is preparing a study of Mill for Macmillan's *Philosophers in Perspective* series ("a series of short studies of major philosophers in the context of their place in the development of philosophy and in the light of recent scholarship").

Bruce Mazlish, M.I.T., has a grant from the American Social Science Research Council for work on the relation between James and John Stuart Mill.

Ann P. Robson (History, Toronto) is doing research for a biography of Helen Taylor, Mill's step-daughter, valued co-worker, etc.

Charles Richard Sanders has written concerning the Collected Edition of the Carlyle letters that he is editing with the aid of Professor K.J. Fielding of Edinburgh and his staff. The first set to be issued will consist of five volumes, with index, up to 1828 and to Craigenputtoch. Page proof of the first volume (through 1822) has been read, and galley proof for the next four volumes is now being read. Much of the textual work on the next set (through 1834 and to London) has been done, and many of the notes written.

Martha S. Vogeler (English, Northern Arizona) is working on a biography of Frederic Harrison.

#### Queries.

David E. Martin (Department of Economics and Commerce, Hull) would like information about the career of W.T. Thornton, JSM's friend and colleague in the East India House; especially valuable would be details of letters, diaries, etc., bearing on Thornton's early career, and his attitude to peasant proprietorship and population.

Mr. Martin (and the editor) would also like to know if anyone has solved the riddle posed by the reference in Caroline Fox's Memories of Old Friends, 76-7, to the publication of some of the "confabs" between James Mill and Richard ("Conversation") Sharp in the latter's Essays and Conversations [sic]. Is she referring to Sharp's Letters and Essays in Prose and Verse, which contains only a passing mention of James Mill?

\* \* \* \* \*

A.W. Coats (Economic and Social History, Nottingham) informs us of interesting developments in the study of the history of economic thought in Britain. A conference was held last January at Sussex, at which Professor Coats gave a valuable paper on research priorities in

the history of economics (to be published in the new journal devoted to economic history which Duke University is planning). Another conference will be held in Nottingham this coming January, and Professor Coats would like to hear from anyone interested. He is also planning a newsletter on the history of economic thought, to be sponsored by the Royal Economic Society; information is sought concerning current research in this area. More news when appropriate.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dissertation Summaries.

J.E. Broadbent, "The Good Society of John Stuart Mill," Toronto, 1966.

This thesis is an attempt to reach a critical understanding of John Stuart Mill as a political theorist concerned with an industrial society. A model of what Mill would have regarded as the good society is constructed. This model is followed by an account of Mill's empirical sociology and normative economics. Mill is then assessed in terms of the coherence of his analysis and the adequacy of his prescriptions.

The good society for Mill would be one led by a non-cohesive intellectual, moral, and aesthetic elite. This group would be socially and intellectually tolerant, and would use its influence in efforts to maximize the possibilities for the development of the capacities and talents of all the members of society. In a developed industrial nation the majority of people are capable of being led by the force of reason. The elite must rely on persuasion, not force, in its leadership. The mass of society in turn should defer to those whom they judge to be their superiors, but they should do so only after critical assessment of reasoned positions brought forward by the elite.

Life in the good society differs only in degree between the elite and the non-elite. It would be a life devoid of the acquisitiveness of bourgeois man and free from the emotional repression which characterizes the Puritan. Citizens in the good society would have a sense of community and share collective goals in many aspects of life, notably in the organization of work and in politics. At the same time they would pursue many interests peculiar to their own uniqueness as persons. People in the good society, therefore, are appropriately described as co-operative individualists.

Mill consciously rejected two important components of the meaning of democracy as it had been previously understood. He denied that government should be dominated by members of any one class, whether majority or minority, who would rule in their own interests. He also argued that all men were not entitled to the same amount of electoral influence. Both of these revisions of traditional democratic theory resulted from Mill's commitment to the normative principle that those with superior capacities are entitled to greater influence than their number alone would warrant. Notwithstanding his revisions Mill must be seen as a democrat. He saw democracy not simply as a kind of government but also as a type of society in which all members would

have equal possibilities for the development of their potential selves. Thus all men are entitled to an equal claim on the resources of society in order to develop both their political and non-political interests. Membership in the elite then is open to all those who demonstrate their capacity to belong.

Mill's sociological analysis and normative economics raise serious problems concerning both his consistency as a political theorist and the viability of his model of the good society. He described his own society as a class-divided one and saw that capitalism necessarily involves class divisions. Mill saw that a society separated into classes results in political power being inequitably distributed and different kinds of moral behaviour characterizing the separated classes. Specifically, Mill described industrial capitalism as a society torn by class conflict, permeated with commercialism, and bestowing severely unjust economic rewards and possibilities for human development. At the same time Mill argued for the moral legitimacy of capitalism, and thus for the perpetuation of the social effects which his sociological observations described and his model of the good society excluded. Thus Mill failed to provide a logically consistent and fully acceptable model of the good life for modern man.

A.H. Khayal, "A Study of the Prose Style of John Stuart Mill," London 1967 (only the first chapter, "A Short Survey of Two of the Eight Revisions of the Logic," summarized below).

Our two revisions are: the 1st edition as revised in the 2nd, and the 4th edition as revised in the 5th. A scrutiny of the two revisions has yielded some interesting results.

There are, in the first place, numerous reference alterations. These alterations are of two kinds: "dropped references" and "reference replacements." If in the 1st edition some particular proposition has been attributed to some particular individual, the reference has sometimes been completely expunged from the 2nd edition. Here is an illustration:

<u>1st edition</u>	<u>2nd edition</u>
"It is well to advert to a curious and interesting remark of Mr. Whewell which is as strikingly true of the former operation..." (I, 364).	"It is well to advert to a curious and interesting remark which is as strikingly true of the former operation..." (I, 364).

Under "reference replacements" I put those propositions that, originally attributed to some specific authority, are reattributed to some vague entity:

<u>1st edition</u>	<u>2nd edition</u>
"I contend that these are not the only requisites..." (BK III, Ch. xviii, § 1, para 3).	"It has, however, been contended that these are not the only requisites..." ( <u>ibid.</u> ).

Of the forty-seven reference alterations in the 2nd edition, only

four are cases of "reference replacements." The rest are instances of "dropped references."

While the 2nd edition records numerous dropped references, the process is reversed in the 5th edition; i.e., new references are supplied. E.g.:

4th edition

"Now it has been well pointed out that...Time...has no concern either with the belief itself or with the grounds of it" (I, 338).

5th edition

"Now it has been well pointed out by Mr. Bailey, that Time has no concern either with the belief itself or with the grounds of it" (I, 342).

A category of alterations that is to be commonly met with in both the revisions is what may be called "one-word replacements." These alterations easily fall into four classes: (a) alterations that are mere verbal trivialities; (b) alterations that affect the expression; (c) alterations that aim at technical clarity; and (d) alterations that affect the meaning. It is curious that verbal trivialities are more numerous in the second revision I consider (i.e., 4th-5th edition revision) than in the first (i.e., 1st-2nd edition revision).

One considerable category of alterations consists of discarded high-sounding epithets and epithetical expressions. The 1st edition is characterized by a plethora of laudatory superlatives. These superlatives have been subjected to a process of gradual elimination in the succeeding editions. It would be significant to discover whether the last revised edition has been completely deprived of all high-sounding epithets.

A comparison of epithets in the 1st and the 4th editions shows that those in the former are more lavish of praise than those in the latter. By the time Mill reached the 5th edition, even such expressions as "forcible" and "one of the best" had grown unpalatable. There is evident a gradual cooling off of his enthusiasm for strong rhetorical expressions.

Alterations, akin to the epithetical deletions, were made to tone down some of the pungent denunciations. If Mill, in the 1st edition, was over-eager to over-praise, he was equally strong in his condemnations. However, like his superlative appreciations, his superlative invectives have also been gradually suppressed from the revised editions.

There is a class of alterations that were made in the interest of greater manoeuvrability. The general tone of the inductive part of the 1st edition is one of comparative rigidity. But in the 2nd edition this rigidity has given way to a marked flexibility. This has been effected by replacing such uncompromising words as "most," "definite," and "positive," by such accommodating terms as "almost," "probably," etc.

Quite a number of alterations have been made in the interest of better grammar. They may be classified as: (1) alterations replacing an ungrammatical repetition of a proper name by a pronoun; (2) alterations replacing a first person plural by a first person singular; and (3) general grammatical alterations. It is significant that alterations of the first and the second type are hardly to be found in the

5th edition; but the 5th edition is richer in alterations of the third type. This may lead us to conclude that each revision was dominated by one particular set of grammatical alterations.

The thesis goes on to study the style of the Logic in general. Next there is an account of Mill's analogies and metaphors, which is followed by an examination of his grammar and the general structure of his sentences. Chapter v follows on Roland Hall's account of Mill's diction in Notes & Queries. The concluding chapter deals with a comparison of Mill's and Carlyle's styles.

G.W. Spence, "John Stuart Mill on Sociology and 'the Art of Life,'" Cambridge, 1968.

This thesis is an exploration of the relation between "science" and "art" in Mill's thought, and an inquiry into how consistent a thinker he was in psychology, ethics, and social philosophy. Various interpretations proposed by critics are considered, and the following conclusions are reached.

Mill hoped, when he wrote on "Bentham" and "Coleridge," to reconcile the opposed positions on the basis of experiential and associative psychology. By 1835 he had decided that reason taught the right ends of conduct; imagination might only develop a desire for those ends. His view that poetry should further moral improvement was inconsistent with his conception of poetry as soliloquy.

To establish moral and political rules we needed sociological theorems, deducible from universal psychological laws. Mill's laws of mind might be conditional on, but were not completely reducible to, physiological laws; consequently he had no objective psychology. His arguments about general historical causes, and about the predominance of intellectual activity, were confused.

His doctrine of habitual volitions upset his "proof" of the principle of utility, since he admitted that we consciously seek other ends than pleasure. But ethical altruism was at least possible on his psychology. He accepted Bain's theory of sympathy.

His ethical first principle was really the ideal of individual development. The institutions which he recommended for a nation were not those most suited to its character, but those that would best facilitate the realization of that ideal. His father's "scale of civilization" and Comte's general stages of progress, combined with his own ideal, appeared to him to justify imperialism.

He failed to reconcile the "organic" and "critical" tendencies in his mind. His statement of the rule of allegiance was incompatible with his rule of free discussion. He did not show that individuality was likely to co-exist, to any great degree, with the discipline and cohesion which he thought desirable in industrial and public life.

He solved, on liberal principles, the problem of reconciling secularism in national education with the freedom of parents to have their children instructed in theology. But his desire to attain moral elevation through the Religion of Humanity led him into a way of thought which is inconsistent with his emphasis on diversity and many-sidedness.

Bibliography of Writings on Mill, by Dudley Hascall and J.M. Robson.

Bibliography: M.

- Mabbot, J.D. "Interpretations of Mill's Utilitarianism," Philosophical Quarterly, 6 (1956), 115-20.
- McCabe, Joseph. Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake. 2 vols. London: Watts, 1908.
- MacCaig, Donald. A Reply to John Stuart Mill, on the Subjection of Women. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1870.
- MacCall, William. The Newest Materialism: Sundry Papers on the Books of Mill, Comte, Bain, Spencer, Atkinson and Feuerbach. London: Farrah, 1873.
- McCallum, R.B. "The Individual in the Mass: Mill on Liberty and the Franchise," in Philip Appleman, et al., eds. 1859: Entering an Age of Crisis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959, 147-61.
- "John Stuart Mill, 1806-1873," in A. Barratt Brown, ed. Great Democrats. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- McCarthy, Justin. "The English Positivists," Galaxy, 7 (1869), 373-82.
- McCloskey, H.J. "Mill's Liberalism," Philosophical Quarterly, 13 (1963), 143-56. Reply by A. Ryan, "Mr. McCloskey on Mill's Liberalism," ibid., 14 (1964), 253-60. Reply by H.J. McCloskey, "Mill's Liberalism: A Rejoinder to Mr. Ryan," ibid., 16 (1966), 64-8.
- "The Problem of Liberalism," Review of Metaphysics, 19 (1965), 248-75.
- Maccoby, S. English Radicalism, 1832-52. London: Allen and Unwin, 1935.
- Maccoll, Norman. "Mr. Mill's Autobiography," Athenaeum, 25 Oct., 1873, 521-2.
- McCosh, James. An Examination of Mr. J.S. Mill's Philosophy, being a Defence of Fundamental Truth. London: Macmillan, 1866. 2nd. ed., 1877, includes as an appendix the second paper from McCosh's Philosophical Papers, q.v. below.
- "Mill's Reply to his Critics," British and Foreign Evangelical Review, 17 (1868), 332-62. Reprinted in American Presbyterian and Theological Review, n.s. 6 (1868), 350-91.
- Philosophical Papers. I. Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Logic. II. Reply to Mr. Mill's Third Edition [of Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy]. III. Present State of Moral Philosophy in Britain. London: Macmillan, 1868. See McCosh, An Examination, above.
- McCready, H.W. "The Defence of Individualism," Queen's Quarterly, 52 (1945), 71-6.
- McCrimmon, James McNab. "Studies towards a Biography of John Stuart Mill," Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1937. (Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations, Northwestern University, 1937, 15-19.)
- MacCunn, John. Six Radical Thinkers. London: Arnold, 1907, 37-87.
- MacFie, R.A. Speech Delivered at a Meeting of the Liverpool Reform League, Including extracts from Archbishop Whately and Mr. J.S. Mill on Plurality of votes. [Liverpool, 1867.]
- McGee, John Edwin. A Crusade for Humanity: The History of Organized

- Positivism in England. London: Watts, 1931.
- MacIver, Robert M., Bertrand Russell, and Lyman Bryson. "John Stuart Mill: On Liberty," Invitation to Learning; Discussion of Great Books and Significant Ideas [New York], I (Winter, 1951-52), 356-63.
- McJarrow, John S. "Mill's 'On Liberty,'" Holborn Review (Oct., 1931), 510-15.
- Mack, Mary Peter. "The Fabians and Utilitarianism," Journal of the History of Ideas, 16 (1955), 76-88.
- McKechnie, W.S. The State and the Individual. Glasgow: MacLehose, 1896.
- McKingsley, Erskine. "The Problem of 'Underdevelopment' in the English Classical School," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69 (1955), 235-52.
- McLaren, Charles B.B. University Essays in Metaphysics, Moral Philosophy, and English Composition. Edinburgh: privately printed, 1870.
- McMahon, Anna Benneson. "Annotated Copy of Browning's Pauline: An Interesting Memorial of Two Great Authors," Dial, 31 (1901), 229-30.
- MacRae, Donald Gunn. Ideology and Society, London: Heinemann, 1961.
- McRae, Robert. "Phenomenalism and J.S. Mill's Theory of Causation," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 9 (1948), 237-50.
- "The Relation of John Stuart Mill's Logic to his Metaphysics and Epistemology." Ph.D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins, 1946.
- Magid, Henry M. "Mill and the Problem of Freedom of Thought," Social Research, 21 (1954), 43-61.
- Magnino, Bianca. Storia del Positivismo. Rome: Mazara, 1956.
- Mahaffy, J.P. "Anticipation of Mill's Theory of Syllogism by Locke," Mind, 1 (1876), 287-8.
- Mansel, Henry Longueville. "Appendix D," Prolegomena Logica. Oxford: Graham, 1851. (Deals with Mill's logic of the moral sciences.)
- The Limits of Religious Thought. Oxford and London, 1858.
- The Philosophy of the Conditioned: Comprising some remarks on Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, and on Mr. J.S. Mill's Examination of that Philosophy. London: Strahan, 1866. Reprinted, with additions, from Contemporary Review, 1 (Jan., Feb., 1866), 31-49, 185-219.
- Marchand, Leslie. "The Symington Collection," Journal of Rutgers University Library, 12 (1948), 1-15. (Includes some J.S.M. material.)
- Maritain, Jacques. An Introduction to Logic. London: Sheed and Ward, 1937.
- Marshall, Alfred. "On Mr. Mill's Theory of Value," in A.C. Pigou, ed. Memorials of Alfred Marshall. London: Macmillan, 1925, 119-33. Republished from Fortnightly Review, 112 (1876), 591-602.
- Principles of Economics. Ed. C.W. Gillebaud. 2 vols. London: Macmillan for the Royal Economic Society, 1961.
- Marston, Mansfield. The Life of John Stuart Mill, Politician and Philosopher, Critic and Metaphysician, with a record of his claims upon the regards of the people as a philanthropist and friend. London: Farrah, 1873.
- Martin, Peter E. "Carlyle and Mill: The 'Anti-Self-Consciousness'



- Theory," Thoth [Syracuse], 6 (1965), 20-34.
- Martinazzoli, A. La Teorica dell' individualismo secondo Stuart Mill. Milan: Hoepli, 1905.
- Martineau, James. "John Stuart Mill," in Essays, Philosophical and Theological, I. New York: Holt, 1879. Reprinted from National Review, 9 (1859), 474-508.
- "John Stuart Mill's Philosophy," in Essays, Reviews, and Addresses, III. London: Longmans, 1891, 489-536.
- Marwick, James D. "John Stuart Mill and Liberty (and the need for the application of his ideals in the present state)," Scottish Bankers' Magazine, April, 1948, 41-3.
- Marx, Karl. "John Stuart Mill," in Von Ricardo zur Vulgärökonomie, Vol. III of Theorien über den Mehrwert. Stuttgart: Dietz, 1921, 230-80.
- Mason, W.E. "The Stereotypes of Classical Transfer Theory," Journal of Political Economy, 64 (1956), 492-506.
- Masson, David. Recent British Philosophy: a review with criticisms: including some comments on Mr. Mill's answer to Sir William Hamilton. London: Macmillan, 1865. 3rd ed. enlarged, 1877.
- Mathieu, V. "John Stuart Mill," in Enciclopedia Filosofica, III. Venice: Istituto per la collaborazione culturale, 1957.
- Mattison, J.T. "Was Mill a Democrat?" History Today, 8 (June, 1958), 431.
- Maurice, Frederick. The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1884.
- Mavrincac, Albert A. "Freedom, Authority, Conscience, and Development: Mill, Acton, and Some Contemporary Catholic Thinkers," in Carl J. Friedrich, ed. Liberty, Nomos, IV (New York: Atherton, 1966), 57-88.
- Maxey, Chester C. Political Philosophies. New York: Macmillan, 1938, 474-87.
- Mayer, J.P. Alexis de Tocqueville. New York: Harper, 1960.
- Prophet of the Mass Age: A Study of Alexis de Tocqueville, London: Dent, 1939.
- "Alexis de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill," Listener, 16 Mar., 1950, 471-2.
- "Letters from Mill to Tocqueville," Times Literary Supplement, 1 Sept., 1950, 556; 8 Sept., 1950, 572; 15 Sept., 1950, 588. Reprinted in J.P. Mayer ed., de Tocqueville's Oeuvres, VI. Paris: Gallimard, 1954, 289-352.
- Mead, G.H. Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century, ed. Merritt H. Moore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Medawer, P.B. "Is the Scientific Paper Fraudulent?" Saturday Review, 1 Aug., 1964, 42-3. (Discusses Mill's inductive logic vis-a-vis method in Scientific papers.)
- Meeke, Ronald L. "The Decline of Ricardian Economics in England," Economica, n.s. 17 (1950), 43-62.
- Mehlberg, Henryk. The Reach of Science. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.
- Meitzel, C. "James Mill und John Stuart Mill," Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften, VI. Jena, 1925.
- Menger, Carl. "John Stuart Mill," in Kleinere Schriften zur Methode

- und Geschichte der Volkswirtschaftlehre, Vol. III of The Collected Works of Carl Menger. London: London School of Economics, 1935, 283-91. Reprinted from National-Zeitung [Berlin], 22 May, 1906.
- Mercer, Thomas W. John Stuart Mill and Co-operation. Manchester: National Cooperative Publishing Society, 1923. Reprinted from Co-operative News, 5 May, 1923.
- Metz, Rudolph. A Hundred Years of British Philosophy. London: Allen and Unwin, 1938.
- Mévil, André. "Un Ami de John Stuart Mill," Journal des Débats, 41 (1934), 597.
- Michaëlis, Carl Theodor. Stuart Mill's Zahlbegriff. Berlin: Gaertner, 1888.
- Michel, Henry. De Stuarti Millii Individualismo. Paris: Hachette, 1895. (Dissertation, Paris.)
- Mill, Anna J. Carlyle and Mill: Two Scottish University Rectors. Edinburgh: Carlyle Society, 1966.
- "The First Ornamental Rector at St. Andrews University," Scottish Historical Review, 43 (1964), 131-44.
- "John Stuart Mill's Visit to Wordsworth," Modern Language Review, 44 (1949), 341-50.
- Miller, Kenneth E. "John Stuart Mill's Theory of International Relations," Journal of the History of Ideas, 22 (1961), 493-514.
- Millet, J. An Millius Veram Mathematicorum Axiomatum Originem Invenit. Paris and London: Didier, 1867. (Dissertation, Paris.)
- Milne, Alan John. "Coleridge and Bentham as Political Thinkers." Ph.D. Dissertation, London, 1952.
- Mineka, Francis E. "The Autobiography and the Lady," University of Toronto Quarterly, 32 (1963), 301-6.
- The Dissidence of Dissent: The Monthly Repository, 1806-38. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.
- "John Stuart Mill: Letters on the French Revolution of 1830," Victorian Studies, 1 (1957), 137-54.
- Minto, William. "His [John Stuart Mill's] Place as a Critic," in H.R. Fox Bourne, ed. John Stuart Mill, 49-54.
- "J.S. Mill," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., 1883, XVI, 307-14. With John Malcolm Mitchell, ibid., 11th ed., 1911, XVIII, 454-9.
- Mitchell, Ellen M. "John Stuart Mill. (Extracts from Hildebrand's 'Aus und über England.')" The Western, n.s. 3 (1877), 555-61.
- Miyoshi, Masao. "Mill and Pauline: The Myth and Some Facts," Victorian Studies, 9 (Dec., 1965), 154-63.
- Moffat, Robert Scott. The Principles of a Time Policy: being an exposition of a method of settling disputes between employers and labourers, with a preface and appendix containing a recriticism of the theories of Ricardo and J.S. Mill on Rent, Value and Cost of Production. London, 1878.
- Moore, George E. Principia Ethica. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959 [1903], chap. III.
- Morgan, Peter F. "Francis Place's Copy of the Westminster Review," Notes & Queries, 13 (1966), 330-2.
- Morison, J.L. "The Mission of the Earl of Durham," Cambridge History of the British Empire, VI. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930, 287-307.

- Morlan, George. America's Heritage from John Stuart Mill. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.
- Morley, Edith, ed. Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and their Writers, I. London: Dent, 1938.
- Morley, John. "Contemporary Opinions [on Mill's Inaugural Address]," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 173 (1953), 256-7. Reprinted from ibid., 7 (1867), 388.
- "The Death of Mr. Mill," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 13 (1873), 669-76. Reprinted in Critical Miscellanies, 2nd series. London: Chapman and Hall, 1877.
- "A Great Teacher," in The Works of Lord Morley, XV. London: Macmillan, 1921, 1-22.
- "John Stuart Mill: An Anniversary," in Miscellanies, 4th series. London: Macmillan, 1908. Reprinted from Living Age, 250 (July 7, 1906) 3-12, and from TLS, May 18, 1906.
- "Mr. Mill's Autobiography," in Critical Miscellanies, 2nd series. London: Chapman and Hall, 1877.
- "Mr. Mill's Doctrine of Liberty," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 14 (1873), 234-56. Republished in revised and abbreviated form in On Compromise, The Works of Lord Morley. London: Macmillan, 1921, III, 151-66.
- "Mr. Mill's Three Essays on Religion," Fortnightly Review, 22 (1874), 634-51; 23 (1875), 103-31.
- "A Political Prelude," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 14 (1868), 103-14. (Deals with J.S.M.'s writings on Ireland.)
- Recollections. London: Macmillan, 1917, I, 52-67.
- "Valedictory," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 32 (1882), 512.
- Morris, John N. Versions of the Self: Studies in English Autobiography from Milton to John Stuart Mill. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Morse, Dean W. "John Stuart Mill on History and Economic Development." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia. (Dissertation Abstracts, 26, 4422-3.)
- Moskowitz, H. "Das Moralische Beurteilungsvermögen in der Englischen Ethik von Hobbes bis John Stuart Mill: Eine historische-kritische Studie." Dissertation, Erlangen, 1906.
- Mueller, Iris Wessel. John Stuart Mill and French Thought. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Munro, C.J. "Locke's Alleged Anticipation of Mill's Theory of the Syllogism," Mind, 1 (1876), 560-6.
- Murphy, Gardner. Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949.
- Murphy, Joseph John. "John Stuart Mill," Macmillan's Magazine, 28 (1873), 348-9.
- Murray, A.R.M. An Introduction to Political Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.
- Murray, Henry. "John Stuart Mill" [review of Elliot's ed. of JSM's letters], The Bookman, 38 (1910), 165.
- Murray, Robert Henry. "J.S. Mill: Optimistic Democrat," in Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge: Heffer, 1929, I, 376-431.
- Musgrave, Anthony. "Capital: Mr. Mill's Fundamental Propositions,"

Contemporary Review, 24 (1874), 728-49.  
Myers, Garry Cleveland. "How Wordsworth Saved John Stuart Mill from  
Insanity," High School Teacher, 8 (1932), 230.  
Myint, H. "The 'Classical Theory' of International Trade and the  
Underdeveloped Countries," Economic Journal, 68 (1958), 317-37.

Bibliography: N.

"N.N." Thirteen Pages on Intellectual Property Written with Special  
Reference to a Doubtful Doctrine of the late John Stuart Mill, by  
one of his pupils. Manchester: Heywood, [1876].  
Nachman, Larry D. "John Stuart Mill's Theory of Progress," Disserta-  
tion, Columbia, 1964. (Dissertation Abstracts, 25 [1965], 7358.)  
Nakhnikian, George. "Value and Obligation in Mill," Ethics, 62  
(1951), 33-40.  
Napier, Joseph. The Miracles: Butler's Argument on Miracles,  
Explained and Defended, with Observations on Hume, Baden Powell,  
and J.S. Mill. To which is added a Critical Dissertation by  
H.L. Mansel. Dublin, 1863.  
Napier, Macvey, ed. Selections from the Correspondence of the late  
Macvey Napier. London: Macmillan, 1879. (Includes JSM letters.)  
Neatby, W.B. "The Existential Import of Propositions," Mind,  
n.s. 6 (1897), 542-3.  
[Neaves, Charles.] "Stuart Mill on Mind and Matter" [verse satire],  
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 99 (1866), 257-9.  
----- "Stuart Mill Again; or, The Examiner Examined" [verse  
satire], Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 100 (1866), 245-6.  
Neff, Emery Edward. Carlyle and Mill: Mystic and Utilitarian. New  
York: Columbia University Press, 1924. Republished as Carlyle  
and Mill: An Introduction to Victorian Thought, 1926.  
Nesbitt, George L. Benthamite Reviewing: The First Twelve Years of  
the Westminster Review, 1824-36. New York: Columbia University  
Press, 1934.  
Newman, Francis W. "Epicureanism, Ancient and Modern," Fraser's  
Magazine, 84 (1871), 606-17. Reprinted in Miscellanies, V.  
London: Kegan Paul, 1891, 99-114.  
Nogaro, Bertrand. "John Stuart Mill et le classicisme au milieu de  
XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle," in Le développement de la pensée économique. Paris:  
Librarie Générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1944, 142-203.  
Northrop, F.S.C. The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities.  
New York: Macmillan, 1948.  
Norton, Sarah, and M.A. DeWolfe Howe, eds. The Letters of Charles  
Eliot Norton. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.  
Nyman, Alf T. Leviathan och Folkviljan. Betraktelser över förstat-  
ligande byråkratli och skattetryck. Tillika en kommentar till  
Stuart Mill's skrift 'Om Friheten.' Stockholm: Natur og Kultur,  
1948.

Bibliography: O.

O'Brien, George. "J.S. Mill and J.E. Cairnes," Economica, n.s. 10  
(1943), 273-85.

- O'Hanlon, Hugh Francis. A Criticism of J.S. Mill's Pure Idealism; and an attempt to shew that, if logically carried out, it is pure nihilism. Oxford: Parker, 1866.
- Oldershaw, Lucian R.F. Analysis of Mill's Principles of Political Economy. Oxford: Blackwell, 1915.
- Olivier, Sydney H. "John Stuart Mill on Socialism," To-day, n.s. 2 (1884), 490-504.
- Ong, Walter J. "J.S. Mill's Pariah Poet," Philological Quarterly, 29 (1950), 333-44.
- Orr, J. "J.S. Mill and Christianity," Theological Monthly, 6 (1891), 108ff.
- Oswald, Eugene. Reminiscences of a Busy Life. London: De la Mare Press, 1911.

\* \* \* \* \*

Francis Mineka and Dwight Lindley have delivered the full manuscript (nearly 1800 letters) of Mill's Later Letters to the University of Toronto Press; copy-editing is now in progress, and though it is too soon to predict the publication date, readers can begin to look forward to this comprehensive record of Mill's life and thought from 1849 to 1873.

Of the many problems involved in the editing, one with a happy solution might be of interest. A few months ago Professor F.A. von Hayek kindly sent me, for the News Letter, a photocopy of a manuscript fragment that he found in his desk when he left London for Chicago in 1950; it had hidden itself under the paper lining, and appeared only when the desk was completely emptied. On the basis of internal evidence and his extensive knowledge of Mill, Professor von Hayek suggested that the fragment is part of a letter to Harriet, dated during the 1840s, and that the work referred to is Macaulay's History. These inferences are borne out splendidly when the fragment is fitted onto the end of the second letter in the Later Letters, from Mill to Harriet, dated Saturday, 23 January, 1849. Professor Mineka had no reason to suspect that something was missing, because many similar letters end abruptly, without a signature.

The following excerpt gives the end of the letter as previously known, with the new fragment added. An asterisk marks the beginning of the fragment, which is reproduced in facsimile at the end of the excerpt.

"...I am reading Macaulay's book: it is in some respects better than I expected, & in none worse. I think the best character that can be given of it is that it is a man without genius, who has observed what people of genius do when they write history, & tries his very best to do the same, without the amount of painful effort, & affectation, which you might expect, & which I did expect from such an attempt & such a man. I have no doubt like all his writings it will be & continue popular--it is exactly au niveau of the ideal of shallow people with a touch of the new ideas--&, it is not sufficiently bad to induce anybody who knows better to take pains to lower people's estimation of it. I perceive no very bad tendency in it as yet, except that it in some degree ministers to English conceit\*--only in some degree, for he never "goes the whole" anything. He is very characteristic & so is his book, of the English people & of this time. I am rather glad than not that he is writing the history of that time for it is just worth reading when made (as he does make it) readable: though in itself I think English one of the least interesting of all histories--(French perhaps the most & certainly the most instructive in so far as history is ever so)."

- only in some degree, for he never "goes the whole" anything. He is very characteristic so is his book, of the English people & of this time. I am rather glad than not that he is writing the history of that time for it is just worth reading when made (as he does make it) readable: though in itself I think English the one of the least interesting of all histories (French perhaps the most & certainly the most instructive in so far as history is ever so).

## Reviews.

American Democracy in English Politics, 1815-1850. By David Paul Crook. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

This is a valuable book which takes up and deepens the subject of Anglo-American relations in the first half of the nineteenth century, previously treated in recent years by Frank Thistlethwaite and G.D. Lillibridge.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Crook, an Australian historian, gives a thoughtful account of the deep and lasting impact of American democracy upon English political argument. The book is fascinating for its historical interest as well as a contribution to the contemporary debate on politico-sociological thought and practice. The author resuscitates notable publications of writers such as Sir James Mackintosh, Fearon, Hazlitt, Wakefield, Thomas Hamilton, Beaumont, Miss Martineau, and many others, largely culled from the periodicals of the time such as the Edinburgh Quarterly, Blackwood's, London and Westminster. The debate on the United States acted as a catalyst in the process of sorting out English problems and attitudes.

Rank and file publicists looked at the emerging New World scene in the light of their own class interests and traditional ideas. Thus the Tories extolled American protectionism and assailed the tendency of "truckling to the mob." Liberals extolled the land of unlimited opportunities while rejecting its political, i.e., democratic-republican, framework. The Radicals depicted America as "a fine country for poor people," and as one in which there was no need for truckling to the powerful and rich. Some saw America as a co-operative, others as an acquisitive and competitive society. Dr. Crook's account offers an effective display of Ideologiekritik, laying bare the conscious and subconscious motivation behind the views represented. At the same time, this procedure brings into view the weakness of the claims made by the sociology of knowledge as far as it goes beyond Ideologiekritik. In contrast to the rank and file, the first string of thinkers taking part in the debate basically transcended their class and other ideological limitations. Two obvious examples in this context were of course Tocqueville and J.S. Mill.

Indirectly, a good deal of light is shed upon Mill's ideas by providing a background canvas of the debate, in which he was to take part. Directly, Dr. Crook gives a useful account of some of Mill's important contributions. On the whole, this account is fair as far as it goes though it does not go far enough; and it is somewhat misleading in demarcating Mill's relative position with regard to Tocqueville and Bentham. Although in the case of other writers Dr. Crook makes use of work published in the 50s and 60s, in Mill's case, apart from the Autobiography, he deals only with publications up to 1840, leaving aside even the Political Economy of 1848, which rightly belongs to the time span covered by him. Mr. Crook acquiesces in the imputation of Mill's discipleship to Tocqueville, fashionable since Roebuck first suggested it in 1835. However, at the same time, he rightly points out that Mill "subtly amended Tocqueville's analysis" and was basically independent of him in his sociological evaluation of the American scene. Mill's

article on "The State of Society in America" in the London Review of January, 1836, is said to be "still affected by the Radical's incurable optimism" and "by the Benthamite tradition." In truth, however, neither Bentham nor Mill was an optimist, nor did Mill eventually repudiate the Benthamite tradition. In 1836 Mill reserved the final judgment concerning the emerging American society to future observers.<sup>2</sup> Twelve years later, in the Political Economy, he dwelt on the adverse aspects of the new dollar-hunting civilization. Yet eventually, nearly a generation after Tocqueville's publication, in Representative Government (which Dr. Crook merely alludes to without entering into its argument) Mill sided with Henry Carey in extolling the unequalled "diffusion of the ideas, tastes, and sentiments of educated minds" in the United States, over-emphasizing Tocqueville's hopes at the expense of his fears concerning the future of American democracy.<sup>3</sup> In 1865 Mill stated that "much of the unfavourable part of [Tocqueville's] anticipations had not been realised."<sup>4</sup> Mill's own early sociological analysis, though less brilliant in execution, had avoided Tocqueville's narrower reliance on the independent variables of equality and centralization. However, as it was not Dr. Crook's aim to offer a full-scale examination of Mill's thought, it would be churlish to judge his welcome book in the light of this and other possible strictures.

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup>Frank Thistlethwaite, The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century (1959); G.D. Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom: The Impact of American Democracy upon Great Britain, 1830-1870 (1954).

<sup>2</sup>London Review, II (1835/36), 381.

<sup>3</sup>Representative Government, ed. R.B. McCallum (Oxford: Blackwell, 1946), 210.

<sup>4</sup>The Letters of John Stuart Mill, ed. Hugh S.R. Elliot (London, 1910), II, 35.

H.O. Pappé,  
University of Sussex.

Women's Suffrage and Party Politics in Britain, 1866-1914. By Constance Rover. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul [Toronto: University of Toronto Press], 1967. Pp. xiii, 240. \$6.75.

By the time the agricultural labourer was granted the right to vote in 1884, it could be argued that of all the qualifications for the exercise of the franchise in England the sex of the voter was the most important; for, while hundreds of thousands of poor and uneducated workingmen swelled the columns of the electorate, no woman, whatever her wealth or education, could cast a ballot in a national election. Women had come to play an increasingly important role in the economic and intellectual life of the nation and it is not surprising that they demanded full citizenship (they had been voting in municipal elections



since 1869). What is surprising is that the parliamentary system, which had repeatedly demonstrated its adaptability throughout the nineteenth century, failed to respond to their pleas.

It is just over a century ago (7 June, 1866) that John Stuart Mill and Henry Fawcett presented a petition to the House of Commons signed by 1,499 women requesting an extension of the vote to women. 1867 saw the founding of the first women's suffrage associations. The centenary of these events has brought forth a number of works on the movement. Dr. Constance Rover (who is Senior Lecturer in Government at the North-West Polytechnic in London) devotes her book to the study of the proponents and opponents of women's suffrage, and particularly to the failure of the major political parties, by 1914, to pass a bill to enfranchise women. She makes no secret of her admiration for those who dedicated themselves to the good fight, and she makes it clear that it is her intention "to commend all friends of women's suffrage rather than opponents" (208).

The women's demand for the vote was met with a mixture of indignation, fear, curious theories about sex differences, and less than scintillating wit. There were always distinguished supporters of the cause both inside and outside Parliament, but the women frequently found it difficult to win a serious hearing, and some resorted to militancy in the early years of the twentieth century, as a response to exasperation. Both constitutionalists (suffragists) and militants (suffragettes), as Dr. Rover repeatedly emphasizes, came from respectable middle-class backgrounds and both campaigned for the extension of the vote to women on the same limited basis as men rather than for a general broadening of the franchise to include all adults.

One of the major problems faced by the movement was that the issue of women's suffrage had remained an open question in parliament since 1884 when Gladstone, on rejecting an amendment to his bill, declared that women's suffrage was not an issue that could be settled along party lines. Neither of the major parties was willing to support a government bill. Thus while the women could evoke a good deal of sympathy on the question of principle, it was difficult to get a majority on specific measures, and none of the private members' bills reached the statute books. Promises of action by statesmen began to sound increasingly hollow, and the Liberals, after their victory in 1906, turned out to be no better than the Conservatives. Asquith, who became Prime Minister in 1908, was not sympathetic, and Churchill and Lloyd George, while favourable in principle, were, like many other Liberals, determined to resist bills that might offer an advantage to the Conservatives by giving the vote to well-to-do women without enfranchising others.

Dr. Rover's analysis of the response of the parties reveals some interesting differences among them. The Conservative leadership was generally favourable while the rank and file was opposed. In the case of the Liberals the opposite tended to be true. The Labour Party endorsed the principle but sought to have it implemented in the form of an adult suffrage bill and not as an extension of a limited franchise. The Liberal Unionists were unsympathetic and the Irish Nationalists, though sympathetic, would do nothing to upset Asquith on whom their cause depended. Asquith's role was crucial. It was difficult for

rank and file Liberals to espouse the cause wholeheartedly in the face of Asquith's equivocations. We get the impression that there was less than complete enthusiasm for women's suffrage even among some of its supporters. The Victorian male was finding it difficult to part with the symbol of his position in society and the family.

Making use of a wealth of primary material, Dr. Rover gives a clear picture of the attitudes of parties as a whole. Yet this is a less than satisfying book. She does not throw enough light on the activities within the parties, and we really are no wiser as to why some M.P.s (except for a few of the leaders) supported or opposed various measures. We are not always told, even in the case of prominent figures, why an individual took one stand rather than another (and, in some instances, M.P.s are not identified by their party labels). The author gives the impression of being too personally involved in the struggle. Is it really necessary to muster modern psychological and anthropological evidence to refute the ridiculous views about the sexes that were espoused by some of the opponents of the movement? Dr. Rover tends to portray the women who opposed the movement and who joined the anti-suffragist societies as individuals who did not really think for themselves, but who either absorbed the prevailing views on women, or surrendered to the attitudes of their husbands. There were many highly intelligent women in the anti-suffragist camp, but their position is never made either comprehensible or credible in this work.

Students of Mill will find very little of special interest here. There are a number of brief references to Mill's early contribution to the cause. At one point (13), he is grouped with T.H. Green as (surprisingly) a supporter of the "natural rights" theory of voting; however, he is quoted later (30) as explicitly repudiating this position--"my whole argument is one of expediency." Harriet Taylor appears only once, as "Mrs. John Stuart Mill," the author of an article on the enfranchisement of women in the Westminster Review (1851). Mill and Harriet are not brought together, and neither the genesis nor the impact of his views on the position of women forms a significant part of this study.

Most books have minor technical deficiencies, but there are too many here to be overlooked. We find a number of glaring typographical errors, several misspellings, including the name of Mrs. Humphry Ward which appears repeatedly, and a host of clumsy footnotes (one sentence on page 103 has five numerals which appear in the footnotes as "3 4 5 6 7 See Pamphlet..."). Such editing does not inspire confidence.

Sydney Eisen,  
York University.

\* \* \* \* \*

# MAN AND HIS WORLD

## TERRE DES HOMMES

THE NORANDA LECTURES/EXPO 67

Some of the most eminent men and women of our generation talk about the vital issues of now: Paul-Henri Spaak, Barbara Ward, Gunnar Myrdal, Linus Pauling and many others participated in this lecture series and each is concerned here with a special aspect of man and his world. This book is a distillation of the most significant thinking of the world today, necessary reading for everyone concerned with what's happening now, and what might not be happening in 20 years.

**\$17.50**

**University of Toronto Press**  
**Toronto/Buffalo**