

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 VI, Number 1

Fall, 1970

This somewhat swollen number has been delayed by the recent discovery by W.E.S. Thomas of the Mill-Molesworth letters here printed as edited by Mr. Thomas and Francis E. Mineka. They will be included in an Appendix to the Letter Letters, but their importance for those concerned with Mill's career in the 1830s prompted their prior publication here. The second article, by D.R. Watson (Modern History, Dundee) on Clemenceau and Mill, apart from its intrinsic value, suggests again the need for studies of Mill's influence on individuals and groups. The next article, by Harriet R. Holman on Mill's Avignon Library, deals with another matter on which too little is known, and even less has been written. Other material in this number includes a thesis abstract, an answer (at last!) to an earlier query (may this prompt more?), lists of recent and forthcoming work, and a review.

As always, my thanks to those of you who send in material of all kinds; the News Letter is really yours.

* * * * *

NEW LETTERS OF J.S. MILL TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH

Edited by William E.S. Thomas and Francis E. Mineka

It is well known that the London Review, and its later absorption of the Westminster Review, were made possible by the financial help of Sir William Molesworth, the Cornish baronet who joined the Philosophic Radical group in 1833. Until recently, letters which Mill wrote to Molesworth, which were seen and partly quoted by Mrs. Fawcett in her biography, had not been traced. In 1945 only one of the originals (Earlier Letters, p. 315, no. 183) had been found. Recently, we have been allowed by Molesworth's descendant, Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn, to make a further search, and six of Mill's letters to Sir William have come to light. The letters provide some interesting new light on Mill's connections with the Philosophic Radicals and his conduct of the London and Westminster Review. We are grateful to Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn for kindly giving us permission to publish them.

I[ndia] H[ouse]
8th December 1836

Dear Molesworth -- I have no time to write at much length at present-- but I will do all that you ask me to do. As to your question, what is the least that we should require of the Whigs;² this I think is the least, & also the most: 1. that all the questions which interest the Radicals as Radicals, shall be open questions: the Ballot, Triennial Parliaments, Household Suffrage, Reform of the Lords, the Corn Laws, Church rates, Electoral districts, abolition of the qualification--perhaps you may be able to add others. 2. that umbrage shall not be taken at our opposing their measures when bad (as the English Church Bill)³ or moving radical amendments to them; e.g. the destruction of the Irish Church,⁴ in lieu of the appropriation clause. 3. that they shall support our candidates, as well as require us to support theirs; & specially that when a Whig & a Radical candidate or candidates come into competition, the one who has the stronger party or is most likely to succeed, (as far, as that can be ascertained) shall be put forward & the other or others shall not only retire, but use their most strenuous exertions in his favour. Less than all this, ought not to satisfy us, & more we ought not to ask; because if all this be granted, we retain every advantage that we should have if unconnected with the Whigs, & as our support of them involves no sacrifice they are entitled to it at all events, so long as they are even a shade better than the Tories.

I take it as a great compliment that you modify what you write in compliance with my suggestions though you do not agree with them. With regard to Fonblanque,⁵ I have stuck in a note, complimenting him on his services & good intentions & gently remonstrating with him for quarrelling with us. You will see whether you are willing to father it or not. With respect to Howick⁶--I know nothing of him personally, but various things in his public conduct have at different times made me think better of him than you do--his voting against the Corn laws &c. & I know positively, though I have never said it to any person but yourself (& it should not be repeated) that more than a year before he proposed in the Cabinet an organic reform in the Lords, & wrote a long paper on the subject. My informant is Senior,⁷ to whom he shewed the paper. Now I doubt if any other member of the Cabinet would have done this or if any one of them supported him in the proposition.--I have a great respect also for Parnell,⁸ & I believe he is moving heaven & earth to have the points of difference made open questions.

I have stolen in the last two days, time to begin a little article for the review⁹ & a day or two more will finish it.

Give my respects to Leader¹⁰--an auspicious name in political partisanship.

Ever yours
J.S. Mill

India House
29th August 1837

My dear Molesworth

It is impossible to be surprised, & quite out of the question to find any fault with your not being willing to go on year after year expending money on a concern which it was quite voluntary on your part to spend anything upon, & which has cost you, as you truly say, already, much more than you at first intended.¹² It has been a great satisfaction to me all along, & is especially so now, to reflect that I had no hand whatever in inducing you to start the London Review, except by not refusing a most unexpected offer when spontaneously made by you to me, & that though I did advise you to buy the Westr., I never advised you to pay so much for it. I should have been much mortified if I had induced you to stake so much money on your confidence in me, & then not succeeded--& the responsibility I have not incurred with you, I am determined never to incur with anyone else. I shall ask nobody to sink any more money in the Review.

I have now one question to ask, which I hope you will answer as frankly as I put it: Do you really wish to carry on the review till next April? I do not consider you at all bound to do so: neither I should think does Robertson:¹³ for as his plan has not yet had anything like a trial, he could sustain no injury in anybody's opinion by its abandonment now. Therefore if you would prefer giving up the review now, that is immediately after the appearance of the forthcoming number (which Hooper,¹⁴ Dilke,¹⁵ & others advise us to announce for the end of October, not the 1st) it had better be done then.

But if you are disposed to try three more numbers, instead of one more, & so terminate Robertson's year, what I intend to do is this. If by that time we can reduce the annual deficit sufficiently, to enable me with any prudence to carry on the review at my own expense, I will do so. In that case, I shall certainly not avail myself of your willingness to abandon what you have already expended, but shall consider you as a shareholder to the extent of the whole amount, & the only change I shall make is, to credit myself with £500 a year for my time & trouble (hitherto unremunerated) ever since the review was started, & prospectively too, as well as with all sums I may have to advance, & nearly £300 which I am already in advance. This I think will be fair if I take upon myself the future expenses.

If the sale should not in April have improved sufficiently to render this course on my part consistent with prudence I shall then offer the review to Dilke, or to whatever person will give you the greatest price for it, & guarantee its being carried on upon radical principles. So much we owe to the radical cause, which must not if we can help it suffer the discredit of being unable to support an old established organ. I shall in that case withdraw entirely from all connexion with the review. It will be commonplace radical, which is all that the bulk of the supporters of our review require; & our particular section of the radicals must in that case renounce the

pretension it has had ever since the Westminster started, of being the leading section: a position which I do not think it has any right to, by its numbers, or even its talents, for there are not above half a dozen men of talent in it, but solely by its having definite principles, which no other section of radicals except the Owenites have.

I differ from most of the sentiments you express about the review, but I am not much surprised that you should express them. The good articles (except your own)¹⁶ in the last number were literary,¹⁷ not political or metaphysical, & literary articles are not to your taste, as you admit. I do not believe however that you will find anybody, except Grote & Roebuck,¹⁸ thinks the number destitute of merit. Such as it is, it is not (nor can any single number be) a specimen of the new system, for the principle of that is, above all, variety. We wished this number to be chiefly literary because the time of the year was unfavorable to politics, & because it was desirable at first to overdo the change of character of the review, in order that people might see there was a change--which they never do unless it is perked [sic] in their faces. Those who liked us as we were before probably do not think this a good number, but I am persuaded that everybody else thinks it a great improvement on our former ones. The next number, & perhaps the next after that will be much more political, as well as much more solid (though I hope equally readable) & may therefore be more to your taste. However that is a secondary question as you have such strong reasons, independent of the mode of management, for intending to give it up.

Neither do I agree with you in thinking the subject of the succession, & the King of Hanover, a bad one. It will be bad if badly treated, & if Robertson's article is not good it shall not be inserted.¹⁹ If that subject is bad, your subject of Orange Lodges²⁰ was bad. Both seem to me to be legitimate engines of party warfare. The editorial errors you speak of must be those (very bad to be sure) in a portion of the article on Spain, which I wrote myself.²¹ These errors remained uncorrected, or rather were miscorrected because the proof came to my house when I was out of town & so was printed off before I saw it. This was not Robertson's fault, & I will take care it shall not happen again. Some such errors are inevitable when articles come in late, but I shall take care they do not happen frequently.

The elections²² proved to me nothing except the decline of enthusiasm, & the certain victory of the Tories at the next general election if we have not the ballot. But it is evident to me from all signs, that the people of England are moderate radical. There are a great many new radical members, but they are all of the moderate-radical kind; & it is evident to me that the reformers generally disapprove of attacks on the ministry. Whenever there is a vacancy, whom do they talk of bringing forward? Whether it is Kilkenny, Lambeth, or Dumfriesshire, it is Ewart, not Roebuck.²³ Ewart's opinions are as strong as Roebuck's, therefore it is not Roebuck's opinions that are objected to, but his conduct. I have been much disappointed by the fact, but I see clearly that very few people are sorry for his being out of Parliament. The Spectator too is injuring itself: I have

been asked by radicals whether the Spectator is going to imitate the Times--& one radical, a writer in our review, told me that four persons in his knowledge, himself being one, had just given it up. Rintoul²⁴ will have to change his tack. As for Fonblanque he is utterly disgusting: not one word to induce the ministers to do anything, even at this critical time, but the old slang about Tory radicals! I have done with him. My advice to the radicals is to be active & stirring, but not to attack the ministry at all--unless for Canadian measures or something positively bad. But I shall not say so in the review, nor do I think it should be avowed as a principle at all. My article²⁵ will be full of speculations on all possible events without predicting any & the principle of it will be that now is the time for radical men of business. Make haste & shew yourself one. The Transportation Committee²⁶ is an excellent beginning. I shall shew that our present straits have arisen because neither whigs nor radicals were men of action. Both have shewn the most signal incapacity & inactivity.

I had nearly forgotten to tell you that your intentions about giving up the review next April were told to Robertson above a week before I received your letter, by the "Great Metropolis" man²⁷--& by this time it must be known to all the world. This is a great disadvantage added to the other difficulties we shall have to contend with between this & April--if the secret has oozed out through any of those who were so angry with Robertson on account of something which they supposed that man had heard through him, it will be curious enough.

ever yours my dear Molesworth
J.S. Mill.

Letter 217.1

India House
22^d September
1837

Dear Molesworth

I am going out of town for a few weeks & before I go I wish to tell you what has been doing about the review. This approaching number will I think be the best we ever had, & as far as one number can, will be a fair specimen of our present system. I have written two long articles myself, one on Carrel,²⁸ involving incidentally the whole political & literary state of France; the other, a political manifesto,²⁹ embracing the whole of the present position of the country, judging all parties, telling each what it has to do, & how far it has been wrong. The former article I know you will like, the latter I hope you will. Yourself, Buller, & Leader are the persons I am anxious to carry with me. If you would like to see the article before it is published, write to Robertson & he will send you a proof. It will not go to press quite yet, for I shall take it with me into the country in case something further should occur. Of our other

articles, those to which I attach most consequence are two; one on the Dissenters,³⁰ by Robertson, who knows them better than any other class, & better than any of us know them. I have seen a great deal of this article, & I think it extremely good, & well done, quite above anything Robertson ever wrote before: & without offending anybody, or compromising any of our own principles, I think it will give us for the first time a footing with the Dissenters: it will give us their ear, & be a beginning of making us their leaders instead of the whigs. The other article, which I consider the best literary article we ever had is on Italian literature since 1830,³¹ written by a refugee named Usiglio with the assistance of the celebrated Mazzini,³² the president of La Jeune Italie, & the most eminent conspirator & revolutionist now in Europe: the article is of the best school of continental criticism, the only good school of criticism now going; & is full, besides, of interesting novelties. We have put both Usiglio & Mazzini on our regular list, & we expect great help from them.

The paper on Carrel I have written con amore & those who have seen it think it the best thing I have yet done. I never admired any man as I did Carrel; he was to my mind the type of a philosophic radical man of action in this epoch. I have endeavoured to bring out this idea & many others & shall probably publish the article with my name hereafter. The leading ideas of the manifesto are 1. the necessity for ministers immediately to propose the ballot. 2. the necessity of keeping the whigs as our leaders if they will let us, on account of the inefficiency of the radical party; shewing incidentally how far Roebuck & the Spectator are right; how far wrong, & giving Fonblanque (without naming him) a kick for his attacks of [sic] the Spectator which he will never forgive me. 3. If the Whigs are to lead us, they must represent the average of our opinions. England is moderate-radical. Advice to the Whigs to throw themselves on the moderate-radicals. 4. Elaborate enforcement of the truth that bold policy is prudent policy, & that to undertake much is the way to succeed. The Whigs shewn to be rash from cowardice, & to have fought all their battles at the greatest possible disadvantage: what they ought to have done; what they ought now to do. 5. advice to our own radicals, to throw themselves on the working classes. 6. Appeal to the working classes in favour of the radicals, shewing them to be their only true friends. 7. Appeal to the people of property in favour of the radicals, as the only true conservatives: those who call themselves so being ready, as in the case of the Poor Law, to sell them for place. 8. Exhortation to Reformers to stand at their arms ready to act at a moment's notice.

If Buller is still with you pray tell him that we shall have ample need of him: & if anything occurs to him that he would like to do, which would be timely about the end of next January, I hope he will write to Robertson.

I have written since last June nearly a whole volume of my Logic,³³ have got over all the difficulties that had puzzled me, & see my way clearly to soon finishing the book. I am therefore in high spirits about my summer's work.

I had nearly forgotten to mention the Hanover.³⁴ I shall be in

constant communication with Robertson while I am out of town, shall see everything before it is inserted, & if there is a word in the article which from my knowledge of your sentiments I think you would not like, it shall not go in without your seeing it.

I look forward with great hopes to your Report on Transportation.³⁵ Lord John Russell's official adoption of the Philadelphia system makes the whole question of secondary punishments plain sailing.³⁶

ever faithfully yours
J.S. Mill

If you could give us an article on Secondary punishments³⁷ for January or April (as it may turn out) I should be exceedingly glad.

Letter 248³⁸

India House
19th October
1838

My dear Molesworth

On returning from the country I found your letter. You say nothing in it about your health but I hear from other quarters satisfactory accounts of it, to my very great contentment.

I shall be happy to give you any assistance in my power in preparing for your edition of Hobbes,³⁹ but I am not aware that my father ever wrote anything respecting him except what is in the Fragment on Mackintosh.⁴⁰ We will of course put in the prospectus for nothing. Tait's £17 is on every account yours;⁴¹ the review has no claim to it; only if you get it let Woolcombe⁴² know, so that he may include it in his statement of your disbursements for the review which I am sorry to say it goes but a little way to liquidate.

Our last number has sold very well: there are only about 150 remaining out of 2000. & I hear from Hooper that many have gone to libraries, where there is good hope of its leading to the review's being permanently taken. If it had not been for the cursed Canada business, which, I have now ascertained, reduced our then rapidly rising sale by full one fifth, it would have paid by this time. However I hope even this will profit us in the end, for the present turn in Canada affairs brings Lord Durham⁴³ home incensed to the utmost (as Buller writes to me)⁴⁴ with both Whigs & Tories, Whigs especially, and in the best possible mood for setting up for himself, & if so the formation of an efficient party of moderate radicals, of which our review will be the organ, is certain--the Whigs will be kicked out never more to rise, & Lord D. will be head of the liberal party and ultimately prime minister. I am delighted with Buller; his letters to his father & mother & to me shew him in a nobler character than he ever appeared in before, & he & Wakefield⁴⁵ seem to be acting completely as one man speaking to Lord D. with the utmost plainness, giving him the most courageous and judicious advice, which he receives

both generously & wisely. He is the man for us, & we shall have him & make a man of him yet.

I was sure you would admire Comte's book⁴⁶ as I do myself, but it is rather too dry for the review yet. Have you seen the third volume, the philosophy of chemistry & physiology? I have been almost as much struck with it as with the others & have learnt as much from it, though there are more questionable things in the former two, but even on those he has shaken me. Pray read it.

I have received your 25 copies & will do all I can to circulate them where they will be useful. Pray bear the subject of Secondary Punishments in mind for our February or Easter number.

There is a great game for you to play in the next session of parliament. Buller has the best cards in the H. of C. & I think he will play them well, but yours are the next best. As for me this has awakened me out of a period of torpor about politics during which my logic has been advancing rapidly. This winter I think will see me through the whole of it except the rewriting.

yours most truly
J.S. Mill

Letter 249⁴⁷

I[ndia] H[ouse]
14 Nov. 1838

Dear Molesworth

What think you of all this rumpus in Canada? I find all the Whigs & moderates here blame Lord Durham for the Proclamation, & he has already the greater part of the real radicals against him for the Ordinance. But I think the liberal party in the country generally is with him. I mean to stand by him, as my letters from Buller, & Rintoul's from Wakefield convince me that he was quite right in resigning & that he comes home fully prepared (if the damned pseudo-radicals do not get round him & talk him over) to set up for himself. For the purpose of acting at once upon him & upon the country in that sens, I have written an elaborate defence of him which will be published in the review next week, & will be in the newspapers before that. I hope exceedingly that you will approve of it for if this man really tries to put himself at the head of the liberals, your standing by him will do a world of good. What a pity Leader made such a damned fool of himself after you quitted town.

Write to me sometimes to say how you are. The Prospectus of Hobbes⁴⁸ is very well done but I am sorry the price of the book is to be so high, as I fear few will give so much for it except for making libraries--not for bona fide reading.

By the bye Nichol⁴⁹ who has been roaming about, finds that a letter to him franked by you, has miscarried, & he begs me to ask you whom you franked it for. I do not think it was for me, as he seems to have got all my letters.

When you write on Secondary Punishments which I hope will be soon, & for us, I must shew you the Report of a Committee at Calcutta on Prisons & Prison Discipline in India.⁵⁰ It is full of good observations & the writer is up to the most advanced ideas on penal law. Though the subject is prisons, all the questions of secondary punishment are in fact included in it. I do not send you a copy, for only one has yet reached the India house.

ever yours
J.S. Mill

Letter 298⁵¹

India House
19th Nov^r 1840

My dear Molesworth

Your note of the 11th of last month was sent to me into the country & I should have written sooner to thank you for what you did in relation to the Lunatic Asylum if I had not wished to be able at the same time to give you a satisfactory answer to your enquiries about my Logic. I have been working at it in the country &, I am happy to say, have finished it--the first draft of it I mean for a great deal of it will require rewriting, & some parts of it, probably, recasting, in order that the earlier parts may have the benefit of the new lights struck out in the latter ones. Of course too there is much to do to it in the way of making it clearer & more popular--& perhaps some of the details require to be worked out more carefully, but I do not expect to have anything to add to the ideas. I hope this winter will enable me to do all that is necessary & that I may begin to print next summer.

I think very much as you do about Whewell's book. His "History"⁵² was of great use to me, by bringing before me all that had been done & the manner in which it had been done. I have got nothing new from his "Philosophy" though I think it likely to be a useful book--his theory is much better than no theory--& his "ideas" are really the metaphysical premisses of the sciences the only contestable point being their a priori origin. I shall have to dwell more upon that point in rewriting my book, than I have done, & it is a great advantage to have the floating doctrines of the enemy fixed in a book of authority, because then one cannot be required to do more than answer what is said in the book.

You ask me if anything good has lately come out, in answer to which enquiry I request your acceptance of something very good.

Your Leeds demonstration⁵³ seems to me a very proper thing, done in the very best way--& I think that is the general impression about it. I cannot but think that it has done & will do good, both in France & here & I am sure it has had a good effect in raising your public character.

Fonblanque has been doing admirably on this war question.⁵⁴ It is

the first time that he has thrown off his ministerial livery. The Times also has been rendering good service of late.

I hope to hear from you now & then

ever yours
J.S. Mill.

NOTES:

¹These letters have been numbered in relation to the numbering in Earlier Letters of John Stuart Mill, ed. F.E. Mineka (Collected Works, XII and XIII). The number here indicates that this letter should be placed in sequence following Letter 183 (also to Molesworth, Dec. 3, 1836). At a few points in the following letters punctuation has been silently supplied.

Sir William Molesworth (1810-1855), founding proprietor of the London Review in 1835 with which he merged the Westminster Review in 1836; elected MP for East Cornwall, 1832 and 1835; a leader of the Philosophic Radicals in Parliament.

²As is evident in Letter 183, JSM had been asked by Molesworth for advice in the writing of his article on "Terms of Alliance between Radicals and Whigs," which appeared in the next number of the London and Westminster Review, IV & XXVI (Jan., 1837), 279-318.

³Charles Buller (1806-1848; MP for Cornwall, 1830-31; for Liskeard, 1832-48; a member of the Philosophic Radical party) had attacked the Established Church Reform Bill on its third reading, 19 July, 1836 (see Hansard, 3rd series, XXXV, cols. 350-2).

⁴Reform of the Church of Ireland was a perennial goal of radicals and many liberals until the final disestablishment of the Church in 1869.

⁵Albany Fonblanque (1793-1872), editor of the Examiner, 1830-47. Fonblanque, though sharing many of the Philosophic Radicals' views, had become increasingly critical of their tactics. JSM's complimentary footnote was published in Molesworth's "Terms of Alliance" article, p. 283.

The compliment had its effect, for a letter of Fonblanque to Lord Durham excepted Molesworth from the other extreme radicals who gathered under John Roebuck at Bath early in Jan., 1837, and tried to shake the Whig ministry. On 2 Jan, 1837, Fonblanque wrote Durham: "The main body of the Radicals disapprove of the course taken by the mutineers who are very few though very noisy; Sir W. Molesworth is the only one of them whose motives I believe to be pure, and he is instigated by Mrs. Grote, who is unfortunately more of a man, but not a better man than her husband. The notion of Mrs. Grote's little party seems to be that the perfection of Radicalism is the fiercest hostility to the Whigs--the number of these madcaps is, however, hardly half a dozen in Parliament at present..." (Lambton MSS). In the same letter Fonblanque indicated that he was "rather inclined to approve" the "plan of Radical operation" set forth in Molesworth's article. For JSM's later differences with Fonblanque on the Radicals, see Earlier Letters, Nos. 231, 233, 234, 235.

⁶Henry George Grey (1802-1894), Viscount Howick, later the third Earl Grey, then privy councillor and secretary-at-war.

⁷Nassau William Senior (1790-1864), economist.

⁸Sir Henry Brooke Parnell (1776-1842), later (1841) first Baron Congleton, liberal Whig politician and highly reputed economist and writer on finance.

⁹"Aphorisms" (a review of Thoughts in the Cloisters and the Crowd), LWR, IV & XXVI (Jan., 1837), 348-57, reprinted in part in Dissertations and Discussions, I, 206-10.

¹⁰John Temple Leader (1810-1903), then MP for Westminster. He and Molesworth had earlier opened, in Eaton Square, a dining club for Radicals only, which developed into the Reform Club in 1836.

¹¹Addressed: Sir. W. Molesworth Bart. M.P./Pencarrow/Bodmin. Postmarked 29 AUG. 37.

¹²Molesworth had advanced £4000 to establish the London Review, and within the first year paid £1000 to Gen. Thomas Perronet Thompson, proprietor of the Westminster Review, to merge it with the London.

¹³John Robertson (d. 1875), the nominal editor of the LWR. For Robertson's plans to enliven the Review and thereby increase its circulation, see Michael Packe, Life of John Stuart Mill (London, 1954), pp. 211-12. Molesworth gave up the Review at the end of 1837, and JSM assumed the proprietorship.

¹⁴Henry Hooper, bookseller, the publisher of LWR.

¹⁵Charles Wentworth Dilke (1789-1864), editor of the Athenaeum, 1830-46.

¹⁶"Life in the Penal Colonies," LWR, V & XXVII (July, 1837), 78-94, signed B.L. Molesworth had used the same initials as a signature for an article on "New South Wales" in the first number of the London Review (April, 1835), and one on "Sierra Leone," LWR, III & XXV (April, 1836). He was deeply interested in abolishing transportation as a punishment, and in 1837 chaired a select committee of Parliament to investigate the problem. See Mrs. Fawcett, Life of Sir William Molesworth (London, 1901), pp. 140-53.

¹⁷The July number contained two articles by Edward Bulwer, one on Thomas Gray and one on Charles Lamb; JSM's review of Carlyle's French Revolution; and a review of Charles Dickens' works, probably by Charles Buller.

¹⁸George Grote (1794-1871), banker; MP for London, 1832-41, later the well-known historian of Greece. John Arthur Roebuck (1801-1879), politician, MP for Bath, 1832-37 and 1841-47; for Sheffield, 1849-68 and 1874-79. Grote and Roebuck were among the leading militants of the Philosophical Radicals.

¹⁹"History of Hanover," signed S.R.T., LWR, VI & XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 198-216.

²⁰"Orange Societies in Great Britain"--their Illegality and Criminality," London Review, II (Jan., 1836), 480-513; and "Orange Conspiracy," LWR, III & XXV (April, 1836), 181-201.

²¹"The Spanish Question," LWR, V & XXVII (July, 1837), 165-94.

²²After the death of King William IV and the accession of Queen Victoria, Parliament had been dissolved. In the general elections of the summer, the Liberals won only by a much reduced majority over the Tories.

²³William Ewart (1798-1869), Radical politician, MP for Liverpool since 1830, had been defeated in the July elections, as Roebuck had been for Bath.

²⁴Robert Stephen Rintoul (1787-1857), journalist, founder of the Spectator, and its editor, 1828-58.

²⁵"Parties and the Ministry," LWR, VI & XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 1-26.

²⁶See n.16 above, and n.35 below.

²⁷James Grant (1802-1879), journalist, author of The Great Metropolis (2 vols., London, 1836) and other books.

²⁸"Armand Carrel, his Life and Character," LWR, VI & XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 66-111, reprinted in Dissertations, I, 211-83.

²⁹See n.25 above.

³⁰"Congregational Dissenters," LWR, VI & XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 217-60.

³¹"Italian Literature since 1830," ibid., 132-68, written by Angelo Usiglio (1803-1875). See Earlier Letters, No. 317.

³²Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), Italian patriot and revolutionary, in exile in England 1837-48. He contributed to LWR and other periodicals.

³³The System of Logic was eventually published in 1843.

³⁴See n.19 above.

³⁵As Chairman of a Select Committee "to inquire into the System of Transportation, its efficacy as a Punishment, its influence on the Moral State of Society in the Penal Colonies, and how far it is susceptible of improvement." See Parl. Papers, 1837-38, vol. XXII, Report 669. The Report has been reprinted in Australiana Facsimile Editions, No. 116 (Adelaide, 1967).

³⁶On March 23, 1837, Lord John Russell had advocated the abolition of capital punishment and the substitution of secondary (non-capital) punishments. See Hansard, 3rd ser., XXXVII, cols. 725 ff. and 730. The Philadelphia system provided for solitary confinement.

³⁷No such article appeared in LWR.

³⁸This is the full letter which includes the excerpts from Mrs. Fawcett's biography of Molesworth that were published in Earlier Letters as Nos. 246 and 248.

³⁹The English Works of Thomas Hobbes, now first collected and edited by Sir W. Molesworth (11 vols., London, 1839-45), and Thomae Hobbes Malmesburiensis opera philosophica que Latine scripsit omnia in unum corpus nunc collecta studio et labore Gulielmi Molesworth (5 vols., London, 1839-45).

⁴⁰James Mill, A Fragment on Mackintosh (London, 1835), pp. 19-68.

⁴¹William Tait (1793-1864), Edinburgh bookseller and publisher of Tait's Magazine. The sum mentioned probably was from his sales of LWR.

⁴²Thomas Woollcombe (1800-1876), Sir William's solicitor and business agent.

⁴³John George Lambton, 1st Earl of Durham (1792-1840), earlier this year appointed High Commissioner and governor-general of the British provinces in North America. JSM had already published two articles on Durham's mission, "The Radical Party in Canada," LWR, VI & XXVIII (Jan., 1838), 502-33, and "Lord Durham and his Assailants," LWR, VII & XXIX (Aug., 1838), 507-12. In the December number, pp. 241-60, JSM defended Durham's policy in Canada, in "Lord Durham's Return." See

Earlier Letters, Nos. 228, n.14, and 249.

⁴⁴This must have been an earlier letter than those of Oct. 13 and 19, 1838, mentioned in Earlier Letters, No. 249, n.3.

⁴⁵Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862), colonial statesman. With Charles Buller he had accompanied Durham on his Canadian mission.

⁴⁶Auguste Comte, Cours de philosophie positive (6 vols., Paris, 1830-1842). The third volume was entitled Philosophie chimique et philosophie biologique.

⁴⁷This is the complete text of No. 249, Earlier Letters, which was published from Mrs. Fawcett's excerpts. We have not repeated the annotation of the first paragraph in Earlier Letters.

⁴⁸See n.39 above. The English works sold at £5. 10s, the Latin at £2. 10s.

⁴⁹John Pringle Nichol (1804-1859), astronomer, and contributor to LWR. For JSM's letters to him, see Earlier Letters.

⁵⁰Not identified.

⁵¹This is the full letter which includes the excerpt from Mrs. Fawcett's biography that was published in Earlier Letters as No. 298.

⁵²William Whewell, History of the Inductive Sciences (3 vols., London, 1837). The next referred to is his Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, founded upon their history (2 vols., London, 1840). Both were extensively used by JSM in his Logic.

⁵³See Earlier Letters, No. 298, n.1.

⁵⁴See, for example, his leading articles in the Examiner for Nov. 8, 1840, p. 705, and for Nov. 15, p. 721.

* * * * *

CLEMENCEAU AND MILL

D.R. Watson

Parallel developments in Britain and in France were at the centre of the development of nineteenth-century liberalism. After 1870 they stood out among the major European powers as having institutions most closely conforming to the liberal ideal, and in the development of theory British and French thinkers were equally prominent. At the intellectual level there was considerable interchange between the two countries, and at the centre of this interchange stood John Stuart Mill. His long-continued association with France, his many French friends and his detailed knowledge of French political and intellectual life are well-known. Typical of the intimate connection between developments in Britain and in France is Mill's remark in a letter to de Tocqueville: "English ideas seldom make much way in the world until France has recast them in her own mould, and interpreted them to the rest of Europe."¹ The influence of French writing on Mill has been definitively explored by Iris Mueller,² but very little has been written on the other side of the coin--the influence of Mill's writings on the development of French thought. Nevertheless there can be no doubt that his influence was very great, especially in the field

of social and political ideas.³ All of Mill's major works were quickly translated into French, and some of them went through many editions.⁴ Hence this note on one aspect of what is without doubt a large field that still awaits proper exploration.

One of those who was influenced by Mill, and who spread his ideas in France, was Georges Clemenceau, famous as the war leader and prime minister of 1917-1920. Because of the hatred which he inspired on the left as a result of his wartime role it is hard to remember that between 1880 and 1900 he was the leading spokesman of Radical Socialism. At that time, when Marxist and Collectivist Socialism were of very little importance, it was Clemenceau's brand of Radical Socialism that inspired a whole generation of left-wing intellectuals, as well as playing an important part in current political controversy. Lucien Herr, the librarian of the Ecole Normale (who year after year gently guided chosen pupils towards Socialism), Jaurès, and Léon Blum, were all influenced by Clemenceau in their conversion to Socialism, before going on to develop a French version of Marxism.⁵ Zévaès, a Socialist militant of these years, and later a prolific historian, has paid tribute to Clemenceau's influence, and a long section of J.A. Scott's study of Republican Ideas and the Liberal tradition in France is devoted to the discussion of Clemenceau's Socialism.⁶ It was Clemenceau who, between 1880 and 1900, popularised in Parliament and in the press the social philosophy which was developed in more abstract and erudite form by Léon Bourgeois as the doctrine of "Solidarité," a middle road (one of so many) between laissez-faire capitalism and collectivist Socialism. All this is well-known, but the influence of Mill's ideas on the development of the social theories of French Radicalism does not seem to have been commented on in detail, although in a general way Mill's influence has been pointed out.⁷ In Clemenceau's case there is clear evidence of Mill's influence, which will now be presented.

There is no room here for a full analysis of the common elements in Clemenceau's political programme and Mill's ideas, but a few of the more important parallels can be noted. "The first and greatest duty of the State is to protect the weak against the strong," said Mill. This idea, and the terms "les faibles" and "les forts," occur again and again in Clemenceau's speeches and writings, notably in his roman à thèse, which he entitled "Les Plus Forts"--"The Strongest."⁸ Another idea of Mill's was that government intervention "should be so given as to be as far as possible a course of education for the people in the art of accomplishing great objects by individual energy and voluntary co-operation." This thought was made the centre of Clemenceau's argument in his major speech of 1884 on the social question; he reconciled his belief in the economic and social doctrines of "laissez-faire," with advocacy of government intervention to remedy social and economic distress, by developing this idea of Mill's: it was necessary at the moment for the government to intervene, to prevent poverty and distress producing a political explosion, but intervention should be designed so as to "prime the pump," so that it would create the conditions of social and economic progress in which it would no longer be needed.⁹

No doubt Clemenceau could have derived these ideas from some other

or intermediate source, but there is, in fact, direct evidence of contact with Mill. In the first place it is noticeable that the young men who were Clemenceau's disciples in these years frequently refer to the influence of Mill. Alexandre Millerand, for many years a leading French Socialist before he moved far to the right, writes, in his unpublished memoirs, that Mill was one of the principal influences on him as a young man; at the time he was a close associate of Clemenceau. Another of Clemenceau's team was Charles Longuet, the son-in-law of Marx, who, Marx boasted to Sorge in 1880, was one of the secret strings by which he controlled all the leaders of French Socialism from "Guesde and Malon to Clemenceau."¹⁰ In fact the influence was the other way round. In the 1880s Longuet remained close to Clemenceau, and did not propagate the ideas of his father-in-law. Instead in a debate with the Marxist Jules Guesde in 1881 he defined his Socialism as being that of Mill.¹¹

In any case there can be no disputing the fact that Clemenceau as a young man in the 1860s was in contact with Mill. As a medical student in 1864-65 he embarked on the formidable task of translating Mill's System of Logic into French, only to abandon it when he found that somebody else was already nearing completion.¹² In 1866 his father took him to England where they met Herbert Spencer and Mill. His father's connections among republican and intellectual circles, dating back to the 1830s, included Mill. At this meeting it was arranged that the young Clemenceau should translate Mill's much shorter book, Auguste Comte and Positivism, into French.¹³ He did this while he was in the United States, and the French translation was published in 1868; it had considerable success, having seven editions between then and 1903. His translation of this book has been used by some of Clemenceau's biographers, who seem to be entirely ignorant of its contents, as evidence that Clemenceau was a fully-fledged disciple of Comte. Going to the other extreme Professor Simon has argued that because Clemenceau translated without comment Mill's criticism of Comte, he agreed with it entirely.¹⁴ In fact Clemenceau did write an introduction, but, as he wrote to a friend, "had the good sense to suppress it," and the book appeared without any indication of his own views.¹⁵ His main motive in doing the translation was probably the fact that in return, the publishing firm of Baillièrè brought out a second edition of his thesis for his medical degree. This was entitled De la Génération des Eléments Anatomiques, and was very far from being a piece of detailed research on one aspect of disease or bodily function. It was a discussion of the fundamental question, much debated at the time, of the origins of life, in which materialist upholders of the spontaneous generation theory confronted the party that maintained that there was a radical distinction between living and non-living matter. Another motive was perhaps a desire to improve his command of the English language, and also his interest in the ideas discussed by Mill. As for his views on the controversy between Mill and Comte, there is other evidence that he regarded himself as a "Positivist," and that he was less critical than Mill had at that time become of Comte's contribution to human thought. Nevertheless, it could certainly be admitted that he regarded Mill's system of thought and

politics as on the whole more satisfactory than that of Comte.¹⁶ a conversation during the last years of his life Clemenceau is re- ed to have said: "Si je suis demeuré toujours disciple de Stuart [sic] Mill, je ne suis pas un matérialiste, ni même un positiviste, mais je prétends demeurer toujours un idéaliste."¹⁷

Another piece of evidence about Clemenceau's ideas at this time and his continuing interest in Mill's writing, is the fact that he began to write a book entitled La Femme, in which he attempted to refute Mill's arguments for the political rights of women. Mill's Subjection of Women appeared in 1869. By that time Clemenceau had returned from the U.S.A. to France, together with his eighteen-year-old American bride, and was living in his father's old manor-house buried in the remote countryside of the Vendée. He had little to occupy him, until the fall of the Second Empire in September 1870 plunged him into politics. Under the Empire, a man of Clemenceau's views seemed excluded from an active political career, and he was seeking to make a name for himself as a thinker and writer, an ambition to which he returned when his political career collapsed in 1893, and after his final retirement from politics in 1920. There is a remarkable continuity between the ideas which he outlined in 1869 and the two volumes entitled Au Soir de la Pensée which he wrote more than eighty years of age.

His youthful manuscript remained among his papers for sixty years and was published after his death by his private secretary, along with other letters and documents and oral reminiscences.¹⁸ It begins with a preface in which Clemenceau outlines his aims; Martet also refers to bulky sheaves of notes on various scientific and medical books which Clemenceau had consulted. Then we have the seven sections into which the work was to be divided, with a few lines outlining the points he wished to develop in each section. They are as follows:

1. De la fonction de reproduction en général et considérée dans le règne minéral;
2. De la sexualité;
3. De la femelle dans la série végétale;
4. De la femelle dans la série animale;
5. De la femme en général et de la femme envisagée dans la science ethnologique--[note] ce n'est pas que j'admette le règne humain. Cette division ne répond qu'à une commodité d'exposition de mon sujet;
6. Biologie de la femme
 - a. Physiologie,
 - b. Pathologie--[note] Femme a une physiologie pathologique une malade (Michelet);
7. Sociologie de la femme.

The last section, which was rather fuller than any of the others, included the following notes in which Clemenceau outlined his criticism of Mill's Subjection of Women:

"Livre de Mill. Fortes pensées mais ni méthode ni clarté. Que faut-il? Egalité des droits dans le mariage? Accordé. Egalité civile? Accordé. Ouvrir de suite la porte de la politique aux femmes? non. La politique se transforme à mesure que l'homme se transforme."

Clemenceau accepted Mill's criticism of Comte in entirety. Rather than he sought to use Comte's method to give a "scientific" basis to his discussion of the relationship of the sexes, and thought that in this way he could refute Mill. But, in general, his later ideas on social and political questions owed much more to Mill than to Comte. The main interest of this evidence about his youthful relationship with Mill is not that he disagreed with him on this particular question, but that it proves that he was already aware of Mill's writings and of his importance.

NOTES:

¹A. de Tocqueville, Oeuvres Complètes, ed. J.P. Mayer, VI, "Correspondance Anglaise," p. 332, quoted by D.R. Watson, "The British Parliamentary System and the growth of constitutional government in Western Europe," in C.J. Bartlett, ed., Britain Pre-eminent (London, 1969). For further discussion of contact between British and French political ideas and institutions, see this essay, and also M.J.C. Vile, Constitutionalism and the Separation of Powers (London, 1967).

²Iris Mueller, John Stuart Mill and French Thought (Urbana, 1967).

³For example his biographer described Jules Ferry as "Nourri de Condorcet, de Comte, de Stuart Mill, véritables 'bibles' des hommes de ce temps," M. Reclus, Jules Ferry (Paris, 1947), p. 25.

⁴The main nineteenth century French translations of Mill's works are: Principes d'Economie Politique, 1861, 1873; Le Gouvernement Représentatif, 1862, 1865, 1877; La Liberté, 1864, 1877; Système Logique, 1866, 1880; Auguste Comte et le Positivisme, 1868, 1885, 1893, 1898; La Philosophie de Hamilton, 1869; L'Assujettissement des Femmes, 1869, 1876; Mémoires, 1874; Essais sur la Religion, 1874, and L'Utilitarisme, 1889.

⁵For Blum, see G. Ziebur, Léon Blum et le Parti socialiste, 1914-1914 (Paris, 1967), pp. 31-2. For Jaures, see his "Le Socialisme et le Radicalisme en 1885," in J. Jaurès, Discours Politiques (Paris, 1904). For Herr, see C. Andler, Vie de Lucien Herr (Paris, 1932), pp. 27, 95.

⁶J.A. Scott, Republicanism and the Liberal Tradition in France, 1870-1914 (2nd ed., New York, 1966), pp. 126-56. A. Zévaès, Notes Souvenirs d'un Militant (Paris, 1913), pp. 235-75.

⁷J.A. Scott, *op.cit.*, does not mention Mill's influence, nor does J. Hayward in "Solidarity, the social history of an idea in France," International Review of Social History, IV (1959). Leo Loubère's articles on the intellectual development of French Radicalism, "The intellectual origins of French Jacobin Socialism," International Review of Social History, IV (1959), and "French left-wing Radicalism and their views on trades unionism," International Review of Social History, VII (1962), do not mention Mill. J. Kayser, Les grandes batailles du radicalisme 1820-1901 (Paris, 1962), is not much concerned with the development of theories but with practical political questions.

⁸G. Clemenceau, Les Plus Forts (Paris, 1898). Mill made this statement in his essay "Centralisation," Edinburgh Review, 115 (1842); see J.M. Robson, The Improvement of Mankind (Toronto, 1968), p. 20.

⁹Mill's statement is in Principles of Political Economy, Collected Works, III (Toronto, 1965), pp. 970-1; see J.M. Robson, op.cit., p. 219. Clemenceau's speech is to be found in Journal Officiel de la République Française, Annales de la Chambre des Députés, 31 January, 1884.

¹⁰Marx to F.A. Sorge, 5 November, 1880, Marx-Engels Werke, ed. Institut Fur Marxismus-Leninismus (Berlin, 1966), Vol. 34, p. 477.

¹¹Reported in La Justice, the daily newspaper owned by Clemenceau, 1 April, 1881.

¹²Clemenceau to Scheurer-Kestner, unpublished letter of 1 March, 1864, Bibliothèque Nationale, NAF 24409, f. 64.

¹³J. Martet, M. Clemenceau peint par lui-même (Paris, 1929), pp. 208-9.

¹⁴W.M. Simon European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century (Ithaca, 1963), p. 157n.

¹⁵Clemenceau to A. Scheurer-Kestner, unpublished letter of 31 October, 1867, Bibliothèque Nationale, NAF 12704, f.442. A letter from Clemenceau to an American friend John Durand, of 1 April, 1867, refers to his work on the translation, which he was just finishing at that moment. He did not intend to submit his version to Mill, as that would cause delay, and the French publisher was pressing him to produce it. He also wanted Durand, who was in Paris, to procure him "the pamphlet of Littré on Mill." See R.L. Hawkins, Newly discovered French letters (Harvard, 1933), letter 3, reprinted from Revue de Littérature Comparée, XII (1932), p. 420.

¹⁶See my forthcoming "Note on Clemenceau, Comte and Positivism," to be published in the Historical Journal.

¹⁷A.G. Gola, Clemenceau et son sous-prefet (Paris, 1937), p. 87.

¹⁸J. Martet, op.cit., Chap. 18, pp. 257-69.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 258.

²⁰Ibid., p. 259.

²¹Ibid., p. 260.

²²Ibid., p. 261. This should obviously be the other way round. In the Comtean hierarchy of the sciences it was sociology that depended on biology, and Clemenceau's plan for his book illustrated this principle, beginning with biological laws and moving on to sociological ones. The statement as printed must either result from a slip of Clemenceau's pen, or from a mistake in transcription. In 1967 the manuscript from which the text was printed was still in the possession of Martet's widow, but I was refused permission to consult it to resolve this point.

²³Ibid., p. 267. One of the reasons, of course, for Mill's rejection of Comte was precisely that Comte's belief in phrenology led him to argue that the female was inferior to the male physically, and therefore intellectually and socially as well. See J.M. Robson, op.cit., p. 112.

²⁴Ibid., p. 243. This fear of the French Left, especially of the Radical party, that the majority of the female vote would be cast for parties of the Right, under the influence of the Church, was obviously an important factor in delaying until 1945 the granting of female suffrage in France.

Harriet R. Holman

The sale of Mill's Avignon library by the Romanille bookshop in May, 1905, after Helen Taylor's removal to England, did not exhaust their stock, for in 1906 the American novelist Thomas Nelson Page (1853-1922) bought some annotated and association items from Mme. Romanille. She was the widow of Joseph Romanille (1818-1891), who had dedicated himself to reviving and purifying the Provençal tongue and became the central figure in a group of writers now known as the Félibrige; they called their anthology Provençalo. Her brother, Félix Gras (1855-1901), was one of that circle.

Page made at least four contemporary references to his purchases, the first of these in a typescript journal inexpertly transcribed from his pencilled notes and not corrected; the date is March 29, 1906. I quote it here without indicating the verifiable corrections I have made (for example, Horne Tooke rather than Cook as author of The Diversions of Purley), with my interpolations in brackets:

"Found an old Bookshop, Roumanille, 23 Rue St. Agricole (Mme Roumanille is widow of R. the first F[élibrige] poet and sister of Félix Gras, another poet), where I got a number of old books--Theocritus and Sappho with French translation, Mme Dacier; H[ume's] Essays, Stuart Mill's copy with his annotations; [Horne] Tooke's Diversions of Purley, Ditto; Térence, Mme Dacier's translation. Also a MS of J.S. Mill on the [sanctity of the] Ballot, a volume by B----- with a letter of B----- [Bentham? Bingham?], J.S.M.'s copy--also a small Greek cup gotten by J.S. Mill in Greece--also a Petrarch charges fifty francs for three sets."

In a letter to his mother on the same date Page was more specific:

"I had an interesting find here today. John Stuart Mill died here and I found an old woman who keeps a book shop who bought most of his library. I got a number of his books for a song, with his annotations in them, also a manuscript of his with his initials. It is an essay on the ballot. Tell Rosewell² to find out for me if it has ever been printed. It is about six or eight pages. Kennedy³ at the library can find out for him."

Again on April 3 from Pau he wrote her:

"Did I tell you of finding John Stuart Mill's library in Avignon? I bought a number of his books with his annotations, among them Hume's essays. I also bought a manuscript of his on the Sanctity of the Ballot. Then I bought a little archaic Greek cup that he had got in Greece. I believe I wrote you most of this in my last letter."

He referred to the subject once more, on May 14, 1906, from Paris, where in comparative leisure he was philosophising on his winter of travel:

"I have myself not done a great deal of shopping. I have gotten some interesting books and a few clothes, leaving the shopping to the ladies, who enjoy what I detest. Among the books [bought on this trip] is a pamphlet, The Diamond Necklace, presented to John Stuart Mill by Thomas Carlyle, and Mill's Plato with his annotations in it."

The letters, like the journal, belong to the Thomas Nelson Page Collection of Manuscripts in the Clifton Waller Barrett Library of the University of Virginia and are here quoted by permission. They are included in Mediterranean Winter 1906, which I have edited and which is scheduled for early publication by Field Research Projects, Coconut Grove, Miami.

I do not know what became of the books. Page's residual legatee, his sister-in-law, Mrs. Rosewell Page, still clear of mind in her hundredth year, still living in Oakland the family home where she has been since 1885, has no remembrance of them. Page's oldest grandson, Dr. Henry Field, of Miami, surmises that they must have been dispersed at the time the Washington home, at the corner of R Street and New Hampshire Avenue, was sold in 1922. (The Washington home, presumably with the library intact, served as Italian Embassy 1913-1920, while Page was Ambassador to Rome, 1913-1919.) Dr. Field is probably correct, for they were not acquired with the two big collections of Page papers at Duke University and the University of Virginia, nor does Page's surviving step-daughter, Mrs. Thomas P. Lindsay, have any recollection of them; nor are they at the Boston Athenaeum, to which she gave most of her library.

It is possible that Page had these books rebound in chagrin rouge leather, as he had earlier purchases rebound in Paris, but as he made no mention of doing so, I believe that he left them in the condition in which he found them.

NOTES:

¹The best account of the Romanille purchase and sale of Mill's books is in F.A. von Hayek's Introduction to The Earlier Letters of J. S. Mill, ed. Francis E. Mineka, Collected Works, Vol. XII (Toronto 1963), pp. xviii-xix.

²His brother, Rosewell Page (1858-1939), Richmond lawyer.

³John Pendleton Kennedy (b. 1871), State Librarian of Virginia, 1903-1907.

* * * * *

Thesis Abstract:

THE IMAGINATIVE DIMENSION
IN THE WRITINGS OF JOHN STUART MILL

Glenn K.S. Man

From the perspective of the expressive theory of poetry as applied to non-fiction prose which George Levine and William Madden articulate

in The Art of Victorian Prose (New York, 1968) and from the perspective of the Fryeian mythic imagination, one can fruitfully examine the literary and imaginative aspects of Mill's Autobiography, his "Bentham" and "Coleridge" essays, and his essays on poetry. In the first instance, these works project their author's private feelings and desires by their structure and by such stylistic elements as tone, metaphor, and imagery. In the second instance, they represent a displacement, in human terms, of the romance myth, one of the four basic mythic structures in literature.

In the Autobiography, Mill's felt needs, his individual response to reality, are given form by the identification process inherent in the structure of the work. The structural movement is one in which Mill moves from identifying with his father and with the narrow utilitarian doctrines of Bentham in his early youth to his break from his father because of his realization of his emotional deficiencies and of the narrow basis of the Benthamite doctrines. On an ideological level, this break leads Mill to find alternatives to the narrow Benthamite doctrines by an eclectic method in which he balances those doctrines by consulting other philosophical, political, and social systems. On a personal level, this break leads Mill to identify with the person of Harriet Taylor who possesses the perfect balance of rational and intuitive qualities which Mill wishes himself to possess but cannot because of his ingrained utilitarian background.

This structural movement in the Autobiography is aided or is brought out forcefully by the stylistic elements of tone, metaphor and symbol. Ironic tone, achieved chiefly by undercutting, functions to distance the narrator (Mill) from the early events of his life and from the early identification with his father. Eulogistic tone functions to unite the narrator with the person of Harriet Taylor which enables him to achieve his new identification. Metaphor works in the Autobiography since the various events and/or acts which Mill (the main character) goes through stand for the various phases of the identification process. This leads up to the culminating metaphor, Harriet Taylor, symbol of Mill's abiding need to balance his own person, symbol of his new identification.

In the "Bentham" and "Coleridge" essays, the structural movement in both essays is controlled by Mill's reaction to the narrow Benthamite doctrines and his search for alternatives. The ironic structure of the "Bentham" essay, which is patterned on praises of Bentham undercut by subtle remarks and direct criticism, indicates as in the Autobiography Mill's reaction to and break from the narrowness of the Benthamite doctrines. The structure of contrast in the "Coleridge" essay reveals Mill's abiding need to balance the narrow Benthamite doctrines as he contrasts those doctrines with the corrective doctrine of Coleridge. To complete the connection between the Millian vision in the Autobiography and the two essays, there is also in the "Coleridge" essay a eulogistic tone, which Mill uses in praising Coleridge for his eclectic attitude, that echoes his praise of Harriet Taylor in the Autobiography.

In the essays on poetry, the reaction to Bentham and his father is clear: Mill sees the need to work out a theory of poetry and to give

poetry an important place in the utilitarian scheme, a place which Bentham and James Mill denied to it. Yet this is only an indirect reaction, unlike the direct attacks on James Mill and Bentham in the Autobiography and in the "Bentham" and "Coleridge" essays. What the essays truly reveal in their structural movement is Mill's abiding need to eclecticize, the method which grew out of his reaction to his early education and to Benthamite utilitarianism. Through the four essays, "What is Poetry?" "The Two Kinds of Poetry," "Tennyson's Poems," and the Inaugural Address to St. Andrews, Mill moves from the exclusive structure of the first essay which is built on distinctions and which excludes poetry from different areas of human endeavor to an inclusive structure in the Inaugural Address which is built on the inclusiveness of a liberal education crowned by the study of poetry which unites and activates the various cultures gained from other studies in the total human endeavour.

Concomitant with this expression of Mill's felt needs, in these three works, through structure and through tone, metaphor, and imagery, is the fact that this expression partakes in the mythic dimension of imaginative literature. For the identification process in the Autobiography also represents a displacement, in human terms, of the romance myth. The main character in the Autobiography, who goes on a search for and achieves a new identity following his "mental crisis" in which he recognizes his true self, is a displacement in human terms of the archetypal romance hero, who engages in a quest which usually leads to a recognition of his true self following a crucial struggle.

This mythic perspective as regards the Autobiography enables one to perceive the essays on Bentham and Coleridge and the essays on poetry as displacements of the romance myth also, since they too express the pattern of Mill's experience as found in the Autobiography. Both this Fryean perspective, and the perspective of the expressive theory of poetry, plumb the depths of the imaginative dimension in Mill's writings.

* * * * *

Recent Publications:

- Alexander, Edward. "John Stuart Mill on Dogmatism, Liberticide, and Revolution," Victorian Newsletter, No. 37 (Spring, 1970), 12-18.
- Burston, W.H., ed. James Mill on Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Carey, George W. See Kendall, below.
- Cooper, Neil. "Mill's 'Proof' of the Principle of Utility," Mind, 78 (1969), 278-9.
- Foulk, Gary L. "Kendall's Criticisms of J.S. Mill," Personalist, 51 (Summer, 1970), 314-23.
- Friedman, William H. "Some Issues Raised by the Deductive Logic of John Stuart Mill." Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1970.
- Hall, Roland. "Further addenda to 'The Diction of John Stuart Mill,'" Notes & Queries, 215 (Jan., 1970), 10-11.

- Harris, Wendell V. "The Warp of Mill's 'Fabric' of Thought," Victorian Newsletter, No. 37 (Spring, 1970), 1-7.
- Kelly, Charles J. "The Presuppositions of John Stuart Mill's Theory of Names and Propositions." Dissertation, Notre Dame, 1969. (DA, 30 [1969], 763-64A.)
- Kendall, Willmoore, and George W. Carey. "The 'Roster Device': J.S. Mill and Contemporary Elitism," Western Political Quarterly, 21 (1968), 20-39.
- Man, Glenn K.S. "The Imaginative Dimension in the Writings of John Stuart Mill." Dissertation, Notre Dame, 1970. (See abstract above.)
- Murray, James G. "Mill on De Quincey: Esprit Critique Revoked," Victorian Newsletter, No. 37 (Spring, 1970), 7-12.
- Parent, William A. "Mill's Conception of the Summum Bonum." Dissertation, Brown, 1970.
- Smith, James M., and Ernest Sosa, eds. Mill's Utilitarianism: Text and Criticism. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1969. Includes extracts from Bentham's Principles, JSM's "Remarks on Bentham's Moral Philosophy," Util., extracts from last chap. of Logic, Moore's critique of Util. (from Principia Ethica), Kretzmann's "Desire as Proof of Desirability," Urmson's "The Interpretation of the Moral Phil. of JSM," Mabbott's "Interpretations of Mill's Util.," Bradley's "Pleasure for Pleasure's Sake" (from Ethical Studies), Jean Austin's "Pleasure & Happiness," & Sosa's "Mill's Util."
- Stocker, Michael. "Consequentialism and its Complexities," American Philosophical Quarterly, 6 (1969), 276-89.
- Turk, C.C.R. "John Stuart Mill and Samuel Taylor Coleridge." Dissertation, University of Sussex, 1970.

* * * * *

Forthcoming Work:

- West, Henry R. "Reconstructing Mill's 'Proof' of the Principle of Utility," in Mind.

* * * * *

Work in Progress:

- David B. Lyons (Philosophy, Cornell) has been awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship to prepare a study of the philosophy of Bentham.
- Eugene R. August, English, Dayton, is working on the argumentative strategy and language of Mill's "Bentham."

* * * * *

QUERIES:

In the manuscript, 1st and 2nd editions of his Logic, Mill refers to "what has been aptly called 'the peculiar zest which the spirit of reaction against modern tendencies gives to ancient absurdities.'" (Book III, Chap. v, §9--replaced in the 3rd ed. by what became §11 in the 8th ed.) Can anyone identify the quotation?

In the 5th ed. of his Logic, Mill added a footnoted reference (Vol. I, p. 36n. of the 8th ed.) to a work entitled Philosophy; or the Science of Truth. Can anyone identify the author, etc., of this work? It presumably appeared between 1856 (the date of the 4th ed.) and 1862 (the date of the 5th ed.).

In MNL, III, 1 (Fall, 1967), the late Professor Jacob Viner, whose death is an irremediable loss to scholarship, asked for help in identifying a passage on history attributed to Mill. Mr. R.L. Weissman has kindly supplied the reference (which he thinks was used by Franklin Roosevelt), which is to the last paragraph of John Morley's Life of Cobden: "History shows that great economic and social forces flow like a tide over communities only half conscious of what is befalling them. Wise statesmen foresee what time is thus bringing and endeavor to shape institutions and mold men's thoughts and purposes in accordance with the changes that silently surround them."

* * * * *

Review:

John Elliot Cairnes and the American Civil War, by Adelaide Weinberg. London: Kingswood Press, [1970]. Pp. 224.

When Civil War broke out in the United States, John Elliot Cairnes was shocked and aggrieved, as were the Northerners, to discover that an overwhelming majority of Englishmen sided with the South. To convince them of their error, he published a book, based partly on a series of lectures, entitled The Slave Power; its Character, Career, and Probable Design: being an Attempt to explain the real Issues involved in the American Contest. It is Adelaide Weinberg's contention that much of the credit for the shift of English sympathies to the North belongs to Cairnes and his book.

Dr. Weinberg argues that the strength of Cairnes' influence derived from his methodology. A disciple of John Stuart Mill, he shared Mill's interest in Comte and Buckle. He believed that "political economy may be made conducive to the solution of the philosophical problem of history" and that economic causes "powerfully" affect "the form which civilization subsequently assumed." When he turned his attention to the Civil War, he argued that slavery was the root cause of the war and that the economics of slavery made the South necessarily aggressive. Slavery was inimical to improved agriculture and also to the immigration of a free labour force;

therefore, to survive, slave states must always be looking for new land to replace the exhausted plantations. Another characteristic which must co-exist with slavery is an oligarchic despotism; therefore slave states could never exist peaceably within a democratic Union. Mrs. Weinberg's book traces Cairnes' arguments as he applies these principles to the different phases of the War with an impressive prescience.

Cairnes' work shows him as a rational philosopher opposing on reasoned grounds the Confederacy based on slavery. Mrs. Weinberg prints in the second half of her book Professor Cairnes' correspondence with Sarah Blake Shaw, a kindly, religious and intelligent Yankee, fervently devoted to the Northern Cause. John Cairnes is revealed as a gentle man, whose own life contained more than enough suffering to permit him to share the personal tragedies created and created by the Civil War.

Ann Robson,
History, Toronto

* * * * *

Collected Works of John Stuart Mill

The Collected Edition of the works of John Stuart Mill has been planned and is being directed by an editorial committee appointed from the Faculty of Arts and Science of the University of Toronto, and from the University of Toronto Press. The primary aim of the edition is to present fully collated texts of those works which exist in a number of versions, both printed and manuscript, and to provide accurate texts of those works previously unpublished or which have become relatively inaccessible.

Editorial Committee: J. M. Robson, *General Editor*, V. W. Bladen, Alexander Brady, J. B. Conacher, D. P. Dwyer, S. Hollander, Clifford Leech, R. F. McRae, F. E. L. Priestley, Marsh Jeanneret, Frances Halpenny, Jean Houston.

PUBLISHED.

Principles of Political Economy, 2 volumes, \$25.00 the set

Essays on Economics and Society, 2 volumes, \$25.00 the set

Essays on Ethics, Religion, and Society, \$20.00

Earlier Letters, 1812-1848, 2 volumes, \$20.00 the set

IN PREPARATION FOR PROBABLE PUBLICATION IN 1971

Later Letters, 1849-1873

System of Logic

University of Toronto Press

Toronto 181, Canada

Nous ne savons pas ce qu'elle deviendra un jour mais aujourd'hui elle comprend non seulement parlement, mais guerre (armée, marine, police, etc.) L'organisation de la femme l'en éloigne. Si dans le futur il arrive jamais que la femme se fasse ouvrir les portes de la politique, c'est que celle-ci (non la femme) se sera transformée. Nous ne disons pas que cela n'arrivera jamais mais que cela n'arrivera jamais tant que la politique et les hommes resteront ce qu'ils sont.

Si les femmes entraient dans la vie politique actuelle qu'elles n'ont pas créée, elles se trouveraient dans la position des nègres en Amérique, dont les circonstances ont rendu fatale l'admission dans le corps politique. Corruption et vénalité augmenteraient singulièrement."

In his preface Comte began by declaring, "Jamais époque ne fut peut-être aussi favorable que la nôtre aux hardiesses de la pensée."¹⁹ He argued that, because traditional ways of thought had been abandoned, "la plus folle anarchie d'opinions et de sentiments se révèle."²⁰ Along with everything else, the traditional relationship between the sexes had been called in question, among others by Mill, "que des raisons de sentiment toutes personnelles et d'un ordre absolument privé ont rangé dans le camp de ceux qui croient, à l'égalité des sexes."²¹ But he thought that the question had not yet been discussed "scientifically," by which he meant according to the Comtean Positivist method. He intended to use this method, and this would give his study any utility it might be found to possess. "Ce qui constitue en effet l'originalité de ce travail c'est que le côté social de la question que j'y étudie est partout subordonné au côté biologique. Or on sait que c'est à Comte qu'appartient la gloire d'avoir montré d'une manière définitive la subordination des phénomènes biologiques aux sociologiques [sic]."²² Thus relying on this method, Comte set out to prove that women should not have the vote by discussing the formation of crystals, and then the differences between male and female first of all in the vegetable and then in the animal kingdoms, before moving on to a discussion of the physiology ("Comprenant psychologie") and pathology of the human female, this in turn leading to sociology by way of Michelet's strange observation, which Comte obviously agreed with, that "la femme physiologique" equals "l'homme pathologique."²³ The whole scheme was an ambitious attempt to apply the rules of Comtean method so that "laws" governing political and social institutions could be deduced from the laws of the physical world.

Comte did not persist with his project, whether because he decided, on reflection, that the Comtean method was not satisfactory, or because his engagement in practical politics left him no time for these speculations. He never changed his mind, however, on the practical conclusion that women should not have the vote, remarking to Martet in 1928: "C'est la force qui détermine toutes les actions de ce monde....La femme n'est pas la force. Elle est menée par qui veut s'en donner la peine. Chez nous elle est menée par le curé....Et je n'ai pas besoin de donner aux curés une force nouvelle."²⁴

In conclusion, then, his translation of Mill's book on Comte and Positivism, contrary to Professor Simon's belief, did not mean that