

The Online Library of Liberty

A Project Of Liberty Fund, Inc.

John Stuart Mill, *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XV - The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1849-1873 Part II* [1856]



The Online Library Of Liberty


This E-Book (PDF format) is published by Liberty Fund, Inc., a private, non-profit, educational foundation established in 1960 to encourage study of the ideal of a society of free and responsible individuals. 2010 was the 50th anniversary year of the founding of Liberty Fund.

It is part of the Online Library of Liberty web site <http://oll.libertyfund.org>, which was established in 2004 in order to further the educational goals of Liberty Fund, Inc. To find out more about the author or title, to use the site's powerful search engine, to see other titles in other formats (HTML, facsimile PDF), or to make use of the hundreds of essays, educational aids, and study guides, please visit the OLL web site. This title is also part of the Portable Library of Liberty DVD which contains over 1,000 books and quotes about liberty and power, and is available free of charge upon request.

The cuneiform inscription that appears in the logo and serves as a design element in all Liberty Fund books and web sites is the earliest-known written appearance of the word “freedom” (amagi), or “liberty.” It is taken from a clay document written about 2300 B.C. in the Sumerian city-state of Lagash, in present day Iraq.

To find out more about Liberty Fund, Inc., or the Online Library of Liberty Project, please contact the Director at oll@libertyfund.org.

LIBERTY FUND, INC.
8335 Allison Pointe Trail, Suite 300
Indianapolis, Indiana 46250-1684



Edition Used:

The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XV - The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1849-1873 Part II, ed. Francis E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).

Author: [John Stuart Mill](#)
Editor: [Francis E. Mineka](#)
Editor: [Dwight N. Lindley](#)

About This Title:

Vol. 15 of the 33 vol. Collected Works contains Mill's letters written between 1856-1864.

About Liberty Fund:

Liberty Fund, Inc. is a private, educational foundation established to encourage the study of the ideal of a society of free and responsible individuals.

Copyright Information:

The online edition of the *Collected Works* is published under licence from the copyright holder, The University of Toronto Press. ©2006 The University of Toronto Press. All rights reserved. No part of this material may be reproduced in any form or medium without the permission of The University of Toronto Press.

Fair Use Statement:

This material is put online to further the educational goals of Liberty Fund, Inc. Unless otherwise stated in the Copyright Information section above, this material may be used freely for educational and academic purposes. It may not be used in any way for profit.

Contents	
ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES	vii
THE LETTERS, 1856-1864	
1856, 503	1857, 520
1858, 545	1859, 587
1860, 658	1861, 719
1862, 760	1863, 816
1864, 915	
INDEXES	
General Index	2017
Index of Correspondents	2078
John Stuart Mill and Helen Taylor (ca. 1869?)	<i>facing page</i> 503

Table Of Contents

[Abbreviations and Short Titles](#)

[The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1856-1864](#)

[1856](#)

[1857](#)

[1858](#)

[1859](#)

[1860](#)

[1861](#)

[1862](#)

[1863](#)

[1864](#)

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

Abbreviations And Short Titles

Am.: American

Arsenal: Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris

Autobiog.: John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, ed. with an Introduction and Notes by Jack Stillinger (Boston, 1969)

Bain, *JSM*: Alexander Bain, *John Stuart Mill: A Criticism: With Personal Recollections*, London, 1882

Bernard: Mountague Bernard, *A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War*, London, 1870

Bibliothèque Nationale: Bibliothèque National, Paris

Bodleian: Bodleian Library, Oxford

Brit. Mus.: British Museum, London

Canberra: National Library of Australia, Canberra

Columbia: Columbia University Library

Cornell: Olin Library, Cornell University

Cosmopolis: "Letters of John Stuart Mill to Gustave d'Eichthal," ed. Eugène d'Eichthal, in *Cosmopolis*, IX (March, 1898), 781-89

Dilke: Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, "John Stuart Mill, 1869-1873," *Cosmopolis*, V (March, 1897), 429-41

Dissertations: John Stuart Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions: Political, Philosophical, and Historical*, 4 vols., London, 1859-75; 5 vols., Boston, 1864-68

Duncan: David Duncan, *Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer*, 2 vols., New York, 1908

ER: *The Edinburgh Review*, 1802-1929

Earlier Letters: *The Earlier Letters of John Stuart Mill, 1812-1848*, ed. Francis E. Mineka, vols. XII and XIII of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Toronto, 1963

Early Draft: *The Early Draft of John Stuart Mill's Autobiography*, ed. Jack Stillinger, Urbana, 1961

D'Eichthal Corresp.: John Stuart Mill, Correspondance inédite avec Gustave d'Eichthal, 1828-1842, 1864-1871, ed. Eugène d'Eichthal, Paris, 1898

Elliot: *The Letters of John Stuart Mill*, ed. Hugh S. R. Elliot, 2 vols., London, 1910

FR: The Fortnightly Review, 1865-1954

Fraser's: Fraser's Magazine, 1830-82

Gomperz: Heinrich Gomperz, *Theodor Gomperz, Briefe und Aufzeichnungen, ausgewählt, erläutert und zu einer Darstellung seines Lebens verknüpft*, Vol. I (all published), Vienna, 1936

Hamilton: John Stuart Mill, An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, London, 1865

Hansard: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series, London, 1830-91

Harvard: Harvard College Library

Hayek: F. A. Hayek, *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor: Their Friendship and Subsequent Marriage*, London and Chicago, 1951

Huntington: The Huntington Library, Pasadena

I.H.: India House

Indiana: Indiana University Library

JSM: John Stuart Mill

Johns Hopkins: The Johns Hopkins University Library

King's: Keynes Collection, King's College Library, Cambridge University

LSE: The British Library of Political and Economic Science, at the London School of Economics and Social Science

Leeds: Brotherton Library, University of Leeds

Logic: John Stuart Mill, A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive; being a connected view of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation, 2 vols., London, 1843. The references are to the 8th edition, London, 1872

LWR: London and Westminster Review, 1836-40

Macmillan's: Macmillan's Magazine, 1859-1907

MacMinn, *Bibliog.: Bibliography of the Published Writings of John Stuart Mill*, ed. Ney MacMinn, J. R. Hains, and James McNab McCrimmon, Evanston, Ill., 1945

Mass. Hist. Soc. *Proceedings: Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Boston, 1859-

Melbourne: Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne

Motley: *The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley*, ed. George William Curtis, New York, 1889

NAPSS: National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, *Transactions*, 1857-84, 1886

NLI: The National Library of Ireland, Dublin

NLS: The National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh

NLW: The National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth

NYP: New York Public Library, New York City, New York

No. Am. Rev.: The North American Review, 1815-1940

Osborn Collection, Yale: The James Marshall and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Yale University Library

Packe: Michael St. John Packe, *Life of John Stuart Mill*, London, 1954

Parl. Papers: Sessional Papers printed by order of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, London, 1849-

Pol. Econ.: John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy, With Some of Their Application to Social Philosophy*, London, 1848. The references are to the last edition revised by JSM (the 7th in 1871) available in the edition of Sir W. J. Ashley, London, 1909, and as Vols. II and III of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, ed. J. M. Robson, Toronto, 1965

Principles: John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, ed. J. M. Robson, Vols. II and III of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Toronto, 1965. References have been made to this edition only for information not available in other editions of *Pol. Econ.*

QR: The Quarterly Review, 1809-

Rep. Govt.: John Stuart Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government*, London, 1861

SR: The Saturday Review, 1855-1938

Sp.: *The Spectator*, 1828-

Stamp: "New Letters of John Stuart Mill. A philosopher in politics," *The Times*, Dec.
29, 1938

UCL: Library of University College, the University of London

UCLA: Library, University of California at Los Angeles

Villey: Daniel Villey, "Sur la traduction par Dupont-White de 'La Liberté' de Stuart
Mill," *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale*, XXIV (1938)

Wellesley Index: The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, ed. Walter
E. Houghton, Vol. I, Toronto, 1966


WR: *Westminster Review*, 1824-1914

Yale: Yale University Library

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

THE LATER LETTERS OF JOHN STUART MILL

1856-1864



John Stuart Mill and Helen Taylor (ca. 1869?)
Photograph in the Radio Times Hulton Picture Library

>John Stuart Mill and Helen Taylor (*ca.* 1869?)

Photograph in the Radio Times Hulton Picture Library

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1856

255.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

India House
Mercredi

1856

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Je n'ai reçu votre aimable billet que ce matin—Je regrette bien ne pas pouvoir profiter de votre invitation pour ce soir et je vous prie de croire que je n'en désire pas moins la réalisation de l'espérance que vous m'avez donnée de vous voir plus souvent et de comparer mes idées avec les vôtres sur les grandes questions qui occupent aujourd'hui tous les esprits élevés. Je vous engage à ne pas vous décourager de venir à mon bureau par l'idée que vous me dérangerez. La semaine dernière a été exceptionnelle pour moi. Ordinairement, à l'exception du mercredi, mes occupations de bureau sont de nature à pouvoir être ajournées au moins pour une heure ou deux.

Votre Dévoué

J. S. Mill

256.

TO ARTHUR HARDY¹

East India House

Jan. 21. 1856

My Dear Mr Hardy

My wife has told you that we were much interested in the account of the Institution² you have founded at Adelaide. Such means for the education of the young & the useful instruction of the old, are more important, if that be possible, in a new than even in an old country, as the helps & instruments to self cultivation are apt to be more scanty, & what is done or left undone now, will determine in a great measure what part the future Australian nation will take in the advancement of the world.

You are aware that Mr Duffy³ has lately emigrated to Australia. His immediate destination is Melbourne but in case anything should lead him to Adelaide I have ventured to assure him that you would be glad to see him or to be useful to him. He is a very valuable acquisition both privately & publicly to any colony in which he may determine to establish himself.

My wife's health has been very precarious since her attack of hemorrhage⁴ but this last summer & autumn it has improved, & I have great hopes that she at last will now recover from that attack. She has suffered greatly both in feelings & in health from the unprincipled conduct of Arthur Ley & his wife about the Trusteeship of her marriage settlement.⁵ Her wish alone ought to have been sufficient to make him resign it—but when the immediate ground of our asking it was (tho' of course not so said to him) that she knew from Caroline herself that he was not only in pecuniary difficulties but that there was a deficiency in his accounts as Treasurer of a Turnpike Trust, a man with the ordinary amount of honour & honesty would have been anxious to do so. Herbert's not joining in the request⁶ was entirely immaterial as the settlement gives the power exclusively to her, & his not choosing to ask it was merely an instance of his usual contradictory disposition. My wife has sent you a copy of Caroline's letter, full of vulgar taunts & malevolent insinuations. You might suppose from this that she had given some offence to Mrs Ley, or that there had been some previous quarrel, but there had been nothing of the kind—for some reason of her own, & very foolishly, Mrs Ley suddenly changed from her usual professions of great affection & regard, to this insulting letter, & this is the only answer she has given. My wife's last letters both to her & Arthur Ley remain unanswered.

I found that the only legal protection in our power against a fraudulent trustee is to lay a *distringas*⁷ on the stock which prevents the possibility of its being transferred without notice given. This would enable us to apply to the Court of Chancery for an injunction. I have therefore taken this precaution, without which any accident to the other trustee would leave my wife's & the children's property entirely insecure.

Pray present my compliments to Mrs Hardy & believe me

Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

257.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath

April 1. 1856

Dear Sir

I am sorry to hear that you have got into the difficulty you mention,² and am willing to assist. But first I must request you tell me exactly how much of the £130 you see any prospect of raising and whether £130 is the whole of what you can be called on to pay in consequence of bills accepted by you for Mr Leblond.

I am

Yrs Faithfully

258.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

East India House

April 5, 1856

Dear Sir

I inclose a cheque for £70, being a loan of £35 each from myself and another friend of freethinking opinions.² This sum I think will complete the amount you require.³

You must excuse me for saying that in making yourself liable for Mr Leblond's bill transactions you were throwing money which you could not spare into the mere gulf of a bankruptcy—injuring yourself and those dependent on you without doing your friend any good, and throwing away the possible means of serving him afterwards. It would have been a totally different thing if by so doing you could have saved him. I am

Yrs Faithfully

J. S. Mill.

259.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Le Pont
on the Lac de Joux

Wed^y ev^g
[Aug. 13. 1856]

I have done pretty well, dearest one, to get here in one day from Besançon—to do which I had to take a char at Orbe but I walked most part of the way, which was very agreeable after going to Pontarlier by the malle poste on a most uncomfortable outside seat, & stewing inside the diligence from Pontarlier to Orbe, seeing little or nothing. But I am well recompensed darling by this place. How very much I wish my own only one could see it. It is the very picture of peace. From my window I look quite up the lake & to the end of its valley which is called even on fingerposts Lavallée (par excellence). It is five or six leagues in length but you see entirely down or rather up the vista as it is quite straight, & the lake, though small compared with those we have lately seen, yet long enough & broad enough for beauty, lies between its bright green slopes which though very high for the Jura, do not shew their height from the great elevation of this valley but are covered with the richest & finest Jura pastures & Jura woods. The villages, this & another smaller one, do not in the least detract from the air of quiet—they are all large well looking houses, evidently inhabited only by their inhabitants, & looking straight upon the lake. The water itself is as peaceful as it is bright & clear. It has no apparent outlet, being entirely imbedded in hills—a bend (the only one) in the valley just at this place separates the Lac de Joux from a very beautiful smaller lake below it, quite shut in by mountains, but the water all seems to come out under ground into the Valorbe, another valley at a great depth below this, & so cut off from it that the road to this does not even lie through that: I enjoy the place much & you may suppose I am very well when I say that after climbing the Mont Tendre, a most beautiful mountain, one of the highest of the Jura, which with a rest on the grass at the top & the return took six hours, I only staid half an hour to eat a crust of bread & drink a whole jug of milk, & set off again to climb another mountain & make a round which took another five hours—& I am not now more tired than is agreeable. The views of the Alps here are splendid, especially that from the Mont Tendre—in spite of a great deal of haze towards Berne & Savoy. I saw the snowy range for a great distance, Mont Blanc tolerably & the Dent du Midi, the nearer Valais mountains & the whole lake of Geneva from end to end well, also the lake of Neuchâtel, the whole Jura, & France I should think nearly to Dijon. The evening walk was still finer: the bit of Valorbe which I descended to get to the source of the Orbe (the place where the water of the two lakes is supposed to come out) equals anything I ever saw—a narrow gorge between precipices but itself full of the richest Jura verdure of pasture & wood so high as almost to hide the precipices: & the source with its exquisite clearness & great mass of water coming out from under an amphitheatre of precipice in the heart of a wood far surpasses Vacluse. I also went over in the rocks above a really immense cave but without any stalactites. If my beloved one was with me I could stay here with pleasure the whole week—the inn would do—a *little* below the mark of St. Martin but larger rooms. As it is I shall leave tomorrow: for quiet enjoyment one requires to be two—by oneself there is nothing but activity. I have been much tempted to go to Annecy—being so near & finding that those who left Besançon with me were to get to Geneva the same evening by aid of railway & steamboat. But I have resisted the temptation & shall go to Yverdon tomorrow—if the rest of the Jura were to be like this I should lose nothing. I shall put in this letter probably at Yverdon & I hope to be in time for the steamer & to land not at Neuchâtel but at St Aubin on the west bank from which Murray says it is but four miles to the Creux du Vent. What I shall do afterwards I do not know except that I shall return to Besançon from la Chaux de Fonds & shall try first to see Weissenstein & the Val

Moutiers. This place has rather spoiled me for other places & this lake for other lakes. How very different a surrondissement my darling's has been these two days. No doubt she is now in Paris & I so hope in a not unpleasant lodging. Though I am very glad to have been here I am not half reconciled to the separation from my dear one—& the more I like the place the more I long for her presence. But I will try to make the time as useful as possible for my health & you see I have begun well today. Adieu my dearest wife with a thousand loves & kisses—your own

J.S.M.

260.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

La Chaux de Fonds

Sunday ev^g
Aug. 17. [1856]

My dearest love, I wrote twice to Paris, once on Wednesday & once on Friday, [2](#) which I hope came safely to her dear hands. The last brought me to that pretty little place Sonceboz, which lies at the junction of a valley & two gorges, one going downward & the other upward, both most beautiful: the valley is that of St Imier & is a good deal like the Val Travers. It is a very small neat village & would be very quiet, but as it is on the principal road into Switzerland by way of Bâle, & the diligences & voitures all stop here, there is generally some bustle going on. The inn is decidedly good, as well as decidedly cheap: I was charged 1½ franc a day for a good bedroom & bed, & the same for my usual breakfast: ½ franc a day for service. I got out at ½ past 8 yesterday & explored the whole of the Val Moutiers: going through the upper of the two gorges & through the Pierre Pertuis, which is not a tunnel being not longer than a mere gateway, the gorge being singularly closed by a mere wall of rock. This led into the Val Moutiers at Tavannes, for many miles beyond which it was an open valley in the full glare of the sun: the beauty consists in two narrow defiles, one above the other below Moutiers. I dined at a one o'clock table d'hôte at Moutiers & then walked on to the last turn in the further of the two defiles, from which the end of it is seen at a short distance. They are fine, but to us who have seen so much, not extraordinary: you have only to imagine a cleft winding through precipitous fir clad rocks of great height, in general just large enough for the road & the little river. The oddity is that the flat thick tables of which this rock is composed, instead of lying horizontal one on another, have been thrown up on end & stand vertically—& as many of them have mouldered or been washed out, those which remain are in some places like buttresses or gigantic bits of wall at right angles to the road. From Moutiers I took a car part of the way back (to Tavannes) & arrived a little before 8. This morning I started at ½ past 5 in the coupé of the malle poste along the Val St Imier (green & full of villages) then over a dividing ridge to this place—which is not at all like what I expected. Murray's description of a great straggling village, composed of cottages each standing in its bit of ground, is as opposite to the truth as can be conceived—it would be thought in

England a compact town, & there is not a cottage in it—all large houses & large blocks of houses, abutting at once on green fields at the outskirts, in a way which reminded me of Brighton—there are about half a dozen houses which have bits of garden in front like our suburbs & about half a dozen square patches of garden ground within the limits of the town: it has nothing whatever of a village except that it is macadamized instead of paved. Murray's description must be copied from some old one: it looks an upstart place, having no promenades or planted trees like Neuchâtel though it has more inhabitants. Murray is equally out as to the country, which he calls bleak, desolate & bare of wood. It is one of the open valleys with sloping sides & those have fewer trees than the narrow ones, but this has *many* & is most cheerful & inspiring. I have had a beautiful walk: first to a pass called the Col des Loges, about half way to Neuchâtel which is noted for the view of the Alps, & though it was very hazy, I saw a *part* of them very well: then a round over the summits climbing another noted mountain called Tête du Rond³ (or something sounding like it) from which the view of the Alps, Jura &c is still finer, then back through woods, over mountains & across the loveliest green valleys. The mountains though high are not a great height above this valley which is itself extremely high. I do not like the town; it is the only blemish in the [*paper torn*] Tomorrow I go to Locle & the Saut du Doubs, & that will be the finale. I have taken my place for Tuesday for Besançon when I shall have the happiness of finding a letter from her & in two days after I shall see her again. It seems already an enormous time since I parted from her. Time never seems long when I am with her, whether it is at home or travelling. I believe this journey has set me up as to health—I am afraid it has done very little for [*paper torn*] to the heat [*paper torn*]

261.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath

Sept. 21. 1856

Dear Sir—

On returning a few days ago from the Continent I found your note inclosing the reprint of my wife's article in the W.R.² on the enfranchisement of women. I think you were not justified in reprinting it without asking the permission of the author which you could easily have done through me, still less with many errors in the reprint. I have marked the principal of them in the margin of the copy you sent. One particularly offensive is the excessive vulgarity of substituting "woman" for "Women"; this occurs in several places and in the first paragraph. One of the purposes of writing the article was to warn the American women to disunite their cause from the feeble sentimentality which exposes it to contempt & of which the stuff continually talked & written about "woman" may be taken as a symbol & test,—& it is therefore very disagreeable to the writer to see this piece of vulgarity prominent on the face of the article itself.

We are glad to hear that there was one lady at the Convention³ who objected to the nonsense attacked in the concluding paragraph.⁴

I Am Yrs Vy Truly

262.

TO ARTHUR HARDY¹

Blackheath

Sept. 29. 1856.

My Dear Hardy—

I did not receive your letter until more than a fortnight after its arrival, as we had not yet returned from our summer excursion, which this year was to Switzerland—& since we have been at home I have had so many things to write & to do that I have been unable to answer it until now. What you say concerning your Institution for working people appears to me encouraging: the success of the library seems to be everything that you could have hoped for, & that, besides being the thing of most importance, will probably in the end lead to the success of the other part of your plan: it is very satisfactory too that the example has been so speedily followed in other quarters.

The trust is in exactly the same state as when I last wrote to you.² We sent your letter to M^{rs} Ley, but with no result. Any one who would write such a letter as she wrote to my wife without any other provocation than being asked to act honorably in the matter, has evidently no wish to do so. You are no doubt the only person whose opinion would have weight enough to induce her to do anything she does not like, and we therefore have still some hope that the thing will be done. It will depend on whether or not she thinks the doing it necessary to your satisfaction. I think it most unjust that my wife sh^d be [hampered?] by feeling that her affairs are partly in the hands of persons in all ways so untrustworthy & so ill affected towards her.

We read every book we can get about the Australian colonies always with fresh interest. They seem to be most prosperous & rapidly progressive communities; & that this is not wholly owing to the gold, is proved by the state of your colony where there are no diggings. I certainly think the Wakefield system, unpopular as it now is in Australia, & badly as it has been administered in some of the colonies, has been one of the chief causes of their unexampled growth. Wakefield³ you know has been for several years in New Zealand. If he should ever visit the colony which he planned & founded, & the only one in which his system has been faithfully executed, you will find him well worth knowing: he is not a mere man of one idea, but has great general power of mind & energy of character. My name would be a sufficient introduction to him.

I suppose Macaulay's 3^d & 4th volumes⁴ are as popular at Adelaide as in London. They are as you say, "pleasant reading but not exactly history." His object is to strike, & he attains it, but it is by scene painting—he aims at stronger effects than truth warrants, & so caricatures many of his personages as to leave it unaccountable how they can have done what they did. If Sarah duchess of Marlborough⁵ had been nothing but a thoroughly unprincipled shrew without talent or any one valuable or amiable quality (as he makes her) could she have been, by mere personal influence, for many years the most powerful person in England? This disregard of consistency & probability spoils the book even as a work of art. What a difference between it & Grote's Hist. of Greece,⁶ which is less brilliant, but far more interesting in its simple veracity & because, instead of striving to astonish he strives to comprehend & explain.

It is of no use writing to you about politics, as nowadays in the colonies you are as well up in all political news as we are.

Pray present my compliments to M^{rs} Hardy & believe me

Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J.S.M.

263.

TO THE SECRETARY TO THE SUNDAY LEAGUE¹

[November 1856]

Sir—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 3^d instant asking my objections to the address of the National Sunday League.²

The passage to which I principally object & which has hitherto made it impossible for me, consistently with my own convictions, to subscribe to the League, is the following: "They themselves would be the first to oppose the opening of any frivolous & vicious places of amusement."

That the Committee should limit their own endeavours to the opening of Institutions of a more or less scientific or literary character on Sundays may possibly be judicious; but it is not necessary for this purpose that they should join in stigmatizing the broader principle, the recognition of which I think should be their ultimate aim. With regard to "vicious places of amusement," if there be any such, I would not desire that they should be open on any day of the week. Any place unfit to be open on Sunday is unfit to be open at all. But with regard to "frivolous" amusements I no more think myself justified in limiting the people to intellectual than to religious occupations on

that day, & the Committee cannot but feel that if their disclaimer does them any service with those whom it is intended to conciliate, it will be by being understood as a protest against permitting, for example, music, dancing, & the theatre, all of which I should wish to be as free on the seventh (or rather the first) as on any other day of the week.

I am also unable to give my adhesion to various expressions in the Declaration which partake of the nature of a compliance with cant; such as the “desecration” of the Sunday, & the preservation of “its original purpose of a day of devotion.” The devotion which is not felt equally at all times does not deserve the name; and it is one thing to regard the observance of a holiday from ordinary work on one day in the week as a highly beneficial institution, & another to ascribe any sacredness to the day, a notion so forcibly repudiated in the quotations from great religious authorities on your fourth page & which I hold to be as mere a superstition as any of the analogous prejudices which existed in times antecedent to Christianity.

I Am Sir
Yrs Very Faithfully

263A.

TO HERBERT FRY [1](#)

East India House

Nov. 14. 1856

Sir

I beg to acknowledge your letter dated the 10th November, expressing a wish to include my portrait in a proposed publication of a series of Photographic Portraits, and in reply I beg to say that I have no desire to figure in a collection as I do not think that my personal appearance can be a matter of any interest to the general public.

I Am Sir
Yr Obt Servt

J. S. Mill

264.

TO LOUIS BLANC [1](#)

Blackheath

le 22 novembre [?1856]

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

J'aurai grand plaisir à discuter avec vous les questions dont vous parlez dans votre lettre et de profiter de vos observations. Justement je suis pour le moment très occupé à mon bureau. Si vous voulez bien venir dîner, absolument sans façon, avec nous, vous ferez grand plaisir à ma femme et à moi. Comme nous serons tout seuls, nous pourrions causer d'économie politique et d'autres choses. Mardi nous sommes occupés, et mercredi il y a séance du conseil de la Compagnie, qui me fait ordinairement rester plus tard que les autres jours. Nous sommes libres jeudi ou vendredi, et je vous engage à venir me prendre à mon bureau à quatre heures.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

265.

TO THE AUTHOR OF "CURRENCY SELF REGULATING &
ELASTIC"1

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse] Nov. 24. 1856

Sir—

I have to apologize for the delay in replying to your letter of the 7th Nov^r requesting my opinion on your plan for the regulation of the Currency.2 I have received so many similar requests on this & other economical or philosophical subjects that my whole time would scarcely suffice for complying with them. I think I might fairly claim to be excused from examining any more plans for an inconvertible currency,3 & if I had not seen, on the first inspection of your book, that it contained more knowledge of the subject & more ability than I have usually observed in such projects, I certainly should not have spared time to read it to the end.

But though I recognize the great distinction between you & the Birmingham school,4 or the writers who are now enlightening the world by their letters in the Morning Post,5 I do not think your scheme more defensible than theirs. To a writer who founds his practical suggestions on theoretic principles (as, in spite of your sarcasms on political economy, you do) it will probably be sufficient to say, that I dispute the basis of your theory, viz. the proposition that in a community which makes large use of credit, an increase of currency does not (unless by promoting speculation) influence prices. I grant that any increase of paper currency which can take place under a convertible system, usually passes off without having influenced any other prices than those of securities: but only because the revulsion comes before the increased supply

of money has reached the markets for commodities. Monied capital is not for ever handed to & fro among money dealers; its ultimate destination is to be lent to producers, & when the increase reached them it would raise wages & money incomes, & must consequently raise the prices of all articles of consumption, in the same manner as you allow it would do if it were issued by Gov^t in payment of the public expenses. If you were right, the supplies of gold from California & Australia, to however many thousands of millions they might extend, could not raise general prices, except indeed during the continuance of any speculative mania to which they might give rise; a proposition in which you will find few to agree with you, & which I can scarcely think that you will yourself, on consideration, maintain.

If it were true that no increase of the quantity of money when taking place through the medium of bankers, could lower its value, the principal objection not only to your, but to every other system of inconvertible currency, would be annihilated. But, not admitting this, I need not further explain why I am not of opinion that your plan, which enjoins an issue of paper up to the whole amount of the national debt (or of some definite portion of that debt) on condition that the holder is willing to pay the current rate of interest for it, would offer any security against the kind of depreciation which you, as well as myself, regard as an evil. The provision which you make for a reflux (& which may possibly be, as you suppose it to be, new) depends for its efficacy entirely on the truth of your theory of the non effect of currency on prices; for if prices rise, the increased amount of currency being permanently wanted in the markets will be “absorbed in the circulation” & will not flow back.

I must add that I agree with most of your comments on the Act of 1844⁶ & should think them calculated to be very useful if they were dissevered from so much that I conceive to be erroneous.

266.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

East India House

le 25 novembre [?1856]

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Veillez m'écrire un mot par le porteur pour me dire quel jour vous viendrez. Si vous m'avez écrit, votre réponse n'est pas arrivée.

Si le messenger ne vous trouve pas chez vous, je vous prie d'adresser votre réponse Blackheath Park, Kent.

Tout À Vous,

J. S. Mill

267.

TO COSTANTINO BAER¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

Dec. 13, 1856

Monsieur—

Votre lettre du 12 mai ainsi que les articles et brochures² que vous avez bien voulu m'envoyer ne me sont parvenus qu'en Septembre, à mon retour d'un voyage. Depuis lors, des occupations multipliées m'ont longtemps empêché, même de lire ces intéressants écrits et ensuite de vous en offrir mes remerciements. Je suis heureux de voir non seulement par vos écrits, mais aussi par le recueil où quelques uns entre ceux ont paru, que l'Italie, et surtout sa partie méridionale, qui au dernier siècle s'est placée si haut dans les études économiques et législatives, maintient encore sa position honorable dans cet ordre de recherches. Votre brochure sur la question de l'or me paraît conforme aux plus sains principes et je compte profiter de celle sur le métayage dans une nouvelle édition de mon livre.³ Quant à votre appréciation de ce livre, quoique trop flatteuse, elle est d'un grand prix, attendu que, parmi les notices auxquelles mon ouvrage a donné lieu, je n'en connais presque aucune qui porte autant l'empreinte d'une grande connaissance du sujet, et qui soit, scientifiquement parlant, aussi satisfaisante. Il me semble surtout que vos remarques sur la nature du rapport entre ce qu'on appelle une science abstraite, et la science correspondante d'application, ne sauraient être ni mieux pensées ni mieux exprimées. Quoique partageant, à tout égard, vos idées à ce sujet, je ne m'étais pas étendu là dessus dans mon ouvrage systématique, les ayant exposés dans un petit volume d'Essais,⁴ cité dans les "Principes" et dont je vous prie d'agréer un exemplaire que j'aurai l'honneur de vous envoyer par la première occasion.

Pour ce qui regarde les applications de l'éc. politique, je vois que, ainsi que la plupart des économistes, vous condamnez le socialisme d'une manière absolue. Vous avez vu par mon livre que je ne suis pas, à cet égard, de votre avis. Le socialisme selon la conception des socialistes les plus éclairés, me paraît inattaquable en principe, et mon dissentiment d'avec eux ne porte que sur la possibilité d'exécution dans l'état présent de la culture intellectuelle et morale de l'humanité. Je ne pense pas que la propriété privée, telle qu'on l'entend aujourd'hui, soit le dernier mot de la société, ni que la nature humaine soit incapable de travailler pour un but plus généreux que celui de l'intérêt individuel et exclusif. Je crois pourtant que les habitudes d'égoïsme sont tellement enracinées dans la grande majorité des peuples mêmes les plus civilisés, qu'elles ne céderont que lentement à des influences meilleures, et qu'aucun

socialisme n'est aujourd'hui praticable comme fait général, mais seulement dans la forme d'associations d'ouvriers d'élite.⁵

268.

TO ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE¹

East India House, London

Le 15 décembre, 1856.

J'ai bien tardé, mon cher Monsieur de Tocqueville, à répondre à votre lettre du 22 juin. Elle m'est parvenue la veille même de notre départ pour un voyage en Suisse, et je n'ai reçu qu'à mon retour l'exemplaire de votre ouvrage² que vous avez bien voulu me destiner. Je l'ai ensuite lu sans aucun délai; mais il contient trop de choses pour qu'on puisse se les approprier toutes à la première lecture; et j'ai voulu attendre une seconde avant de vous faire part de mes impressions. Bien que des occupations multipliées aient ajourné trop longtemps cette seconde lecture, je me suis bien trouvé de l'avoir attendue puisque ce laps de temps me permet aujourd'hui d'exprimer avec délibération et sans aucun entraînement, l'opinion pleinement favorable qui, exprimée tout de suite, eût pu paraître hasardée. Il était certes difficile qu'après votre premier ouvrage,³ un autre quelconque ne parût pas relativement inférieur. Il est arrivé à peu de monde de frapper deux fois un aussi grand coup. Celui-ci pourtant se soutient parfaitement, même à côté de son prédécesseur. Envisagé seulement comme un chapitre d'histoire universelle, il me paraît un des plus beaux qu'on ait jamais fait; et si l'on peut regarder comme le but principal de votre vie philosophique, celui de caractériser la nature et les tendances de l'époque actuelle, pour mieux diriger ces tendances dans ce qu'elles ont de bon et les corriger autant que possible dans ce qu'elles ont de mauvais, je trouve que vous avez fait un pas important dans l'explication de cet état de choses actuel, en montrant ses racines dans le passé. Pour faire cela, comme vous l'avez fait, il a fallu une patience immense, et une capacité rare de combiner les faits et d'en présenter en peu de mots les traits les plus caractéristiques. Si ensuite cet ouvrage n'ajoute pas d'autres grandes vues générales à celles qui brillent dans votre *Démocratie en Amérique*, il fait peut-être mieux, il en reproduit les mêmes avec un grand surcroît de lumière, et avec de nouvelles applications. Quant à la critique, je n'en trouve, pour ainsi dire, aucune à faire. Il y a bien quelques différences générales, et même très importantes, entre votre manière de voir et la mienne, en tant que vous tenez beaucoup plus que moi au passé, surtout par son côté religieux. Mais si peu de traces de cette différence d'opinion se rencontrent dans cet ouvrage, que, même de mon point de vue, je n'y trouve presque rien à relever. J'aurais seulement insisté plus sur le bon côté de la philosophie du dix-huitième siècle, que vous ne laissez pas de reconnaître et de faire voir, tout en appuyant davantage sur ce qu'elle avait de défectueux. Je ne puis trop exprimer ma profonde sympathie pour le noble amour de la liberté qui règne dans votre ouvrage et qui en fait une protestation continue contre le triste régime que votre grande patrie, l'œil droit du monde, est réduite à subir dans ce moment.

Acceptez, avec mes remerciements, l'assurance de mes sentiments d'estime et d'admiration.

J. S. Mill

269.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

India House

Dec. 16.[1856?]

Dear Sir

I should feel very little doubt of the success of Sir W. Hamilton's Lectures.² His reputation for learning (with everybody) and for profundity (with one of the two great divisions of the philosophical world) stands higher than that of any other Englishman of this century; and even those who do not agree in his opinions (of whom I am one) regard him as the most powerful intellect on his own side of the question, and think it important to be well acquainted with all his speculations. Every student of logic and metaphysics will look forward with great interest to the publication as a whole, of a system only fragments of which have yet been printed. The sole obstacle to its pecuniary success is the abstruseness of some of the speculations, and in some degree, of the author's mode of exposition; though his stile, in a merely literary point of view, is good and clear. Against this may be set the almost certainty that the book will be much read and *used* at the Universities; and their demand for it is likely I think to last a long while. So that I should suppose it has as good a chance of selling several editions as any book on its kind of subject.

I shall be happy to revise the Pol. Ec. for another edition³ on the terms you propose. Will you be good enough to send me the sheets—and tell me about what time you think you shall require them for the printer? I am engaged about a new book⁴ (in one smaller volume) which I think I could finish in time for publication in May, and I am not so certain of being able to do so if I put it aside to revise the Pol. Economy. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1857

270.

TO ASA GRAY¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

January 19, 1857

Dear Sir

I have received your letter dated the 22nd of December, informing me that I have been elected a Foreign Honorary Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:² and I beg that you will express to the Academy my high sense of the honour conferred on me, which is enhanced by their having selected me as the fittest person to fill the place left vacant by Sir William Hamilton.³

The writings which the Academy has thought worthy of this distinction have been nowhere more intelligently read, or more conscientiously examined, than in America; judging from the reviews which I have seen, some of them by writers who differ widely from me in opinion. And all means of information lead me to believe that there is in America a public for such speculations, at least as thoughtful and more earnest than that of England. It is gratifying to me to have my name associated with so important a portion of that public as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. I have the honour to be, Sir

Your Very Obedient Servant

J. S. Mill

271.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

Blackheath Park, Kent,

le 3 février 1857

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Je prends la liberté de recommander à votre obligeance mon beau-fils M. Algernon Taylor, qui voyage en Italie pour se distraire d'une maladie chronique dont il souffre depuis longtemps, et qui compte voir en passant, avant la fin du printemps la belle ville que vous habitez.

Je me rappelle toujours avec plaisir la soirée si agréable que j'ai passée avec vous,² et le projet dont vous me fîtes part alors de venir en Angleterre dans le courant de cette année. Si ce projet se réalise, comme je l'espère, ma femme et moi comptons que vous viendrez nous voir, et que nous reprendrons alors à trois notre bonne causerie.

Votre Dévoué

J. S. Mill

272.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

York

Saturday evg
[Feb. 14, 1857]

My dearest love, if I do not write tonight you will not hear from me till Tuesday, so I write though it is but to say that I have got here comfortably. I had a pleasant hour & a half's ramble in that beautiful town, & the journey was very pleasant as long as there was light, though I could not succeed in getting a foot warmer till Newcastle. There was a stoppage of twenty minutes at Berwick which I availed myself of for a sort of dinner which disagreed with me. However I have done very well, and have just time to write this scrawl before it will be too late for the post. I enjoy excessively the feeling of those three days and shall enjoy the remembrance of them & be very happy till you come & a great deal happier afterwards, so be cheerful darling & keep loving me as you so sweetly do. Bless you my own only darling love.

I am at the George, alone in the coffee room by a flaming fire.

273.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Monday
[Feb. 16. 1857]

Darling of mine, I write directly to say that I have arrived here all right. It was not without some drawbacks. I could not get inside York Cathedral. Any day but Sunday it is open at nine, (& till five) but on Sunday not till ten. I was there at $\frac{1}{4}$ to 8, & went to the only verger that lives near, & his people told me that no one has the key but the verger whose turn it is, & that he was sure to be there about nine—but he had not arrived at $\frac{1}{4}$ to ten when I had to leave. I saw a very beautiful ruin (St Mary's Abbey) & a nice public garden & the *outside* of the Minster quite equalled my expectation. But the journey; never travel by a Sunday train when you can help it, for it stops at every station. It took longer getting to Peterborough than we took the whole way, add to which that it was an east wind & very cold, & they had no footwarmer ready, nor could I get one the whole journey. I therefore arrived cold & with a head ache, but (a sign it had done me no harm) I instantly scampered off to the cathedral, heard part of the service & saw the building which is one of the finest I know (in England). The inn was an old-fashioned red brick place with very moderate charges, & there were two really gentlemanly & well informed & decidedly liberal men in the coffee-room all the evening with whom I had a good deal of pleasant talk. This morning it was cold & foggy but became fine afterwards & there was a foot warmer. The cold made me go in the first class both days & I got here very prosperously, by the ten o'clock train, (having to wait to get a rent in my great coat mended). So here is my history. I long to hear from my beloved one & to know both how she is & how she manages at that place. I have hardly known which way to turn since I arrived here between one & two, & therefore must content myself with this bare recital of particulars—but she will be glad to have it because it says that all is right. I hope she got mine from York. With the utmost love

Your Own

J.S.M.

274.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Tuesday
[Feb. 17. 1857]

My dearest love, what a pleasure it was to see her precious writing, but it was vexatious that she had such a bother the first day, how tired she must have been, no wonder her fingers were stiff. It is a good thing on *every* account that L[ily] is pleased & in good spirits. I am glad she will not be so busy after today & will be able to be with you, though it is provoking to think that you might so easily have been with her in some more agreeable place than that one seems to be.

I do not find my eyes any better for the trip—but I suppose they will come right by degrees, as they did seven years ago. I have seldom any defect of sight, but occasional aching, which however I think is nervous only. Sykes,² though I did not see him till today, seemed almost surprised to see me so soon—I might have taken two days

more, you see. He said they had had a “fright” because Mrs Sykes thought she saw your death in the papers, it was the wife of a Mr Mills of the India House.³ I found two letters from Haji which I send in another cover together with a bill of Bagnall. Lapworth’s which has also come I need not send. It comes to £57. 6. not more I should think than we expected. It was the strangest feeling yesterday & this morning to be there & at the same time fresh from all those places. I have hardly anything running in my mind’s eye but innumerable large railway stations. On Saturday night at York I slept little & dreamt much—among the rest a long dream of some speculation on animal nature, ending with my either reading or writing, just before I awoke, this Richterish⁴ sentence: “With what prospect then, until a cow is fed on broth, we can expect the truth, the whole truth & nothing but the truth to be unfolded concerning this part of nature, I leave to” &c &c. I had a still droller dream the same night. I was seated at a table like a table d’hôte, with a woman at my left hand & a young man opposite—the young man said, quoting somebody for the saying, “there are two excellent & rare things to find in a woman, a sincere friend & a sincere Magdalen.” I answered “the best would be to find both in one”—on which the woman said “no, that would be *too* vain”—whereupon I broke out “do you suppose when one speaks of what is good in itself, one must be thinking of one’s own paltry self interest? no, I spoke of what is abstractedly good & admirable.” How queer to dream stupid mock mots, & of a kind totally unlike one’s own ways or character. According to the usual oddity of dreams—when the man made the quotation I recognised it & thought he had quoted it wrong & the *right* words were “an *innocent* magdalen” not perceiving the contradiction. I wonder if reading that Frenchman’s book⁵ suggested the dream. These are ridiculous things to put in a letter, but perhaps they may amuse my darling. I intend to come here early & go away late during her absence in order more quickly to get through my heap of work. I should have liked to go to Paddington to vote against the directors of the G. Western,⁶ but I could not. The opponents cannot expect to succeed when they do not ask for proxies. The directors asked me for one which I refused. I think them more & more wrong the more I look into the management, & they must be made to give way sooner or later. I wrote to my darling from York & again yesterday. I sent the paper yesterday & shall send today’s as those of the three days of absence are enough at home for the present. The Govt is bringing in a bill to make the savings banks a Govt responsibility.⁷ Adieu *darling*. your

J.S.M.

275.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Wed^y

[Feb. 18. 1857]

I do, dear, wonder very much that she should have urged you to come to such a place as it seems to be, & herself so occupied that she could not be with you.² It has turned out better than there was reason to expect in her having a respite from all that bustle & occupation, & being able to be more with you. She is very fortunate in having come to

this man—she will evidently have the best chances with him that the case admits of—so it is well for her, & everything shews more & more that it is best for us also. I hope my precious that I shall hear tomorrow that a lodging has been found fit for you to be in & that she being more with you it is more endurable. I will not forget the Bid^d letter³ darling. That will be for Friday—& tomorrow is the voting for Martin which is at Lewisham.⁴ I have done exactly what she says darling about dinner, that is I have only spoken to Henry & to Mary. The only difficulty I shall have in ordering relates to the servant's dinners, as I do not know the quantities to order: but I must do the best I can. I get on quickly with the Pol Econ.⁵ as there is but little to add or alter. Adieu my darling

Your

J.S.M.

276.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Thursday
[Feb. 19. 1857]

My most precious one, I do not get on well with the idea of your time being passed in a dirty gloomy inn in that detestable place—& so much of it, as it seems, still alone. Surely that decousu irregular character of the planche life is not inseparable from it, but pretty nearly so in practice I suppose as these comparatively regular people have so much of it. I detest equally your returning all that way alone—but for that there does not seem, as things now look, any alternative.

I pass the evening always at the Pol. Economy, with now & then a little playing to rest my eyes & mind. There will be no great quantity to alter, but now & then a little thing is of importance. One page I keep for consideration when I can shew it to you. It is about the qualities of English workpeople & of the English generally.² It is not at all as I would write it now, but I do not, in reality, know how to write it.

I gave my vote at Lewisham this morning about nine, & found Martin himself there.³ He reckons himself sure of success, on the number of positive promises, after taking off the usual percentage (10 per cent) for failures. I will not forget to post that letter tomorrow. On Sat^y I shall take back the books to Rolandi⁴ & get others. Can I do any other useful thing?

Your

J.S.M.

277.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

Tuesday
[Feb. 24. 1857]

It was less of a shock the first moment than I should have thought it would have been—no doubt because the *same* letter said you were better & because the sight of your beloved handwriting gave me confidence—but I have been growing more anxious every hour since. Thank Heaven however we know by experience that this is not necessarily dangerous—though a warning of the danger there always is. It must have been much less bad than the former time, or you could not have written immediately. But it would be very imprudent to attempt travelling for I do not know how many days, & then it can only be by very short journeys. L[ily]'s being ill at the same time is an additional misfortune. But why should I not come. I am ready to come any day & stay any time—& I do not see that your being there is inaverrable—you are *really* on a visit, & it is nobody's concern to whom. You will judge best of everthing & either you or L. will let me know—but all my wish is to be with you & to be doing my little little to help. The blessing & comfort it was & is to me to have been with you on that former occasion no words will ever express.

I will do about the letters as you say & will send today's paper as usual—I shall hear again tomorrow—

278.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

Wednesday
[Feb. 25. 1857]

Do not torment herself dearest *dearest* love about this having happened when & how it has. There is nothing, in comparison, worth thinking of, except to do the best that can be done now & especially not to be too impatient to come home, at the great risk it would be to travel either too soon or by too long journeys. It seems to me quite impossible that you should come in a Saturday & Sunday, or even with a Friday superadded—& therefore quite necessary that I should come for longer, though that will make it necessary to say something to Sykes. You will judge best what I had better say, & will tell me *when* my coming will be of most service. One time of the week or another will be indifferent if I ask for leave—But it is quite impossible you should do these long journies which we did in going. I should think you ought not to take less than *four* days, if you set out anything like as soon as you hope to do—& in that case I shall require a week. Have you seen any medical man?

Since L[ily] returns with you at any rate, I shall not send any more newspapers to G[lasgow] but shall keep them here, & send them if you say so, or if there is any change of plan.

There are many things I wished to say, but I can write about nothing but the one subject.

Your Own My Precious Darling

279.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Thursday
[Feb. 26. 1857]

Dearest—

I expect to be with you before this note & therefore only write it in case of any (impossible) stoppage on the way. I shall go by tonight's mail & consequently arrive in Edinburgh a little after eleven. adieu

Your

J.S.M.

280.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

India House

March 13 [1857]

Dear Chadwick

Neither have I made myself conversant with the details.² What disgusted me was the stupidity (if it was no worse) of supposing that people here could judge of the effect that would be produced on the minds of barbarians who put to death several thousands per year by the more or less of reparation demanded where some was evidently due; the ridiculous appeals to humanity and Christianity in favour of ruffians, & to international law in favour of people who recognize *no* laws of war at all (witness the poisonings & stabbings in the back) & the attempt to make out Bowring a “flagitious” liar because he said the obvious truth that if the Chinese *thought* they were insulting a

vessel entitled to our protection, it was immaterial whether it had really ceased to be entitled or not.

I think you cannot make too much of the poisonings & of Yeh's cutting off heads. Coulson³ told me at the club (I do not know if you heard it) that a friend of his told him that his brother (or some near relation) at Canton had himself *seen* 3000 put to death in one day—they were told off in 30 parties of 100 each. If you like to come & talk over the points, pray do. I am too busy to write more, having all Thornton's work to do in addition to my own.

Yrs Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

281.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

East India House

March 13. 1857

Dear Sir

I am very much obliged for the trouble you are taking to procure a copy of the reprint,² and for your kind offer of information on the present state of Cooperation in England. The information of that kind which would be of most use for my present purpose (a new edition of the Pol. Economy)³ would be some approximate estimate of the number of establishments now in operation, distinguishing those which are for production from those which are only stores—and a general notion of whether they are increasing in number and prosperity, or falling off. I am Dear Sir

Yrs Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

282.

TO LORD OVERSTONE¹

India House

March 25
1857

Dear Lord Overstone

I have just heard from my friend Mr Alexander Bain that he is a candidate for the Examinership in Logic and Mental Philosophy,² and that he thinks an expression of my opinion on his qualifications for the post may be of service to him. I think him in all probability the fittest person for it in the three kingdoms, having on the whole a greater knowledge of the entire subject than any other person I could mention and having also been a very successful teacher of it for some years at an University (Marischal College Aberdeen)³ How much mental philosophy owes to him as an original, profound, and at the same time sober and judicious thinker, may be seen in his principal work "The Senses and the Intellect",⁴ in my opinion the best book yet written on the Philosophy of Mind. I cannot imagine that any other person of this generation has made good equally strong claims to such a post as he applies for.

I Am Dear Lord Overstone

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

283.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Monday
[April 13. 1857]

Darling—

I have got here quite comfortably, & am on the point of setting out for Bond St. &c. It was worth much more than the extra 2/3 to hear her say in such a nice strong voice that she was well.

The three days were very pleasant, and in looking back, seem very long. I can hardly fancy it is so short a time since I was here last. That is always the case in pleasant absences.

I always now forget something—I either left my India House clothes brush behind this morning, or it has dropped out of my pocket.

Fare well & *be* well my own love for the sake of your

J.S.M.

284.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

India House

June 10. 1857

My Dear Sir

I am extremely sorry to hear such bad news of the Central Cooperative Agency.² But if the supporters of cooperative establishments will not have common sense and reasonable confidence, they never can succeed. The vulgar seem to reserve all their distrust for those who desire to befriend them.

You may perhaps like to see the inclosed,³ containing information which reached me too late to be inserted in the text of my new edition.⁴ Much of it is very encouraging.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

I will send another copy to Mr Shorter⁵ in returning the book he was kind enough to send me.

285.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath Park

June 14 [1857]

My Dear Monsieur Louis Blanc

If you are disengaged next Wednesday (17th) we should be very glad if you would come and take a quiet dinner with us at half past six—I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

286.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

East India House, London

le 30 juin 1857

J'ai tardé trop longtemps, mon cher Monsieur Villari, à répondre à votre lettre du 15 avril. Aujourd'hui j'ai encore des remerciements à vous faire de l'aimable accueil que vous avez donné à mon beau-fils Algernon Taylor,² et du service que vous lui avez rendu en lui donnant une lettre de recommandation à Monsieur votre père. Si, comme je le désire, votre projet de visite en Angleterre se réalise,³ ma femme et moi pourrons vous témoigner personnellement notre reconnaissance, et nous serions charmés d'avoir avec vous des causeries pareilles à celle qui a rempli si agréablement pour moi cette longue soirée à Florence.⁴ Nous pourrons alors vous donner plus pleinement l'explication de la conduite louche que le gouvernement anglais a tenue envers l'Italie,⁵ et qui vous a justement indigné, mais qui est à mes yeux très conforme à la nature de ce gouvernement. En général les étrangers, même les plus éclairés, prêtent au gouvernement anglais une profondeur de politique et une suite dans les idées et dans les projets qui ne lui appartiennent nullement. Je ne crois pas que Palmerston ni aucun ministre anglais ait songé, ni à soulever les patriotes Italiens ni encore moins à les trahir. Sauf l'infâme conduite de Sir James Graham dans l'affaire des infortunés Bandiera, dont encore probablement lui-même n'a pas prévu le résultat tragique,⁶ je ne pense pas qu'aucun homme d'état anglais ait commis aucun crime d'intention contre la liberté Italienne. Mais le gouvernement anglais, comme tous les gouvernements, craint les révolutions et les soulèvements, et lors même qu'il désapprouve réellement les oppresseurs des peuples, il ne veut ni n'ose faire pour les opprimés autre chose que de provoquer bien timidement quelques concessions très graduelles de la part de leurs tyrans. Je crois que Palmerston a réellement espéré qu'en mettant pour ainsi dire le roi de Naples moralement au ban de l'Europe, il le forcerait à changer un peu de conduite.⁷ Il ne connaissait pas son homme: mais, règle générale, les hommes d'état anglais ne connaissent pas le monde ni la vie. Même nos plus grands roués politiques sont parfois d'une innocence qu'un étranger a beaucoup de peine à comprendre et à croire. Quant à la garantie donnée au *statu quo* en Italie,⁸ n'en croyez rien. Nos ministres n'ont fait que ce qu'ils ont avoué. Malheureusement ils avaient besoin de l'Autriche contre la Russie. C'était le plus grand mal de la situation. Alors, afin que l'Autriche fût libre de les aider, les gouvernements de France et d'Angleterre lui ont dit "Si vous envoyez votre armée en Crimée, nous ne permettons pas que *pendant ce temps seulement* on vous attaque par derrière." Heureusement l'Autriche n'y a pas mordu, et on n'a pas donné suite à ce pacte, qui en tout cas eût cessé avec la guerre. Mais tout en atténuant la culpabilité de notre gouvernement envers la cause de l'Italie, je ne puis que dire avec douleur: Ne battez jamais d'espoir sur ce gouvernement. Il vous donnera des mots et des sentiments, jamais des actes. Je crois que son appui moral vaut quelque chose, momentanément au moins, pour la Sardaigne.⁹ Mais c'était là justement ce qu'il fallait à l'opinion aristocratique d'ici—une révolution royale. Le gouvernement anglais n'aidera jamais

un peuple à renverser son gouvernement, quelque odieux qu'il puisse être, même à ses propres yeux. Vous avez bien vu qu'il ne s'est pas opposé à l'intervention française à Rome,[10](#) à l'intervention russe en Hongrie.[11](#) Même en temps de guerre contre la Russie, il n'a pas voulu soulever la Pologne.[12](#) Cela ne dit-il pas tout?

J'ai appris avec beaucoup d'intérêt ce que vous m'écrivez sur les oeuvres inédites de Machiavelli et Guicciardini.[13](#) Des publications aussi importantes sous le rapport historique ne sauraient manquer de faire sensation en Europe. Je conviens avec vous qu'une revue qui a la prétention de rendre compte de tout, ne devrait pas négliger le mouvement intellectuel de l'Italie. Mais je n'écris pas dans le Westminster Review, et n'y ai pas d'influence. Quand j'écrivais, il y a vingt ans, j'y ai fait imprimer quelques bons articles de Mazzini sur les auteurs Italiens.[14](#) Je ne sais pas qui a pu vous dire que j'ai écrit quelque chose sur le Socialisme. Je n'ai écrit là dessus que ce qui a paru dans mes Principes d'Écon. Politique.[15](#) J'ai fait dernièrement un petit livre qui paraîtra l'hiver prochain et dont je me ferai un plaisir de vous offrir un exemplaire, si toutefois son titre "De la Liberté" comporte son entrée en Toscane.[16](#) Il ne s'agit pas cependant de liberté politique dans ce livre, autant que de liberté sociale, morale, et religieuse.

Vous avez vu par les elections de Paris qu'il y a encore de la vie en France.[17](#) C'est ce qui est arrivé de mieux en Europe, à mon avis, depuis 1851.

Vous me feriez grand plaisir en m'écrivant quelquefois. Notre entrevue d'il y a deux ans m'a donné un souvenir si agréable, que je regretterais beaucoup de laisser tomber ce commencement de relation entre nous.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

287.

TO NICOLAS VILLIAUMÉ[1](#)

East India House, London

le 26 août 1857

Monsieur

Des occupations multipliées m'ont empêché jusqu'ici de répondre, autrement que par l'envoi réciproque de ma nouvelle édition,[2](#) au don que vous avez bien voulu me faire de votre important Traité d'Economie Politique.[3](#) Je ne connais pas d'autre écrivain français qui me paraisse avoir aussi bien approfondi les lois abstraites de l'Economie Politique, et votre livre est d'autant plus précieux qu'il se recommande par la conformité de principes à ceux qui professent en France des opinions démocratiques

avancées, opinions que je partage à beaucoup d'égards, mais qui, il faut l'avouer, se sont rarement trouvées jusqu'ici réunis comme chez vous, à des opinions économiques éclairées. Vous avez puisé si heureusement dans ce qui offrent de meilleur les économistes anglais, que je suis tout surpris d'apprendre que vous ne les lisez que dans les traductions. Je me sens très honoré en retrouvant tant de fois chez vous mes propres opinions, et je crois qu'en économie politique nous sommes rarement en désaccord sérieux. Notre plus grande divergence porte peut-être sur la liberté du taux de l'intérêt; encore ne suis-je pas éloigné de penser que cette liberté puisse admettre des modifications là où comme dans les républiques anciennes, et même en France, la classe de débiteurs se compose surtout de ceux qui travaillent la terre de leurs mains.

Vous avez probablement deviné que l'impression de ma nouvelle édition se trouvait trop avancée pour que j'eusse pu la faire profiter de votre ouvrage autrement qu'en y ajoutant, en forme d'appendice, les renseignements importants que vous avez donnés sur l'état actuel des associations ouvrières.[4](#)

Je suis, Monsieur, avec les sentiments les plus respectueux

Votre Dévoué Serviteur

J. S. Mill

288.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

Salutation [Hotel], Ambleside

Sept. 13. [1857]

Dearest—

I have been very fortunate in having had a most beautiful day for Helvellyn. I ascended it from Patterdale having gone there by an early coach from here, & I returned here in the same way in the evening, walking up the pass so you see I was not tired. The view though there were a few clouds was splendid. It was a disappointment as to plants, as on those sunny heights everything was still more gone by than in the valleys—of all the rare plants which grow there I could only distinguish two, and those were only in leaf. But the day before I was unexpectedly successful in plants between Windermere & this place. I made a circuit & saw M^r Crosfield's cottages[2](#) which I will describe to you when I have the happiness of being with you again; they are not what we want; besides other objections they are in a real village or rather hamlet. I have planned a very nice round for today, and shall go to Broughton tomorrow down the Duddon, and to Lancaster, & I hope to Settle on Tuesday. I talked yesterday with people from Fleetwood & others from Blackpool & I am afraid they

are but ugly places—I so hope to hear that you have not inflicted purgatory on yourself to give me this walk. I feel however that it will do me great good. Today the sky is gloomy—but not very threatening. Yesterday everything looked its very best. I shall write again as soon as I receive yours. Adieu my own wife from your

J.S.M.

289.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Lion Hotel Settle

Wed^y morning
[Sept. 16. 1857]

I got her two darling letters both together this morning—the train I came by to Lancaster yesterday being an hour behind time I was too late for the train I ought to have come here by, and I arrived here too late for letters. So you see my experience of these northern trains is like yours, & so is my observation of the dirty, mean, horrid looking people who go by them & frequent the stations. I am not at all surprised my own dearest one that neither of the two places turned out fit to stay at, and I shall be quite happy in rejoining her at Leamington instead of that Manchester: it is much pleasanter thinking of her in a place we know & which looks & feels clean & civilized, unlike anything in Lancashire I should think. I have been lucky in weather & it greatly increased the pleasure that I knew what pleasure it would give my darling. On Sunday I was about all day & in the evening had from the mountains overlooking Grasmere on the east, the most glorious mountain view I have yet had—four fine ranges of dark mountain one behind another with the sun behind all. On Monday morning there was a Scotch mist but I made out my walk over Wrynose & down the Duddon to Broughton & though I could not see much of the mountains in Little Langdale it was still very fine & I found a rare fern & a rare mint, peppermint to wit, which I had never found before. The weather cleared afterwards & I saw the Duddon very well & to increase the luck, the valley proved to be much finer descending than it would have been ascending. The absence of a lake made more space for other varieties & there is about half way a sort of Vallée de Cluses, of a type not met with elsewhere in the lake district. Yesterday I saw Furness Abbey which in its way was fine too. But the weather is now both covert & hazy though not looking like rainy. This place is a prettier country town than any in the lakes & the country about looks very pretty though the mountains have not the fine forms & beautiful arrangement of the Lakes. Please darling continue to write here, as I find it is the best centre for all I want to see—within a day's walk of everything. I have time to explore Craven between this & Sunday & I shall certainly go to Manchester on Monday & to darling on Tuesday. I saw the last Times yesterday at Lancaster. The Indian news seems to me more bad than good, but not, I think, of any bad omen.² I saw in a Liverpool paper an announcement from a French paper of the death of Comte.³ It seems as if there would be no thinkers left in the world. I shall know by her answer to this how long a

letter takes—I should think it will not be safe for her to write after Saturday as I suppose letters northward obey the *London* post & therefore are not sent on Sunday. I shall enquire at the post office here on Monday before leaving.

I fancy it much pleasanter for her at Leamington & even prettier than that Lancashire coast, & now adieu from her own

J.S.M.

I wrote to Fleetwood on Sunday⁴—I hope they sent it on.

290.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Settle

Friday morn^g
[Sept. 18. 1857]

Dearest,

I have spent the last two days in walking about this neighbourhood, & have seen the famous Malham Cove & Gordale Scar. It is much prettier country than I expected, & bears the same relation to the Lakes that the Jura does to the Alps, being greener, & with the green not of fern but of rich & abundant turf, but the mountains not of the fine shape of those of the Lakes, but *round*, or with long inclining ridges & immense bases, now & then however a peaked top jutting out, as it does in the Jura not much higher than the rest. If it had but the fir woods (but what an *if* that is) it would want little of being equal to the Jura; & Gordale Scar is a minor Creux du Vent. The mountains as in the Jura continually break into wall-like cliffs—this is characteristic of limestone to which also these mountains & those of the Jura owe their fine turf & their comparative absence of bog & likewise their abundance of plants—I have done very well botanically considering the lateness of the season. The weather has remained fine, the south west wind spending itself in bringing something between clouds & haze which entirely shrouded the higher mountains till towards evening; but today it is brighter, the wind having changed to north. It shews how cheap the country must be to live in that at the inn at the station where I staid the night I arrived (as there were no means of getting my portmanteau a mile & a half to the town) I had tea with bread, breakfast with eggs & cold meat, & a bed, for all which including attendance the charge was two shillings & two pence. I shall probably see Ingleborough & its caves tomorrow. There are no more letters yet dear at the post office. When she writes will she tell me by what railway she got to Leamington: is there a branch direct from Birmingham, & how do the trains suit? but only write what you happen to know, & I will find out the rest for myself. It is a real pleasure thinking of her at a pleasant place & one I know & have seen with her. I am glad too that she will have seen those pictures.² I shall see them either on Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning & will

certainly be with my beloved one on Tuesday evening. I do not generally find that Art & Nature mix well together in my case—but Furness Abbey while it exemplified this, shewed that I can get into the Art state quickly & I will if Manchester ugliness will let me. Adieu darling—your own

J.S.M.

291.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Settle

Sat^y morn^g
[Sept. 19. 1857]

I have just got your darling letter you angel which would make me set off directly to rejoin you if I did not know that you would much rather I did not on account of the good this excursion does me. I too was feeling very sad all yesterday but for an opposite reason (partly) to yours, namely perfect beauty. It was the first *splendid* day since I have been here, & I was all day wandering over the edge of the hills having such a sun & sky as made the views both near & distant perfectly beautiful & I think that always makes one melancholy, at least when one is alone, which to me means not with you. I am now going to climb Ingleborough & see the caves, at least the principal of them, for there are multitudes all about here. I fancied Leamington would be pleasant because it has a civilized air, though very ugly—the frequented parts of the N. of E. are generally hideous as to the *human* part of them, but this Settle is a nice quiet, really pretty, very little country place, not tourified, the people of the place are civil & the few strangers one sees in the coffee room are really gentlemanly. I shall enquire at the post office Manchester my own love. I will certainly look particularly at the pictures my darling liked. Adieu till Tuesday evening & blessing from her own

J.S.M.

I wrote yesterday to Post Off. Leamington. Excuse the Ambleside envelopes.

292.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Oct. 5, 1857

I have nearly finished an Essay on “Liberty”² which I hope to publish next winter. As the Liberty it treats of is moral and intellectual rather than political, it is not so much needed in Germany as it is here.

293.

TO HENRY CARLETON¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse] Oct. 12. 1857.

Dear Sir—

The little volume² which you did me the honor to send me, arrived safely, but not until several months after the date of your letter announcing its despatch. I read it as soon as I received it, which was about a fortnight ago, & I not only agree with you throughout on the main question (of Liberty & Necessity) but also have to thank you for a very useful exposition & illustration, in small compass, of the Law of Association as applied to the analysis of the principal mental phenomena. I could mention points on which I differ from you; but on several of these the difference is possibly more verbal than real. For instance, when you say on page 130 that truth is to every man what it appears to him to be, I cannot suppose you to mean that if I think poison to be wholesome food, it really is so to me, but only that I cannot help viewing as truth what presents itself to my perceptions or judgment as such. So when you say that “sin and crime exist of necessity,” I do not understand you to mean that it is necessary they should always exist; but only that when they exist, they are the necessary consequences of the causes which have produced them. I do not think you successful in the faint attempt you make to reconcile your doctrine with the received notions of Divine perfection; but your theory is quite as consistent with those notions as the opposite theory. In truth nothing can reconcile the order of nature as we know it with perfect wisdom & goodness, combined with infinite power. To make any consistent scheme, at least one of the three must be given up.

There is something doing in this country also for the “Ass[ociatio]n Philosophy.”³ Mr. Bain has published under the name of “The Senses and the Intellect,”⁴ the first part of a treatise on the mind, which I think you would be much pleased with. He has not yet got to your special subject, but he will soon arrive at it. Mr. Herbert Spencer’s “Principles of Psychology,”⁵ though not so sound as a whole, contains many searching analyses of complex mental phenomena, and happy applications of the principle of association. He has unfortunately put at the head of it a dissertation under the title of the “Universal Postulate,”⁶ which seems to me not only erroneous, but quite inconsistent with the philosophy of the work it is prefixed to.

I hope that like myself you have been successful in warding off your chest complaint, and that your eyesight, to which your preface alludes, is at least not getting worse.

294.

TO FREDERICK SINNETT¹

Blackheath

Oct. 22. 1857.

Dear Sir—

It is now some weeks since I received your letter but I have not until now had time to answer your question.

In principle I am quite in favour of considering all land as the property of the State, and its rent as a fund for defraying the public expenses. But there are two objections to the application of this maxim to a country in the circumstances of Australia. One of these you have mentioned, viz. that a large immigration is most effectually attracted by granting the land in absolute property, at a price to be only once paid. I agree with you that a time comes when a colony is so far advanced in population & importance that immigration ceases to be the first object so far as the colony itself is concerned, & that when this time comes, the advantage of the colony should take precedence over the interest which the mother country may have in getting rid of a surplus population. But I doubt if that time has yet come in the case of Australia. A great temporary immigration has been brought about by the gold discoveries,² but I should think that for retaining the immigrants, the colony depends very much on the facilities allowed of acquiring land; & Englishmen do not like to settle where they cannot get land in fee. In India we have the system you desire, but that is one great reason why few English settle there; & the English who do go, & the greater number who would like to go, are always clamouring to have the system changed to one of grants in fee: & so I should think would a large part of the resident population of Australia who have not yet got land.

There is a second objection which weighs with me as much as the first; the very great difficulty of levying a land tax, or any annual payment, from settlers scattered widely apart over a great wilderness. It is difficult enough, as the Americans find, to prevent squatting even when only *one* payment is demanded, as a condition preliminary to occupancy. But if a payment has to be made annually I cannot but think that to collect & enforce it, if practicable at all, would require so costly an establishment as would absorb the chief part of the receipts, & be quite unsuitable to the finances of a country like Australia. In India the revenue establishments are one of the heaviest items of the public expenditure, although India in general is thickly peopled. I believe that attempts have been made formerly to collect taxes from outlying lands in the older Australian colonies but that their failure was so complete that they were abandoned.

The newly introduced parliamentary government of the provinces³ seems to have some difficulty in getting into regular play, but this will be got over in time. We are glad to hear your favorable account of your own prospects.⁴ My wife sends very kind remembrance to you which is joined by Haji & his sister—the former I think is very unlikely to become either a Catholic or a monk, although he passed some months in visiting convents in Italy, among his various peregrinations in search of relief for his constant bad health. I am y^{rs} truly

295.

TO WILLIAM HENRY SMITH¹

[After October 31, 1857]²

I had already read the book with great interest. As is the case with everything of yours that I have read, it seemed to me full of true thought aptly expressed and, though not resolving many questions, a valuable contribution to the floating elements out of which the future moral and intellectual synthesis will have to shape itself. I have been much pleased, both on your account and that of the book itself, at the decided success it has met with.

296.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

Dec. 11, 1857

Dear Sir—

I am unable to put my name to the Memorial² which I have just received from you, because I am, to say the least, very doubtful as to the desirableness of the measure proposed in it.

I quite agree in the opinion that educated persons should count in a greater ratio than that of their mere numbers in the constituency of the country. But I have not seen any method proposed by which persons of educated minds can be sifted from the rest of the community. All that could well be done is to give votes to a limited number of what are called liberal professions, on the presumption (often a very false one) that every member of these professions must be an educated person. But nearly all the recognized professions have as such, interests & partialities opposed to the public good, & the members of Parliament whom they would elect if organized apart would, I apprehend, be much more likely to represent their sentiments & objects as professional, than as educated men.

The only provisions for increasing the influence of the more educated class of voters, to which I see my way, are 1st, an educational test for all electors, such as would exclude the wholly uneducated. The amount of expurgation of even the present constituencies, which this would effect, would be found I believe much greater than is supposed. 2^{dy}, I regard it as an indispensable part of a just representative constitution, that minorities be not swamped but that every considerable minority be represented in a fair proportion to its numbers.³ This would be secured by the simple plan proposed some years ago by Mr. Marshall, of allowing a voter if he pleases to give all his votes

to the same candidate.⁴ Other modes of effecting the same object have been proposed, but they would necessarily be unpopular as they propose to operate by abridging the rights of the individual voter, while the plan in question would extend them, & it would besides, allow weight to degree of preference as well as to number, a distinction highly favorable to the more eminent candidate.

I may add that I *should* be glad to see a representation given to the graduates of the Univ. of London,⁵ such as is already possessed by Oxford, Cambridge, & Dublin.

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1858

297.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

Jan. 11. 1858

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Je n'ai aucune raison pour ne pas vouloir être cité comme l'auteur de la brochure sur la Révolution de Février.² Au contraire je me réjouirais d'associer mon nom à cette protestation en faveur de principes qui sont les miens, et d'hommes que je respecte profondément.

Ma femme me charge de vous offrir l'expression de sa sympathie dans votre travail justificatif.³

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

298.

TO JOHN HOLMES¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

Jan. 19. 1858.

Dear Sir—

I am very much obliged to you for sending me the paper which you read at the Birmingham meeting.² I only knew enough of the Leeds experiment to be aware that it had been very successful; & of the Rochdale one, only a little more.³ I now know the particulars of the success, & some of the details of the plan, & I hope as occasions arise to make my knowledge useful. The only doubt which could reasonably be entertained about the success of cooperation in this country, was grounded on the low moral & intellectual condition of the masses. Your success & that of the Rochdale Association proves that there are at least two bodies of workpeople to be found who

are sufficiently free from shortsighted selfishness—for that is really all that is required—to be capable of succeeding in such an enterprise, and the results, economically considered, as exhibited in your paper, are so advantageous that they can hardly fail to call forth imitators. It is now shewn that with honest & intelligent management, cooperative establishments can undersell individual dealers. But to do this, the management must *be* honest & intelligent. If the experience of cooperation teaches the working classes the value of honesty & intelligence *to themselves*, it will work as great a moral revolution in society as it will, in that case, a physical. But it will never do the last without the first, and that you see this so clearly, gives me much confidence in the value of your influence, & hopes of the permanency of your success. I am y^{rs} very truly

John Holmes Esq

The People's Flour Mill
Leeds

299.

TO ARTHUR MILLS¹

East India House

Jan. 23. [1858]

Dear Sir

I return your proofs² with a few pencil marks in the margin.

In the *earlier* facts as stated by you there are some about which I feel doubtful. I have no doubt you have always good authority for them, but they are sometimes apparently deficient in explanations which would give them a somewhat different colour from that which they now bear. I have marked all such passages for your judgment. But generally speaking your statements are strictly accurate.

I Am
Very Faithfully Y^{Rs}

J. S. Mill

300.

TO ARTHUR MILLS¹

Exam. off.

Feb. 17. 1858

Dear Sir

I send you as requested a note of the points which have occurred to me as requiring correction in your book. They are mostly very trifling, but some few are important.

I Am
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

301.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

Feb. 20. 1858

Mary—

I have received your note of Feb. 15. I do not know why you write to me after so long an interval if you cannot shew more good sense or good feeling than are shewn in this note. There is besides, a total want of modesty in supposing that I am likely to receive instruction from you on the subject of my strongest convictions²—which also were those of your father. There is certainly nothing in your note to make me desire that there should be any more communication between us than there has been for many years past.

J.S.M.

302.

TO GIUSEPPE MAZZINI¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 21. 1858

Dear Sir—

It gave me much pleasure to see your handwriting after so many years interval.² I did not answer your first note when I received it, because I hoped in answering it to have said that I had been able to do something for D^r Laurenza.³ I have been disappointed of this, through his not obtaining a certificate from D^r Scott,⁴ the E.I.C's examining

physician, without which no one is appointed to the medical charge of troops. I do not understand clearly from D^F L. what are D^F Scott's objections. They are very probably quite unreasonable; but I have no power of overruling them, & unfortunately I have no interest or influence that can be useful to D^F L. in any other quarter though I shall lose no opportunity if any should chance to offer, as I regret much my inability to be of service to an Italian patriot & a friend of yours.

When I began writing to you I thought that this country was meanly allowing itself to be made an appendage to Louis Bonaparte's police for the purpose of hunting down all foreigners (& indeed English too) who have virtue enough to be his avowed enemies.⁵ But it appears we are to be spared this ignominy; & such is the state of the world ten years after 1848 that even this must be felt as a great victory.

I sympathize too strongly both with your taste for solitude & with the devotion of your time & activity to the great object of your life, to intrude on you with visits or invitations. We, like you, feel that those who would either make their lives useful to noble ends, or maintain any elevation of character within themselves, must in these days have little to do with what is called society. But if it can be any pleasure to you to exchange ideas with people who have many thoughts & feelings in common with you, my wife & I reckon you among the few persons to whom we can sincerely say that they may feel sure of being welcome.

I Am D^R Sir Yours Very Truly

303.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

India House

March 9. 1858

Dear Chadwick

The inclosed Memorandum² supplies answers to some of the grossest misstatements in Ashworth's paper.³

If you look through the last 20 pages of Dr Royle's pamphlet⁴ which I send, you will learn more to your present purpose than I can tell you.

Ever Yrs

In Haste

J. S. Mill

304.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

East India House, London

le 9 mars 1858

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Vos deux lettres, dont la dernière porte la date du 10 janvier, méritaient bien une réponse plus prompte. Je vous prie de ne pas voir dans le retard que j'y ai mis, une preuve d'indifférence aux sentiments d'amitié que vous voulez bien me témoigner. Ce retard vient de la multiplicité de mes occupations, et surtout de la lutte que la Compagnie des Indes, dont je suis un des employés, soutient maintenant pour son existence.² Le gouvernement Anglais se propose d'arracher à la Compagnie la part qu'elle conserve encore dans l'administration de l'Inde. L'ignorance du public ne permet pas d'espérer que la Compagnie puisse s'en tirer; mais il importe qu'elle succombe honorablement, et que sa cause soit plaidée d'une manière digne d'un gouvernement qui a été, j'ose le dire, unique dans le monde par la pureté de ses intentions et par la bienfaisance de ses actes. Cette tâche étant dévolue surtout à moi, elle a dû être depuis quelque temps ma principale occupation.

Cependant depuis l'ouverture du parlement, une question d'un intérêt encore plus vif est venue compliquer la situation. Je veux parler de la misérable tentative du ministère Palmerston de traîner la nation anglaise dans la boue, en faisant d'elle une succursale de la police française.³ Nous sommes sauvés pour le moment de cet avilissement, par la chute du ministère, qui, tout puissant en apparence un mois auparavant, a été chassé du pouvoir par la combinaison de ses ennemis naturels avec ceux qui lui ont retiré leur appui à cause de son indigne soumission à des exigences déshonorables au pays. Cet événement m'a comblé de joie; cependant je ne suis pas encore rassuré: les successeurs⁴ de Lord Palmerston ne valent pas mieux que lui, et il n'est rien moins que certain qu'ils ne seront pas, au fond, tout aussi obséquieux. S'ils ne font pas une nouvelle loi, ce qui est encore douteux, ils feront certainement tout le mal possible au moyen des lois existantes, et celles-là sont déjà bien assez odieuses: heureusement il nous reste le jury, et la presse indépendante exerce sur lui une certaine influence. Vous voyez par la part qu'il a prise dans cette affaire que Lord John Russell a du bon,⁵ quoique vous l'ayez parfaitement bien jugé être un homme très médiocre. Tel qu'il est, il vaut encore mieux que la plupart de nos soi-disant hommes d'état, qui, s'ils savent quelque chose, ne savent que les traditions de la politique anglaise, soit conservatrice, soit libérale mais qui sont d'une ignorance profonde sur la politique générale, et sur les idées et l'histoire des autres pays.

J'espérais vous offrir depuis longtemps mon petit livre sur la liberté, mais plusieurs raisons m'ont décidé à ne pas le faire imprimer cet hiver.⁶ Au reste, il n'a guère de valeur que pour l'Angleterre. Il traite de la liberté morale et intellectuelle, en quoi les

nations du Continent sont autant au dessus de l'Angleterre qu'elles lui sont inférieures quant à la liberté politique.

Ma femme me charge de vous faire ses compliments. Elle s'intéresse autant que moi à la cause de l'Italie et aux patriotes et philosophes Italiens. Nous espérons bien vous voir avant peu, soit ici, soit peut-être à Florence. Algernon Taylor se rappelle à votre souvenir. Sa santé est toujours très faible. Moi même je me porte assez bien. Je serai charmé d'avoir de vous la longue lettre dont vous me parlez, et j'espère y répondre une autre fois moins tardivement. Votre dévoué

J. S. Mill

305.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Ex[aminer's] Off[ice]

March 11, 1858

Dear Mrs [*Name Heavily Blacked Out*]

It seems to me that in a matter so entirely domestic and personal, no one can interfere but yourself. I imagine that you should see the man, tell him what your opinion is, and arrange it with him as you find best. It is the sort of small annoyance to which every body is liable, and which every body must settle for themselves.

I Am
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

306.

TO WILLIAM NEWMARCH¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

March 20, 1858

Dear Sir—

I have been turning over in my mind the proposal which was the subject of your note of the 17th, for founding a Professorship at King's College in the name of Mr Tooke.² In so far as its object is to pay honor to Mr Tooke I entirely sympathise with it. Few

persons have rendered greater services to P. Economy & its applications than Mr Tooke, & the value of what he has done is likely to be rated more & more highly as the subject is better understood & as the ephemeral controversies of the present time die away. But I am not certain that the best mode of demonstrating respect to his memory is the one suggested. It does not seem to me that the persons, of more or less merit, in whose name professorships have been founded at the Universities, are remembered to any purpose through those endowments. I for one do not even know when most of them lived or who they were. The present plan has certainly the recommendation of aiming at public usefulness. But to endow a permanent Professorship to an amount worth accepting by any eminent man, with the interest of subscriptions, would require a much larger sum than I sh^d think it would be possible to raise. And would the lecture be attended? There is a Professorship of Pol. Ec. at Univ. College but I believe there are hardly ever any pupils. This brings me to what is with me a decisive objection against the plan as connected with King's College, namely that it is a distinctively Church Institution.³ I have been fighting all my life for the principle of Schools & Colleges for all, not for Churchmen or any other class of religionists & I believe Mr Tooke's opinions on the subject were exactly the same, while K.C. was founded in avowed opposition to religious equality, as the National Schools were founded in opposition to the Lancastrian.⁴ I have always refused to support any kind of Church schools & for the same reason I could not join in giving any additional advantages to a Church College over those which are bound by their constitution to religious neutrality.

I Am D^R S^R Yrs Very Truly

J.S.M.

307.

TO GIUSEPPE MAZZINI¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

April 15. 1858

Dear Sir—

I heartily wish that I knew where to find such a young man as you describe. He is wanted for many other purposes besides that which you are aiming at. But I do not know of any such person.

Your project is a very good one if it could be successful.² But of this there seems little chance. Even supposing the indifference of the English to foreign affairs overcome, you would probably find that you had only substituted one obstacle in the place of another. The English, of all ranks and classes, are at bottom, in all their feelings, aristocrats. They have some conception of liberty, & set some value on it, but the very

idea of equality is strange & offensive to them. They do not dislike to have many people above them as long as they have some below them. And therefore they have never sympathized & in their present state of mind never will sympathize with any really democratic or republican party in other countries. They keep what sympathy they have for those whom they look upon as imitators of English institutions—Continental Whigs who desire to introduce constitutional forms & some securities against personal oppression—leaving in other respects the old order of things with all its inequalities & social injustices and any people who are not willing to content themselves with this, are thought unfit for liberty. There is here & there an Englishman who is an exception, but if all the exceptions were to unite I doubt their making much impression on English policy. Even Louis Napoleon was never really unpopular here until he was supposed to have insulted & threatened England.

Yrs Very Truly

308.

TO PATRICK O'CALLAGHAN¹

Blackheath

April 17. 1858

Sir

In reply to your letter of the 9th inst. I beg to say that I have not the honor of being a member of the British Association,² unless the body which met at Birmingham³ last year to discuss subjects connected with Social Science, has merged in the older Association; but in any case I have no prospect of having to prepare any paper for the meeting⁴ in September next, nor of being able to attend the meeting.

I Am Sir

Yr Ob^T Serv^T

J. S. Mill

P. O'Callaghan Esq
etc. etc.

309.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

April 22, 1858

Dear Sir

Since receiving your note, I have read your volume of Lectures² a second time through, and I find my original opinion confirmed, that its view of the logic of Political Economy is thoroughly sound and philosophical, and expressed in clear and precise language. This is the most cardinal point of all in an Examiner,³ whose object should be to test the general direction of the pupil's faculties, still more than his positive acquirements. But your book also shews what appears to me a thorough knowledge of the questions of political economy which it touches on, and these are some of the most important.

If this expression of opinion can be of any assistance in promoting your object, you are most welcome to make use of it.

I Am D^R Sir
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

310.

TO J. BRITTEN¹

E[ast] I[ndia] H[ouse]

July 1.1858

Sir—

I have to acknowledge a letter from you dated June 24.

You are not the first, nor the hundredth person who has thought that he was able to prove "that a large majority of the principles or dogmas usually accepted by economists as being the settled principles of the science are wholly fallacious." I have read many such attempts: some of them more or less ingenious, others merely stupid, but all shewing equal incapacity of seeing through the most obvious paralogisms: and not only did none of them, in my judgment, effect their object, but I have rarely found that anything was to be learnt from them, even incidentally. Having obtained no better fruit from a considerable course of such reading, I may claim to be excused from

giving time which I can ill spare, to the examination of any new attempts of the kind, unless I have some special reason to expect that it will differ very much in character from its predecessors. And I certainly cannot accede to your proposal, that I should not merely study the book which is to refute me and all other political economists, but also assist you in writing it. I am Sir y^t ob^t Ser^t

311.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

East India House, London

le 1 juillet 1858.

Monsieur

Si j'ai un peu tardé à répondre à la lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'adresser il y a plus d'un mois, c'est que je voulais auparavant avoir le temps de donner à votre important ouvrage,² la lecture soigneuse qu'il mérite.

Je vois dans ce livre, l'exposition la plus philosophique qu'on ait donnée jusqu'ici des principes qu'on peut invoquer en faveur de l'intervention gouvernementale. Si je trouve que vous n'avez pas toujours donné un poids suffisant aux raisons du côté opposé je dois reconnaître que vous en avez au moins rendu compte avec une sincérité et une impartialité dignes d'un écrivain qui met la vérité et le bien public au dessus du triomphe de son opinion.

Vous avez vu par le dernier chapitre de mon Traité,³ qu'il y a bien des points de contact entre votre manière de voir et la mienne. Il n'y a entre nous d'autres différences que celles qui peuvent exister entre penseurs. J'adhère à tout ce que j'ai écrit sur la question que vous avez traitée, et j'accorde qu'il était temps que le gouvernement général de l'Angleterre se mêlât jusqu'à un certain point de surveiller des institutions locales d'ailleurs fort mal organisées, et plus corrompues encore que l'état. Malgré cela, je trouve très dangereuse la tendance que vous signalez par l'expression que "l'Angleterre s'administrative" [*sic*]⁴ ; et cela surtout par la raison qu'une nation qui se repose sur son gouvernement du soin de penser pour elle dans les affaires pratiques de la vie sociale, n'est pas et ne peut pas être libre. Je ne connais rien de plus fatal à la liberté qu'une bureaucratie très capable et très fortement organisée, à la tête d'un peuple qui ne cultive pas, par une active gérance de ses intérêts collectifs, le sens pratique des affaires sociales.

J' Ai L'Honneur D'Être

Monsieur

Votre Dévoué Serviteur

J. S. Mill

312.

TO THOMAS CARLYLE¹

Blackheath

July 8. 1858

My Dear Carlyle

Mr Russell,² the young man who wrote to you about the Poona Professorship,³ called on me the day after I received your note. He seemed a reasonable and modest person enough, but with rather vague notions about the nature of the information he was in quest of. I was able however to give him some particulars about the prospects of personal advancement, and the general eligibility of the position of a teacher of Hindoos. I also recommended to him such books as I thought most worth his reading.

You are well out of dusty London at this season; though we by no means find it necessary to go so far as Annan⁴ for the calm and silence you speak of. We have a quiet corner down here, where we shall be at any time happy to see you.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

313.

TO HENRY SAMUEL CHAPMAN¹

East India House. July 8. 1858

My Dear Chapman

You are a much better correspondent than I am. I really do not know how many letters I have received from you since I wrote one. I am always busy, and have been particularly so of late; but your last letter especially (dated Feb. 14) contains so many points of interest, that I will not delay any longer replying to it.

The history it contains of the constitutional changes which have succeeded one another in your colony since what may be called its enfranchisement, has connected and made intelligible the scattered information I had picked up from the newspapers. You have certainly now obtained a very democratic constitution,² and I am glad to see by the papers that you have yourself, since you wrote, had the forming of an administration to work it.³ No constitution, less democratic, would be either practicable, or probably desirable in the long run, in a society composed like that of

the Australian colonies. The only thing which seems wanting to make the suffrage really universal, is to get rid of the Toryism of sex, by admitting women to vote; and it will be a great test how far the bulk of your population deserve to have the suffrage themselves, their being willing or not to extend it to women. I am sorry, by the way, that the vulgar and insulting expression “manhood suffrage”⁴ has found its way to Australia. Whether so intended or not, it asserts the exclusion of women as a doctrine, which is worse than merely ignoring them as was done by giving the name universal suffrage to a suffrage limited to men. The adoption of the ballot in Victoria⁵ has made some noise here, and has been a good deal appealed to by its advocates in parliament. You have heard, no doubt, of the dinner given by Nicholson.⁶ It will perhaps surprise you that I am not now a supporter of the ballot, though I am far from thinking that I was wrong in supporting it formerly. You remember, I daresay, a passage which always seemed to me highly philosophical, in my father’s History of India, where he discriminates between the cases in which the ballot is in his estimation desirable and those in which it is undesirable:⁷ now I think that the election of members of parliament has passed, in the course of the last 25 years, out of the former class into the latter. In the early part of the century there was more probability of bad votes from the coercion of others, than from the voter’s own choice: but I hold that the case is now reversed, and that an elector gives a rascally vote incalculably oftener from his own personal or class interest, or some mean feeling of his own, the influence of which would be greater under secret suffrage than from the prompting of some other person who has power over him. Coercive influences have vastly abated, and are abating every day: a landlord cannot now afford to part with a good tenant because he is not politically subservient: and even if there were universal suffrage, the idea of a manufacturer forcing his workpeople to vote against the general feeling of their class, is almost out of the question: in this as in so many other things, *defendit numerus*. If these things are true in England, they must be still more true in Australia, where I cannot imagine that any artificial security can be required to ensure freedom of voting. But if there be even a doubt on the subject, the doubt ought surely to turn the scale in favour of publicity. Nothing less than the most positive and powerful reasons of expediency would justify putting in abeyance a principle so important in forming the moral character either of an individual or of a people, as the obligation on every one to be ready to avow and justify whatever he does, affecting the interests of others. I have long thought that in this lies the main advantage of the public opinion sanction: not in compelling or inducing people to act as public opinion dictates, but in making it necessary for them, if they do not, to have a firm ground in their own conviction to stand on, and to be capable of maintaining it against attack. I shall probably at some time write and publish something about the ballot, which will shew the grounds of my present opinion more fully,⁸ and perhaps more clearly, than I have now done. There is another constitutional point which I must touch upon, because you say you have quoted me on the subject, and my former opinion is, to say the least, very much shaken, the payment of members of parliament.⁹ There is, no doubt, something to be said for it, especially where, as you remark, there is no unoccupied class; but I am afraid of its raising up just such a class, of men without any fixed occupation but that of being in parliament, for the sake of the certain payment as members and the possible one as placemen. Certainly, by all accounts, the American legislatures, both state and federal, are very much composed of a low class of adventurers whose principal object is money, and some Americans have a decided opinion that the

payment of members is one great cause of this. By the way, as you have quoted Bailey¹⁰ and me on this subject, I wish you would quote us on the subject of women's suffrage also.—The representation of minorities seems to me not only a good but a highly democratic measure. The ideal of a democracy is not that a mere majority of the people should have all the representation, but that if possible every portion of the constituency should possess an influence in the election proportional to its numbers. This cannot be realized literally, but it seems to me a good arrangement that any portion of the constituency amounting to a third should be able to obtain a third of the representation, by concerting to aim at no more. This should not be done by limiting each voter to fewer votes than there are members to be elected, which curtailing the power of the individual voter, must always be unpopular. The plan I like is the cumulative method,¹¹ which I am glad to see has been carried. This plan has also the advantage that when a voter can give all his votes to one person, intensity of preference carries weight as well as the mere fact of preference: an arrangement very favorable to candidates who stand on personal merit, as compared with those who are voted for only because they belong to a party. I see you think that this plan will increase the influence of the Irish Catholics: notwithstanding my good opinion of Duffy,¹² I should be sorry for this result, but the objection is only temporary, and the advantage permanent.—About education and the public lands, you seem to be in the right track, and with a good prospect of keeping in it.

There is probably little I could tell you about English politics that you do not already know. The East India Company has fought its last battle,¹³ and I have been in the thick of the fight. The Company is to be abolished, but we have succeeded in getting nearly all the principles which we contended for, adopted in constituting the new government, and our original assailants feel themselves much more beaten than we do. The change though not so bad as at first seemed probable, is still, in my opinion, much for the worse. The difficulty of governing India in any tolerable manner, already so much increased by the mutiny and its consequences,¹⁴ will become an impossibility if a body so ignorant and incompetent on Indian (to say nothing of other) subjects as Parliament, comes to make a practice of interfering. In other respects, politics are more satisfactory than usual. The defeat of all the attempts to make England instrumental to keeping Louis Napoleon where he is,¹⁵ and the conversion of the Tory chiefs into temporary Radicals for the purpose of remaining in place,¹⁶ are the best things that have happened in Europe for a long time. The complete disconcerting of the old placehunters, and the failure of all their attempts to form a party¹⁷ are very agreeable and amusing to all but themselves.

I Am
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

314.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

East India House

le 8 juillet 1858

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Il y a bientôt trois mois que je dois une réponse à votre dernière lettre, mais vous savez comme je suis occupé, et j'espère que vous m'excuserez. Celle de mes occupations qui est depuis quelque temps la plus pressante, tire maintenant à sa fin: la Compagnie des Indes, comme gouvernement, va cesser d'exister,² mais elle périt avec un certain éclat, et on a suivi la plupart de ses conseils dans l'organisation du gouvernement qu'on va mettre à sa place. Ce résultat, contraire à l'attente générale, est dû en grande partie aux divers écrits que la Compagnie a fait paraître, et auxquels je n'ai pas été étranger.³ Malgré ce succès, je suis peu disposé à accepter une place dans la nouvelle administration, et je profiterai probablement de l'occasion pour obtenir ma retraite.⁴ Dans ce cas nous ferons usage de notre liberté pour voyager; mais la nouvelle loi donnant six mois pour effectuer le changement, je ne serai pas libre avant la fin de l'année, et dans le cas même où nous irions à Florence ce ne pourrait être qu'à un temps très éloigné.

Vos observations sur l'Inde sont d'une grande justesse, vû le peu de documents qui sont à votre portée. Vous avez surtout très justement apprécié le genre d'hommes qu'on a souvent nommés Gouverneurs de Bombay et de Madras.⁵ Les nominations à ces fonctions-là sont faites par le gouvernement, et non par la Compagnie; et le général Adam,⁶ dont vous parlez dans votre lettre, en fut un des plus nuls. Il est vrai aussi que les Anglais, en général, ne se font pas aimer des races indigènes, ce qui, au reste, se peut dire également des autres peuples européens qui gouvernent des pays éloignés, habités par d'autres races. Cependant les populations de l'Inde reconnaissent généralement que l'administration anglo indienne est juste. Elle ne les rançonne ni ne les tyrannise comme leurs propres chefs, et elle tâche de leur donner de bonnes lois et des tribunaux honnêtes et impartiaux, chose inconnue en Asie avant elle. Quant aux princes indigènes, et surtout à l'Oude, vous avez été mal informé, ce qui n'est pas étonnant. On n'a pas violé la foi des traités: au contraire, les traités exigeaient que les princes de l'Oude fissent une réforme complète de leur gouvernement atroce, et on les a par une fausse délicatesse laissé violer cet engagement pendant cinquante ans, en se contentant de remontrances qui n'étaient jamais suivies d'effet.⁷ Enfin on s'est lassé de cette indulgence, et on a dépossédé une famille indigne de régner, qui sans notre appui eût été chassée depuis longtemps: en lui assurant toutefois une grande richesse. Cette histoire serait trop longue pour une lettre, mais je pourrai vous la raconter quelque jour si elle vous intéresse.

Votre D vou 

J. S. Mill

315.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

le 9 Juillet 1858

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc—

Pardonnez moi de n'avoir pas encore reconnu r ception de votre excellent livre.² D'abord je voulais le lire avant d'en parler, et plus tard je fus si occup  que j'ai ajourn  toute lettre qui pouvait souffrir un retard. Je vous aurais assur ment t moign  mes remerciements la premi re fois que je vous eusse vu.

C'est presque une chose heureuse qu'un homme l ger et sans autorit  comme Lord Normanby, ait reproduit les calomnies ridicules et atroces de 1848,³ puisque cela vous a donn  une occasion de les  craser comme vous l'avez fait. Lord Normanby, comme l'aristocratie et la bourgeoisie anglaise en g n ral, a tout simplement cru ce que lui disaient les contrer volutionnaires fran ais qu'il voyait, et dont l'opinion anglaise vulgaire est devenue l' cho. Parmi les membres du gouvernement provisoire, Lamartine est le seul qu'il voyait aussi, et le seul, par cons quent qu'il n'a pas injuri . S'il vous e t fr quent , il aurait fait, de vous aussi, une exception. Ce n'est pas un malhonn te homme, mais il a toutes les faiblesses de sa classe, et entr'autres celle d'adopter sans examen, sur les affaires des autres pays, tout t moignage et tous les *on dit* de ceux qu'il regarde comme repr sentant l'opinion conforme   celle de son parti en angleterre. Tous ces mensonges l   taient oubli s, mais l'impression restait, et il fallait qu'on les rappel t de l'oubli pour qu'il f t possible, en les r futant, d'en att nuer l'effet. Il n'y a pas d'opinion   laquelle on tient aussi fortement qu'  celle dont on a oubli  les fondements. Vous avez bien profit  de l'occasion. Votre ouvrage sera historique, et ceux qui d sirent la v rit  pourront d sormais en juger par eux-m mes en comparant l'accusation et la r ponse. Aussi vous avez d  voir que la r futation n'a pas  t  sans effet. Toutes les notices qu'on a faites sur votre ouvrage,⁴ au moins toutes celles que j'ai vues, malgr  l'extr me ignorance propre aux  crivains anglais sur la politique  trang re, laissent voir que si vous n'avez pas beaucoup  branl  les pr ventions contraires aux hommes et aux  v nements de 1848, du moins on a ressenti l'effet de la loyaut  et de la franchise de vos explications.

Vous n' tes pas oubli  ici. Ma femme vous cite souvent, et me prie de vous pr senter ses compliments affectueux.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

316.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

New Bath Hotel
Matlock

Sunday ¼ past 5
[July 11, 1858]

My dearest will I know want to hear whether I was in time for the train, and how I prospered, so I write immediately. Happily the N. Kent was only two or three minutes behind time, so I got to Euston station in ample time—& on getting to Derby, found I could go on in half an hour by railway to Ambergate, six miles from here. So all was right, and I have come from Ambergate here in a phaeton, along a valley a good deal like the Wye near Tintern—a narrow space of meadow between high & mostly thickly wooded hills, & even the river at the bottom looking nearly as large as the Wye though really much smaller as to quantity of water. This place as far as I could see it in coming & can see it from the window at which I am writing, seems quite a village, not at all the dressed up street like watering place I thought it might be—& the high hills & perpendicular cliffs come quite close to it. The weather has been all day & is now most beautiful & there has been no rain lately nor for a long while in Derbyshire & Leicestershire except two or three thunderstorms. The grass looks much more parched than with us, that is in the level country, for *here* they say there have been showers. The difference of climate is shewn in this that much of the grass is not yet carried, & some not cut. There seems a prospect of fine weather. Thanks to my precious darling for encouraging me to come. I am now going out for a stroll & shall come in to *tea*, having had a good dinner of soup & roast lamb at the Railway station at Derby, strange to relate. It seems fully as pretty as I expected & this seems a very clean & prettily situated, & not very pretentious inn though I do not think I shall like the people who keep it. I cannot yet tell my movements but will write tomorrow. If dear one writes tomorrow (which I shall not expect) direct Post Office Matlock. Adieu my own darling love.

Your

J.S.M.

317.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

Matlock

Monday 2 o'clock
[July 12. 1858]

My dearest love, I have pretty well exhausted Matlock—yesterday evening I climbed the highest hill in this part of the country, the one called Masson, & between that walk & this morning's I have gone to nearly every point & caught every view from both sides of this gorge of about a mile & a half in length. It is exceedingly pretty, some points even striking, but one sees the best at first: beyond a narrow compass one only passes or looks into country pretty indeed but in a tamer way. I should like to pass a day here with you but I question if we should care to stay longer. So I mean to go on to Chatsworth by a train at $\frac{1}{4}$ before 4. In case there is a letter tomorrow morning I shall not lose it, for as the distance is but $\frac{1}{4}$ of an hour by railway I shall run down here for it. In this way I shall make best use of my time. I have done pretty well as to plants & have had the best of weather—yesterday evening & night were of the most perfect brightness: today it is cloudy but warm, with occasional outbreaks of sunshine. It feels quite strange that yesterday morning we should have been talking of the necessity of my having a fire: all the care I have needed was to keep my feet *cool*. The people here say however that they have had it very cold a week ago—& two rainy days this last week. If you write tomorrow darling, please direct to Bakewell which seems the best centre, for Haddon Hall, Monsal & Millers-dales & even Castleton if I have time to go there. I shall write again tomorrow & then not on Wednesday or Thursday as she said, but on Friday. This watering place seems to have but few people as yet, & those of a rather humble character. There is but the least little bit of town if one can call it so, & the rest is houses dotted about a small portion of the side of a very steep slope. The opposite side of the gorge is steep woody cliff nearly the whole way, & the part of it called High Tor is a sort of *Salève* [2](#) on a small scale. There are plenty of cut walks but no drives except the high road up the gorge. Adieu my darling from your own

J.S.M.

318.

TO HARRIET MILL [1](#)

Chatsworth Hotel Edensor

Tuesday 3 o'clock
[July 13. 1858]

I came on, dearest, from Matlock as I said, & when I got to Rowsley left my portmanteau to go by the omnibus & walked to & across Chatsworth to this inn which belongs to the Duke² & is on the outskirts of the park: & in the evening I walked over all the finest parts of the park. All the way from Matlock is a broad valley between high, green, often wooded hills: at Rowsley it forks into two, in the lefthand of which is Bakewell; the righthand (rather the smaller valley but with the larger river) is filled up by Chatsworth. It is a very fine park & a great ugly clumsy house. This morning after going by railway to Matlock & back on the chance of a letter, I walked round by Haddon Hall, saw it, & made a circuit hither. Before I leave this evening for Bakewell I shall endeavour to see the conservatories of Chatsworth: the house I don't want to see. Today began very hot, but the wind had changed a little to the west & the day got overcast & threatened rain; but there has been none as yet. I shall stay at Bakewell all tomorrow at any rate: whether I shall excuse from it to Castleton or go at once to Dovedale will depend upon the facilities I find. I hold to returning on Saturday, but it may perhaps be on Saturday night, so as to arrive on Sunday morning. If my precious love writes tomorrow, direct to Bakewell, as I shall not leave till the post comes in. After that if she goes to Folkestone it will not be worth while for her to write again, but I shall enquire on Saturday morning at Tissington near Ashbourne. I have been most unexpectedly fortunate in weather though there must have been more rain on the whole season here than further south, to judge by the extreme greenness of everything. I shall write again on Friday my darling wife, till then adieu & a thousand blessings such as you give to your

J.S.M.

319.

TO HARRIET MILL¹

Bakewell

Thursday ev^g.

[July 15-16. 1858]

My darling! I received her most precious letter yesterday morning and the pleasure it gave was almost worth the absence. As to prolonging my stay, what she so kindly & sweetly writes would induce me to do it, if it were not that this excursion has not quite fulfilled our expectations or rather hopes in the matter of health. I have found no deficiency of strength, but have never been without a dry furred tongue, & never many hours without other decided sensations of indigestion, & this in spite of the greatest care, & observance of your advice in every particular. An excursion of this sort is excellent to strengthen me against indigestion, but it does not perhaps tend so much to cure it when it exists. Perhaps the regularity of home may do better. I dare say however I shall be the better for this *afterwards* as has so often been the case. As I shall therefore see her on Sunday morning & she will not get this till Saturday, I will keep all description for a nice talk & will only say that, contrary to my expectation, the place which seems most suitable for us to make any stay at is *Buxton* which I

walked to yesterday, returning on the top of the omnibus. On consideration I thought that Dovedale had not the étoffe of a place for more than a day, so I was driven there in a phaeton this morning from here—the place was not a disappointment but was soon seen & I have just come in from an eleven miles walk taken since I came back. Tomorrow morning I shall go to Castleton & shall have the greater part of tomorrow & the greater part of Saturday to spend there as I shall go from thence to Sheffield, no great distance, & return by a night train from there, arriving in town at about five on Sunday morning when I will rest a little & breakfast & then come home to my darling. The weather has been excellent—the last two afternoons there has been a little rain, not enough to do any harm, & tonight there has been a little since dusk, with some lightning. I found no plants Tuesday or today, but yesterday was a splendid day for them, as I found five, of which Jacob's ladder was one. Adieu with a thousand loves from your

J.S.M.

Friday morn^g. I have only now got my darling's second sweet & lovely letter—through the stupidity doubtless of the Post Office. One does not think it necessary in England to ask to look over the letters oneself, but I sh^d have done so if there had been none this morning. You see darling the reasons are strongest for going home. It has rained all night but seems as if it would clear for today. your own

320.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

East India House

July 22. 1858

Dear Chadwick

Do not pay any regard to anything you may have heard or read about seven vacancies.² They are the very bad guesses of people entirely uninformed. No one *can* have information, as the Directors do not themselves know whom they will elect,³ and the Government will not determine whom to nominate until it knows who have been elected. I do not think that any single vacancy is certain (or even very probable) except Guildford⁴ and I do not think it at all probable that Reigate will be vacated—but this is only my own guess, perhaps no better founded than those of others—and I beg you will not mention it. I do not think I shall have earlier information than yourself on the subject.

I find difficulty in getting sanitary information for you here.⁵ The best chance will be by your conferring personally with Mr Appleton⁶ of the Military Department in this house.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

321.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

India House

July 31. 1858

Dear Chadwick

Your paper² is very good, and full of useful matter. I do not know if I can suggest any additions to it but I will go through it a second time with that view. There are some very bad misprints or *lapsus calami* in it, rendering several of the sentences obscure & confused.

If you want the paper returned immediately, drop me a line.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

I agree with you about the representation of minorities but not about effecting it by *single votes*, which would make the minority equal to the majority. I prefer Marshall's plan of *cumulative votes*.³

322.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Aug. 5. 1858

Dear Sir

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the remaining £250 due on account of the fourth edition of the *Political Economy*.²

I suppose you are delaying the account of the sale of the *Logic*³ & *Essays*⁴ last year, until there is a balance of profit.

Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

323.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

Aug. 23. 1858

Dear Sir

Pray excuse my not having sent this book sooner.² It had been mislaid.

The apparently slow progress of Cooperation is not discouraging. It cannot progress more rapidly than the intelligence and moral feelings of operatives. The interest of each is indeed best promoted by the good of the whole, but no selfish person will ever know or believe this. It is just as well that cooperative experiments should only be attempted by those who are capable of making them succeed. Those which exist are most precious instruments of popular education. The Rochdale history is really glorious.³

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

324.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

East India House, August 30, 1858.

I . . . have been interested by the information as to your papers in the Rhinish Museum.² I was disappointed however at your not saying anything of your historical work on Greek philosophy,³ which I expect will be very valuable not only by throwing new light on historical points, of which there are always a great number to be cleared up by any competent inquirer, but also by exhibiting the speculations of the ancients from the point of view of the experience philosophy, a thing hardly yet attempted, and least of all in your country.

I have no objection to your annexing to the Logic any part of the controversy with Whewell⁴ which you think likely to be useful. There are not many defences extant of the ethics of utility, and I have sometimes thought of reprinting this and other papers I have written on the same as well as on other subjects.

325.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE EXAMINER-OFFICE¹

East India House, Oct.2, 1858

Dear Sirs,—

I thank you heartily for your unsought and only too complimentary expression of the friendly feelings of which I had already received from you individually so many proofs. I have not long had the honour of presiding over you; but during that time, if it had been the sole object of all of you to make my situation agreeable to me, you could not have more effectually exerted yourselves for that purpose.

It is no mere reciprocation of politeness when I say that I have been proud of my associates; and my feelings on my retirement would have been very different from what they are, were it not for the conviction that I leave behind me an office surpassed by none and equalled by few in the high qualities of the chiefs of departments, and the general efficiency of the establishment.

Believe me to be, gentlemen, with sincere regard, yours faithfully and obliged,

J. S. Mill

326.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Lyons² Oct 21. [1858]

Dear Lily

Mama is decidedly better today, and has no doubt that she shall be quite well with two or three days more rest. Her head is a great deal better than yesterday, but still it aches with the least exertion, and therefore she asks me to write for her. It has been one of the usual attacks of fever. She has taken the fever mixture and some pills, and it is now over. She is very weak, and does not mean to get up till tomorrow, when she has ordered a warm bath in the bedroom which she says will quite set her up. This is the exact state of the case, therefore be sure there is nothing to be uneasy about. As it is doubtful if they deliver letters on Sunday she will not write again till Saturday. If this reaches you in time to write a word to Avignon on Saturday, it will be sure to be in time, we shall go so slowly: or you might even write on Sunday with scarcely a chance of not being in time: besides that at the worst it would be sent on. And now, Mama says, adieu dear—as do I. Yours

J.S.M.

327.

TO DR. CECIL GURNEY¹

Avignon

Oct. 28. 1858

Dear D^R Gurney,

My wife is lying at the Hotel de l'Europe here, so very ill that neither she nor I have any hope but in you to save her. It is a quite sudden attack which came on at Lyons, of incessant coughing which prevents sleeping, and by the exhaustion it produces has brought her to death's door. I implore you to come immediately. I need hardly say that any expense whatever will not count for a feather in the balance. I am Dear D^R Gurney

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill²

328.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

[Avignon]

[Oct. 29 or 30? 1858]

Dear Lily

Mama has had a tremendous attack of bronchitis with congestion & fever much worse than at Lyons. We have done everything possible & today for the first time she is a little better. The cough has been unceasing & most painful preventing her lying down day or night or getting any sleep besides that the intense nervous irritation caused by the congestion the fever & the fatigue made her almost out of her mind. We have had the best physician here but his prescriptions are too weak. She has taken a number of her own. On Thursday she did not think she sh^d recover. She thought you w^d see by her letters from Lyons how ill she was but she did not like to alarm you. Today she is certainly better. The cough is less frequent & the head for the first time more calm. We took every precaution on the road. She was carried by the porters in a chair to the railway at Lyons & we had a coupé to ourselves from Valence here but she says the whole [?] incidents of such a journey are totally unfitted for her. The excessive hardship of every part—the inability to have anything fit for a delicate stomach to eat, the tremendous noise everywhere, the coarse manners of the women, the intense

fatigue of waiting in the railway rooms for at least half an hour & then the immense distance to go both to & from them. This inn is thought one of the best in France & we appear to have the best rooms yet bedrooms & sitting room are of red tiles with thin carpet over w^{ch} she endeavoured to obviate the first day by using a footstool but in vain—but still far more than all the evident fatal effect upon her of the air of the S[outh] of F[rance]. She dragged herself up to write you a few words on Wed^y that you might not be anxious, hoping it w^d prove as she said—but she felt ill as she wrote & got gradually worse till at night she was very ill. She does not wish you to come to her because she thinks she has taken the turn to get better & therefore it w^d be a very great pity to break up your good arrangements w^{ch} are a great pleasure to her to hear of. You shall know continually how she is going on. We have got all your letters from Montp[ellier] today here & continue to write here for it will probably be weeks before we leave this place. All notice of your letters must be at a future time.

She is anxious that you sh^d not think of coming to her. She w^d be extremely annoyed if you did.

J.S.M.

And now she says adieu dear girl in haste.

329.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Hotel de l'Europe
Avignon

Nov. 1. 1858

Cable

By the Electrical and International Telegraph Company.

She is not better or perhaps worse have written to beg D^f G[urney] to come.²

330.

TO THE MAYOR OF AVIGNON¹

[After November 3, 1858]

Monsieur Le Maire,

Par vos fonctions officielles, vous avez eu connaissance du malheureux événement qui a créé pour ma famille avec la ville que vous administrez un lien indissoluble. Nous croyons ne pouvoir rendre un meilleur hommage à celle que nous avons perdue qu'en faisant autant que possible les choses que, vivante, elle eût voulu faire; et comme elle n'aurait pas pu venir s'établir à Avignon sans que les malheureux de cette ville en eussent profité, nous souhaitons que, dans la triste circonstance où nous nous trouvons, ils aient encore à la remercier de quelque chose. Veuillez donc, monsieur le maire, accepter au profit de la Caisse des pauvres le don de mille francs, somme proportionnée à nos facultés plutôt qu'à nos désirs, et que nous vous prions de vouloir bien inscrire au nom de ma bien-aimée épouse, M^{me} Henriette Mill, née Hardy, décédée à Avignon le 3 novembre 1858.

Agréez. . . .

J. Stuart Mill

331.

TO JAMES BENTHAM MILL [1](#)

[After November 3, 1858]

[Mill, in writing to his brother James after his bereavement, says:—]

When I was happy, I never went after any one; those that wanted me might come to me.

332.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON [1](#)

Hotel d'Europe, Avignon

Nov. 9, 1858

My Dear Thornton—

The hopes with which I commenced this journey have been fatally frustrated. My wife, the companion of all my feelings, the prompter of all my best thoughts, the guide of all my actions, is gone! She was taken ill at this place with a violent attack of bronchitis or pulmonary congestion—the medical men here could do nothing for her, & before the physician at Nice [2](#) who saved her life once before could arrive, all was over.

It is doubtful if I shall ever be fit for anything public or private, again. The spring of my life is broken. But I shall best fulfil her wishes by not giving up the attempt to do something useful, and I am not quite alone. I have with me her daughter, the one person besides myself who most loved her & whom she most loved, & we help each other to bear what is inevitable. I am sure of your sympathy, but if you knew what she was you would feel how little any sympathy can do.³

We return straight to England but shall be detained here for some days longer & I beg of you the kind office of inserting the inclosed notice twice in the Times & once in the Post, Herald & Daily News & in the principal weekly papers. Believe me my dear Thornton

Very Sincerely Yours

[The Notice]

Died on the 3^d November, at Avignon, after a few days illness, to the inexpressible grief & irreparable loss of those who survive her, Harriet, the dearly loved wife of John Stuart Mill, late of the East India House.⁴

333.

TO DR. HENRY CECIL GURNEY¹

Blackheath Nov. 24. 1858

Dear Dr Gurney

The sum which Sir J.O.² received shall be paid into your banker's as soon as the proceeds of the sale of some securities come in which will be on the 1st of December. It is well earned by the sacrifices you made³ & above all, the risks you incurred to health & practice in the hope of saving that precious life—& though I am not in circumstances to think lightly of such a sum, I never less grudged any payment. Would to God it had been all I have & that we had written to you three days sooner! You did all that man could, & your presence was an immense good to us even as it was. We⁴ have only just arrived here, having remained at Avignon to see her removed to her (& our) last resting place & to complete the purchase of a small house & garden near the cemetery⁵ which we shall now frequently require. Helen's health kept up while we remained at Avignon but broke down as soon as we arrived here: She is however better today & I hope is doing well. She begs to be kindly remembered to you. To myself the return to the place which is full of memories unlike those of that dreadful time is soothing—but no one except ourselves can know what a blank our life now is.

I Am Dear Dr Gurney Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

334.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath

Nov. 25. 1858

Dear Sir

I trust you will not have supposed that your note would have remained unanswered from any other cause than my not having received it. It came into my hands two days ago, on my returning from a journey on the Continent, which was abruptly closed by the most melancholy event² which could possibly have happened to me. I have now next to nothing left to care for in life, except to use such power as I have of helping forward my opinions—which it is uncertain if I shall ever again have energy enough, even if left to myself I had wisdom enough, effectually to serve by anything I can write. I have only the greater desire to be useful to fellow labourers in the same field of usefulness, and I have so many opinions and modes of thinking in common with you that I regard you as one of the principal of these. You may therefore rely on me in any quarter in which I have influence—but I have no ground for believing that Lord Stanley³ is one of these. I have seen him in private just three times—the first was when he offered me a place in the Council of India⁴—the last when I took leave of him on my retirement. We have conversed exactly once on any topic of public interest. He has on these different occasions been very polite and flattering, but I have no reason to think that he retained any interest in me from the time when he knew that I was not going to serve under him. The mode of transacting business which he has adopted, almost exclusively with the Chairmen of Committees of Council, has not brought him into much contact with the officers of the India House, and I had therefore no opportunity of acquiring any influence with him. This being the case it would be an impertinence in me to volunteer any recommendation to him, especially if it relates to the patronage of another minister, a case in which, as I know, ministers have generally the strongest feeling of delicacy about intermeddling even in the slightest manner. I am therefore unable to help you in the way you propose; but if you think it can be of any use to you to mention me, in any terms however strong, either verbally or in writing, to any minister or other person whatever, as one who would derive the greatest satisfaction both public and private from your obtaining what you seek—and who would think it a credit to any minister to obtain the aid of abilities and principles like yours for the public service, and an absolute disgrace not to avail himself of them when offered—you have my fullest authority to do this—and there are some members even of the present Government, especially Bulwer⁵ and

Disraeli,⁶ on whom so decided an opinion from me if known to them might perhaps have some influence.

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

335.

TO GEORGE GROTE¹

Blackheath, 28th November 1858

My Dear Grote

I knew that you would feel with me and for me. Your letter has done as much good to me and to my fellow-sufferers as we are now capable of receiving.

If I were to attempt to express in the most moderate terms what she was, even you would hardly believe me. Without any personal tie, merely to have known her as I do would have been enough to make life a blank now that she has disappeared from it. I seem to have cared for things or persons, events, opinions on the future of the world, only because she cared for them: the sole motive that remains strong enough to give any interest to life is the desire to do what she would have wished; but will this give the strength or the energy to do any new thing? Perhaps not. I shall try, however. I can at least put in order for publication what had been already written in concert with her, and this is my occupation for the present.

Pray express to Mrs Grote my gratitude for her kind sympathy. I will write again soon.

336.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath Park

Nov. 28. 1858

Dear Sir

The concluding words of my note² were for yourself only. But you have my full authority to say, to all and sundry, wherever and whenever it can be of any use to you,

that I take the strongest interest in your application, that I should derive the greatest satisfaction both on private and on public grounds from your success, and (in the words I before used) should think it a credit to any minister to obtain the aid of abilities and principles like yours for the public service, and an absolute disgrace not to avail himself of them when offered.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

Herbert Spencer Esq.

337.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Blackheath Park

Nov. 30. 1858

Dear Sir

You can have my little book "On Liberty"² for publication this season. The manuscript is ready; but you will probably desire to look through it, or to have it looked through by some one in whom you confide, as there are some things in it which may give offence to prejudices.

Should you decide to publish it, I propose that we should make the same arrangement as we made for the Political Economy, viz. to publish one edition at half profit, and if another is called for, make a fresh agreement respecting it.

I have also, prepared for publication, a selection of my articles³ published in periodicals which I should like to bring out somewhat later in the season. If it would suit you, I propose the same terms. There are enough to make, I should think, two volumes of the size & type of the early editions of Carlyle's Miscellanies:⁴ but I have not calculated exactly, and it *may* extend to three. I send you a list of the subjects.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Y^{Rs}

J. S. Mill

1. The Right & Wrong of State Interference with Corporation & Church Property.

2. The Currency Juggle.
3. A few remarks on The French Revolution.
4. Thoughts on Poetry & its Varieties.
5. Professor Sedgwick's Discourse on the Studies of Cambridge.
6. Civilization.
7. Aphorisms.
8. Armand Carrel.
9. Writings of Alfred de Vigny.
10. Bentham.
11. Coleridge.
12. Tocqueville on Democracy in America.
13. Bailey on Berkeley's Theory of Vision.
14. Michelet's History of France.
15. The Claims of Labour.
16. Guizot's Essays & Lectures on History.
17. Early Grecian History & Legend.
18. Vindication of the French Revol^t of February 1848, in reply to Lord Brougham & others.
19. Enfranchisement of Women.
20. Whewell on Moral Philosophy.
21. Grote's History of Greece.

338.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

[November ? 1858]

[In reply to my condolence, he said] I have recovered the shock as much as I ever shall. Henceforth, I shall be only a conduit for ideas.

339.

TO LOUIS NICOLAS MÉNARD¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] 1 Decembre 1858.

Mon Cher M. Ménard—

Comme vous avez bien voulu témoigner le désir d'avoir de nos nouvelles, j'écris uniquement pour vous en donner, car je ne me sens pas encore capable d'écrire une lettre qui puisse vous intéresser à tout autre égard. Nous sommes arrivés sans accident et la santé de ma chère fille s'est soutenue jusqu'à la fin du voyage mais pour s'ébranler aussitôt après. Dès le lendemain elle fut malade mais elle est à présent à peu près rétablie et j'espère qu'elle s'y maintiendra. Elle et son frère se recommandent à votre souvenir. Quant à moi j'ai éprouvé un véritable soulagement

en me retrouvant dans le lieu où nous avons vécu heureux avec celle que nous déplorons, et où son image n'est pas mêlée aux souvenirs déchirants de sa dernière maladie. Votre ville et tout le pays du midi me seraient en horreur si son tombeau n'y était pas—ce qui en fait pour moi un lieu non seulement sacré mais le seul, sauf celui-ci, qui me soit cher.

J'espère que l'éditeur² de la traduction française de mon Ec.Pol. vous en a envoyé de ma part un exemplaire. Vous y trouverez, si je ne me trompe, autre chose qu'un simple traité scientifique, et j'aime à croire que ce que vous y verrez de mes opinions et de mes sentiments ne sera pas de nature à affaiblir la sympathie morale et intellectuelle que vous avez semblé ressentir envers moi.

Agréez mon cher M Ménard avec l'expression de notre reconnaissance, celle de mon amitié et de mon dévouement.

J.S.M.

J'espère que M^{me} M. se porte bien et que la santé de votre petite demoiselle se rétablit.

340.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

B[lackheath] P[ark], Dec. 4, 1858

Dear Sir—

Your letter found me under the shock of the bitterest calamity which could possibly have fallen on me. I have lost by a death, which may almost be called sudden, my perfect friend, companion, guide, teacher, all in one. The little you saw of her may have been enough to make you surmise that there was much more to see, but nothing I could say could give you the smallest idea of what she was or of what her loss is to me.

You will not wonder that I care very little now for speculative controversies. I am obliged to you however for sending Professor Apelt's² treatise, & the other pamphlet. I have not yet looked into them, but the passages you cite from Apelt are sufficient to convince me that I should not in any case have thought of answering him. If you are yourself inclined to append to the translation any remarks on his objections, they are sure to be fresher & more vigorous than mine would be, & are likely to be a valuable addition to the book itself.

I wait with much expectation for your historical essay.³ My small volume on Liberty⁴ will be published early this winter. Its subject is moral, social, & intellectual liberty, asserted against the despotism of society whether exercised by governments or by public opinion.

341.

TO ARTHUR HARDY¹

Blackheath

Dec. 5—1858

My Dear Sir—

Before receiving this you will already have heard the terrible & most unexpected blow which has fallen upon us. I have not felt equal to writing to you before & now when I do, language is so utterly incapable of expressing such a loss, or what that loss is to us, that it is sickening to attempt it. But you will desire to know some of the sad details. We left England on the 12th of October, intending to pass the winter at Hyères, where she had wintered once before or at some other place in the south of France. For the first time we were able to do as we pleased as I had just retired from the I. H. & we were looking forward to a happy half year or year in a mild climate. She was apparently in her usual health, perhaps even better than usual, & as fit for travelling as when she set out on other much longer journeys by which her health had not suffered but benefitted. She continued pretty well up to Lyons, but when there she had a sharp feverish attack, which yielded to the usual remedies but left a good deal of cough behind it. We staid there a week, at the end of which she felt sufficiently recovered to go slowly onward, but the day after we arrived at Avignon she was again taken very ill—she was better the next day, but the improvement was not progressive—and a great shortness of breathing came on. She had the best medical men the place afforded but as usual with French physicians their remedies were not sufficiently powerful & after a few days becoming alarmed though we never suspected immediate danger, I wrote to D^r Gurney of Nice² who attended her in a dangerous illness there in 1853, asking him to come over & see her. He came instantly but found all at an end! The very day before her last we thought her illness had taken a favorable turn. From the symptoms D^r Gurney thinks the cause of death was excessive & violent congestion of the lungs. She is buried in the cemetery of the town of Avignon & with her all our earthly happiness; we have henceforth no interest in life but to fulfil her wishes in all we can, & to return continually to her grave. We have bought a small house & garden near the cemetery, where we shall go early in spring & intend to pass much of our time there until our turn comes for being buried along with her. Algernon would have written to you if I had not, but I wished to write myself if able. He & Helen are pretty well, though Helen at one time broke down & had an attack of illness, but fortunately it proved short. It is useless to write more. Believe me yrs very truly

Arthur Hardy Esq

342.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 6. 1858.

Dear Sir

I understand that a difficulty has arisen with respect to the publication of my friend Mr Bain's second volume (which completes his work as an Analytical Treatise on the Mind)² in consequence of the limited sale of the first volume, which though not discouraging as to prospects of ultimate success, has not yet repaid its expenses. Both Mr Grote and myself are very desirous that the remaining volume should be published, as it is more popular than the first both in subject and in execution and we think it likely not only to sell better but to add to the sale of its predecessor. We are therefore willing, if you will publish the second volume this season, to guarantee you against loss by it, to the extent of £100 (that is each of us to the extent of £50). I mean that if at the end of such time as you would be willing to wait for indemnification (and which should be agreed on) you are still a loser by vol. 2 we will make up the loss if short of £100, & pay £100 towards it if greater; the subsequent proceeds being applied to our indemnification.

I should like to stipulate that if we then pay up the whole of your loss by both volumes, the entire copyright should belong to us—that is to Mr Bain himself to whom we should transfer it. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

343.

TO JANE MILL FERRABOSCHI¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Dec. 13. 1858

Dear Jane

Your letter to Avignon was sent to me here. I thank you for your expressions of sympathy. But you cannot know, nor can anything I could say enable you to conceive, the immensity of my loss.

I am glad to hear that your health is so much better. When you write to Mary or Harriet, please to thank them for their letters, and to give my best remembrances to Mr Ferraboschi.

Yrs Aff^Y

J. S. Mill

344.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Dec. 21. [1858]

Dear Chadwick

I am quite disposed to give you such help as I can in fighting the questions you are at work upon. In happier circumstances I might have assisted actively by personal exertions. I always meditated joining the Law Amendment Society² when we returned from abroad. I can now only work with my pen. You shall have the letter you mention, if you think it would be useful to the object, but before writing it I should like to read your paper³ once more quietly through.

With regard to Parliam^{ty} Reform, what you urge me to do is already done. I have a pamphlet⁴ by me, written several years ago, which only required a little adaptation to the present time. This it has received, and I propose publishing it about the time of the meeting of Parliament. If the knowledge of this would in any way interest Lord Grey,⁵ I should be glad that you should tell him. I cannot hope that he will agree with the whole of what I have written, but I believe he will with a considerable part of it. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

345.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

Dec. 22 1858

Dear Mary—

I received your letter addressed to Avignon & in writing recently to Jane² I asked her to thank you for it.

You always write as if you had some great reason to complain of me & as if some caprice of mine had been the cause of the estrangement as you call it. I have always told you & now repeat that your own conduct & manifestations of feeling were the sole cause of the existence of any estrangement & you have given no sign from that time to this that your conduct and feelings had been in any way wrongly interpreted.

J.S.M.

346.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Dec. 30. 1858

Dear Chadwick

I am obliged to you for the opportunity of reading Lord Grey's paper,² and am glad that he is applying himself to the subject with a view both to present exigencies and to permanent principles. It is very desirable that his suggestions should be made as public as possible to invite discussion and call out other modes of effecting the same object. The essential is, as you observe, that the object itself should be recognized as necessary. My own thoughts on the matter have been travelling in a rather different channel, except as to the representation of minorities, which I have long held to be of the utmost importance, and also that the cumulative voting which Lord Grey advocates³ is the best mode of effecting it. His suggestion of the choice of a certain number of members by the House itself seems to me very valuable.⁴ I have often thought of it as a good mode of constituting an Upper House in a democratic constitution, but never before as applicable to any of the members of the Lower House itself. But I do not think they should, in the latter case, be chosen for life. There are considerable objections to making a small, and the least popular section of the House, a kind of privileged order within it, and still greater objections to their being irremovable. And what weighs with me quite as much, is the importance, when

working against the current, of retaining whatever advantage is to be found in adhering to the old constitutional landmarks. It conflicts with everybody's idea of a House of Commons that any of its members should hold their seats for life. The same objection applies still more strongly to the proposal that the Crown should appoint a certain number of members by warrant.⁵ There would not, I think, be a chance that this could be carried, or that even if carried it would be permanent, and it seems unnecessary, since election by the House itself at the commencement of each Parliament would answer the same purpose. The ministers, being the leaders of the majority, would in fact nominate two thirds of the number, while the provision for cumulative voting would give a similar power over the remaining third to the leaders of the Opposition: and each side would have a strong interest in selecting to be brought into Parliament in this manner the persons who would most strengthen the party. In spite of these and all other objections, I should much prefer Lord Grey's plan exactly as it is, to a low suffrage and equal electoral districts without any regulating counterpoise.

Your letter in the D. News is excellent.⁶ But I am afraid, on that subject as on so many others, *jacta est alea*.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1859

347.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 2. 1859.

Dear Chadwick

I returned Lord Grey's paper² by post yesterday to your address. I now return Mr Greg's.³ I agree with him in expecting no substantial improvement in the representative system at present. But I differ from him, among many other things, in thinking that some bill will certainly pass.⁴ None of the parties will wish the question to lie over and give rise to a prolonged agitation. There will be a compromise. What is done may be little in amount, & that little may be more bad than good. All we can do is to point out what are the evils, and throw out suggestions which will lead people's minds in a right direction so far as they can be got to attend to them. Your letter⁵ (which I return) is very valuable in this way. But a letter in a newspaper is too little read—I wish you could get out your matter in some better form.

I have never been able to agree with you and Mr Greg about voting papers.⁶ I do not doubt their benefit in the election of poor law guardians. But in political elections, a person who does not *care* to vote will seldom give a good vote. He will be assailed by canvassers who will not leave him until they have seen him fill up his voting paper. It is possible that more conservative votes might be given in that way. So much the worse. When things get into a state in which any person of my opinions can wish for the success of the conservative candidate, conservative voters will have got quite sufficiently frightened to come up to the poll.

But I expect no good so long as any election expenses whatever, borne by the candidate himself, are permitted by law.⁷ Liberalism & Conservatism ought to unite in putting down that greatest of existing abuses. As for the measure to be expected from the present Government—all that anybody can know of it is, that it will be all trick.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

348.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Jan. 10. 1859.

Dear Chadwick

I return Lord Grey's two letters.² Independently of the hopelessness of carrying a provision for life members in a representative assembly, I should fear that to assign a superior status to one section of the House would by exciting antagonism between the elective majority and the permanent minority, do more harm than good even to the interests which the life members would represent.

I see no tenable ground for resisting the democracy of mere numbers, but by directly and openly asserting two broad principles—that every one is entitled to *some* voice in the representation, and that every *intelligent* person is entitled to a *more potential* voice.

If it has not occurred to Lord Grey, it would be worth suggesting to him (as he is not a politician of routine, or afraid to entertain new proposals) that one of the most conservative as well as most liberal provisions in a reform bill would be to give the franchise to all women who fulfil the rating or other conditions required of men. There is precedent for this in local elections:³ the women enfranchised would be almost solely those of the higher and middle ranks—& the immediate effects would undoubtedly be highly favorable to conservatism.

On the question of the dockyard labourers I agree with Mr Greg.⁴ Unless all who are in a dependent condition could be disfranchised, I see no good but harm in excluding a single class. In this country of publicity the Government influence is the least bad of the bad influences.

Yrs Faithfully

J. S. Mill

349.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, Jan. 12, 1859.

You will not have been surprised at my not answering your letter of Dec. 10.² I am however sincerely thankful to you for it. No letter that I have received did me more

good, and it is a real pleasure to think that, so little as you saw of her, should have made so true an impression. If I understand you rightly in your last letter as offering to translate the little book on Liberty,³ I could not desire any better fate for it, supposing that when you have read it, you think it likely to be successful and useful in Germany. I will take care that you have one of the earliest copies or the sheets, if you will let me know the safest mode of sending it, as the title might cause it to be stopped at the post or further on, under the idea of its being political. . . .

350.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

B[lackheath]

Jan. 13, 1859

Dear Mary—

It is well you have at last perceived that it was not likely I should be inclined to commence a discussion with you about the past. Such things are either cleared up at the time or not at all. I have no ill will to you & am quite willing to put the best interpretation that the case admits of, upon everything that has happened between us. But I do not expect that I shall ever again wish to *see* any person (two or three excepted) unless on necessary business or for some public purpose. The melancholy life I have before me would be quite insupportable if I could not be left alone with those who are fellow sufferers with me & who feel as I do.

351.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Jan. 20. 1859.

Dear Chadwick

I write, without waiting to go through your paper, to say that it would be very repugnant to me at present to make any sort of public appearance—even that of attending a meeting. In any case I should not have liked that my first connection with the Law Amendment Society² should be by taking the chair—an office, too, which it requires much more experience than I have had of public meetings to be qualified for. When I return from abroad I shall probably ask you or some one else to propose me as a member of the Society. I may probably then be desirous of moving actively for the promotion of public objects.

I will write you the letter I promised,[3](#) without delay, and make any suggestions that occur to me about the paper itself.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

352.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK[1](#)

Blackheath

Jan. 21. 1859

Dear Chadwick

I inclose a letter[2](#) which I hope will serve your purpose.

I have scratched over the margin of your proof with suggested alterations, very slight in appearance but which would make a great difference in the intelligibility of the paper. It is very carelessly written as to the mere construction of the sentences. Some of the proposed alterations in page 2 have a further object—attained however by equally slight changes—that of avoiding a slur upon Malthus, not at all required for your purpose.

After revisal of the composition, it is a very telling paper.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

353.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK[1](#)

Blackheath

Jan. 21. 1859.

Dear Chadwick

I have read carefully twice over your paper on the advantage of enquiry by Commissions as a preparation for legislation,[2](#) and specially for Parliamentary

Reform; and I not only agree with you entirely on the general principle, but also in thinking Parliamentary Reform a very strong case for its application. Disfranchisement indeed, may be sufficiently judged of from general principles and notorious facts; but when the question is, how far to carry *enfranchisement*, few persons, I should think, are rash enough to imagine that they have nothing important still to learn respecting the new classes of voters to be created—their numbers, their local distribution, their degree of education (even the number of them who can read and write); their amenability to corruption, the probability of their exercising the franchise if conferred, and the influences under which they are likely to exercise it. If the franchise is to stop anywhere short of universal suffrage, or to arrive even at that by any succession of steps, the choice of the intermediate measures must necessarily be more or less a question of statistics; and the statistics of the whole subject are in their infancy. Even on so narrow a point as the admission of the £10 householders in the small towns to vote for the counties,³ all is uncertainty as to the nature of the change it would make in the composition of the county constituencies.

Your paper cannot be too much read, or too widely circulated.

I am

Dear Chadwick
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Edwin Chadwick Esqu.

354.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Jan. 26 [1859].

Dear Chadwick

I have gone through your proof,² which requires as much correction in the wording as the other did. I do not know if my pencil marks are legible. Your facts are very striking, and the view of the subject one which it is of great importance to exhibit. But I do not well see where your principle is to stop, or at what place you would draw the line of demarcation between it and conflicting principles. You had better I think, not trouble yourself with what socialist writers have said against competition: It is much better that your results should be seen to come, as they do, from your own thoughts and observations.

You should not have proposed me as a member of the Law Amendment Society without asking me first.³ I should have much preferred not joining it till my return. I expect to be abroad at least a year, and I certainly shall not go near the Society till afterwards. I shall not leave finally for the Continent till some two months hence.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

355.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

[February ? 1859]

[His pamphlet on *Parliamentary Reform*, written some years previously, was revised and sent to press. On this he remarked in a letter:—] Grote, I am afraid, will not like it, on account of the ballot,² if not other points. But I attach importance to it, as a sort of revision of the theory of representative government.

356.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

[February ? 1859]

[A few days later he wrote—] Grote knows that I now differ with him on the ballot,² and we have discussed it together, with no effect on either.

357.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

[February, 1859]

[In 1859 J.S. Mill sent Holyoake a copy of his essay *On Liberty*, asking him not to review it until the other reviewers had done so.]

It is likely enough to be called an infidel book in any case; but I would rather that people were not *prompted* to call it so.

358.

TO [JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, JR. ?][1](#)

Blackheath

Tuesday
[February, 1859?]

Dear Sir

I shall be quite unable to write anything during my stay here—and an article on the French treaty[2](#) should be written immediately. Besides I never write well unless I feel moved to write on the particular subject—which on this subject I do not. I hope soon to find something suitable to Fraser.[3](#)

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

359.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK[1](#)

Blackheath

Feb. 7. 1859

Dear Chadwick

Strange as you seem to think it, I have voted at every election since I have been qualified, and have attended one electoral meeting in my own district. That meeting (here at Blackheath) gave a very favourable reception to language and doctrines far from demagogic. It is true there was little or no catechizing, and little indication of the degree of political information of the electors. I am quite aware from other evidence of the density of ignorance among the bulk of the English population—of *all* classes I might say: certainly of the working and lower middle class. The new introduction by the Government of a reading and writing qualification[2](#) I regard as a striking proof of the utter want of principle of their Conservatism.

Have you seen Hare's book (the Charity Commissioner) on Representation?[3](#) If not I beg you to read it without delay. It seems to me most masterly in theory and of the greatest possible practical value.

Voting papers, except in the form in which Hare admits them, I am more opposed to than ever, for it seems to me that they make bribery and intimidation both much easier and much more certainly effectual.

I am obliged to you for a sight of Gaultier.⁴ It is very sound and as you say, a good logical *exercise*. Shall I return it to you or to Gilbert,⁵ whose name I see is in it?

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

(1) Why say *understated*? Your opponents charge you with overstatement. It would be better to deny both. [*Scored through.*]

(2) That when, of the measures I proposed, any prominent part was omitted by the legislature, it has invariably happened that on subsequent experience, impartial persons have independently represented the necessity of its being restored; & that whenever any of those measures has been even imperfectly adopted, a more extensive application of it has been subsequently demanded, & in many instances, made.

(3) restricted by charges, which might be reduced to less than half their amount not only without loss, but with positive benefit to the shareholders; who would also be gainers by reducing the rates for conveyances of goods, to the immense advantage of the metropolis & the great towns by cheapening &c.

(4) by persons carefully selected for the task, before introducing bills on important subjects into Parliament

(5) recommended such previous enquiry as a necessary preparation for measures of Parliamentary Reform.

(6) Until this evil shall be cured discrimination is in my opinion necessary in extending the elective franchise.

(7) These, however, if I were elected, I should consider it my duty to examine, whenever my duty to my constituents & to the country required that I should possess a knowledge of them.

360.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Feb. 24 [1859].

Dear Chadwick

I have just returned from Avignon² and have found your notes waiting for me. I hasten to return the supplementary matter of your paper—the detention of which I much regret as this being apparently the original manuscript, you may have been prevented from sending it to the press. The matter is all telling and useful. But the short paper *1A3* would I think require more working out to produce its proper effect. The objection that will be made to paper B is, that you select the best cases of the working of nomination and the worst of popular election, and that nomination very seldom gave the particular good results you depict—scarcely oftener than a good representative system would. Still, there is a point to be made though it is not so exactly germane to your immediate purpose—enquiry by a commission—as paper A is. By the way *did* Bristol reject *Romilly*?⁴ Are you not thinking of its rejection of Burke?⁵

I am glad you coincide with so much of the pamphlet.⁶

Very Truly Yrs

J. S. Mill

361.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

le 26 février 1859

Monsieur

A mon retour d'une absence, j'ai trouvé votre billet du 7 février. Je suis très flatté que vous ayez eu même la pensée de traduire mon petit livre.² Rien ne pourrait lui être plus avantageux que d'être traduit par une plume comme la vôtre; et rien ne saurait m'agréer davantage, pourvu toutefois qu'après l'avoir lu tout entier, vous persistiez dans votre désir. Car il est certain que nous représentons, vous et moi, en quelque sorte, deux systèmes opposés, et je trouverais très naturel que vous pussiez regarder mon ouvrage comme à tout prendre, plus nuisible qu'utile. Il est vrai que comme nous possédons chacun la philosophie de nos opinions respectives, nous sommes, mieux que beaucoup d'autres adversaires, faits pour nous entendre.

Je suis, Monsieur, avec la plus haute considération

Votre D evou e Serviteur

J. S. Mill

362.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

March 2. 1859

Dear Sir

On returning from an absence² I find your note. It is a great encouragement to me that you agree so fully with me on the various points touched on in the pamphlet.³ The idea of combining double voting ( lection   deux degr es) for the less educated with direct voting for those of higher qualifications is well worth considering as a mode of making the distinction in a manner probably less obnoxious to the "opinion d mocratique" than the plural voting which I proposed not as an immediately practical measure but as a standard of theoretic excellence. I have however had a complete adhesion to it by *one* Chartist leader of some weight.⁴

Have you happened to see Hare's book on Representation.⁵ I have not been so delighted with any political treatise for many years.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

363.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath

March 2, 1859

Dear Sir

There is now no longer any need for reserve respecting the Liberty.² as it has received almost all the notices from the newspapers and weekly periodicals which it is likely to have.³ There has been an amount of response to it far beyond what I expected.

I was very much pleased with your oration on Owen.[4](#)

I wish that in quoting from some paper a recommendation for taking all taxes off “industry” and laying them all on “realized property” you had taken occasion to protest against the iniquity of the proposal—which I have shewn very fully in my Pol. Economy.[5](#) Why should those who save, pay all the taxes for those who have spent all they got? A necessary consequence too would be that those who will not consent to pay any part of the taxes must be willing to renounce all control by their votes over the levying and expending of them, otherwise it would be exactly as if the poor rates were voted and expended by the paupers. There would be no limit to the taxes they would exact from other people for their own emolument or pleasure. A heavy tax on *inherited* property I do not object to.

I am glad you agree with me about plural voting.[6](#)

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

364.

TO ARNOLD RUGE[1](#)

Blackheath

March 2. 1859

Dear Dr Ruge

On returning from Avignon[2](#) I find your note. I am grateful for the sympathy it expresses and only wish that you had known her who is gone sufficiently to know what a feeble and inadequate expression that dedication[3](#) gives of what she was. While she lived, she never sought to be known beyond her small circle of intimates—but now it seems perfectly shocking that the world should be utterly unaware of the treasure it has lost.

I am glad that you are so usefully and interestingly occupied in writing for your country and I shall be much pleased to read the article you mention.[4](#) I am aware that my little book[5](#) is, generally speaking, as little needed in Germany as it is much here. Citizenship and political activity are what Germany most wants, and I trust is again in the road towards acquiring. I am

Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

365.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

March 3, 1859.

Dear Sir

Having been absent from home² it is only within the last few days that I have had an opportunity of reading and studying your book³ —which I have done with no ordinary feelings. You appear to me to have exactly, and for the first time, solved the difficulty of popular representation; and by doing so, to have raised up the cloud of gloom and uncertainty which hung over the futurity of representative government and therefore of civilization. That you are right in theory I never could have doubted, and as to practice, having begun with a great natural distrust of what seemed a very complicated set of arrangements, I ended by being convinced that the plan is workable, and effectually guarded or guardable against fraud. In the details I have as yet found only one point which, it seems to me, might be improved, and that is so minor a one as hardly to be worth mentioning. You propose that (assuming the quota to be 2000) the *first* 2000 votes a candidate obtains at the place for which he stands, should be counted for his return, and his name struck out of all *subsequent* voting papers. Should it not be the *last* 2000 rather than the first? Otherwise there is a premium on hanging back from the poll; the later votes having more power than the earlier ones, inasmuch as after the attainment of their first object, their second votes also are counted.

Excuse my offering this very small criticism on a scheme for which I shall henceforth be a zealous apostle.⁴ I am as sanguine as you are yourself respecting the moral and political effects of it, which would far transcend anything that is apparent at first sight. A thing so complete will not however be attained at one step, and it is therefore mortifying that the principle of representation of minorities is not in some way recognized (however imperfectly it might be realized) by the ministerial Reform Bill.

Allow me to add that while I so entirely concur both in the principles of your book and in its practical proposals, I have also the good fortune to agree with most even of your incidental remarks on things in general. I am

Yours With Great Respect

J. S. Mill

366.

TO JAMES LORIMER¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 3. 1859.

Dear Sir

Allow me to thank you for your very interesting treatise² which, having been absent, I have only just had an opportunity of reading. We agree to a considerable extent in our practical views, particularly in the important point (almost new I think in the theory of representation) that the proper safeguard against the undue preponderance of a class more numerous than all others taken together, is not the exclusion of anybody, but the *graduation* of influence proportionally to just claims. Between *some* influence and *more* influence, the ratio is finite and appreciable, but between some and none at all it is mathematically infinite. No one could without voluntary degradation admit that he ought to be counted for *nothing*, though every reasonable person is eager to admit that there are persons entitled to be counted for more than himself.

But while we agree thus far we differ very much on other points. I would not give any one a plurality of votes in consequence of any merely *social* superiority, and your general principle of making the representative assembly an exact reflection of existing inequalities of weight and position seems to me liable to very strong objections, with which as I shall probably write something on the matter, I will not trouble you here.

I would also include women in the ultimate universal suffrage that you contemplate—which as far as I can collect from a note in your book, you would not do. I think your principles break down altogether if you allow of any exception among persons *sui juris*. I am

Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

367.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

March 4. 1859.

My Dear Monsieur Louis Blanc

Having been absent² I only received your kind and sympathizing note a few days ago, and have not until now had time or heart to write to you in acknowledgment of it. I feel a tie between myself and every one who knowing even a little of her, valued and appreciated her to the extent of their opportunities. I do not speak from feeling but from long standing and sober conviction in saying that when she died this country lost the greatest mind it contained. You cannot know what she was privately, but you, more than most men can sympathize in the nobleness of her public objects, which never stopped short of perfect distributive justice as the final aim, implying therefore a state of society entirely communist in practice and spirit, whether also in institutions or not. This entire faith in the ultimate possibilities of human nature was drawn from her own glorious character, while her keen perception of present difficulties and obstacles was derived from her wonderful practical discernment, and comprehension of life. I am

Y^{Rs} Most Sincerely

J. S. Mill

368.

TO HORACE GRANT¹

Blackheath

March 4, 1859

Dear Grant

Since my return from Avignon a week ago, I have had so many things to attend to that I have not, till now, had time to express to you how deeply interested I feel in your account of your health. I suppose the medicine they gave you to stop hemorrhage was sugar of lead, the most effectual of styptics but which always disorders the stomach dreadfully. That effect however will go off, if only the bleeding does not return. It is consolatory that the pulmonary disease did not appear on examination to have advanced. When organic disease exists, hemorrhage may at any time shew itself without marking any fresh advance of the malady.

I recognized your accustomed kind attention in sending the Daily News and the Athenaeum. The D. N. had on last Monday week an attack on the pamphlet,² not at all in harmony with the previous article.³

I have not yet been able to look at the little book of your Quaker friend.⁴

Hickson has probably told you that I hope to be able to walk across to Fairseat before I leave England.

Y^{Rs} Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

369.

TO WILLIAM E. HICKSON¹

Blackheath

March 4, 1859.

Dear Hickson

I inclose directions for taking the Bromide of Potassium. I should think the two cases somewhat similar, as the temporary paralysis was caused in my wife's case by an injury to the spine, suffered in a carriage.² It is right to say that she took iodine at the same time, according to the prescription I send. But the iodine did not apparently do any good until she added the bromine to it.

Thanks for your musical present. It is a great advantage to you as it is to me, and very useful under depression, to be interested in a great *variety* of things. I will refer again to "Time and Faith"³ on the subject of M. Aurelius,⁴ and should be very happy if so great a character could be exculpated. But, being the *inferior* of the two, I fear he must be held responsible even for Verus.

I Am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

370.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath

March 4. 1859

Dear Sir

I fully expected, both that you would go heartily with me in the main object of the little book on Liberty, and also that you would think it does not go far enough. Any difference that there can be between us in the matter can only, however, be on points of detail, not of principle. There are none of your writings which I admire more than your "Over-Legislation".²

I see I omitted to send you a pamphlet I have published on Parliamentary Reform.³ I send it by this post. But I recommend to you, as much better than it (if not already known to you) the book by Hare the Charity Commissioner on "the election of representatives".⁴ I am much mistaken if you will not recognize in it a combination of theoretic wisdom and practical sagacity very rarely found in any writings on such subjects.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yrs.

J. S. Mill

371.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 6 mars 1859

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

A mon retour d'une absence j'ai trouvé votre bonne et affectueuse lettre. J'y reconnais une sincérité de sympathie qui toujours soulage un peu le malheur dont elle ne console point. Je voudrais pouvoir de quelque façon que se soit, vous rendre ce bien. Si j'avais pu vous faire connaître celle qui n'est plus, il me semble que je vous aurais plus que payé de tout bienfait et de toute amitié qu'il eût été possible de recevoir. Elle était, non seulement le coeur le plus aimant et l'âme la plus élevée, mais aussi l'esprit le plus profond et le jugement le plus infallible qu'il m'a été donné de connaître. Tout ce qu'on trouve de meilleur dans mes écrits n'est que la plus pâle réflexion de ses lumières et de sa grande âme—et l'on s'en apercevra bien, je le crains, dans ce qui me reste à faire, malgré tous mes efforts pour me diriger toujours par son souvenir.

Vous me demandez comment cette catastrophe est arrivée. Nous étions en route pour le midi. Nous voulions passer l'hiver à Hyères et le printemps en Italie, peut-être à Florence. Quoique délicate, elle se portait bien lors de notre départ, mais la fatigue du voyage ou quelque cause inconnue a déterminé à Avignon une attaque de poitrine qui

quoique sérieuse, ne sembla dangereuse que le jour même qui fut le dernier de sa vie. Ainsi l'affranchissement que j'avais désiré, et dont je me promettais tant de bien pour nous deux, est devenu le malheur de ma vie—et c'est peu de chose encore, car Dieu sait que j'aurais racheté de tout mon bonheur sa simple existence même éloignée de moi. Il me semble que j'aurais pu tout supporter excepté qu'elle cessât d'être.

J'ai acheté une petite maison près de son tombeau, et je vous engage lorsque vous m'écrirez d'ici à une année, d'adresser vos lettres à Saint-Véran près Avignon, Vaucluse. Si je n'y suis pas, vos lettres m'arriveront plus vite que si vous les adressiez ici.

Votre Dévoué

J. S. Mill

Algernon Taylor vous remercie de votre souvenir et vous présente ses respects.

372.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 10 [1859]

Dear Chadwick

The reason why I think that voting papers would facilitate bribery and intimidation is, that the person who can influence a voter could actually stand by him and see him sign the paper.² In regard to bribery, a great additional motive would be created by the fact that the briber need no longer *trust* the bribee. He could have ocular demonstration that the voter fulfilled his bargain. In these respects the experience of the Poor Law elections is not much to the point, as there is comparatively little inducement either to bribe or intimidate at those elections.

Craik³ is entirely wrong in his arithmetic. If anything is as plain as that $2 + 2 = 4$, it is that with three persons to be elected, and cumulative voting, it would require a third plus one of the electors to be sure of returning one member. Craik's error is in supposing that while the one third concentrate all their votes on one candidate the two thirds will split theirs among three. Of course they would know better than to do that. They would only divide theirs between two, which would give them exactly the same power of carrying two candidates as the one third would have of carrying one. If either the two thirds or the one third aimed at more than they could do, while the other party did not, they would fail of doing the whole of what they *could* do. But this liability would be common to both sides, & to both in the same degree.

I am not disposed to republish Gaultier's book⁴ myself, but I should be very ready to give anybody a recommendation who would do it.

I very much hope you will read Hare⁵ and help to make the book known.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

373.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

March 12. 1859.

Dear Sir

Your note partakes of the comprehensive and thoughtful character of your book. I may well be pleased when, besides approving my suggestion,² you furnish me with arguments for it which I had not myself thought of. Your own third course, however, is the real thing; and though I agree with you that in the present stage your main idea should not be encumbered with minutiae which would make it less easily intelligible, this and all similar detailed improvements should be kept in reserve, to be brought out when the time actually comes for legislating on your principles. For the quality in your plan which will contribute most to make it take a strong hold of every competent mind which can be got to look into it, is precisely the finished perfection of adaptation of which it is susceptible. It is the only representative mechanism which is capable of fulfilling all the demands of principle. Every other is a mere rough piece of botching compared with it; and this character of the plan stands out so prominently when once it is understood, that it has a fair chance, if sufficiently promulgated, of being widely and enthusiastically taken up by the élite of the nation.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly,

J. S. Mill

374.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] March 17. 1859.

Dear Bain,—

I am glad that you like the Liberty so much & agree with so many of the heresies of the Reform pamphlet. With regard to the plural voting, one must not withhold one's opinion as to what is right in principle because one does not see one's way to getting it fully acted on. The right principle, put into a legislator's head, may decide his judgment on some important practical question involving the same principle. It is a great point also to meet the claims of mere numbers with something which appeals to the reason & sense of justice of the numbers themselves, which no other mode of inequality of political rights does. One must never suppose what is good in itself to be visionary because it may be far off. That this is not really visionary is illustrated by the fact that Holyoake² has already taken it up warmly & in the most unqualified form. We must remember too that the numerical majority are not the politically strongest force yet. The point to be decided is, how much power is to be yielded to them; & justice always affords the best basis for a compromise, which even if only temporary may be eminently useful.

Pray read Hare.³ His plan supersedes all that I or anyone else has said about grouping of boroughs representation of minorities &c by realizing all these ends through a self acting machinery in a degree of perfection almost ideal.

I am going to write to Reeve,⁴ & will inform you immediately of his answer.

Y^{Rs} Very Truly

375.

TO M. E. GRANT DUFF¹

Blackheath

March 20. 1859

Dear Sir

I am obliged to Mr Herzen² for his writings, and shall have pleasure in reading them. But I have not yet seen any one, except from necessity; and as I am going abroad very shortly, for an absence of some duration, there would be little use in commencing an acquaintance which I should not be able, for the present, to prosecute. After my return, I shall be happy to see Mr Herzen, if he should then wish it, and still more (I hope I need not say) yourself.

I Am
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

376.

TO GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS¹

Blackheath Park

March 20. 1859

My Dear Lewis

I agree with you that now is the first time (perhaps also the last) when a parliamentary reform might have a chance of being decided by reason, and not by the tug of hostile parties, each holding fast not by what it ought, but by what it can. It is important therefore that the opportunity should not be lost.

Respecting the ballot²—it is quite possible to make the secrecy of the act of voting quite independent of the voter's will; so that he shall be unable to make known his vote, in any other way than by pledging his veracity to it. If, however, the operation of the ballot were such as you consider probable, there would still be the great evil done of a recognition by the State that electors may vote as they please, and are not accountable for their vote as a moral act. This would not be the intention; but that it would be the popular interpretation of the ballot I feel sure. You must have observed that of late the most popular advocates of the ballot have actually rested its justification on the avowed doctrine that the suffrage is a *right* and not a *trust*; a doctrine which, even if there were no non-electors, would be enough to corrupt and destroy the purest democracy conceivable. There will never be honest or self-restraining government unless each individual participant feels himself a trustee for all his fellow citizens and for posterity. Certainly no Athenian voter thought otherwise.

Have you seen Hare's book on Representation?³ If not, let me beg you to read it. I think it both a monument of intellect, and of inestimable practical importance at the present moment. His suggestions appear to me the real basis of a reconciliation between Radicalism and Conservatism. Had I seen his book before writing my pamphlet I should have made it very different.

I Am
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill.

377.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath

March 27. 1859

Dear Sir

I am truly sorry that you have been so unwell, and that there is less chance than there seemed to be of your obtaining a position compatible with your pursuits.² I cannot but think, however, that there must be some posts (though fewer than formerly) which would suit your purpose. The difficulty is to know which they are, and to catch them before they are promised.

I did not propose to give votes *at present* to *all* who can pass my elementary test—unless plural votes were given to the higher grades of education in all classes. Neither do I propose an educational test as in itself perfect, but as being better than a property test. If education is not a complete guarantee against being swayed by class interests, often ill understood, property is still less so. What you say of the shoemakers³ only shews, at worst, that they are no better than the shipowners—and probably in this instance less ignorant; for the shoemakers, most likely, suffer more real inconvenience from the sewing machines, than the shipowners from foreign competition.

I think your principle of attaching direct taxation to representation,⁴ a very important one. If the taxes were to be spent under the control of those who fancy they do not pay them, they would think they could never lay on too much, or spend it too lavishly. I am afraid however I should come under the same ban with them in the two instances you give of improper expenditure—for I cannot help thinking that public gardens should be the property of the town, in order that they may be free to all without payment: and though I do not think so of public baths, yet in order to foster the taste for them, and render them ultimately a profitable private speculation, I should not object to their being experimentally provided by public authority. These cases exemplify the difference there is between us in degree, though I think not in principle, respecting the limits of government interference.

I Am
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

378.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 28. 1859

Dear Sir

I have read your two pamphlets,² and I like much both their spirit and most of the things you say. I should have been glad however to have had your opinion, grounded on observation, as to whether the introduction of new machinery does not often *temporarily*, and even for some considerable time, diminish the employment for labour. If so, the operatives have reason to complain, not of machinery, but of the State, for not doing something to help them. I fear also that so much cannot be done for the condition of the poorer classes by reduction of taxation as you seem to think there is room for—especially when there is a treacherous despot just across the Channel watching his opportunity.

I have desired my publisher to send you a copy of a book of mine,³ of which I request your acceptance. In it you will find my opinions on both the subjects referred to in your note. I am

Y^{Rs} Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

379.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

Blackheath Park

le 28 mars 1859.

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Votre belle et touchante lettre m'a fait du bien. Je vous honore d'avoir su voir, au moins en partie, dans mes écrits, ce que je dois à un enseignement et à une collaboration dont le bonheur n'existe plus maintenant qu'en souvenir.² Cependant vous risquez toujours de lui attribuer trop peu de tout ce que vous louez en moi. Nous n'étions pas, comme on pourrait le croire, deux esprits différents mais égaux, dont l'un aurait apporté autant que l'autre au fonds commun—comme par exemple

l'élevation des idées serait dûe surtout à l'un, la justesse des appréciations pratiques à l'autre. Il n'en était point ainsi. Elle me dépassait également aux deux égards. Sa hauteur atteignait le ciel, tout en restant ferme sur la terre. Elle était complète sans moi, tandis que moi je suis très incomplet sans elle. Ce qui m'appartenait dans l'oeuvre commune n'était guère qu'un certain talent de rédaction et d'interprétation, qui encore ne vaut quelque chose que pour les lettrés et pour les savants, car elle trouvait toujours beaucoup mieux que moi le chemin de l'esprit et du coeur de la simple humanité.

Passons maintenant aux affaires de l'Italie. Je ne m'étonne point de l'illusion où semble être pour le moment chez vous l'esprit national. Je crains pourtant qu'elle ne puisse devenir très fatale. Soyez bien persuadé que le plus dangereux ennemi qu'ait en ce moment l'avenir de l'humanité c'est celui dont vous invoquez l'appui.³ Je comprendrais qu'à tel époque donné, on mît la nationalité avant la liberté, je pourrais même le pardonner, parce que la liberté a souvent besoin de la nationalité pour exister. Mais comment peut-on croire que la nationalité Italienne puisse exister avec cet homme?⁴ A-t-elle existé sous son oncle?⁵ Pense-t-on que ce soit par un sentiment généreux qu'il veut faire la guerre à l'Autriche sous prétexte de l'Italie?⁶ Est-ce une nationalité que d'être dans la dépendance servile d'un despote étranger? Sait-il même ce que c'est que la foi, que l'honneur, que le respect de la parole donnée? La France, même libre, veut beaucoup trop imposer son joug aux autres peuples; et son maître actuel, en flattant ce défaut national, désire faire usage des Français pour asservir les Italiens afin de les tenir tous deux subjugués les uns par les autres, tout comme en use l'Autriche à l'égard des divers peuples qu'elle domine. C'est navrant pour un ami de la liberté d'être forcé de souhaiter le succès même de l'Autriche contre une puissance plus retrograde encore et plus malfaisante qu'elle. Je ne voudrais pourtant pas que l'Angleterre prêtât main-forte à l'Autriche attaquée, à moins d'une renonciation préalable à l'Italie. Je ne voudrais jusque-là qu'une médiation, et une neutralité armée. Mais si la guerre a lieu, je ne pense pas que l'Angleterre s'arrête longtemps à ce point.⁷ Un peuple n'a jamais qu'une idée à la fois, et le nôtre, je le crains, cesserait bientôt de sympathiser avec le patriotisme Italien s'il se présentait comme l'appui du tyran perfide de la France. Ce que veut cet homme est par là même mauvais, car il ne veut que l'accroissement et l'affermissement de son pouvoir, et il n'y a pas de plus grand mal sur la terre.

Je serai charmé de voir votre ouvrage sur Savonarola⁸ et je le serais encore plus de vous voir. Quoique probablement nous ne retournerons pas en Angleterre sans passer par Florence, je ne crois pas que ce soit avant le printemps de l'année prochaine. Mais pendant une partie de ce temps nous ne serons pas plus loin qu'Avignon: nous y serons même à quelques jours d'ici, pour y séjourner quelque temps, et nous y serons aussi dans l'automne. Je ne pourrai pas vous y offrir l'hospitalité, car la maisonnette suffit à peine pour nous loger: mais à cela près, si vous pouviez venir passer quelque temps avec nous en famille avant l'hiver, nous pourrions causer sur bien des choses, et parcourir ensemble ce pays classique pour tout Italien.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

380.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

March 29. 1859

Dear Sir

I have long ceased to regard speeches in Parliament² as meaning anything except that the speaker has not made up his mind to vote next day for the thing he attacks. The position of a Member of Parliament must be very corrupting, for it seems to divest people of all concern for the day after tomorrow. People are not afraid to *flétrir* by a passing word, something that they have never once thought about—provided there does not seem to be at the time any strong party for it among their own friends. This is what is called being practical.

Your plan, if kept before the public, will be adopted as soon as any really large concession of the suffrage has to be made to the working classes—but all parties at present think they can get off, this time, without that; so they do not like to delay and incumber their measure with provisions which are not understood.³

Does Gladstone⁴ know of your book? I should think him, of all prominent public men, the likeliest to appreciate it.

I have been working at propagandism since I last wrote to you, and have called the attention of various people to your plan who are sure to talk about it when they understand it.⁵ I have also an article in the forthcoming Fraser,⁶ great part of which is on your book. A copy shall be sent to you. You will see that I have ventured to differ from you about educational suffrage, which I prefer to any property test, and which indeed I think the necessary accompaniment and supplement of your plan.

Further consideration of the point I wrote to you about before,⁷ has made me think your last solution of it a very important element in the plan. In the case of those popular favorites who would receive many thousand votes, a considerable number would probably be given for them and them only. Now every one of these which is not counted for the candidate's return, corresponds to one elector unrepresented. The same result will often, though not *so* often,⁸ happen in the case of those who put only one or two additional names on their list. So that if a voter with a long list is counted in preference to one with a short list, there is a double evil: one is perhaps disfranchised while the country loses the benefit of the other's more careful consideration.

As you do not mind the trouble of writing to me, and as I should not like to lose any letter from you, let me mention that after ten days or so my address will be Saint-Véran, près Avignon, Vaucluse, France.⁹ I hope to hear from you, especially if there

is anything to be done which I can do. I shall take your book with me, and as far as writing is concerned, can do as much anywhere else as here.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

381.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, March 31, 1859.

. . . . The book² has had much more success, and has made a greater impression, than I had the smallest expectation of.—We shall be at Avignon for some time. . . . I hope to hear from you sometimes at that place, as I am very desirous to know, how your various literary projects go on. . . .

382.

TO WILLIAM E. HICKSON¹

Blackheath

March 31, 1859.

Dear Hickson

Since your first note I have been in daily expectation of hearing that all was over.

He² was, I think, without exception the most unselfish person, of the male sex, whom I have ever known intimately enough to be able to judge. The only thing which can at all alleviate our regret is that his health had long been too much broken to make life any enjoyment to him.

I would attend the funeral, at whatever inconvenience, if any mark were necessary of my respect and affection for his memory. But I am in the midst of printing against time (a selection from my review articles)³ and am hurrying the printer in order not to delay my departure from England. I hope to start within ten days, and I fear therefore I shall be unable to make out my projected visit to Fairseat.

My address will for some time be Saint-Véran, près Avignon, Vaucluse, France, where I shall be glad to hear from you, and shall be much interested in knowing whether the bromine experiment succeeds.⁴

I Am,
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

383.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath

March 31 [1859]

Dear Sir

I wrote today to Mr. W. Hickson explaining to him my reasons for preferring not to attend the funeral;² but as you may perhaps desire to hear from me before you leave town, I write again merely to say that much as I should wish in any way to shew the great regard I felt for my friend, yet in the present circumstances I would rather not attend.

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

384.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

Blackheath

April 4. 1859

Dear Sir

Your approbation of the 'Liberty' gives me much pleasure, and the last sentence of your letter has caused me a still deeper feeling. I did not for a moment think of doing any good by those few words of preface, but only of expressing some insignificant fraction of what I feel to the noblest and wisest being I have known. But I could do nothing more useful with the rest of my life than devote it to making the world know and understand what she was, if it were possible to do it.

With regard to your impediments at the College:² Mr Davies³ I know nothing of. Maurice I do know, and respect highly.⁴ I should have sent him a copy of the book, if I had not thought that my doing so might appear a sort of bravado: for though I was persuaded that he would see some good in it, and though I know that he has the kindest feelings towards me personally, I was quite prepared to find that it contained much which he would think it his duty to discourage.

I had already read Mr Huber's papers in the Reasoner with great satisfaction.⁵

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

385.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

April 4, 1859.

Dear Sir

I have read your letter with much pleasure, and entirely agree with it. I shall be very glad to receive your observations on any part of my Political Economy² and there will be time enough for you to prepare them at leisure, as I am going abroad immediately probably for a year or more; and as you might lose all your trouble by the miscarriage of a letter, I would suggest your withholding your remarks until my return.

I Am
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

386.

TO JAMES LORIMER¹

Blackheath

April 7. 1859.

Dear Sir

Many thanks for your letter. I should think the difficulty you had in obtaining a publisher was owing to the same cause which you refer to in the case of Mr Hare, the scientific apparatus of your treatise. Probably something of the same kind has stood in your way with Reeve.² The English public do not like to see even their own conclusions rested upon arguments which they are conscious that they themselves could never have used. You do not at all exaggerate the English dislike of theory, and of any political suggestion which is at all out of the common way. But this dislike is always greatest at first, and though a Minister may be obliged to bow to it, it is a great mistake in any one else to humour it. Every repetition and inculcation of a really good doctrine or proposal, does a little towards raising it from the class of impracticable into that of practicable things. The errors of the public owe half their mischievous power to people who do not participate in the errors, but who think it practical to summarily reject everything that is opposed to them. Therefore, when, as in the case of Hare's plan, there is really no obstacle to its adoption but the novelty of the idea, we should always, I think, talk and write about it as if that were no obstacle at all.

I hope you may yet find some channel for saying all you would wish to say in reply to me.³ If you do, you could not oblige me more than by telling me where it is to be found. I shall be out of England for some time, but a letter addressed Saint-Véran près Avignon, Vaucluse France, will find me either immediately or in no very long time.

I Am
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

387.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

April 10. 1859.

Dear Sir

My address for some time will be, Saint-Véran près Avignon, Vaucluse, France, where I shall be happy to hear from you any time when you are disposed to write.

Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

388.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

April 11, 1859

Dear Sir

I have sent your letter to Mr Hare.² It will please and encourage him, as it well may.

His plan would be the most effectual of all antidotes to the fatal habit of mind which as you say, is creeping over the non-democratic portion of all the large constituencies.³

I dare say the first attempt to introduce representation of minorities will be made in some such manner as you suggest.⁴ But this will only be owing to the timidity of our statesmen—for the *whole*, in this case, is so much more defensible than any *part*, that it would probably be quite as easy to get it adopted in totality as partially.

I am just leaving England for the Continent.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

389.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, près Avignon

May 4. 1859.

Dear Sir

Many thanks for your letter. You have made a good move in endeavouring to get the subject brought before the Social Science Association.² The meetings of that body are of considerable use in getting an audience for new views of things practical. If Lord Brougham³ would take up your plan he would do a great service. Lord Lyndhurst's⁴ approbation is valuable. Parker⁵ has sent me an article cut from an Edinburgh paper (the Evening Courant)⁶ containing an intelligent appreciation of the plan, though the writer knew it only from the article in Fraser.⁷

I do not see how we can now avoid the terrible calamity of war.⁸ If we allow Austria to be crushed between Russia and France, which left to herself she certainly will be, the fate of England is sealed, for the two together will be a match for her at sea, and vastly superior on land. It is quite possible that Europe may be divided between two great military despotisms, and freedom driven to take refuge in America and Australia. I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

390.

TO ARTHUR HARDY¹

Saint-Véran près Avignon
Vaucluse France

May 14, 1859

My Dear Hardy

I received your letter² when on the point of leaving England, and I put off answering it till our arrival here. I have been further delayed by the troubles and interruptions incident to getting into a new place, but still more by the painfulness of writing on the only subject on which I should care to write, or doubtless you to hear.

Though she could not be to anyone else, even if not separated by half the circumference of the globe, all that she was to us, her immediate family, it must make a blank in any life to lose one whose equal we may be perfectly sure that we shall not live long enough ever to see again.

To us who have known what it is to be with her and to belong to her, this silly phantasmagoria of human life devoid of her, would be utterly meaningless and unendurably wearisome, were there not still some things to do in it which she wished done, and some public and other objects which she cared for, and in which therefore it is still possible to keep up some degree of interest. I have been publishing some of her opinions, and I hope to employ what remains to me of life (if I am able to retain my health) in continuing to work for them, and to spread them, though with sadly diminished powers now that I no longer have her to prompt and guide me. I thank you for your wish that we should sometimes correspond. I should be glad to do so, as I feel a tie between myself and everyone who had any sincere feeling of regard for her. Up to next spring it will be best to address any letter to this place, as though we shall not be always here, we do not intend to be in England before that time at soonest. I believe I told you that we have bought a small house and a little bit of ground here, near the place where she lies.

I Am My Dear Hardy
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Arthur Hardy Esq.

Mount Lofty
near Adelaide
[South Australia]

391.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran

May 15. 1859.

Dear Sir

It gave me pleasure to hear from you again, and still more to learn that you propose writing something in further development and defence of the plan. The assertion that you propose to abolish the representation of localities might well astonish any one who had not noticed the extraordinary mistakes made by people who write critical notices of a book after one hasty reading. If they have taken in the main idea, it is as much as they have done even in very favorable cases; and if the main idea is new to them, it is all that their mind will hold, and they generally assume that it is advanced without any qualifications and restrictions, though the book may be full of them. This seems to be one of the conditions of daily writing. It is a fact that your book lays so great a stress upon the representation of localities, that I was struck and almost surprised by the great pains you took not only to prevent any of the advantages of local representation from being lost, but to give them an unexampled extension, since you allow any locality or corporate body which has a definable existence to have a member of its own, if it chooses to elect one by its local majority.

The number and population of the unrepresented towns, as stated in your letter, surprised me.

I inclose a letter² I have received on the subject of your plan, which as you think of writing further on it, you may like to see. The only difficulty stated by the writer is easily met. I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

392.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Saint-Véran, près Avignon,

May 16, 1859.

. . . . I am rather anxious to hear from you, not knowing whether you have received the sheets of the little book,² and, in case you have, whether you still have any idea of translating it. I should much prefer you to any other translator who is likely to offer, but I have always thought it probable that you might have good reasons against undertaking it, and that some other part of Germany might be more suitable for bringing the book before the German public. In addition to an offer made through Messrs. Parker³ I have lately received one under the signature of Eduard John,⁴ Justizrath at Marienwerder . . . who has sent me a portion of a translation actually executed; but as it is in the German manuscript character, which I do not read fluently, I am not at present able to judge of its merits. . . . I could write much about politics, but think it more prudent to wait for some better opportunity; though I certainly do not side with France in this miserable war,⁵ which I condemn as strongly as any Austrian can. . . .

393.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Hotel Nevet, Montpellier

May 26. [1859]

Dearest Lily—

I got here quite prosperously, except that by a blunder *not* common with me, I first got to Arles instead, & had to wait some time for a train to get back, during which I botanized & did not get here till 7. I however strolled about a good deal both before & after tea & cutlets. Today I began my walk at half past eight & was fairly driven in at $\frac{1}{4}$ past 2 by the load of plants. It has taken me till now ($\frac{1}{2}$ past 4) to determine them, so I shall hardly have time for another walk before the table d'hôte which is unluckily at 6. I am in a very pleasant groundfloor room opening on a shady court yard with large trees, or garden as they call it, thanks to which I here also hear the nightingale in bed. I am very well and not at all tired. This place much exceeds my recollections & expectations, & I now think you would like to see it. To me it is very strange, having seen it twice before² and been familiar with it in winter, to see it now in the full blaze of summer, with a richness and verdure I did not think it capable of—but cultivation has gained immensely on the garrigues since my time. I think it a delightful place, and should have *felt* it delightful once. *Now*, the contrast with the change in my own life

the reverse way, deepens the melancholy which is the groundplan of life and is always in the depths whatever else may be on the surface. But I would not wish it otherwise and would rather seek than avoid any place or circumstance that makes it more so.—My plans remain the same, except that as the weather seems unsettled and may be rainy in the mountains I may possibly stay a day longer here than I intended; but I do not think I shall do so. The weather today is exquisite—the most perfect English summer day, with delicious flying clouds & breeze—but there are storms in the air—it has evidently rained much here & I think you had a storm of rain yesterday afternoon. Tomorrow I shall go down to the sea & next day climb St Loup. If I stay longer I will write again from here. Do not, dear, write here more than once. I will now go & put this in the post, & then see if the best chemist here has got me the citrate he said he would if he could find it in Montpellier.

Your Ever Affectionate

J.S.M.

394.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Hotel Nevet

Sunday morning
[May 29, 1859]

Dearest Lily

I have only just got your letter as yesterday morning they denied having one and I was so late returning from my walk (after 7) that the office was shut. Thanks for it dear, it was a great pleasure. If I have had a fair specimen of Montpellier in the last week in May, the climate must be exquisite—to be out all day for several days in that season & never have to *think*, even, of heat. On Friday I was out from ½ to 9 till between 5 & 6, by the sea, in the most delightful weather, with now & then a few drops of rain towards afternoon—& as for plants, the load of the day before was a joke to them. Yesterday I had marked out for climbing the Pic St Loup, and was out soon after ½ past 8, but after a delightful walk of about twelve miles to the foot of the mountain a succession of thunderstorms came on & though I found shelter, first at a very pretty convent called Notre Dame des Champs, afterwards among sheep & shepherds in a hut, it put a stop to my projects & I had to walk back, mostly through rain, seeing by the way two fine rainbows, *one of them when the sun did not shine*. So I have the Pic still to climb, which is a reason for staying here today: but a stronger reason is that unless this storm inaugurates a change, the weather must be rainy in the mountains. Not to repeat the walk over the same ground I have engaged a carriage to take me to the neighbourhood of the mountain & bring me back when I am tired. It is a beautiful morning, & if it looks fine towards Le Vigan I shall go there tomorrow, for I hunger

& thirst for mountains. Yesterday I was less encumbered with plants but they were all choice ones. I have got the citrate, which the chemist made on purpose for me. This mode of life is doing me a world of good—more than I could possibly hope for in the time, so I would not willingly be forced to give up the mountains for the present. We seem to have had the rare fortune of falling on a *wet summer* in the driest region of Europe.

Ever Affectionately

J. S. Mill

I expected that the weather would be bad for Montpellier, from heat, & good for the mountains. I have found it the reverse. It has never been so hot as in *any* day at Avignon.

395.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Hotel Nevet

Monday May 30 [1859]

Dearest Lily

Still here! When I got up it rained violently, continued raining all the morning & is only now (1 o'clock) for the first time clearing. There is not time now to go to Le Vigan today, even if it were advisable to go to mountains in such weather. I have been all the morning drying my papers by a fire—the first I have had, but the papers I spread out last night were almost as wet this morning as they were at first. I got to the top of the Pic St Loup, or as they call it here (the country people I mean) the Pied de St Loup, so I got to the head of the saint's foot. The view was very fine, the walk & plants very good. I am now going to see what sort of walk I can get. Tomorrow I will certainly either go to Le Vigan or return home.

Thanks again for your nice letter dear. I was extremely interested by everything in it & only hope M. Pascal's² news will not prove again a mere put off of the marbrier. Your affectionate

J.S.M.

396.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Le Vigan

May 31 [1859]

Dearest Lily

I write a line to save the post and let you know a day sooner that I have arrived here. It is 40 miles from Montpellier & as the only diligence was a night one, I preferred taking a carriage from the hotel. It has been a tolerable day & gives tolerable hopes: though only hopes for the future. The number of days I stay here will depend on the weather & on anything I hear from you. I should think you must have heard from Gurney² by this time. This seems a beautiful place though a most primitive French town & inn. I enquired for your letter & received it immediately on arriving.

Your Ever Affectionate

J. S. Mill

397.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Le Vigan

Thursday evg [June 2, 1859]

Dearest Lily—

only one word to say that I have taken a place by the diligence to Nîmes for Saturday morning & as I shall arrive there somewhere about 3 or 4 in the afternoon, am sure of a train to take me home tolerably early in the evening. It will be time enough for Benoît to go to the station for my things after I arrive. I shall want nothing but tea, with eggs or not according as I have or have not dined.

As I shall so soon be able to tell you all about this place I will only say that I have climbed today the highest mountain within reach & have been out from ½ past 8 to past 7. I had a fine day & saw everything to perfection.

I received your second letter to this place—third altogether—yesterday morning. Thanks dear for all of them.

Your Affectionate

J.S.M.

398.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Saint-Véran, near Avignon

June 11, 1859

I sincerely condole with you on the unhappy events² which have caused you so much pain and disturbance of mind. The delay in answering my letter has occasioned no inconvenience, and since you are willing to translate the little book,³ or rather have by this time actually done so, I desire nothing better than to leave it in your hands and certainly should not think of giving the preference to any other translator.⁴ I have no objection to the omission of any part or the whole of the note to which you refer, nor of the sentence on page 9,⁵ though in the latter case I have not been able to discover what there is which renders it more unsuitable for publication than all the rest of the chapter. Perhaps some words in it may be understood as a declaration against kingly government, but nothing of the sort was intended, nor did it occur to me that anyone could think so. The only opinion expressed or implied is in favour of free political institutions, and even that is but incidental. But I do not think the retention of the sentence of any importance. . . .

399.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

June 17. 1859

Dear Sir

I was very glad to hear from you again, and particularly so to hear that you are going to have the opportunity of a public discussion at the Social Science meeting.² What is wanted is to get the subject much written about and talked of; previously to which the theory that two and two make four was no doubt regarded as a paradox, and such people as Disraeli³ got up in public places and attacked their political opponents for maintaining it. How I should have liked to have been there to answer him on the spot. But there was nobody to do it. I like your idea of writing a paper and sending it to the members of the Association, but I am rather doubtful about attaching signatures to it. That foolish Memorial to Lord Palmerston⁴ has thrown a wet blanket on the idea. I

suppose you will give brief and pungent answers to the popular objections against the plan, which are only expressions, in varied phrase, of the popular inability to understand it. Where there is anything definite in the objections, the truth is generally the reverse of what is asserted. For instance, it is supposed that the plan would enable minorities to govern; whereas the fact is that *now* a minority very often governs (by being the majority of a majority) while under your plan a minority never could by possibility do so. It is the only plan which *ensures* government by the majority.

I see no prospect of anything but mischief from the change of ministry.⁵ Its effect on foreign affairs will be bad, and dangerously so, while reform will not be benefitted.⁶ The new cabinet will never be able to agree on anything but the well worn useless shibboleths of Whig mitigated democracy, and besides they will be unwilling to propose anything new from the certainty that the Tories would oppose it, would by misrepresentation rouse vulgar prejudices against it, and finally throw it out in the Lords. The Liberals, by refusing to take the bill of the late government as the foundation for theirs, have given redoubled force to the mischievous custom almost universal in Parliament, that whatever one party brings forward, the other is sure to oppose⁷—whereby the enemies of change, even if very far from being a majority, are able to combine with the opponents and defeat the proposals of either. All parties seem to have joined in working the vices and weak points of popular representation for their miserably low selfish ends, instead of uniting to free representative institutions from the mischief and discredit of them.

I intend to pass the greater part of the summer among the Pyrenees, during which time I shall have no settled address but my publisher Mr Parker will be able to tell you where to direct to me for the time being. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

400.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

Saint Véran, près Avignon

le 22 juin 1859.

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Je ne vais pas renouveler notre discussion sur les affaires politiques. S'il dépendait de moi, je ne voudrais pas maintenant vous décourager. Le sort est jeté, et je souhaite ardemment que l'événement réponde à vos désirs. Seulement tâchez de ne pas mal penser de l'Angleterre à cette occasion,² et surtout gardez-vous de croire qu'elle ne sympathise pas avec l'Italie. Cette sympathie est tellement forte qu'en ce moment elle

suffit pour balancer non seulement la méfiance et la haine que doit inspirer une ambition criminelle, mais encore les motifs les plus graves de sûreté nationale. Songez que l'Autriche est la seule alliée sur laquelle nous aurions pu compter³ (car il n'y a pas de fonds à faire sur la Prusse et l'Allemagne sans l'Autriche) dans le cas très probable et peut-être prochain où nous aurions à lutter pour notre existence nationale contre la France et la Russie réunies. Dans cette lutte nous n'aurons plus l'Autriche avec nous, d'abord parcequ'elle sera probablement trop affaiblie, ensuite parcequ'elle sera trop offensée de notre neutralité actuelle. Nous aurons, hélas, l'Italie contre nous, car vous serez forcés à suivre dans toutes ses guerres votre prétendu libérateur.⁴ Ainsi l'ombre d'indépendance dont on vous flatte aura pour résultat que vous aiderez à abattre la seule liberté bien affermie qui existe dans l'ancien Continent.⁵ Vous nous pardonnerez, j'espère, de n'être pas très enthousiasmés de cette perspective. Si vous pensez sérieusement là dessus, vous verrez que ce danger doit être désormais la principale préoccupation de nos hommes d'état. Assurément tout le parti libéral aurait demandé la guerre contre la France, pendant que nous avons encore des alliés, si était la répugnance que lui inspire l'idée d'appuyer la domination de l'Autriche sur l'Italie.

Je vais maintenant quitter Avignon pour les Pyrénées, où je me propose de passer la saison des grandes chaleurs. Mais je compte revenir à la fin de Septembre, et vous me feriez un plaisir véritable (à moins que les affaires de votre pays n'exigent votre présence) si vous vouliez venir passer ici quelque temps avec nous. Comme je vous l'ai déjà indiqué, la petitesse de notre demeure m'empêche de vous y offrir un logement, mais il y aura un couvert pour vous, et je serai à votre disposition pendant la journée. Si cette lettre vous parvient, veuillez me dire si nous pouvons avoir cette espérance. Ecrivezmoi toujours à Avignon, on saura où envoyer vos lettres.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

401.

TO ELIZABETH CLEGHORN GASKELL¹

[July, 1859]

[Where I think you do me an injustice is in saying that] in publishing letters not written for publication you disregarded the obligation which custom founded on reason has imposed, of omitting what would be offensive to the feelings and perhaps injurious to the moral reputation of individuals . . . and the notion you seem to entertain that everything said or written by any one, which could possibly throw light on the character of the sayer or writer, may, justifiably, be published by a biographer, is one which the world, and those who are higher and better than the world, would, I believe, perfectly unite in condemning.

402.

TO ELIZABETH CLEGHORN GASKELL¹

[July, 1859]

You entirely mistake the motives which actuated the letter to which you refer²—It was not hurt feeling on a sensitive point but a sense of truth & Justice which I flatter myself wd have been the same in any other case.

Even *now* I shd feel that I was acting contraryly [*sic*] to her wishes & character by any partiality or unreasonable sensitiveness, much more therefore at a time when I could afford to regard these things with indifference.

The case being simply that in the exercise of the discretion of an Editor you neglected the usual and indispensable duties which custom (founded on reason) has imposed of omitting [*sic*] all that might be offensive to the feelings of individuals. Had what was said referred only to myself the publication of it would have been equally unjustifiable. Miss Bronté [*sic*] was entitled to express any foolish impression that might occur to her in a private letter—It is the Editor who publishes what may give just offence who is alone to blame.

403.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Luz²

July 18, 1859

Dear Sir

Since writing my note³ this morning, I have received a message from Avignon which makes it necessary for me to return there⁴ before going to Bagnères de Luchon. Therefore please direct to Avignon instead of Luchon for the present.

I have also received your letter inclosing the accounts, and the very interesting letters from Mr Hare⁵ and Mr Kingsley,⁶ to both of whom I will write. I am sorry to say I never received Mr Gladstone's letter,⁷ to my great regret, but I have written to Bagnères to enquire about it. I should like his second note to be forwarded to Avignon (Saint Véran).

The sale of so large an edition of the Liberty⁸ in so few months is very satisfactory. You have not told me the number you think it advisable to print of the second edition. If so many as 2000, I think I may fairly ask £200 for the edition.

I do not propose to make any additions or alterations. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

404.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

St. Véran, Aug. 6. 1859

Dear Bain—

Your letter of July 11 reached me in the Pyrenees & I was pleased with all the news it contained, except what related to the weakness in your foot.² I hope however that your Scotch excursion will cure what remains of that & if not you have the resource of hydropathy the benefits of which have been so strikingly exemplified in your case.

The “Liberty” has produced an effect on you which it was never intended to produce if it has made you think that we ought not to attempt to convert the world. I meant nothing of the kind, & hold that we ought to convert all we can. We *must* be satisfied with keeping alive the sacred fire in a few minds when we are unable to do more—but the notion of an intellectual aristocracy of *lumières* while the rest of the world remains in darkness fulfils none of my aspirations—& the effect I aim at by the book is, on the contrary, to make the many more accessible to all truth by making them more open minded. But perhaps you were only thinking of the question of religion. On that, certainly I am not anxious to bring over any but really superior intellects & characters to the whole of my own opinions—in the case of all others I would much rather, as things now are, try to improve their religion than to destroy it. My review of you has been in Reeve’s hands for several weeks, but I have yet heard nothing from him concerning it.³ I am expecting the proof shortly. The testimonies & notices you tell me of seem to be of the right kind & of good promise for future ones. I hope that the National will follow up its apparent intention of reviewing you.⁴ Its review of me I saw before I left England.⁵ I thought the writer’s drift was plain enough, but he wrote from an erroneous point of thought. I have seen as yet no review of the “Dissertations” but that in the Saturday Review⁶ which is so complimentary on the whole, & so very weak where it differs from me that I think it is likely to do more good than harm to the opinions it attacks. I am sorry your former reviewer in the Saturday⁷ has left off reviewing. The Principal of the Owens College⁸ feels as many sincere Christians now do, & I hope the “Liberty” will make many more such. It is curious that the most enthusiastic adhesion I have received is from Kingsley who seems to have been very strongly impressed by the book. When he had only seen it at Parker’s he sent a message thanking me for the pages on Xtian morality & he has since written to me saying that it made him “a clearer headed & braver minded man upon the spot.”⁹

I suppose this letter will be forwarded to you. I do not know at present where I shall be for a month to come, so please address as at [post?]10 S. V. &c.

405.

TO WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Aug. 6. 1859

Dear Sir

I regret that a note which I am informed by Mr Parker that you did me the favour of writing and which was forwarded by him, has never reached me.²

In acknowledging the kind expressions in your second, allow me to say that in venturing to send you my last publication,³ I intended a mark of respect to one of the very few political men whose public conduct appears to me to be invariably conscientious, and in whom desire of the public good is an active principle, instead of at most, a passive restraint. I am

Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

406.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, near Avignon

Aug. 6. 1859

Dear Sir

Your note of July 14² reached me in the Pyrenees, where I was seeking for health, not unsuccessfully. I think you have judged rightly in the subject of your paper for the Social Science Association,³ which will, I expect, be very valuable, and I shall be much interested in knowing the impression it makes. The best use that can be made of the Association is to make it a means of gaining adhesions to important practical suggestions fitted for immediate adoption.

I was much gratified by your approbation of the Dissertations. You give them the sort of praise which one thinker most desires to receive from another: and that you should

find so much usefulness in them is of itself sufficient to justify my having republished them.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

407.

TO CHARLES KINGSLEY¹

Saint Véran, near Avignon, Aug. 6, 1859

Your letter of July ⁵2 reached me long after its date, while wandering in search of health in the Pyrenees. Allow me, while expressing the great pleasure it gave me, to say that its humility, as it respects yourself, seems to me as much beyond the mark as the deference expressed towards me exceeds anything I have the smallest title to.

Laudari a laudato, or by any other *viro*,³ has never been very much of an object with me. But to be told by a man who is himself one of the good influences of the age, and whose sincerity I cannot doubt, that anything I have written makes him feel able to be a still better influence, is both an encouragement and a reward—the greatest I can look for, now that a still greater has been taken from me by death.

Far from having read none of your books, I have read them nearly all, and hope to read all of them. I have found in them an earnest endeavour towards many of the objects I myself have at heart; and even when I differed from you it has never been without great interest and sympathy. There are few men between whom and myself any nearer approximation in opinion could be more agreeable to me, and that you should look forward to it gives me a pleasure I could not forbear to express.

408.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

Saint Véran, près Avignon

le 6 août 1859

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Votre lettre du 23 juin m'est parvenue, mais un peu tardivement, et je ne vous ai pas alors fait de réponse, parceque peu après l'avoir écrite, vous avez dû recevoir ma lettre du 22,² si toutefois l'administration des postes l'a laissé passer. Elle peut

dorénavant laisser tout passer, car je n'ai plus besoin de faire aucune observation sur les affaires politiques. Ce serait inutile car aujourd'hui tout le monde en Italie, sauf peut-être les Lombards,³ doit être du même avis que moi. Moi-même je n'aurais jamais pensé qu'on vous eût sitôt revendus à l'Autriche pour avoir sa neutralité ou peut-être son alliance contre la Prusse et l'Angleterre: Au moins, si vous lisez nos débats parlementaires, vous savez à présent de quel côté se trouve la véritable sympathie envers l'Italie.

Si vous n'avez pas reçu ma lettre, il est probable que vous ne recevrez pas davantage celle-ci. Cependant je ne m'abstiendrai pas de renouveler l'expression de mon désir que ce soit à votre convenance de venir passer quelque temps ici au mois d'Octobre, en partageant notre vie modeste et tranquille, sauf le logement que je ne puis pas vous offrir, à cause de la petitesse du pied à terre que nous possédons.

Si cette lettre vous parvient, veuillez en accuser réception, afin que je sache à quoi m'en tenir.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

409.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Paris

Aug. 24. 1859.

Dear Sir

I thank you for your paper,² which I have read with great pleasure. The expressions which your modesty almost apologizes for, seem to me quite indispensable. I should rather have liked them stronger than at all weaker. Unless the pretensions of the plan are stated highly—as they well may be—sufficient attention will not be attracted to it. I only wish you had had other names to refer to in the second paragraph than merely mine, or that the reference in the note to p. 13 had been brought in simultaneously.

Your paper is excellent. If I had a criticism to make, it would be that you suppose the persons to whom it is addressed less ignorant than, I am afraid, they are. You address them as if they were well acquainted with the subject of discussion, but were under the influence of some of the futile objections which have been brought against you. No doubt this is the case with some, but for the greater number I fear that a brief popular explanation of the plan itself and of its purposes is still required. The conclusion of the paper in some measure supplies this, but a good deal is, I think, lost by not beginning with it. However "I speak as to wise men—judge ye what I say."³

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

410.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

Avignon

Sept. 5. 1859

Messieurs.

Votre lettre du 3 sept. ne m'est parvenue qu'aujourd'hui. Pour parler d'abord de ce qui regarde le grand morceau. L'étude des proportions fait voir que les dimensions que vous indiquez seraient tout à fait insuffisantes. Elles ne dépassent que très peu celles du morceau destiné à être superposé. Je suis donc forcé à abandonner l'idée de prendre tous les morceaux dans le même bloc, et à me contenter par le grand morceau du marbre blanc clair dont nous possédons déjà un bloc à Marseille.

Mais il reste la question du temps, qui est pour moi de la plus grande importance. J'ai été au désespoir du délai de huit jours qui s'est déjà écoulé. S'il fallait y ajouter encore six semaines, ne seulement tous nos plans pour l'hiver et l'été prochain seraient entièrement bouleversés, mais, ce qui nous affligerait bien davantage, nous serons forcés d'ajourner presque à l'année prochaine l'érection du monument. Je vous prie, Messieurs, avec la plus grande instance de tout faire pour abréger le délai autant que possible. Puis qu'il ne s'agit que de trois morceaux au lieu de quatre j'espère qu'ils pourront être rendus à Avignon avant la fin du mois actuel. Cela même ne nous donnerait que tout juste le temps nécessaire.

Après avoir consulté le sculpteur, je vous donne, Messieurs, les dimensions *exactes* des divers morceaux. La différence de ces dimensions-celles que je vous avais indiquées, est peu de chose, mais elle suffit pour avoir un effet très appréciable sur les proportions.

Vous voudrez bien adresser les marbres à M. Dupré, marbrier à Avignon.

Je vous engage Messieurs à me donner une réponse immédiate, et à mettre dans les travaux toute l'urgence possible.

Agréez Messieurs

411.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

St. Véran

7 Sept. 1859

Messieurs—

Je viens de recevoir votre lettre du 6 septembre. Je vous remercie de vos assurances que vous mettrez toute la promptitude possible à préparer et à envoyer les trois morceaux de marbre mais j'espérais que votre lettre m'aurait indiqué de combien le délai dont il était avoír été question dans votre lettre du 3 serait susceptible d'être raccourci. Je vous prie de vouloir bien vous expliquer à ce sujet avec M. Pascal, l'architecte de la ville d'Avignon qui s'est chargé de diriger les travaux du monument et qui connaît exactement mes intentions. Il est d'autant plus nécessaire que M. Pascal soit au rapport avec vous, car nous-mêmes ne serons pas à Avignon pendant la moitié du mois.

Nous nous entendons parfaitement sur le prix, qui selon vos [2](#) lettres du 25 août et du 3 sept est, pour les trois morceaux livrés à Avignon: 6000 fr plus les frais du transport. Mais quant à la proposition que vous me faites d'en payer la moitié ou le tiers d'avance, je ne comprends pas par quel motif vous avez pu faire une proposition tellement inusitée, et je ne peux pas y consentir. Le prix sera payé lorsque les trois marbres se trouveront rendus à Avignon dans les conditions convenues. Si vous désirez des renseignements je vous pourrais les obtenir de mes banquiers, la maison Prescott Grote et Cie de Londres, à qui je pourrais ajouter beaucoup d'autres personnes si vous le désiriez.

S'il vous arrive d'avoir des questions ou des observations à faire, veuillez les adresser à M. Pascal, à l'Hôtel de Ville d'Avignon.

412.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

Briançon le 16 sept. 1859

Messieurs—

J'ai reçu aujourd'hui de M. Pascal communication de vos deux lettres du 10 et 11 sept.

Ce que nous avons à discuter ne regarde pas les possibilités de veines ou de taches dans les morceaux. Depuis que j'ai vu le bloc il n'y a plus eu de doute sur cette partie du sujet.

Je consens à prendre sur moi tous les risques qui ne regardent que la qualité du marbre. Mais il n'en est pas de même quant aux chances de dommage dans le transport. Dans tout ce qui s'est passé entre nous et expressément dans ma lettre du 7, il a été stipulé que les marbres seraient livrés à Avignon moyennant un surcroît de prix convenable. Il est évident pour moi, qui ne sais pas du métier et qui n'ai aucune expérience en pareilles matières, je ne pourrais me charger des précautions nécessaires pour assurer le transport d'un objet de cette nature et il ne me conviendrait nullement qu'après avoir payé les marbres 6000 francs un ou plusieurs d'autre cas arriveraient fêlés au milieu gâtés par des écornures.

Je vous prie donc de vouloir bien me dire pour quelle indemnité vous consentiriez à vous charger des risques du transport. Si ces risques sont petits vous n'auriez pas de motif suffisant pour vous y refuser; tandis qu'ils sont grands vous ne pourriez vous étonner que je ne veuille pas m'y exposer. Selon toute probabilité ils seraient petits pour vous, et très grands pour moi. Ceci est donc une condition *sine qua non* du marché. Pour la question de fournir le marbre en trois morceaux ou en deux je n'y tiens pas, et je me remets là dessus à votre jugement.

Veillez donc, Messieurs, m'informer par le premier courrier quel surcroît de prix que vous demandez en considération des frais et risques du transport. Vous voudrez bien mettre votre lettre dans une enveloppe adressée à M. Pascal qui me l'enverra après en avoir pris connaissance

Agréez Messieurs &Cs

J. S. Mill

Si la Compagnie du chemin de fer garantit la sûreté de pareilles marchandises moyennant une prime d'assurance, cela offrirait une solution facile de la difficulté.

413.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

Sisteron

Sept. 24. 1859

Je viens de recevoir votre lettre du 20 sept.

Puisque vous acceptez les conditions posées dans ma lettre du 16 sept et que vous consentez à prendre sur vous les risques du transport moyennant un surcroît de prix de 800 frcs, je consens au surcroît, et je m'engage à payer le prix de fr 6800 à la livraison

sur wagon en gare d'Avignon des deux blocs, en bonne condition, avec les dimensions exactes indiquées dans la lettre qui vous a été adressée par M. Pascal.

Je vous engage à presser le travail autant que possible, en tout cas, à ne pas dépasser le terme de 20 jours mentionné dans votre lettre à M. Pascal du 10 sept. Vous voudrez bien avertir M. Pascal du jour où les marbres arriveront à Avignon.

414.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 5, 1859

Dear Sir

Thanks for the prompt payment of the £200² and likewise for Fraser.³ I shall be happy to send you another paper⁴ when I feel prompted to write anything which will suit the Magazine. If any subject should occur to you on which I can write at a distance from books, I should be glad if you would mention it.

The articles you sent from the two reviews, and three newspaper articles,⁵ have reached me since I last wrote. Of these the only one of much importance is that in the National, which I conjecture to be by Martineau.⁶ It is quite as favorable as it could be, consistently with the writer's opinions, and will I think be useful. The others are poor stuff, except the article in the Guardian,⁷ which interested me somewhat. By the way there was on the other side of the page, part of an article, evidently favorable on Mr Bain's book.⁸ I wish you had sent that likewise.

I have received and answered Mess^{rs} Rankin's letter.⁹

If it is not a secret, who is G.D.H., the writer of the article on Bacon?¹⁰

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

415.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

S. Véran. Oct. 15. 1859

Dear Bain—

I have received an application from Lorimer, saying that he is a candidate for the office of Principal of the Univ. of St. Andrews,² vacant by Sir D. Brewster's removal to Edinburgh³ & asking me to write in his favour to Sir G. Lewis.⁴ Before I give him any answer I am desirous to know whether you are likely to be a candidate, as if you have any idea of being so I should not think of giving a recommendation to any one else. Therefore please write directly that I may be able to answer Lorimer as soon as possible.

I am your debtor for an interesting letter dated as long ago as Sept. 8. I am afraid I shall not be able to repay you in kind. You have probably seen before this time what I have written about your book.⁵ I am glad to see by the advert^t that Reeve has put it at the head of the number. What you say of the notices in the Athenaeum⁶ & Press⁷ gave me pleasure. I saw accidentally part of another, apparently favourable & likely to be useful, in the Guardian.⁸ The single paragraph in the Westminster⁹ was shabby but I hope Grote persists in his intention of reviewing you there¹⁰ when he has finished with Plato—who seems to take him a length of time only to be warranted by using the opportunity to speak out very plainly on the great subjects—a thing I rather wish than expect he will be found to have done; though the perfect impunity of the bold things in the Liberty ought to give him courage of one *qui bene est ausus vana contemnere*.¹¹ Have you seen any of the recent reviews of the Liberty? That in the Dublin Univ Mag,¹² for instance, & the series of letters in the Engl. Churchman?¹³ People are beginning to find out that the doctrines of the book are more opposed to their old opinions & feelings than they at first saw, & are taking the alarm accordingly & rallying for a fight. But they have in general dealt candidly with me, & not too violently. As was to be expected they claim for Xtian morality all the things which I say are not in it, which is just what I wanted to provoke them to do. The article in the National Rev. on my writings generally is worth reading.¹⁴ It seems to be by Martineau & I am obliged to him for it, since it is favourable to the utmost extent consistent with the writer's opinions & decidedly tends to increase rather than diminish the influence which he says is already so great. I really had no idea of being so influential a person as my critics tell me I am. But being thought to have influence is the surest way of obtaining it really. The arguments of the reviewer on the controverted points you will I think agree with me in considering to be very easily answerable.

I hope to hear that your peccant limb is quite restored.¹⁵ It has been a very tedious business for you. As for myself I am in very fair health though I do not find it so easy a matter to keep my digestion right as it used to be a year or two ago. We shall be here, I expect, for at least two months from this time, & it is at present uncertain where we shall be able to go afterwards. I am employing myself in working up some papers which have been lying by me, with additional matter into a little treatise on Utilitarianism.¹⁶ I only hope you will like it as well as I expect to like your discussion of Phrenology.¹⁷ That, both on its own account & from the nature of the topics which it raises, is one of the most important things you could do. In what shape do you intend to publish it?

I was very sorry to see the death of Nichol.[18](#) He had a geniality of character which was very pleasing & interesting: his influence which his activity & enthusiasm made considerable was almost always given to right opinions & his conversation was that of a thinking, instructed, & right feeling man on many more subjects than those which he mostly wrote upon.

416.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

Oct. 22. 1859

Messieurs—

Le délai de 20 jours que vous avez demandé pour l'expédition des blocs de marbre s'est terminé le 15. Comme vous n'aviez donné de réponse ni à la lettre que je vous écrivis de Sisteron, ni à celle écrite d'ici par M. Pascal, celui-ci vous envoya une dépêche télégraphique, à laquelle vous répondez le 18^{me} [que] l'un des blocs serait expédié de Paris en trois jours, mais que l'autre ne serait pas prêt, et sans la moindre indication du jour où il le serait. Après le temps précieux perdu en correspondances, j'avais le droit de compter que vous vous tiendriez au temps fixé par vous mêmes. Je ne veux pas que l'un bloc soit envoyé sans l'autre, parceque si après que je l'eusse accepté, l'autre se trouvait écorné et gâté dans le transport le premier me serait inutile et j'en serais pour mon temps et pour mon argent. Vous m'avez manqué de parole, et probablement fait échouer tous [les] projets pour cet hiver. J'ajoute seulement que si les blocs n'arrivent pas avant la fin du mois je me croirai libéré de tout engagement envers vous.

417.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE[1](#)

Saint Véran, près Avignon

le 29 octobre 1859.

Monsieur,

Vous avez exprimé, il y a quelque temps, quelque velléité de traduire le petit livre sur la Liberté.[2](#) Quelque prix que je mise à ce qu'il fût traduit par une plume comme la vôtre, je craignes dès lors que la divergence d'opinion ne fût trop considérable pour que vous donnassiez suite à ce projet, et je vous en dis quelques mots à cet effet. N'ayant plus eu de vos nouvelles j'ai peur que mon présentiment ne soit vérifié. Depuis ce temps-là, j'ai reçu plus d'une proposition au même sujet, mais aucune que me parût acceptable. Aujourd'hui il m'est arrivé une proposition de faire une

traduction qui paraîtrait sous les auspices d'Emile de Girardin,³ avec des notes et une préface de lui. Ce projet réunirait évidemment des conditions excellentes pour la bonne exécution et pour le succès: mais il me répugne d'être associé, de quelque manière que ce soit, avec l'homme qui a tué Carrel.⁴ Dans ces circonstances il me serait très désirable de savoir si vous avez positivement renoncé au projet que vous aviez d'abord conçu. S'il n'en était point ainsi, j'aurais, avec le grand avantage d'être traduit par vous, celui d'avoir une réponse toute prête à l'offre qu'on vient de me faire. Je prends donc la liberté de vous demander un mot là-dessus, et ce serait pour moi un grand plaisir si ce mot était plus favorable que je n'ose l'espérer.

Agréé, Monsieur, l'expression de ma considération très particulière.

J. S. Mill

418.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Vêran

Oct. 30. 1859

Dear Sir

I was much pleased by receiving from you so satisfactory an account of your proceedings at Bradford,² and of the prospects of the cause; and the more so as the omission by the newspapers of all mention of your paper had made me fear that some unforeseen obstacle had prevented your reading it. I was very much interested by your account of Mr Fawcett.³ So active an interest in progress in a man early afflicted with such a misfortune as blindness, is very rare and meritorious. Is the recovery of his sight quite hopeless?⁴ It is very desirable that the friends of real representation should be in communication, in order to combine their efforts in forcing the idea on the attention of careless people, since want of familiarity with it is the chief obstacle it has to encounter. Mr Fawcett's idea therefore of bringing a few together at Cambridge⁵ is very good, and I hope you will go.

I have not much opportunity of helping you at this distance, but I endeavour to do so. I lately offered to the editor of the Edinburgh Review⁶ to write an article on your book, not much expecting that he would consent, but unwilling to lose a chance. He answered "I am afraid it will not be compatible with the other arrangements of the Review for me to accept the article you suggest, at least at present. The whole question of Parliamentary Reform has been so bedevilled by bungling operators and repeated failures, that I find it very unsafe to continue the discussion of it until we have some clear prospect of a definite result. I agree with you however in thinking that the plans advocated by Mr Hare and Mr Lorimer (of Edinburgh) are not devoid of merit and of interest." So he keeps the door open, and is willing to advocate the plan—when he thinks it will succeed.

You are safe in directing to me here for some weeks.

Every Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

419.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, near Avignon

Nov. 5. 1859.

Dear Sir

I have received your letter of Nov. 2, and the prospectus contained in it. I need not say that I wish success to the scheme,² but I have not much confidence in the management by a company or board, of a business in which, in addition to the ordinary considerations of profit, questions of speculative opinion necessarily play so large a part. A Catholic society for the purpose may succeed, because its creed is definite, and every person concerned knows what it is: and because it has an assured market for its publications, most of which besides are reprints of prayer books and generally accepted works. But freethinkers and extreme liberals do not form a body at all; they differ as much from one another as they do from the orthodox, and have often as bad an opinion of the tendency of each other's writings as the orthodox have. In any case it would not be convenient for me at present to embark any money in the scheme.

With regard to the Westminster: I have never ceased to consider myself as a potential contributor, and I shall be very well disposed to give it an occasional article; but so long as it cannot pay its expenses without gratuitous assistance, I should not think of accepting payment for any contributions I might furnish.

I am aware of the interest Lord Stanley takes in the Westminster,³ and I was equally surprised and pleased to hear of it. I am

Y^{Rs} Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

420.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran, près Avignon

le 5 novembre 1859.

Monsieur

C'est avec un grand plaisir que j'ai reçu votre lettre. La traduction du petit livre ne saurait être dans des mains plus capables.² Je suis heureux de trouver en vous un ami de Carrel. Je me réjouirai toujours de l'avoir, moi aussi, personnellement connu, et je conserve de lui un souvenir des plus vifs. Pensant qu'un petit opuscule que j'ai consacré à sa mémoire pourrait peut-être vous intéresser, je vais écrire à mon éditeur de vous expédier un exemplaire d'un recueil de mes petits écrits, dans lequel vous trouverez cette notice.³ Je vous prie de l'accepter comme témoignage des sentiments avec lesquels je suis, Monsieur

Votre Dévoué Serviteur

J. S. Mill

421.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

St. Véran Nov.14.1859.

Dear Bain—

I am glad that you & Grote liked the article in the Edinburgh.² It is a considerable thing to have got the Ed. to say that the experience philosophy & the association psychology are getting up again, & to praise & recommend a book on that side of the question. I shall look with interest for Grote's article when he is able to write it.³ With regard to his Plato, one would be reconciled to the long time he spends over it if he were going to speak out his whole mind at last. But his timidity on the population subject is of bad augury. It would be easy enough to keep from any close contact with the physical part of the subject & yet convey clearly enough all he means, or needs to say. But he seems to be incurable. I have no doubt however that there will be much useful & improving matter in his book, & the longer he is in finishing it, the more thought there is likely to be in it when it is done. And with this we shall have to be contented, in default of better.

It is very pleasant to hear that you will be ready with the discussion of Phrenology & the science of character by next spring.⁴ It is an excellent plan to publish it in the first instance in Fraser if Parker will take it. Besides being much earlier and more widely read, it will be an advertisement of the other volumes. I expect to learn a good deal from it & to be helped by it in anything I may hereafter write on Ethology⁵—a subject I have long wished to take up, at least in the form of Essays, but have never yet felt myself sufficiently prepared. I do not think of publishing my Utilitarianism⁶ till next winter at the earliest, though it is now finished, subject to any correction or enlargement which may suggest itself in the interval. It will be but a small book, about a fifth less than the Liberty, if I make no addition to it. But small books are so much more read than large ones that it is an advantage when one's matter will go into a small space. I have not written it in any hostile spirit towards Xtianity, though undoubtedly both good ethics & good metaphysics will sap Xtianity if it persists in allying itself with bad. The best thing to do in the present state of the human mind is to go on establishing positive truths (principles & rules of evidence of course included) & leave Xtianity to reconcile itself with them the best way it can. By that course, in so far as we have any success, we are at least sure of doing something to improve Christianity.

I have just sent to Parker for next month's Fraser a paper on Non-Intervention,⁷ in which there are some severe things said of Lord Palmerston's conduct in opposing the Suez Canal.⁸ That affair is damaging the character of England on the Continent more than most people are aware of; it is so direct a confirmation of the old & false ideas respecting the selfish foreign policy of England.

It is amusing to have drawn out Candlish.⁹ I expect a series of attacks now from the bigotted portion of all religious sects.

422.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.¹

St. Véran 22 novembre 1859

Messieurs—

Je vous prie de vouloir bien m'informer par le premier courrier, s'il y a moyen de prendre sur ce qui reste du grand bloc, un morceau ayant les dimensions suivantes, savoir—longueur 1.90 mètres largeur 75 centimètres, hauteur 40 centimètres: et en cas de réponse affirmative, quel en serait le prix (frais de transport compris) et en combien de jours vous pourriez l'expédier.

423.

TO WILLIAM GEORGE WARD¹

St. Véran Nov. 28. 1859

Dear Sir—

It gave me real pleasure to hear from you again after so long an interval, & I am much indebted to you for the opportunity of reading your first volume while still unpublished.² I have read it all with great interest, much of it with sincere admiration & sympathy: & (what you probably care more about) with no little admiration also for the eminent Catholic writers whom you quote.³ Many of them I was already disposed to think highly of, but my knowledge of them was chiefly at second hand. The questions you put to me I will with pleasure attempt to answer. A candid adversary has as great a claim as a supporter, to one's best endeavours for making one's meaning clear to him, even if no change of opinion is likely to result. I never feel so sure of doing good as when I find that my writings have given matter for thought to those who differ from me; a service which your treatise is well calculated to render, if I may judge from its effect on myself.

With regard to the passages in which I am mentioned⁴ (with the same good feeling which you have always shewn towards me) my answer is that both Mr Herbert Spencer & you have misunderstood me. When I spoke of inferences as necessarily following from premisses,⁵ I was not using the word necessary in its metaphysical but in its popular sense. I meant neither more nor less than that the reasoning process is, to us, conclusive evidence of what it proves: take the testimony of our senses, which neither you nor I nor any one considers to be necessary in the philosophical sense. As soon as I read Mr Spencer's criticism⁶ I saw that I had given ground for it, by an incautious use of the word necessary, which I endeavoured to correct in revising the book for another edition. My mistake was not so much in using the term in a double sense, as in not giving proper notice that I did so. For at that time I thought the word necessary a word worth retaining in philosophy; & I therefore, in conformity to my own rule (so to define words that their application may cover the same ground, & if possible even the same extent of ground, as before) used it as a designation for those properties of things which are deducible from the properties implied in their names. All mathematical truths, & truths analogous to mathematical, are in this sense necessary. As therefore I wished to keep the word necessary specifically for truths which are the results of reasoning, I was not unnaturally led into applying the term to the reasoning process itself. But (as I said before) I meant nothing in this case by necessity, but conclusiveness.

I dare say you are not aware that in the last ed. of the Logic I added a chapter in reply to Mr. Spencer,⁷ in which may be seen what I have to say against his own doctrine, but if I remember right, I scarcely if at all, touched upon his remarks on myself.

While I am on this part of the subject, I hope you will allow me to say, that I do not think there is any ground for the distinction you draw between the evidence of present & that of past sensations, classing the one as experience & the other as intuition.⁸ If remembering were one act of the mind, trusting to memory another act, & judging that memory is to be trusted a third, your doctrine might be admissible. But they seem to me to be all three the same act, just as when I press my hand against an object—feeling resistance, trusting the feeling, & judging that it is to be trusted are all one. We cannot remember that which did not happen; no more than we can see or feel what *does* not happen. When I feel so & so, I cannot doubt that I *do* feel so & so; & when I remember to have felt so & so I cannot doubt that I *did* feel so & so. Memory I take to be the present consciousness of a past sensation. It is strange that such consciousness can exist; but the facts denoted by *was*, *is*, & *is to come*, are perhaps the most mysterious part of our mysterious existence, as is strikingly expressed in the well known saying of St Augustine.⁹ If I have made sufficiently clear what I mean, I think you will see that it leaves in my apprehensions nothing to be done by the intuitive act which your doctrine interposes. There indeed remains the act of generalization which we perform when from remembering particular facts we ascend to the general proposition that Memory may be trusted, in other words that we have a faculty of Memory; but this generalization & classification of acts of our own mind, has nothing in it contradictory to the Experience doctrine, which always admits facts of internal consciousness as well as of external sensation, & considers the same logical processes as applicable to both.

Now as to the still more important subject of the meaning of *ought*. I will endeavour to explain the sense I attach to it, though this cannot be done in very few words. I believe that the word has in some respects a different meaning to different people. We must first distinguish between those who have themselves a moral feeling—a feeling of approving & condemning conscience, & those who have not, or in whom what they *may* have is dormant. I believe that those who have no *feeling* of right & wrong cannot possibly *intue*¹⁰ the rightness or wrongness of anything. They may assent to the proposition that a certain rule of conduct is right; but they really mean nothing except that such is the conduct which other people expect & require at their hands; with perhaps the addition that they have a strong motive for themselves requiring the same from other people. This you will probably agree with, & I will therefore pass to the case of those who have a true moral feeling, that is, a feeling of pain in the fact of violating a certain rule, quite independently of any expected consequences to themselves. It appears to me that to them the word *ought* means, that if they act otherwise, they shall be punished by this internal, & perfectly disinterested feeling. Unless they would be so punished, or unless they think they would, any assertion they make to themselves that they ought so to act seems to me to lose its proper meaning, & to refer only to the sentiments of others, or of themselves at some other time or in some other case.

If I am asked, what is the nature of this feeling, & whence it comes, I do not think that it is exactly of the same nature, or has exactly the same origin, in all who have it. My father's theory of it,¹¹ which you quote, seems to me a sufficient account of it as it exists in many minds. I certainly do not accept that theory as an exhaustive analysis of the phenomenon: yet I do not think your refutation, even of that theory, a sufficient

one; inasmuch as the generation of a complex feeling from simpler ones being a sort of chemical union, not a mechanical juxtaposition, it is quite to be expected that the compound will be to appearances unlike the elements it is formed from. The pains of conscience are certainly very different from those of dread of disapprobation; yet it might well be, that the innumerable associations of pain with doing wrong which have been rivetted by a long succession of pains undergone, or pains feared or imagined as the consequence of wrong things done, or of wrong things which we have been tempted to do (especially in early life), may produce a general & intense feeling of recoil from wrongdoing in which no conscious influence of other people's disapprobation may be perceptible.

However, I do not hold this to be the normal form of moral feeling. I conceive that feeling to be a natural outgrowth from the social nature of man: a state of society is so eminently natural to human beings that anything which is an obviously indispensable condition of social life, easily comes to act upon their minds almost like a physical necessity. Now it is an indispensable condition of all society, except between master & slave, that each shall pay regard to the other's happiness. On this basis, combined with a human creature's capacity of *fellow-feeling*, the feelings of morality properly so called seem to me to be grounded, & their main constituent to be the idea of punishment. I feel conscious that if I violate certain laws, other people must necessarily or naturally desire that I sh^d be punished for the violation. I also feel that I sh^d desire them to be punished if they violated the same laws towards me. From these feelings & from my sociality of nature I place myself in their situation, & sympathize in their desire that I sh^d be punished; & (even apart from benevolence) the painfulness of not being in union with them makes me shrink from pursuing a line of conduct which would make my ends, wishes, & purposes habitually conflict with theirs. To this fellow feeling with man may of course be added (if I may so express myself) fellow feeling with God, & recoil from the idea of not being in union with Him. May I add, that even to an unbeliever there may be a feeling similar in nature towards an *ideal* God? as there may be towards an ideally perfect man, or towards our friends who are no more, even if we do not feel assured of their immortality. All these feelings are immensely increased in strength by a reflected influence from other persons who feel the same.

This is the nearest approach I am able to make to a theory of our moral feelings. I have written it out, much more fully, in a little manuscript treatise¹² which I propose to publish when I have kept it by me for the length of time I think desirable & given it such further improvement as I am capable of. Perhaps the short statement I have now made will convey some notion of what my opinion is though a very imperfect one of the manner in which I should support it.—I am very sincerely yours,

J.S.M.

P.S. I had not heard of the article in the Rambler but have now sent for it.¹³

424.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.[1](#)

S. Véran

le 29. novembre 1859

Messieurs—

Je viens de recevoir votre lettre du 27. Je vous prie maintenant de préparer le nouveau bloc dans les conditions de votre lettre du 24, c.à.d. au prix de 3000 frs rendu sur wagon en gare à Avignon, et dans l'intervalle de 15 jours.

425.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI[1](#)

S. Véran. Nov. 29. 1859.

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari—

Je vous remercie beaucoup de votre lettre et de l'envoi de la Revue où se trouve votre article.[2](#) Je l'ai lu avec très grand plaisir. Abstraction faite des louanges dont vous me comblez, et dans lesquelles je vois un nouvel indice de l'amitié et de la sympathie que vous ressentez pour moi, je puis dire en toute sincérité que vous avez donné une excellente analyse de l'ouvrage. Vous en avez mis en relief les idées dominantes, vous avez assez appuyé sur chacune pour la faire bien saisir, et cela de la manière non d'un copiste, mais d'un penseur dont les idées ne sont pas tirées de l'auteur dont il parle mais se sont rencontrées avec lui. Grâce à vous, les lecteurs de la Revue doivent avoir aujourd'hui du livre et de moi une idée très avantageuse, ce qui, je l'avoue, me fait plaisir, car la vive sympathie que j'éprouve pour l'Italie fait que je me plais à l'idée d'être en rapport intellectuel avec les bons esprits du pays.

Comme vous je crains que la position actuelle des affaires, empirée comme elle est par la démission de Garibaldi,[3](#) n'ait des suites fâcheuses. Qu'il en résulte la dissolution des volontaires, ou des excès populaires dans la Romagne, l'un ou l'autre résultat serait également nuisible à la cause de l'Italie. C'est sans doute ce que désire celui qui[4](#) a mis les choses en cet état, et qui ne veut pas que les Italiens soient soustraits à leurs tyrans actuels par une autre main que par celle d'un nouveau maître. Ce n'est qu'en se tenant sous les armes, et en montrant la ferme volonté de se battre pour la liberté envers et contre tous, que l'Italie pourra obtenir du Congrès des conditions supportables. Je suis persuadé que l'Angleterre fera dans le Congrès,[5](#) si elle y prend part, tout son possible pour vous. Mais comme tout le monde sait qu'elle

n'en fera pas un cas de guerre son influence sera peu de chose. Les trois despotes⁶ sont probablement déjà d'accord pour lui ménager un affront.

Je félicite le gouvernement toscan de votre nomination à la chaire d'histoire à Pise.⁷ Je sens toutefois combien il vous sera difficile d'appliquer à ces paisibles travaux les forces de votre esprit, tant que les destinées de l'Italie restent suspendues sur le fil d'un rasoir.

Votre Tout Dévoué

426.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Saint Véra

Dec. 8, 1859.

Dear Sir

Fraser for December² has arrived this morning—nine days after it was posted. Napoleon the Third has taken that time to make up his mind whether to let it pass.

Possibly therefore the two French reviews³ may now have received their copies; and therefore if you have not sent the article, in an envelope, to them, it is unnecessary to do so for the present.

The same post brought the Daily News,⁴ and also the Economist:⁵ your people having cut out the article which you doubtless intended to send and having sent the paper without the article, instead of the article without the paper.

A Mr Durand⁶ of New York who conducts a periodical called the Crayon (of which he says he has sent a copy through you) requests permission to reprint one or more of the Dissertations in his magazine. I cannot give him permission without your consent; but as the sale would rather be promoted than injured by his doing so, it would perhaps be desirable. I should like the number which he has sent, to be forwarded by post.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

427.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran

Dec. 19. 1859.

Dear Sir

I duly received the Bradford paper² you were so good as to send, and I quite agree with you as to the excellence of the account it gives, in so short a compass, of your plan. I also received the Law Magazine, and read Mr Mayo's paper³ with much interest. It shews a real understanding of the subject, and a decided capacity for such studies. I was more prompt in answering his letter than I have been in acknowledging yours.

It gave me great pleasure to hear of the article you were writing for Fraser.⁴ The line you intended to take (I speak in the past tense, for it is probably by this time completed) seems to me very useful, and one which you are well entitled to take. The more I think of your plan, the more it appears to me to be *the* great discovery in representative government. As you have read the two volumes of Dissertations, you have seen how during a great part of my life I have been troubled by the difficulty of reconciling democratic institutions with the maintenance of a great social support for dissentient opinions. Now, your plan distinctly solves this difficulty. The portion of the House of Commons returned by an union of minorities would *be* this social support, in its most effective form; since its members would meet in the same arena with the organs of the majority; would command public attention, which under any other organisation of minorities might be refused to them; and would have the opportunity of obtruding upon the public daily proofs of the superiority of individual value which they would generally have over their antagonists. In no other way, that I can conceive, would it be possible to maintain a real superiority of power in the majority, along with a full & fair hearing for minorities, and an organization of them which would be all the more effective from being natural and spontaneous. If the Americans would but adopt your plan (which I fear they never will) the bad side of their government and institutions, namely the practical exclusion of all the best minds from political influence, would soon cease. Let us hope that in the old country (thanks to you) democracy will come in this better form.

I Am Dr Sir
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

428.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 20. 1859.

Dear Chadwick

I quite agree with you in expecting no benefit whatever from any reform bill likely to be brought forward by the present government.² Neither they nor the Tories *wish* to make elections unexpensive; they will not, therefore, take the only effective measure against bribery, by prohibiting and making penal *all* expenses whatever (the small amount of *necessary* expense being defrayed by the locality). That is *mauvaise volonté* on their part: but *this* is chiefly stupidity: neither of them will adopt Hare's plan,³ whereby any person of reputation for talent would be sure of being brought in by some set of electors or other if he chose, without needing any local influence. If Hare's plan were acted on, you would be in Parliament directly;⁴ and anybody else whose adherents or admirers are scattered over the country generally. As this plan would be essentially, and in the best sense of the word, Conservative, as well as, also in the best sense, liberal and democratic, it ought to unite both parties in supporting it: only such people as Bright,⁵ the mere demagogue and courtier of the majority, are its natural opponents. Notwithstanding this, we shall not have it, until some government finds itself obliged to give a largely extended suffrage, and has sense to see that this plan would diminish the danger of the concession, under cover of which they could contrive to pass it. I am strongly of opinion however that the way by which most good can be done on the Reform question, is by agitating on this point.

I am glad you like the paper in Fraser.⁶ It has certainly been very successful, and coming out just at the time it did, may have some practical effect. It *has* been sent, not to Galignani (who certainly would not reprint it in his paper) but to several of the principal French reviews⁷ and public writers. What you say about the real nature of the liberality of English public men is very true. But I had nothing to do with that. I was only concerned with their acts, and the doctrines they profess. The opposition to the Suez Canal⁸ adds greatly to the difficulty of their doing the kind of things mentioned in your letter—for every project for international communication patronized by England, is sure henceforth to be opposed by other countries.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

429.

TO DERVILLÉ ET CIE.1

S. Véran le 20 Déc. 1859

Messieurs—

Quelques jours s'étant écoulés depuis la terminaison des quinze jours que vous avez fixés dans votre lettre du 1^{er} décembre pour l'expédition du morceau supplémentaire de marbre statuaire, je vous prie de vouloir bien m'informer si ce morceau est prêt, ou sinon, quel jour vous croyez pouvoir l'envoyer à la gare.

Agréer De

430.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE1

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 21 Décembre 1859

Monsieur

J'ai appris avec plaisir par votre lettre du 7 que vous aviez presque terminé un nouveau livre, sur la Centralisation.2 Je ne doute pas que la lecture ne m'en soit aussi utile qu'agréable. Je vous applaudis de vous être beaucoup occupé, en cette matière, des lois et des usages anglais. Je ne me rappelle pas d'avoir remarqué dans votre ouvrage "L'Individu et l'Etat" des erreurs importantes sur l'Angleterre. Sans doute il serait à peine croyable qu'il ne s'en rencontrassent pas quelques-unes, vu la très grande difficulté qu'éprouve toujours un étranger à bien connaître un pays quelconque: difficulté peut-être encore plus grande pour l'Angleterre que pour les autres pays, tant la pratique des institutions anglaises s'écarte parfois de leur théorie. Je n'ai pas l'ouvrage avec moi ici, sans cela je le relirais pour tâcher de vous donner les indications que vous désirez.

Pour passer à un autre sujet, il y a une idée nouvellement éclosée en Angleterre, qui n'a pas encore, que je sache, passé le détroit, et qui pourra être intéressante à un penseur qui s'occupe comme vous du mécanisme des institutions politiques, et qui est capable d'apprécier les idées grandes et fécondes. Celle-ci se rapporte au système représentatif, dont en France comme en Angleterre il est important de perfectionner la théorie, en attendant qu'on puisse de nouveau le posséder de fait. Tous les systèmes existants ont le grand défaut que la majorité est seule représentée; tandis que dans les principes même du suffrage égal et universel, une minorité quelconque d'électeurs a

le droit d'être représentée par une minorité correspondante de l'assemblée. Or, un penseur anglais, Mr. Hare, a proposé une organisation au moyen de laquelle, en supposant par exemple un député par dix mille électeurs, tout candidat qui réunirait dix mille voix *dans tout le pays* serait nommé. J'ai rendu compte de son système dans le supplément de la seconde édition d'une brochure que j'ai publiée sur la réforme parlementaire,³ ne l'ayant pas connu à temps pour en parler dans la première édition. Je vous ferai envoyer cette brochure par mon éditeur, et si, après avoir lu l'analyse que j'ai donnée du livre de Mr. Hare,⁴ vous désirez en savoir davantage, je vous enverrai ensuite le livre même.

Je suis charmé que l'opinion favorable que vous avez bien voulu exprimer du livre *de la Liberté* se soutienne à un examen plus approfondi, et que vous soyez content aussi de ce que vous aviez lu des Dissertations. Je me suis tant occupé, dans ce recueil, de la France et de choses françaises, que je ne puis manquer d'être tombé dans beaucoup d'erreurs. Je vous aurais une véritable obligation de toutes celles que vous voudriez bien me mettre à même de rectifier.

J'adresse ma lettre à Paris, croyant que le froid de la saison vous y aura probablement ramené.

Agréez, Monsieur, l'expression sincère de mes sentimens respectueux et amicaux.

J. S. Mill

P.S. Je rouvre ma lettre pour répondre à la vôtre du 18. La loi de réforme de nos corporations municipales est de 1835.⁵ Sans pouvoir l'assurer je crois que le renseignement qu'on vous a donné doit être inexact, et que si les Communes ont besoin d'un assentiment quelconque pour s'imposer ou pour emprunter, c'est de celui du Parlement.

Je vous remercie de l'indication sur la Revue des Deux Mondes.⁶ Je puis la voir au Musée d'ici.

Puis que vous êtes toujours à Fontainebleau je vous y adresse la lettre.

J.S.M.

le 22 Décembre

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1860

431.

TO JANET DUFF-GORDON¹

[Early 1860]

Dear Madam,

I have only just received your note informing me of the death of one of the men whom I most valued,² and to whom I have been morally and intellectually most indebted. I had learned the sad news some weeks ago from the *Athenaeum*,³ and it was a greater shock to me as the characteristic vigour of his assumption of authorship last winter⁴ had made me hope that his health had undergone a decided improvement and that the termination of his career was still far distant.

I believe that few persons, so little known to the common world, have left so high a reputation with the instructed few; and though superficially he may seem to have accomplished little in comparison with his powers, few have contributed more by their individual influence and their conversation to the formation and the growth of a number of the most active minds of this generation.

For myself I have always regarded my early knowledge of him as one of the fortunate circumstances of my life.⁵ I am

Yours Very Faithfully,

J. S. Mill

432.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Hotel Bedford
[Paris]

Jan.25 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

I got here prosperously and without once feeling cold, and have done all my business here—witness the paper I am writing on, & witness also the two numbers of the *Revue des 2 mondes* which they promise to send by the same post. I luckily found at the gare About's book "La Grèce Contemporaine"² which I read in the train during the heavy shower and when the country was not interesting—but generally I did not want to read, as I never saw the mountains look finer. All on the right, (& on the left too as we approached Lyons) were covered with snow so nearly to the very plain, that I feared I should find snow on the ground here—but I only found the most enormous mud & wet. About's book will interest you if we go to Greece, and what he says mostly agrees so well with all I know, that I incline to trust him in what I do not know. I have bought the *Flore de Dauphiné*,³ a quite new one. I went into Notre Dame in passing; they have erected a *flèche* on the roof, in imitation of that of the Sainte Chapelle: it is not so ugly as it might have been, but they have covered the interior with their polychromatism which to my eye is by no means an improvement. The hinder half of the building is shut up, as the workmen are still on it both within & without. I am going via Calais, as the Boulogne hours do not suit; so I shall arrive early tomorrow. I am now going out to put this in the post and to have dinner. I will write again as soon as I arrive. Good bye dear. I do not half like this going away from you.

J.S.M.

433.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Jan. 26.[1860]

Dear Lily—

I arrived here about nine this morning not at all tired, but having been ill (though not *very*) during the passage. It was a rough sea, and the *short* pitching of the steamer was trying. There had been five or six weeks of rain at Paris and it rained here up to yesterday but I found a hard white frost. As you will know by this time, Parliament met on Tuesday instead of today,² as we thought. I was luckily able to get yesterday's paper at the London Bridge station & so read the debate—which was as satisfactory as any debate ever is in that stupid house. I found Hadji looking pale but, I thought, with a more animated (or rather less dead) expression of countenance than usual. He seems disposed to be amiable. Puss (who seems to have entirely forgotten me) quite startled me by her size—rather bulk than stature. It may be an illusion, from having been used to a little puss & little doggy (to whom remember me) especially as the teapot also looked as if it had grown. Elizabeth³ asks to be allowed to have a woman

to help her one day in the week. I assented (thinking the request moderate) and she is going to try to get M^{rs} Goodenough. I write this in some haste previous to going out to the ironmonger's at Greenwich. So goodbye dear. I shall not always give you these small sheets. Ever affectionately

J.S.M.

434.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Saturday
Jan.28 1860

Dearest Lily—

I have not lost any time since I arrived here. I saw Coulson yesterday morning, and he advised me to see him again in a fortnight, after taking four of the pills, which he thinks will very likely be sufficient, & I should not wonder if they were, as I seem better even without taking them, and yesterday was the first evening for more than three months when I have had no signs of indigestion without having taken either magnesia or anything else. I took the first pill last night. Yesterday I saw Parker, Prescott, and Thornton. I was very glad to find that Thornton has again hopes for his poor boy—who appears to have gone through a crisis, evacuated the contents of an abscess or an ulcer in the lungs, and to be now better. India affairs, or at least India *House* affairs, seem even worse than appeared from his letter. He told me some instances of the ignorance & presumption of Wood² which startled even me. From Parker I heard as usual some gossip about publications, and (of course) outpourings against the new shilling magazines, Thackeray's³ & M^cMillan's,⁴ which he describes as mere Barnum affairs,⁵ paying any fabulous sums to get *names*, while the bulk is written by the mere riff raff of the press. In proof of the first he affirmed what seems quite incredible, that they give Tennyson a guinea a line for poems i.e. for the *first* publication, for they do not even get the copyright. He says that T. has given one to M^cMillan, one to Thackeray, one to *Once a Week*,⁶ & that *Mrs* Tennyson proposed to him (Parker) that he should give one to Fraser, but P. refused, saying that it would not pay to give such a high price & that he should not like to give him less than others gave. As for M^cMillan we shall judge for ourselves what it is worth, as I have bought the three numbers and will send them to you as soon as I have looked through them (if I have time to do so). He says Kingsley has refused to write for M^cMillan or for any magazine but Fraser. He says however that K. is *done up* in point of health & means to rest for years to come except as regards his parish. He told me various things of the Queen's & Prince's civilities to K.⁷ and that he was given to understand he might be a Dean or something more, but that he kept to what he had said years ago, that he would take no preferment that would remove him from Eversley. I tell you any gossip I hear that may either interest or amuse you. In my "main objects in coming here" as the footman who climbed Mont Blanc said (meaning to throw a summerset on the top) I have not got on fast. With all diligence I have only read four Saturdays, and have only

got through the merely provisional sorting of *one* of the two packets of plants. This part of the job takes much longer than I ever knew it to do before. In the Saturday I am stuck (after the intermission) by its general *dénigrement* of all public men & notorieties, the extreme exaggeration of its hostility to democratic changes, & by a very uniform & monotonous line of subdued jocularly in its criticisms on minor victims.⁸ Still it is as interesting as ever to read, malgré the oldness of the topics. I inclose a Mem. of your account at Prescott's, extracted from your book. You will see that the balance is ample. Now touching the house—there are no visible cracks outside, all having been filled up during the summer but what has struck Ross⁹ is a very marked bulging of the east half of the brickwork above the darling's *window* beyond the west half, which is very apparent even from the road & must be disagreeable to Ross's feelings as a house proprietor. In your room there is a second large crack inside near the one which Suter¹⁰ saw & pronounced harmless—but this one is larger (it is just on the right side of the top of the window) & shews the west end of the house to be breaking away from the east end. Hadji thinks it may not be new since Suter saw the other but may then have been hid by the paper. The kitchen side of the house seems safe enough at present, but the cracks must *have* been prodigious: they have not reopened, and the wall is [shored?] up by shores near the kitchen window. I think I must have Suter to see the crack in your room. H. says that Girling¹⁰ (who professes to understand such things) declares that the brickwork of the lamed arch need not be taken down, but that an iron bar, applied I do not yet understand how, will make all perfectly safe. If what he says when I see him appears plausible, it may be well to try, and so postpone the decision on anything further till you are here. I find to my surprise that Haji is still taking music lessons. This agrees with the other signs that he is not really studying economy. Hann¹¹ has undertaken to give black edges to the cards. I find I cannot get a Times to read, as Wray¹² has none disposable except at 12 when I shall always be out: & the reading room I frequented in Gracechurch St. is given up. I must be content with the Telegraph.

[PS.] I shall soon hear from you now dear & I begin to be impatient for news of you. I have left out many things which I will put into my next. Ever aff^y

J.S.M.

[Enclosed memorandum of Helen Taylor's account]

Balance end of March —	£ 15.11.8
July div. on consols —	34.16.1
Brighton div. —	19. 5 —
S. Western d ^o —	10. 4.6
N. Western d ^o —	10. 4.6
Cash, (Nov.25) —	205.18.5
January div. on consols —	36.11 —
	332.11.2

Expended		
Cheque to Hajji —	40.— —	
d ^o to [Peppercorne?] 13	199.7.6	
d ^o Empl. of Women 14	5 — —	
	244.7.6	244. 7.6
		88. 3.10
Deduct cheque to J.S.M.	30 — —	
Balance in hand		58. 3.10
13 Probably Peppercorne and Price, stock and share brokers, 2 Royal Exchange Buildings.		
14 Probably a contribution to the Society for Promoting the Employment of Women, founded in 1859 by Jessie Boucherette and Adelaide Proctor.		

435.

TO HELEN TAYLOR[1](#)

Blackheath

Tuesday Jan. 31 [1860]

Your second letter has just come, dear, your first having arrived yesterday. I need not say how glad I was to receive them. All they tell is satisfactory except the delay in the sawing, which is shameful, as the man got on considerably faster with the former one, in spite of the fêtes, and himself spontaneously told me the day before I left, that it would be done on Thursday. I do not suppose the words Concession Perpétuelle need necessarily be on the monument,[2](#) but I do not know, and I suppose we need not decide till we can ask Pascal or somebody who does know. I was very much interested by the rose plantations and the jonquils. Here there are no signs of spring except a little green on the honeysuckle in a hedge near Plaistow. The weather is excessively wet: yesterday it rained so incessantly till late in the afternoon that I only got out late to Deptford to order potatoes. Saturday was the only really fine day and that was beautiful. I think the scenery here & that at Avignon are exactly suited to make each other more thoroughly appreciated. Here the green, the majestic trees, and the beautiful irregular shining & gleaming outline of the masses of wood, seem all the more beautiful for being so unlike the beauties of atmosphere and form at our other home. I have not been in town again since I wrote, though I should have gone yesterday but for the rain, & I shall go today chiefly to see various people at the I[ndia] House beginning with Willoughby.[3](#) I told you I had seen Coulson. I have not yet taken my second pill, but shall take it tonight. I have hardly had a vestige of indigestion all the time till yesterday evening, when I had a good deal: the direct effect of the pill I suppose had worn itself out, & it had not yet sufficiently acted as an alterative. I could not expect that it should. The experience thus far is very satisfactory. I omitted to tell you that I was weighed the day after my arrival, & had gained some pounds since we left England. As for the plants—the mere preliminary

sorting, which every former year has been done in one evening, took *four* of above six hours each, & the best part of yesterday forenoon: but yesterday evening I got down the first parcel of the herbarium & got on pretty well, having got half through it. I find it extremely interesting but rather bodily fatiguing, as it is any thing but sedentary work. In the “Saturday” I have just got through June. There are many things in it which I should not have liked to miss seeing, though very few that tend to raise the writers in my estimation. I have read nothing else except glancing through one number of Macmillan—which seems to me not at all worth taking. It seems both poor & dull except a tolerable political article by Masson,⁴ & there is an elaborate review of Tennyson’s last publication by Ludlow,⁵ (the sometime Christian Socialist, & writer of a bad book about India)⁶ making out to the writer’s entire satisfaction that the four Idyls are the most splendidly moral & impressing work of the age, chiefly on the point of conjugal infidelity. It is hardly worth sending, at most worth bringing, but Fraser has just come in & shall be sent as soon as read, for it contains Hare’s paper (under a better title).⁷ I shall be glad to subscribe for Spencer’s large programme of intended works,⁸ though I think it rather too ambitious a one. I have had a note from Bain saying that he is to be at home till the 6th & will put off going if I cannot come before, but I must try to do so though I grudge all time taken from the reading & the plants at present. I get on well with Hadji, who is less silent than usual though he never speaks about his own concerns. I suppose Ellen⁹ has given him some taste for neatness, for one day when I left the room untidy I found on coming in that he had arranged everything with quite studious tidiness. He has got on a little with music & his practicing is now quite tolerable. Tell me dear directly you get tired & wish me back. I do not say ennuyé for I know you never can be that. Ever affectionately

J.S.M.

436.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

Feb. 2. [1860]

Dear Sir

Your bulletin of progress has followed me here, where however I am only for a short time. It is, I think, very satisfactory, and I have no fear that the plan² will fail to make progress if a quiet agitation is kept up on the subject. I hope your paper in Fraser³ will be soon followed up by another⁴ of a more distinctly practical character. The effect of the present one is I think a little damaged by the introduction of so much of other people’s generalities which (especially those of Carlyle)⁵ are associated in most minds with anything rather than a plan admitting of actual legislative realization. The same generalities shaped in your own mind and clothed in your own language (which would not have precluded using the *authority* of the men as far as available) would have had the practical remedial principles much more distinctly imbedded in them and

would therefore have made more of the impression which is desirable. I am feeling strongly on this point through the evidence which is always coming before us of the obtuseness of the English practical intellect when any *new details* are concerned, and the utter absence of Conservative *principles* among the professed Conservatives. Witness the reform article in the last Quarterly,⁶ which will not condescend even to *discuss* the representation of minorities. The suggestion about forming a Committee may prove useful when we have a sufficient number of the right names to put on it—which I hope we shall have by & by.

Yours Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

437.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Feb. 2. 1860

Dearest Lily—

Your nice letter came by the second post yesterday, just as I was on the point of going out: three letters in three successive days. How does it happen that you get my letters regularly on the second day instead of the third? you answered my Thursday's on Sat^y & my Saturday's on Monday. Do the letters no longer remain a day at Paris? or does the favour of the Director abridge the delay at Avignon? Now for business. I find that, probably by my own fault, I misunderstood the point on which Girling had given an opinion, opposed to Suter's. It was, the stability of the kitchen wall as now shored up, which G. from his experience guarantees, while S. according to Hadji wants to have a job there. The suggestion of the iron bar to support the arch above the darling's window came from *Suter*, & it can, as I & also Hadji conceive it, only be put up from inside. That being the case, what had better be done? Had it better wait altogether till you are here also? Say what you think and feel as best. If needful I will have a fire in the room and remain in it all the time; which would I hope prevent mischief though not obviate the desecration about which I also feel very strongly. Doubtless the job Ross proposes can be done wholly from without, and to this we shall probably come ultimately (*viz.* next summer) if not to worse, for the house *seems* at least to be in a more precarious state than it has ever yet been. I will do, in regard to it, exactly what you think best. I do not expect any danger before, at soonest the end of another dry summer.—M^{TS} Goodenough is to come on Saturday. Eliz. says if she could not have had her, she, knowing your unwillingness to have a stranger, would have gone on as well as she could without. But it seems fair that she should have help once a week in the cleaning.—I have been in town once since I last wrote, doing one or two little jobs, & seeing India House people, which has brought on me the (agreeable) task of

reading several very good papers of Willoughby's. He & all I have seen are in a high state of dissatisfaction, & every fresh thing I hear of Wood shews more & more how much ground there is for it. I would rather have to do with any public affairs now than with India. There is nothing new to say about my health. I have taken the second pill & shall take the third tomorrow. I am in the middle of my second packet and of the Caryophylleae. You can trace my progress in Babington,² the order of the families being the same. The Cruciferae alone took more than a whole evening, but they contained one or two difficult genera, having got through which, & also the troublesome Helianthemums, amounts to a considerable progress. In the Saturdays I have just finished July 16. The best service they have rendered is by being always strenuous for arming, & against Louis Napoleon, but in doing so they have become anti-French to a degree I do not like—though some of them write candidly enough too on the French people. While I am writing a Times has come from Wray with a message that I can now have one. Thanks dear for your kind feeling about it. The fact is I have been so immersed in last year's S. Review politics that a glance at the Telegraph has generally been enough for me hitherto. Hare's paper in Fraser³ rather disappoints me. There is nothing in it that lowers my opinion of his mind, but it is ineffective. On a subject which ought to be studiously presented in the most eminently practical light, his paper is overlaid with quotations of rhapsody from Carlyle & generalities from Maurice & Ruskin, as applicable to any other subject as to this. I have not yet read any more of Fraser, but will lose no time in doing so. I have desired Wray to post the February number of the Englishwoman's Journal to you: I have read no more of M^cMillan yet. I found the Westminster at Galignani's, so perhaps it would not have been stopt if it had been sent to Avignon. I do not know if I mentioned that I glanced (at Galignani's) at the article in the Quarterly on reform.⁴ They made a good deal of use & mention of the pamphlet (last spring)⁵ though they adopted nothing of what it proposed—but they made no use of the ballot part, for though they liked the conclusion, the premises I presume were too un-Tory for them. I was struck with the *de haut en bas* manner in which they set aside as not worth even consideration any plan for representing minorities. What an illustration such things give of the low state of the general intellect. Is it not surprising that Conservatives have no sense or appreciation of Conservative principles? Conservatism with us means a blind opposition to change. I know no Conservatives who are really so but the Saturday reviewers whose adherence is to *principles* of stability & principles of unjust domination so far as now practically maintainable, but who have no mere instinctive attachment to details as they are. *N. B.* To shew *our* preference for openness I shew Haji your letters. This put me into a dilemma with the last, but on reflection I thought you would not dislike his seeing the few words about him. If I was wrong, say so. I shall see if he shews me your letters to him: if not, I shall shew no more of mine. He did not shew me M. L.'s⁶ letter, though he told me she had asked him to lend money.—February opened with a beautiful day of hard frost, & there has been a little snow today. Sundridge Park was lovely & Camden too in spite of the new villas. ever affectionately J.S.M.

438.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

Feb. 4. 1860

Dear Sir

I received your note, and by the same post your letter from Avignon with its inclosure. I need hardly say I should be happy to hear from Mr Fawcett, and as to my occupations here I can have none more important than to aid you and him in any mode in my power. I am doubtful about the move you now propose. It seems to me of the utmost importance not to begin with the Lords or in any quarter under suspicion of Toryism. Those who wish not for the equal rights of all but for the despotism of the numerical majority will be only too ready to run down the plan as a *fetch* of Tory Anti Reform. It is not at all Tory, though, in the best sense, Conservative, and having also the advantage of being a strict logical corollary from the broadest principles of Democracy it ought not to throw away that advantage. If we only are unguarded enough to give any handle for representing it as anti-democratic we shall throw away all our best chances. I think we should rather strive to bring the plan and its recommendations forcibly before individuals of position and influence, & among these Lords Lyndhurst & Brougham² hold a high rank. With respect to Lord Grey,³ if the question were, who is likeliest in the H. of Lords to see the merits of the plan, and seeing them to do his duty towards it, I should name him without hesitation, but it would be most undesirable that he should identify himself with it *early*, as he has got so confirmed a character for being crotchety and unpractical, i.e. (being interpreted) for *having no following*, that people think they may dismiss anything at once of which *he* is the most prominent supporter. Any public move should, I am convinced, go to the Commons first, and should turn the Liberal side of the scheme outwards, shewing the other side afterwards.—I have received this morning a note from Mr A. F. Mayo. He says “I am happy to find that Mr Hare’s plan is becoming more talked about. Mr Dilwyn,⁴ M. P. for Swansea, whom I have been endeavouring to stimulate for months, has at length made a speech in public at Swansea on the subject. It is a pity that Mr Hare did not state his Act synthetically and in order at the beginning of his work.” I give this last opinion for *quantum valeat*. Pray consider me always at your call while I remain here. I am often in town between 12 and 4 and could call on you in York Street to talk over matters if you are there and at liberty. It is certainly very desirable to make use of the present reform discussions for agitating on so great a principle of reform. The best mode of doing it would depend on the strength we can count on. I will suggest to Mayo to communicate with you. I am not at present in the way of sounding many people. We can count on Bain, and, I should think, Helps.⁵ While I am writing a note has come in from Mr Fawcett. I am glad he is going to see Lord Stanley. Out of office⁶ Lord S. will not feel tongue tied, and his advocacy would give both Radical and Conservative support. I am also very glad to find both that Lord Grey approves and that he declines to initiate.

Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

439.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Feb. 4. 1860

I found your letter yesterday, dear, when I came in at five o'clock, & by the same post a note from Hare, who had just heard from Parker of my arrival. I agree entirely in every word you say on that subject & shall write to him accordingly. Most of all do I agree that *on no account* ought the plan to be propounded under Tory auspices. This morning a note has come in from Mayo (who sent us the Law Magazine). Among other things he says "I am happy to find that Mr Hare's plan is becoming more talked about. Mr Dilwyn, M. P. for Swansea, whom I have been endeavouring to stimulate for months, has at length made a speech in public at Swansea on the subject." This is encouragement to go on propagandizing. Mayo also says that before I mentioned Bain's book² he had read it with very great approval & had been propagandizing at the Athenaeum for that too. A man with so much zeal should be kept up with. I went yesterday to Richmond to see Bain. The place is getting overrun with building, especially the high ground where the Rose hotel stands, & the whole neighbourhood of the Sheen road (I mean the one which goes down hill from opposite the Star). The space between that road & the park wall is almost entirely filled up, & Bain's is one of the tiny houses in that slip of ground close to the park wall. He still requires crutches³ (for his stick is almost a crutch) & though he walks with it as fast as I do, he cannot keep up very long, so we had only about an hour's walk, but the walk to & from Greenwich & between London bridge & Waterloo make up a decent day's exercise. He is in good spirits on things in general. His first volume has sold 640 in all, & the deficit is now made up. The sale made a start on the publication of the second vol. & another start when the article in the Edin. came out. The second has only yet sold 320, but it is sure to equal the first. He has finished & is sending to Parker the first of his papers on Phrenology which are to appear in Fraser in alternate months.⁴ He has been staying with Grote & has seen some of his writing on Plato which from the account he gives of it must be very good, & considerably outspoken. He also says that Grote has benefitted much in health by his Surrey house & is getting, for the first time, fond of the country. Their lease in Savile Row is expiring & they do not mean to have any permanent house in town now. All this is good, as it will both prolong his life & increase the amount of work he will do. Of the six people who have the appointment of the St Andrews professor, the two clever men, Ferrier & Tulloch,⁵ are decidedly for Bain, which is creditable to both & quite remarkably so to Tulloch. Of the four mediocrities, two are against him, the other two doubtful, and likely I should think to vote against him. But he has a chance of a professorship at Aberdeen,⁶ a more important university: for when the arrangements for the union of

the two Colleges there take effect,⁷ there will be (if all goes as is projected) a separation of the Logic from the Moral Philosophy Chair, & the former will be in the gift of the government, in which case if *Lewis*⁸ is still in office Bain considers himself almost sure of the appointment.—I send you two letters relating to M^r Austin. The first, from Miss Duff Gordon⁹ (whom I never saw, unless perhaps when a child) had been left for me at Prescott's. I was glad it was from her rather than from her mother or grandmother, & answered it by another about the same length, expressing regret & respect for him & mentioning nobody else. Yesterday evening came one from M^{rs} Austin which seems to involve the unpleasant necessity of writing to her.¹⁰ My principal anxiety is to do as exactly as I am able what would have been done if I had still my darling to guide me, not only for the reasons which exist in all cases, but for the special one that all relations with persons should shew her to be as much present as before. I inclose for your remarks & suggestions what I think of saying.—Archdeacon Allen¹¹ having heard that I am here, has written another letter very like the first, wishes I would visit him next summer, is thinking of going again to London on Feb. 13 for convocation & asks to be allowed to call on me to which I must of course assent. I have a letter from Hardy¹² who appears to be making a search himself for M. de Gaillard,¹³ but as yet without success: I suppose I must write to M. de Gaillard to report progress. So much for general news. For myself, my improvement in digestion has by no means kept up to the degree it attained at first. Last night I took the third pill & will report further in next letter. I have finished Fraser—it is a goodish number & I will send it at latest on Monday: In the Saturdays I have got to August 6, & in the plants to the end of Thalamiflorae & am going to begin my great heap of Leguminosae, which I shall get quickly through as I do not think any of them will require any redetermining.—About the *gilding* we need not, as you say, decide yet.¹⁴ My feeling is strongly against it, as being less grave, & more gaudy & ostentatious, besides being considerably less legible. But we must consider the pros & cons. I am glad the dames were less tiresome than we feared, though their quality of mind was well illustrated by your anecdote. Even provincial women of their station in England would perhaps have been a little better. I am sorry for the man's accident with the thorn. I hope it can be poulticed out. your ever affectionate

J.S.M.

P.S. A note has just come in from that fine fellow Fawcett, & one from Lady Duff Gordon.¹⁵ The last would make the letter too heavy & contains nothing that need affect the present question. I will write again immediately.

440.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Feb. 5. 1860

Dear Sir

It gave me great pleasure to hear from you. One who, suffering under such a calamity as yours,² has the heart and energy to commence a career of vigorous exertion for great public objects, must be a man of the right mould, and I am proud of being thought to have been of any use to such a man.

You have selected well the object of your present efforts. We can never do enough in pressing forward Mr. Hare's plan, which, in my deliberate belief, contains the true solution of the political difficulties of the future. It is an uphill race, and a race against time, for if the American form of democracy overtakes us first, the majority will no more relax their despotism than a single despot would. But our only chance is to come forward as Liberals, carrying out the Democratic idea, not as Conservatives, resisting it. To become identified with Toryism would be fatal to the plan, for the Conservative is not only the least powerful, but the silliest party. It has been left behind by all its able men, and the others are daily shewing that of all politicians the Conservatives are the least alive to any real *principles* of conservation. It is they—it is Disraeli, the Quarterly Review, &c, who go out of their way to insult the idea of representation of minorities. It will be, as it has been through all my lifetime, that in every real pinch, Radicals have had to do duty as Conservatives, often in opposition to those they were attempting to save.

As you so clearly see, Mr. Hare, like many discoverers, has much to learn in the art of presenting his discoveries with a view to popular effect; but he seems truly anxious for advice and help, and we who did not make the discoveries must aid them in that way. I need hardly say that I shall be glad to read the paper you propose sending,³ and to give my opinion on it. I beg that I may be counted on for cooperation whenever wanted, though I am glad that the very useful task of visiting public men, for which I have decidedly no vocation, is undertaken by yourself.

To say the truth, I am rather glad than otherwise that Lord Grey,⁴ though approving the plan, is unwilling to move actively at present in its favour. It is important at starting to keep clear of those who have the unenviable reputation of being crotchety. The case is different with Lord Stanley,⁴ who would be the most valuable single accession we could obtain. He is reserved, and will not shew the extent of the impression which may be made, but he will take the book and study it, and some day you will see the result.

As I am often in town, and you probably are never at Blackheath, I should be happy to call on you as often as wanted instead of giving you the trouble of coming on purpose.

I Am Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

441.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Tuesday Feb. 7 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

I received your Thursday evening letter yesterday & was made very glad by hearing that you are in good spirits & that the work is proceeding satisfactorily. I will make a translation carefully & send it.² I was in hopes that by this time you would have told me what you think had better be done about the repairs here. Yesterday while I was out a man (a builder) came on the part of Ross, without any definite message, & after looking at the outside, told Haji there was no danger: but I think Suter must look at the great crack near the window of your room. I have been waiting till I hear from you. I write but a short letter this time because I wish to inclose two notes from Fawcett which I think will interest you. I shall meet him & Hare tomorrow & as I shall also see Coulson, there will be much to write to you next morning. I have been doing better again as to health, though I have still occasionally a little acidity even while taking the mercury. I do not think I shall recover a perfectly healthy digestion quickly. My chronic ailments however slight are always a long while in going away. I took the fourth pill last night, so it is time to see Coulson. I am getting on pretty well with the plants. I have finished Leguminosae, Rosaceae & others, & of the fourth packet there remain only the stonecrops & saxifrages, both of which are rather numerous. You should see how plethoric the packets have grown, & what difficulty I now have in making their girdles meet. After next spring's acquisitions I shall have to build my barns bigger. Of the Saturdays I have just finished Sept. 10. They are wonderfully steady in their quality in all respects. They are certainly however a proof of the influence of my writings, for besides that they are continually referring to me by name, I continually detect the influence of some idea they have lately got from the Dissertations. They must also get me plenty of readers, for they are always treating me & my influence as something of very great importance. Did you notice the death of D^r Todd?³ another great loss. I hope the Evening Mail will give a letter in the Times today from the editor of the Gazette de Nice⁴ who says the French papers misrepresent & suppress everything & that the anti-annexation party there & in Savoy must look to the English papers only to make the truth known. I send, by this post, Fraser, which I am ashamed to say I forgot yesterday. I saw two days ago the first flowers, being a primrose & some winter aconite: not here, but in the Christmas rose garden in the Park. The laurustinus everywhere is quite as backward as it was this day fortnight at Avignon, & there is not a crocus or a snowdrop visible. your ever affectionate

J.S.M.

442.

TO SARAH AUSTIN¹

Blackheath

Feb. 10. 1860

Dear Mrs Austin

From my remembrance of the Lectures² I should say, without hesitation—If a bookseller will undertake them, publish them all, with only such revision as may remove needless repetitions & so far reduce the bulk. They are much more calculated for popularity than they would have been if he had, by rewriting, made them (as he would have done) more elaborate, & more difficult reading. I am persuaded that his reputation with all students of his subject would sell the book (if not too voluminous) & I am sure the book would greatly extend his reputation. But you cannot have better advisers than Sir J.R. and Sir G.L.³ I am sorry to say I have sought in vain for my copy of the Tables.⁴

I Am Yrs Faithfully

443.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Saturday, Feb 11. [1860]

Dearest Lily—

I received your letters yesterday & today. I am very glad that you thought I hit the right mark in my answer² to that letter. I sent it yesterday, except that for the sentence about the Tables, I had to substitute “I am sorry to say that I have sought in vain for my copy of the Tables.” It must be in some recess of the boxroom, not to be found without a general clearance. She will be able to get one from somebody else. You have very truly characterized her letter; which is like all her letters & if you saw her daughter’s you would say she has an apt pupil. Only the daughter has the grace to mention *my* loss though in a very inadequate manner. As it requires no answer I will not send it but bring it. I cannot translate the inscription at all satisfactorily,³ but for the mere formal purpose a general indication of the sense, even though in bad French, is sufficient. There is no reason at all against putting up the two lower blocks as soon as they are ready. I shall most likely have finished everything else by the end of my second fortnight with Coulson. I am deep in the Compositae, and though I have not yet got through half the number of packets, I am more than half through the work, as after Labiatae the new acquisitions (except the Grasses) are much more thinly

scattered. In the Saturdays I am at October 29. But neither of these would keep me here, as you know. Suter has been here; the iron bar is to be *outside*, & he not only thinks that there is no necessity to put it up at once, but thinks it better not. The great crack in your bedroom he will send a man on Monday to stop. About seeing Hare, Fawcett, &c. you will have seen that I took your advice before I received it. The truth is that though I detest society for society's sake yet when I can do anything for the public objects I care about by seeing & talking with people I do not dislike it. At the moment of going to do it, I feel it a bore, just as I do taking a walk or anything else that I must & ought to do when not wishing to do it. But I believe the little additional activity & change of excitement does me good, & that it is better for me to try to serve my opinions in other ways as well as with a pen in my hand. With such people as Hare & Fawcett it is a pleasure, & ranks with going to the Pol. Econ. Club (for which by the by, Fawcett asked me to propose him as a member, or rather expressed a wish to be a member & I offered to propose him, which I have done).⁴ Archd. Allen's visit would be a bore, but he has written to say he is not coming to town at present. He renews his invitation very warmly. This morning the papers have Gladstone's budget.⁵ It is a great success. He turns the edge of the argument about relieving the rich instead of the poor, by raising the income tax to tenpence, & he takes off the paper duty,⁶ & *all* the remaining protecting duties, making a clean sweep of all duties on manufactures, on butter, cheese, eggs &c. & leaves a number of other duties, giving for the first time a really good fiscal system. He says wine will still be more heavily taxed than beer, therefore there need be no reduction of the malt tax. The French concessions are larger & better than anybody knew of. His speech was one of principle, good throughout, & pointing out many bad effects to which I had not adverted as produced by the taxes which the French treaty takes off.⁷ All other wines are to have the same benefit as French. Except a little complaint from the representatives of the silk interest, nobody but the wise Mr Bentinck ventured to complain.⁸ They only asked for time to consider, & I have no doubt that the intending *opponents* find their hopes dashed. It will be supported I think zealously by all liberals. Very judiciously they mean to finish this before bringing in the Reform Bill,⁹ lest the enemy should defeat this by forcing them to dissolve on that.—I hope the really touching appeal to the English public from a number of Savoyards, in yesterday's Times,¹⁰ is in the Evening Mail. There was also a good leading article on that topic.¹¹ Mayo has written again & has sent a paper of notes & criticisms on Bain's book of which as I told you he is a great admirer.¹² I bought at the railway station to read in my journeys to & fro, a shilling copy of Emerson's Representative Men.¹³ It seems to me very empty mouthing, with only a foundation of a few vague & general ideas which are right or wrong according as they are taken. Is it a *pair* of revolvers you want? I ask, because one hears of a pair of pistols (or as the old phrase is, a brace) but revolvers I only remember hearing of in the singular number, & I should think one of their advantages must be that there is no need for people to burthen themselves with two. We have bitter cold weather again here: it was hard frost all day yesterday, to the benefit however of my walk. I have kept my word with you in letter & spirit: according to weather I walk (at five miles an hour) for two hours or for between three & four: the only exception (not counting the days of going to town, when I have plenty of exercise) was the rainy day I told you of, when I went only to Deptford. There are now a few nice snowdrops out near the door but no

crocuses. I think the Vichy water is doing me good. It is only like very pure water with a slightly pungent taste.

Your Ever Affectionate

J.S.M.

[P.S.]

With all help from Boyer's dictionary¹⁴ I cannot find an equivalent for "earnest" for "instructor in wisdom" or for what we mean by "goodness." If you can amend any part of it, do.

444.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Tuesday Feb. 14 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

Your nice letter of Saturday came yesterday, but not till after I had gone out, though I staid till I thought the time for the second post had passed. I quite understand the way you are affected by spending hours in the company of such people. You do not mean to keep up *both* the Demoiselles & the Dames? It is a great happiness to me to be a support to you under depression, but it would be very painful to me to think that I should always continue to be the only one, as I must necessarily fail you some day & I can never be at ease unless, either by means of persons or of pursuits you have some other resource besides me, and I am sure my own darling would feel as I do. But to speak of things more germane to the present moment. Suter came yesterday & the crack in your room was filled up. Everything has thus been done which seems necessary or desirable for the moment. His man, who seems intelligent, thinks that the sinking is caused by the foundation not going down below the sand, which being washed away more & more by the landsprings, the wall goes on sinking. In what I said about the shrubs I did not mean to suggest doing anything now. I am even disposed not to have any of them propped up (for they are not actually levelled) & as for cutting them, nothing would induce me to have the dearest one's shrubs touched without the presence of some one who understands the subject & knows what she would have liked: It is easy however if you think it desirable, to have a few stakes put in the most important places. But it cannot well be done yet for it is hard frost, with cold wind, & snow on the ground. I was caught yesterday in two snow showers. It will be a late spring in both countries evidently. The birds who had begun singing have left off, though there are great numbers of them. The other day looking out of my bedroom window I perceived five bulfinches perched on the thorn near the dining

room window.—There have been two notes from Gregson. He seems to take matters very slackly: The first said that he & Cooper thought it was best to sell the securities.² The second, in answer to an enquiry by Haji, said that he had not seen the will, but only extracts furnished by Cooper & that these satisfied him that the third share is divisible now. I tried to see him to get some explanation of this vagueness, but as he was not at home, I wrote a note to him to say that I think it important that he should see, not extracts, but the will itself, as the difference of opinion between Cooper & his principal makes it necessary to have the best evidence. Meanwhile Haji is under an impression that the consols are already divided, as he says there are £200 more to his account than would be the case otherwise. This ought not to have been done with Gregson's consent, unless after further communication with you.—Fawcett has sent his MS. pamphlet this morning.³ It is very well done, but I can suggest some additions & a few omissions of things which would be better away, & I am writing to him to say that I will call tomorrow to talk about it. He will probably send over to Hare who is close by. I am glad you thought my advice & notions on the former occasion correct. I had not shewn Fawcett's letters to Haji but I have shewn him this one. I have not sent Lady D[uff] G[ordon]'s letter as it is heavy, but I shall know by your next whether you would like it sent. I have got through the Compositae & am in Campanulaceae. In the Saturdays I have got into the middle of December. Although not so quick in perceiving such things as dear one was I cannot help seeing continual marks that some of the writers have taken their cue from the Liberty & the Dissertations. A very favorable notice of the Diss. in a Bradford paper has been sent,⁴ & there is one of the Liberty in a large quarterly review called the London Review⁵ which I found here, & which had got to a 25th number without my even knowing of its existence. As to health I think I am going on very well. I seldom have any acidity now, but I do not yet feel confidence that after eight pills I shall be able to get on without medicine. I shall see what Coulson says. I do not think of seeing either Clark or Ramadge this time. The success of the Budget seems as far as I can judge to be complete.⁶ There is something going on about Savoy & Nice, which has induced our Government to ask Kinglake⁷ to put off his motion for the present. There is another notability dead, Sir W. Napier, aged 74.⁸ How is poor little Bruno? Another pet, little Goldie, keeps singing very loud in the kitchen. Tell me anything you would like me to bring when I come. You spoke of bulbs, & roots from Halley. It will soon be time to get them. Shall I bring Macmillan? It is hardly worthwhile if we have but a few days to stay at the little place before going our journey. I will bring the West^f in any case. Your ever affectionate

J. S. Mill

445.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Friday, Feb. 17 [1860]

As there is no letter this morning, dear, I will write without waiting for one. Gregson writes that he has seen the will² at Doctor's Commons & examined it and that it bears out Cooper's extracts, which however he is not allowed to compare verbatim. The extracts he has sent. They prove that Arthur's³ impression is wrong, & that the time for making the division does not in any way depend on Mrs Hardy's life or death. They do not however clear up all doubt. By the words used, the trustees, after the death of any one of the three legatees, become trustees for that one's sons till of age, & daughters till of age or married: so that in your case & Haji's the trust has expired. But this does not shew that it could not be kept alive by consent, unless there be something in the law which makes this impossible. I shall try to see Gregson to ask this question. But on the whole I am now rather for letting the division take effect. Now that the Birkenhead shares are commuted to Liverpool corporation bonds, I do not know that they are likely to rise by keeping. The following words are from Gregson's note "By it (the will) it is perfectly clear that the children of M^{rs} Mill became entitled to the principal of one third of the residue immediately on her death. They will also become entitled to a further share on the death of either M^{rs} Ley or M^r Alfred Hardy without children. The will expressly required that the number of three trustees should always be kept up, which I apprehend has not been done, as I observe that the will was only proved by M^r Harman & M^r Arthur Hardy & not by M^r Booth⁴ the third executor. It would be proper to see that this is done in order to protect the contingent rights of M^{rs} Mill's children in the remaining two thirds of the funds" or rather I should say (if at all) their right to a third of those now appropriated to M^{rs} Hardy.

I had a long talk on Wed^y with Fawcett. Hare was not there, but a young Cambridge friend of F. named Wilson⁵ was there who seems to be intelligent & a warm supporter of the plan. As we had to go over the pamphlet & discuss all points of it, there was little general conversation. I once tried to lead the talk to the subject of women, but nothing came of it. I shall however have plenty of opportunities. This morning F. has sent the MS.⁶ revised & I shall call on Monday to talk about it further. I have impressed on him that in the present stage the only thing that can usefully be aimed at is to get access to individual minds likely to be influential. I have discouraged sending the pamphlet to any members of parliament but *select* ones. I have on the other hand suggested sending it with a few words of remark to all who signed the Memorial to Lord Palmerston for an educational suffrage.⁷ Though that scheme was not a good one, those who signed it were mostly persons of talent or instruction, & they have all given evidence that they want something out of the common line of parliamentary reform & are alive to one of the strong recommendations of Hare's plan. Most, no doubt, will disregard it, but if we can recruit only a few of them, it will be a great gain. F. says that Cairnes (whom he knows) is with us. Mayo has sent his remarks on Bain: they are all on one detached point, & without being striking or very good, they are worth shewing to Bain which I shall do, having Mayo's permission. I have now read up the Saturdays within two numbers. I think they grow worse rather than better, though there are often good things of a kind one finds nowhere else. I am on the point of beginning Labiatae, & I see my way to leaving about Monday week. Haji intends going to Norwich first,⁸ & following in the middle or at the end of the same week. What is your opinion now about going to Greece? Do you think it would do to cross Italy? I am frightened at the thought of going round by Malta, especially at a stormy

season, & I doubt too if there are any regular steamers from Malta to Corfu or Athens. The French steamers to Athens touch I think at Messina but not at Malta. I can perhaps learn this before I go. The frost here may be said to have gone though it still sometimes freezes in the night & is still very cold all day, with continual snow showers (which do not lie) & a great deal of wind. Your ever affectionate J.S.M.

446.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Saturday Feb 18 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

I have just received your Tuesday evening's letter. We have had nothing here comparable to the weather you describe. There has been no snow that has lain, or none of any depth, & skating [*sic*] had only just begun when the thaw came. It was a slow, cold thaw, but the weather is getting daily milder, & yesterday was beautiful. I saw yesterday in Morden road the first crocus. I wrote to you fully yesterday, & I write again today chiefly to say that Ross has been here, with his man, the same whom Haji saw. They both say that the sinking & cracks can only be finally stopped by underpinning the house at the corners. Tudor House, Ross said, was as bad, but it was underpinned & it never sank afterwards. On the other hand, Suter's man told Haji that Powell's² house had been underpinned long ago & that it did not stop the mischief, which as Powell told Haji has gone so far that he means to leave the house which otherwise he would not. The man said, what I can hardly believe, that it can be done without destroying or much injuring the shrubs: only the rose on the wall nearest the corner must go: I believe there are other stems and roots of roses along the wall though the shrubs hide them. I have asked the man to send a rough estimate of the cost of doing this. The kitchen wall, in the part which has bulged out & is propped up, he says cannot be mended, but only pulled down & rebuilt. Ross, for his part, does not care whether the underpinning is done or no (he avers that there is no danger, as the wall sinks *upright*) but he cares very much for our having the brickwork of the arch in front taken down & replaced (though it would be evidently absurd to do this with any prospect of more sinking) & he does not seek to disguise that the reason of his caring for this is because Powell's lease expires at Midsummer & people who see the state of our house may be deterred from taking that. So he evidently hopes to get us to do this immediately, in which he will be disappointed.—I have finished the Labiatae & shall certainly be ready to come by the time I mentioned. I am sorry to perceive by your note to Haji that you do not think they will have finished the work before the end of March or beginning of April. This settles the question against Greece, & therefore in favour of Catalonia & the Eastern Pyrenees. In the Saturdays I have overtaken Haji, having only one to read besides the one which came today. On further consideration I inclose Lady D[uff] G[ordon]'s letter. Ever affectionately J.S.M.

447.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Tuesday Feb.21 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

Your letter of Friday morning arrived yesterday. Let me first say that there is no shop of Colt's² from one end to the other of Regent Street. I must therefore go again to town tomorrow & get at the Post Office Directory to trace where it is. I shall then go to the London Library & see if I can find any books worth bringing, though if it is for myself only, I do not think it much worth while. I went over yesterday with Fawcett his pamphlet³ as revised by him, and the alterations which I suggested on his revision. We seemed to agree perfectly, but Hare it seems has not yet seen it. He sent to tell Hare, who came. I like Hare more & more. I like very much the expression of his face. I inclose a note I had just before had from him. The pamphlet is to be sent about privately first & afterwards published. Hare said that Hickson has written to him saying that Rowland Hill some years ago proposed for South Australia the very principle of Hare's plan⁴ & that Hickson himself had afterwards proposed it to the Commissioners on the Corporation of London, for adoption in the municipal elections there.⁵ This has suggested to Hare to make a push for trying the plan in that way & he is going to press it upon Ayrton.⁶ We had a good deal of talk on the women question. They seemed to go so thoroughly with me in feeling, that there was little or no actual discussion which would have shewn whether they enter into every corner of the subject, but it seemed to me that they will go the whole way with us. They warmly assented to my statement that all employments & positions should be open to women & that then each would fall naturally into what it turned out they were fittest for individually. It appears that Fawcett presses the subject on his friends as he does all things which he cares about, & as he noticed the way in which they seem to be afraid of doing anything in the matter for fear of ridicule, Hare said if he were in Parl^t he would bring it forward (the question of the suffrage for women, as I understood). Since I finished the Saturday I have been looking through the Reasoner, & nothing in it has struck me so much as the progress making on that question. Continually some new advocate for it is starting up. A Colonel Clinton,⁷ a great radical who writes letters to the Reasoner & is for plural voting, is strongly for women's suffrage, & there is a curious document called the Belfast Resolutions, professing to have been agreed to at a public meeting at Belfast⁸ & signed by a Mr Scott as Chairman, in which a whole radical system of government & political economy is elaborately set forth & near the beginning is a demand that all women as well as all men shall not only be electors but eligible to Parliament. Fawcett thinks it a great thing to have had a woman (Miss Craig)⁹ appointed Secretary to the Social Science Association, & so indeed it is. He says it was done by a most strenuous personal canvass by Miss Parkes¹⁰ & others & that now everybody is glad of it, as the duties are done most admirably. So also at some place in the North, I forgot which of the large towns, he

says that a woman was with great difficulty got chosen Librarian & that the admirable way in which the office is filled is having the most beneficial effects. Various things he says incline me to attach more importance than I did to what Miss Parkes & her set are doing. He says the E[nglish] W[oman]'s Journal increases in sale & has got into places where it was scouted at first. By the bye he said that Miss Craig got her living at Edinburgh as a needlewoman till Miss Parkes found her out, brought her to London & kept her there till she succeeded in getting this Secretaryship for her.—Politics are satisfactory. The first move against the Commercial Treaty & Budget, headed by Disraeli, was defeated last night by an unexpectedly large majority (between 60 & 70)¹¹ though the Metropolitan members whose election depends on the publicans, are up in arms against opening of the wine licenses & Ayrton, as well as Horsman¹² (now grown completely factious) spoke on the Tory side. There is to be another attempt made tonight, on the motion of Du Cane,¹³ member for Essex, which I hope will fail as ignominiously. The general feeling of the country as far as I can judge, seems right, & I think that a great many Tories must have abstained from voting not to drive the ministry to a dissolution. I saw Coulson yesterday. He recommends to me to take no more mercury, but quinine daily for a week & then to leave off medicine. I am very doubtful whether the mercury has done me any permanent good. Yesterday I had more acidity than I have had for some time. I shall probably have to reconcile myself to having a weak stomach & merely take care not to overload it. Perhaps the excursion may do good. But I hardly like going to Spain after what I read in the papers about the bitter feeling against England there. Still I do not suppose it will affect our comfort in a short tour. I am now here alone, Haji having just left for Norwich,¹⁴ not to be back while I remain if I go next Monday. I inclose a note from him. There will be nothing to keep me here. I have got into Monocotyledoneae & into the last but two of the fourteen packets. I do not think I shall bring a hat as I intended. In Spain & the Pyrenees a wideawake¹⁵ will do better. Even if we go to Greece I can get a hat at Avignon or Marseilles. I shall be glad to bring MacMillan. It improves a little as it goes on, & there is an article by Maurice on Macaulay,¹⁶ this month, which I like. The Social Science Association has sent a thick volume of its Transactions¹⁷ from which I find that my name is on the Council. I think I ought to write to have it taken off, especially after what I wrote to the Secretary of this very Association about the other subject.¹⁸ It is still cold here. Yesterday the frost & snow seemed to have come back. But there is nothing like what you tell me there still is at Avignon. The prospect of a very late spring makes me care much less about the retardation of a mere short excursion, our principal object having been frustrated. An Avignon winter judging from our experience is anything but what one means by a Southern one. What Gregson said about filling up the trustees turns out to be bosh, as the stock certificates he himself gave me are signed by Harman in person & by Cooper in behalf of Booth. Ever your affectionate

J.S.M.

[P.S.]

I will bring 2 doz. sherry from Paris. We shall not, I suppose, want any tea. I have answered Guillaumin's¹⁹ letter.

448.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Thursday Feb. 23 [1860]

Dearest Lily—

Your Sunday evening's letter arrived yesterday. Your report about the progress of the work seems favorable but if we do not leave before April, it would entirely negative going to Greece as far as I alone am concerned. I should arrive rather later than I did before;² I wish to see both the places I did not then see, & those I did: we should inevitably do it more slowly; & it is impossible to stay a *day* later than I did, on account of the heat. Still, if you decidedly preferred that journey to any other, I should do so too, for I have no very strong attraction towards the alternatives, which are Catalonia & the Pyrenees, or some part of Italy or Sicily. If you would rather travel in Greece before trying tent life in the East, we might, next winter, go to Egypt first, & then to Greece, postponing Palestine & Syria. By that however we should lose the approach by Corfu & the Corinthian Gulf which I very much *tiens* to shewing you first. The same objection applies to going by Malta, for, judging by the long & detailed list of steamers in Bradshaw's Continental, there is no steamer from Malta or Marseilles to Corfu but only to Syra & Athens. Everybody who sees Greece first by the south coast of the Morea, & Athens, is disappointed. If we go this year it will be best to start from Ancona, stay a week at Corfu, go from there to Athens, then see Attica & the Morea *only*, which we might do thoroughly, & then return by Italy or by Constantinople as the season, the convenience, or our inclination might determine.—I have bought your revolver. With the case, caps &c. complete it cost £5, & 50 cartridges in addition make three shillings more. It was not too heavy for me to carry home. I hope they won't stop it at the Custom House. I believe importation of arms is prohibited, not to mention that they may think I intend to fire at the Emperor. I made up a list of books for the London Library, but it was not a very attractive one. If they send half a dozen volumes however that will probably be reading enough for the time we want it, especially as I hope to resume writing. It is again hard frost here: should it be so on Monday I shall perhaps be afraid to come. I have been, however, a good deal better these two days. In the plants I have only now the Grasses to go through, as I have not acquired this time any ferns or other cryptogams. I shall like very much to hear an account of your domiciliary visits with the ladies of the Bienfaisance. I have just been reading a manuscript essay on Strikes,³ by Fawcett: it is the best thing I ever read on the subject, with some new lights even to me, & I hope it will be published. I think we may look to him with great hopes (notwithstanding his misfortune) as one of the successors. A propos, the misfortune, according to what Hare tells me, seems to have happened under most painful circumstances. It was the effect of two stray shots from his father's gun: only two, but one went into each eye, breaking the spectacles & no doubt forcing in the broken glass. What a sad concurrence of circumstances was necessary to make one poor man (or rather two) afflicted for life! If the coincidence

had been the contrary way, would it not have been thought manifestly providential?—Everything looks well for the Budget,⁴ for though the Tories are making a distinct party opposition to it, they evidently cannot muster their full strength. But I am sadly afraid the Government may be forced to give up the best provision of all, that which destroys the brewers' public house monopoly; for not only the publican interest is the most powerful, next to the attornies, in all the larger constituencies, but the Teetotallers have with their usual narrow-mindedness come up in great force & are pouring in petitions against what they call a great extension of the trade in intoxicating liquors. By the bye I believe I am very unpopular at present with the teetotallers.⁵ A correspondent of Holyoake complains that they misunderstand me & think me "opposed to Temperance." I perceive Francis Newman is a leading Maine law man, & writes papers with his name in the Reasoner, in one of which he obliquely glances at me.⁶ I think, he, like the Saturday reviewers, is among the greatest enemies to our *principles* that there now are; such will mostly be found among those who agree with us on many details. After your letter I think I may authorize Gregson to consent to Cooper's proposed sale & division. Ever your aff^{te}

J.S.M.

[P.S.]

Your Brighton dividend, received at Prescott's, this time is £26.19.

449.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Blackheath

Sat^y Feb.25 [1860]

I write but a few words, dear, as I shall see you so soon. I shall certainly go on Monday ev^g & consequently arrive on Wednesday by the express at midday. I have finished the plants, & done everything that requires doing, & though it freezes every night rather hard it does not freeze in the day. I am not taking any medicine, & have had very little indigestion since I wrote last. I have certainly gained a good deal by the course of medicine, & perhaps now the excursion will set me up. Your Wednesday's letter came yesterday. I have not heard anything further of or from Ross or his man. If I had seen either of them I should have again repeated that I would do nothing till we return, there being in their opinion & in that of every one else who has been spoken to, no immediate or rather no present danger. If it is desirable to write to Ross, this can as well be done from St Véran. I do not know what you mean by Suter's "job" as the putting up of the iron bar which was what he recommended need not in his opinion be done at present & I do not see why it should not wait till we can decide on everything at once. Gladstone has defeated the second motion of the Tories against the budget by the quite unexpected majority of 116.² But he has been obliged to limit his measure about licensing to the sale of wine, leaving the beer question as he says to

be considered hereafter as a separate subject. I cannot blame him though I am sorry.—Do not feel any anxiety about my passage for there is no wind, to speak of, here. So now dear I leave off, & shall not need to write again before the pleasant moment of seeing you.

Your Ever Affectionate

J.S.M.

450.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Feb. 26. 1860

Dear Mr Fawcett

It would never for a moment occur to me, seeing what you are in other respects, to regard your loss of sight as excluding you from political life. It could only do so if it had, as in most men it would have done, thrown a damp on your wishes and aspirations. You have only to take every fair opportunity of making yourself known as a public speaker and lecturer. When you have thus proved that you are under no real disqualification, your misfortune will, I am satisfied, be very much in your favour, not only by exciting interest, and neutralizing envy and jealousy, but because it will cause you to be much more and sooner talked about. You will then, I think, have quite as good a chance of being elected to Parliament, as any other man of independent opinions.

I return the pamphlet² by post. I like the original title best, but either is good. The addition on the back of the title page is very desirable, but instead of “interest in the improvement of the Representation” I would say “interest in improving the *quality* of the Representation” or, more generally, “in correcting the deficiencies of” &c. or some other and better phrase to distinguish those you address from *mere* Parliamentary Reformers of the old school.

Parker writes “I am just going to Cambridge, and will see Mr Fawcett and discuss with him further the ‘Strikes’ paper.”³ By this I conclude he thinks you are at Cambridge.⁴ He does not say when he will be back, but I suppose very soon.

I have marked in pencil on the margin of the proof, a few misprints, and two or three slight alterations or additions which occur to me.

Ever Yours Sincerely

J. S. Mill

451.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran

le 7 mars 1860

Monsieur

C'est avec grand plaisir que j'ai reçu votre lettre du 8 février. Elle m'a suivi en Angleterre, où j'étais allé pour affaires, et si j'étais eu le temps de m'arrêter à Paris en retournant ici, j'étais répondu à votre lettre personnellement plutôt que par écrit. Je me promets de profiter à une meilleure occasion de votre invitation aimable et amicale.

Je suis charmé que votre nouveau livre² soit à la veille de paraître. Je le suis aussi d'apprendre que la traduction aura, à votre ais, l'avantage de l'*à propos*, et que l'opinion commence à pencher du côté contraire à la centralisation. Je puis le dire sans blesser vos convictions, car vous conviendrez, je pense, qu'en France l'engouèment pour la centralisation a été excessif, comme j'accorde que de notre côté de la Manche on a dormé un peu dans le fanatisme contraire. Du reste, ni votre point de vue ni le mien n'est exclusif, en notre divergence, quoique considérable, repose sur une différence de nuance plutôt que de principe.

M. Guillaumin³ me fit, il y a quelques semaines, la proposition de faire traduire le petit livre par M. Paillottet.⁴ Je lui fis savoir sans délai que vous aviez bien voulu charger de cette tâche. Je me suis aperçu seulement hier, par le Journal des Economistes, que M. Guillaumin avait eu l'imprudénce d'annoncer sa traduction avant de me faire part de son projet. Si vous avez vu l'annonce, vous avez sans doute compris comme la chose s'ést passée.

Agréez, mon cher Monsieur, l'expression de ma haute considération et de mes sentiments d'amitié.

J. S. Mill

452.

TO LORD OVERSTONE¹

Saint Véran

near Avignon

March 25. 1860.

Dear Lord Overstone

I have just heard that M^r Hare, the Charity Commissioner, and author of the remarkable Treatise on Representation, is to be proposed to the Committee of the Athenaeum on the 27th, for selection without ballot.² If I could be sure that you had read Mr Hare's book it would be quite needless, indeed I should hardly feel at liberty, to express to you any opinion of mine on the subject; but in case you have not, I venture to say that there are few books you would find better worth reading, or which are likely to give you a higher opinion of the author. My own conviction is, that Mr Hare has discovered, what the best political thinkers have rather lamented the want of, than hoped to find—an effectual and practicable mode of preventing numbers, in a popular constitution, from swamping and extinguishing the influence of education and knowledge. Whatever your opinion may be on this point, I feel sure that as a mere specimen of intellectual power applied to the great political question of the modern world, the book would amply repay in pleasure, the time spent in reading it.

Believe Me

Dear Lord Overstone

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

453.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

St. Véran le 6 avril 1860

Mon Cher Monsieur—

Je vous remercie beaucoup de l'envoi de votre nouveau livre.² C'est un ouvrage très remarquable et qui me paraît même supérieur à celui auquel il fait suite.³ Je pense qu'il fera époque dans la grande discussion de la Centralisation. Vous ne vous attendrez pas, à coup sûr, qu'il n'y ait pas une divergence considérable entre nos opinions. Cependant (comme vous avez dit à propos du livre de la Liberté) je suis plus frappé des coïncidences d'opinion que des différences: et je crois que vous eussiez dit cela avec encore plus de raison si vous aviez connu un certain manuscrit inédit que j'ai dans mon portefeuille.⁴ J'attends avec un vif intérêt l'introduction⁵ promise dans l'annonce de la Liberté. Je suis plus que curieux de voir de quelle manière vous concevrez la différence entre nos deux manières de penser. Il est au reste très

convenable que le plus modéré et le moins fanatique des localistes soit présenté et commenté par le plus philosophe des centralistes.

Je n'entre pas ici dans les questions qui nous séparent et que j'espère discuter avec vous de vive voix. Vous êtes un de ceux avec qui on ne peut que gagner à comparer ses idées. Je donnerai seulement un mot d'éclaircissement sur deux points.

L'un des deux me regarde personnellement. Je n'ai jamais entendu nier l'influence des races. Vous pouvez voir dans mon article sur Michelet⁶ que j'admets pleinement cette influence. Dans la phrase que vous avez citée, je voulais seulement blâmer une tendance qui existe dans tous les temps mais plus particulièrement dans celui-ci (par suite de la réaction du 19^{me} siècle contre le 18^{me}), c'est celle d'attribuer toutes les variétés dans le caractère des peuples et des individus à des différences indélébiles de nature, sans se demander si les influences de l'éducation et du milieu social et politique n'en donnent pas une explication suffisante. Je ne puis comparer cette tendance qu'à l'habitude qu'avaient les peuples primitifs d'attribuer tout ce qu'on faisait, sans pouvoir dire de qui et comment on avait appris à le faire, à l'inspiration directe d'un dieu. Dans le cas dont il s'agit, savoir celui des différences de caractère entre les peuples celtiques et les peuples anglo-saxons, je crois avec vous que la race y entre pour beaucoup; mais quant à leur goût pour ou contre la centralisation, je vous demanderai si la diversité dans le développement historique de la France et de l'Angleterre dont vous avez fait une esquisse si vraie et si instructive, ne suffisait pas à elle seule comme explication.

L'autre point sur lequel je veux dire un mot, c'est celui-ci. Je reconnais pleinement la tendance que vous signalez dans la législation anglaise vers une centralisation plus grande. Non seulement je reconnais cette tendance, mais encore j'y applaudis même. Mais notez bien que ce mouvement centralisateur est plus utile que nuisible chez nous, justement parce qu'il est en opposition tranchée avec l'esprit du pays. De là il arrive que ces changements si grands en apparence, se réduisent dans la pratique à des proportions presque exigües. Vous croyez peut-être que l'administration de la charité publique est réellement centralisée chez nous depuis la loi de 1834.⁷ Eh bien, il n'en est rien. L'immense abus qu'on avait fait du pouvoir local avait tellement effarouché le public qu'il est devenu possible de faire cette loi; mais il n'est pas été possible de l'exécuter: le pouvoir local a fini par regagner sa prédominance sur le pouvoir central; et celui-ci n'a pu conserver ses attributions qu'en les exerçant avec une réserve si excessive qu'elles sont restées plutôt une ressource pour des cas extrêmes qu'un ressort régulier d'administration. Il en sera ainsi pour longtemps de tout ce qu'on tentera chez nous dans le sens de la centralisation. On admettra bien l'intervention du pouvoir central comme remède héroïque et passager: on ne l'admettra pas comme régime. Maintenant c'est à réfléchir si ces dictatures momentanées du pouvoir central ne remplissent pas suffisamment les conditions de votre système.—Votre tout dévoué

J. S. Mill

454.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran

April 6. 1860

Dear Mr Fawcett

I was very glad to hear from you, and was much pleased that you are going to lecture on Strikes. Your being urged to do so by Sir J. Shuttleworth,² and his presence as Chairman,³ take away all appearance of the proceeding's being uncalled for; and anything which tends to make you known as a public speaker without looking like a desire on your part to push yourself into notice, is useful for your ulterior views.

With regard to being examined before the Committee on Strikes,⁴ I should not have anticipated a much more favorable answer than you received, though I should have expected a civil one. It is contrary to the theory of a Parliamentary Committee to examine witnesses on anything but matters of fact; and it is only because members of parliament are not what they are *censés* to be, that such a practice could ever have crept in. As it is, I have always felt that there was a sort of impropriety in it, and have avoided rather than sought to be examined on questions of argument and theory, though I have once or twice consented⁵ when particularly asked to do so by the Chairman of the Committee. In the case of the Corrupt Practices Committee,⁶ the same reasons do not apply, as inventors may always with propriety offer themselves to explain their plan.

Mr Hare's letter in the Times⁷ seemed to me a very good move, and I am glad to hear from him that it has met with some response from the press. Mr Martineau's⁸ is an important adhesion. If he has made up his mind to do all that he can, it will probably be found to be not a little. In your remarks on the impossibility of making any impression in the House of Commons, you must, I think, have overlooked Sir J. Pakington's speech.⁹ He seemed to me to have sought an occasion for separating himself from Disraeli on the question, and to be quite ready to consider any feasible plan for the representation of minorities. I hope he has your pamphlet,¹⁰ but I would not counsel any more direct application to him. There is a great deal in leaving an idea time to crystallize.

I expect to leave Avignon in about a week, after which I must refer you to Parker for my address.

Ever Yours Sincerely

J. S. Mill

455.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran

April 6, 1860

Dear Sir

Your letter of the 29th gave me great pleasure. It is very satisfactory that your proposals in the Times² were so decidedly supported by the Economist,³ and received so much attention from the papers. Several passages in the leading articles of the Times have since pointed, by slight indications, in the direction we wish for.⁴ Notwithstanding the inaccessibility of members of Parliament to any idea which will not serve for the hustings, the situation seems to me favourable for gaining the attention of leading politicians to such a plan as yours. Did you notice Pakington's speech?⁵ He ostentatiously separated himself from Disraeli, complimenting Lord J. Russell on the provision in his former bill for representation of minorities (which Disraeli had reproached him for as unconstitutional) and altogether seemed on the lookout for some unobjectionable mode of doing what your plan does in the best of all modes. The foundation is evidently laid for making an impression on his mind. But I would not recommend (unless some special opportunity offers) entering into any communication with him, beyond sending him Mr Fawcett's pamphlet.⁶ We must be on our guard against the danger of making people feel bored by the subject before they understand it.

What Sir E. Lytton says is true, but not much to the purpose; as he was not asked anything but what was perfectly consistent with his remarks. He was not applied to as a minister, but as one of the leaders of opinion. An important member of parliament has it in his power to help forward materially by incidental notice, ideas with which it may not be yet time for him to identify himself as a practical statesman. And from the tone of Sir E. L's letter⁷ I should not despair of his doing so in this case, though he will not commit himself beforehand.

I do not like to discourage any move in favour of the plan, but I confess I should not expect that much good could be done at present by any appeals to the inadequately represented places. Any feeling that might be excited, would be sure, I think, to turn itself into a movement for the more practical object of merely obtaining more members: while the plan would be made chiefly known by its least beneficial feature, the increased representation it would give to the large towns. I say this in ignorance of all that may have occurred to you on the other side.

I was glad to hear from Mr Fawcett that Mr Martineau promises to do his utmost in the National.⁸ That Review is, I believe, a good deal read by a rather advanced order of liberals; and independently of Mr Martineau's own abilities as a reasoner and writer, he is attended by a *cortège* of younger men who can also use their pens

efficiently. His adhesion is very valuable, and tends to hasten the time when you will be able to cite an imposing number of thinkers, differing in other respects, but agreeing in their support of your plan.

I have not yet seen the new Fraser,⁹ but hope to see it in a day or two. Perhaps if a good article were offered to the Westminster, it would be accepted, but it should be by a new person, if possible. If I were in England, I would try to move Herbert Spencer, but I do not know how he is affected by the plan. Have you any means of knowing?

I expect to leave Avignon about this time next week, but I shall keep Parker informed of my address.

Yours Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

456.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

S[aint] V[éran] April 11. 1860

Dear Bain—

I propose leaving Avignon in a day or two to pass a few weeks or months in the Pyrenees & in Spain—during which time as my address will be frequently changing I had better refer you to Parker for it.

I mentioned in my last letter that I had completed the first draft of the new book.² I have read since my return here, several things which have interested me, above all Darwin's book.³ It far surpasses my expectation. Though he cannot be said to have proved the truth of his doctrine, he does seem to have proved that it *may* be true which I take to be as great a triumph as knowledge & ingenuity could possibly achieve on such a question. Certainly nothing can be at first sight more entirely unpalatable than his theory & yet after beginning by thinking it impossible, one arrives at something like an actual belief in it, & one certainly does not relapse into complete disbelief.

Another book I have been reading is Baden Powell's last,⁴ which though much inferior to Darwin is a wonderful book for a clergyman & an Oxford professor⁵ to write, & remarkable as an exemplification of one form of modern theism. It is curious to see natural theology reverting to the form in which it was conceived by Aristotle⁶—that it is not what cannot be predicted, but what can, that proves an intelligent agency. There is in Powell's otherwise very consistent system an awkward gap at the point where this doctrine comes face to face with historical Xtianity. What can he mean by holding that miracles are *impossible*, & yet that those of the new testament may be received as matters of faith, though not of science?⁷ Is this last a mere saving

clause, as when Voltaire said nearly the same thing?⁸ If so, he must intend it to be seen through, as Voltaire did. But the general tone of his mind, so unlike Voltaire's, makes this improbable.

When you next write I hope to hear that you have quite got rid of your lameness.

457.

TO WILLIAM ELLIS

[The Letter to William Ellis originally numbered in the sequence here as from Avignon on May 1, 1860, has been transferred to the following year as Letter 488A.]

458.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Barcelona

May 9. 1860

Dear Sir

On returning here after a tour of more than a fortnight I found your letter—and I inclose a few sentences by way of reply to your circular.² I hope they may suffice, though they are not so good as I could wish, having been written when I was tired and somewhat pressed for time. I am very glad that Lord Grey has got his Committee.³ It enables you, with a favorable Chairman, to bring forward the whole subject with advantages which you might have waited long for.

The mention of your plan in the H. of Commons both by Bulwer⁴ and by Walter⁵ will also do good, notwithstanding the disparaging remarks of the latter. As you observe, he rather misses the matter in saying that I think a proposition has only to be logically proved in order to be universally agreed to. What I do think is that when a thing is “logically proved,” it is the duty of whoever sees that it is so, to stand up for it, whether it is likely to be agreed to or not. This, however, is a view of obligation which M.P.'s and journalists, being “of the day daily” cannot be expected to understand.

I shall be anxious to hear from you. Please direct Poste Restante Perpignan, Pyrénées Orientales, till further notice.

Ever Yrs Truly

J. S. Mill

459.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Barcelona

May 9. 1860.

Dear Sir

I beg to acknowledge your letter requesting that I will state my impression respecting the causes of the much greater proportion of parliamentary electors who abstain from exercising the franchise in the large than in the small constituencies.

I am unable to answer this question from experience of my own individual feelings and conduct; since, however imperfectly any of the candidates who offered themselves may have represented my political opinions considered generally, I have not felt myself released from the obligation of voting for that one of them who had most in common with me. But so far as I can form any judgment from the probabilities of the case, and from such opportunities of observation as I have had, I should say that the causes which induce a very great proportion of voters in the numerous constituencies to neglect the exercise of the franchise, are principally two, viz.

1. In the case of the uneducated a habitual indifference to politics, unless in times of great popular excitement, or when some question affecting their class interests or feelings is at stake, or unless they expect to be, in some shape or other, paid for their votes, which they often can be in the smallest, but seldom in the larger constituencies.
2. In the case of the educated, a conviction that any candidate who, in any sufficient degree, represented their sentiments, would not have the smallest chance of being elected. And this state of things is likely, I apprehend, to be permanent, in all constituencies of which the majority are uneducated and give their votes freely; so long as, by an omission in our Constitution as iniquitous as it is impolitic, minorities are denied the right to which they are equally entitled with majorities, of being represented in proportion to their numbers.

I Am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Thomas Hare Esq.

460.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Barcelona

May 12. 1860

Dear Mr Fawcett

I have not yet acknowledged two interesting letters from you, dated the 10th and 17th of April. The last I only received a day or two ago, on returning here from making the circuit of Valencia, Madrid, and Saragossa. It gave me much pleasure to hear that your lecture² was so successful. It is a great encouragement. Respecting Mr Hare's plan, although Massey's³ move has come to nothing, and I suppose Capt. Gordon⁴ has abandoned his projected motion, there have been several incidents that are very favourable. The mention by Bulwer and even that by Walter in the H. of Commons⁵ will be extremely useful, and Lord Grey's Committee with the prospect of Mr Hare's being examined,⁶ is one of the most fortunate things which could have happened. I received the pamphlet⁷ but I am sorry to say the Globe⁸ miscarried. From what you say of it however, there seems to be good fortune in that quarter too. Any newspaper of good circulation which takes up the plan, stamps it in the opinion of commonplace people as at any rate not Utopian, *quoiqu'en dise* Mr Walter. I still think the two parties will patch up something this year!⁹ The Lords will alter the bill, and the Commons will accept it altered. Your list of provisions for a temporary Reform Bill is very good, but who will support it? unless Lord Stanley or Pakington take it into their heads that it would be a good compromise, and I fear even they could not carry their party with them. Jones¹⁰ I believe to be quite incapable of having a fundamentally new, and at the same time true, idea in Political Economy. His merit was that he called attention to the great variety in the tenures of land as affecting the laws of distribution.

Please direct for the present to Perpignan (Pyrénées Orientales) Poste Restante.

Yrs Vry Truly

J. S. Mill

461.

TO JOHN NICHOL¹

Amélie les Bains
Pyrénées Orientales

May 19, 1860

Dear Sir

Your letter of April 12 has only just reached me here, and the volume² you mention has not been forwarded. As I expect to be in England in July I will not expose your book to the risk of loss at the little post office of this remote corner of France. When I return, I will lose no time in reading it. I regret that my absence prevented my seeing you when you were in London, but I hope that I may have at no distant time another opportunity. If, in the meantime, there is anything I can do that would serve you, my publisher Mr Parker (445 West Strand) will forward any letter. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

462.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Ax (Ariège)

le 10 juin 1860

Mon Cher Monsieur—

Votre bonne et intéressante lettre m'a suivi jusqu'à cet endroit charmant, digne d'une plus grande célébrité qu'il n'a encore acquise.

Il est vrai, comme vous dites, que l'Angleterre n'a plus à lutter contre la tyrannie ou la compression officielle, et en cela elle est sans doute plus avancée que la France—mais de même que beaucoup d'autres progrès, celui-ci promet plus qu'il ne tient. L'opinion a hérité de toutes les autres tyrannies. Son joug paraît léger, parce qu'on ne songe pas ordinairement à lutter contre lui. Il est entré dans les âmes. Tout se fait chez nous par contrainte morale. On trouve tant de petits obstacles à sortir de la voie commune en quoi que ce soit, que peu de monde le fait même en théorie, et il est presque impossible de le faire en pratique. Les classes supérieures, soit par leur position, soit par leur intelligence, n'y songent pas plus que les autres, et c'est ce qui fait que je ne fonde pas sur ces classes autant d'espérance que vous semblez le faire. Toutefois il y a en Angleterre beaucoup de choses qui semblent mortes, mais qui ne font que dormir, et qui sont capables de s'éveiller; témoin la renaissance de l'esprit militaire,² qui peut-être ne contribuera pas peu à fausser les calculs de l'homme qui gouverne actuellement la France.

463.

TO GEORGE W. HASTINGS¹

Bagnères de Luchon

June 18. 1860

Sir

Allow me, through you, to offer my grateful acknowledgments to the Council of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, for the honour they have done me in nominating me to the distinguished office of President of the Social Economy Department for the next annual meeting of the Association.² I am, however, under the necessity of declining that honour, as I have occupations in hand which will require all my time and attention during the ensuing autumn; and I feel assured that the Association will have no difficulty in finding some one much better qualified to preside over its deliberations than a person of my little experience in such matters. I am Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

G. W. Hastings Esq.
&c &c &c

464.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

July 14. [1860]

Dear Sir

I am glad of the prospect you hold out of my seeing you next week in London. I shall be happy to meet you any day and hour that you may do me the favour to appoint.

Your pamphlet² (which I liked very much) was so far from having miscarried, that the one you send is the third copy I have received. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

465.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

July 18. [1860]

Dear Sir

As I wish in any case to go to town one day this week to see Mr Hare I will if it suits you call on you in Norfolk Street about twelve on Friday. If I do not hear from you, I shall conclude that this arrangement will suit you.

I look forward with much pleasure to seeing you again.

Very Truly Yrs

J. S. Mill

466.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

July 18 [1860]

Dear Sir

I have been waiting to fix a time for calling on you until I heard on what days Mr Fawcett will be in town. I have just heard from him and have fixed to call on him in Norfolk Street on Friday about twelve. When I have [seen?] him I will call at your office, but if anything should make it inconvenient to you to see me then and there, have no scruple about it, as I can without inconvenience come to town any other day.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

467.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 18 1860.

Dear Sir—

Your article² has interested me very much & its main position is unshakeable, but I suspect we sh^d differ greatly on a subject into which you do not enter, that of the *limitations*. Though you do not say so, the whole of your reasoning seems to converge to the conclusion that all Europe (if not the whole human race) will some time or other be brought under one government. That there may one day be a kind of loose federation among the countries of Europe, & a common tribunal to decide their differences, is likely enough. But as for actual incorporation, when there is not identity of language, literature, & historical antecedents, I see no spontaneous tendency to it, nor any likelihood of its being brought about but by that which has produced it heretofore, viz. conquest, which of all tendencies we ought most to execrate.

As you asked me to do so I have made two or three brief notes on particular passages

- (a) I would omit the reference to [Roussillon?].³*Réunion* does not in French necessarily mean reuniting but simply uniting [. . . ?]
- (b) Would it not be better to omit Nice & Savoy, or at least to refer to them in a manner which would not recognize their union with France as an accomplished & irrevocable fact?⁴
- (c) These rivers & mountains do not form any conceivable system of natural boundaries⁵
- (d) Kilometre stones are not milestones & I doubt if St Denis is so much as four miles from Paris.⁶
- (e) The bracketed passage is only true in a very strained sense.

The generalities of Buckle's⁷ theory are very vulnerable, & I hardly think he could have held by them if any competent person had criticized them before publication. He could have afforded to part with most of them, for the premisses are much broader than was required to support his conclusions, & it is exactly in this unnecessary margin & overplus of premisses that, as it seems to me, the error lies.

468.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK

[Originally an excerpt from E. T. Cook, *The Life of Florence Nightingale* (2 vols., London, 1914), was to appear at this point. In the course of printing, however, the full MS has been located. The complete text, correctly dated, is to be found as letter 440A in Appendix II.]

469.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Sandwich

Tuesday ev^g 4th [Sept., 1860]

Dearest Lily—

We have got here from Canterbury today, having spent eight hours on foot, walking and botanizing, besides seeing Canterbury Cathedral & Richborough by the way. Though these two days journeys were by far the least promising botanically speaking, of our whole route, we have found a great many plants, and though there is not yet much that is quite new to me, I have filled up an immense number of the gaps in my Kent Flora. But the greatest treat was Canterbury Cathedral. I had not the remotest idea that it was so magnificent. We must go and see it together. It is nearly as fine as the fine foreign cathedrals. The time has passed very pleasantly. Mr Irvine² is a very agreeable companion and seems to me very sensible and right thinking and feeling on things in general; and with the novelty to me of botanizing with a good botanist & the quantity of botany I learn, no excursion that we do not make together could pass more pleasantly. Tomorrow we shall have a botanical exploration of this very rich neighbourhood, and I expect to get many novelties. We shall I suppose be at Deal tomorrow night and at Dover the next. I shall write to you either tomorrow or next day, probably the latter, as there is a great deal to be done tomorrow & I may be too tired. I am writing this previously to having a 'meat tea' which is going to be an ordinary regimen. N. B. We were out at six this morning, for two hours before breakfast, and shall do the same tomorrow. ever dearest Lily your affectionate

J.S.M.

470.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Royal George Folkestone

Thursday evening [Sept. 6, 1860]

Dearest Lily—

We arrived here at $\frac{1}{4}$ to 9 tonight, having been on our legs since $\frac{1}{4}$ past 9 in the morning, besides a short walk before breakfast. So you see we do not lose time. Yesterday and today have been splendid days of walking & botanizing; yesterday was equal in number of new plants to almost any day I ever had even on the Continent & today not very much inferior. I had no idea that Kent was so rich or that there could be such botanizing in it. What contributes as much to make it pleasant is the very great pleasure Mr Irvine takes in it. The country is all new to him and he says he never had so pleasant & altogether so successful an excursion. We expect two more equally good days at Sandgate, Hithe, &c. and in Romney Marsh. I suppose we shall stop tomorrow night at Hithe & have a walk next day before returning to town, but I will write again to tell you for certain at what hour on Saturday I shall arrive. Though the journey is so pleasant I look forward with the greatest pleasure to returning to you and resuming our home life, first at Blackheath, afterwards and better at St Véran. I do not half like amusing myself while you are not even quiet, but fatigued and bored—but I shall soon be back dear. I will not write any more now I have written this to be sure of being in time for tonight's post, as soon as we arrived, or rather as soon as the bag arrived, which this time was later than we were, though we were so late.

Ever Your Affectionate

J.S.M.

471.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Sept. 9. 1860

Dear Sir

I was very glad to hear from you, and to read your MS.² Not having seen the paper by Dr Whewell to which it replies I cannot judge how far it is a sufficient answer to the particular mode in which he puts the argument. But at all events it contains a great deal of the matter out of which the answer must be made, and I am glad that Macmillan desires a paper of the kind. I have put down a few notes which occurred to me in reading it, but there are none of them to which I attach importance except the one marked (*h.*)

I return the MS. by this post.

I hope you may not be disappointed in your anticipations of getting some notice taken at Glasgow³ of Mr Hare's plan.

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

472.

TO FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE¹

Blackheath Sept. 10, 1860

Dear Madam—

Your note should have been answered sooner, but I was from home when it arrived.

I should most willingly do my best to be of use to you in the matter which you speak of, if you think that I am a suitable person to be consulted about a work of the kind. In one respect indeed I am very well fitted to test the efficacy of your treatise,² since I probably stand as much in need of conversion as those to whom it is addressed. If in spite of this (or perhaps all the more on that account) you would like me to read and give my opinion on it, I will do so with much pleasure.

I am very happy to hear from yourself that you did not mean to convey impressions which I still think the words of the concluding passage of your Notes are calculated to give.³ I did not myself think you could possibly mean it, since in the same passage you also seem to imply that women should not be excluded by law or usage from the liberty of trying any mode of existence open to men, at their own risk in case of failure. But as the advocates of the "rights of women" contend for no more; and are even, in general, ready to make what appear to me far too great concessions as to the comparative unfitness of women for some occupations, I do not think they can justly be accused of jargon, nor of contending that women ought to do certain things merely because men do them.

Believe Me
Dear Madam
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

473.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

[After Sept. 19, 1860]

Your letter of September 19 gave me much pleasure, because it contained better and more encouraging accounts of your health, and also because it said that things were likely to be made pleasanter to you at the India House by changes in the mode of transacting business.² I shall be greatly interested by hearing more of these changes, since, as you are aware, I think that the practical goodness of a government depends, much more than is generally supposed, on the forms of business. It is a comfort to hear of any changes for the better. Unfortunately, the deteriorations in the structure of the instrument of Government in detail, which I always feared would follow from the substitution of the traditions of the Government Offices for those of the India House,³ seem to be taking place still more rapidly than I looked for. If the Council at Calcutta is to be abolished, and a Cabinet of Secretaries put in its place, as the newspapers say, and as is too probable, the change will be almost fatal: for the Members of Council are the only high administrative Officers not dependent on the will of the Governor-General, and their Minutes are the only Channel through which an independent and ungarbled opinion necessarily reaches the home authorities. The difficulties of governing India have so much increased, while there is less and less wisdom employed in doing it, that I begin to despair of the whole subject, and almost believe that we are at the beginning of the end.

474.

TO FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE¹

Blackheath Sept. 23. 1860

Dear Madam—

I have read your Treatise,² or rather the portion of it which you did me the honour of sending to me. If any part of your object in sending it was to know my opinion as to the desirableness of its being published, I have no difficulty in giving it strongly in the affirmative. There is much in the work which is calculated to do good to many persons besides the artisans to whom it is more especially addressed.³ In point of arrangement indeed, of condensation, and of giving as it were, a keen edge to the argument, it would have been much benefitted by the recasting which you have been prevented from giving to it by a cause⁴ on all other accounts so much to be lamented. This, however, applies more to the general mode of laying out the argument, than to the details.

With regard to the substance of the book, it is scarcely necessary to say that there is very much of it with which I am in entire agreement and strong sympathy, and when I

am not, I neither have any desire to shake your own conviction, if I could suppose myself capable of doing so, nor should I regret the adoption of the same creed by any one to whose intellect and feelings it may be able to recommend itself. It would be a great moral improvement to most persons, be they Christians, Deists, or Atheists, if they firmly believed the world to be under the government of a Being who, willing only good, leaves evil in the world solely in order to stimulate the human faculties by an unremitting struggle against every form of it. In regard however to the effect on my own mind, will you forgive me for saying, that your mode of reconciling the world as we see it with the government of a Perfect Being, though less sophistical than the common modes, and not having as they have the immoral effect of consecrating any forms of avoidable evil as purposes of God, does not, to my apprehension, at all help to remove the difficulty? I tried what I could do with that hypothesis many years ago; that a Perfect Being could do everything except make another perfect being—that the next thing to it was to make a perfectible one—and that perfection could only be achieved by a struggle against evil. But then, a Perfect Being—limited only by this condition, might be expected so to form the world that the struggle against evil should be the greatest possible in extent & intensity; and unhappily our world conforms as little to this character, as to that of a world without evil. If the Divine intention in making man was Effort towards Perfection, the divine purpose is as much frustrated as if its sole aim were human happiness. There is a little of both, but the absence of both is the marked characteristic.

I confess that no religious theory seems to me consistent with the facts of the universe, except (in some form or other) the old one of the two principles. There are many signs, in the structure of the universe, of an intelligent Power wishing well to man and other sentient creatures. I could however shew, not so many perhaps, but quite as decided indications of an intelligent Power or Powers with the contrary propensity. But (not to insist on this) the will of the benevolent Power must find, either in its own incompleteness or in some external circumstances, very serious obstacles to the entire fulfilment of the benevolent purpose. It may be, that the world is a battlefield between a good and a bad power or powers, and that mankind may be capable by sufficiently strenuous cooperation with the good power, of deciding, or at least accelerating, its final victory. I know one man, of great intelligence & high moral principle, who finds satisfaction to his devotional feelings, and support under the evils of life, in the belief of this creed.

Another point on which I cannot agree with you is the opinion that Law, in the sense in which we predicate it of the arrangements of Nature, can only emanate from a Will. This doctrine seems to me to rest solely on the double meaning of the word Law, though that double meaning cannot be more completely and clearly stated than you have done. It is much more natural to the human mind to see a divine will in those events in which it has not yet recognized inflexible constancy of sequence, than in those in which it has. No doubt, this instinctive notion is erroneous; and Will is in its own nature as regular a phenomenon, as much a subject of law, as anything else; but it does seem rather odd that unchangeableness should be the one thing which, to account for its existence, must be referred to a will; Will being, within the limits of our experience, the thing of all others most liable to change. Indeed it cannot be unchangeable unless combined with omnipotence, or at all events with omniscience.

With all that you say in affirmation of the universality of Law, and in refutation of the objections on the subject of Free Will and Necessity, I need hardly say how heartily I agree.

I have made a few cursory remarks in the margin of your book, but what I have now said is the chief part of what I had to say. I do not yet return the volume because, unless what I have said of it takes away your desire to shew me any more of the book, I hope to see the remainder. If so however it should be soon, as I shall leave England for the Continent in about a week.

I have not time or space left to say much on the other subject of our correspondence.⁵ My opinion of the medical profession is not, I dare say, higher than yours. But it would be dealing very rigorously with the M.D.'s of whom you have so low an opinion, to expect that they should already have made any improvement in medical practice. Neither, when we consider how rare first-rate minds are, was it to be expected, on the doctrine of chances, that the first two or three women who take up medicine should be more than what you say they are, third rate. It is to be expected that they will be pupils at first, & not masters. But the medical profession like others must be reformed from within, under whatever stimulus from without; & it surely has more chance of being so, the more the entrance to it is widened. Neither does the moral right of women to admission into the profession, at all depend on the likelihood of their being the first to reform it. On this point, however, we are agreed.

I Am Dear Madam
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

475.

TO FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE¹

Blackheath Park

Oct. 4 1860

Dear Madam—

I should have been very sorry to miss reading the sequel of your book.² If when I had only read the first volume I was very desirous that it should be published, I am much more so after reading the second, as the exhibition it contains of what life is in this country among the classes in easy circumstances, being so earnestly and feelingly, and many parts of it so forcibly done, and so evidently the result of personal observation is at once a testimony that ought not to be lost, & an appeal of an unusually telling kind on a subject which it is very difficult to induce people to open their eyes to. And though the things into which are put the best of one's heart & mind

never do all the good which, to one's own feelings, seems to lie in them, few books have a better chance than this of doing *some* good, and that too in a variety of ways. I should not feel any doubt about it if the book were published with your name. Indeed, the mere fact that these are the opinions of such a woman as all the world knows you to be, is a fact which it would be of as much use to the world to know, as almost anything which could at this time be told to it.

I have seldom felt less inclined to criticize than in reading this book; and moreover I have said in my former letter the substance of nearly all the criticism I should have to make. There is however a new point of difference between us, sufficiently a matter of principle to be worth mentioning to you. In one, and only one of your inferences from the doctrine (improperly called) of necessity, I do not agree; it is when you say that there ought to be no punishment (only reformatory discipline) and even no blame. It seems to me that on the principles of your Treatise, retaliation from others for injuries consciously and intentionally done them, is one of these natural consequences of ill doing, which you yourself hold to be the proper discipline both of the individual and of the race. With many minds, punishment is the only one of the natural consequences of guilt, which is capable of making any impression on them. In such cases, punishment is the sole means available for beginning the reformation of the criminal; and the fear of similar punishment is the only inducement which deters many really no better than himself from doing acts to others which would not only deprive them of their own happiness, but thwart all their attempts to do good to themselves & others. With regard to the legitimacy of resentment: a thoroughly evil will, though I well know that it does not come into existence without a cause, seems to me not the less on that account an object of aversion; and a strong indignation against wrong is so inseparable from any strong personal feeling on the subject of wrong and right, that it does not seem to me possible, even if desirable, to get rid of the one, without, to a great degree, losing the other. I write these things for your consideration, and not as pretending to lay down the law on the subject to any one, much less to you.

My address while abroad will be Saint-Véran, près Avignon, Vaucluse, France, and I am very far from wishing that you should do as Frederic's General said he would.[3](#)

I have returned your Treatise today by the Book Post. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

476.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI[1](#)

S. Véran

6 Nov. 1860

Mon Cher M. Villari—

Voici bien longtemps que je n'ai pas reçu de vos nouvelles quoique ce soit moi qui ai écrit la dernière lettre. Ce m'est toujours un grand plaisir d'avoir une lettre de vous et je le désire d'autant plus car dans un temps comme celui-ci,² on ne sait jamais à quel endroit un patriote Italien peut s'être porté ni dans quelle situation il est. Je voudrais aussi m'entretenir avec vous sur les grands événements de cette année. Vous aviez bien prédit l'année passée que les Italiens feraient aujourd'hui de plus grandes choses qu'en 1848, bien que celles-là suffisent assurément pour la gloire éternelle de ceux qui y ont pris part. Vous avez le droit d'être fier de votre pays: aussi est-il, comme vous voyez admiré par l'Europe et les Anglais même qui sont difficiles en cette matière le reconnaissent comme digne d'être libre. Il est vrai que ceux, qui ont tout préparé pendant dix ans, qui ont entretenu le feu sacré par les seuls moyens alors praticables, Mazzini et ses amis, n'éprouvent pas encore la justice qu'ils méritent.³ Cela était inévitable, et ils ont, je crois, assez de grandeur d'âme pour s'y résigner. Je sais par ma propre expérience, ayant toujours avoué sur bien des sujets des opinions qu'on appelle extrêmes, que ce sont ceux-là qui font accepter par les gens de la foule les opinions avancées immédiatement praticables, en leur donnant la satisfaction de se croire dans le juste milieu, et d'avoir d'autres sur qui se décharger du reproche d'être des exaltés ou des exagérés. Maintenant l'avenir est à vous, pourvu toutefois que vous ne provoquiez pas un conflit prématuré avec l'Autriche,⁴ dans des conditions où vous ne pourriez vaincre que par l'appui d'une puissance étrangère. Peut-être le prix que cette puissance a exigé de son intervention en 1859⁵ a été presque vrai bonheur pour l'Italie, en la dégageant de tout lien de reconnaissance et en ôtant à un monarque absolu l'influence que, plus désintéressé en apparence, il eût obtenue sur l'esprit public de votre pays. C'est à l'œuvre d'organisation que je vous attends maintenant. Il y aura de grandes difficultés à la fusion de tant de peuples, tous Italiens, mais différents par leurs antécédents et par leurs mœurs; et de plus grandes encore à la profonde rénovation morale dont la population de la moitié méridionale de l'Italie a besoin. Mais vous avez aussi de grandes ressources dans l'enthousiasme général, dans le prestige d'un grand homme,⁶ dans celui d'un roi fidèle à la liberté,⁷ et surtout dans le génie Italien qui à aucune époque n'a manqué quelque déplorable que fût d'ailleurs la situation. L'année prochaine sera pour ceux qui pensent, un chapitre de l'histoire tout aussi intéressant que celle qui vient de s'écouler. J'ai grande confiance dans le bon sens dont la partie avancée de l'Italie a fait preuve dans les circonstances présentes, et dans la haute capacité gouvernementale qui a toujours été moins rare en Italie qu'ailleurs.

Si cette lettre vous parvient, donnez moi je vous prie, de vos nouvelles et croyez toujours à mon dévouement et à ma véritable sympathie.

477.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

Saint Véran
near Avignon

Dec. 10. 1860.

Dear Sir

I would with great pleasure accede to your proposal with respect to a reprint of the chapter on the Futurity of the Labouring Classes for separate sale,² if it rested with me to do so. The current edition however of the Pol. Economy is the property of the publisher Mr Parker, and he alone has the power of authorizing what you propose. Your application therefore should be to him, unless you prefer waiting till the present edition is out of print, which it is likely to be, I believe, in a few months. I propose making some additions to the chapter for another edition,³ so as to bring up the facts of Cooperation to the latest date, and if I have anything to say worth saying in the way of advice to Cooperators, that will be, I think, the most suitable occasion.

I am very glad to hear such good news of the progress of Cooperation. The publicity given to the brilliant results of the Rochdale and Leeds experiments, by Mr Holyoake's book,⁴ Mr Bright's speech,⁵ and otherwise, was likely to encourage others to do the same. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

478.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 24 Décembre 1860

Mon Cher Monsieur

Votre lettre m'est parvenue en même temps que la traduction,² et si j'ai un peu tardé à y répondre, je vous prie de n'en accuser que mes occupations, car je ne cesse pas de travailler à de nouveaux écrits.

Je ne connais pas de traduction où l'on se soit plus consciencieusement occupé de rendre le sens de l'auteur, non seulement dans toute son exactitude mais dans toute sa force. Cela vaut infiniment mieux qu'une paraphrase fidèle et élégante mais plate, et je vous en sais on ne peut pas plus de gré. Il y a tout au plus cinq ou six endroits où il y a eu de légers malentendus sur le sens de telle ou telle phrase, que je dois attribuer à un défaut de clarté dans l'expression, et qui, du reste, sont très peu importants. Il n'y a

que la division en alinéas qui laisse à désirer, et je devine que je dois m'en prendre là dessus à l'imprimeur.

Quant à la préface, j'avais senti qu'elle devait être surtout une critique. Est-il besoin de dire que non seulement je ne m'en plains pas—mais que je l'eusse au besoin provoquée? Les termes flatteurs dont vous vous servez à mon égard suffiraient pour contenter un amour-propre beaucoup plus exigeant que le mien, et le fait même qu'avec les divergences que vous indiquez, vous avez assez bonne opinion de l'ouvrage pour prendre la peine de le traduire, est lui-même un compliment qui en vaut bien d'autres. Je trouve, au reste, que les grandes réserves que j'ai faites pour les cas où l'on se sert de sa liberté d'une manière nuisible aux autres, répondent suffisamment à une grande partie de vos observations. Je me sens un peu tenté de prendre ma revanche en rendant compte dans quelque revue anglaise de vos deux ouvrages.³ Les questions qui ne peuvent se vider que par de grandes concessions de part et d'autre, sont celles qui gagnent le plus à une discussion assez prolongée pour devenir serrée.

J'espère, mon cher Monsieur, que nous pourrons causer sur ces matières et sur d'autres en peu de temps, car je me rends en Angleterre au mois prochain. Ce ne sera pas avant le jour que vous désignez pour votre départ de Fontainebleau, mais selon toute probabilité ce sera bientôt après. En attendant donc de vous retrouver à Paris, croyez bien à la sincérité de mon estime et de mon dévouement.

J. S. Mill

479.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véra

Dec. 24. 1860

Dear Mr Fawcett

I was unwilling to write to you while all your time and thoughts were required for the contest in Southwark,² and I have not had time to write any letters since the election until today. I shall be most desirous to hear from you vivâ voce when I come to England, all that there must be to tell. At present I only know what I have read in the Times,³ or rather in the Evening Mail.⁴ From that, although evidently not favourable to you, I can see that a great point has been gained, that you have made a very favourable impression generally, and that people are familiarized with the idea of you as a candidate. The compliments paid you, and the great support you received, will tell much more for you at any future election, than the preference given by the majority to a more known man⁵ will tell against you. He little deserves the preference, for his public conduct has always seemed to me anything but honorable to him. Still it is some credit to the Southwark people to have preferred a celebrity,

though a second or third rate one, to a local or pothouse candidate, and to have elected him free of expense. You must have done considerable good by standing on the footing of no expenses,⁶ and going about speaking to them in the way you did. I was all the while wishing greatly that I could have helped you, but I have no power of helping anybody with electors. You will be your own best helper if you go on making yourself known by well-considered writings. I shall like much to see the articles you mention in your last letter.⁷ I left England at the very beginning of October without having seen Macmillan for that month, but when I return I will make a point of seeing all the numbers which contain anything of yours.

I have not been idle since I came here. I have two things finished,⁸ one of them a considerable volume and have made good progress with a third.⁹ I wish, when I leave this world, to carry as few of my thoughts away with me as I can; therefore I go on writing even what I do not mean to publish at present. I expect to be in England soon after the middle of January, when I shall hope for an early opportunity of seeing you.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

480.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran

Dec. 24. 1860.

Dear Sir

I am surprised to find on referring to your letter, how long I have suffered it to remain unanswered. I received your paper in the Statistical Society's Journal,² and was very much pleased with it. On the point raised by Mr Hickson I do not exactly recollect all the reasons he gave. I think the chief of them was, that if a voter was allowed to put down an indefinite number of names, he would generally put the latter part of his list at random, or insert the name desired by anybody who asked him. I do not think this argument valid against such strong reasons as those which tell the other way; but it seems worth considering, not with a view of limiting the contingent votes to a small number, but perhaps of limiting them to tens instead of hundreds. All that occurs to anybody on the details of the subject is worth bringing before you as a suggestion for your judgment. It is necessary to look forward to many unfavorable contingencies, for the purpose of contriving the best means of obviating them. For all means will be used to thwart the benefits of the plan. Political parties, as they now have their candidates, will then have their lists of candidates, to catch the contingent votes. These they will make as long as the law allows, putting the names in the order of their importance to the party: and it is a question whether the unlimited number of votes does not give an

advantage to the mere party voters who will vote for the whole list of the party, over the independent thinkers who, besides that they will be divided among themselves, will only find a limited number for whom they can vote with thought and conscience. Does not this seem worth thinking of? I have little doubt that whatever your ultimate judgment may be on the matter, you will have sufficient reason for it. I am

Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

481.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

[1860]

[Here is an interesting remark in a letter to Thornton, in 1860. Thornton had been to see Oxford, and Mill recalls his own visit twenty years before, and says—]

In that same holiday² I completed the first draft of my *Logic*, and had, for the first time, the feeling that I had now actually accomplished something—that one certain portion of my life's work was done.

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1861

482.

TO GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT¹

S[aint] V[éran] Jan.15.1861

Mon Cher Beaumont—

Je viens d'achever la lecture de la correspondance et des opuscules et fragments inédits de Tocqueville.² J'y ai trouvé à chaque pas de nouvelles preuves de sa haute valeur comme homme et comme esprit, et de la perte irréparable que l'humanité a faite par sa mort prématurée.³ Si même il nous eût été épargné jusqu'à la complétion de son deuxième grand ouvrage!⁴ A ce propos vous me pardonnerez j'espère, si j'exprime un regret qui, à ce que je crois, sera général, de ce que vous avez poussé un scrupule, d'ailleurs très louable, jusqu'à ne vouloir rien imprimer qui n'eût absolument reçu la dernière touche de l'auteur. Je sais bien la conscience que mettait notre ami à ne donner au public l'expression de sa pensée qu'après qu'il l'eût amenée à la dernière perfection qu'il se sentait capable d'y donner; mais autre chose est de réserver un écrit pour le rendre plus parfait, et autre de vouloir qu'il soit supprimé lorsque le sort a ordonné que le perfectionnement ne puisse plus avoir lieu. Les brouillons même d'un penseur et d'un observateur comme Tocqueville seraient d'un prix inappréciable pour les penseurs à venir, et à moins qu'il ne s'y soit opposé de son vivant, il me semble qu'il n'y aurait pas d'inconvénient à publier ses manuscrits imparfaits en ne les donnant que pour ce qu'ils sont et en conservant scrupuleusement toutes les indications d'une intention de revenir sur un morceau quelconque et d'en soumettre les idées à une vérification ultérieure.

Quant à la correspondance je me réjouis d'apprendre que la partie sans doute très considérable, qui ne pourrait être imprimée quant à présent, est toute prête à l'être en temps convenable.⁵ Ce que vous en avez pu donner est d'une grande valeur par lui-même, et encore plus en faisant connaître ce qu'a été l'homme. Quelle idée ne se fait-on pas de la face d'intelligence et de la haute vertu de celui qui a su se maintenir comme penseur et comme écrivain dans une élévation si sereine et si impartiale audessus de toutes les misères de notre temps, quand on vient à apprendre que cet esprit si calme n'était rien moins que calme par nature et par tempérament, qu'il était d'un type tout opposé et que cela même faisait la plus grande souffrance de sa vie. C'est une consolation pour ceux à qui sa mémoire est chère, qu'il fut heureux dans sa famille, qu'il eut des amis vrais, et qu'il fut apprécié de son vivant autant que cela puisse jamais arriver à un homme très audessus du vulgaire par l'esprit et par les sentiments.

483.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK^{[1](#)}

Blackheath

March 1, 1861

Dear Chadwick

It is long since I have read anything on the subject of Education which impressed me so much as the facts and ideas contained in your letter to Senior,^{[2](#)} and I wish they were in the hands of every reading and thinking person in the country. Among several points of great practical importance which you have made out by an irresistible weight of evidence, two appear to me to stand in the very highest rank: the equality, if not superiority, in attainments & intelligence, of the short time pupils over the others; and the immense advantage, both in efficiency & economy of large over small school districts. These results of experience, the first of which was so unexpected as to amount to a discovery, afford the means of overcoming the two principal obstacles to the efforts of the Government and of individuals for the improvement of popular education, namely, the early withdrawal of the children from school owing to the demand of parents for their labour, and the impossibility of obtaining, or, if obtained, of keeping, schoolmasters of a high average of excellence. You have put it in the power of any Education Minister who avails himself of the results of your inquiries, to elevate the general standard of popular improvement to a height & with a rapidity which have hitherto seemed quite hopeless. Too much cannot be done to give publicity to matter so valuable. I am

Dear Chadwick
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

484.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE^{[1](#)}

Blackheath Park,
Kent

le 4 mars 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

J'ai reçue l'Illustration² et la Presse,³ qui sont très satisfaisantes, et dont j'ai trop tardé à vous remercier. Quant à l'article de la Revue des Deux Mondes,⁴ ne vous donnez pas la peine de l'envoyer. Je suis abonné à la Revue. Il est vrai que je ne la reçois qu'à Avignon, mais j'ai le moyen de la voir ici.

Je suis très sensible à l'intérêt amical que vous témoignez pour tout ce qui peut me faire plaisir.

Je songe toujours à faire un article sur vos deux ouvrages.⁵ A présent j'ai sous presse un volume sur le Gouvernement Représentatif, où je m'occupe entr'autres choses de la Centralisation au point de vue du dernier chapitre de mes Principes d'Economie Politique, auquel vous avez bien voulu donner votre approbation.

Ma fille et moi vous prions de nous rappeler au souvenir bienveillant de Madame Dupont-White et de Mesdemoiselles vos filles.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

485.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Blackheath Park

le 15 mars 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

L'article de la Revue Nationale² est très satisfaisant en ce qui me regarde, mais il vous traite avec injustice, surtout quand il trouve que vous ne m'êtes pas assez favorable. Vous m'avez traité le mieux possible, et je préfère être présenté aux lecteurs français par un traducteur qui n'est pas un simple partisan. En cela, je suis conséquent avec ce qui est dit dans le livre même, sur l'avantage de mettre les opinions divergentes en face l'une de l'autre.

L'article de M. Taine³ est un chef d'œuvre en fait de compte rendu. On n'a jamais présenté les doctrines de mon Système de Logique avec une intelligence aussi approfondie et un aussi parfait ensemble.

Ce que vous me dites sur l'état des esprits en France, m'intéresse extrêmement. Malgré tous les obstacles, il me semble que les choses prennent déjà en France un meilleur aspect. Il y a, du moins pour le moment, une liberté de discussion véritable,

et cela ne peut manquer d'ébranler la torpeur générale qui était le plus grand fléau du régime actuel. Si l'empereur ne se dégoûte pas de l'expérience qu'il tente en ce moment, c'est qu'il aura pris son parti d'essayer de se réconcilier un peu avec les amis les moins exigeants de la liberté.

Je ne me suis pas occupé du budget des cultes⁴ dans mon nouveau livre, le regardant comme n'étant pas précisément une question de gouvernement représentatif. Du reste, j'aurais de la peine à me prononcer là dessus en thèse générale. C'est, il me semble, surtout une question de temps et de lieu.

Veillez offrir à Madame Dupont White et à vos demoiselles mes hommages respectueux. Ma fille vous prie de la rappeler à leur souvenir amical.

Votre Bien Dévoué

J. S. Mill

486.

TO HIPPOLYTE TAINÉ¹

Blackheath Park, Kent,

le 15 mars 1861.

Monsieur,

Quoique je n'aie jusqu'à présent l'honneur de vous connaître que par vos écrits, vous ne trouverez, j'espère, pas déplacé que je vous exprime la très grande satisfaction personnelle, aussi bien qu'admiration désintéressée, que m'a fait éprouver le compte que vous avez bien voulu rendre de mon système de logique dans la *Revue des Deux Mondes*.² On ne saurait donner, en peu de pages, une idée plus exacte et plus complète du contenu de ce livre, comme corps de doctrine philosophique. J'ajoute qu'il était impossible de présenter aux lecteurs français cet ensemble d'opinions, de manière à lui attirer davantage leur attention, et c'est ce qui importe le plus à un penseur.

Quant à la critique que vous avez faite du point de vue psychologique qui caractérise l'ouvrage, il ne m'appartient point de la juger. Seulement je crois que vous vous trompez en regardant ce point de vue comme particulièrement anglais. Il le fut dans la première moitié du XVIII^e siècle, à partir de Locke, et jusqu'à la réaction contre Hume. Cette réaction, commencée en Écosse, a revêtu depuis longtemps la forme germanique, et a fini par tout envahir. Quand j'ai écrit mon livre, j'étais à peu près seul de mon opinion; et bien que ma manière de voir ait trouvé un degré de sympathie auquel je ne m'attendais nullement, on compte encore en Angleterre vingt philosophes *a priori* et spiritualistes contre chaque partisan de la doctrine de

l'expérience. Pendant toute la durée de notre réaction de soixante-dix ans, on a regardé ici la philosophie de l'expérience comme française, de même que vous la qualifiez d'anglaise. A mon avis, on s'est trompé de part et d'autre. Les deux systèmes se suivent par la loi des réactions dans toutes les parties du monde. En effet, l'Allemagne se tourne aujourd'hui vers la doctrine *a posteriori*. Seulement les différents pays ne coïncident exactement ni dans les révolutions ni dans les contre-révolutions.

Veillez agréer, monsieur, l'expression de mon véritable respect et de ma considération la plus distinguée.

J. S. Mill

487.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Blackheath Park

le 28 mars 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Rien ne me saurait être plus agréable que de vous avoir pour traducteur de mon nouveau livre.² Vous n'aurez qu'à vous entendre là dessus avec M. Guillaumin, qui vient de demander et d'obtenir mon autorisation pour en publier une traduction.

Nous sommes tous deux très sensibles aux souvenirs amicaux de votre famille, et aux amitiés dont elle ne cesse pas de nous combler. Nous comptons sur une prochaine visite à Fontainebleau; seulement nous n'aurons pas le temps de nous arrêter cette fois-ci en route, ne faisant qu'un très court séjour en France.

Agréez, avec mes salutations amicales, l'expression de mon sincère dévouement.

J. S. Mill

488.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran, près Avignon

le 1 mai 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Je vous remercie de l'envoi du Journal des Débats.² L'article de M. Baudrillard³ fait beaucoup d'honneur au livre, et doit servir notablement le succès de la traduction.

Je suis charmé que vous donniez une si pleine adhésion à mon autre livre,⁴ et que vous vouliez bien le traduire. Quant à la préface, je suis sûr qu'elle n'eût pas manqué de m'être agréable, quel que fût le nombre "de *si* et de *mais*" qu'elle pût contenir. Et quand je prendrai la revanche dont vous parlez, j'espère bien avoir auprès de vous un succès pareil. J'ai écrit au directeur de la Revue d'Edinbourg pour lui proposer un article sur vos deux ouvrages.⁵ S'il accepte, je m'en occuperai dès mon retour en Angleterre. Je lirais volontiers le livre de M. Odilon-Barrot⁶ en vue de cet article, mais il ne me sera utile que lorsque je commence à travailler sur la question et il vaudra mieux que je le prenne à Londres, ou en passant par Paris.

Ma fille se rappelle au bon souvenir de Madame Dupont-White et de vos demoiselles, et je vous prie de leur offrir mes hommages respectueux, et de croire à mes sentiments amicaux et à mon dévouement.

J. S. Mill

488A.

TO WILLIAM ELLIS¹

Avignon, May 1, 186[1].

Dear Ellis,—

Your letter, which has followed me here, reminds me that I have not yet thanked you for your last publication.² I have read it, as I had done all your others, with great interest. The line of usefulness you have chosen for yourself is as difficult and quite as important as any other, and you have given it the dignity of an apostolate. With respect to the criticisms and suggestions you invite, I have so little of the appropriate experience compared with yourself, that what I can offer does not amount to much. Besides, you are daily bringing all that you do to the best and only effectual test, actual practice. The only criticism which occurs to me in reference to this little book is, that the answers and remarks which you assign to the boys might perhaps with advantage be put into more eloquent language, knowing as I do the efficacy which your teaching possesses for extracting from the minds of pupils thoughts which hardly anyone would suppose them capable of. I have full faith in all that you say in the Preface, but the scientific and somewhat recondite language in which your boys express themselves, gives an air of improbability to the conversations which they need not necessarily have. With regard to the rest of your letter, I need hardly say that your approval of what I write gives me much pleasure. I have always looked upon you as one of my public, both for old friendship's sake, and because you are a student of

the same subjects as myself. There are enough of people now who praise my writings with exaggeration, without being at all competent to judge of them. But though these are the persons I write to benefit, they are not (it is unnecessary to say) those whose praise, unless as a means to that object, gives me any satisfaction.

I Am, Dear Ellis,
Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

489.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

S[aint] V[éran] May 1, 1861

Dear Sir—

M. Dupont White, whom you probably know, at least by reputation, has lately published two books (or written one book in two parts) entitled *L'Individu et l'État & La Centralisation*.² These from their merit & the sort of theoretic & scientific character which he has endeavoured to give them afford a good occasion for bringing the whole question of the limits of governmental action under discussion. M. D. W. takes decidedly the governmental side, a thing now rather uncommon among thinking men, even in France: & as the things he says in favour of centralization are about the best that can be said for it, there would be some use in a review³ which should concede the portion of truth contained in them & at the same time bring forward the still more important truths which as stated by him they contradict.

If you would like such an article from me I would try to write it, & would send it to you some time in the course of this summer or autumn. I could include M. Odilon Barrot's new book on *Centralisation*⁴ if after reading it I should find that it affords good additional material for an article.

There are two other purposes for which I have been wishing to write to you—one is to recommend a contributor, the other a book. The contributor is Professor Cliffe Leslie of Belfast. He is probably already known to you as a man of an extensive range of thought & acquirements & a clear effective & popular writer—but he is modest & thinks he requires a recommendation & though the offer to give him one came from myself it was warmly accepted by him. The book which I wish to mention to you is a new life of Savonarola by Pasquale Villari,⁵ professor of history at Pisa, a valued friend of mine. Besides being a very interesting chapter of history which contains much new information interestingly told, the book places the character of Savonarola in a new light, shews him to have been the most enlightened lover of liberty & one of the wisest practical politicians of his time. A person sufficiently acquainted with the religious & political history of Italy at that period could write a review of it which I

sh^d think would be very interesting to many readers of the Edinburgh. Not having that necessary qualification I do not offer to do it myself.

490.

TO JANE MILL FERRABOSCHI¹

[Address undecipherable]

May 13 1861

Dear Jane,

You cannot do better than place your papers in Mr Crompton's² hands as he is your trustee, and you have more confidence in him than in Mr Gregson.³ I know of no reason to distrust Mr Gregson and he still has charge of my legal documents, but this is no reason whatever for not putting yours in Mr Crompton's care. You had better obtain the other Trustee's control and send a letter from him requesting Mr Gregson to deliver your papers to Mr Crompton.

I was aware that you had lost your first child but I did not know that you had now only one. I am sorry that your health is still delicate. From

Yrs Aff^Y,

J. S. Mill

491.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

St Véran, Avignon

May 18. 1861.

Dear Sir

I am glad that you and Mr Leslie are likely to get on well together,² and also that you are so well pleased with my book.³ With regard to writing an article for you, I am looking out for a subject that will suit the Review and myself; but on Foreign Policy, I could add little, of a general kind, to what was said in a paper I published a short time ago in Fraser.⁴ The principles concerned are so mixed up with the specialities of the cases to which they are to be applied, that they can hardly be discussed with fruit unless à propos of some particular application; and at the present moment the only case which offers itself, on which people are not already agreed, is that of Turkey,⁵ on

which I am not master of the details, and in which (as I know by my experience of Oriental nations) details are all-important.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yrs

J. S. Mill

492.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

St Véran, Avignon

May 19. 1861

Dear Sir

I ought to have acknowledged the receipt of Mr Nisbet's [*sic*] article.² But it came in my absence. I had not time to read it immediately on my return, and when I did, I thought it likely that I might see you, or have occasion to write to you on some other matter. I was greatly interested by the article, and thought it a very complete and satisfactory vindication of one of the greatest benefits ever conferred upon Ireland. To me, no vindication was necessary, but I was much gratified by the additional knowledge I obtained of the subject.

No expression of opinion which I have received respecting my book,³ has given me so much pleasure as yours; your adhesion being so much more complete than any knowledge I had of you entitled me to hope for, while that knowledge was quite sufficient to make me feel that there are few persons whose adhesion is more complimentary or more valuable. Such a testimony strengthens my hope that the opinions which I have expressed are not only true, but may, within some assignable length of time, become practical.

What you say of the Irish system of education as a striking example of the right combination of central and local agency, is important, and I should much like to see the illustration fully developed.

I Am Dear Sir
With Sincere Respect
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

493.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran

le 26 mai 1861

Mon Cher Monsieur

Je vous remercie beaucoup de l'envoi de l'article de Monsieur Baudrillart.² Je l'avais déjà lu grâce au hasard qui m'a fait connaître un négociant d'ici,³ économiste et publiciste, dont les lumières et les opinions dépassent de beaucoup ce que je croyais pouvoir trouver dans l'ancienne ville des papes, et qui est abonné à la Revue Nationale. Je suis de votre avis sur l'article. Personnellement j'ai tout lieu d'en être content; mais M. Baudrillart, ainsi que je le savais déjà, porte l'opinion anti-centralisatrice jusqu'au fanatisme. Lorsque j'ai vu qu'il croyait que la liberté locale eût mieux valu sous le règne d'Acbar⁴ ou de Charlemagne, je me suis dit—Il n'y a que les Français pour avoir des idées absolues. Cependant je trouve qu'ils sont en train de se corriger de ce défaut, comme les Anglais du défaut contraire.

J'écrivis au directeur de la Revue d'Edinbourg, pour lui proposer un article sur vos deux ouvrages;⁵ mais il se trouve que le directeur lui même se propose de traiter la Centralisation à propos de l'éducation publique dans son numéro de juillet,⁶ et à ce que je crains, dans un esprit assez différent du mien. J'attends donc pour voir comment il s'en tirera, et s'il y aura place pour moi après lui. Je n'ai pas encore vu la deuxième édition de votre Centralisation.⁷ Y avez-vous mis du nouveau? Je lirai votre ouvrage de 1846⁸ avec d'autant plus de plaisir, que vous y aurez moins épargné la société actuelle, que je passe pour ne pas estimer beaucoup.

Ma fille est très sensible au bon souvenir de Madame Dupont-White et de vos demoiselles. Je vous prie de me recommander à leur bienveillance, et de croire toujours aux sentiments d'estime et d'amitié de

Votre Bien Dévoué

J. S. Mill

494.

TO GEORGE W. CHILDS¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

June 9. 1861

Dear Sir

On returning from the Continent, I have only now found your letter.

It must be flattering to any author, and is most agreeable to myself, that my writings should obtain the favourable opinion of competent judges in the United States, and that I should have been thought of as a fit person to write a treatise on Representative Government specially for that country. I have, however, so many demands upon my time and exertions, that it will not be in my power to undertake what you propose; an inability which I the less regret, as what I could write would be little more than a rather flat repetition of a volume I have very recently published.²

I have the honor to be

Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

495.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath

July 5 [1861]

Dear Sir

My daughter and I thank you very much for your kind invitation, but I am so very busy just now, and have so much occupation awaiting me for some time to come, that I do not like to make any engagement that can possibly be postponed. There is no visit I should like better than the one you kindly propose and a little later in the summer if it should happen to suit you I hope I may have more time at my disposal.

I have written a few additional pages for the new edition,² to keep up the fight against the objections to the plan. I am continually meeting with proofs of the increased attention—of which these very criticisms are one. The first time I am in the neighbourhood of St. James's Square I will return your interesting Sydney correspondence,³ and bring you a German newspaper containing some things which I think will amuse you.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

496.

TO HENRY TAYLOR¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

July 5th, 1861

My Dear Taylor,

Your letter of May 28th came while I was abroad, and I have not hitherto had time to make the acknowledgment which is due to the feelings you express and to the considerate and sympathizing view which you take of what I have been endeavouring to do. I am very glad that my treatment of the subject,² as a general thesis, has obtained so much of your approbation. With regard to its applicability to this country³ and immediately, I am quite alive to the force of many of the considerations which you bring forward. You only state them as misgivings, and as misgivings I share most of them, though probably in a considerably less degree than yourself. On one thing we are almost sure to be agreed: that whenever the movement for organic change recovers strength, which may happen at any time, and is sure to happen at some time, it will make a great practical difference what general theories of constitutional government are then in possession of the minds of cultivated persons. It is as a preparation for that time that my speculations, if they have as much truth in them as you seem to think they have, may be valuable. In the meantime, while they keep up the faith in possibilities of improvement, they tend rather to moderate than to encourage eagerness for immediate and premature changes of a fundamental character. If the opinions make any way, they will influence, more or less, what is done from time to time in the way of partial improvement; and while changes in right directions will be facilitated, the barriers will, I hope, be strengthened against those of a bad tendency. It is not to you that anything need be said on the necessity of keeping a true ideal before one, however widely the state of facts may differ from it, and the extreme peril, both of having a false ideal, and of having no ideal at all, between which states (with a tendency at present towards the latter) politicians both speculative and practical seem to be divided.

I am very sorry to hear that your health imposes on you so much confinement.⁴ I hope that is the worst of the inconveniences it causes you. I, too, am not likely to forget the old days you remind me of,⁵ nor any of those with whom I used to discuss and compare notes, so agreeably and usefully to myself. If I have ceased to frequent them, it is not from estrangement, but because society, even of a good kind, does less and less for me; and I have so much to do in the few years of life and health I can look forward to (though my health is now on the whole good), that I really have no time to spare for anything but what is at once absolutely necessary to me, and the only thing besides reading which is a real relaxation, active out-door exercise. I do not however give up hope of again seeing you & to do so will always be a pleasure.

I Am Dear Taylor
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

497.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Blackheath

July 12. 1861

Dear Sir

I have my hands so full just now that I shall not for some months be able to undertake any review article, least of all one which would require much reading, and a great deal of careful thinking on a practical subject not familiar to me. Neither do I feel disposed to attempt writing anything comprehensive on the question of national education in the present stage of the discussion. Whether I may be differently inclined some time hence I cannot at present say. But in any case I should not venture to engage myself beforehand. I have however more than one subject in view, which I will mention when I see my way more clearly.

I have read the paper on the *ape* controversy² with much interest. I like several of the papers in this number very much; especially the one on Buckle.³ It is the only thing yet written about him which seems to me exactly in the right tone. The article on my own book,⁴ I can sincerely say, gave me less pleasure by its praises than by its intelligent adhesion to some of the opinions I attach most importance to. I should like much to know, if it be not a secret, the authorship both of that and of the article on Buckle.

I have had some conversation with Mr Cliffe Leslie⁵ on his proposed article on Income Tax Reform. I think it will be a good one. He will probably set about it as soon as the Report and Evidence are accessible;⁶ but he does not like the idea of its not appearing till April, and I should certainly think January would be a better time, as giving it a chance of helping to shape the speeches in Parliament or at public meetings, and the newspaper articles, by which alone any impression can be made upon unwilling Finance Ministers.

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

498.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

B[lackheath]

July 30. 1861.

Dear Sir

I was very sorry to hear that the state of your health² had compelled you to suspend the issue of your "First Principles"³. I sincerely hope that the cause of the interruption has ceased, or will soon do so.

Allow me to thank you for your volume on Education,⁴ which I have only within the last few days had time to read. It is full of things well worth saying, & contains hardly anything with which I disagree, though I sh^d sometimes suggest other things as requiring to be taken into consideration *along* with those on which you lay stress.

As connected with your last chapter,⁵ some very important & conclusive evidence has been collected by Mr. Chadwick⁶ (& is now printing by order of the H. of C[ommons]) shewing that the half-time scholars, those who attend school only three hours a day, are not only equal but superior in their attainments to those who attend six hours. I believe we sh^d hear little of injury to health from over application if people were not kept at one kind of mental work for a longer time than it is possible for them to apply their minds strenuously to it.

I have been in the habit of attributing the diminished strength of constitution of the middle & higher classes (which I believe to be a fact) to a physiological cause not mentioned by you, being the same which explains the strong constitutions of many savage tribes. Formerly all the weakly children died, & the race was kept up solely by means of vigorous specimens. Now, however, vaccinations, & improved bringing up of children, by their very success keep alive to maturity, & enable to become parents, a vast number of persons with naturally weak constitutions. This influence, diffused by intermarriage through the succeeding generations, must necessarily, unless counteracted by powerful causes of an opposite tendency, diminish the average vigour of constitution of the classes in which it occurs.

I Am Dear Sir

Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

499.

TO HARRIET GROTE¹

Blackheath

Aug. 3. 1861

Dear Mrs Grote

I am very happy to hear that Mr Grote is getting rapidly well.²

We will come to you on the 21st with pleasure,³ and as I suppose Bain also will go by way of Caterham, I will leave it to him to fix which of the trains you mention will suit him best—both being equally convenient to us. I am

Dear Mrs Grote

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

500.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Blackheath

Aug. 4. 1861.

Dear Sir

I have read Mr Harrison's letter in the Daily News.² But I do not agree with him to the extent or in the manner which he seems to suppose. I believe that I agree entirely with the view taken in Mr Fawcett's article.³ But I do so, specifically on the ground stated, I believe, for the first time by him viz. that the power of striking tends to bring about something approximating to what I consider the only right organization of labour, the association of the workpeople with the employers by a participation of profits. I regard the payment of a fixed sum per day as essentially demoralizing, and I disapprove of what the men are doing,⁴ precisely because as Mr Harrison says they are on the conservative side, standing up for the existing practice, a practice which is making workmen more and more fraudulent in the quality of their labour just as dealers are in that of their goods. I see no hope of improvement but by altering this; and payment by the hour appears to be a step, though but a small one, towards making the pay proportional to the work done. At the same time, I think that the men would be right in standing out for the recognition of a certain length of working day, beyond

which the payment per hour should be higher; & that in this way it should be made
the interest of the masters, not to overwork the men.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

John Chapman Esq.

501.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Aug. 8. 1861.

Dear Chadwick

I have had a visit from a Walachian, Mr Alexandre Pétreskou,² who has been sent to
France and England by his Government to qualify himself for being a Professor of
Political Economy. I have advised him to go to the Social Science Meeting³ where he
will be able to see and hear much that may be useful to him. Do you intend to be
there? If yes, I will ask you to give him a little help which will be the more necessary
as, though he speaks French excellently, he is probably no great hand at speaking
English. If you are not going, it would oblige me much if you would send any
introductions that would be useful to him at Dublin. He is evidently a well informed
and very intelligent man, and worth our taking a little trouble for him.

Do you wish your two agricultural papers⁴ sent to M. de Lavergne,⁵ or will it be time
enough when I pass through in September?

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Will you kindly direct the inclosed letter⁶ to Fawcett and send it, as I have mislaid his
Wiltshire address.

502.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Blackheath

le 8 août 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Je commencerai par répondre à vos questions.[2](#)

Shibboleth,[3](#) page 136, peut se traduire par un quelconque des équivalens que vous proposez. C'est un mot tiré d'une anecdote d'histoire juive, pareille à celle qu'on raconte à l'occasion des Vêpres Siciliennes.[4](#) Les meurtriers palermitains ont (dit-on) reconnu leurs victimes à leur incapacité d'articuler certain mot italien, difficile aux organes français. La Bible dit que le mot *Shibboleth* a une fois servi aux juifs pour un but social d'une nature semblable. Par suite on a donné ce nom chez nous à tout signe vocal qu'une classe ou un parti exige pour se reconnaître.

Section, mot assez en usage chez les américains, veut dire dans leur langue politique non seulement un parti, mais une subdivision quelconque de la nation. Tout ce qui a un intérêt ou une opinion communs avec lesquels il faut compter, s'appelle une section.

On pourrait traduire *stupidest*[5](#) (p. 138) par *le plus borné*. En me servant de ce mot je n'étais pas sans une certaine envie de faire enrager le parti conservateur.

Hobson's choice[6](#) est une expression proverbiale, dont l'origine m'est inconnue. L'alternative indiquée est "*that or none*": "ce que je vous offre, ou bien rien du tout."

J'aurai, en quelques jours, à vous expédier la seconde édition. Vous n'aurez pas à vous occuper des changemens purement verbaux; et il n'y en a pas d'autres, si ce n'est une courte note au 14^{me} chapitre, et quelques pages ajustées au septième.

Je ne crois pas plus que vous à des projets positifs sur la Sardaigne,[7](#) et je pense même qu'un tel projet ne deviendrait positif que lorsque la réalisation en serait assurée. Je crois seulement qu'il y a quelqu'un qui a les yeux sur tout, et que les agneaux sont tenus à des précautions continues lorsqu'ils ont pour voisin un loup.

Veillez nous rappeler au bon souvenir de Madame Dupont-White et de vos demoiselles, et agréez mes salutations amicales.

J. S. Mill

503.

TO HENRY FAWCETT[1](#)

Blackheath

Aug. 8. 1861

Dear Mr Fawcett

I have had a very interesting conversation with a young Walachian, M. Alexandre Pétreskou, who has been sent to Paris and London by his Government to qualify himself for being a Professor of Political Economy. He knows some of the best Frenchmen, but nobody at all in England. I have advised him to attend the Social Science meeting, and as I suppose you will be there, I hope you will allow me to give him an introduction to you, and recommend him to your good offices. I do not believe he speaks much English, but his French is excellent. He seems both intelligent and well informed, and eager to inform himself still more; and anything we can do for him will be done for the benefit of his countrymen, who have almost everything to learn, but are very desirous to learn it.

I am very busy revising the Logic for a new edition.[2](#)

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

504.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES[1](#)

Blackheath

Aug. 18. 1861

Dear Sir

I have not waited all this time to read your MS,[2](#) though press of occupations has delayed my writing to you about it. I think it may be worked up into a most valuable paper and one particularly wanted at the present time. I have been very much struck with the ignorance which, in nearly all the writing which has appeared in England about the American disruption, has been shewn respecting the necessary conditions of American slavery and the transcendant importance of the stake at issue in the present contest. The English organs of opinion cry out for a recognition of the secession, and for letting slavery alone; but slavery will not let freedom alone. As you have shewn, more powerfully than had been done before, American slavery depends upon a perpetual extension of its field; it must go on barbarizing the world more and more, and the Southern states will never consent to a peace without half the unoccupied country, and the power which it would give of unlimited conquest towards the south. Instead of calling on the North to subscribe to this, it would be a case for a crusade of all civilized humanity to prevent it. I think it very important therefore, that in recasting your lectures in the form of an article, you should connect them expressly and openly with the present crisis, and make them, in effect, a pamphlet on that; though without entering into the mere details or personalities of the quarrel. I am

convinced that you could make it most telling; and the only thing I should like better is that it should appear with your name, and be written about in many reviews, instead of being contributed to one.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

505.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

B[lackheath Park]. Aug.21.1861

Dear Sir—

It gave me much pleasure to hear from you again after so long an interval & to receive from you so many expressions of kind and friendly feeling. But I greatly regret that you are suffering so much in health,² & the more so as the morbid affection which you mention is of a kind to necessitate much temporary forbearance as to mental application, which from the opinion I have of your capacity I consider as a misfortune.

I am sorry you should feel any doubt respecting the interest I must necessarily take in what is occurring in the Austrian Empire. Even in this extraordinary time in which there is scarcely a spot on the globe where some great historical change does not seem to be either dawning or approaching its crisis, I do not know anything more important or more intensely interesting than the progress & chances of the political transformation of Austria. I have read with the greatest pleasure your letters to the *Neueste Nachrichten*³ & I need say nothing more than that I agree, from beginning to end, in the view you take of the Hungarian question.

I am glad you are not discouraged from prosecuting your translation of the *Liberty* by the fact of there being another translation in the field.⁴ You have a full right to state that yours is the translation undertaken with the concurrence & approbation of the author at a time when no other had been announced.

It is a sign of the times that there is a Russian translation of the *Liberty* published at Leipzig.⁵ The French translation has been very successful.⁶

Pray let me hear from you now & then. I shall be here for another month & afterwards at Avignon where I spend fully half the year. Thanks for your kind enquiries about my health. It is now, & generally, very satisfactory.

506.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Blackheath

le 14 Sept. 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Je répondrai à vos questions en suivant l'ordre que vous avez suivi.

1°. Je ne sais pas au juste le nombre des électeurs.² Il n'est pas bien constaté, et d'ailleurs il varie tous les ans. On croit cependant qu'ils sont au nombre d'un million à peu près.

2°. Il n'y avait primitivement dans l'Inde³ la propriété foncière proprement dite que celle des associations ou communautés villageoises. Là où ces communautés existent encore, on leur a conservé leurs droits. Dans une grande partie de l'Inde ces communautés ont disparu. Depuis lors, en certaines provinces il n'existe pas de propriété foncière complète, mais seulement un droit d'occupation permanente, moyennant un paiement annuel au gouvernement, dont le taux est fixé par des baux à long terme; le plus souvent au terme de trente ans. A la fin du bail, l'ancien cultivateur a droit de priorité pour le renouveler. Dans ces provinces, comme dans les provinces à communauté, il y a, comme vous voyez, impossibilité de fait à ce que des Anglais puissent devenir propriétaires fonciers.

Mais il y a une troisième partie du territoire qui comprend le Bengale, le Behar, et en général les plus anciennes possessions de l'Angleterre dans l'Inde: dans celles-là on a reconstitué la propriété, et même la grande propriété à condition seulement d'un paiement annuel à l'Etat, qu'on peut comparer à l'impôt foncier en France, excepté qu'il est ordinairement beaucoup plus considérable. Dans ces provinces-là un Anglais peut devenir propriétaire par contrat à l'amiable en désintéressant les propriétaires actuels. S'il achète une terre, il est tenu, comme de raison, à payer l'impôt. Depuis quelque temps, les acquireurs britanniques demandent qu'il leur soit permis de racheter cet impôt: et c'est là ce qu'ils entendent en disant qu'ils veulent devenir propriétaires.

3°. Vous avez parfaitement bien compris ce que sont les "assessed taxes".⁴ On pourrait peut-être les appeler des impôts de consommation. On ne pourrait pas les traduire par *taxes établis*.

4°. Les *repudiating states*⁵ sont ceux qui ont refusé de reconnaître leurs dettes. Le mot *repudiate* est leur propre mot. Ils les ont désavouées.

5°. Les élections anglaises ne se faisant pas par la voie du scrutin, les électeurs se présentent à un lieu donné qu'on appelle *polling place*:⁶ ils déclarent leur nom et leur

vote, qui sont écrits par des *poll clerks*,⁷ ceux-ci s'assurant en même temps que le nom du votant est dans la liste de ceux qui ont droit de voter au même *polling place*. L'élection commence et finit par un meeting. Au premier de ces deux meetings on propose les candidats; à celui qui suit l'élection, on en déclare le résultat. Comme ces meetings ont lieu en plein air, on a besoin d'une estrade en bois qu'on appelle *hustings*.⁷ L'autorité locale, les candidats, les électeurs qui les proposent, et généralement tous ceux qui ont l'intention de parler, montent sur le *hustings* pour se faire voir et entendre.

6. Un *deadlock*⁸ a lieu lorsque les rouages d'une machine ou les roues de deux voitures s'embrouillent de manière à ne pouvoir se dégager à moins d'être démontées. *Impasse* est une métaphore différente, mais à peu près équivalente.

Je vous félicite d'être si près de la fin de votre travail. Je lirai votre préface avec le plus grand intérêt.

Pour en venir à la dernière question: nous nous proposons, s'il n'arrive rien d'inattendu, de partir d'ici pour Avignon le soir du 23 et ce serait avec beaucoup de plaisir que nous nous arrêterions pour un jour à Fontainebleau. Nous comptons donc pouvoir arriver à Fontainebleau par quelque train de l'après-midi du 24.

Nous nous recommandons tous deux très cordialement aux bons souvenirs de toute votre famille.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

507.

TO LEONARD H. COURTNEY¹

Blackheath

Sept. 19. 1861

Dear Sir

I am glad to have had the opportunity of reading your objections to my arguments on the Income Tax;² and I am always glad to receive and consider intelligent objections from all quarters to any of my opinions. I have often profited very much by such criticisms; but their authors cannot expect that I should have time to answer them; and I hope, therefore, that you will excuse me if I do not discuss your arguments, or point out why they do not, in the smallest degree, alter or shake my opinion. It so happened that none of my cross-examiners in the Committee³ took the same view of the subject which you, and the actuaries, take; and their questions, therefore, drew out very little

of what I could have said in opposition to that view. I will merely place before you one form of the argument, which appears to me very simple and conclusive. The actuaries argue that income of equal capitalized value should pay equal amounts to the tax. Granted: that is, equal *total* amounts. But if these equal total amounts are to be made up by equal annual payments, it is implied that the payments are of equal duration, and the owner of the terminable income would be required to go on paying his quota to the tax after his income had ceased.

If you will only consider what would be the payments required from the two supposed taxpayers if each of them was required or empowered to redeem the tax by paying down a gross sum once for all, you would, I think, see that the opinion of the actuaries has no ground whatever to stand on.

I Am Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

508.

TO [JAMES A. FROUDE?[1](#)]

Blackheath

Sept. 20.1861

Dear Sir

Many thanks for the proof of the second part,[2](#) which I return corrected. I leave England for Avignon on Monday next, when my address will be Saint V eran, Avignon, Vaucluse, France.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

509.

TO HENRY PARKES[1](#)

Blackheath Park

Sept. 22. 1861

Dear Sir

I am sorry that I missed you on both the occasions on which I called at your lodgings, and the more so as I am leaving England tomorrow for the winter, and shall therefore have no opportunity of seeing you until my return, if you are still in England at that time. Allow me to thank you for the valuable documents which you did me the favour to send. The reports—I have not yet had time to read the evidence—disclose a state of things among the poorer population, in some respects worse than I should have expected; but it is very satisfactory to find that attention has been so strongly called to the existing evils.[2](#)

My address for the present will be, Saint Véran, Avignon, Vaucluse, France, where if there should be any way in which I can be of use to you I hope you will let me know.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

Henry Parkes Esq.

510.

TO HENRY FAWCETT[1](#)

Blackheath

Sept. 26. 1861

Dear Mr Fawcett

I am very glad to receive such a pleasant account of your proceedings at the British Association,[2](#) and glad also to have received it before leaving England. We start for Avignon on Monday, and do not expect to be in England again till after Midsummer, as we meditate a journey for next spring.

I hear you are writing an elementary book on Political Economy.[3](#) Something like a class book on the subject is much wanted, and besides being a useful thing when done, it is a very useful thing to yourself to do, as it is a much more complete exercise of the scientific intellect to construct a treatise on a whole department of knowledge, than to write essays, either scientific or popular, on detached points. My own occupation, however, during this winter, will be of the latter kind, of which I have several subjects. The paper on Utilitarianism which I think I told you of, is coming out in the next three numbers of Fraser.[4](#)

In revising my Political Economy for a new edition,⁵ I have made use of some of your observations on Strikes,⁶ of course mentioning to whom I am indebted for them. Though they were published anonymously in the Westminster, I hope there is no objection to connecting them with your name. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

511.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran

le 10 octobre 1861

Mon Cher Monsieur

Bien des remerciemens pour votre Préface.² Sans rien dire des choses amicales et flatteuses que vous avez bien voulu y mettre pour moi personnellement, j'ai tout lieu d'être content de cet écrit comme discours préliminaire. Il établit et caractérise vigoureusement les bienfaits de la liberté, et il pose les questions principales du régime représentatif, avec un sentiment très juste de leurs difficultés et des conditions de leur solution. Il y a, en outre, un grand nombre d'observations vraies et fortement exprimées. Je ne vois nul motif de supprimer aucun des passages que vous avez marqués d'une note d'interrogation. Je ne trouve guère, dans l'écrit, d'autre différence sérieuse entre nos opinions que celle qui regarde la doctrine de l'Utile, et je suis bien loin de désirer que vous gardiez le silence sur cette différence. A propos, je publie en ce moment même, dans *Fraser's Magazine* une exposition sommaire de la doctrine de l'Utile³ comme je l'entends: celle-là, je serais fort curieux de la voir jugée par l'Académie. Quand elle sera complete, elle formera un petit volume dont je me promets de vous faire hommage. Vous verrez là les *contorsions* que j'ai choisies. Il y a seulement une question de fait où vous me paraissez mal informé. Comme beaucoup de Français, vous semblez être d'avis que *l'idée de l'Utile* est en Angleterre *la philosophie dominante*. Il n'en est rien. Je conçois qu'on puisse voir dans cette doctrine une certaine analogie avec l'esprit de la nation anglaise. Mais en fait elle y est, et elle y a presque toujours été, très impopulaire. La plupart des écrivains anglais ne la nient pas seulement, ils l'insultent: et l'école de Bentham a toujours été regardée (je le dis avec regret) comme une insignifiante minorité.

En arrivant ici, j'ai trouvé votre livre sur les relations du Travail avec le Capital.⁴ Permettez-moi de vous en faire, quoiqu'un peu tard, mon compliment. Cet ouvrage me paraît d'un très grand mérite. Vous y avez montré que pour être Centraliste vous

n'en êtes pas moins économiste de la meilleure trempe; très supérieur, ce me semble, à la plupart de ces messieurs dans leur propre spécialité.

Je vous remercie encore de l'envoi du livre sur Phidias.⁵ Le sujet en est pour moi du plus grand intérêt, comme tout ce qui se rapporte soit aux grandes époques de l'art, soit à celles de l'histoire. J'ai lu avec un grand plaisir, l'année passée, une étude de M. Beulé sur Phidias, dans la Revue des Deux Mondes.⁶ Je me rejouis de voir que le goût de l'antiquité grecque paraît renaître dans la nouvelle génération en France. Il y a eu dernièrement dans la Revue Nationale un article charmant, et très satisfaisant sous le rapport de la vérité historique, sur la position et le rôle des poètes à Athènes,⁷ article auquel la lecture de M. Grote n'a pas été étrangère; et plus récemment encore, un article d'histoire et de critique sur Hyperide,⁸ qui fait très grand honneur à son auteur.

Ma fille vous prie de la rappeler aux bons souvenirs de Madame Dupont-White et de vos demoiselles. Je vous engage en même temps à leur faire mes hommages, et de croire toujours à mon estime et à mon attachement.

J. S. Mill

512.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

[November, 1861]

[In 1861, he began to turn his thoughts to a review of Hamilton's Philosophy. Writing to me in November, he says,]

I mean to take up Sir William Hamilton, and try if I can make an article on him for the *Westminster*.²

513.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

[November? 1861]

[In reference to the argument that an exemption of savings would be an exemption in favour of the rich who can afford to save, at the expense of the poor who cannot, an eminent political economist has suggested to the writer that] the rich get this advantage only in so far as they save, and in so far as they do so, they forego the advantage of being rich, and place themselves on a par with the poor. If a rich man saved all the excess of his income above that of his poor neighbour, he would, in fact, be equally poor, since all the rest of his income would in fact be simply managed for him by the public.²

514.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

[Saint Véran]

[November, 1861]

[A month before,² he had written to Thornton, in terms that showed how well he had recovered his natural buoyant spirits, and his enjoyment of life.]

Life here is uneventful, and feels like a perpetual holiday. It is one of the great privileges of advanced civilization, that while keeping out of the turmoil and depressing wear of life, one can have brought to one's doors all that is agreeable or stimulating in the activities of the outward world, by newspapers, new books, periodicals, &c. It is, in truth, too self-indulgent a life for any one to allow himself whose duties lie among his fellow-beings, unless, as is fortunately the case with me, they are mostly such as can be better fulfilled at a distance from their society, than in the midst of it.

515.

TO JAMES LORIMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Nov. 2. 1861.

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for sending me your article.² The tone in which you write about the book,³ and the importance which, whether deservedly or not, you attach to it, must tend greatly to increase its influence. I am glad that there are so many points on which we entirely, and heartily, agree. Of those on which we differ, only one is practically important—the extension of the suffrage to women. The fact of their not generally desiring it, instead of an argument against its being given to them, is to my mind one of the strongest reasons to the contrary. For it arises from that entire want of knowledge and interest in politics, and of the very first and most elementary notions of duty to the public, which makes the influence that, as you truly say, they exercise, in 99 cases out of 100 destructive of public virtue in the men connected with them. I do not know how to reconcile your refusal of votes to women because they possess social influence, with the main principle of your system, that of granting plurality of votes on account of, and in proportion to, the social influence already possessed.

On this last subject, I confess, your answer to my objections has not convinced me. I do not well understand the sort of social weight or importance which you appear to

contemplate; a sort which has no influence either on people's opinions or on their votes. I do not see how persons whom the democracy, by your supposition, always votes against, can be said to be looked up to by it. Being looked up to in this sense, seems only to mean, being thought to be better off, not better, than other people. And even if it meant the latter, it is surely of more importance to single out, for a superior political position, those who *are* better, than those who are thought to be so. The former is exactly my plan; for the same general presumptions which must be employed to classify the voters according to their probable degrees of intelligence, correspond almost equally well with their probable degrees of moral trustworthiness also.

What you tell me respecting the North British Review is very satisfactory. It is excellent news that the Free Church party cannot support a Review without the cooperation of persons more liberal than themselves, and better still that one of the organs of opinion has reached the point of discarding routine doctrines in politics, and looking the question, whether universal suffrage shall be made a blessing or a curse, fairly in the face. I wish the conductors of the Review all success and prosperity in their new course, but I am quite unable to accept their proposal of writing a political article for them. My hands are already full, and even if they were not, there are other periodicals which have a prior claim on me.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

516.

TO SAMUEL PAULL¹

S[aint] V[éran] Nov. 23. 1861

Sir—

I have received your letter dated Nov. 19. I certainly think with you that the estimates made by architects, engineers & others should be so drawn up as to distinguish clearly the payments for labour from all other payments, specifying both the quantity of labour & the rate at which it is paid. This is essential to the idea of an estimate. & it is on every account proper that the person who has to pay for the labour should know what he pays for, & at what rate he pays it, & should not be paying contractors' profit when he supposes himself to be paying labourers' wages.

At the same time I sh^d not be sincere with you if I allowed you to suppose that I attach much importance to this or any such matter of detail as a means of benefiting the labouring classes, or that I look upon questions of wages as capable of being settled in the way of arbitration, on grounds of equity. The insuperable difficulty is that there

being no *principle* of equity to rest the settlement upon, any decision must be arbitrary, dependent on the direction of the judge's sympathies. That the workmen should not starve may be said to be equitable, & also that the employers should get some profit. But between these limits I do not see what standard of equity can possibly be laid down. As long as the employers & their families are able to live better, & expend more on themselves than the labourers & their families, it may always be said that wages are not what they ought equitably to be. I can conceive Socialism, in which the division of the produce of labour is made among all, either according to the rule of equality (Communism) or according to any other *general* rule which may be considered more just than absolute equality. But under a system of private property in past accumulations in which no general rule can be laid down, I think that to give any one the power of deciding according to his own views of equity without a general rule would only perpetuate & envenom instead of healing the quarrel between capital & labour. The only thing which people will in these circumstances submit to as final, is the law of necessity, that is, the demand & supply of the market, *tested* (when not otherwise known) by the result of a strike. All that I consider practicable in the present state of society is to strengthen the weaker side in the competition, which can only be done by the prudence, forethought, wise restraint, & habit of cooperation, of the working people themselves.

517.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Nov. 25. 1861

Dear Sir

I am truly glad that matter so important at this time as what you have written on Slavery² is not to be buried in an anonymous article in a review. It seems to me that what will most help to give a better direction to public opinion, is that persons of talent, the more known and respected the better, should put themselves forward ostensibly, and even what in different circumstances might be called ostentatiously, as champions of the right view of the subject. The abolitionist feelings which were but lately so strong in England cannot have died out; they must be still there, and to rouse them into activity it is perhaps only necessary that the real state of the case should be well brought before them. I shall be only too happy to be associated with you in the demonstration, in the manner you propose. But the passage you think of quoting³ seems to me scarcely fit for the purpose; it is only suited to the expression of individual feelings between friends who think alike on the subject. If I had been writing for publication I should not have used that expression about a crusade without leading the reader up to it by a gradual preparation. I have tried to do this in the inclosed paper,⁴ which is in the form of a letter to you, and of which you are free to make use in the way you propose or in any other.

As you say, the French are shewing to much greater advantage on this question than the English. The writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*⁵ deserves all you say of him; he understands the subject and wrote excellently on it in the *Revue* before the secession. There is in the last number of the *Revue Nationale* (10th November)⁶ a noble and stirring article by Pressensé,⁷ the most distinguished of the French Protestant clergy, and in that character well known to the religious world in England. Have you seen “Un grand peuple qui se reveille” by Agénor de Gasparin?⁸ I only know it by extracts, but it seems to be very good.

I am happy to find so very near an agreement in our opinions on the utilitarian question. Indeed increased knowledge of each other seems always in our case to disclose fresh points of agreement. I cannot enter into this subject at present, but should like to discuss it with you at some future time. There is to be a third paper in the next number of *Fraser*,⁹ on the relation between justice and utility, which will conclude the subject. The mode of treatment suggested in the last page of your letter¹⁰ is very much to the purpose, and I should like extremely to see the question handled from that point of view by yourself or by some other competent person.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

P.S. Ever since I had the advantage of reading part of your MS. lectures on Slavery, I have been anxious that you should write on the subject, in a manner adapted to the general reader, and with express reference to the American quarrel. Like yourself, I have felt ashamed and grieved at the figure which English public opinion exhibits in the face of mankind at this great crisis of human history.¹¹ The people of this country have amply proved the sincerity and strength of their anti-slavery convictions; and if most of their leading organs now express themselves as if there was no distinction between right and wrong on this momentous subject, it can only be because the public have not yet realized the vastness of the stake which is at issue in the present contest. Had they done so, would our most powerful newspapers be able to argue the question as if the right to rebel in defence of the power to tyrannize, were as sacred as the right of resisting by arms a tyranny practised over ourselves? or as if a community which takes its stand, not upon slavery merely but upon the extension of slavery as the fundamental condition of its existence, and which has broken loose from national ties because it feared lest something might be done to prevent it from carrying this scourge through the whole of the American continent, were a society just like any other—having the same moral rights of every kind, & as fit to take its place in the community of nations, as any body of human beings whatever. It is most deeply to be wished that such a society may be crushed in its commencement, before it has made itself such a pest to the world as to require and justify a general crusade of civilized nations for its suppression.

518.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

[December, 1861]

[He soon abandoned the idea of an article on Sir William Hamilton. In December he said:—]

I have now studied all Sir W. Hamilton's works pretty thoroughly, and see my way to most of what I have got to say respecting him. But I have given up the idea of doing it in anything less than a volume.² The great recommendation of this project is, that it will enable me to supply what was prudently left deficient in the *Logic*, and to do the kind of service which I am capable of to rational psychology, namely, to its *Polemik*.

519.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint-Véran, Avignon

le 4 Decembre 1861.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Les traductions que vous donnez sont toutes deux admissibles surtout la seconde; mais l'une et l'autre sont équivalentes plutôt qu'identiques à l'idée que j'ai voulu exprimer. Il doit y avoir quelqu'expression théologique qui rendrait encore plus exactement ce que j'ai voulu dire. Nous entendons par "the canon of inspiration"² l'ensemble des Ecritures reconnues révélées. Ce canon a été incomplet aussi longtemps qu'on croyait pouvoir y ajouter des écrits nouveaux. Quand on cessa d'y ajouter, il fut complet.

Je ne sais pas si la traduction de l'Economie Politique, qui fut faite sur la 3^{me} édition, a été ou non, retouchée sur la 4^{me}. Celle-ci du reste est presque épuisée et il y aura du nouveau dans la 5^{me}. Mais il n'y aura rien de changé quant au fonds.

Je ne sais pas où en est la 2^{me} édition du représentatif. La préface sera une excellente annonce de la traduction. L'article de Littré,³ dont il m'a parlé, en sera une autre.

Mon écrit sur la Centralisation et sur vos deux volumes est fait et expédié à Reeve.⁴ Il sera peut-être trop long pour la Revue d'Edinbourg. Mais je suis sûr de la faire publier quelque part. Je crois que vous n'aurez pas lieu d'en être mécontent, bien que je vous aie passablement maltraité sur plusieurs points.

Ma fille se recommande au bon souvenir de Madame Dupont-White et de vos demoiselles. Je vous prie également de leur offrir mes hommages et de me croire

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

520.

TO ARTHUR W. GREENE¹

S[aint] V[éran] Dec. 16 1861

Sir—

Your letter shows such openmindedness & candour, & so much desire of truth for its own sake, that I would most gladly do anything I could to help you through your perplexities. But it is not easy for me to do so without knowing more clearly than your letter tells me, what are the historical facts, which it appears to you difficult to account for except on the Xtian theory, and what particular Christian theory it is which you think accounts for them.

I am desirous to explain, that neither in the Logic nor in any other of my publications had I any purpose of undermining Theism; nor, I believe, have most readers of the Logic perceived any such tendency in it. I am far from thinking that it would be a benefit for mankind in general, if without any other change in them, they could be made disbelievers in all religion; nor would I willingly weaken in any person the reverence for Christ, in which I myself very strongly participate. I am an enemy to no religions but those which appear to me to be injurious either to the reasoning powers or the moral sentiments. Among such I am obliged to reckon all those which, while holding that the world was made by a perfectly good Being, declare that Being to be omnipotent; for such persons are obliged to maintain that evil is good. That the world was made by a good & wise Being, is in itself perfectly credible; but if that Being has done, for Man & other creatures the best that it was possible to do, the Maker must have been limited by extremely severe conditions of some sort, whether the limit was set by the power of other & malevolent beings, as held by Zoroaster,² or as Plato thought, by the intractability of the material.³

That, however, the world was made, in whole or in part, by a powerful Being who cared for man, appears to me, though not proved, yet a very probable hypothesis. Like all enquiries which ascend to a time beyond credible records, & which suppose powers of the existence of which in the historical times we have no evidence, it is, & must remain, as I conceive, uncertain. In this respect it resembles the geological theories respecting the [evolution?] of the earth, or Laplace's hypothetical explanation of the solar system.⁴ Since you have read the "Logic" as attentively as I perceive you

have, you will understand me when I put the argument, such as it is, into an inductive form.

The eye, (let us say), is a very complicated phenomenon; it would be begging the question to call it an instrument. But it consists of many different parts, & these parts being found together, in a number of instances far more than sufficient to eliminate chance, their being found in that particular state of coexistence in combination proves that they are connected through some common cause. Going now a step further & comparing these facts together to ascertain if possible something in which they agree, we can find no single point of agreement except one very striking one, viz., that every one of them contributes to render sight possible. We may therefore conclude that there is some connexion through causation between the sight which is to follow & the cause which preceded & as we say, produced the eye. Induction can carry us no further than this. But the only mode supported by any of the analogies of experience, in which a fact to come can contribute to the production of the fact by which it is itself produced, is by the preconception of that fact & the purpose of producing it in the mind of an intelligent being.

In a case like this where a hypothesis has many strong analogies in its favour, such as have not been, & do not seem capable of being established in favour of any other hypothesis, & when there is not & cannot be any evidence against it, I do not think that we are bound, in regard of logic, to reject it. I consider it a case in which it is allowable for each person to let his belief be affected (if such be the tendency of his mind) by his own emotional needs, & the conditions favourable to his moral culture. If (as is the case with all characters of any elevation) he has privately consecrated an internal altar to an *ideal* Perfect Being, to whose ideal will he endeavour to conform his own; then disposed as he will naturally be to persuade himself that this ideal Being is an actually existing one there is enough in the course of Nature (when once the idea of Omnipotence is discarded) to give to that belief a considerable degree of support. And the more especially so since if we were made by an Intelligence, that Intelligence has made our nobler capacities of feeling & principles of action, & can scarcely be supposed to have made these unless there had been feelings & principles corresponding to them in his own nature.

This *is* my position in respect to Theism: I think it a legitimate subject of imagination, & hope, & even belief (not amounting to faith) but not of knowledge.

If now we suppose that God made man & the world, not as he would, but as he could, it might follow as a consequence that man's faculties could only be developed progressively & under many obstructions & the whole course of history would admit of being set forth & explained on that theory. I do not see, however, that the succession of historical events requires any supernatural explanation. We cannot indeed trace its natural laws back to the very beginning, but as far back as we have any record, all that has happened seems perfectly capable of explanation from human & natural causes. Of course I cannot prove this in the compass of a letter; but it is the result to which the study of history leads me. I could hardly recommend to you any *one* book which treats history from this point of view with much success unless it be Comte's Cours de Phil. Pos. [5](#) of which the concluding volumes are historical but

cannot well be appreciated apart from the earlier ones which are scientific. There is much in the book with which I do not agree, but there are few books from which I have learnt so much or which afford more matter calculated to meet the difficulty you meet in explaining history apart from the supernatural.

I shall be happy to hear from you again & to give such further answer as I can to your difficulties. I shall be here till near the end of January, after which I shall be travelling for some months. I am Sir

521.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Dec. 20. 1861

Dear Sir—

I received the proof of your article² only this morning. It is an able & will be a useful paper, & puts some points in a new & forcible way, though I differ from it on several matters of detail & some of principle. The chief of these is the question of exempting savings, on which your arguments have not shaken my conviction. The strongest of them is that a tax on expenditure is unjust to those professional persons who are obliged to spend more than they gain in the early years of their career. It is impossible to answer this argument completely. But the force of it is much weakened by several considerations. In the first place what the professional man is obliged to expend in maintaining himself before his earnings come in, is *capital*, & as such, would, on my plan, have been *previously relieved* from the portion of income tax it now pays. The not taxing the capital when it was formed, is an equivalent for taxing it, when it is laid out. In the second place, the tax he pays on this outlay would, if savings were untaxed, be entirely refunded to him by the exemption he would enjoy in the process of replacing the outlay from his subsequent earnings. (This entirely refutes the last sentence of the first par[agraph] of p. 114.) The inconvenience is thus limited to that of making an advance. That is doubtless a special disadvantage. But some inequalities are unavoidable in all modes of taxation; & even your plan would not relieve him from the whole of it, since taxing him on only two thirds of his income would not come up to the requirements of the case of one whose income is less than half of his present expenditure.

I will not go into any of your other arguments on this point except to say that in the note at pp. 114-5 where you reply to the passage from my letter I do not think the words “to the disadvantage of the poor man” state the case fairly.³ In the case supposed, the poor as a body would lose a part of the rich man’s income *tax* & gain the whole of his income.

At p. 99 I think you overstate the case against taxes on articles of general consumption. You say that a duke's family does not consume very much more "of certain things" than an artisan's or a clerk's. Not nearly so much in proportion to their means; but much more absolutely, since they pay for all that is consumed by their servants & dependants.

In the argument at pp. 101 et 109, you argue that it is unjust to tax the owner of a precarious income on the whole of what he receives in a prosperous year, because he cannot afford to spend it all in that year, as he must lay by a part for an unfavorable year. In this of course I agree, but you do not notice what seems the necessary complement of this doctrine, viz. that when the unfavorable year comes, & what was reserved before is brought out for consumption *then* on the same principle of justice it ought to pay the tax: for in *that* (the unfavourable) year he can afford to spend *more* than the year's income.

At p. 109 I do not clearly understand the sentence near the bottom beginning "they may well ask."

P. 113 The concluding paragraph of this page does not seem to me fair to Hubbard.⁴ His doctrine is that the industrial classes as a body save in the ratio mentioned, (which he thinks he has statistical evidence of) not that every individual among them does so: & that as it is impossible to be just to every individual, we should endeavour to be just to the body *as* a body.

I do not find anything else that I need touch upon. There are some bad errors of the press, but as the proof seems to be an uncorrected one they have probably been detected by yourself. I will only refer to p. 125 line 2, which is unintelligible, & to the first line of the note at p. 115 where the sense is reversed: it should be *by* him *for* the public, instead of "*for* him *by* the public."

I have no idea who wrote the review of Austin & Maine in the Edinb.⁵ The writer does not seem to know much of the subject beyond what he has learnt from the two books he is reviewing. But they are a good foundation of knowledge. I agree entirely with your admiration of Maine & to some extent though not wholly with your criticism on Austin. He was not addressing himself to the public but to students, & that great quantity of repetition has its use. It is like the repetitions in Euclid. It is much oftener wanted by learners than one is apt to suppose & they often have not the patience to go repeatedly over the ground for themselves. I am glad you are writing on the study of Jurisprudence.⁶

I hope I am not wrong in directing this to Belfast.

522.

TO ARTHUR W. GREENE¹

S[aint] V[éran] Dec. 27. 1861

Dear Sir—

I could easily write out an argument & send it to you on the historical evidences of Christianity considered as a supernatural revelation. But as you seem disposed to pursue, for the present, special studies, & in the meanwhile to bear with whatever degree of uncertainty you may be now feeling respecting these great questions, I will only say, that you do not seem to have yet made yourself acquainted with the principles of historical criticism, which are now familiar to advanced historical enquirers throughout Europe; under the application of which the evidences of the supernatural part of Jewish & Xtian history crumble so completely that almost all theologians deserving the name (in Protestant countries) now rest the proof of the divine origin of Xtianity not so much on external evidence as on the intrinsic excellence of its ethics or (as some think) the philosophical truth of its metaphysics.

On the other point referred to in your letter, the incompatibility of omnipotence in the Creator (supposed morally perfect) with the imperfections of the creation, I will observe, that the theory of the *fall* only makes the contradiction worse: for (quite independently of the Necessarian doctrine of Volition) no good Being would have created mankind with the sure foreknowledge that they would fall, & thereby condemn themselves to eternal perdition. You say that a Being, capable of what I must call this horrible wickedness, may be perfectly good in some higher sense than our faculties are able to conceive: but it must be a sense not merely different, but contrary, to every sense in which goodness has any claim to be loved or revered by us. A Being of great but limited power may be forced to tolerate all the misery, all the meanness & all the wickedness which we see, for the sake of ulterior ends. But omnipotence is not restricted to means, since it can attain all its ends without them; if therefore we maintain that an omnipotent & *good* Being tolerates these things, we must maintain them to be good in themselves, that is, we must (as I said in my former letter) affirm Evil to be Good.

It seems to me anything but a presumption in favour of a religion that “intolerance” is “of the very essence of it.”² Other religions are not correctly described as holding that it is a matter of indifference whether they are believed or not. All religions calling themselves Xtian (not to add Mohamedanism) hold that it is unspeakably important to believe the true religion, & each believes itself to be the true: but the Protestant forms of Xtianity, not claiming for themselves any divinely confirmed infallibility, hold as a principle that the mode in which truth ought to be arrived at & the only legitimate mode of obtaining full assurance of it, is by the operation of the individual reason & conscience: which makes the permission & even encouragement of free enquiry indispensable, in theory at least, however much the contrary may often be the case in practice.

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1862

523.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

Blackheath

Thursday ev^g
[1862 ?]

Dear Thornton

Louis Blanc is coming to dine with us on Sunday, and it would give us great pleasure if you could come and meet him. We dine at five.

The cheque arrived safely yesterday morning.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

524.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 10 janvier, 1862.

Mon Cher Monsieur

Il est très flatteur pour moi que la Revue des Deux Mondes éprouve le désir d'avoir de ma prose.² Cela est si bien à ma convenance que j'ai eu quelquefois l'idée de lui en offrir; mais j'ai tant d'occupations et de projets plus au moins en train d'exécution, qu'il m'est difficile, et même, pour le moment, impossible, de m'engager positivement à rien. A ce propos, ma réponse à la Revue Nationale ne fut pas un refus; j'ai seulement dit ne pouvoir rien promettre. Je présume qu'il n'y a pas incompatibilité entre les deux Revues; je sais, du reste, combien l'une d'elles est plus importante que l'autre. Cependant je voudrais conserver, à cet égard, toute ma liberté.

Je suis bien aise que mon livre se soutient dans votre opinion favorable au troisième examen. Peut-être aurais-je dû faire une note sur la Constituante de 1789.³ Cet exemple ne compte pour rien en faveur de l'élection à deux degrés, car il y a des momens où l'opinion générale se fait jour à travers tout obstacle, et où les modes d'élection les plus divers aboutissent à des résultats à peu près identiques: il en était ainsi en 1789, et je pense que le tiers état aurait nommé, en général, les mêmes députés sous un système électoral beaucoup plus défectueux. La question des renouvellements partiels n'est pas fondamentale: au reste, je ne crois pas les avoir condamnés d'une manière absolue.

Mon article sur vos deux livres est accepté par Reeve,⁴ mais pour le numéro d'avril, ou peut-être même pour celui de juillet. L'écrit sur la doctrine de l'utilité a paru dans Fraser's Magazine (Octobre, Novembre, et Decembre).⁵ J'ai laissé mon éditeur le maître de décider le moment de le réimprimer en volume, mais n'ayant rien appris sur ses intentions, je présume que cette réimpression est ajournée.

Veillez offrir à Madame Dupont-White et à vos demoiselles mes hommages respectueux, auxquels ma fille vous prie d'ajouter l'expression de ses sentiments amicaux. Votre tout dévoué.

J. S. Mill

525.

TO GEORGE GROTE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 10. 1862.

My Dear Grote

A long letter from you is indeed a pleasure. We are very sorry that you and Mrs. Grote are unable to join us, but the reasons you give are superabundantly conclusive.² Your life and health are so important to the world, and besides, so valuable to myself, that on either interpretation of our common standard of ethics I have the strongest reason against wishing you to expose them to any danger. I must be content with the minor pleasure of writing to you from Athens, and reporting to you what I have seen after our return.

I do not see that the opinions you express in your letter on practical ethics³ constitute any difference between us. I agree in them entirely, and I consider them to follow conclusively from the conception of our own happiness as a unit, neither more nor less valuable than that of another, or, in Christian language, the doctrine of loving one's neighbour as oneself, this being of course understood not of the feeling or sentiment of love, but of perfect ethical impartiality between the two. The general happiness, looked upon as composed of as many different units as there are persons,

all equal in value except as far as the amount of the happiness itself differs, leads to all the practical doctrines which you lay down. First, it requires that each shall consider it as his special business to take care of himself: the general good requiring that that one individual should be left, in all ordinary circumstances, to his own care, and not taken care of for him, further than by not impeding his own efforts, nor allowing others to do so. The good of all can only be pursued with any success by each person's taking as his particular department the good of the only individual whose requirements he can thoroughly know; with due precautions to prevent these different persons, each cultivating a particular strip of the field, from hindering one another. Secondly, human happiness, even one's own, is in general more successfully pursued by acting on general rules, than by measuring the consequences of each act; and this is still more the case with the general happiness, since any other plan would not only leave everybody uncertain what to expect, but would involve perpetual quarrelling: and hence general rules must be laid down for people's conduct to one another, or in other words, rights and obligations must, as you say, be recognised; and people must, on the one hand, not be required to sacrifice even their own less good to another's greater, where no general rule has given the other a right to the sacrifice; while, when a right *has* been recognised, they must, in most cases, yield to that right even at the sacrifice, in the particular case, of their own greater good to another's less. These rights and obligations are (it is of course implied) reciprocal. And thus what each person is held to do for the sake of others is more or less definite, corresponding to the less perfect knowledge he can have of their interests, taken individually; and he is free to employ the indefinite residue of his exertions in benefitting the one person of whom he has the principal charge, and whose wants he has the means of learning the most completely. These, I think, are exactly your conclusions. And they are consistent with recognising the merit, though not the duty, of making still greater sacrifices of our own less good to the greater good of others, than the general conditions of human happiness render it expedient to prescribe. This last distinction, which I do not think inconsistent with the expressions about perfection attributed to Christ, the Catholic theologians have recognized, laying down a lower standard of disinterestedness for the world and a higher one for the "perfect" (the saints): but Protestants have in general considered this as Popish laxity, and have maintained that it is the *duty* of every one, absolutely to annul his own separate existence.

I am very glad that you like the papers on Utilitarianism so much.⁴ I am not more sanguine than you are about their converting opponents. The most that writing of that sort can be expected to do, is to place the doctrine in a better light, and prevent the other side having everything their own way, and triumphing in their moral and metaphysical superiority as they have done for the last half century and as they do in France still more than in England. In Germany the tide seems to be turning; & there is a commencement of turning even here. It was only lately that M. Schérer,⁵ one of the heretical Protestant theologians of France (who gave up a theological professorship at Strasbourg because he could not believe the doctrine of Biblical inspiration) declared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* that the inductive and utilitarian ethics were now shewing that they could produce as good & noble fruits as the other doctrine.⁶

My meditations on Sir W. Hamilton's work have shaped themselves into an intention that an examination of his philosophy considered as representative of the best form of

Germanism, shall be the subject of the next book I write:[7](#) for it cannot be done in anything less than a book, without assuming points which it is of great importance to prove. I have tolerably well settled in my own mind what I have got to say on most of the principal points. But I do not feel properly equipped for such a piece of work until I have read your account of Plato,[8](#) in which I expect to find much new and valuable thought on the great problems of metaphysics. It is some consolation for your not going over Greece with us, to think that you will be finishing Plato, which I hope may be ready for publication by the end of the year.

I have written nothing since coming here except an article on Centralization,[9](#) which has been accepted by Reeve but not for the January nor perhaps for the April number. There will be nothing in it new or particularly interesting to you. I meant to have written a paper on the American question, but the miserable incident of the Trent[10](#) came in the way. If that goes off favourably, which now seems more probable than the contrary, the world has had a narrow escape from one of the greatest calamities of this century.

I quite agree in your high estimate of Bain's new book.[11](#)

We think of leaving Avignon about the 29th, arriving at Athens about the 22nd of February.

With our kind regards to Mrs Grote I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

[P.S.]—As you truly say the Protagorean Socrates lays down as the standard, the happiness of the agent himself;[12](#) but his standard is composed of pleasure and pain, which ranges him, upon the whole, on the utilitarian side of the controversy.

526.

TO HENRY SAMUEL CHAPMAN[1](#)

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 12. 1862.

Dear Chapman

I received your letter of August 26th here, and read it with great interest. I have since watched the progress of politics in your colony by means of the letters in the Times which I read with a degree of confidence that I should not have given them if I had not known their authorship:[2](#) I should now, however, have been able to divine it, if

you had not told me. The course of affairs under your present Constitution is exactly what it is likely to be under the falsely called democracy in which manual labourers alone are really represented.³ The old countries will in time come under similar influences, and the only way to mitigate them is to struggle courageously against them, as you do, but as the more educated classes in America do not; and to strive always for a fair representation of minorities. I look upon that as the sheet anchor of the democracy of the future. If it is not adopted, there is no knowing that society may not be barbarized down into not only a dead level of narrow minded stupidity, but into lawlessness; what French writers call *la souveraineté du but* being accepted as the supreme rule, and the *but* being, to make everything conform to the will (even the passing and momentary will) of the dominant majority. This particular feature of evil, which had scarcely begun to shew itself in the United States even when Tocqueville wrote, has made fearful advances since. We are here in the heart of a difficulty and danger wholly brought upon us by that spirit. Governments have often enough *acted* lawlessly, but even the first Napoleon, in the height of his despotism, never *professed* lawlessness; he seized the Duke of Enghien⁴ exactly as the Americans seized the senators in New Granada;⁵ but he never did what the American Government by its organ Mr Seward⁶ has done within the last month—*profess* in a public despatch that in the position his country is now in it is not bound by international rules or precedents. That open repudiation of law, and assertion of mere will and convenience, by a great nation, though it has escaped even the bitter comments of the Times, is to my mind the most alarming fact, for the future of the human race, that has occurred for generations past.

In all other respects your country seems to be thriving wonderfully. The particulars in your letter, of the reduction of household expenses from the enormous rates which had kept up for some years after the gold fever began, are very striking, and are most satisfactory indications of the return of society economically considered, to a normal condition. What you say about public libraries, schools, and the University, and about the eagerness for the better sort of new books, is very pleasant to read of, and very creditable to the country. It gives me great pleasure to hear of your own prosperity, and to think of the influence which your position both socially and politically⁷ is likely to give you in turning things into the best channel which the conditions of the state of society admit of. I was interested also by what you say concerning your son,⁸ whom I shall be glad to see, and should be still more glad to be in any way useful to. I shall not, however, be in England for a good many months to come, as we set out in a few weeks to travel in Greece and Turkey, and shall return here before going to England.

Many thanks for the Argus.⁹ I received another number of it lately (but I should think, not from you) containing a letter against Mr Hare's plan, the objections in which are the same inconclusive ones which have been made in England. But I was glad to perceive by the first sentence that the Argus has itself written in recommendation of the plan. It is decidedly making its way and has now defenders in America and on the Continent of Europe. I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

527.

TO HERMAN MERIVALE¹

[Jan. 12, 1862]

[I shall probably be encouraged to ask you a question] now and then about Indian affairs. The rise of prices which you tell me has taken place, I can throw no light on. If permanent it must, I suppose, depend upon the same cause which is slowly raising prices through the whole commercial world, namely, the gold discoveries;² though why this cause should have acted with so much greater visible force in Bengal than it has hitherto done in Europe, I cannot perceive. Can it be (since India has so long been the gulph into which silver has been constantly sinking and never reappearing) that the great upturning of things and persons which has taken place in India, among its other effects, has had that of bringing some of the hoarded silver into circulation? That would be an adequate cause, but scarcely seems a probable one. In the case of rice, the great export trade to Europe from the Bay of Bengal,³ which had sprung up within a few years previous to my leaving India House, may go far to account for a rise of price.

I Am
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

528.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 20. 1862

Dear Sir

You have probably heard from Mr Leslie what is doing in the Political Economy Club with a view to giving the privileges of Honorary Members to the Professors in the Queen's University. The proposal will be brought before the Club on the 6th of February with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee, consisting of Mr Newmarch, Mr Blake,² and myself, and I am very confident that it will be adopted.³

I have been hoping to see an advertisement of your essay on the American question,⁴ or to hear from you respecting its progress. I fear that the Trent affair may have delayed it, as there was no chance of getting a hearing for the Northern side of the question while we seemed on the brink of war with the United States.⁵ I seldom experienced so great a feeling of consternation on reading a piece of public news, as I was struck with on the arrival of the first intelligence of that affair. But it is ended, and as well ended as such a thing could be; and I have begun to look out again for tidings of your work. I also resumed a purpose which had been suspended by that untoward affair, of myself writing something on the American contest for immediate publication. The article is finished, and is to come out in the February number of Fraser.⁶ I much wished when writing it, that I had your papers on the subject to help me, and that they had come out first, so that I might have quoted them. But I hope they will follow soon after, and that others will be encouraged by our example, to help in bearing up against the stream.

We propose starting on the 29th of this month for Athens, and letters addressed Poste Restante there, will reach me till near the end of May.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

529.

TO CÉLESTIN DE BLIGNIÈRES¹

St. Véran

le 22 janvier 1862

Monsieur—

Le livre que vous avez eu la bonté de m'envoyer² s'est trouvé être en effet le même que j'avais reçu il y a trois ou quatre ans. Il ne m'est pas pour cela inutile; je suis en train de le relire et j'en déjà relu une grande partie. Ce livre me paraît très remarquable sous le rapport de l'exposition et de l'expression. Il résume les plus importantes doctrines de M. Comte avec une clarté que lui-même n'a pas surpassée, et de manière à offrir souvent, pour ainsi dire, de nouveaux reflets de lumière par la manière de présenter les idées. Quant à la question qui fait, à ce qu'il paraît, votre principale différence avec M. Comte je suis assurément et pleinement de votre avis. Je crois, pourtant, que mon dissentiment va plus loin que le vôtre.³ On ne saurait faire mieux sentir que vous ne le faites la distinction fondamentale des pouvoirs temporel et spirituel, la nécessité de ce dernier, son existence universelle sous une forme ou sous une autre, et les suites funestes de sa réunion avec le pouvoir temporel. Voici maintenant en quoi je crois être en dissentiment avec vous. Je suis très porté à croire

(sans vouloir décider positivement cette question pour l'avenir) que la nature même d'un pouvoir spirituel légitime ne comporte pas une organisation réelle. Tant qu'un accord essentiel de doctrines n'existe pas parmi les chefs spirituels, toute tentative d'organisation, en la supposant praticable, serait évidemment nuisible. Si au contraire, cet accord existait il me semble que l'organisation en corps ne serait pas nécessaire. L'autorité, qu'exerce dans les sciences positives l'opinion des savants, ne repose pas, ce me semble, sur leur réunion en Académies ou sous tout autre nom, mais sur le fait même de leur unanimité. D'ailleurs, leur organisation me donnerait des craintes sérieuses pour l'indépendance de la pensée. Tout corps scientifique organisé est toujours plus ou moins porté à repousser les innovations scientifiques, qui, pourtant, ne laissent pas d'être quelquefois nécessaires même dans les sciences qui ont reçu définitivement leur constitution positive. J'incline à croire que, lorsque l'accord général des opinions de ceux qui ont fait les études nécessaires s'étendra aux questions morales et sociologiques, la classe spéculative pourra être la classe enseignante, et exercer une grande et salutaire autorité morale, sans être organisée en corps sous une autorité dirigeante qui me semble toujours dangereuse. Je sais que la morale positive repousse toute prétention à se servir de moyens coercitifs pour agir sur les rénovateurs; mais l'opinion générale, ralliée par une puissante autorité morale suffit toujours pour exercer une pression tyrannique sur la pensée; et je ne puis oublier que M. Comte lui-même est allé jusqu'à vouloir détruire, à la manière des premiers chrétiens, les documents historiques du passé.

Cette manière de penser me conduit à admettre une certaine modification dans le principe de la non-participation des esprits spéculatifs au pouvoir temporel. Je conviens non seulement que la capacité philosophique ne doit nullement être un titre aux fonctions politiques, mais encore que les philosophes ne doivent pas, en règle générale, gouverner ni administrer, sauf les cas exceptionnels qui naissent des exigences d'une époque de transition, sauf aussi l'avantage que pourra retirer leur propre développement philosophique d'une certaine initiation dans les affaires pratiques de la vie, laquelle doit avoir lieu dans leur jeunesse et sous une autorité supérieure. Mais il me semble que les philosophes peuvent être très à leur places dans les assemblées politiques délibérantes; ce qui tient à ce que je conçois la fonction de ces assemblées tout autrement que selon l'idée ordinaire. Je les crois très peu propres à faire des lois, mais très utiles comme organes de l'opinion, soit pour critiquer tant la législation que l'administration, soit pour y donner ou refuser, en dernier lieu, la sanction nationale. Vous voyez que c'est une sorte de pouvoir spirituel que je leur accède, au sein même du pouvoir temporel. J'ai développé cette idée dans un volume sur le gouvernement représentatif, dont une traduction française est à la veille de paraître.⁴ Dès qu'elle aura paru, je vous prierai d'en accepter un exemplaire. Je ne vous offre pas l'ouvrage anglais, ne sachant pas si vous avez l'habitude de la langue anglaise. Cet ouvrage, si vous lui faites l'honneur de le lire, vous mettra au courant de la plupart des différences qui me séparent de quelques opinions de M. Comte auxquelles vous semblez adhérer.

Je compte partir dans huit jours pour un voyage en Orient,⁵ et ne retourner ici qu'à la fin de l'été. Bien qu'une lettre adressée Poste Restante à Athènes avant le milieu de mai me trouverait probablement, je n'ose vous proposer de m'écrire pendant mon absence; mais ce serait toujours pour moi un plaisir de comparer mes idées avec celles

de l'auteur d'un livre si recommandable par les qualités morales et intellectuelles qu'on ne peut pas manquer d'y reconnaître dans le vôtre.

530.

TO REV. LOUIS REY¹

Saint Véran

le 26 janv. 1862

Mon Cher Monsieur

Comme je ne serai pas ici cette année, comme à l'ordinaire, au mois d'avril, permettez moi de vous offrir dès à présent ma contribution annuelle aux fonds de l'Eglise Protestante.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

531.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

S[t] V[éran]

Jan. 26. 1862

Mon Cher M. Villari—

J'ai lu avec le plus vif intérêt votre brochure.² Elle soulève à chaque page des sujets de discussions et d'entretiens dont l'occasion s'offrira, je l'espère, quelque jour. Je ne trouve pas que vous ayez fait la part trop belle aux peuples latins; d'ailleurs ce n'est pas un mal que de donner aux nations renaissantes une haute idée de leur rôle et de la place qu'ils sont tenus d'occuper dignement dans l'avenir de l'humanité. Je trouve aussi que vous avez à plusieurs égards justement apprécié les qualités et les défauts des peuples germaniques. Après cela, j'aurais bien à vous faire quelques critiques—D'abord, il me semble que, comme presque tous les penseurs des pays latins, vous ne connaissez pas assez le protestantisme. Vous pensez qu'il n'a qu'une efficacité négative. Nul anglais ne pourrait en avoir cette opinion. Son côté négatif est presque accessoire, et a cessé de prédominer, une fois que la séparation avec le catholicisme s'est pleinement effectué. C'est par son côté affirmatif qu'il s'est maintenu dans les pays protestants et surtout parmi les anglo-saxons. Si vous me demandez ce qu'il a produit dans l'ordre moral, je répons, le sentiment du devoir,

sentiment essentiellement religieux, qui est le trait le plus saillant de la moralité anglaise. L'esprit anglais est peu sympathique: il a très peu de point d'honneur national, mais il a, à un plus grand degré que tous les autres peuples, le principe du devoir, et cela lui est tellement particulier que jamais ni les hommes politiques ni les opinions des autres nations ne comprennent ce qui, dans sa civilisation et dans sa conduite, tient à ce principe. Ce qui vous fait croire au peu d'efficacité sociale et politique du protestantisme, c'est qu'en effet toutes les églises nationales protestantes, sauf celle d'Ecosse, ont joué politiquement un fort triste rôle: celle-là seule a été l'église du peuple; toutes les autres ont été les églises des grands, c'est à dire, elles sont tombées, dès leur origine, dans les errements que l'église catholique n'a commis que dans sa décadence. Pour connaître le protestantisme il faut l'étudier dans l'histoire écossaise, et dans celle du puritanisme anglais et américain. Je suis très impartial en vous disant cela, puisque je n'aime ni le protestantisme écossais ni le puritanisme bien que la liberté politique leur doive beaucoup à tous deux.

Ensuite, vous dites des peuples germaniques, qu'ils oscillent entre un mysticisme tout abstrait et un matérialisme qui ne songe qu'aux choses de la terre. Cela pourrait être vrai, jusqu'à un certain point de l'Allemagne; mais je pense qu'il y a en Angleterre un plus grand nombre que partout ailleurs de ceux qui, en théorie et en pratique se tiennent à une égale distance de ces deux extrêmes, et dont les sentiments religieux se montrent surtout dans la direction plus spirituelle qu'ils donnent à la conduite pratique de la vie. Que pensez vous à cet égard des quakers? Ce sont eux qui ont commencé tous les grands mouvements philanthropiques modernes, l'affranchissement des nègres, l'instruction populaire, l'adoucissement des peines, la réforme des prisons, etc. Je vois qu'en nous accordant la poésie, vous nous refusez la philosophie; c'est que vous n'estimez guère ni l'école de Locke, ni la forme écossaise de la réaction contre elle. Mais nous avons la prétention d'avoir produit quelques uns des meilleurs penseurs philosophiques qui aient existé en temps modernes dans toutes les écoles.

Je pourrais remplir plusieurs feuilles des observations que vous avez bien voulu me demander sur votre brochure mais j'aime mieux réserver ces questions pour un temps où, soit en Italie, soit ici ou en Angleterre, nous pourrions discuter ensemble d'une manière plus satisfaisante les grandes questions philosophiques. En attendant je vous prie de me tenir au courant de tout ce que vous écrivez, car je tiens extrêmement à suivre vos idées.

Il me reste de vous engager à m'écrire Poste Restante à Athènes, ce que sera une adresse suffisante jusque vers la fin de mai. Lorsque cette adresse ne suffira plus, je vous en donnerai une autre. Nous revenir ici au mois de septembre c.à.d. ma fille et moi. Algernon Taylor ne demeure plus avec nous, il s'est marié et demeure habituellement en Angleterre. Croyez toujours aux sentiments d'estime et d'affection de votre dévoué

532.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

S[aint] V[éran] Jan. 28. 1862.

Dear Thornton—

I have been very long in answering your letter of 25 Dec. The reason is that I waited for the return from Paris of the only person I know here, who has in any degree the same tastes, pursuits & opinions with myself,² & from whom I hoped to be able to procure better information than I have respecting the small landed proprietors here. He has not yet returned & I am therefore less able than I hoped I should be to answer your questions. But I hope you will be here next autumn, when you can see him yourself & when we can investigate the matter together, so far as relates to this district, which however is in many respects unlike many other parts of France; as the south, also, is in many particulars unlike the north. One point of unlikeness here, to many other French provinces (but to how many I do not know) is that nearly all the working people have large families—that is, when the greater part of the children do not die. I fear that in many parts of France besides this, the population is kept down more by death, and less by prudence, than I formerly believed. There seems to be hardly such a thing as prudence in pecuniary matters here, on the part of the men, though often a great deal in the women, to whom exclusively the well-doing & prosperity of any working family seems here to be attributable. In consequence probably of the large families the idea of all the children supporting themselves on the parental bit of land seems not to exist in this country. Most peasants who have land, seem to farm other land with it, as metayers or as bailiffs, & the majority of the children go out as domestic servants or labourers or artisans; these (one may suppose, & what little I know confirms it) do not desire, when the parents die, to take their share of the land; as they say, what could they do with it? but take their portion in money. This payment in money, however, as I surmise, helps to encumber the little landed properties. Another mode in which the large families tend to prevent division is that when the parent dies there are usually children under age, & as the legal difficulties of dividing the inheritance are in that case considerable, it sometimes remains undivided in the first instance, & is managed by one of the family on the joint account. There is an example of this in the case of a woman servant of ours, one of a large family, the youngest of whom, a son, is not yet of age, & the land is managed for them by an uncle, who pays them nothing, but is *censé* to expend the proceeds, whatever they are, on the land itself. Her notion of what should be done is, that when the youngest brother comes of age, those of the family who are well off, among whom she reckons herself, should give up their shares to the rest, that of the remainder one brother should retain the land & the others receive their shares in money. Then, she says, when we are old we can go sometimes to see the home of our childhood. This does not throw any light on the question of indebtedness as regards the land generally. But in this aspect Lavergne's book,³ which I have read & which is on the whole very favourable to peasant properties, is extremely *rassurant*. I have never seen the burthens of the small properties estimated at so low an amount by anybody as they are

by this most careful and well-informed authority. He says that the average indebtedness of the whole landed property of France does not exceed a tenth of the value, & in the case of rural property, a twentieth. The burthen of interest he estimates up to a late period at 10 per cent, but thinks that it must now be considerably less, as 'les dernières crises ont amené une tendance générale vers [une] liquidation.'⁴ which I suppose means that the usurers have sold up: but the previous amount of mortgage debts, you see, is not at all consistent with Louis Blanc's impressions.

About Lord Canning's measure⁵ I entirely agree with you. I have always thought that a general redemption of even the permanently settled revenues must be a bad bargain to the Government, for the simple reason that it cannot answer to the proprietor to give as much for it as it would answer to the Government to take. We know that in all countries in which the good faith of the Govt is relied on, the Govt can borrow at lower interest than an individual can do even on good landed security. Suppose that the difference is no greater than that between 4 & 5 per cent; the Govt makes a losing bargain unless it can get 25 years' purchase while the proprietor cannot afford to give more than 20, since he must pay 5 per cent. for the money if borrowed, & if he has it of his own, can get that or still better interest for it in other ways. The effect on agriculture of the redemption must be wholly injurious. If the proprietor has capital or can borrow it, he would do much better by expending it in cultivating & improving the land than in freeing himself from an annual payment, which being fixed, in no way diminishes the profits of improvement. I observe that Lord Canning does not mean to sell at less than 20 years' purchase; this can only answer if Govt will never be able hereafter to borrow under 5 per cent.

We start on Thursday for Athens, where we expect to arrive about the 22nd of February, stopping a week at Corfu by the way. Letters directed poste restante Athens will find us for the next three months & more, for we shall be either there or journeying about Greece till near the end of May, after which we propose going to Smyrna & Constantinople but not returning to England until after the time when I shall hope to see you here, when I look forward to shewing you whatever is best worth seeing in this district & having out the subject of Darwin & many others.

[P.S.] I have been writing a paper on the American question which will come out in the February Fraser⁶ & which if noticed at all is likely to be much attacked, as it is in complete opposition to the tone of the press & of English opinion, a tone which has caused me more disgust than anything has done for a long time. I shall therefore be glad to know what is thought of the article by people who have not got pens in their hands & shall be obliged to you for any information of that sort which you may be able to communicate.

My kind regards to Major Couper.⁷ I sh^d much like to hear from him.

533.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan 29. 1862

Dear Sir

I am desirous to see anything of consequence which may be written on the subject of my article in the forthcoming number of Fraser,² especially any attack; and should therefore be obliged by your sending here, in the usual way, anything that may come out up to the 8th, and to Athens (Poste Restante) anything worth sending that may come out afterwards, and that can either be inclosed in an ordinary letter, or sent by newspaper post.

I hope the remaining sheets of the Logic and Political Economy³ will be looked through carefully. The reader who examines them is evidently a painstaking and careful man, but it nevertheless happens at times that one word is put instead of another with a very awkward effect.

I Am
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

534.

TO JOHN NICHOL¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 30, 1862

Dear Sir

I hope that you heard of my absence from Mess^{rs} Parker in time to be saved the trouble of a fruitless journey to Blackheath. I should be glad to hear that you had succeeded in obtaining the Professorship, but I do not see any way in which I could have helped you towards it. I have no influence, or acquaintance, with either the present Home Secretary² or the Lord Advocate,³ and I, as yet, know too little of you (I hope this will not always be the case) to entitle any opinion which I am in a position to give in your favour to any attention in deciding a question of this nature.

I write in great haste, as I am on the point of starting for a long journey. If you should have occasion to write to me, a letter addressed care of Mess^{rs} Parker, Son, and Bourn with "to be forwarded" written on it, will find me.

I Am
Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

535.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

Athènes, le 28 février 1862

Mon Cher Monsieur

L'adresse de M. Reeve est Henry Reeve Esq. 62 Rutland Gate Hyde Park, London; ou l'on peut lui adresser une lettre, Council Office, Whitehall, London, en mettant "Private" sur l'adresse.

Vous voyez que votre lettre m'a suivi jusqu'ici, ou, pour mieux dire, nous a précédé en arrivant. Ce pays-ci ne fournit pour le moment rien d'intéressant en fait de nouvelles politiques. Vous avez probablement entendu parler d'une tentative de révolution militaire,² mais on pense qu'elle se terminera, suivant l'usage d'ici, par une transaction sur les intérêts personnels des chefs de l'insurrection.

Je vous félicite d'avoir terminé votre travail sur le Représentatif.³ Je ne verrai la traduction qu'à la fin de mon voyage. La lettre que vous me destinez sera toujours la bien venue, quoique j'eusse hésité à vous en demander une. Jusqu'à la fin de mai mon adresse sera Poste Restante à Athènes.

Votre Dévoué

J. S. Mill

536.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Athens March 6. 1862

Dear Mr Fawcett

I was very glad to receive a letter from you at this remote place, and this particular letter contained many things which were specially pleasant to me. I was glad that you agreed with me so completely on the American question, glad that you thought the article² was doing good, glad that the Cambridge petition³ is going on so well, glad above all that you are working with vigour, both orally and by writing, and that your treatise on political economy is making progress.⁴ The article on Cooperation in M^cMillan⁵ I have seen, and liked. Such a paper was wanted, and will be useful. The facts relating to the success of Cooperation require to be kept before the public mind. There will be a good many additional details including the Rochdale history, in the next edition of my Pol. Economy, which I have ordered to be sent to you when published.⁶ I am glad that a right view of the American question found favour with the Southwark meeting.⁷ The democracy often has great injustice done it by those who though they think themselves wiser, have not the industry, courage or public spirit to stand up for their wiser opinions, but either remain silent, or if they say anything, truckle to the low feelings and prejudices which they affect to be personally superior to. I am not at all surprised that Thornton is not with us in the American question. Though a superior man on many points, on others he feels with the herd, and one never knows which these last may be. I should be more surprised that Mr Hare is not entirely with us, were it not that he probably has not much studied the subject, nor is well in possession of the antecedent facts. I thought his article in M^cMillan⁸ very good, and much better adapted for its purpose than those he formerly wrote in Fraser. I observed in a letter of the Sydney correspondent of the Times that Mr Hare's plan is attracting great attention there,⁹ partly through the exertions of Mr Holden,¹⁰ and that the Senate has referred it to a Committee, to consider about its practical applicability in that colony.

We have not been favoured by the weather in our journey hitherto: we found the ground covered with snow in the North of Italy, almost incessant rain at Corfu, and of the few days we have been here, very much spoiled by a thick haze. However, we have seen Athens pretty thoroughly, have climbed Hymettus and Pentelicus, and are going to set out on an excursion for a week or ten days to Sunium, Rhamnus, Marathon and other places on the eastern coast, returning here afterwards, and when the weather is sufficiently settled, starting again for Peloponnesus. You have noticed perhaps that the garrison of Nauplia is in a state of rebellion against the government,¹¹ but though the King¹² and his ministers are very unpopular, the insurrection has not spread any farther, and the matter will probably terminate as such things usually terminate here, by the submission and pardon of the chiefs of the revolt. It is a strange and half savage country, but advancing most rapidly in material prosperity, which in modern civilization is usually the first step towards moral progress. The worst is that the government, and all or nearly all the politicians, are bent solely on selfish objects, and the revenues of the country are spent in jobbing while there is hardly a road passable to carriages in the whole country; a striking contrast to the splendid roads which the English made all over Corfu and the other islands, but which are now very much falling off, because the legislature will not vote money to keep them up.

My address will be Poste Restante, Athens, probably for two months to come. When you write, pray tell me how the matter is settled about Cairnes and Leslie,[13](#) and also whether judgment has yet been given in Mr Williams' case,[14](#) and to what effect. Our newspapers sometimes miscarry, and I should not like to lose so interesting a piece of news.

I Am

Dear Mr Fawcett

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

537.

TO THOMAS HARE[1](#)

[Before June 11, 1862]

[It (proportional representation) has become a matter of philosophical discussion in Germany; and in a letter which I received not long ago from Mr. Mill, he informed me of the attention which the scheme had attracted, and of its adoption by an able writer of Zurich. He adds]

It is encouraging to find that, though practical politicians are only too glad to turn from the whole subject, right ideas, now that they are promulgated, are making rapid way among thinking persons, the future teachers of all parts of the world.

538.

TO GEORGE GROTE[1](#)

Athens

June 11. 1862

My Dear Grote

I write, as I promised, from Athens, to tell you how our journey has prospered. It has been a complete success: the tent travelling has answered perfectly, and we have gone everywhere and seen everything, without being in any way disturbed by the Nauplia insurrection,[2](#) nor experienced any of the dire consequences in the form of renewed brigandage, which the English at Athens told us we might expect and no one more than those connected with the Legation, always excepting poor Sir Thomas Wyse and Miss Wyse.[3](#) We have made two expeditions of six weeks each, in which we have seen Greece more thoroughly than it has often been seen: We encamped two days at

the foot of Parnassus, and two on the plateau of the mountain, climbed the mountain itself, encamped three days in the valley of the Styx, one day and two nights on Kyllene, saw nearly all Peloponnesus except the northwest corner, almost every foot of Attica and the Megarid, the north of Eubœa, the coast of Phthiotis, Lamia, Thermopylæ, Cæta, Phokis and Bœotia, Delphi, the magnificent coast from thence to Naupactus and the strait of Rhium, where we crossed over. I look forward to many interesting conversations with you about localities: for instance, I walked from one end to the other of Sphakteria⁴ and wondered that there should ever have been any puzzle about that matter. We both thought the beauty of Greece quite incomparable: not so the air and the sky, about which there is as much humbug current as about any purely physical subject I know. The people are very backward, and full of the faults and vices produced by long servitude, but improvement seems to be taking place, though slowly. I hardly know what is most to be desired for them at present. The whole people, even the civil and military officers of the government, shew an unanimity in their detestation of it which I should think has seldom existed in any country not held down by foreign forces without producing a revolution; but though all sympathized with the Nauplia insurgents, the people did not join them, but allowed them to be put down, from fear, as it is said, lest brigandage should be renewed, and the tranquillity by which they have begun to profit in their pecuniary interests, brought to an end. Most people however say that if the King does not now change his policy, there will be a revolution within a year, and nobody with whom I have conversed thinks that he will change it.⁵

There has been a mission of German archaeologists here, Böttiger⁶ and another, from the Prussian Government, with whom Curtius⁷ and others have voluntarily associated themselves. They have made some important excavations—have uncovered the real entrance to the Parthenon, have ascertained on what seems sufficient evidence the boundary which separated the temple itself from the Opisthodomus, and the true position of the statue of the goddess: they have made some discoveries at the Erechtheion, though that subject is still mysterious; have ascertained as they think, the true line of the city walls, and Curtius thinks he has made great discoveries about the Pnyx. But their main achievement is that they have opened up the Dionysiac theatre, have dug down to the stone chairs of the magistrates, which are now seen in fine preservation in the very front of the scene, and have converted the fact of its being a theatre at all from a matter of faith into one of sense. They have begun to publish the results of their operations, and I shall learn from Mr Finlay⁸ and tell you where you may find them.

A friend and correspondent of mine, Professor Villari of the University of Pisa, is now in England on a mission from the Italian Government,⁹ to make enquiries into popular education in England, competitive examinations &c. with a view to practical application in Italy, where he holds an important post under the minister of public instruction, and I have ventured to send him an introduction to you. He wishes much to know you, and I think he will both interest you, and derive real benefit from your ideas and conversation. My first knowledge of him was as having commenced a translation of my Logic,¹⁰ which however he has never yet had time to finish. When I was in Tuscany seven years ago, I saw him, and we have been frequent correspondents ever since. He is a man of talent and knowledge and I think, much

judgment and good sense, and his opinions about Italy seem to me always marked by those qualities. He has at different times sent me things which he has published, always of merit; the most considerable is a life of Savonarola,[11](#) full of new and valuable historical matter from the documents of the period.

I have had an application of another sort with reference to you, from one of my former colleagues in the India House.[12](#) I inclose his note, though the matter with a view to which it was written has probably long since been decided. I have told him in reply, that there is no one more unlikely than you to be influenced by any recommendation, unless, being grounded on personal knowledge, it bears the character of actual testimony; but that no one, also, can be more surely relied on for giving conscientious and impartial attention to everything which comes before you in the shape of evidence.

We propose starting on the 17th for Smyrna, and continuing our tent journey from thence by the Troad to the Dardanelles, where as the season will be getting too far advanced for travelling in Asia, we shall probably take the steamer for Constantinople. One has not seen Greece without seeing Ionia, the Hellespont, and the Bosphorus. We had the unexpected pleasure of seeing Mount Athos very clearly from near Oreos in Eubœa.

We were sorry to see in the Times Mrs. Stanley's death.[13](#) That of Sir Thomas Wyse occurred unexpectedly early, just before our first return to Athens. He had very little the appearance, when I saw him, of a person who had a mortal disease. He is much regretted and will be much missed here.

I suppose you have now nearly if not quite, finished Plato.[14](#) I am very impatient for it. I am

My Dear Grote
Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Our kind regards to M^{rs} Grote.

539.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON[1](#)

Athens June 14. 1862

Dear Thornton—

I have been a long time without acknowledging your letter of March 20, but you know enough of the little time which travelling leaves one, not to be surprised at this

especially as during the few days I have been stationary here I have received an extraordinary number of letters which required, or the writers thought they required to be answered immediately. Our journey has been successful in every respect & we have sustained no inconvenience at all from the insurrection or its consequences, which, moreover, has been put down;² but there are few who do not seem to expect a much more serious one before long. This however & all other matters relating to Greece will be better discussed in the conversations I am looking forward to having with you in our little hermitage not long after the conclusion of our journey. As to the time of your coming, as you are engaged elsewhere for the first week in October if it is still equally convenient to you to come to Avignon after or before that time, I will if you allow me decide for the later of the two periods, as it will leave us a wider margin for the time of our return to Avignon. The weather will also probably be cooler for walks & other excursions.

I confess I am surprised that you attach any importance to Forster's or any other exhibitions of what they call spiritualism.³ Since in all that relates to the communicators with spirits, the men are manifestly impostors, why should one feel any difficulty in believing them to be so altogether, & their apparent marvels to be juggling or other tricks? Their exploits certainly would never do anything to shake my total disbelief in clairvoyance, of which apart from its extreme antecedent improbability, I have never read of any case the evidence of which did not leave the most obvious loopholes for fraud. That so many people should have believed in it is to me one of the many proofs that honest people do not in general at all appreciate either the facility of being cheated or the frequency of the disposition to cheat.

540.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Athens

June 15. 1862

Dear Sir

Your letter of March 4 gave me great pleasure, but I have delayed answering it, because I have been travelling about Greece for the last three months; and when I was able to write, which was only from Athens, the letters on personal or merely practical matters got themselves answered first. Probably long before this time, your book is in print.² It is as much wanted as when we first talked about it, and is probably more likely to produce an effect than if published before the reaction which, I was so glad to hear from you, had commenced against the Southern feeling at one time so much fostered by the Times. The victories of the North have had much to do with the change;³ the altered tone of the Times itself is the measure of the greater chance it thinks there is of the North being successful. I think with you that it is a moot point whether the reunion of the North and South would be as desirable an issue of the struggle as a separation confining slavery within the Mississippi. Reunion would be

best if the North could be depended upon for not making concessions to slavery, but I agree with you in having no confidence in their staunchness in this respect. I am much obliged to you for the Economist. I liked your letter in it exceedingly, and I value very highly your approbation of my article.⁴ As to the one point on which you think we differ, I did not mean to defend Seward's despatch as a whole.⁵ His arguments to shew that the Trent was violating international law were weak and sophistical, and have been nowhere more strongly repudiated than by so high an American authority as Sumner,⁶ whose speech in the Senate of the United States on "maritime rights"⁷ is worth your reading, and who goes the whole length of Thouvenel's excellent despatch.⁸ I am not *au courant* of the discussion on colonial emancipation originated by Goldwin Smith.⁹ But I think it very undesirable that anything should be done which would hasten the separation of our colonies. I believe the preservation of as much connexion as now exists to be a great good to them; and though the direct benefit to England is extremely small, beyond what would exist after a friendly separation, any separation would greatly diminish the prestige of England, which prestige I believe to be, in the present state of the world, a very great advantage to mankind.

We are about to start for Smyrna and Constantinople, after a very pleasant tour in Greece, and shall go thence by Vienna and Switzerland to Avignon returning to England at the end of autumn. When I return, you are one of the persons I shall most wish to see.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

541.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Constantinople

June 24. 1862

Dear Sir

Since I wrote to you from Athens some ten days ago, I have received the copy of your book² which you did me the favour to send. I read through it immediately, and I cannot help writing at once to tell you how pleased I am with it. It seems to me exactly the thing which was wanted: it brings the true aspect of the case, in all its parts, before the public, in a manner so clear, full, and impressive, that any one who reads it, unless strongly prejudiced beforehand (if he possesses the feelings and moral convictions to which it appeals) can scarcely fail to be convinced by it. The great thing now is to get it read. I wish I was in a position to do something *promptly* that

might assist in making it widely known. I cannot doubt that the Daily News,[3](#) M^cMillan,[4](#) and probably the National Review,[5](#) will make good use of it. Might it not be a good thing to send a copy to Lord Brougham? He would probably talk about it, and help to get it read.

I do not think there is an opinion or a sentiment in the book with which I substantially disagree; and this is so very generally the case when I read anything you write, that I feel growing up in me, what I seldom have, the agreeable feeling of a brotherhood in arms. This feeling being one of the pleasantest which life has to give, I owe you thanks privately as well as publicly for adding as much to it as you have done by your present volume.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

542.

TO HARRIET ISABELLA MILL[1](#)

Therapia, near Constantinople

July 5. 1862

Dear Harriet

My answer to your two previous letters must have reached you after all was over.[2](#) It seems to have been a strange disease. It is frightful to think of the quantity of suffering which so often accompanies the process of going out of life.

I write by this post (the first since receiving your letter) to Messrs Dymock and Paterson,[3](#) to say that I have not the smallest idea of disputing the will. I should never dream of taking advantage of a legal technicality to defeat the moral right of any one to make what disposition he pleased of his own property, even if I did not think, as I do, that disposition to be a very proper one.[4](#)

I hope your health will not have suffered materially by what you have gone through.

J.S.M.

543.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Vienna,

July 17, 1862

We have just arrived here—somewhat sooner than we expected, and are at the Kaiserinn Elisabeth Hotel. If you are at Vienna, we should be most happy to see you.² If I knew where to find you, I would call on you myself.

544.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Vienna

July 21. 1862

Dear Mr Fawcett

Many thanks for your interesting letter. None of my correspondents tell me so much of what I want to know as you do; though on the subject of Dr Williams' affair² you presuppose a knowledge I do not possess, for though I receive an English newspaper, it sometimes miscarries, and unluckily the paper containing the judgment has not reached me. I am glad that it is on the whole favourable to latitudinarianism and satisfactory to Dr Williams' friends, though I am sorry to hear that there is any question of recantation. Two other pieces of news in your letter gave me great pleasure—that the Cooperative Cotton Mills hold firm,³ and that Cairnes and Leslie have been elected to the Pol. Ec. Club. Cairnes' is a splendid book⁴ and if it is but read, must tell. As it is impressively and popularly written, it has, I hope, a good chance of readers. I see the National Review has an article on it,⁵ with large extracts, and in an excellent tone. He has one of the clearest intellects I know, combined, I think, with an excellent moral nature, and is capable, if he has anything like fair play, of doing great things. Buckle's untimely end grieved me deeply.⁶ I knew of it early, having met at Athens with his travelling companion Mr Glennie,⁷ a young man of, I think, considerable promise, who occupies himself very earnestly with the higher philosophical problems on the basis of positive science. I look forward to much pleasure from your book.⁸ I sought for your name in the reports of the Social Science meetings,⁹ which were unusually interesting this year: Hare seems to have made considerable way,¹⁰ and the movement against the disabilities of women appears to be advancing in a most satisfactory manner.¹¹ After what passed at those meetings their admission to University degrees is almost *une cause gagnée*,¹² and that, (next to, if not even before, the elective franchise) is the most important point of all practically, and in its effect on their own minds.

I received at Athens a very pleasant note from Fitzjames Stephen,[13](#) to which I would gladly have returned a fitting answer but had too many other letters to write, that I had not time. When you see him, pray thank him from me, and say that I look forward with pleasure to our better acquaintance.

We have enjoyed our journey extremely, and are bringing back a store of most pleasant recollections from it. We do not go at once to England, but first to Avignon, where we shall remain till the beginning of winter. If you write soon, please inclose to Parker, with the words "to be forwarded," as he will know when to send your letter, which I should be very unwilling to lose.

Remember me kindly to Mr Hare when you see him. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

545.

TO FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE[1](#)

[August ? 1862]

[A copy went to John Stuart Mill, who was much pleased with the "Observations",[2](#) and was certain that] the publication of them would do vast good.

546.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN[1](#)

Salzburg

Aug. 10. 1862

Dear Sir

I have long been wishing to send something to the Westminster but my good intentions have hitherto come to nothing, because I waited in hopes of offering something elaborate, and every paper I planned either required too much space, or I had not time to write it. Without giving up all hopes of this kind, it occurs to me however, that I might be more useful to the Westminster by occasionally sending something slighter and of less pretension, which one has oftener time for, and for which suitable subjects are more easily found. Perhaps it might suit you to take a short paper on Professor Cairnes's excellent book "The Slave Power".[2](#) If so, I could

perhaps get it ready in time for the October number, though I cannot positively promise it for so soon, as I shall be travelling for the next two or three weeks. If you like the proposal, please write to me at Saint-Véran, near Avignon, Vaucluse, France.

I was very sorry to hear of the loss and inconvenience you sustained by Manwaring's failure.³ I congratulate you on having produced, under all difficulties, so good a number as that for July.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

547.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Aug. 31. 1862

Dear Sir

I have just arrived here and found your two notes. I will lose no time in setting to work, and I can promise that you shall have *something* on Professor Cairnes' book by the 20th of September at latest.² It is, however, an unlucky time for writing on the subject, as even in so short an interval events may have given an entirely new colour to the prospect. But it seems better, if only for the purpose of making Mr Cairnes' book known as widely as possible, to write at once, rather than wait till December. If the article, when it reaches you, appears too slight for the subject, or is in any way superseded by the course of events, I shall not only take in no way amiss your omitting it, but should be obliged to you for doing so, and in that case shall be happy to attempt a better article for the January number.

From the shortness of the time, as well as for other reasons, I should rather not review any other book along with that of Mr Cairnes. I am

Dear Sir,
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

548.

TO HENRY HUTH¹

St. Véran
Avignon

Aug. 31. 62

Dear Sir

On arriving here I found your two letters. I am extremely obliged to you for the interesting particulars you give respecting Buckle whose [death] no one, not personally intimate with him could regret more deeply than I do.² I sympathize sincerely with M^{rs} Huth³ and thoroughly appreciate the loss both to herself and to her sons⁴ of a friend like him in such close relations with them as he was.

I would most gladly respond to her earnest appeal by giving her any advice in my power: but the intimacy and personal influence of a first rate person morally and intellectually not only to young persons but to all who are capable of receiving it, the loss of which as I know by my own experience, nothing can replace—And such are the imperfections of our educational institutions that they can hardly do any thing out of the little which could be done to supply the place of such an influence—If I knew of anyone whom I could recommend as a tutor, or of any place of education fitted for forming the kind of persons whom I conclude M^{rs} Huth desires her sons to be, I sh^d be only too happy to recommend them, but I go so little into general society that I am not in the way of hearing even of the best that is to be had. I am truly sorry that I have so little to say which can either help M^{rs} Huth in her difficulty or comfort her in her distress.

I am very glad to hear of the improvement in your own health and of the approach to completeness of your own work which I expect to read with much interest.

My address will be here, until the beginning of winter.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

549.

TO HENRY PARKES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 2, 1862

Dear Sir

On arriving here after a long journey only three days ago, I found your note of 28th June. Allow me to thank you for the pamphlets on Australian affairs. I take great interest in whatever affects the progress and prospects of communities which are likely to be of so much importance in the future history of mankind.

I shall be here for the next few months, but intend returning to England early in winter. Should you be at that time in England and in London, I shall hope to have the meeting with you which accidental circumstances have so long postponed. I am

Dear Sir
Y^{Rs} Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

Henry Parkes Esq.

550.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT [1](#)

S[aint] V[éran] le 7 sept. 1862

Mon Cher Monsieur

Je ne suis nullement disposé à acheter le pré de M. Cade aux prix de 1000 fr. l'éminée qui me paraît très au dessus de sa valeur. J'ai tout lieu de croire que ce pré ne vaut pas même 700 francs l'éminée prix ordinaire des prairies de ce côté-ci et je propose à M. Cade ce prix-là avec les frais d'achat et la troisième coupe d'herbe. Au reste on m'offre au voisinage des prés de meilleure qualité à un prix très inférieur à ce qu'il demande.

Agréez mon cher Monsieur l'expression de ma considération la plus amicale

551.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN [1](#)

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 11. 1862

Dear Sir

I send the article by this post,2 and I am glad to think that you will receive it before the latest of the dates mentioned in your note of Sept. 2. If you think it good enough for insertion, and are able to send a proof, I shall be much pleased. If time forbids this, I hope that some careful person will collate the proof with the manuscript.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that the article is gratuitous. I am

Dear Sir
Y^{Rs} Very Truly

J. S. Mill

552.

TO E. R. EDGER1

S[aint] V[éran] Sept. 13. 1862

Sir,—

On returning a few days ago from a distant journey I found your note dated June last & I have read attentively the MS.2 which accompanied it.

I sh^d have much to say against several of your positions, & especially against your definition of liberty; but I do not understand that you wish to discuss the subject with me, for which in any case I have not time. I understand you as wishing me to tell you whether, as far as I can judge from your MS., I consider you competent in point of ability to pursue enquiries of this nature with a useful result and I need not hesitate to answer, that I do think you competent. But what I seem to myself to see in your paper is promise rather than performance. It gives signs of several of the qualities which go towards making a genuine thinker: a real desire to go to the bottom of a subject, & not merely to skim its surface; a certain faculty of laying out a large subject & looking at it as a whole; finally, whatever you see, you see clearly, & are able to express clearly to others. I would therefore exhort you by all means, not only to continue thinking, but to continue writing; not however (I would recommend) with a view to early publication. The way to cultivate a really philosophical intellect is to go on long thinking out subjects for one's own instruction—with a view to understand them as thoroughly as possible oneself; reading in the meanwhile whatever is best worth reading on the subjects one is studying, collating one's own thoughts with those of the books one reads & gathering from them new materials for thinking. Those who do this, patiently & unambitiously, without looking much to any ulterior object, are the most likely to be able, sooner or later, to teach something valuable to others. They may never discover any great new truths; to do this is a good fortune which happens

to few persons in a century, & the less we think of it as likely to happen to ourselves, the better for us. But originality does not consist solely in making great discoveries; whoever thinks out a subject with his own mind, not accepting the phrases of his predecessors instead of facts, is original, & it is hardly possible for any one to do this even on the most hacknied subject without turning up some new or neglected aspects of truths, or making some unexpected & perhaps fruitful applications of them.

I would recommend to you, then, by all means to persevere in your speculations; but, were you a Plato, a Locke, or a Bentham, I could not advise you, unless you had a pecuniary independence, to give your time to such pursuits to the neglect of other modes of gaining a subsistence. I believe that to do anything in philosophy, tranquillity of mind, & especially freedom from anxiety as to the means of livelihood, are almost indispensable. To *live* by philosophy, unless as a public teacher in an University, is wholly impossible; & if your daily occupation leaves you even a little leisure, you will very probably in that little do quite as much, in a favourite pursuit, as you would be likely to do by devoting all your time to it. The mind, if strained too long on one subject, works less pleasurably, & for that reason, even were there no other, less vigorously; while combining two occupations makes each of them, as I have found in my own experience, a rest from the other. Regretting that you could not receive this answer to your application at an earlier period,

I Am Yours Very Sincerely

553.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 13. 1862

Dear Sir

Your letter of Feb. 13 has only reached me within these few days, on my return from a distant journey. I am not likely to forget the correspondence I have had with you, and am glad that you would like to continue it. There are many things which, in your position and with your superiority to the prejudices of that position, you must see and know much better than I do, and on which it would often be of great use to me to receive the facts and remarks which you could give. It may also be useful to both of us to compare our ideas on the practical questions bearing on the elevation of the minds and condition of the operative classes. I agree with you that more is expected from Cooperative Societies than they can, as least immediately, realize, and that the ready money principle is one chief cause of the success of the Rochdale Store.² As you say, if a private tradesman were always paid ready money he could afford to sell cheaper. But would his goods be certain to be of the perfectly genuine quality which those at Rochdale are? in addition to which, the working people who buy at the

Rochdale Store, share the profits among them, and obtain, at the same time, the best possible investment for their savings.

In the new edition of my Political Economy,³ I have somewhat altered and enlarged what I had before said on the subject of Cooperation and on that of Strikes. As you may not have seen the edition, I will, the first time I write to my publisher, desire him to send you a copy; and it would give me great satisfaction to receive any criticism which your experience and judgment may suggest to you, on the view I take of those subjects.

I Am
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

Mr John Plummer

554.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 17, 1862

We have now been rather more than a fortnight in this quiet harbour, after our journey, and are fully enjoying its peacefulness. We did not see so much of the Alps, as we expected, after leaving Ischl. . . .

I am doing little at present but reading up the French and English reviews. But since I arrived I have written and sent off an article on the American question (à propos of Mr. Cairnes' book) which will be in the Westminster Review next month.² A very interesting series of notes on America and on the war have been published this summer in an English periodical (Macmillan's Magazine)³ and are, I see, lately reprinted as a volume under the title of "Six months in the Federal States":⁴ the Author is a Mr. Dicey, who had within the last two years published a book on Rome and Italy.⁵ He writes very judiciously, as well as with right feeling, on the whole subject, and what he says respecting the people of the North, being evidently a faithful transcript of what he has seen and heard, ought to have some influence. The Times, as might be expected, is as bad as ever, and even more undisguised in the expression of its bad wishes. It let out, however, a curious admission the other day—that, whatever might be in other respects the issue of this war, it must lead to the destruction of slavery.⁶ This will be true if the North succeeds; but if the South should be successful, I expect the very reverse.—In Europe things appear to be going on well, as far at least, as mental progress is concerned. This is very visible in the higher order of writers in France; among whom I invariably remark that what is bad in thought and sentiment is found chiefly in the publicists who had made themselves known before

1848, and that the generation of those who have risen into notice since that time is both higher in morality, and more philosophic in the intellect.—The Garibaldi affair is very painful, but it has ended as little mischievously as perhaps it could have done. It has at least given Louis Napoleon no pretext for intervention and less excuse than ever for keeping his troops in Rome; while Garibaldi,⁷ it is to be hoped, is still reserved for better times. If it also destroys Rattazzi,⁸ that will be another benefit arising from it. . . . With our compliments to your sister I am yours very sincerely,

J. St. Mill

P.S. I had written the preceding before I received yours. . . . I should have written before, had I thought you would have felt any such anxiety as you mention on our account.⁹ It will always be a pleasure for me to hear from you; let me know what you are doing and thinking, and how the political affairs of your country are proceeding. I can assure you that, however little expression I may habitually give to such a feeling, you are one of the few persons whose friendship I value and whom I would gladly see asserting an influence on the current of public affairs.

J. St. Mill

555.

TO JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY¹

[Saint Véran, Avignon]

September 17th, 1862.

My Dear Sir,

I value the permission you gave me to correspond with you much too highly not to avail myself of it thus early, although I have very little to say that will be new, and at the same time interesting, to one whose thoughts are engrossed as yours must be. If you see Macmillan's Magazine, which has from the beginning been steadily on the right side in American affairs, you must have remarked the 'Notes of a Journey in America,' which have been in the course of publication for some months, ending with a general summing up in the September number.² This last paper especially appears to me excellent, and likely to do much good in England. The whole series has been reprinted in a volume,³ with the name of the writer, Mr. Edward Dicey, author of a recent book on Italy and Rome. You will probably see the Westminster Review of next month, which will contain an article of mine on the American question, apropos of Mr. Cairnes's book.⁴ It is hastily written, and slight, for such a subject, but "every little helps," as the nursery proverb says. I am not at all uneasy about public opinion here, if only the North is successful. The great number of well-meaning people and sincere enemies of slavery who have been led into disapproving of your resistance to the South, when carried to the length of war, have been chiefly influenced by thinking the re-conquest of the South impossible. If you prove it to be possible, if you bring the

Slave States under your power, if you make use of that power to reconstitute Southern society on the basis of freedom, and if finally you wind up the financial results without breaking faith with any of the national creditors (among whom must be reckoned the holders of depreciated currency), you will have all our public with you, except the Tories, who will be mortified that what they absurdly think an example of the failure of democracy should be exchanged for a splendid example of its success. If you come well and honourably through one of the severest trials which a nation has ever undergone, the whole futurity of mankind will assume a brighter aspect. If not, it will for some time to come be very much darkened.

I have read lately two writings of Northern Americans on the subject of England, which shew a very liberal appreciation of the misdirection of English opinion and feeling respecting the contest. One is Mr. Thurlow Weed's letter,^{[5](#)} which was published in the newspapers, and in which those just and generous allowances are made for us which many of us have not made for you. The other is the Rev. Dr. Thompson's 'England during our War,'^{[6](#)} reprinted from the *New Englander*, which is even over-indulgent to our people, but too severe on our Government. I believe that our Government has felt more rightly all through than a majority of the public.

We shall be at this address until the end of November; afterwards at Blackheath Park, Kent. I need hardly say that if your occupations should allow of your writing to me it would not only give me great pleasure, but would make me better able to be of use to a cause which I have as much at heart as even yourself.

I Am, My Dear Sir,
Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

556.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN^{[1](#)}

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 24. 1862.

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for the proof, of which I now return the concluding page.^{[2](#)}

I cannot think of receiving payment for any paper which I may offer to the Review so long as it is not in a position to pay all its contributors.

I shall be very happy to give you my best judgment on any matter on which you may wish to have it. In the case of Italy I am entirely with you as a matter of feeling; but

going on the principle that one ought not to urge upon a Government any course which, were one in their place, one would not feel it right to adopt, I cannot think the immediate incorporation of Rome with the Kingdom of Italy³ of such vital importance to Italy or to the cause of freedom and progress, as to be worth a war between England and France, while there would be nothing so likely to turn the French nation against all that we wish for, and make them identify themselves with their present ruler, as any attempt by a foreign power to act upon them by intimidation. Italy has already our moral support and events have proved that this is much. L[ouis] N[apoleon] is *detested* in Italy; and the longer he remains at Rome, the more certain it becomes that he will have no influence over the destinies of the country but what force, or intrigue and corruption, may give him. This is not a thing of small importance: for it was a great question whether Italy would form its character as a selfgoverning nation on French ideas or on English, and this question is now rapidly deciding itself in favour of English. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

557.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 9. 1862

Dear Sir

It was a curious coincidence that I should receive a letter from you dated Innsbruck, so soon after having left that place. I hope you had better weather than we had during the latter part of our Alpine journey.

Since I wrote last, I am enabled to announce to you another valuable adhesion. The *Journal des Economistes* (for June last) which now contains some of the most important and thorough discussions not merely on political economy but on morals and politics in general, that are to be found in any periodical, contains a review of my book on *Repr. Govt* by M. Eugène Véron,² one of the most promising writers of the *Revue Nationale*; in which article a clear and intelligent account is given of your system, and a complete approval and support of it.

I have read your little book on what may be called the *Building Question*,³ with great interest. It is much to be desired that Mr. Peabody,⁴ whose influence, if exerted, would naturally be paramount in the disposal of his own magnificent gift, may see that the only way of making it useful is to erect such houses as will pay, and by

selling them when built, provide a sum to recommence with. Your plan is, I think, evidently the best for combining remunerativeness with the social object in view, by appropriating the upper stories (as in Paris) to working people, the lower ones being laid out in middle class lodgings and the groundfloor in shops. You have also done good service by insisting on the fitness of having a single local government for the whole of London; which gave you, moreover, an opportunity of shewing that your plan of election, adapted as you propose, affords the only mode in which such a government could advantageously be constituted. I hope the writers in the London Review and the Nonconformist⁵ supported this part of your proposal as well as the other. I hear very good accounts of the London Review, which is said to be fitting itself more and more to take the place of the Saturday.

I suppose Mr. Morin⁶ of Geneva has sent you his second pamphlet, containing the account of your plan. Competent advocacy of it seems to be multiplying on all sides.

I cannot end my letter without expressing my exultation at the glorious news of Lincoln's having made up his mind to propose to Congress to declare all slaves in the insurgent States free.⁷ The same scribes among us who taunted him with not doing it will now, of course, snub him for doing it; this is *selon les règles*. But it has come sooner than I myself ventured to predict, and however little apparent effect it may have at the first moment, it is the death-blow to negro slavery in America.

We expect to return to England early in December, up to which time we shall remain here, and I need not say how glad I shall be to hear from you.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

558.

TO JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY¹

S[aint] V[éran] Oct. 31. 1862

My Dear Sir—

Allow me to thank you most warmly for your long & interesting letter, which if it had been twice as long as it was, would only have pleased me more. There are few persons that I have seen only once,² with whom I so much desire to keep up a communication, as with you; & the importance of what I learn from you, respecting matters so full of momentous consequences to the world would make such communication most valuable to me even if I did not wish for it on personal grounds.—The state of affairs in America has materially improved since you wrote, by the defeat of the enemy in Maryland & their expulsion from it,³ & still more by

Mr. Lincoln's anti-slavery proclamation,⁴ which no American, I think, can have received with more exultation than I did. It is of the highest importance, & more so because the manifest reluctance with which the President made up his mind to that decided step indicates that the progress of opinion in the country had reached the point of seeing its necessity for the effectual prosecution of the war. The adhesion of so many Governors of States, some of them originally Democrats, is a very favorable sign,⁵ & thus far the measure does not seem to have materially weakened your hold upon the Border Slave States. The natural tendency will be if the war goes on successfully to reconcile those States to emancipating their own slaves, availing themselves of the pecuniary offers made by the Federal Govt.⁶ I still feel some anxiety about the reception which will be given to the measures by Congress when it meets & I should much like to know what are your expectations on the point. In England, the Proclamation has only increased the venom of those who after taunting you so long with caring nothing for Abolition, now reproach you for your Abolitionism as the worst of your crimes.⁷ But you will find that whenever any *name* is attached to these wretched effusions, it is always that of some deeply-dyed Tory—generally the kind of Tory to whom slavery is rather agreeable than not, or who so hate your democratic institutions that they would be sure to inveigh against whatever you did, & are enraged at being no longer able to taunt you with being false to your own principles. It is from these also that we are now beginning to hear, what disgusts me more than all the rest—the base doctrine that it is for the interest of England that the American Republic should be broken up. Think of us as ill as you may (& we have given you abundant cause) but do not, I entreat you, think that the general English public is so base as this. Our national faults are not now of that kind & I firmly believe that the feeling of almost all English Liberals, even those whose language has been the most objectionable, is one of sincere regret for the disruption which they think inevitable. As long as there is a Tory party in England it will rejoice at everything which injures or discredits American institutions, but the Liberal party who are now & are likely to remain much the strongest are naturally your friends & allies & will return to that position when once they see that you are not engaged in a hopeless, & therefore as they think an irrational & unjustifiable contest. There are writers enough here to keep up the fight, and meet the malevolent comments on all your proceedings by right ones. Besides Cairnes,⁸ & Dicey,⁹ & H. Martineau,¹⁰ & Ludlow,¹¹ & Hughes,¹² besides the D. News,¹³ & M^cMillan,¹⁴ & the Star,¹⁵ there is now the West^r¹⁶ & the London Review,¹⁷ to which several of the best writers of the Sat. have gone over; there is Ellison of Liverpool,¹⁸ the author of “Slavery & Secession” & editor of a monthly economical journal “The Exchange”¹⁹ & there are other writers less known who if events go on favorably, will rapidly multiply. Here, in France, the state of opinion on the subject is most gratifying. All Liberal Frenchmen seem to have been with you, from the first. They did not know *more* about the subject than the English, but their instincts were truer. By the way, what did you think of the narrative of the Campaign on the Potomac in the R. des deux Mondes of Oct. 15, by the Comte de Paris?²⁰ It looks veracious & is certainly intelligent & in general effect likely I sh^d think to be very useful to the cause.

I still think you take too severe a view of the conduct of our Gov^t. I grant that the extra official *dicta* of some of the Ministry have been very unfortunate, especially that celebrated one of Lord Russell on which I have commented not sparingly in the

W.R.²¹ Gladstone, too, a man of a much nobler character than L^d R, has said things lately²² which I very much regret though they were accompanied by other things shewing that he had no bad feelings towards you & regretted their existence in others. But as a Gov^t I do not see that their conduct is objectionable. The port of Nassau²³ may be all that you say it is, but the U. States also have the power, & have used it largely, of supplying themselves with munitions of war from our ports. If the principle of neutrality is accepted,²⁴ our markets must be open to both sides alike, & the general opinion in England is (I do not say whether rightly or wrongly) that if the course adopted is favorable to either side it is to the U. States, since the Confederates owing to the blockade of their ports have so much less power to take advantage of the facilities extended equally to both. Then again if the Tuscarora was ordered away,²⁵ the Sumter was so too.²⁶ What you mention about a seizure of arms by our Gov^t must, I feel confident, have taken place during the Trent difficulty, at which time alone (neither before nor after) has the export of arms to America been interdicted.²⁷

It is very possible that too much may have been made of Butler's proclamation²⁸ & that he was more wrong in form & phraseology than in substance. But with regard to the watchword said to have been given out by Pakenham at New Orleans,²⁹ I have always hitherto taken it for a mere legend like the exactly parallel ones which grew up under our own eyes at Paris in 1848 respecting the socialist insurrection of June.³⁰ What authority there may be for it I do not know, but if it is true nothing can mark more strongly the change which has taken place in the European standard of belligerent rights since the wars of the beginning of the century;³¹ for if any English commander at the present time were to do the like, he never could shew his face again in English society even if he escaped being broken by a court martial; & I think we are entitled to blame in others what none of us, of the present generation at least, would be capable of perpetrating. You are perhaps hardly aware how little the English of the present day feel of *solidarité* with past generations. We do not feel ourselves at all concerned to justify our predecessors. Foreigners reproach us with having been the great enemies of neutral rights so long as we were belligerents, & with turning round and stickling for them now when we are neutrals, but the real fact is we are concerned & have no hesitation in saying (what our Liberal party said even at the time) that our policy in that matter in the great Continental war was totally wrong.

But while I am anxious that liberal & friendly Americans should not think worse of us than we really deserve, I am deeply conscious & profoundly grieved & mortified that we deserve so ill; & are making, in consequence, so pitiful a figure before the world—with which if we are not daily & insultingly taxed by all Europe it is only because our enemies are glad to see us doing exactly what they expected, justifying their opinion of us, acting in a way which they think perfectly natural because they think it perfectly selfish.

If you kindly favour me with another letter here, it is desirable that it should arrive before the end of November. After that time my address will be Blackheath Park, Kent.

I Am, My Dear Sir,
Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill.

559.

TO NIKOLAI OGAREFF [1](#)

S[aint] V[éran] Nov. 7, 1862

Monsieur—

Je vous remercie très sincèrement de votre lettre et de l'envoi de votre livre. [2](#) Loin de voir avec indifférence l'immense révolution morale, politique et sociale qui s'avance à pas croissants en Russie, [3](#) je la regarde comme un des phénomènes les plus importants d'un siècle déjà si riche en grands événements. J'en observe toutes les péripéties avec le plus vif intérêt, quelque difficulté que j'éprouve à apprécier leur portée autrement que sous un point de vue général. Vous pouvez donc juger de la part que je puis tirer de votre Essai pour préciser mes idées et pour donner plus de détermination à mes espérances.

Quant à vos conclusions dont vous pensez que quelques unes pourraient me sembler douteuses il faudrait que je fusse bien présomptueux pour avoir des opinions décidées sur la manière dont les principes généraux de science sociale doivent être appliqués à un état de choses si éloigné de tous ceux dont j'ai une vraie connaissance. Mais je n'ai aucune répugnance doctrinaire envers l'administration communale des terres, et je ne suis pas éloigné de penser avec vous que la réorganisation sociale de la Russie doit respecter une institution si profondément historique et si enracinée dans les mœurs populaires. Cela admis, la plupart de vos conclusions en découlent naturellement. Quoiqu'il en soit, il me semble impossible de ne pas accepter l'idée qui fait l'esprit de tout votre livre—savoir que le fonctionarisme est le véritable fléau de la Russie et qu'une réforme quelconque ne peut réussir qu'autant qu'elle émancipe les personnes et les choses de ce joug insupportable, et fasse décider les intérêts tant communs que particuliers par les intéressés. Ceci est dans ma conviction plus important que le système représentatif même le mieux ordonné, bien qu'en Russie les deux choses paraissent devoir aller pas à pas et être nécessaires l'une à l'autre.

Agréez Monsieur l'expression de mon respect et de considération toute particulière.

560.

TO SISTER MARIE DE ST. ELIE [1](#)

[After Nov. 28, 1862]

Madame—

C'est avec les sentiments du plus sincère respect pour vous et pour votre œuvre charitable que je me trouve dans l'impossibilité de m'associer à cette œuvre par une souscription pécuniaire.

Je ne suis pas Catholique et votre établissement est essentiellement un foyer d'éducation et par là de propagande catholique. Or dans un pays où la très grande majorité des familles riches professe la religion catholique, il me semble que je suis plus dans mon devoir en réservant les modiques moyens dont je puis disposer pour être employés à appuyer des efforts, également bienfaisants dans leur but, et plus en harmonie avec mes propres convictions.

561.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 5. 1862

Dear Sir

Your letter to Constantinople of 8th July arrived there after our departure, and was forwarded here. I have consequently only received it within the last two days. It gave me much pleasure on many accounts. I have also to thank you for the newspapers containing your excellent letters in the Daily News,² and for a copy of your Lecture,³ which I shall read with great interest. It is very gratifying that your book should have already done so much good. There is certainly a counter current in our favour, though the readers of the Times are not allowed to hear anything about it. You probably recognized me in the review of your book in the October number of the Westminster.⁴ You may add the editor, D^r Chapman, to the number of those on whom you have made a great and useful impression. I have no doubt that, in opinion, he was with us before; but your book raised him to greater earnestness on the subject.

The article in the Edinburgh⁵ was in a very odious spirit. I should not wonder if it were Senior's.⁶ The wretched thing in Fraser which you so justly characterize,⁷ with others as bad as itself by which it has been followed, have quite disgusted me with the present conduct of the Magazine.⁸

I had hoped to see you at the Political Economy Club this evening, but I infer from your letter that you will not be there, as indeed neither shall I; being at present not very well, and indisposed to be out at night without stronger temptation than is held out by today's question.⁹ I expect to be here for several months, and I hope it will not be long before I see you. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

562.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Blackheath

[December] 13. 1862²

Dear Sir

The article I proposed to you is sent by book post today.³ I can answer for the correctness of the information, and I agree generally in the remarks, which are drawn from real and intelligent observation. I am however particularly requested to say that if you do not think the article sufficiently good either in matter or execution to be inserted, the writer will be neither surprised nor discouraged. It was written, and is offered, solely from interest in the subject and in the review, and if thought worthy of acceptance, it will be gratuitous.

I Am Dear Sir
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill.

563.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 14. 1862

Dear Sir,

I am indebted to you for calling my attention to what certainly seems to have been an oversight on my part,² and I only wish I had known of it before, instead of just after, the publication of a new edition. My mistake was, that in setting out the number of cases I did not strike out those in which the statement of the two witnesses conflict. As I now understand the matter, out of twelve cases in which both witnesses make an assertion, there will, (according to the figures in my example) be six cases in which

both are right: one in which both are wrong: three in which A is wrong and C is right; and two in which C is wrong and A is right. But the last two suppositions being known à posteriori not to have been realized, the cases consistent with known facts are in all only seven out of twelve; and among these the correctness of the joint operation of A & B is realized in six. The probability is therefore six to one, as you state.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Very Truly

J.S.M.

564.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

Dec. 14, 1862

I will not wait for the further letter which you promise, before saying how glad I shall be to see you in January, and thanking you as well for the kind and friendly feelings shewn in your letter as for the very interesting information contained in it. I am particularly glad of what you have been doing on the Subject of the Principle of Contradiction, as I have commenced writing something² to which a full understanding of that subject is indispensable, and I do not feel that I have yet thoroughly mastered it. Your account of Austrian politics is very valuable, and I thank you for the American news, which, as you anticipated, was entirely unknown to me. The paper giving an account of my article in Frazer reached me duly.³ I am much gratified that you thought the article worth so full an abstract even for Germany, though I am almost ashamed of the very flattering terms in which you spoke of it and of me. I am very glad that you are so far advanced with the Logic and I return your paper of questions duly filled up.⁴ I am much interested also with your Herculean speculations. . . .⁵

565.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 16. 1862

Dear Sir

I thank you very much for your very gratifying letter, and also for the Daily News containing the admirable letter signed Anglo Saxon.² I am much mistaken if Goldwin Smith will not grow into a power in the country, and this letter shews more than anything I have yet seen of his, that he is likely to be a highly beneficent one. But the value of the letter, both here and in America, would be greatly increased if it were known from whom it comes and I greatly regret that he has not published it with his name. Would it be possible to ascertain from him whether he would allow me to make the authorship known to some of my American friends and correspondents? Every new name of importance, which is attached to sentiments like those of his letter, is worth volumes in promoting a return to friendly feelings between the two countries.

Things are already going better in both countries. Today's Times contains, along with the cheering intelligence of Lincoln's proposal to Congress to redeem all the slaves,³ the noble as well as wise act of the New York Chamber of Commerce in opening a subscription for Lancashire:⁴ Meanwhile a strong Lancashire abolitionist⁵ writes to me as follows: "The tone of public opinion both here [Manchester] and in Liverpool has undergone a slight change for the better during the last three months. Whilst formerly nearly all people frequenting the Manchester and Liverpool Exchanges were openly professing to sympathize with the South, they now mostly declare that they do not have any sympathies for either of the contending parties. I fancy that before long they will come round still more to the right side. As regards the working classes, I find that their opinions on the American question have not altered in the least, notwithstanding the enormous increase of the distress. It is even intended to hold a public meeting in the Free Trade Hall on the 31st of this month,⁶ the last day of slavery, in order to send an address of the working men of Lancashire to President Lincoln. The address and the resolutions are drawn up by Mr Francis Newman.⁷ It is not decided yet whether any M.P.'s will be allowed to join in this demonstration; or whether merely working men will be the speakers. At any rate the principal representatives of the operatives will be Hooson⁸ and Edwards,⁹ the President and Secretary of the Store in Great Ancoats Street, two very intelligent men and good speakers, and known as the leaders of the most advanced section of the Manchester working men."

I know this will delight you as much as it does me.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

566.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 20. 1862

Dear Sir

I write at once to say that I have no objection to be quoted in the manner you propose, as the writer of the article in the Westminster.² I should think Dr Chapman would not object, especially as it must be through him that the authorship became so generally known as you tell me it is; but I should prefer that the application should come from yourself.

I have not yet seen the article in the Spectator,³ but will get it. I was extremely pleased with your Lecture,⁴ and glad to hear that there are several societies in different places anxious to circulate it. I hope the enlarged edition of your book will soon come out.⁵ I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

567.

TO GEORGE FINLAY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Dec. 24. 1862

Dear Mr. Finlay—

I am very much indebted to you for your most interesting letter & for the important memoir² which accompanied it & which I hope I may shew as yours to any one who may be in a position to benefit by it. I suppose the copy which you gave to Mr Scarlett³ will have served for the information of the Government here; otherwise it might have been as well to send a copy to Gladstone & indeed it would be worth while doing so in any case. I have learnt very much from the paper & as far as I can judge there is only one point in it on which I have any doubt, viz. the preference you give to the abolition of the land tax over any change in the mode of levying it. The rent of land is in itself so fit an object of taxation that if there is any possible mode of rendering such a tax unoppressive it seems desirable to retain it. No doubt the money & valuation necessary for a great assessment would take too long and could not be trusted to the present race of officials, but would it not be possible to take a low average of what each landed property has actually paid for the last five or ten years & lay this as a fixed annual charge on the estate? I do not see that this would create any insuperable difficulties in the event of mutations. If the mutation takes place under the law of inheritance, the law when it decides the share of the estate due to each claimant, would impose on him the same share of the tax. If the case were one of

bequest, sale, or gift, the owner might be allowed to charge the whole, or any part, or no part of the tax on the alienated portion as he pleased, provided always that if either the portion alienated or the portion retained were burthened beyond its total value, the remaining portion should be liable for the excess.

If it has been possible for Prince Alfred to accept. . . .[4](#)

568.

TO MAX KYLLMANN[1](#)

24th December 1862.

Dear Sir—

I thank you very sincerely for your two letters[2](#) & for the important & most gratifying intelligence which they contain. Hardly anything could do more good at present than such a demonstration from the suffering operatives of Lancashire[3](#) —while there is in the fact itself & in the state of mind which prompts it, a moral greatness which is at once a just rebuke to the mean feeling of so great a portion of the public on this momentous subject & a source of unqualified happiness to those whose hopes & fears for the great interests of humanity are as mine are, inseparably bound up in the moral & intellectual prospects of the working classes.

I am very well pleased with the Resolutions & Address. I applaud your endeavour to get the passage about the “rights of husbands” struck out but taken with the context it does not necessarily bear the objectionable meaning, though the phrase would not have been used by any writer who had a just feeling respecting the equal rights of the two sexes.[4](#)

On the subject of the query you put to me I perfectly agree in your opinion as far as you have stated it. The improvement in the condition of the working classes through the success of cooperation could not be used up in increase of numbers in less than a generation, & in that time the moral & intellectual influences of cooperation which are of still greater value than the physical, will have had a considerable period in which to operate. If cooperation were universal the necessity of regulating population would be palpable to every one. And even a partial application contains important lessons of the same kind.

569.

TO JOSEPH NAPIER[1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark] Dec. 24. 1862.

Dear Sir—

I have had the honor of receiving your letter of Dec. 22nd.

I have not seen Bishop Fitzgerald's publication,² but you are quite right in supposing that what I wrote about Miracles³ had not the smallest reference to Butler, but only to the writers who professed to reply to Hume, & especially Campbell.⁴ It is many years since I read or looked into the Analogy & I cannot at present remember whether my remarks apply even partially to anything said by Butler. That in their main scope they are inapplicable to him is evident, since it appears from your letter that he fully recognized the distinction between improbability on the doctrine of chances & improbability in the only sense which constitutes incredibility.

My view of the general question is briefly this: That a miracle, considered merely as an extraordinary fact, is as susceptible of proof as other extraordinary facts: That *as a miracle* it cannot, in the strict sense, be proved, because there never can be conclusive proof of its miraculous nature; but that to any one who already believes in an intelligent creator & ruler of the universe the moral probability that a given extraordinary event (supposed to be fully proved) is a miracle, may greatly outweigh the probability of its being the result of some unknown natural cause.⁵

570.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 29. 1862

Dear Sir

I am glad to hear that Mr Coningham² intends to recommend your son.³ The recommendation being to the parliamentary distributor of patronage,⁴ I do not know through what office or for what vacancy it will be available. But if Mr Stansfeld⁵ is intimate with Sir Charles Wood⁶ and is willing to speak to him in your son's behalf, you probably could not have a better channel for promoting your wishes in relation to the India Office. I have myself no title to ask any favour of Sir Charles Wood, nor any reason to suppose that I have any influence with him; but neither on this nor on any other occasion have I any objection to be mentioned as one of those who would be glad of any good fortune which happened to a son of yours, and would applaud any one who would not be deterred by your opinions from giving your son a fair chance. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

G. J. Holyoake Esq.

571.

TO MRS. HENRY HUTH¹

Blackheath Park

Dec. 30. 1862

Dear Madam

It would be very gratifying to me if I had it in my power to say anything which could be either useful or consoling to you. But even if I thought myself competent to give advice in such a matter as that on which you wish to consult me, I could not be qualified to advise concerning the education of those of whom I have no personal knowledge.² Since, however, you say that the points on which you wish for my opinion are definite, and clearly before your own mind, I should be very happy to give you the best answers I can under the circumstances; but I should be able to do this much better, and should much prefer doing it, in a written form.

I Am

Dear Madam

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1863

572.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] Jan. 7. 1863

Dear Bain—

I have been here now for about a month & as it is a long time since I either wrote to you or heard from you I think it is time to send you a bulletin from myself & to ask for one from you.

I have done a good deal of work on Hamilton² at Avignon & some here, though in both places I have had & shall have for some time longer, exceptional occupations which make me rather slow in getting on: My plan has been to go deliberately through the whole writings of Hamilton, writing down in the form of notes, the substance of what I as yet find to say on each point. This will make it comparatively easy to write the book³ when I have finished the preparatory work. The only point which I have yet developed at any length is the formation of the idea of externality,⁴ & consequently of matter, & this, I think I have brought out more fully & clearly than had ever been done before, though my theory does not differ essentially from yours or from Grote's, as indeed from our premises there can be but one theory. But I have grappled with the details of the subject in a manner which I have nowhere yet seen. I mean in this book to do what the nature & scope of the Logic forbade me to do there, to face the ultimate metaphysical difficulties of every question on which I touch.

By the way, is it not surprising that Hamilton sh^d have believed & made the world believe, that he held the doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge? As held by him the doctrine is little better than a play upon the word knowledge, since he maintains that a great mass of Belief, differing from Knowledge in the mode but not in the certainty of conviction, may philosophically & ought morally to be entertained respecting the attributes of the Unknowable. Nor is even this all, for he does not hold to the doctrine of unknowability even in his own sense; but thinks that the primary qualities of matter are given in Consciousness as attributes of Things in Themselves: I used to wonder at the catena of authorities he brought to prove that almost all philosophers have thought as he did; but I ought to have known that he was more likely to be right in his erudition than in his philosophy, & I now find him so, for his own doctrine amounts to no more than what *was* thought by the writers whom he quotes. His speculations on the point seem to me of no philosophic value except as refutations of Schelling⁵ & Hegel,⁶ while the use they can be practically put to is shown in Mansel's detestable, to me absolutely loathsome book.⁷ We are taught there, from Hamilton's premises, that as we cannot know what God is in himself,

nothing that we are told concerning him is in the smallest degree incredible because it is monstrous to the human reason or conscience; & that because we cannot know what Absolute Goodness is, we are at liberty & in some cases are bound to believe that it is not the perfection of human goodness but the direct contrary of it. It is true that these conclusions are very illogically drawn from Hamilton's & Mansel's own premises; these being, that we do not know God as he is in himself, but know him as we do other things, in his relation to us; in other words, phenomenally; which places him in exactly the same category, as an object of thought, with our human fellow creatures, & with Matter; which also we do not know as they are in themselves. God, in fact, is a subject of knowledge insofar as thinkable at all, namely as a subject of phenomenal experience, & as such is amenable to the canons of phenomenal credibility; & if any proposition concerning Man or Matter may & ought to be rejected because it violates those canons, so for the same reason may any proposition concerning God.

Having been so much disappointed by Hamilton's conception of the relativity of human knowledge I sh^d like to look again at Ferrier to see if his is any better.⁸ I think you have my copy of the Institutes of Metaphysic; if so, & if you are not at present needing it, I sh^d be obliged by your sending it, but this need not be done for the next two or three weeks, for I have enough in hand to occupy me during that time.

In Herbert Spencer's "first principles" I do find a much better conception of the doctrine of relativity⁹ though if he holds to it in its proper sense he must give up much which he has said in his Principles of Psychology.¹⁰ The book is a remarkable one in many respects & its wide reaching systematisation of so many heterogeneous elements is very imposing. But was there ever so strange a notion (for a man who sees so much) as that the doctrine of the Conservation of Force¹¹ is a priori & a law of Consciousness? He expresses himself almost as if he thought that there is no objective standard of truth at all, which is in one sense true, but not in the obvious sense; inasmuch as each person's phenomenal experience is to him a standard relatively objective, & the correction of error consists to each mind in bringing its ideas & their relations into nearer accord with what are or would be in the given circumstances, its sensations or impressions & their relations. Of course Grote meant nothing at variance with this,¹² but the omission to state it explicitly seems to me both an imperfection in the theory & a great stumbling block to its reception & on my pointing it out he at once said that he would supply the defect.

We have just returned from a visit to Grote during which I had an opportunity of reading some of his MS.¹³ I chose the Theætetus¹⁴ as falling in with the subject of my present thoughts & I was delighted to find how good it is. He has triumphed wonderfully over the difficulty of rendering the thoughts or semi-thoughts of Plato & of those on whom Plato commented, with the language of modern philosophy; the view of Plato himself which goes through it will, I think, be recognized as original & striking; & his own thoughts on the matters discussed are good & well stated. I found however an oversight which you also must have perceived in reading it, viz. that his mode of defending the Protagorean maxim is very open to misconception.¹⁵

I do not know if I have told you how great an admirer you have in my translator Mr Gomperz. (I call him my translator because his translation of the Logic is nearly

finished.) He is the most clearheaded German I have ever yet known or known of. He is coming to London some time in this winter & I am sorry the time of year will prevent me from bringing you & him together unless indeed he sh^d travel northward, in which case I am sure he will wish to be introduced to you.

With our kind regards to M^{rs} Bain

573.

TO MRS. HENRY HUTH¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 7. 1863

Dear Madam

The plan which has occurred to you for the home education of your sons is excellent, provided that you can succeed in finding any person of the calibre you require, who would be willing and able to exercise the general superintendence which you contemplate. That, however, is the difficulty; and it is one in regard to which I am not able to give the smallest suggestion.

Whether, however, you are able to realize your wishes in this respect or not, I think I should recommend as what would be ultimately desirable, to send your sons to one or other of the two old Universities.² Twenty years ago these were about the last places which I should have recommended in any parallel case; but they are not very much changed, and free enquiry and speculation on the deepest and highest questions, instead of being crushed or deadened, are now more rife there than almost anywhere else in England. And the places not only afford great facilities for study, but a strong stimulus to it, by the competition for honours. If Oxford should be chosen, Balliol College, where they would be under Jowett,³ would be preferable, not only on account of his liberal tone of thought, but also of his remarkable success in training pupils in the studies of the place. I mention this because I believe it is necessary to apply a long time (even years) beforehand, in order to be admitted to the College.

If you decide to look forward to one of the Universities, what is to be done in the meanwhile will naturally be considerably influenced by that decision. There is little difficulty, I believe, in finding persons well qualified to prepare youths for the matriculation examinations. Meanwhile, both for that purpose and for general cultivation, your sons might probably with advantage attend some of the classes at University College, London; and if they are still of an age for school, and you are not able to do better for them at home, the London University School is, I should think, one of the least objectionable which could be found. Mr Key⁴ is a good scholar, a man of considerable ability, and free from the ordinary prejudices of schoolmasters, at least those of an ecclesiastical kind.

As you have allowed me to read Mr Buckle's impressions respecting your sons,⁵ I cannot help saying that I hope you will not be in the smallest degree discouraged by his having thought one of them naturally slow, since he also testifies to his being painstaking. Not only in the pursuits of ordinary life, but in those of intellect, much more depends on labour and perseverance than on quickness: the last is even often a snare, since those who can do with ease, much that to others requires labour, often get into the habit of not doing at all, anything which they cannot do with ease; a habit as fatal to real and great eminence as hopeless stupidity would be.

I Am Dear Madam
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

574.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 9. 1863

Dear Sir

Many thanks for your note. I shall avail myself of every occasion that offers for making known to Americans how powerful and warm a supporter their cause has in M^r Goldwin Smith.²

Since I wrote last, I have seen the article in the Spectator on a negro army³ and I think as highly of it as you do. That paper (which I had not seen for a long time) pleased me so much both by its opinions and its ability that I have commenced taking it in.

I thought your reply to the Saturday Review⁴ very good and effective, and I agree in substance with the view you take of the interest of the slaveholders, quoad the renewal of the slave trade. The true parallel case is that which you put, when you compare their position to that of the owners of existing machines, in relation to an improvement in machinery. But I think, both in the one case and in the other, their interest in keeping up the value of their existing stock *might*, conceivably, preponderate over their interest in cheapening the means of future production. Obviously it does so if they are going to *sell* their slaves, or machinery. Even if they are not, their present credit, or means of borrowing is increased by the high price of their stock. If neither of these things is of importance to them, still other and new producers starting with cheaper slaves or machinery, would be able to undersell them, and by lowering the price of the produce, diminish the annual returns to their capital in the full ratio of the diminution in the pecuniary value of the capital itself. They could not transfer part of their capital elsewhere, for they have lost part of the capital

itself. What would, I think, prevent their interests from suffering on the whole, is the vastness of the market, which is capable of absorbing a greatly increased quantity of produce. By working their slaves harder, they could at once recover at least a part of their loss: when the slaves were worn out by overwork, and replaced by a cheaper article, the loss would cease altogether; and both before and afterwards they would be in the situation of manufacturers [in] a very brisk and thriving trade, who almost always gain more by increasing the total production, than they lose by the depreciation, or in many cases even by the total sacrifice of superseded machinery.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

575.

TO HENRY PITMAN¹

Blackheath Park

13 January, 1863

I am sorry to hear that so useful a publication as the Co-operator has to complain of want of encouragement.

A vehicle for Co-operative news and an organ for discussing the many important practical questions which arise in the progress of Co-operation, is very much wanted; and its discontinuance would be much to be regretted. I have paid £1 . . . for the extension fund.

576.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

Blackheath

Jan. 15. 1860

Dear Sir

In going through Mr Austin's Lectures,² I find that one important Lecture,³ numbered as the 40th, is wanting, and that an appeal is made to any of Mr Austin's pupils who possess notes of it, to supply them.

I made and wrote out rather full notes of the whole course, and though the series is not complete—having been lent to various persons, by some of whom it was returned imperfect—I find on reference that the missing lecture (No. 46 in my numeration) is among those I have left. I shall be very happy if the notes can be made useful to supply, in however imperfect a manner, the hiatus.

All the other notes are equally at Mrs Austin's disposal, if she should wish to examine them in case the developments they contain of the memoranda which it appears that Mr Austin often made for extemporaneous exposition, should include passages worth subjoining to the Lectures in an Appendix or otherwise. In looking for the missing lecture, my eye fell upon a criticism on the Code Napoleon,⁴ which is not in the printed sheets, and which seems to me exceedingly well worth preserving.

I Am
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Henry Reeve Esq.

577.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

Blackheath

Jan. 17. 1863

Dear Sir

I have sent to your address by the Parcels Delivery Company, the whole of the notes.² The Lectures of which no notes remain, are Nos 17 to 24, and 61. I have put separate from the rest No 46 (corresponding to the missing No 40 in the printed sheets) together with the one immediately preceding it, which contains the remarks on the Prussian and French Codes,³ and which, though one of the most important Lectures of the whole course, is also totally absent from the printed series.

I Am
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

578.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 17. 1863

Dear Sir

I shall not be able to attend the meeting,² but if I have an opportunity, I will endeavour to place the tickets you sent advantageously to the cause.

I read with great pleasure the report of your interview with M^r Adams,³ and am particularly glad that in his judgment, public opinion in this country is improving on the subject of the struggle in America. My own impression on the point coincides with his.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

579.

TO SAMUEL BAILEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] Jan. 21, 1863

Dear Sir—

Allow me to thank you very sincerely for the gift of your last two works. The one on Shakespeare² was very pleasant reading & many of the conjectural emendations seemed to me happy, while in other cases I fancied that a good deal might be said for the received text. But it is almost an impertinence in me to make any observations on a subject on which my opinion is so little worth consideration.

The new volume of your Letters is, I think, at least equal to either of its predecessors.³ Like everything I have read of yours, it is both instructive & interesting, & if, as might be expected on such a subject, I sometimes differ from you, it is always as from a thinker, & from one whose canons of thought are not fundamentally different from my own. You may probably anticipate what are our principal points of difference. I am not able to see how it is possible that the mind sh^d directly perceive that one event *produces* another or how the idea of producing could be suggested without *repeated* experience of the sequence of one event upon the

other. Neither can I see how a fact can be known to be *necessary* by direct perception or how necessity can be in any way a direct subject of human apprehension. Apart from these points & minor ones connected with them I agree with you in essentials on almost [all] the topics discussed. In several instances you have done, & done well, what I have been long wishing to see done. This is particularly true of your remarks on Comte's depreciation of psychology:[4](#) & on the improper assimilation by Comte & others, of physical to moral laws, an assimilation dictated by their desire to attach the idea of religious obligation to a prudential regard for the warnings of physical science.

In the discussion on Personal Identity[5](#) you have (I think for the very first time) chosen the right starting point for the inquiry by considering *first* what makes me the same person to the apprehension of *others* while psychologists have usually started from the far more complex question, what makes me the same person to my own apprehension. You have in fact commenced the examination of personal identity by considering what it is which constitutes identity in the other & simpler cases in which it is predicated; & by thus for the first time applying to the question the only philosophical method of investigation you have as might be expected, arrived at much better results.

On the subject of Language[6](#) I of course agree in your principal thesis. The origin & history of a word are not the appropriate evidence of its present meaning. But have you not a little underrated the worth of this kind of knowledge in its bearing on the great questions of metaphysics? The most keenly contested questions in psychology are those which relate to the *origin* of certain of our mental notions; & is not light often thrown on this by the *origin* of the corresponding words? A certain school of psychologists are always contending that such & such notions must be part of the original furniture of the mind, on the ground that there have always been names for them; & we know how strong is the tendency to suppose that whatever has got a name, has a real existence, not as a particular mode of contemplating things which when looked at for other purposes are known by other names, but as an independent entity. It seems to me very pertinent in opposition to this notion, to shew (if it can be shewn) that, for instance, all abstract names were originally concrete, & that all the more general words of relation were once nouns or verbs.

The part of your book which treats of "Moral Sentiments"[7](#) I value even more than all the rest. Several important points of what we agree in holding as the true theory I have not seen so well brought out anywhere else. I am the more interested by what you have done because I have myself been led into a very similar vein of thought & have published it in a series of three papers which unless you are a habitual reader of Fraser's Magazine, you are not likely to have heard of.[8](#) If I reprint them separately as I am thinking of doing I will beg your acceptance of a copy. In the last of these papers (December 1861) I derive most of the peculiar characters of the moral sentiment from the element of vindictiveness which enters into it. Our modes of developing the idea are different but not conflicting.

I Am Dear Sir

580.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 26. 1863.

Dear Sir

I presume Mr Holden² has sent to you, as either he or someone else has sent to me, the Sydney paper containing the debate in the Lower House on the bill respecting the Legislative council.³ If you have seen it, you must indeed have been delighted. The second reading carried, and a large majority of the speakers on both sides (including the head of a late ministry⁴) strong supporters of your system, with full understanding of it! How encouraging this is as to the reception it will obtain here, when people once give their minds to it as a question of the day. If we could obtain as good a debate as that for it in the House of Commons, it would not be far from being carried.

I inclose a letter I have received from the Foreign Minister (I believe) of the Sandwich Islands,⁵ announcing his intention to bring forward *there* a proposal for the representation of minorities. Surely this is as great a wonder as anything in our time, marked out as it is from all former times by the universality of discussion and progress all over the world. Please return the letter. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

581.

TO JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] Jan. 26. 1863

Dear Sir.

You can imagine better than I can tell you how much your letter interested me. I am obliged to you for the information respecting the first settlers in New England. I did not know that there were so many people of family among them though I knew there were some and I was quite aware that the place which the refuse went to was Virginia.

All the popular literature of the century following shews that colony to have been the one regarded as the Botany Bay of that time. But my argument did not turn upon this nor was I thinking of race or blood but of habits & principles. New England as I understand it, was essentially a middle class colony: the puritans of the higher classes who took part in its foundation were persons whose sympathies went in a different channel from that of class or rank. The southern colonies on the contrary were founded on aristocratic principles, several of them by aristocratic men as such, & we know that the greatest of them, Virginia, retained aristocratic institutions till Jefferson succeeded in abolishing them.²

Concerning the Alabama, most people of sense in this country, I believe, are reserving their opinion until they hear what the Gov^t has to say for itself.³ My own first impression was, that the Gov^t was not bound nor even permitted by international rules to prevent the equipment of such a vessel, provided it allows exactly similar liberty to the other combatant. But it is plain this notion was wrong since the Gov^t has shewn, by issuing an order which arrived too late, that it considered itself bound to stop the Alabama. What explanation it can give of the delay will be known when Parlt meets; & what it ought to do now, in consequence of its previous default, a person must be better acquainted than I am with international law to be able to judge. But I expect to have a tolerably decided opinion on the subject after it has been discussed.

I write to you in much better spirits than I have been in since I saw you. In the first place things are now going in an encouraging manner in the West. Murfreesboro is an important as well as glorious achievement⁴ & from the the general aspects of things I feel great confidence that you will take Vicksburg⁵ & cut off Arkansas & Texas⁶ which then by your naval superiority will soon be yours. Then I exult in (what from observation of the politics of that state I was quite prepared for, though not for the unanimity with which it seems to have been done) the passing over of Missouri from slavery to freedom:⁷ a fact which ought to cover with shame, if they were capable of it, the wretched creatures who treated M^r Lincoln's second proclamation⁸ as waste paper & who described the son of John Quincy Adams⁹ as laughing in his sleeve when he professed to care for the freedom of the negro! But I am now also in very good heart about the progress of opinion here. When I returned I already found things better than I expected. Friends of mine who are heartily with your cause, who are much in society & who speak in the gloomiest terms of what the general feeling was a twelvemonth ago, already thought that a change had commenced. And I heard every now & then that some person of intellect & influence whom I did not know before to be with you was with you very decidedly. You must have read one of the most powerful & most thorough pieces of writing in your defence that has yet appeared, under the signature Anglo Saxon in the Daily News. That letter is by Goldwin Smith, & though it is not signed with his name he is willing (as I am authorized to say) that it sh^d be known.¹⁰ Again D^r Whewell,¹¹ one from whom I sh^d not have expected so much, feels, I am told, so strongly on your side that people complain of his being rude to them on the subject & he will not suffer the Times to be in his house. These, you may say, are but individual cases. But a decided movement in your favour has begun among the public since it has been evident that your Gov^t is really in earnest about getting rid of slavery. I have always said that it was ignorance, not ill will, which made the majority of the English public go wrong about this great matter. Difficult as

it may well be for you to comprehend it, the English public were so ignorant of all the antecedents of the quarrel that they really believed what they were told, that slavery was not the ground, scarcely even the pretext, of the war. But now when the public acts of your Gov^t have shewn that now at least it aims at entire slave emancipation, that your victory means that & your failure means the extinction of all present hope of it, many feel very differently. When you entered decidedly into this course, your detractors abused you more violently for doing it than they had before for not doing it, & the Times¹² & Saturday Review¹³ began favouring us with the very arguments & almost in the very language which we used to hear from the W. India slaveholders to prove slavery perfectly consistent with the Bible & with Xtianity. This was too much; it overshot the mark. The Anti Slavery feeling is now thoroughly rousing itself. Liverpool has led the way by a splendid meeting¹⁴ of which the Times suppressed all mention, thus adding according to its custom to the political dishonesty a pecuniary fraud upon its subscribers. But you must have seen a report of this meeting; you must have seen how Spence did his utmost,¹⁵ & how he was met; & that the object was not merely a single demonstration but the appointment of a Committee to organize an action on the public mind. There are none like the Liverpool people for making an organization of that sort succeed if once they put their hands to it. The day when I read this I read in the same day's newspaper, two speeches by cabinet ministers: one by Milner Gibson¹⁶ as thoroughly & openly with you as was consistent with the position of a cabinet minister; the other by the D. of Argyll¹⁷ was a simple anti slavery speech, denouncing the proslavery declaration of the Southern bishops, but his delivering such a speech at that time & place has but one meaning. I do not know if you have seen Cairnes' *Lecture*¹⁸ or whether you are aware that it has been taken up & largely circulated by religious societies & is at its fourth edition. A new & enlarged edition of his great book is on the point of publication¹⁹ & will I have no doubt be very widely read & powerfully influential.

Foreigners ought not to regard the Times as representing the British nation. Of course a paper which is so largely read & bought & so much thought of as the Times is, must have a certain amount of suitability to the people that buy it. But the line it takes on any particular question is much more a mere matter of accident than is supposed. It is sometimes better than the public & sometimes worse. It was better—on Competitive Examinations²⁰ & on the revised Educational Code²¹—in each case owing to the accidental position of a particular man who happened to write in it—both which men I could name to you. I am just as fully persuaded as if I could name the man, that the attitude it has long held respecting slavery, & now on the American question, is equally owing to the accidental interests or sympathies of some one person connected with the paper. The Sat. Review again is understood to be the property of the bitterest Tory enemy America has, Beresford Hope.²² Unfortunately these papers, through the influence they obtain in other ways & in the case of the Times very much in consequence of the prevailing notion that it speaks the opinion of all England, are able to exercise great power in perverting the opinion of England whenever the public are sufficiently ignorant of facts to be misled. That when once engaged in a wrong line, writers like those of the Times go from worse to worse, & at last stick at nothing in the way of perverse & even dishonest misrepresentation, is but natural to party writers everywhere; natural to those who go on day after day working themselves up to write strongly in a matter to which they have committed themselves, & breathing an

atmosphere inflamed by themselves; natural moreover to demagogism both here & in America, & natural above all to anonymous demagogism, which risking no personal infamy by any amount of tergiversation never minds to what lengths it goes, because it can always creep out in time, & turn round at the very moment when the tide turns.

Among the many lessons which have been impressed on me by what is now going on, one is, a strong sense of the *Solidarité* (to borrow a phrase for which our language has no short equivalent) of the whole of a nation with every one of its members: for it is painfully apparent that your country & mine habitually judge of one another from their worst specimens. You say that if England were like Cairnes & me, there would be no alienation; & neither would there if America were like you. But (I need not use soft words to you, who I am sure detest these things as much as I do) the low tricks & fulsome mob-flattery of your public men, & the bullying tone & pettifogging practice of your different Cabinets (southern men chiefly I am aware) towards foreign nations, have deeply disgusted a great number of our very best people, & all the more so because it is the likeness of what we may be coming to ourselves. You must admit too that the present crisis, while it has called forth a heroism & constancy in your people which cannot be too much admired & to which even your enemies in this country do justice, has also exhibited on the same scale of magnitude all the defects of your state of society, the incompetency & mismanagement arising from the fatal belief of your public that anybody is fit for anything, & the gigantic pecuniary corruption which seems universally acknowledged to have taken place & indeed without it one cannot conceive how you can have got through the enormous sums you have spent. All this, & what seems to most of us entire financial recklessness (though for myself I do not pretend to see how you could have done anything else in the way of finance) are telling against you here—you can hardly imagine how much. But all this may be, & I have great hope that it will be, wiped out by the conduct which you have it in your power to adopt as a nation. If you persevere until you have subdued the South or at all events all west of the Mississippi; if having done this you set free the slaves with compensation to loyal owners & (according to the advice of M^r Paterson in his admirable speech at Liverpool),²³ settle the freed slaves as free proprietors on the unoccupied land; if you pay honestly the interest on your vast national debt, & take measures for redeeming it, including the debt without interest which is constituted by your inconvertible paper currency; if you do these things, the United States will stand very far higher in the general opinion of England than they have stood at any time since the war of independence. If, in addition to this, you have men among you of a calibre to use the high spirit which this struggle has raised, & the grave reflexions to which it gives rise, as means of moving public opinion in favour of correcting what is bad & strengthening what is weak in your institutions & modes of feeling & thought, the war will prove to have been a permanent blessing to your country such as we never dared hope for, & a source of inestimable improvement to the prospects of the human race in other ways besides the great one of extinguishing slavery.

If you are really going to do these things, you need not mind being misunderstood—you can afford to wait.

582.

TO JOSEPH NAPIER¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 27, 1863

Dear Sir—

I have at your suggestion reread the second chapter of the second part of the Analogy² & the result is somewhat different from what you seemed to expect. I am afraid I must admit that Butler's authority is against me & that he either overlooked, or did not admit the distinction which I endeavoured to draw between two kinds of improbability, improbability before the fact & improbability of an alleged fact. For though as you say he does not deny that there is a certain small antecedent presumption against a miracle, he looks upon this as being exactly the same sort of presumption which there is against any common event (of the conditions of which we have no special antecedent knowledge) before it has happened. Now in my view it is a totally different sort of presumption—one which constitutes, as far as it goes, a ground of disbelief, which the other & universal presumption does not even in the smallest degree. In proof of this: let there be a million tickets in some repository, numbered & placed indiscriminately. Of these I take out one. The antecedent presumption against its being No 72 is a million to one; but when I *have* selected a ticket & it is affirmed to be No 72 the antecedent presumption does not render this in the smallest degree incredible, because, instead of its being unlikely that an event with a million to one against it could happen it was certain that such an event would happen, & it is certain that such an event did happen when I took out the ticket, whether it was No 72 or not.

Now (without further purpose distinguishing miracles from any other kind of extraordinary event) it seems to me clear that against any extraordinary event there exists not a slight addition to this entirely unimportant kind of improbability, but an improbability generically different from it. And Butler surely must have thought so since he would not have credited a statement that [*illegible word*] has on only a small fraction more of evidence than that on which he could have believed an ordinary man who said that he rose one morning with a headach[e]. But though he must have habitually acted on this view of the subject I am afraid he forgot it in his argument.

583.

TO JOHN WILSON¹

Blackheath Park

31 January, 1863

Although I am much too occupied to be able to accept your invitation to be present at the Soirée of the Liverpool Co-operative Provident Association, I am glad of the opportunity you have offered me to express, as I have done in my published writings, my warmest sympathy with the Co-operative Cause. Of all the agencies which are at work to elevate those who labour with their hands, in physical condition, in social dignity and in those moral and intellectual qualities on which both the others are ultimately dependent, there is none so promising as the present Co-operative movement. Though I foresaw, when it was only a project, its great advantages, its success has thus far exceeded my most sanguine expectations, and every year adds strength to my conviction of the salutary influence it is likely to exercise over the destinies of this and other countries.

584.

TO GEORGE FINLAY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 2. 1863

My Dear Mr. Finlay—

Many thanks for your letter which was both interesting and encouraging. I now write in high spirits on the subject of Greece as today's newspapers for the first time state positively & authentically that the Duke of Saxe Coburg consents to be a candidate.² I earnestly hope that the Greeks will not throw away the opportunity of getting a king who would bring them every possible advantage they could have had from Prince Alfred,³ with the addition of being a man of mature age and *tried* principles. It seems to me that they have drawn the one solitary prize in the lottery & that his election & acceptance would be the very happiest event which the chances of politics could have turned up for Greece. I had never ventured to hope for anything so good as a prince who is more liberal & constitutional than his German subjects understand or care for & who is looked to by the liberals in Germany at large as a possible head of the future German Empire. If he is elected, it will be his object to make Greece a great country by making her a free & prosperous one to begin with, & all the best European thought will have a greater chance of access to her than to any crowned head in Europe except his uncle Leopold.⁴

I was very happy to learn from you that there is a real desire in the Assembly for moderate establishments & a great retrenchment of expenditure. This is good not only in itself, but because it implies putting a restriction on the evils of centralization & functionarism. But the land tax or rather *a* land tax will be wanted nevertheless, for a time at least, if they intend to be honest to their creditors.

Mr Grote was extremely interested by the plans & inscriptions you sent to him through me. He did not know the existence in the character. . . .

585.

TO ROBERT CRICHTON WYLLIE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 3. 1863

Sir—

I have had the honour of receiving your letter & the printed slips which you have been kind enough to send. These I have read with the attention due to any work of D^r Rae² & they appear to me quite worthy of his intellect and acquirements. The picture which he draws of the dangers that menace the interesting community of which you are one of the rulers, is most formidable.³ Of the remedies which he proposes, I cannot be a competent judge, but as far as my means of judgment extend he seems to be right in much, perhaps even in all, that he proposes.

The other paper will I think place D^r Rae very high among ethnologists & philologists.⁴ After having reached by independent investigation the highest generalization previously made, viz., that all languages have grown by development from a few hundred words, D^r Rae seems to have supplied the first probable explanation of the manner in which their primitive words may themselves have originated. If this hypothesis is made out, it is the keystone of the science of philology: it is a priori extremely probable, & the facts he brings forward establish a strong case of verification a posteriori. I hope that D^r Max Müller⁵ has been put in possession of this important speculation.

It must be of great value to your country to have such a man as D^r Rae settled among you.

It is very gratifying to me that you are disposed to carry the principle of representation of minorities into practical operation. That such should be the questions agitated in a country which three quarters of a century ago was in the savage state, is surely one of the most remarkable signs of the very hopeful times in which we live.

586.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

Feb. 7. 1863

Dear Sir

Mr Curtis'² letter gives one a very favorable impression of his own sentiments, though in some respects a painful one of those of his countrymen. Perhaps, however, it is no worse than was to be expected, and the worse it is the more searching and the more prolific of good is the present crisis likely to be. The danger of American democracy was stagnation—a general settling into a dead level of low morality and feeling. The strenuous antagonism now springing up in the better Americans against the tone of mind of the worse, is the most hopeful feature of the present struggle, and the battle against the devil could not be fought on a more advantageous field than that of slavery.

I was delighted, as you were, with the Exeter Hall meeting, and the Liverpool meeting which preceded it was even better. Leeds, Bradford, Bristol,³ and other places have also roused themselves and there is to be another meeting at Manchester on the receipt of Lincoln's answer to the Manchester address.⁴ There is, besides, a latent feeling on the right side in many quarters, which will assert itself in time. For instance; I have it under the hand of the Duke of Argyll that he agrees entirely with my two articles—and I had yesterday a conversation with Sir Stafford Northcote and the Mayor of Liverpool,⁵ and was surprised and pleased to find how nearly right they both are on the subject. When our whole strength comes to shew itself, it will be seen to be very great. It is fear of the Times that makes public men keep silence. Perhaps they do not overrate the power of the Times, but they ridiculously exaggerate the danger to themselves of braving it. The Times has been very often defeated; but as it is never wrong without a great number of people to keep it in countenance, it never suffers any permanent loss of influence. It has passed unhurt through much severer blows than any it has had lately. It lost no credit by its sudden turn round on Bernard's trial,⁶ the very day after he was acquitted—as strong a case as the sharp turn in 1834 from ultra Whiggism to Peel Toryism.⁷ Such things would have ruined a writer who gave his name; but anonymous journalism can dare anything with impunity.

I was glad that the noble spirit of the Lancashire operatives found an exponent in Bazley,⁸ when he said in seconding the address, that the work-people do not want cotton made by slaves.

I Am Dear Sir
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

587.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 13. 1863

Dear Bain—

I thought Ferrier's book² quite *sui generis* when I first read it, & I think so more than ever after reading it again. His system is one of pure scepticism very skilfully clothed in dogmatic language. To find the meaning of any of his propositions one is obliged to invert it—to turn it as it were bottom upward, and discover the purely negative underside, of which the side turned towards the spectator is but the superficial outcome, and which negative underside contains all the reality there is in the proposition. For example, matter, according to him is the variable element in cognition. But he avers that neither the world at large, nor thinkers, when they discussed the subject of matter, ever imagined that they were affirming or denying the existence of a variable element in cognition. Consequently the entire purport of Ferrier's proposition is, that if matter is not this, "there is nothing else for it to be" (to use an expression of his own). Again, the whole of his doctrine of the Absolute may be thus expressed: Unless the Absolute is what I say it is, that is, unless a toothache, regarded as my toothache, is the Absolute there *is* no Absolute. This strikes me as very cool, in a thinker whose doctrines are of this character, to class other people as sceptics, & present his own system as the first & only real safeguard against scepticism. The truth is, it outdoes in scepticism almost all the systems so called, inasmuch as it abolishes *noumena*. According to it there are no "things in themselves"; they have no locus standi anywhere, not even in Herbert Spencer's region of the Unknowable.³ To this doctrine I have little to object, but I do object in toto to the mode in which it is arrived at. For the only legitimate mode of arriving at it is by the psychology of which he thinks he can never speak too scornfully, viz. by pointing out the genesis through ascertained laws of the mind, of the belief that people have that they do perceive, or have evidence of things in themselves. Until this is done, this next to universal belief is *primâ facie* evidence of its own truth, just as the impressions of the senses are. All such attempts however he repudiates, rebuking philosophers in general for commencing their study of the mind with the *origin* of an idea & not seeing the very obvious truth (which it will be one of the purposes of what I write on Hamilton to enforce) that since we cannot observe the first moments of human consciousness, a theory of the genesis of our notions is an indispensable condition of ascertaining what those are which we possess originally. Despising this instrument of investigation which he does not know how to use, he arrives at all his conclusions, without one single exception that I remember—certainly at all those which he declares to be of primary importance—either by deduction from arbitrary definitions or by reasoning in a circle. How, for example, does he prove the doctrine which he considers it his greatest feat to have established, the principal proposition of the Agnoiology?⁴ By arguing that as Ignorance is a defect, there can be no ignorance but of things which might possibly be known. He erects the accidental dyslogistic connotation of a word into the chief constituent of its meaning, & from this definition of his own concludes that there are no other things to be ignorant of, & not (which is the only valid conclusion) that if there are we may be ignorant of them without blame. His general mode of settling the questions which divide philosophers is to transfer the names of the things, real or unreal, which they contend about to things the reality of

which nobody ever thought of contesting; after which, as there are no names left for the things which people do contest, the conclusion is quietly slid into that there are no such things. I do not in the least dispute that if this negative conclusion be true, there is much to be said for transferring the existing words with all their associations from nonentities to the realities which are the proper objects for those associations; & what makes me to a certain extent tolerant of the book is that I think philosophy will most likely ultimately use the words in something like his sense of them, so that his system serves a mode of stating a connected set of opinions grounded in truth, which connected statement he mistakes for deducing them from one another. But the fact that there is nothing else for the words to mean has to be proved first; which cannot be done by begging it in the definitions of the terms. What, again, can be a more glaring paralogism than that by which he establishes his grand proposition that certain supposed laws of our cognitions are necessary laws of all cognition existing, possible or imaginary, finite or infinite? It all rests upon a double meaning of the word Contradictory. He lays down as a principle that what is contradictory cannot be known, not merely by our intelligence but by any intelligence. He gets this admitted by presenting it as if it meant that our intelligence cannot believe that a thing is & also that it is not. So presented, the reader is not willing to admit that the impossibility does not arise from the limitation of *our* intelligence, but is a law of all intelligence. But when the time comes for drawing the consequences of the admission, the Contradictory is found to be that which contradicts not itself, but “the necessary laws of cognition,” & from that time forward anything which we cannot, as the author expresses it, “conceive to be conceivable” is placed, on that ground, among things unknowable by any, even infinite, intelligence, though it may not involve any self-contradiction at all. Thus, the proposition that the human capacities of conception (in their second power at least) are a measure of the possibilities of universal intelligence steals in as a demonstrated truth without having been once faced.

Then how strangely absurd are his representations of other writers, above all his romance about Plato. There has been plenty of nonsense written about Plato’s Ideas, but I did not expect to be told that what Plato means by them (though he failed to express his meaning distinctly) was the Ego! This wonderful conclusion seems to be reached by the following syllogism. The Ego is (according to my system) the universal element in cognition; therefore Plato’s Ideas were the Ego. How Plato would have stared at this interpretation of what he conceived as the very opposite pole, the point furthest removed from (& raised above) the Ego, of all the elements which enter into the generation of Knowledge!

In spite of all this, however, & of the flourishing of trumpets which accompanies every fresh paralogism or disguised assumption, one cannot help being struck in almost every page with the ability of the writer, though I cannot think that it lies in the direction of metaphysical speculation. And the book, like all books by persons of talent on difficult subjects of thought, helps more or less to clear up one’s own ideas.

I have not left myself room for saying much on other subjects but I have not much to say. I am reprinting the Utilitarianism⁵ & will send it to you as soon as published. I have just received Lyell’s new book⁶ but have not yet read any of it. Littré writes that he will very shortly publish his life of Comte⁷ which I expect will be interesting & I

shall perhaps make it an occasion for writing something about Comte, though I do not like being diverted from Hamilton. I have heard nothing very lately about Grote. His new eight-volume edition is out.⁸

Your paper on the Methods of Debate⁹ must have given many valuable ideas to those whom it was addressed to. There is a point in the appended note that I sh^d like, at some time or other to discuss with you. It strikes me that the principle on which the chances are estimated on the [?subject] of Alexander differs in one respect from the true principle.

588.

TO MAX KYLLMANN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] Feb. 15. 1863.

Dear Sir—

I wish there were somebody like you in every great town in the country, for as soon as you see that anything is true & important you exert yourself to get it acknowledged. The beginning you have made with the operatives on the subject of Mr Hare's plan² is most valuable. They are more open to conviction than any other class, being the only class not prejudiced in favour of existing institutions in general. And they have the strongest interest in adopting this plan, since while it gives more complete expression & fuller effect than anything else can do to the democratic principle, it also completely removes the strongest & best founded of the objections which are sincerely felt to that principle, considered as a practical one. When difficulties can be removed not by compromising a principle but by carrying it still more completely out, the advantage is well worth gaining.

I should strongly advise keeping the demonstration respecting the grievances of the working classes as distinct as possible from the movement relating to America. It is good generalship in politics as it is in war not to bring all your enemies upon you at once, but to divide them, and fall upon each division apart from the rest. Bad principles are but too ready to league with each other as it is, without being provoked to it by each receiving a slap in the face at the same moment from the same hands. And you cannot well afford to alienate those who would agree with you as to one of the two objects proposed but not on the other. For the same reason it seems to me desirable that the question of the suffrage sh^d be kept apart from the other things complained of & sh^d be made the subject of a distinct demonstration by itself. The changes in the law that have made cooperation possible would not have been obtained so soon if the demand for them had usually been coupled with the question of the suffrage.

Thanks for your information about the Haslingden movement.³ Before I received your letter, one of the circulars had found its way to me & I shall the first time I go to

town pay a subscription in the manner directed. I will also send a subscription to Mr Bradlaugh.[4](#)

The Anthropological Society I hear of for the first time[5](#) from your letter. I sh^d suppose from the publications it announces that its objects must be very much the same as those of the Ethnological Soc^{ty}[6](#) which already existed. The names mentioned are all new to me except two: Capt. Burton, whom I know as other people do from his books more as an enterprising traveller than as a man of science,[7](#) & Mr Luke Burke,[8](#) who I sh^d think answers to your requisition of willingness to carry out premises to all their consequences, but the little I have seen of his speculations does not give me any confidence in his soundness as a scientific thinker. It is possible that some of the others may be distinguished names, for I am very little acquainted with the present state of this class of studies.

Mr Lincoln's answer[9](#) is excellent—quite beyond my expectation.

589.

TO JOHN PLUMMER[1](#)

Blackheath Park

Feb. 20, 1863

Dear Sir

I thank you for your letter, and for the book and newspaper you sent. Your friend's paper in the Coventry Herald[2](#) is of real promise. There is a clearness and discrimination in his mode of expressing his thoughts which augurs well for their quality. I will read Mr Chorley's book[3](#) as soon as I have time and shall be very glad to see you and him if you are able and disposed to come so far.

I am glad to hear that you are now chiefly employed in writing. Perhaps hitherto your influence with the operatives may have been all the greater for your remaining a factory workman, but henceforward, even if it were not a matter of necessity, you can certainly do more good by devoting yourself to such valuable writing as yours is. I am

Dear Sir

Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

Mr John Plummer

590.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Feb. 21 [1863]

Dear Sir,—

Although I am prevented by pressing occupations from accepting your invitation to join you in celebrating the glorious memory of Washington,² and the great work of liberation in which he took so important a part, I am thankful for the opportunity afforded me of associating myself, if only by letter, with the principles and purposes which are identified with that illustrious name.

The prospects of the human race are so deeply interested in the success of the great experiment which is working itself out in the United States, that the lovers of freedom and progress in other countries feel whatever injures, and still more whatever dishonours, America as a personal calamity. Foremost among all things which injure and dishonour a country stands the personal slavery of human beings. Rather than consent to the further extension of this scourge, the American people have voluntarily incurred all their present sacrifices; and because what was originally a war against slavery has grown into a war for its extinction, my hopes for the future welfare and greatness of the American Republic were never so high as in this, to superficial appearance, the darkest hour in its history.

I have the honour to be, dear sir, very faithfully yours,

J. S. Mill

591.

TO CHARLES A. CUMMINGS¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] Feb. 23. 1863

Dear Sir—

I duly received your letter of Feb. 2 & I thank you for the favour you have done me by sending me the Christian Examiner of January.²

My object in writing is not solely to make my warm acknowledgments for your kindly & generous estimate of my writings but also to set my country right with you in one point & myself in another. You are under some misapprehension in thinking that the writings which you honour with such high praise, have been neglected in England in comparison with my longer treatises. They have been much more widely read than ever those were, & have given me what I had not before, popular influence. I was

regarded till then as a writer on special scientific subjects & had been little heard of by the miscellaneous public. I am in a very different position now.

For the other misapprehension I am probably myself accountable & I only advert to it because if it were well founded, there would be less sympathy between my feelings & yours than there really is. I do not, as you seem to think, take a gloomy view of human prospects. Few persons look forward to the future career of humanity with more brilliant hopes than I do. I see, however, many perils ahead, which unless successfully avoided could blast these prospects, & I am more specially in a position to give warning of them since being in strong sympathy with the general tendencies of which we are all feeling the effects, I am more likely to be listened to than those who may be suspected of disliking them. You think from American experience that I have overrated the magnitude of some of the dangers. I am perhaps of all Englishmen the one who would most rejoice at finding that I had done so & who most warmly welcomes every indication which favours such a conclusion. But whatever may be their amount, the dangers are real, & unless constantly kept in view, will tend to increase; & neither human nature nor experience justify the belief that mankind will be sufficiently on their guard against evils arising from their own shortcomings shared by those around them. In order that political principles, requiring the occasional sacrifice of immediate inclinations, should be habitually present to the minds of a whole people, it is generally indispensable that these principles sh^d be embodied in institutions. I think it therefore essential that the principle that superior education is entitled to superior political might, sh^d be in some way constitutionally recognised. I suggested plural voting as a mode of doing this: if there be any better mode, I am ready to transfer my advocacy to that. But I attach far more importance to Mr Hare's system of election, which it gives me the greatest pleasure to see that you appreciate as I do. It would be worthy of America to inaugurate an improvement which is at once a more complete application than has ever been made of the democratic principle, & at the same time its greatest safeguard. With the system of representation of all instead of majorities only & of the whole people instead of only the male sex, America would afford to the world the first example in history of true democratic equality.

I omitted to say that I was not the founder of the W. R. though I was one of its writers from the commencement. At a much later period of my life I was for several years its proprietor & chief conductor.[3](#)

592.

TO HENRY SAMUEL CHAPMAN[1](#)

Blackheath Park

Feb. 24. 1863.

Dear Chapman

I am very much obliged to you for the information in your letters and for the newspapers and newspaper articles which you kindly sent, relating to the proceedings in the Legislature of New South Wales. I was not wholly uninformed on the subject, Mr Holden having opened a communication with me and also with Mr Hare: but your information has generally been both earlier and fuller than his. I was delighted with the debate on the second reading of the bill.² The fact that so many of the speakers had so thorough and intelligent an appreciation of Mr Hare's plan, is a most satisfactory proof that its advantages will be felt in other legislative assemblies when once they can be induced to look upon it as one of the questions of the day. At present few engaged in practical politics have begun to concern themselves about it. But those few are an increasing body, and by the time the question of the suffrage is again practically raised, it will not be possible to keep this question out of the discussion. The plan is making its way into America. The Christian Examiner, formerly the organ of Channing,³ and still representing the best minds of New England, takes it up very favourably in the number for January,⁴ and advises testing it by application to State elections.

I had noticed the change for the worse in the Melbourne correspondence of the Times. I used to read those letters with great interest while they rested on your authority, because I knew that matters would be regarded and judged on principles not very different from my own. They cannot have the same interest to me now, even if they were to be depended on as to facts, which you tell me they are not.

Buckle is, as you truly say, a great loss,⁵ and one which we are not likely to see replaced. Notwithstanding the undue breadth of many of his conclusions, and the want of a proper balance in his mind, he was performing a most valuable function in popularizing many important ideas, and stimulating the desire to apply general principles to the explanation and prediction of social facts. He has left, I am told, a great deal of manuscript, much of it in a state approaching to completion.

If I possessed photographic cards, I would with great pleasure send you one, but I have not adopted that fashion, and am not likely to adopt it; and I have refused so many applications for photographs of myself (some of them from persons whom I should have much liked to oblige) that I could not now with any consistency, comply with any.⁶

I shall be very glad to see your son⁷ when he is in town. I cannot have that pleasure at Easter, as I shall not be at home, but in the long vacation I shall hope to see him.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

593.

TO WILLIAM JAMES LINTON¹

Blackheath Park

Feb. 25 [1863]

Sir

My time is so fully occupied that I am quite unable to attend the meeting on Friday or to take any part in the proposed movement in favour of Poland.² I heartily sympathize in its object, and shall be very glad if the general feeling can be manifested in an imposing manner.

I Am Sir

Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

W. J. Linton Esq.

594.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath Park

Feb. 25. 1863.

Dear Sir

I am obliged to you for your letter, and if the sheet is not struck off (which I fear it is) I will add to the note in which you are mentioned,² what is necessary to prevent the misapprehension you desire to guard against.

Your explanation narrows the ground on which we differ, though it does not remove our difference; for, while I agree with you in discountenancing a purely empirical mode of judging of the tendencies of human actions and would, on that subject as on all others, endeavour to reach the widest and most general principles attainable, I cannot admit that any of these principles are *necessary*, or that the practical conclusions which can be drawn from them are even (absolutely) universal.

As I am writing I cannot refrain from saying that your "First Principles" appears to me a striking exposition of a consistent and imposing system of thought; of which, though I dissent from much, I agree in more.

I hope your health is much better than it was some time ago.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

595.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 28. 1863.

Dear Sir—

I send you the leaf of my reprint² containing the passage in which you are mentioned. I wish to be permitted to say that the corrected statement of your opinion derived from yourself, but I do not feel at liberty to say so without your permission.

I have thought it best to leave the note as it stood, & make the correction in an additional paragraph.³ But if you can suggest any alteration in the first mention of the note which would save me from seeming still to ascribe to you an opinion which you do not hold, I shall be happy to adopt it.

I am happy to hear that your health is so considerably improved.

596.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 9, 1863

Dear Chadwick

I send a paper on the Polish question, in the form of a letter to the Editor.² If you like you can alter the form to that of an article from a correspondent; but on the whole

probably it is better as it is. I have signed it with my initials, and have no objection to being known as the author.

I also inclose an article by my daughter on Greek politics,³ which is at your service if you like it. It is entirely her own, but I quite agree in all of it.

I will look out passages from the book on the Alps, and send you references to them.

Proofs would be agreeable if there is time and it is not inconvenient.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

597.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 10 [1863]

Dear Chadwick

I have returned the proof,² corrected, to the Editor.

I have no objection to being named in your leader, but I wish only my initials to be put to the letter itself; and I would rather that, in your first sentence, my name was introduced more indirectly. You might say “we feel thankful to a correspondent, whose initials sufficiently indicate his name” or some such words, and you might then go on mentioning me by name as at present.³

I would rather you did not add the sentence proposed in your letter, because I do not wish to be understood as having peculiar sources of information. Herzen’s and Ogareff’s writings are open to all the world, and the notification by the Insurrectionary Committee⁴ to which my letter refers was mentioned by the correspondents of some of the English newspapers.

Many thanks for your offer of separate slips, but I do not care to have any.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

598.

TO MR. JONES^{[1](#)}

Blackheath Park

March 13. [1863]

Mr Mill requests Mr Jones to make up a parcel for him of such books on the accompanying list as he is able to send by the end of next week.

These are independent of Kinglake's Crimean War,^{[2](#)} which Mr Mill wishes for as soon as it can be had, and which will be returned within a fortnight from the present time.

The "Inquiry into the Theories of History"^{[3](#)} if not already sent, may be dispensed with. If sent, this also will be returned in a short time.

Several other books in Mr Mill's possession are sent in the present parcel.

599.

TO [JOHN WILLIAM PARKER?]^{[1](#)}

Blackheath,

March 14, 1863

Dear Sir

I have sent the cover which I have selected.^{[2](#)}

Please add to the list of those who are to receive copies, Professor Cliffe Leslie, 1, York Street, Belfast.

I Am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

600.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN^{[1](#)}

Blackheath Park

March 16. 1863

Dear Sir

M. Littré has nearly ready for publication a life of M. Comte,² which would afford a very good occasion for a general estimate of M. Comte and of his philosophy. If you would like to have such an article from me, I would undertake it.³ I cannot exactly say how soon it could be ready, as I have more than one thing in hand which I should like to finish before commencing it. But I would promise it as early as is possible without a very inconvenient interruption of other things. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

601.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

March 22, 1863

Dear Sir,

I thank you very much for your note, and look forward to talking over the subject of it with you, when you come, which I hope will be very soon.—I need hardly say that a translation by you of anything I write, will be, in every sense of the word, an authorized translation.²—Your idea supplementary to the remarks on the sense of dignity, is well worth following out, and it would give me great satisfaction, if you would write something on the subject, and publish it with the translation.—I am,
yours very truly,

J. St. Mill.

602.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 24. [1863]

Dear Chadwick

The wine can be had in as few dozens as you please, and I will with pleasure take out, when we leave for Avignon on Saturday next, any order you like to give.

My daughter thinks that you can select passages from Senior² better than she can. She sends by this post, several scraps about America that she has copied out from books which she has been reading; and will make extracts from Prince Dolgoroukov's book on Russia³ if we get it, as we expect to do, to take with us to Avignon. She also sends a short article, of no pretension, on one of the points we talked of, the other day—the effect of the cheap press in keeping things right in Lancashire⁴—in case you think it is worth putting in your paper. I am,

Dear Chadwick
Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

603.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

March 25. 1863

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for your note, and for the papers you sent. The letter of the Daily News correspondent² is good and satisfactory. All recent information seems to confirm the statement that there is a renewal of excitement in favour of the war and that the bulk of the Democratic party now share it. It is impossible not to participate in your doubts as to the success of the North in effecting a complete reunion; but if it could be effected, I am not convinced by your letter that there need be any sacrifice of the principles of free government.

You will have observed Forster's notice for Friday on the subject of the war ships fitting out for the Confederates.³ I have long been wondering why he did not make this move sooner. There is to be a meeting of Trades Unionists tomorrow in favour of the North, at St James's Hall, at which Bright will preside. They have sent me an admission, and if I can, I intend to go.⁴

It will be a disgrace to Cambridge if Macleod gets the Professorship.⁵ Fawcett's qualifications I shall be better able to judge of after the publication of his book.⁶ But

at any rate I am very glad that there is a candidate of whom you are able to speak so highly as you do of Mr Courtney.

Honorary members of the P. E. Club can and do bring forward questions, and I will hand in yours (which are excellent) on Friday.⁷ I regret that you are not to be there, the more as I leave for Avignon on Saturday, but expect to be back for the June meeting and hope I may still see you this summer.—I will return your Daily News today or tomorrow. When at Avignon I shall have it sent to me regularly. The Spectator I shall regret to lose, but I believe it is not admitted into France. I am

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

604.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

April 2. 1863

Dear Mr Fawcett

Mr Kyllmann's office at Manchester is at 28 Brazenose Street; his lodgings are at 35 Ducie Street, Oxford Road. Mr Kyllmann will be very glad to see you, and hopes that he may be of some service to you, if you come to or through Manchester.

The work of Ogareff which I told you of, is entitled Essai sur la Situation Russe,² and is published by Trübner, in Paternoster Row.

I have brought your book³ with me here, and hope to have time to read it before I return to England. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

605.

TO HENRY SOLLY¹

S[aint] V[éran]

April 6. 1863

Dear Sir—

I am obliged to you for your letter, and am glad of the information it gives respecting the Working Men's Club & Institute Union² of which I previously knew very little. I have no doubt that in so far as these clubs take the place of the public house, they will be very useful, but I confess to some uncertainty whether they are a movement sufficiently in advance to meet the demands of the present time. I am doubtful whether an organised movement & subscriptions for the purpose of making the men of the working classes more comfortable away from the women & children, is the thing wanted now, so much as an effort on a large scale to improve their dwellings, & bring cooperative arrangements for comfort & mental improvement home to all of them without distinction of sex or age. I do not say this to discourage you, nor with any fear of its doing so, but to account for my not taking so warm an interest in the scheme as you seem to expect that I should do. I think your plan likely to do good, but that there are others likely to be still more useful.

606.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

S[aint] V[éran]

April 17. 1863

Dear Thornton—

The wine merchant yesterday dispatched to you a packing case containing six dozen of the Chateaneuf wine which you drank at Blackheath. According to the rate of speed of the French railways in the transport of goods you may expect to receive it some time between a fortnight & a month hence. I have paid for the wine & all expenses here & I inclose the receipted bill. The duty & charges of carriage you will have to pay on delivery.

It was pleasant to receive a letter from you dated Marlow. I know not only the country but the house, & remember well its view over that beautiful valley.² I am glad that I have carried you with me to so great an extent on the subject of Utilitarianism. What you say respecting the supposed case of Iphigenia³ does not at all contradict my opinion, as I never contended that the *feeling* of justice originates in a consideration of general utility, though I think it is that consideration which gives it its binding, & properly moral, character, and you yourself seem to think that in such a case as the one you suppose, the feeling of justice ought to yield to general utility.⁴ More than this no utilitarian can possibly ask. But I am inclined to think that such a case cannot possibly arise, or that the feeling of justice (except where, being divided against itself, it can be appealed on *both* sides) never need come into conflict with the dictates of utility. The case of Iphigenia was one of supposed religious duty, which where it intervenes, takes away the conflict, by removing the sense of moral wrong from the

sacrifice. The nearest approach to it that occurs to me within the purely social or political sphere is the case of a people required by a powerful enemy under penalty of extermination to surrender some distinguished citizen, say the Carthaginians in the case of Hannibal.⁵ Now in such a case as this I think there can be no doubt that the morality of utility requires that the people should fight to the last rather than comply with the demand: not only because of the special tie between the community & each of its members, & between the community & a benefactor who in the case supposed is demanded as a victim precisely because of the greatness of his services—but also for a more general reason—namely the reason which makes it right that a people inferior in strength should fight to the death against the attempt of a foreign despot to reduce it to slavery. For such iniquitous attempts, even by powers strong enough to succeed in them, are very much discouraged by the prospects of meeting with a desperate though unsuccessful resistance. The weak may not be able finally to withstand the strong if these persist in their tyranny, but they can make the tyranny cost the tyrant something, & that is much better than letting him indulge it gratis.

I think such a case as that of Hannibal comes within these reasons, & indeed is a mere case of the same principle.

607.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

S[aint] V[éran] April 23, 1863

Dear Sir—

Your letter of the 18th only reached me yesterday evening on our return from an absence of nearly a week.

Come by all means if you like, though I should not for an instant have thought of proposing it to you. I do not invite my friends to this place, unless in very rare cases when I happen to have an interval of leisure—because it is impossible for me when here, to give them the time I sh^d wish to give, or shew them the attention to which they are entitled. The greater part of all my intellectual work is done in the virtual solitude in which we live here, & the time which is not taken up in writing (in which at present both of us are occupied) we spend in wandering alone about the mountains and wilds of this part of France, gathering the health & spirits which are necessary to render life in England endurable to us.² If, knowing this, you still like to come, I can only say that I shall be glad to see what I can of you; & I should not have said so much if you had not expressed yourself as if your motive for coming to Avignon was chiefly to see us & I sh^d very much regret that you sh^d either be disappointed or think us unfriendly in case you sh^d see less of us than you expect.³

I am much gratified by what you say about Mr Grote,⁴ & am glad that you have seen enough of him to appreciate him so fully. I had no doubt that he would be interested by your Herculean investigations, which I am glad to hear are going on favourably.

608.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon.

April 23. 1863.

Dear Sir

I am sorry that your visit to London should have been during one of my frequent absences, and no less so that your note could not receive an answer in time. As I expect to return in June, I hope to be more fortunate in the course of the summer. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

609.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

April 24. 1863.

Dear Chadwick

Your letter was put into my hand just as we were starting for an excursion to Mirabeau and among the lower Alps of Provence. We have just returned, and I send by this post an article on Greece by my daughter,² if you should still think it suitable. She is now occupying herself in translating extracts from some exceedingly interesting articles in the late numbers of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* on the present state of Turkey,³ which she will forward before long.

I have to ask you to excuse me to Mrs Chadwick for having so long delayed an answer to her letter about the wine, but the delay has been caused by my not having been able to get the facts from the wine merchant before now. I now find that the same wine you tasted at Blackheath will cost 75 francs (£3) for a cask containing 50 litres, or about six dozen; the cask will be about 18 francs extra, and the cost of journey and duty amounts to about eight shillings a dozen. I have since we arrived here, tasted a different quality of wine, which I think good, and even prefer to the other, and of which I mean to lay in a small stock myself—which is considerably cheaper. The Chateauneuf you tasted at Blackheath is of the vintage of 1858; this of which I now speak is also Chateauneuf, but of 1861, and grown by a different

proprietor. It is less dry and rough and approaches more to the quality of Burgundy. It is only 50 francs (£2) the 50 litre cask; the other expenses being of course the same. I believe it would be excellent wine for keeping, and very good in two years time. If you should like to have either of these, I shall be very glad to order and forward it for you. If you prefer to have the wine in bottles, I do not think the additional cost would be much, as the wine here is all charged by the litre measure, and the bottles cost scarcely more than the cask.

I quite agree with you about the great importance of the principle of Scholefield's bill,⁴ and I was glad to see that it appeared to be received more favourably than most of the former extensions of the principle of limited responsibility. It is a good sign that the Saturday Review supports it,⁵ which, on such subjects, in general servilely follows Lord Overstone. I will watch the progress of the bill, and if I see need, I will send you something about it, but it seems to me that you have yourself treated it extremely well. I am

Dear Chadwick
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

610.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

S[aint] V[éran]

May 4. 1863

Dear Sir

It is my full intention to be present at the June meeting of the P[olitical] E[conomy] Club & your letter gives me additional reason for doing so. I am glad your question² is to come on then instead of in July.

It does not seem to me that taskwork even if it could be made universal would destroy the partial opposition of interests between employers & employed. There would still remain the question of the rate of payment & the employers & workmen, supposing them both to be entirely selfish, could not have the same wishes as to that point. Nothing that I can imagine except cooperation would entirely take away the antagonism. But in order to do so, it is not necessary that cooperation should be universal. If it was only very frequent, a labourer who remained in the employment of an individual & who received from him as much (for labour of the same efficiency) as he could earn under cooperation, would see that he had no reason to complain. The employer's profits would then be a mere consequence of increased efficiency in the

instruments of production, occasioned by private ownership of them. The capitalist would only take from the workmen what he first gave them.

Not to mention that cooperation in the form of participation of the labourers in the profits, would be perfectly compatible with individual ownership & would go much nearer to producing identity of interest than taskwork would.

Hoping to see you in a month's time, I am

611.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

May 6. 1863

Dear Chadwick

I send you by this post an article on [Servia²](#) by my daughter. You will see she avails herself of your permission to undertake the Eastern question. If however there should be a debate of any consequence on Servia in the H. of Commons in the meantime, this article would not be fit for insertion without alteration, and she would be glad in that case either to alter it or to write another in its place, if you think the subject likely to interest your readers.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

612.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Saint Véran, Avignon, May 9, 1863

I did not for an instant make any of the suppositions which you deprecate, in reference to your first note. What I did fear, was that you were perhaps a little hurt at my not having met with greater warmth the intimation of your project of coming to Avignon.² I should extremely regret if this were the case, and I do not think it would be so, if you were fully aware of the great esteem and respect I have for you and of the sincerity of my wish to cultivate your friendship. I hope the additional letter you promise will set me at ease on this subject.—I am much pleased, though not at all surprised, at the feelings you express towards Mr. Grote.—I am glad that you will see something of Oxford. The two old universities are a feature in English national life

which foreigners seldom see enough of to possess the key to many of the peculiarities of character of the lettered classes of England, compared with those of other countries. I suppose you will see Professor Max Müller, who has been there long enough to understand the place, and will be able to assist you with many explanations. I hope your visit will enable you to make good progress with your Herculean labours.

613.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

May 17. 1863.

Dear Mr Fawcett

I inclose a testimonial, which renders it needless for me to express any otherwise the high opinion I have of your book² and the great pleasure I had in reading it. Through the whole volume I did not find more than a few half sentences here and there which appeared to me defective in point of Political Economy, and even there I found, by things you said elsewhere, that you were in no error on the points involved. Some of the modes you have employed of shortening and simplifying the exposition seem to me happy; others are perhaps discussable. In particular, that of going at once to money prices, without first discussing the general laws of exchange value, answers very well in the simpler questions, but you were not able to adhere to it when you came to international values and in consequence that part of the book has not all the clearness which you have generally succeeded so well in attaining: the natural difficulties of that intricate question being increased by requiring the readers to adopt the statement by barter, for which nothing preceding has prepared them. I think, too (as Ricardo thought) that it is of importance to cultivate in learners the habit of arguing questions at first on the supposition of barter, in order to adjourn the difficulties which arise from the wrong and confused associations which cling to the idea of money. All this however can be better discussed between us *viva voce*.

I should have liked to hear the discussion on Cooperation.³ I suppose what your opponents questioned was merely the probability of its success in the more difficult kinds of industrial enterprise. Of such a doubt one can only say, *Solvitur* (or *Solvetur*) *ambulando*. The thing is practicable or not, according to the intellectual and moral qualities of those who attempt it. Doubtless many will attempt it and fail, but some, and in the end, many, will succeed. It is not necessary that all should. The success of cooperation on any large scale, will establish a practical minimum of wages, and will strike at the root of the opposition of apparent interest between employers and labourers, since whatever profit the capitalist can obtain in the face of cooperation, must be a mere equivalent for the advantage the enterprise derives from his capital, skill, and unity of management. I have put this view of the case before Leslie in answering a letter from him on the subject.⁴

Roebuck's⁵ and Horsman's⁶ speeches were well calculated to provoke a reaction and I am glad that you think they have done so. I am afraid however that Horsman's will do much harm in the United States. The news from America is encouraging. The North seems to be, for the first time, in possession of the whole Mississippi,⁷ and cutting off the supplies from Texas must tell on the weakest point of the Slaveholders' Confederacy. (One should never use any other designation for it than this, the one adopted by the Emancipation Society of Manchester). But the best thing of all is that the North does not seem to be in the least discouraged. If only their patience and determination hold out, they must yet succeed. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

614.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Testimonial to Henry Fawcett.

Having been asked by Mr. Fawcett to express my opinion respecting his qualifications for the office of Professor of Political Economy, I have no hesitation in saying that I think them of a very high order. Mr. Fawcett's "Manual of Political Economy",² a book to which justice is hardly done by so unambitious a title, shews a really scientific knowledge of the subject, both in its principles and in their applications; the exposition is clear and precise, and many of the illustrations of the more difficult points are original, and go into the heart of the subject. The objection which might possibly have arisen from Mr. Fawcett's inability to read his Lectures is obviated by his great practice and readiness in extemporaneous speaking. Altogether I think that the selection of Mr. Fawcett to fill the Chair of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge would be creditable to the University, and beneficial to the purposes of the Professorship.

J. Stuart Mill

May 17, 1863

615.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 18 mai 1863.

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Votre lettre, quoique portant la date du 2 mai, ne m'est parvenue que depuis trois jours. M. Parker ne m'a jamais rien dit de l'intention qu'on lui suppose. Cependant, le bruit dont parle M. Trübner² ne m'est pas inconnu, m'ayant été porté par un autre libraire qui désirait devenir mon éditeur,³ et à qui je donnai un accueil assez favorable, sans pourtant me lier par aucune promesse. Si le cas arrivait, et que j'eusse à choisir un nouvel éditeur votre recommandation de M. Trübner et votre amitié pour lui seraient pour moi un grand motif de préférence. Ceci n'est pas un vain compliment, mais l'effet de la véritable estime que j'ai depuis longtemps pour vous.

Nous serons de retour à Blackheath au mois de Juin, et ce serait un vrai plaisir pour moi de vous revoir. Si vous me faites le plaisir de venir me voir, je vous engage à m'écrire un mot la veille d'assez bonne heure pour que j'aie le temps de vous avertir si je suis empêché d'être chez moi le jour que vous aurez choisi. Je voudrais vous éviter l'ennui de faire inutilement une si longue course.⁴

616.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, June 6 [1863].

We have just returned and shall be very glad to see you.—Will you do us the pleasure of dining with us to-morrow, when I hope to be able to introduce you to Professor Bain, who is in London for a short time. Ever yours truly,

J. St. Mill.

617.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, Thursday

[June 11, 1863]

M. Louis Blanc . . . has fixed to dine with us on Sunday (at five). We shall therefore hope to see you and Mr. Wessel² on Sunday . . .

Very Truly Yours

J. St. Mill.

618.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, June 16, 1863.

Be assured that I shall never refuse to hear anything you may wish to communicate, either about yourself or any other subject. Whatever you desire to say, it is for yourself to judge of the necessity of saying it. As to there being any need of justifying, of excusing, or explaining anything to us, there is not the smallest shadow of anything of the kind. I am not aware of your having been maligned by anyone²—certainly not to us. Nobody has ever said of you, in our hearing or to our knowledge, so much as an uncomplimentary word. And if anyone had, it would not have produced a particle of effect on either of us. We know enough of you to judge for ourselves, and our esteem and respect could be of very little worth, if it could be lessened either by anybody's tittle-tattle, or by such small matters as those you mention in your letter, even if we perceived them. So that if this is all, you may be perfectly at ease.—But some expressions in your letter make me fear that this is not all, and that you wish to say something quite unexpected on our part, the answer to which no conviction, however strong, of our regard and friendship could make other than painful to you. If I rightly understand the wishes you speak of³—which I sincerely hope I do not—, it does not rest with me to say anything, but that I should never willingly be the smallest obstacle to them. But you seem to ask my opinion, and if I give it sincerely, I have no choice but to say—painful as it is to say it—that I do not think you have any chance. If there were any unfavourable impression respecting you, that might be altered. But there is not the smallest particle of it,—but an unchangeable high opinion of you and the most genuine friendly feeling.—If your letter did not mean what I suppose, I must trust to your kindness to forgive the misunderstanding. But if it did, do not for a moment suppose that I am unwilling to hear anything you wish to say. If you think fit to carry the matter farther, either by speech or writing,—even if only for the relief of your own feelings—, you will have my truest sympathy, as you have my sincere friendship and esteem.—We hope to see you and your friend to-morrow, and I hope, nothing that has passed will make any difference in your feelings towards us, who remain unchanged to you, and that you will not allow it to affect in any degree our future intercourse.

I Am Yours Very Sincerely

J. St. Mill.

619.

TO HARRIET GROTE¹

Blackheath

June 16. 1863

Dear Mrs Grote

I am extremely obliged to you for D^f Schlesinger's [2](#) note. When it came, I was on the point of writing to tell you and Mr Grote the same good news about Gomperz. I have seen him twice, the last time for a whole evening, and he was, to all appearance, quite himself again. D^f Schlesinger's expectation of his immediately returning to Vienna has not been fulfilled. He is not now with D^f Schlesinger, but is at the Victoria Hotel, Euston Square, with a friend named Wessel who has joined him from Vienna. What his intentions are about staying or going, I do not at present know.—Pray thank Mr Grote for his note and the kind trouble he took about the luggage.

I Am
Dear Mrs Grote
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

620.

TO F. W. JONES [1](#)

[Summer? 1863]

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communication dated the 18th inst. and to express my thanks to the Society for having done me the honour to elect me an honorary member. The subject of a Wholesale Agency [2](#) which is occupying the attention of the Society is one of great importance, and I hope it will be found practical to establish such an agency, both as a great means of saving expense, and as a valuable extension of the Co-operative principle. It is the enormous number of mere distributors who are not producers that really eat up the produce of labour, much more than the mere profits of Capital, which, in a great majority of cases, are not more than a reasonable equivalent for the industry which created the capital and the frugality which prevents it from being squandered. The direction in which I look for the greatest improvement in Social economy, is the suppression of the vast number of middlemen who share among themselves so large a proportion of the produce of the country, while the service they render though indispensable, might be as well and better performed by a tenth part of their number.

621.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT [1](#)

Blackheath, July 2, 1863

Madam—

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your note, dated June the 30th, which has just reached me. It will not be in my power to attend the meeting of the society, but I highly applaud its intention of proposing a test for the education of women—a proposition which I hope goes the length of affording them the same advantages in respect to examinations for certificates and degrees which are open to men. If these are useful and necessary means of rendering education efficient in the case of men, they must be equally so in the case of women, and will certainly be adopted as soon as the latter object is as seriously desired as the former.—I am, &c.,

J. S. Mill

622.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

July 3. 1863

Dear Sir

Many thanks for your very interesting letter. I am sorry that I shall not see you at the Club² this evening. If it is not inconvenient to you will you come on *Sunday* next (5th) and dine with us at six? My friend Professor Bain is coming, and would, I am sure, like much to see you; and I cannot ask you to come in the morning, as I may perhaps be out. I am the more desirous that you should come on Sunday, because I have an engagement of some standing, which will take me out of town on Monday by an early train, and I shall certainly not return till Thursday evening. If you cannot come next Sunday, can you the Sunday after? but if you leave town before then, I must arrange to return by Friday or Saturday, and so should be glad to know what your plans are. If you address a line here saying on which of these days you will come, it will be forwarded to me. Come to dinner if possible, otherwise at any hour of the day that suits you.

I Am Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

623.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 5. 1863

Dear Sir—

I have been intending to write to you almost from the time when you left, but delayed, partly because I thought I might hear from you & partly because I was expecting an opportunity of seeing Mr Grote, who would certainly have wished to send you a friendly message. I have been disappointed however & shall not be able to see him for more than a week & will therefore no longer delay writing to you, though I have nothing particular to say except to express our earnest hope that your health is by this time completely restored,² & our unalterable feelings of friendship and regard.

Our life which has been more than usually broken in upon during the last month owing to the presence of several persons³ in London whom I highly value, or to whom attentions were due from me which I have few opportunities of paying—is now about to relapse into its usual wholesome tranquillity; & I have been enabled to have a few days work at my book on Hamilton with which I now mean to persevere steadily. I have always found that real intellectual work is to me all that Cicero in his oration pro Archia says of literature—when one wants healthy excitement, an outlet for energy, active pleasure, or consolation, nothing else affords it in the same degree.⁴ It would give me great comfort to see you reaping the same benefits from the same cause. Your clear, firm intellect & your great store of acquired knowledge qualify you to take a high position not only as a scholar but as a writer & thinker, & I know nothing to prevent your doing so unless you allow yourself to be discouraged by too great dissatisfaction with what you produce. That you must be dissatisfied is inevitable, for nobody ever does anything of much value unless his standard of excellence is much above his present powers of execution. But if one gives way to discouragement this disparity is always increasing, for self-culture raises one's standard always higher & higher, so that unless one keeps one's powers of execution in such full exercise as makes them also grow *pari passu*, one is driven to absolute despair. Ever since I have had eight or ten years of intellectual activity to look back upon I have often said to myself, If my judgment were what it is now, & my powers of execution only what they were a few years ago, I sh^d perhaps never have had the heart to do anything. I have gone on chiefly because my standard though always far above myself never seemed at an absolutely unattainable distance, and I have generally found that however discontented I might be with the best that I could do, others who had not by dwelling on the subject formed the same high idea of what there was to be done, did not perceive a tenth part of the shortcomings which I myself saw, & that what was not good enough for me was often sufficient to be very useful to them. And I feel certain that you will find exactly the same.

With compliments to [M^{rs}?] J. Wertheimstein⁵ & kind regards to Mr Wessel, I am

624.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Victoria Hotel, Ashford

Tuesday ev'g
[July 7, 1863]

Dearest Lily—

I had a long detention in town on Monday from having omitted to procure the July time table. The train had been changed from 9/45 to 9/15 and when I arrived it had been just five minutes gone. So I had to wait for another train at half past 11 during which I had my hair cut and gave Peppercorn² a commission to buy Brighton stock. I arrived here just before two and had only half a day's walk. That however was pleasant, and we have been out from six in the morning to six in the evening today.

I have decided to return home on Friday instead of Thursday. I found Irvine³ disposed to stay—and it appears that he took a walk before I came, to a boggy neighbourhood where he found quantities of plants that I want to find, and I cannot in conscience ask him to go there again with me until I have gone with him all the walks he wants to take—which will fully occupy Wednesday & Thursday. So you may expect me, dear, on Friday evening. I will write again on Thursday.

This new disturbance in Greece is vexatious⁴—but I hope it is only the soldiery, who we knew are bad, and that it will be put down.

Your Affectionate

J.S.M.

625.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

le 13 juillet 1863

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

M. le professeur Cairnes, l'auteur du livre que sans doute vous connaissez sur l'esclavage américain,[2](#) doit diner avec nous jeudi à 6 h. et ce serait un grand plaisir pour nous si vous pouviez et vouliez y venir.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

626.

TO JOHN PLUMMER[1](#)

Blackheath

July 13, 1863

Dear Sir

I shall be here for the next two months at least, and if you will give me a line two or three days before you come I will take care not to miss you. I am much interested by what you tell me of your proceedings and shall be happy to lend you any books I have that will be likely to be of use. I am

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

627.

TO JOHN PLUMMER[1](#)

Blackheath

July 17. 1863.

Dear Sir

If your arrangements should make it convenient to you to be here at five o'clock p.m. to dine with me on Monday next, it will give me great pleasure. If not, I shall be happy to see you at 12 o'clock as you appoint in your letter.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

628.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL [1](#)

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 18 juillet 1863

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je vous remercie de votre bon souvenir, et aussi du cadeau de votre livre, [2](#) bien qu'il ne soit pas encore arrivé. Le sujet dont il traite est comme vous le dites très bien à l'ordre du jour, et je tiens la critique des Evangiles comme encore plus importante au progrès dans ce pays-ci qu'en France. L'échange d'idées avec vous est pour moi une trop vieille habitude pour ne pas la reprendre avec plaisir. Je me suis souvent rappelé les paroles de M. Enfantin [3](#) lors de la dispersion de la société de Ménilmontant [4](#) —que l'héritage du Saint-Simonisme allait fournir des pensées et des moyens de combat à toutes les opinions qui divisent l'Europe. Il en a été ainsi, et les anciens Saint-Simoniens ont joué un rôle important et j'ajoute, utile, dans tous les camps. Je me ferai un plaisir d'aller vous voir la première fois que je me trouverai à Paris pour y rester quelques jours. Ordinairement je ne traverse Paris qu'en courant, et sans m'y arrêter même une seule nuit.—Avec des compliments amicaux pour M. votre frère, [5](#)

Je Suis Toujours, Mon Cher D'Eichthal,
Votre Bien Dévoué

J. S. Mill

629.

TO JOHN GORHAM PALFREY [1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark] July 18, 1863

Dear Sir—

Want of time has prevented me from sooner acknowledging the present of your two works; as it still obliges me to postpone the pleasure I expect to derive from your History of New England. [2](#) But I will not any longer defer expressing to you my

sincere thanks for your having given me the opportunity of reading your two series of papers on the Slave Power.³ Had but such a book as yours been in the hands of our people at the commencement of the present contest, I think that it would have saved many from disgracing themselves & their country by sympathizing with the atrocious slaveholding conspiracy.

They had a slight though wholly insufficient excuse in their total ignorance of all the antecedents of the question. But now they have contracted the habit of siding with tyrants & the most complete proof that could be laid before them of the character of the tyranny would now make comparatively little impression on them. I feel the warmest sympathy with the tone & spirit of your book & the highest admiration for the band of men, of whom you are one, who founded & led the AntiSlavery party in the U.S. in still worse times than these, and I have found myself often exclaiming as I read your book that the noble Commonwealth of Massachusetts will yet redeem America & the world.

630.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Blackheath Park

le 23 juillet 1863

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Le livre² que vous avez bien voulu me destiner, m'est parvenu avant votre seconde lettre. Je n'avais pas d'inquiétude sur son arrivée, étant de longtemps accoutumé aux délais de libraires français. Je n'en fis mention dans ma lettre que pour expliquer pourquoi je ne vous disais rien d'un livre que je n'avais pas encore reçu. Maintenant que je le possède, je me promets de le lire avec le plus grand intérêt. Je me souviens que je vous dois déjà la connaissance des écrits si importants de M. Salvador³ sur la même question, et sur bien d'autres étroitement liées avec elle. Je suis charmé d'avoir une étude de ce sujet, faite de votre point de vue.

Moi aussi j'ai été frappé de l'article du Westminster Review sur le Saint-Simonisme,⁴ sans avoir même des soupçons sur la source d'où il provient. Votre confirmation de son exactitude serait très précieuse à l'auteur quel qu'il soit.

Excusez si je n'écris pas davantage, étant actuellement très occupé.

Votre Très Dévoué

J. S. Mill

631.

TO J. STUART STUART-GLENNIE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 23, 1863

Dear Sir—

Dr Tyndall's² answer to your question must be considered, I sh^d think, to set at rest all doubt respecting the complete establishment of the law of Conservation of Force so far as regards the mutual convertibility of Heat & Mechanical motion. Though the law is not yet similarly established in any other of its subdivisions, there is good reason to expect that it will be so, & I am quite willing to accept it hypothetically as established.

Supposing this mutual convertibility to be an universal law it will necessarily modify at least in the mode of expression, much of the received physical & metaphysical philosophy; & in endeavouring, even in the present state of the subject, to discover what these modifications ought to be, you are engaged not only in a very useful undertaking,³ but in one for which the letter you have written to me shews that you have a considerable amount of qualification. I would therefore encourage you to go on, and as the best help I can give you, is to offer such remarks as occur to me on any part of your speculations which you may communicate to me, I will begin doing so with your letter.

With regard to Matter, there has long been a growing tendency in thinkers to regard its particles as mere centres of force—even as local centres arbitrarily assumed to facilitate calculation and not implying the hypothesis of an absolute minimum. I think also that philosophers have long since given up the conception of Inertia in the sense in which you contend against it. No one any longer speaks of a *vis inertiae*, sufficient of itself to neutralise part of an impelling force. It is quite understood that as much force as is lost by the impinging body is always transferred to the impinged, at least in the form of pressure, & that if this is often imperceptible to the senses it is because a small amount of force is distributed over so great a bulk that the effect on the whole is that of an inappreciable fraction. We may now add as the complement & correction of this doctrine that force which is lost as motion, reappears in some other shape. With respect to Cause I confess I cannot see that the philosophical conception of it is at all altered by the new principle. The *existence* of force, no doubt, must now be placed as the existence of matter was before, among those facts which having in their nature no beginning are not dependent on any Cause. The existence of a certain quantity of Force, as of a certain quantity of Matter, becomes itself one of the primeval causes. But every change of state, from one manifestation of force to another (as from locomotion to heat or conversely) remains an *event*, dependent on a certain combination of *previous* conditions & our conception of Causation is still, in regard to such events, exactly what it was before. Not to mention that the ultimate effects,

which follow from these different manifestations—e.g. the locomotion which we see, & the heat which we feel—remain essentially & irrevocably different as they were before. They are shewn indeed to be consequences of the same Primeval Cause, under different sets of collateral conditions, but neither this, nor anything else, can make them identical in themselves; the sensations are different—& do not coexist as the causes do: they are effects dependent as they have always been considered to be upon a law of sequence.

The mutuality of action, of which the range is so greatly extended by the discovery of the Conservation of Force, does not as it seems to me affect the idea of Cause. Even if established as the universal law of all action, it would only shew that all, instead of merely some, Causes are reacted upon by their effects; that there is reciprocal succession between the different links of two series. This phenomenon is always allowed for in the inductive theory of Cause. It is always recognized, for example, in the phenomena of gravitation. The position of every body in the solar system is the joint effect of the position of all the other bodies of the system, and it also itself exerts an influence on the position of each of them. But this is still a case of succession not of coexistence, for only one of these relative positions of all the bodies can exist at a time, & the change from one position to another is effected by motion which is successive. If the position of each body were merely a fact in correlation with the position of every other, all the different positions mutually determining one another, the system would be in equilibrium & all motion would cease. That it does not cease proves that the present position of each body is determining not the *present* position of every other, but a *change* in that position. So that even in this example (the most favourable of all to you because gravitation has not been proved to require time for its transmission) you need the old idea of Causation to account for the facts.

I may add that if a different definition is now wanted of Cause & Effect it would be necessary to look out for clearer expressions than “a relation” & the “realization” of that relation, terms which as it seems to me require explanation still more than Cause & Effect do.

I shall always be happy to discuss these matters further with you either by word of mouth or in writing.

632.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

July 26. 1863

Dear Sir

I thank you for sending me some more of your writings. Independently of the value of their matter, I have been struck with the goodness of the composition, which, in self-

instructed writers even of great merit, often remains far below the standard of their thoughts. One who has so much both useful and interesting to say, and who can say it so well, is right to seek admittance into some of the higher periodicals. If you like to send your article to McMillan through me, I shall be happy to take charge of it; or, if you send it direct to the editor, and let me know just before, I will write a note to Mr Masson² which may perhaps cause it to be earlier attended to.

My daughter thanks you for your present, and will be very happy to see both yourself and Mrs Plummer should you be again in London.

I suppose you have received by this time a parcel from my publisher containing all my writings which you did not already possess, except a small volume of Political Economy essays,³ which is out of print. The other books which I promised to send you will speedily follow. I am

Dear Sir
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

633.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath, July 29, 1863.

I have delayed writing to you for several days after receiving your letter of July 18, because that letter made me hope that I should before this time receive another which might perhaps explain some part of the first. I wish that anything I could say would relieve the unhappiness of which your letter contains so much proof. In so far as it is caused by the notion that you have in England—at Oxford or anywhere else—enemies who plot against you and delight in making you suffer, I am convinced that you will some day look upon this as the most visionary phantom which morbid nervous excitement could conjure up.² Consider the total absence of motive for such malignity, and the extreme improbability that it would be harboured against one the whole of whose character and demeanour inspire the most friendly as well as respectful feelings. But what makes this delusion so painful to us, is the measure it gives of what you are suffering from other causes. The alleviation of that can not, in the nature of the case, come from others, but must come from yourself. There is a remedy for most sufferings. But as far as my experience goes, it is to be found only in resolutely turning the mind to other things. You have noble objects: you have intellect and acquirements, which can be made useful to the world, and public spirit to desire to put them to that use. It is uphill work, at first, to prescribe to yourself as a task, what could be more agreeably and easily done from a genial impulse; but it is what everybody has to do, who accomplishes anything considerable, for nobody can command genial impulses at pleasure. If you would only set yourself in a determined

manner to complete any of the literary undertakings you have had in view, forcing yourself to work at it a certain (not too great) number of hours every day till it is finished, you will find that existence will become much more bearable to you even from the first. But this should be done regularly, as men transact official or professional business; and it should not be done to the detriment of the health. The thoughts can be trained to flow in a given channel only by the aid of habit.—You express yourself, as you always do, much too warmly about what you consider as your obligations to me. It is a very small claim on gratitude to give a little of one's society to a man whom one esteems and likes, and I have not had an opportunity of shewing my regard for you in any other way, except the very easy one of introducing you to Mr. Grote. You say that I have two different languages to you, and that one of them makes you fear that you are destined always to be the subject of the greatest misconceptions. If you mean that I misconceive you, I entreat you, my dear friend, to speak plainly to me, and tell me *in what*—that I may either clear the matter up by shewing that I do not think of you as you suppose, or if I really do misunderstand you in any respect, that the error may be corrected. Any thing uncomplimentary to you, anything that it could give you pain to know, I am the farthest possible from thinking, and am anxious to know what, in my language to you at any time, can have given you so groundless an idea.—Our health which you inquire about in so kind a manner, is much as usual; but we are not at all easy in our minds, for we are really anxious about you. It would be a great relief to us if we knew that you had exchanged a life of brooding over painful thoughts for a healthful exertion of the active faculties.—Mrs. Grote has many times inquired after you with kind interest, and Mr. Bain regretted your departure, as he had hoped to have some more conversation with you. When I last saw Mr. Grote, he said, he was going to write to you. . . .

634.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath

July 30. 1863

Dear Sir

I am sorry to have put you to inconvenience by my bad writing. My address when in France is Saint-Véran, Avignon. Avignon, France, is however a sufficient direction.

I have had some thoughts of printing a cheap edition of my Political Economy,² but as I cannot do so without my publisher's consent until the edition now on sale is exhausted, I should be glad of any information you could give me, that might lead him to think his interest would not suffer by it. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

635.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Blackheath

Aug. 1. 1863

Dear Sir

My proposal to write on Comte was connected with the Life, with extracts from his Correspondence, which has long been in preparation by M. Littré,² and which may now, I believe, be expected very soon, but perhaps not so soon as October. In any case my being able to write the article depends on your being able to wait some time for it, as I have work in hand which requires continuity of thought, and which would suffer very much if I were to break it off and take up a quite different train of ideas. In anything I write for you on such a subject, I desire to do my very best, and to be able to give it my undivided attention. I cannot, therefore, say at present how soon I shall be able to write it, certainly not for the next number. I regret that I am unable to help you at a time when help would be particularly useful to you. Your time and thoughts may well be taken up by so important a medical discovery,³ which I earnestly hope may prove as beneficial both to the world and to yourself as there is reason to anticipate. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

636.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

le 3 août 1863

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc,

Etes-vous libre quelque jour de la semaine prochaine commençant Lundi le 10 août?
En ce cas vous nous feriez beaucoup de plaisir si vous voulez venir diner avec nous.
Nous dinons à six heures.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

637.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Aug. 24. 1863

Dear Mr Fawcett

Stephen's² letter contained some very interesting information which I have seen nowhere else; the manifestations in Massachusetts on the setting out of a negro regiment,³ and still more, the prospect of a more thorough Emancipation Act in Missouri.⁴ I showed the letter to Mr Hare, who happened to be here, and then sent it by post to your father as you desired.

Everything now looks encouraging,⁵ both for the success of the North, and for the cause of negro emancipation. But nothing that has come from America has so strongly impressed me, as the manifesto of the Committee of negroes to induce their fellow negroes to enlist⁶—so absurdly ridiculed for its highflown language. I was not at all prepared for anything so admirable in tone and feeling. Degraded and looked down upon as these people are said to be, their strongest feelings were not as negroes but as citizens and republicans—what they expected to tell on the negroes of the north and make them give their lives for the cause was not the interests or the wrongs of their race; it was the idea that they were to fight for liberty, and humanity, and civilization, and that the improvement of the world would go back if the North did not prevail. Is not this noble? And not a soul seems to have noticed it. One would think that the most highminded and heroic feelings, impelling to corresponding actions, were the commonest and most natural things in the world, in a despised and downtrodden race. I suppose the truth is, nobody read the manifesto.

We leave for Avignon about the end of the month, and shall not return till February.
Let me hear from you sometimes.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

638.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

Aug. 25. 1863

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Nous partons pour Avignon au commencement de la semaine prochaine, mais avant de partir je vous prie de m'informer quels sont ceux de mes écrits dont je vous ai envoyé des exemplaires, afin que je me donne le plaisir de vous offrir les autres.

Je serais charmé s'ils pouvaient vous donner autant de plaisir que j'ai retiré de la lecture de votre grand ouvrage historique.² Une histoire de la Révolution du point de vue socialiste, manquait auparavant, et il en rejaillit mille lumières nouvelles. Je me trouve souvent, à votre égard, dans un désaccord d'opinions, non total, mais partiel, que vous n'aurez pas de peine à concevoir. Mais l'impression toujours dominante est d'estime et d'admiration. Même lorsque je vois les faits autrement que vous, il est très important de reconnaître qu'ils peuvent être vus comme vous les voyez.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

639.

TO JOSEPHINE VON WERTHEIMSTEIN¹

Blackheath Park, Kent,

le 25 août 1863.

Madame, pardonnez-moi, de n'avoir fait jusqu'ici aucune réponse directe à la lettre que vous avez bien voulu m'écrire. Je croyais mieux remplir votre désir en écrivant à celui qui est, à si juste titre, l'Objet de notre commune sollicitude.² J'écrivis sans délai, mais comme depuis lors je n'ai pas eu de ses nouvelles, je n'ose presque pas lui écrire de nouveau sans avoir préalablement demandé à vous ou à M. Wessel dans quel état d'esprit il se trouve maintenant. En même temps je remplis le devoir de vous assurer directement, à quel point nous partageons votre peine et votre inquiétude.

Vous vous êtes servie, Madame, dans votre lettre, d'expressions de reconnaissance très au-delà de mon droit. Je serais trop heureux de pouvoir les mériter, mais jusqu'ici je ne vois presque rien que j'aie fait pour lui. S'il y a quelque chose que j'aurais pu faire, c'eût été peut-être de lui donner, par des preuves d'estime, la confiance qui lui manquait en lui-même. Ces preuves d'estime il les a eues, non seulement de moi, mais de M. Grote, et, je le crois sincèrement, de tous ceux qui l'ont connu ici. Cela n'a servi à rien quant à présent, mais il faut croire que cela ne sera pas perdu dans l'avenir. J'ai reconnu en lui, dès le commencement, une haute capacité intellectuelle: cette impression est allée toujours en s'accroissant, tandis-qu'une connaissance plus intime y a ajouté une véritable estime morale. Ce n'est que plus tard que j'ai reconnu chez lui cette extrême sensibilité aux impressions pénibles qui le rend en même temps très susceptible de souffrance et peu accessible aux consolations. En lui écrivant je m'efforce toujours à le décider à en chercher dans les hauts travaux intellectuels dont il est si capable, et dans la carrière utile et honorable qu'il peut remplir dans le monde de l'intelligence comme dans celui des intérêts sociaux. Si j'ai quelque pouvoir sur son esprit, je ne me laisserai pas de l'exercer dans ce sens: et, ses autres amis aidant, nous finirons peut-être par réussir. . . . Si [M. Wessel] est encore avec vous, je lui aurai une véritable obligation toutes les fois qu'il voudra bien nous donner des nouvelles de son ami. . . .

640.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

Aug. 28. 1863

Dear Sir

I have received your article, and after reading it have sent it to Mr Masson with a strong recommendation of it and of its author.²

Though it is not a striking article, it is a very good one, and not only such as I think he would do well to print but calculated to make him wish to try what other things you can write which would suit him.

My daughter (Miss Taylor) thanks you for the volume of poems, and desires to be remembered to Mrs Plummer.

Letters will not find me here beyond Monday morning after which they had better be directed to my publisher with "to be forwarded" written on the cover.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

641.

TO HARRIET GROTE¹

Hotel Windsor
Rue de Rivoli [Paris]

Sept. 2. [1863]

Dear Mrs Grote

We deferred our departure from England till yesterday in the hope of your being in Paris today, but I have inquired for you at the Hotel Meurice and find you have not arrived, and as we are expected at Avignon tomorrow morning we have missed the sight of you for this time.

We took Daisy to Savile Row and duly delivered him there on Monday. He is out in very fine flower at present. It cost both Helen and me an effort not to make use of your kind permission to take him with us to Avignon, but prudence prevailed, on account of the absence of any fence capable of restraining his wandering propensities. He is a most beautiful and amiable dog and his pleasant ways have been a great source of enjoyment to us.

Helen thanks you for your letter, and hopes you have continued to enjoy your excursion. She is very sorry to have missed seeing you here.

I hope Mr Grote is quite well. I enjoyed his visit, two or three days before he left London. I need not say how glad we should always be to hear from either of you. I am

Dear Mrs Grote
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

642.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 6. 1863

Dear Sir

On arriving here, three days ago, I found M. Littré's volume on Comte,² which is just published. After reading it, I feel an increased desire to make it the subject of an article for you. But I feel some embarrassment for the following reasons. What I wish to write is an estimate of Comte's philosophy. But the book suggests much to be said about the man himself, his character and career, the conduct of others in relation to him, and various points in the character of his country and of the age, which some of the incidents of his life illustrate. It, therefore, is worth reviewing merely as a biography, independent of the great philosophical questions raised in it; and as the attempt to combine both points of view in one article would not only run to too great a length, but would almost necessarily spoil both, *two* articles seem to be required, one of which, though I should not be unwilling, I have no particular wish to write, while I could not possibly set about either before next year. In these circumstances, you would perhaps like to have an article on the biographical aspect of the book without waiting so long for it; and I should myself prefer to be relieved from that part of the task, if you have any other contributor to whom you would not be unwilling to confide it. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

643.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Sept. 15. 1863.

Dear Sir—

You wished to be informed, of anything worth reading which came out on the gold question. If you have not yet returned to England you may not be aware of Fawcett's paper read at the British Association,² & the newspaper discussion which has followed it, at the rate of two or more long letters in the Times every day³—Cairnes, among others, taking part. If you have not yet done so, you will find it worth while to look through a file of the Times, as well as to read Fawcett's paper which I doubt not he will gladly communicate to you. The Daily News⁴ had a fuller report of it than the Times. It seems to me that three important ideas have emerged from the discussion, all tending to explain in their several degrees why the apparent depreciation has been

so much less than might have been expected from so great an addition to the quantity of gold in the world. The first is, that the increase must be compared, not with the gold alone which existed before, but with the gold plus the silver, which last is said to be double the value of the gold. This was brought forward by Cairnes. Second: one writer⁵ has urged that railways & free trade are rapidly producing an approach to equality of prices all over the world in place of the great inequality that existed before, England being the place where they were, as a rule, highest. This change, if there had been no gold discoveries would have taken place by a fall in some places, & a rise in others: consequently the operation of the new gold for some time in such places as England, would chiefly consist in preventing a fall; & its only manifest effect might for some time be that of raising *prices* in the cheap countries to nearly the level of the dear ones. This, which is an original & I think a just, remark, Cairnes notices but rejects,⁶ having I think been set against it by a stupid metaphorical way of putting it in a leading article of the Times.⁷ The third idea is one I have myself for some time entertained, & it has been taken up by one writer in a newspaper letter.⁸ It is this: We are already suffering a much greater depreciation than appears on the surface, because the diminished purchasing power of money is experienced in the form of deteriorated quality rather than of higher price. It is the interest of dealers thus to disguise the progressive rise of prices. There are always things to be had at the prices or something like the prices one has been accustomed to pay, but they are no longer of the same quality. The same purpose is also often effected by giving smaller & smaller measure without change of name.

Of course all these circumstances affect only the rapidity of the depreciation & have nothing to do with determining what it will ultimately amount to, which is a question of permanent cost of production, and as the business gets out of the hands of private diggers into those of quartz crushing companies conducting it on ordinary mercantile principles, gold will ultimately be of the value which will yield to such companies the ordinary rate of companies' profit.

We propose remaining here till the end of the year or about the meeting of Parliament. I shall be happy to hear from you sometimes in the interval.

644.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Saint Véran, Avignon, Sept. 17, 1863

Let me begin by saying how much I rejoice to hear that you are better both in health and in spirits, and are vigorously at work, with a result satisfactory even to yourself, which is always the most difficult thing to a good writer.—Let me next thank you, which I do sincerely, for telling me frankly what you have in your mind against me. The only way to clear up misunderstandings, is to speak plainly about them, and some of the impressions which seem to have been made upon you are such as, if you had not told them to me, I certainly should never have guessed. I feel as strongly as you do the ludicrousness of your having to ask me what I have seen to make me entertain I

know not what mean opinion of you, and I wonder that what you feel to be so ridiculous you should nevertheless have thought to be probable. I may in my turn ask you, what have you seen in me which made it likely that, absolutely without cause, I should have formed an unfavourable opinion of one for whom I have professed, and continue to profess, so much esteem and regard? As to the idea that any intimate friend of mine or any person deriving information from me has spread any reports or communicated any impressions disadvantageous to you, I am sure, since you say it, that you yourself fully believe it, but I tell you with the same frankness you have used to me, that I disbelieve it totally.—Surely, too, I may well be surprised that you should think anything of a bad joke about Vienna, which I have not the smallest recollection of making, but which, I am quite sure, had not the slightest reference to you? I can only have meant, that the next time we went to Vienna, there would perhaps be something new to be seen there.—My letter from Avignon² was quite another thing, and knowing as I now do the state of your feelings, I can well understand your being pained by it. But you must recollect that I did not know then what I know now,³ and it never entered into my head that your object in coming was to say anything particular, which you thought you had not had an opportunity of saying before. I thought that you simply desired to see the place and to see us, and in so doing I neither thought you obtrusive, nor imagined that you expected anything but what your knowledge of our friendship for you perfectly entitled you to expect. But knowing that my time was much occupied, I feared you might be disappointed, and it seemed right to let you know that I could not give you so full and free an invitation to come whenever it might be convenient to you, as I had done in England; and to tell you so, before you had undertaken so long a journey under what might have been a mistaken impression, that I had more leisure for seeing friends here than in England. I thought I was using a freedom which I could not have taken with a mere acquaintance, but which I am even bound to use with a friend. . . .⁴

645.

TO HARRIET ISABELLA MILL¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 17, 1863

Dear Harriet

It is very fortunate that you received the offers you mention in time to save you from the unpleasant and perhaps dangerous voyage to Shetland.²

Even had I been at home when your letter arrived, an answer from me could not possibly have reached you in time by return of post. As it happened, I did not receive your letter till after the date you fixed for deciding the question. Perhaps however this is not to be regretted, as it is well that you should decide for yourself on a question of which you have fuller means of judging than anyone else. I sincerely hope that your troubles are over, and that your health will now speedily recover itself.

J.S.M.

646.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 18. 1863

Dear Sir

Since you wish it, I will undertake both articles,² provided that on further consideration I think it desirable that the biographical one should be written at all. My doubt arises from the fact that neither Comte nor the French national character appear at all in a favourable light in Littré's book, and there are so many people disposed to think and say the worst possible of both, that I am not sure of its being desirable that we should add our voices to swell the cry. If I write both articles, the first will be on Littré's book combined with another biography of Comte by a more thorough disciple, Dr. Robinet;³ and the second will combine the biography by Littré with his *Paroles de Philosophie Positive*⁴ and with a very well made compendium of Comte's final doctrines, by Célestin de Blignières.⁵ I have not much prospect of being ready for the April number but I will give you the longest notice I am able. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

647.

TO JOHN APPLETON¹

S[aint] V[éran] Sept. 24. 1863

Dear Sir—

Though I did not immediately answer your letter of July 18 it was by no means for want of being greatly interested by it. But it so exactly coincides with my own interpretation of passing events as to leave me hardly anything to say. I have just been reading it again, for the third or fourth time since I received it, & I find that we think alike on every point which you touch upon. This cannot but confirm me very much in my way of thinking. But indeed the true nature of all that is going on in America just now is so simple & obvious that to see it as it is requires only that one should not be

totally ignorant of American affairs during a few years before the secession. As almost everybody here from the prime minister down to the smallest newspaper writer *is* thus ignorant, they naturally see, in what is now going on, only what their wishes or their prejudices prepare them to look for.

The general direction of the sympathies of nearly all classes here except the working, & the better part of the literary class, is disgraceful enough to this country. But things are mending a little. The worst enemies of America are becoming convinced that it will not do to let any more Alabamas go out from these islands. It is curious to see the Times daily arguing, in total opposition to its former doctrines, that to allow vessels of war to be in substance, even if not literally, fitted out in this country for a belligerent is wrong as well as inexpedient.² The government, as a government, has always been better than the public in all that relates to this contest; & I am persuaded that this country will not give you any serious cause of complaint against its conduct, but only against its inclinations. Some members of the Cabinet too, have been all along warm friends of the cause. The D. of Argyll & Milner-Gibson have not disguised it in their speeches & my opinion is that even Lord Russell is more with the North than against it. The sentiments of the others will, I doubt not, be very greatly modified by your success of which there can now be little doubt, from the gradual but constant progress of the Northern army & the increasing exhaustion of the South, & the dogged pertinacity for which no one originally ventured to give the people of the Free States credit for as much as they have shewn. Complete victory may not yet be very near at hand, but it is a consolation to think that provided the success is complete at last, the longer the war continues the less possibility there is of a compromise preserving slavery, & the more thoroughly the war will have become one of principle, tending to elevate the national character.

The thing I most wish to hear from you now is what you, & men like you are thinking about the mode of settling Southern affairs after the war. I cannot look forward with satisfaction to any settlement but complete emancipation—land given to every negro family either separately or in organized communities under such rules as may be found temporarily necessary—the schoolmaster set to work in every village & the tide of free immigration turned on in those fertile regions from which slavery has hitherto excluded it. If this be done, the gentle & docile character which seems to distinguish the negroes will prevent any mischief on their side, while the proofs they are giving of fighting powers will do more in a year than all other things in a century to make the whites respect them & consent to their being politically & socially equals. Such benefits are more than an equivalent for a far longer & more destructive war than this is likely to prove.

I am in hopes too that this great trial of American institutions which has necessarily brought all that is defective in them to the surface, will have done the work of a whole age in stimulating thought on the most important topics among the people of the Free States. I have long thought that the real ultimate danger of democracy was intellectual stagnation & there is a very good side to anything which has made *that* impossible for at least a generation to come.

Many thanks for the documents you kindly sent.³ I have received so many from various quarters in the U. States that I have not yet had time to read half of them. All that I have read are extremely interesting & valuable. I am &c

648.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 25, 1863

Dear Sir

Since I wrote to you I have read the volume on Comte's life and doctrines by Dr Robinet.² The result is, that I think it desirable to abandon the biographical article. There is so bitter a feud between those who followed Comte in the last developments of his opinions and those who only went a certain way with him, among whom was Littré; and the two parties differ so widely in their statements of fact, that there is no chance of getting at the truth: and any remarks founded on mere conjecture would be of course utterly valueless, besides the possibility that they might be unjust to one side or the other. I therefore propose to limit myself to one article, which I will set about as soon as I am free from my present occupations and in which I shall pass slightly over Comte's personal history and character, and confine myself in the main to an estimate of his doctrines and method. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

649.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 25, 1863

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for the notes. When I return to England, I will sound Mr Parker on the subject of publishing at once a cheap edition of at least the Political Economy.² The other books may perhaps follow.

The British Association documents³ have not yet reached me, printed matter not being forwarded unless by express directions. But when there are enough of them to make a parcel of, I shall probably order them to be sent, and shall then be enabled to read your papers. I am

Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

650.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 3. 1863

Dear Sir

I am glad to hear so much good news concerning you, and especially that you are to be at Edinburgh and to read papers there,² and that you are forming a connexion with the Telegraph, as the large sale of that paper makes it an important vehicle for opinions, besides enabling it, I should hope, to remunerate you liberally. I am glad, too, on all accounts, that you have been asked to write for Mr Chadwick's paper.³ I am disappointed that you have not heard (nor I either) from Mr Masson,⁴ but I consider it a sign that if he has not yet determined to print your article, at least he has not decided to reject it. I agree with you that Mr Herbert Spencer, in his Social Statics,⁵ carries his hostility to government agency beyond reasonable bounds. I attempted to strike a more correct balance between the considerations on both sides in the concluding chapter of my Political Economy.⁶ I am glad you have found the books useful. I can often send you reviews and magazines, and you are welcome to the loan of any of my books. If, during my absence, you should want any book which you remember to have seen at my house, let me know, and I will send directions for its being sent or delivered to you. It is a pleasure to lend books when one knows that they [will] be really useful to the borrower.

My daughter begs to be remembered to Mrs Plummer and I am Dear Sir

Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

651.

TO HENRY SAMUEL CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

October 5. 1863

Dear Chapman

I find I have not yet acknowledged your letter of 25th May last. You have probably, however, heard something about me from your son,² between whom and me some communications have passed, though I have not yet seen him, as he remained at Cambridge until after I had left England. I shall hope to see him when I return. I heard with regret of your father's death.³ A life seldom lasts so long as his unless it has been a pleasant and desirable one, so that one may reasonably be glad of its prolongation and sorry when it comes to an end.

I am much obliged to you for the interesting documents you sent. I duly received, I believe, all of them, and have looked into them as much as time allowed. I was much interested by your account of the kind of new books which are sought after in the colony, and the ardour to get them. Australia seems to go ahead in opinions as well as in industrial occupations. In this country it is quite amusing to see how speculations on religious and other subjects, which have for generations been familiar to instructed people here, and to people of all sorts in the rest of Europe, are just now getting down to the inferior strata of cultivation, and (as a great part of the current literature now springs from those inferior strata) are being written about as startling novelties both by friends and enemies.⁴ The consequence, however, is a stir in the middle and lower intellectual regions such as has not been seen for centuries, and the effects of which, in one way or another, cannot fail to be considerable.

Do not direct to Parker any more, as he is retiring from business,⁵ but direct to me at Blackheath Park, Kent, from whence letters are regularly sent to me when I am at Saint-Véran.

I am at present writing chiefly on metaphysics;⁶ but the forthcoming Edinburgh Review has an article of mine on Austin's Lectures⁷ which may interest you.

I Am Dear Chapman
Ever Yours Sincerely

J. S. Mill

652.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 14. 1863

Dear Mr Fawcett

I thank you very much for your letter, and for the extract from that of Mr. Stephen.² The tidings from America may be considered good. It is a question if Rosecranz's check³ is to be regretted, since if the war ends too soon, it may end without the complete emancipation of the slaves; but if it is ended by the aid of 40 or 50,000 negro soldiers, and after another year's experience of enfranchised negroes growing cotton and sugar for wages not only slavery will be extinguished, but the South will probably settle down into a free country much more easily than is supposed, and the anti negro feeling in the free states will have, in a great measure, disappeared. We shall then have nothing to regret but the exasperation of the Americans against England, which is a great evil to both countries, but the English have brought it upon themselves.—I have read in the Daily News two speeches of yours at Edinburgh:⁴ they seemed imperfectly reported, but I thought both of them good. There was also, I am glad to see, a useful discussion on the admission of women to degrees.⁵ The most numerous as well as the best speakers seem to have been on the right side. Hastings⁶ in particular deserves praise and encouragement. He is very much in earnest on the subject. He told me he had succeeded in getting women included in the Cambridge local examinations.⁷—I am glad you are writing on the gold question.⁸ Cairnes's letters⁹ were good, but I think him wrong in rejecting an important remark made in a letter to the Times.¹⁰ It was to this effect. Railways and free trade are producing a comparative equalization of the prices of things in different and distant places. Had there been no gold discoveries, this would have been effected by a rise in the remote out-of-the-way places, and a fall in the great markets. The new gold has caused the equalization to take place almost wholly by a rise of prices in the remote places to something near the level of the great markets; and in effecting this, a great deal of the gold has necessarily been absorbed; just as if the gold had physically spread itself over the lower levels, before reaching the higher. The writer having used this metaphor,¹¹ Cairnes, disgusted by it, and thinking that the metaphor was the argument, rejected the doctrine contemptuously.¹²—I have not yet seen Cairnes's pamphlet¹³ which you mention. Is it a secret who is the writer of the review of your book in the Saturday Review?¹⁴ It ought to help you with the professorship.¹⁵—Fitzjames Stephen's article on America in Fraser¹⁶ begins excellently, and goes off quite poor and weak. He assumes all sorts of bad consequences in case of the subjugation of the South, which the facts that are daily occurring prove to be neither necessary nor probable.—I am glad to hear such a good account of Mr Potter.¹⁷ Kyllmann¹⁸ is a most valuable person and I fully expected you would like him. You could not do better than give him carte blanche to draw upon you for copies of your pamphlet. I understand from Mr Hare that two pamphlets in favour of his plan have

been published in America.¹⁹ The stir in the national mind gives a good chance for the opening of all subjects which, like the constitution of the American democracy, have been prematurely closed.—We are here till January, and I hope to hear from you now and then. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

653.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

S[t]. V[éran].

Oct. 23. 1863

Dear Thornton—

I am glad you are so earnestly engaged on the subject of Cooperation.² I shall be very glad if the Edinburgh takes your article, & confident that if it does not the Westminster will. I suppose you will be able to get useful information, or indication of sources of information, from Kyllmann. Plummer also might be very useful to you, & would be delighted to be so. If you were to write to him, Mr. John Plummer, Kettering, is a sufficient address (unless indeed he has removed to Northampton which he talked of doing). He would be glad to send you information, or, when in town for a day which he is sometimes, to call on you.

Have you considered the subject of the taxation of charities? If not, perhaps when you do, you may not agree with Gladstone.³ I have not hitherto agreed with him, though a little shaken, not by any of Gladstone's arguments, but by some of Hare's.⁴ Hare is, I suspect, the teacher if not prompter of Gladstone on this subject. My counter arguments are: 1st. That the charities which are not useful, as the majority are not, should be reformed altogether instead of being merely taxed, &c. That anything, really useful to the public or a part of the public, which an individual has thought worth giving a part of his fortune for, deserves so long as its usefulness continues, as much encouragement from the State as is involved in not taxing the income so appropriated. 2nd That of those among whom the funds are distributed, all whose income from that & other sources together exceeds £100 pay their proper quota to the tax already, & those whose income is below £100 have, on the general principle of the tax, the same claim as all other such people to be exempted from it. 3rd You are aware that I would, if I could, exempt savings from income tax, & make the tax on income virtually a tax on expenditure.⁵ By this rule, any portion of income should be only taxed if spent on private uses, but should be free from taxation (at least at its origin) when devoted to public ends.

As for the American question, if you had time to read one or two books I could recommend to you, & if you were reading the Daily News every day (as I am whenever L[ouis] N[apoleon]'s post office lets it pass, which it does nearly four times in every week), I think you would soon come over to my opinion. In the pro-Southern English papers which I see the facts favourable to the Northern side of the question are *always* suppressed, & in the Times & Saturday Review the grossest lies told, in simple recklessness of assertion without knowledge: The D[aily] N[ews] is the only daily paper of which I can say (though the Star which I know less of may deserve the same praise) that what I think the just view is supported with adequate knowledge, & without prejudice, & the facts favourable to it fairly presented. The American correspondent of that paper is an intelligent man, not like that poor gobemouche Mackay,⁶ in the Times, who simply retails the stuff he hears from a disreputable clique at New York, almost all of them personally interested in slavery either through commerce or politics, who used to be held up to contempt in the English papers as the worst section of the democracy. Their following consists chiefly of the mob of Irish emigrants. It is with these & their clients in the press & the town council that our journals have allied themselves. Everything high or intellectual or noble-hearted or that used to be friendly to England in the North is heart & soul with the war. But you will soon hear all this from Leslie Stephen⁷ better than from me.

654.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 31. 1863.

Dear Mr Fawcett

As you are writing on the gold question,² I have copied out, and send you, an interesting passage on the enormous absorption of the precious metals by hoarding,³ since the gold discoveries, in the agricultural parts of Germany, which have absorbed a great deal in that time, through the increased price of their produce occasioned by railways and the opening of the English and French markets. The passage is from an article on the question of Salaries, published in 1857 in a German review, which the translator in the Revue Germanique for October (from which I take it) calls the Revue Trimestrielle Allemande.⁴

I was very glad to see the prominent part you were able successfully to maintain at the Social Science meetings.⁵ I suppose the contest for the Professorship will be decided shortly.⁶ I am

Dear Mr. Fawcett
Vry Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

655.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon.

Oct. 31, 1863

Dear Sir

I have received your note, and also one from Mr Masson, in which he says that he likes your article,² but cannot publish it for want of room. I do not know if he has expressed to you a willingness to insert anything else: but if you have anything in view, on any subject, that you think suitable for McMillan, you need not, I think, be discouraged, as you will be pretty sure to get it accepted either there or somewhere else.

I am glad to hear that the Quarterly is even tolerably good on Cooperation.³ My friend Mr Thornton, who is very ardent in the cause, is writing on the subject,⁴ and I should not wonder if he were to communicate with you respecting it. Your proceedings at Edinburgh⁵ interested me much. I was glad also to hear that you had seen so much of the three persons you mention in your note. They are all of them persons of great knowledge and public spirit and they may be able to help you and you them, to very good purpose, in the pursuit of public objects.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer I am Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

656.

TO HENRY CHENEVIX¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Nov. 4. 1863.

Dear Sir—

Your communication raises a great many more points than can be properly discussed in a letter, & more than I have time to discuss at all. You have seen in my Logic my opinion on the subject of miracles generally, viz. that no event, however extraordinary, can be proved to be miraculous, & therefore that no such event can prove the existence of a supernatural power;² but that to one who already believes in such a power, any miracle, consistent with his theory of the character & purposes of the Power he recognises, is no more incredible than any other extraordinary fact. I cannot say I ever saw any advantage in the theory which supposes miracles to be manifestations of unknown general laws, or in other words, feats of knowledge & skill, not of power. If any one has been endowed by God for the special purpose of working wonders to serve as credentials for a divine message, I see no antecedent reason for supposing that this power would have been given in the form of a knowledge of laws yet undiscovered rather than in that of a power of superseding all laws, while in the former case to work the wonder & keep the knowledge secret, implies a charlatanerie which one would not willingly impute to a person divinely inspired & which is not implied in the other case.

Unless I could pretend to know either that there is no supernatural power or that such Power never works but in one way, I cannot presume to say that Christ may not have worked miracles: & I confess if I could be convinced that he ever *said* he had done so, it would weigh a great deal with me in favour of the belief. But in my opinion there is not a single miracle in either the Old or New Testament the particular evidence of which is worth a farthing. Those of Christ seem to me exactly on a level with the wonderful stories current about every remarkable man, & repeated in good faith in times when the scientific spirit scarcely existed. We know that in the time & place he lived in, no one thought miracles in the smallest degree incredible; those who rejected his mission did not trouble themselves to dispute his miraculous powers but preferred ascribing them to evil beings. With regard to prophecies, in the sense attached to the word by modern theologians I do not believe that any such ever were made. The splendid religious & patriotic poetry of Isaiah, Jeremiah & others so far as it contains any predictions of future events contains only such as are made by Carlyle or anybody who argues that moral degeneracy in a people must lead to a catastrophe. The catastrophe they specially looked forward to was that which everything shewed to be then imminent, a Babylonian conquest. This again they as Hebrews naturally believed not to be permanent inasmuch as the Babylonians being wicked & idolaters could only be suffered to prevail temporarily over God's people as instruments for their punishment. The only exception I am aware of to this character of the prophetic writings is the book of Daniel which predicts events in such minute detail down to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes & with such extreme vagueness afterwards that I firmly believe (with Coleridge) that it predicted only what had already happened.³

I do not suppose that what I have said will help you much in your difficulties, but it will shew you that I judge of the credibility of alleged miracles from the probabilities of each particular case & the value of the evidence adduced in it & no other principle of judgment seems to me tenable.

657.

TO ANTOINE ÉLISÉE CHERBULIEZ¹

St. Véran, le 6 novembre 1863

Monsieur—

Si j'ai tant tardé à vous remercier de l'envoi de votre important traité d'Economie Politique,² c'est que j'ai dû attendre le moment où un loisir suffisant me permettrait de le lire attentivement et d'en parler avec connaissance de cause. C'est seulement depuis hier que j'ai pu en achever la lecture, et je ne remplis qu'un devoir en vous disant que vous avez fait, à mon sens, l'un des meilleurs ouvrages qui aient encore paru sur l'Economie Politique. Vous en avez saisi toutes les lois générales, même celles qui sont loin d'être encore reconnues par la plupart des économistes, et vous les avez exposées et groupées d'une façon qui en démontrant une vraie originalité d'esprit met souvent ces lois sous plusieurs rapports dans un jour plus ou moins nouveau. Dans la science abstraite je ne me suis jamais trouvé en désaccord avec vous, si ce n'est dans quelques détails peu importants; encore ces divergences apparentes disparaîtraient probablement devant des explications aisées. S'il n'y a pas tout à fait la même unanimité en ce qui se rapporte aux applications, cela est dans l'ordre des choses humaines. De même les dissentiments ne tiennent pas à des différences de principes. Le plus saillant d'entre eux se rapporte à la question de l'assistance légale. Les économistes anglais, dont la plupart étaient autrefois très opposés à la taxe des pauvres y sont en général devenus favorables depuis l'enquête qui a amené la réforme de 1834.³ Ils ont cru connaître que l'assistance bornée au strict nécessaire, et assujettie à des conditions plus désagréables que le travail libre, ne produit plus l'imprévoyance et la démoralisation que vous signalez, à si juste titre, comme effets de l'aumône mal ordonnée: tandis que la charité publique et privée telle qu'elle existe en France, n'étant pas susceptible d'une organisation aussi vigoureuse, me paraît produire tous les mauvais effets qui résultèrent du système anglais lors de sa plus mauvaise administration. J'ajoute qu'il me semble que la haine des pauvres contre les riches est un mal presque inévitable là où les lois ne garantissent pas les pauvres contre l'extrémité du besoin. Le pauvre, en France, malgré l'assistance qu'il reçoit, a toujours devant les yeux la possibilité de mourir de faim, tandis qu'en Angleterre il sait qu'en dernier ressort il est créancier de la propriété jusqu'à concurrence d'une simple subsistance, que tout prolétaire qu'il soit il n'est pas absolument déshérité de sa place au soleil, à quoi j'attribue que malgré la constitution aristocratique de la propriété et de la vie sociale en Angleterre, la classe prolétaire y est rarement ennemie soit de l'institution de la propriété soit même des classes qui en jouissent.

En me félicitant, Monsieur, que la chaire d'Economie Politique dans une des institutions les plus importantes de la Suisse soit remplie par une intelligence aussi forte et aussi éclairée que la vôtre, je vous prie d'agréer l'expression sincère de ma considération la plus distinguée.

658.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Nov. 14. 1863.

Dear Sir—

I have read the papers you sent.² I think there is a great deal of valuable matter in them, & I would encourage you on every account to go on with your project. There is very little in them that I at all disagree with—only a sentence here & there. Wherever this is the case I have made a pencil note, or will do so, for I will venture to keep the MS a day or two days longer for the purpose of reading it again. I am not sure that I rightly understood a sentence in one of your letters in which you seemed to speak of sending the paper for the editor's consideration before completing it. You know the editor & all the elements of the case much better than I can do but I sh^d think that this would very much diminish the chance of the article's being accepted. If I were you I would give it the very utmost finish of execution in my power before letting him see it. There are very few editors who would not, on such a subject, care very much more about what an article *seems* than about what it *is*. Your paper will be judged by its composition, its mode of laying out the subject, & the degree in which it makes its theory plausible. As to whether the theory is true or not the editor probably is not political economist enough to think himself able to judge, & most likely cares very little.

At present the MS is little more than material for an article. The reader has to make out for himself what you are trying to prove, & what you do prove.

I have read Cairnes's article³ a second time & I only think him materially wrong in two things—first, in overlooking & even rejecting the point of view which is the prominent one in your article—the altered distribution of the precious metals which is in progress, & the tendency of prices to rise earliest and most in the more backward & remote countries. This is the great point of originality in your paper. The second mistake which I perceive in him is a much smaller one—it is one of terms only: he says that if prices did not rise at all, but were only prevented from falling this would still be *depreciation* of the precious metals. I sh^d not call this depreciation. It is exactly the absorption without depreciation, which is affirmed by some of those whom he attacks.

With respect to the question whether *credit* in any of its shapes is to be counted on either side in addition to the metals, is not the real state of the case, that the increase of gold would not produce any increase of credit until prices had first risen? As soon as they had risen from the action of the gold alone, larger sums would be required for all purchases, & as the ordinary object of credit is to make purchases, the nominal amount of credit called into operation would (all other things remaining the same)

increase exactly in the ratio in which prices had risen. So that the difference in the credit employed before & after would not be a cause but an effect of the different state of prices before & after, & might be struck out of the account on both sides, so far as the consequences of the increase of gold are concerned—only taking care to remember that every fluctuation of credit from *other* causes would act as a disturbing agency & vitiate the comparison.

If the new gold has, as you suppose, anywhere taken the place of credit—which if a fact, is to me a surprising one—it must be, I think, from some local cause tending to a substitution of money for credit, which would equally have acted if the new gold had never been discovered—& must be classed with hoarding & the other things which cause more gold to be used without lowering its value.

I believe your interpretation of the state of things in India to be perfectly correct.⁴ But I do not see that it conflicts with Cairnes's.

I do not like Courcelle-Seneuil's *Etudes*,⁵ though his treatise on Pol.Econ.⁶ seemed to me very sound & sensible. But I agree with him more than I believe I do with you about the influence of race—which (it is pretty certain) is only the influence of external circumstances transmitted by inheritance & capable of being modified *ad libitum* or actually reversed by change of circumstances. Those of your remarks which bear on the possibility of a science of society do not seem to me to have the degree of weight you seem to attach to them. But the subject is too long for the end of a letter, or indeed for a letter at all.

If the second reading of your paper suggests any additional remarks worth sending I will write again. If not I will merely post the MS.

659.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 18 Novembre 1863

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Ce serait un grand plaisir pour moi que de faire ce qui pourrait vous être agréable, dans l'affaire de la proposition de M. Trübner² comme dans toute autre. Mais je suis empêché, au moins pour quelque temps d'ici, d'accueillir aucune des demandes qui m'ont été faites à ce sujet. Mon éditeur M. Parker étant co-intéressé avec moi quant à plusieurs de mes ouvrages, et jusqu'à un certain point dans tous, j'ai cru devoir ne pas m'opposer à ce qu'il se défît de ses droits de la manière qu'il jugeait lui être la plus avantageuse. Ceci entraîne de ma part des relations au moins temporaires, avec la maison Longman;³ mais je suis très décidé à ne prendre avec MM Longman aucun engagement qui enchaîne ma liberté à l'égard d'ouvrages ou d'éditions à venir.

Nous sommes en bonne santé tous deux, et vous remerçons de votre bon souvenir.
Croyez toujours à l'amitié sincère de votre dévoué

J. S. Mill

660.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Nov. 22. 1863.

Dear Bain—

I also have been for some time meditating a long letter to you, & the receipt of yours has brought my intention to a crisis.

I am very glad that the Grammar is at last out.² I shall receive it probably before my return to England as I shall most likely need to have a parcel sent here from Blackheath in which case all books received there will be put into it. I am the more glad to hear of your progress in revising the Senses³ for the new edition as I shall soon be in the position of waiting for it. For I have finished my book on Hamilton,⁴ as far as regards the first writing; & I shall not commence rewriting until I have your analysis of the Primary Qualities in its most matured form. I have got much help from the first edition from which I have quoted largely, but hope to get still more from the second.⁵

Do you remember the proof which Hamilton thinks he gives,⁶ that extension & figure are perceived directly by the eye? If one colour is laid upon part of another so that both are seen, the boundary which divides them must be also seen, & this is a line, i.e. extension. If the one colour is surrounded by the other, the line returns into itself, i.e. forms a figure. I hope you will notice this argument. I sh^d like to know fully your opinion of it. There is one obvious answer: viz. that the extension & figure thus perceived are different things from the extension & figure perceived by touch & the muscles, & are only identified (or rather connected) with them by experience. This is true but *what are* this ocular extension & figure? Can we call them mere modifications of colour, or are they colour with the addition of *outness*, or what? I want a better theory of them than I am able to give.

I will read again Spencer's Psychology. I remember thinking his account of Extension very good;⁷ & I shall be glad not only to profit by it but to have an opportunity of quoting from him something with which I agree. I sometimes regret (considering that he is, & deems himself unsuccessful) that when I have had occasion to speak of him in print it has almost always been to criticize him. He is a considerable thinker though anything but a safe one—& is on the whole an ally, in spite of his Universal Postulate.⁸ His speculations on Mathematical axioms⁹ I do not now remember, but

when I read them I did not attach any importance to them. His notion that we cannot think the annihilation or diminution of force I remember well—& I thought it out—Whewelled Whewell. The conservation of force has hardly yet got to be believed, & already its negation is declared inconceivable. But this is Spencer all over;[10](#) he throws himself with a certain deliberate impetuosity into the last new theory that chimes with his general way of thinking & treats it as proved as soon as he is able to found a connected exposition of phenomena upon it. This is the way with his doctrine of “Heredity”[11](#) which however will very likely prove true.

At present my table of contents is as follows:[12](#) . . . On all these heads I have written chapters which are not unfit to print even now, but I hope to improve all of them very much before I do print them. I am now covering the blank pages with notes for additions & improvements grounded on a third consecutive reading of Hamilton’s philosophical writings from beginning to end. You see if I fail to give a true character of them it will not be for want of being well acquainted with them. I was not prepared for the degree in which this complete acquaintance lowers my estimate of the man & of his speculations. I did not expect to find them a mass of contradictions. There is scarcely a point of importance on which he does not hold conflicting theories, or profess doctrines which suppose one theory while he himself holds another. I think the book will make it very difficult to hold him up as an authority on philosophy hereafter. It almost goes against me to write so complete a demolition of a brother-philosopher after he is dead, not having done it while he was alive—& the more when I consider what a furious retort I sh^d infallibly have brought upon myself, if he had lived to make it.

Before the rewriting I mean to read or reread as many books as I have time for, from which I can hope to get suggestions for enriching the book. What is the title of the work of the younger Fichte[13](#) which you advised me to read? Do you know the psycho-physiological writings of Vogt[14](#) & Mohlschott,[15](#) said to be the heads of the new materialist school in Germany?

I have been reading, I may say studying, Tyndall’s Lectures on Heat.[16](#) The equivalence of a certain quantity of heat & a certain quantity of mechanical power seems to be very completely established. But the theory is still very imperfect, & Tyndall is hardly the man to perfect it. There is a terrible phrase “potential energy” which covers a great dark spot in the subject. How do they resolve such questions as this? By the trifling mechanical motion of applying a match, I light a great heap of coal and disengage an enormous force in the form of heat. Where was the previous equivalent of this? No equivalent amount of mechanical motion existed just before, to be converted into it. Must we seek for the equivalent at a distinct geological period when the force was as they say, *stored up* in the coal? That is *conservation* of force with a vengeance, in one sense of the term; but not in the sense in which it is taken in the theory, if I understand it rightly: nor according to the philosophical meaning of force: for in that meaning there is a force where there is no activity, & the conservation of force can only mean that one of the modes of activity only ceases when another takes its place. I say nothing of the purely hypothetical machinery, the interstellar & interatomic ether. I sh^d like to know your opinion on the whole subject, & how far you consider the new doctrine to authorize a new attitude towards the

undulatory theory.¹⁷ Indeed I sh^d be much obliged if in the two or three years which will elapse before a new ed. of the Logic¹⁸ is called for, you would make a note of such alterations in any part of it as may be required by the progress of science.

Does D^r Clark still continue his studies on the origin of the Gospels?¹⁹ If so, there is a book which he ought to have—Les Evangiles by Gustave d'Eichthal published at Paris by Hachette.²⁰ Only the first part is yet out, containing the examination of the first three gospels. The author proceeds in the same way as D^r Clark, collating the parallel passages in opposite columns, & many of his conclusions are almost identical: he thinks Matthew's the genuine history, & his opinion of Mark & Luke is very similar to D^r Clark's. Only instead of thinking that Mark copied Matthew & Luke, he thinks that Mark copied Matthew, & Luke copied Matthew & Mark. He rejects many passages of Matthew as interpolations made subsequently, & not known to either of the others. Another recent book which would probably interest D^r Clark is called Etudes sur la Bible (Nouveau Testament) par Michel Nicolas.²¹ It is a reprint of review articles only one of which I have seen—the one on St John; but in that I thought there was considerable merit. D^r C is probably acquainted with Baur²² & the Tubingen school, at all events through Mackay.²³

I only remarked your name once in Littré's citations from Comte's letters,²⁴ & the mention, I think, was very harmless. At the time when he lost his Polytechnic appointment & had to consider what he should do for an income it seems I suggested that he could perhaps write articles for English reviews & offered to translate them for him, adding that probably both you & Lewes would be willing to help him in the same way.²⁵ In his answer he desired me to thank you & Lewes for the offer, in case either of you had made it. That is all I find on the subject.

I have not made any arrangement with Longmans²⁶ as yet, wishing to take this opportunity of buying back Parker's interest in the Logic & P E Essays, the only books of which I did not retrieve the entire copyright. I have made a proposal to Longmans to this effect & am still expecting their answer: In the meantime the transfer of my books to them is only provisional.

With our regards to Mrs Bain

661.

TO THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE HOSPICES
D'AVIGNON¹

Saint Véran

le 23 novembre 1863

Messieurs,

Etant possesseur d'une petite campagne attenante au côté septentrional du chemin vicinal No 1, je désirerais jouir de la cep des saules et autres arbres qui bordent la route de ce côté au voisinage de ma propriété. Si donc il pouvait convenir à votre administration, Messieurs, de me céder ce droit, moyennant la somme annuelle de 25 fr. au bénéfice des pauvres de la ville, je vous en aurais une véritable obligation. Les arbres en question seraient au nombre de cinquante, à commencer en face du Moulin de la Folie, en suivant le chemin vers l'Est.

Veuillez agréer, Messieurs, l'expression de ma considération la plus distinguée.

J. Stuart Mill

662.

TO WILLIAM RATHBONE, JR.[1](#)

Saint Véran, Avignon

Nov. 29, 1863

Dear Sir

Nothing can be more true than your observations on the importance of having a definite plan of constitutional reform grounded on intelligible principles, to present to the nation at the time (perhaps not far distant) when the temporary indifference to the subject will have given place to a renewed and possibly an eager interest in it. The ruling classes are singularly shortsighted in not perceiving that they will certainly, in no long time, have to deal with a reaction of this nature. But they have been in a fool's paradise ever since they succeeded in stifling Lord Russell's reform bill,[2](#) and it will require stirring events to raise them from their dream.

I have no doubt that the plan of election which you propose, and which is not very different from that established by the present Prussian Constitution, would be a considerable improvement on our present electoral system; at least if the one-third of the House, which you reserve for the democracy, were elected by universal suffrage. What I do not see is, that the plan rests on any principle of justice or expediency which could, or which should, induce the democracy to accept it in any character but that of a more or less temporary compromise. I have never been able to see any clear ground on which it can be maintained that the State does more, or incurs more cost, for the protection of the class who have independent property, than for that of the class who earn large incomes, and for these than for the great mass of the earners of small incomes; still less that the work and costs incurred for the sake of these three classes are in the proportion of 3, 2, and 1. I do not feel the force of this consideration as a ground even for the apportionment of taxation. As regards representation, I speak

with great deference to those who know more of the feelings and modes of thought of the English working classes than I can pretend to do. But I do not think them likely to be persuaded of the justice of any limitation of the suffrage, or inequality in its distribution, grounded theoretically on property. An educational qualification I think they might in principle assent to: at all events the restriction of the suffrage to those who can read, write, and cipher, would probably be approved of by most of those whom it would not exclude. But a property qualification, even as a mere index and presumption of education, would, I think, always remain odious, and would even compromise the principle of educational qualification, if imprudently identified with it.

You are probably aware that the plural voting involved in your plan does not, in my mind, necessarily constitute an objection to it;³ but I could not, as a matter of principle, defend plural voting in consideration merely of property nor would it, I think, if placed on that footing be looked upon by the working classes as any thing but an invention of the oligarchy to enable them to frustrate the practical effect of universal suffrage in case they found themselves impelled nominally to concede it.

I am very sensible of the great practical difficulties of the subject, and I confess that I have no hope of soon seeing what I think the true principles embodied in a specific plan likely to obtain any very wide acceptance. In the meanwhile I see nothing better to be done than to stand up on all occasions for certain general principles about which I have no doubt—e.g. that of personal representation (Mr Hare's plan); an educational franchise of some sort; non-exclusion on such irrelevant ground as that of sex, &c: and practically to support by way of a step, any proposal having a chance of being carried, the effect of which would give to the mass of ed. people what so many small minorities possess—a *share* of influence in the representation.

I Am
Dear Sir
Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

William Rathbone Jun^r Esq.

663.

TO THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE HOSPICES
D'AVIGNON¹

S[aint] V[éran]

30 Nov. 1863

Messieurs

J'ai eu l'honneur de recevoir votre lettre du 27 novembre et je vous prie d'agréer mes remerciements de la complaisance dont vous avez usé en voulant bien accéder à la proposition faite dans ma lettre du 23.²

Recevez, Messieurs l'assurance de ma considération la plus distinguée.

J. S. Mill

664.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 4. 1863

Dear Mr. Fawcett

It gives me very great pleasure to hear of your election,² which you had previously expressed so much doubt about that my hopes were anything but confident. Your success is an excellent sign of the feeling of the University, and the more so since so many warmly supported you who did not agree in your political opinions. I wish that Whewell had been with you, and rather wonder that he was not.³ I suppose he felt interested for some one of the other candidates. Mayrs⁴ (is that his name?) had influential supporters, and Courtney, I believe, has considerable qualifications for the office, but it seems strange that Macleod should have got so many as fourteen votes.

A History of Political Economy is not a kind of book much wanted on its own account, but it would afford an opportunity for interesting discussions of all the contested points, and for placing them in the strong light which results from the comparison of conflicting opinions and from a study of their origin and filiation. Though, therefore, it is a work I should hardly suggest to anyone, yet if any competent political economist with a talent for philosophical controversy feels spontaneously prompted to undertake it, the result is likely to be both useful and interesting to those who care for the subject.

About Cooperation, I recommend to your attention the first article in the Journal des Economistes for last month (November).⁵ It is by J. E. Horn, who is somewhat of an authority on commercial subjects, and is not only good in itself, but contains the important information that a revival of Cooperation has begun to take place in France. When I speak of revival, I do not mean that the old Associations had ceased to exist and to flourish, but that the movement for forming new ones, which had been intermitted, has lately recommenced. Are you aware of the form of cooperation which is spreading in Germany, under the leadership of Mr. Schulze-Delitsch,⁶ one of the

prominent political men of the Progressist party in Prussia—the *Sociétés de Crédit Populaire* (I forget the name in German).⁷ One of these associations has also been started in Paris, and if it succeeds, others are likely to follow. Knowing that Thornton is writing on Cooperation,⁸ I called his attention to these points the last time I wrote to him.

As for me, I have had little time to think on any scientific subject except Metaphysics, on which I am making good progress in the work I am about.⁹ I hope to meet you at the February meeting of the Club.¹⁰

I Am Dear Mr. Fawcett
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

665.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 5 1863.

Dear Sir

You have no reason to feel at all discouraged by Mr Masson's non-acceptance of your article.² It is no proof at all of want of merit in the article. He probably preferred some other mode of treating the subject, or preferred to have it treated by some other writer.

Mr Thornton writes to me that he has made great use of your account of Cooperation in the Companion to the Almanac,³ and that he means to write to you shortly; perhaps by this time he has done so.

In the volume of Miscellaneous Essays by Mr Herbert Spencer there is, I believe, a criticism on Comte's classification of the Sciences.⁴ Will you be kind enough, if there is, to return the volume to Blackheath Park, as I have occasion to consult that particular paper and a parcel will probably be sent to me from Blackheath Park in two or three days.

I hope an Edinburgh Review which I sent to you by post from here, arrived safely.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer, I am

Dear Sir
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

666.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 16. 1863

Dear Sir

Your letter of September 10² did not miscarry, but arrived safe, which I am sorry to hear was not the case with my answer. I wrote you a long letter dated Sept. 22, which I did not direct to the place from whence yours was dated (Stameen, Drogheda) but, as I confidently believe, to your address in Dublin. I cannot account for its not having reached you, as I have no evidence that my letters are ever stopped at the Post Office. That establishment, as far as my experience goes, confines its rigours to newspapers, or, at most, to printed matter.

I have to thank you for your article in the National Review.³ I stated in my letter the only material point on which I differ from you. I seem to myself to see a meaning through the mist of an absurd metaphor in the “hydrostatic theory” of the spread of the new gold through the world.⁴ I expounded this at some length in my letter, and am vexed that its loss has deprived me, all this time, of the benefit of your remarks. This subject must now be deferred till the next time I write: but I must not omit to thank you for the Bombay dissertations. The young Competition-wallah⁵ has shewn a great deal of knowledge and talent; and neither is Sir A. Grant’s paper,⁶ which he criticizes, devoid of merit. Will it be sufficient if I bring them with me when I return to England at the end of January, or do you require them sooner?

To come to the subject of your last letter I agree with you in thinking very highly of Mr Loring’s series of papers.⁷ It is true, he sometimes, I think, attempts to make out too much; especially when he contends that the sale of ships of war to belligerents even in their own ports, is a violation of neutrality. But, on the whole, his argument is triumphant, and the temperate manner in which he states his very strong conclusions, gives them additional force. As to altering people’s opinions on the general question of the right and wrong in the American contest, I am very much of the way of thinking of Mr Goldwin Smith.⁸ People do not want to be convinced. But it is very different with the practical question of neutrality. Nobody, the Tories as little as the Liberals, desires to be at war with America, or to give the United States what, according to international law, is just cause of war. Accordingly even the Times and Saturday Review, base as they are on the main subject, are, on the whole, on our side

on the shipbuilding question.⁹ I can conceive that a well reasoned discussion like Mr Loring's might have a decisive effect on a public man who had not quite made up his mind, and might even shake one who had. But how to induce them to read it? It might perhaps be useful to send the pamphlet, with a letter, to some few persons of influence, both friends and such as are open to conviction. If you think it desirable, and if there is nobody willing to do it who is better acquainted with them, I should have no objection to write to the Duke of Argyll¹⁰ and to Mr Gladstone.¹¹ It is just possible that Mr Vernon Harcourt¹² might make some use of it either in the Times or Saturday Review, but I have no acquaintance with him. Should you know no other channel, I have no doubt that Fawcett would be able and glad to get it recommended to him. The only other thing I can think of is to get, if possible, the Daily News and the Spectator to write about the pamphlet in a manner to give it importance as a discussion of the legal question. I must add that if anything is to be written on the subject, I am not a fit person to write it, as I have never studied international law, and should not like to be caught tripping on some matter of detail.

I am very glad that you have been writing on this subject for Macmillan,¹³ and that you have been able to resume your article on Ireland for the Edinburgh.¹⁴ As I receive both publications, I need not avail myself of your kind offer.

Every mail now brings good news from America. Things look more and more promising both for the success of the North, and for the rapid destruction not only of Slavery but (what seemed far more difficult and distant) of the antipathy and contempt of the white American towards the negroes. In the lost letter I gave my reasons for not sharing in your misgivings about the state of things which would follow the complete occupation of the South by the Northern armies. Many signs indicate that the difficulties will settle themselves much more easily and quietly than any one expected. I have been right in all I ventured to prophesy thus far, and I am very confident that I shall prove so in this.

I hope you have quite recovered from your last summer's indisposition.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

667.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 22. 1863

Dear Sir

I am obliged to you for your information about cheap editions. I shall probably have the power shortly to bring out a cheap edition of my Political Economy.²

I inclose £5 towards your new project and am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

668.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 26. 1863

Dear Sir

I have written the inclosed notes to accompany the copies of Mr Loring's pamphlet,² which had much better be sent to their destination directly than in the roundabout way via Avignon.

Mr Lincoln appears to me a very favourable specimen of an American public man, and a credit to the nation which elected him, as he seems to be simply honest without any trick or charlatanerie. He is the "rusticus abnormis sapiens" whom America has not taught us to expect to find among her politicians, even when they have commenced life as rail splitters. That which a great man, in his position, would have foreseen and designed from the first, he, without designing it, has in the main executed, through the force of circumstances gradually shaping the conviction of a sincere and upright mind. He is an example how far singleminded honesty will often go, in doing the work and supplying the place of talent. As Solomon, I think, said, and as my father used to say, "The righteousness of the righteous man guideth his steps."³

The Times has made a miserable figure in the Cobden affair,⁴ and though Cobden would have served his cause better had he shewn less irritation, he deserves honour in having, for once, brought the slanderer to book, and shewn him that it is not always safe to put forth calumnious inferences from an opponent's doctrine as the opponent's own opinions. The incident is every way fortunate, and will have a chance of making people think on both the questions you mention—anonymous journalism and peasant proprietorship—both of them subjects on which it is very difficult to make the English public think at all. In England (unlike Ireland) the agricultural labourer thinks so little about the possession of land as a matter in any way concerning him, that the emigration which will doubtless go on extending itself in both countries will

probably, as far as England is concerned, take effect only in a considerable rise of agricultural wages—which it will render inevitable, and which, I incline to believe, the English peasantry will be contented with.

What I wrote in the missing letter⁵ respecting the gold question was to this effect. Shortly before the gold discoveries, there had begun to take place, and has been taking place ever since, a great increase of facilities of communication and a great enfranchisement of trade; having for their necessary effect to bring the prices of many commodities, in different parts of the world, far nearer to equality than they had ever been before. Had there been no gold discoveries, this equalization would have taken place, partly indeed by a rise of prices in the more remote and poorer regions of the earth, but partly also, and perhaps still more, by a fall of prices in the great manufacturing countries. The influx of gold had first to make this phenomenon disappear, before its effect would be apparent at all in a rise of English prices. During the interval it would be steadily raising prices in the distant countries and in those which export raw produce. In those regions the gold would cooperate with other causes tending to a rise; in England it would be acting in opposition to causes tending to a fall; consequently there would be little or no rise of prices in England until there had been a rise in the distant markets sufficient to bring about that nearer approximation of prices in the two regions, which corresponds to the increased facilities of trade. This seems to me to be what the promulgator of the “hydrostatic theory” had in his thoughts;⁶ and it would account for the rise of general prices in England being in a considerably less ratio than that of the increased quantity of gold in the world. It certainly appears that the rise of prices has been much more marked and considerable in the places where their range had previously been low; especially those in which hoarding does not prevail, but to some extent even where it does.

I am truly glad of the improvement in your health, and am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

669.

TO WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 26. 1863

My Dear Sir,

The accompanying pamphlet² seems to be so well worthy to be read by those who, as English statesmen, have the power of determining the public attitude of this country

towards the American belligerents, that I hope you will excuse the liberty I take in inviting your attention to it. There has been much able discussion in this country on the points of international law involved in the shipbuilding question; and through that discussion the opinion which previously existed in this country has been greatly modified, and the Government is now well supported in the course which, to the credit of its justice and firmness, it has in the main adopted. Still, there are many points which may yet have to be discussed with the Government of the United States; and this pamphlet, if you are not already acquainted with it, will shew, more completely than anything else I have seen, the light in which these points appear to an able and instructed American, whose feelings are strongly with the North, but who is moderate and reasonable—and the strength of the arguments by which his case can be supported. I do not profess to agree with him on all his points; but, as far as I am qualified to judge, I do on most of them, and when I do not, it still seems to me that his opinions are such as may naturally, and without any great unreasonableness be shared by his countrymen in general. I am

My Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

1864

670.

TO WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Jan. 22. 1864

My Dear Sir—

When I took the liberty of sending you Mr Loring's pamphlet² nothing was farther from my thoughts than to engage you in a controversy of any sort. I am much honoured by your having spared time to write to me so fully on the subject, & am very glad to find in the view you take of it, nothing from which I differ in principle. I did not mean to identify myself with all Mr Loring's sentiments; I think him decidedly unjust to our Government, which has shewn itself throughout in a far more favourable light than the predominant portion of our public. But as he seemed to me to be often right, & when wrong, only in a manner in which it is most natural & scarcely unreasonable that an American sh^d be so, I thought that his statement would interest you & that your being acquainted with it might perhaps be of use.

In addition to the two important points touched on in your letter, it seems to me that several others are raised by Mr Loring. I pass over those which are evidently untenable, or which have a moral, but not a jurisprudential value. But he argues—

1st. That a State which professing itself neutral does not make all reasonable exertions to enforce the obligations of neutrality upon its own subjects, gives, to the belligerent who is prejudiced by their acts, just ground of complaint, & in certain cases, lays itself open to a demand of indemnity, and that the Gv^t of the U. States has faithfully acted on this principle at times when we were belligerents & they were neutrals.

2nd. That the use of neutral territory as a place where an expedition may be fitted out, & from which it may issue & execute warlike operations without having acquired the right to do so in the country of the belligerent whom it serves, is, by international law, not a commercial operation but a hostile act.

3rd. That the *Alabama*, &c., in burning their prizes before condemnation by any prize court, are acting in a manner forbidden by international law, & which deprives them of any claim to the privileges or immunities which distinguish regularly commissioned cruisers from pirates.

4th. That those cruisers have made use of the British flag in a manner which brings them within the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 17 and 18 Vict., chap. 104.

As to the argument which Mr Loring founds on the fact that the ships were built by contract, his reason for insisting so strongly on that point probably is that it makes the precedent of the Santissima Trinidad so far inapplicable.³ He would no doubt be very glad to get rid of that case altogether, & to have it ruled that ships of war must not be sold at all by a neutral country to a belligerent. This opinion—which I hope I am not mistaken in thinking that you are not far from agreeing in—is forcibly maintained in an article by Professor Cairnes in Macmillan’s Magazine for the present month,⁴ which seems to me one of the ablest & most valuable papers which this controversy has called forth. But to return to Mr Loring. He regards the building by contract as intrinsically important simply as evidence of intent. You think that the intent of the Confederate agents may admit of proof, but not that of the builder. Doubtless it is in general neither provable nor probable that the *motive* of the builder was one of hostility or was any other than the profit of the transaction, but his *intention*, I apprehend, depends only upon whether or not he *knew* that he was selling the ship to an agent of a belligerent. I presume that on the general principles of law any one would be held to have intended all such consequences of his actions as he foreknew or expected.

I sh^d be much to blame in replying to your letter by so long a one as this, did I not add my sincere hope that you will not consider it necessary to make the smallest answer to it.

I thank you heartily for your kind invitation to your breakfasts⁵ & I promise myself to make use of the privilege. I do not expect to be in England for the first two months after Easter, but shall be there in June

I Am My Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

671.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 24. 1864

Dear Sir

I thank you for the separate copy of your article, which I had already read in Macmillan,² and which seems to me extremely valuable. I have recommended it to Mr Gladstone in my answer³ to a long and on the whole very satisfactory letter which he wrote to me on the subject of Mr Loring’s pamphlet. Though he was not favourably impressed by the pamphlet, he appears to have spontaneously arrived at a conclusion very similar to yours—namely that the whole subject of building warships for foreign belligerents requires an “international overhauling”, as a consequence of

which, the case of the Santísima [*sic*] Trinidad⁴ will have to “go to the wall.” I gather from various expressions that he thinks the sale of ships of war by neutrals to belligerents should not be regarded as a legitimate commercial enterprise even in the circumstances and to the extent authorised by that precedent. It is very satisfactory to find a man in Mr Gladstone’s position so far advanced on the subject.

I have not heard from the Duke of Argyll,⁵ but that he is with us on this as he is on the main question, there can be little doubt.

Things continue to advance in the right direction in America. It does one good to read of negroes at the President’s levee:⁶ One is consoled for the madness of all Germany⁷ by the progress of the cause of freedom in America, and by the wonderful resurrection of the spirit of liberty in France,⁸ combined with a love of peace which even sympathy with Poland does not prevail over.

Do not write again here, as we return to Blackheath early in February. I wish I could hope that you would be at the meeting of the Political Economy Club⁹ but I suppose your professorial functions interfere. I am Dear Sir

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

672.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 27. 1864.

Dear Chadwick

I did not answer your last letter when I received it, but waited in hopes that I might have something interesting to say, or to send. But the spirit has not yet moved my daughter to write anything further about Greece. The information seems insufficient as to what is going on there, and it is longer than usual since we have heard from any of our correspondents at Athens. We have received the Penny Newsman regularly, and are very well pleased with it, all but the articles on foreign affairs. I wish you had some regular writer who understands European politics, for respecting America I have no fault to find. You deserve success, for you are working very hard against many difficulties.

Do not write again to Avignon, as we expect to be at Blackheath next month in time for the Club meeting.²

We have just sent you some honey from Mount Hymettus which we have lately received from Athens and which I hope you will do me the pleasure to accept. I am

Dear Chadwick
Ever Yrs Truly

J. S. Mill.

673.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 27. 1864

Dear Sir

My chief object in the present letter is to ask you not to write again to Avignon, as we return to Blackheath next month.

I was much interested by what you told me in your last respecting the progress of opinion on the subject of your plan—especially the accounts from Frankfort.² I have not seen the article you mention in Fraser,³ but will make a point of seeing it while in England. I should have very much liked to have seen the article which you wrote on the land and house question.⁴ The editor of Macmillan is a great goose for not publishing it. Whatever people may say against Cobden, his controversy with the Times⁵ has for the first time in the country turned people's minds to the question of small properties in land—a thing I tried hard to do, seventeen years ago,⁶ at the time of the Irish famine but without the slightest success.

Your labours about Christ's Hospital⁷ are sure to be useful some day, and not a distant one, even if Gladstone is not able to do anything with the subject at present.⁸ The overhauling of the great misapplied charitable endowments cannot be long postponed after his great speech.

We have ventured to send you a small portion of some honey from Mount Hymettus which we have just received from Athens, and which you will give us great pleasure by accepting.

Helen joins with me in begging to be remembered to your daughters.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

674.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Feb. 17 [1864]

Dear Chadwick

My name is disengaged for the Club meeting,² and I hold it at your disposal.

Your appointment by the Institute³ does them credit and is of some moment, as it authorizes you to invite their attention to various important subjects by sending them your writings and other documents.⁴ It is probably owing to Senior⁵ and his many friends in the Academy and in Paris generally that you are so justly appreciated there. I am

Yrs Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

675.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

Feb. 22. 1864

Dear Sir

I duly received your interesting letter of the 5th, which I have ever since waited for leisure to acknowledge.

Your article on Ireland² seems to me excellent, and, as far as I can see, stands perfectly well without the omitted part; but I much regret the omission, as a discussion by you, of the nature and grounds of property in land, would have been the most valuable part of the article. The editor may have been, and probably was, short

of room, but had this reason not existed, I should have expected beforehand that some other would have been found for avoiding the insertion of anything fundamental on that question. It is one of the subjects which the Edinburgh Review and those by whom it guides itself are shy of, and on which they act as long as possible on the maxim *quieta ne movere*.

The conversation at the P. E. Club was good and interesting, but scarcely a discussion, being all on one side.³ All thought that financial embarrassments are no hindrance to the carrying on of a really popular war, or of any war by a government strong enough to enforce sacrifices.

I have not yet told you the dénouement of my correspondence with Gladstone. In my answer⁴ to him I enumerated a number of points, raised by Loring, to which he had not adverted in his letter. The result was, that he referred the pamphlet and my commentary on it to the Judge Advocate General.⁵

About the time when I heard from you, I received a note from the Duke of Argyll⁶ in a very satisfactory tone respecting the pamphlet and the subject generally. I found a copy of the pamphlet waiting for me here, so that if your copies from America have not arrived, I have one at your call which I will send to any one whose attention you may wish to direct to it.

I send this letter to Dublin from whence I presume it will be forwarded if you are still absent.

I Am Dear Sir
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

676.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath]

Feb. 24, 1864

Dear Sir—

The prices you mention for the Liberty & the Representative Govt will do very well, but I am disappointed that there is so little difference in the case of the Pol Econ.² between the estimated price of a double column edition & one in the ordinary form. In the estimate you favoured me with at Avignon the proposed price for the cheaper of the two forms was 10/6 to 12/. From this & from what seemed to be your own impression I had hoped that a double column edition could be offered at 7/6 or 8/. A

smaller difference would not bring the book within reach of a much larger class, and could hardly be an equivalent to the purchasers for the difference of type.

677.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 29. 1864

Dear Sir—

I am very glad that you will be able to afford the Pol. Econ. at a lower price.² I propose giving up all pecuniary advantage to myself from the popular editions, to enable them to be sold cheaper. With regard to advertising you are the best judge. I sh^d think that the most useful advertising would be in the papers which are most read by the more intelligent of the working classes—namely, I suppose, principally the cheap press, but there may be higher priced papers which are taken at working men's clubs, mechanics' institutions &c. It is probable that in revising the book for the cheap edition I may be able to save some space by omitting some of the long quotations in notes, especially those in foreign languages. I do not however expect much saving from this cause, but there is an App^x to the first volume of considerably more than a sheet, which it is quite unnecessary to include in the popular edition. To set against this there may be some small additions to the text, but I do not anticipate their extending to anything like the same number of pages.

I have no objection whatever to the publication of Mr. Stebbing's analysis of the Logic.³ I remember thinking very favorably of it.

Thanks for the account. I was quite unprepared to find that the balance is in my favour.

678.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

March 6. 1864

Dear Sir

I beg you to accept the few volumes I sent. Your doing so will be a favour to me more than to yourself, as I am clearing out the books I do not want, to make room for those

I do. Lord Brougham's book is a rich collection of facts respecting the institutions and constitutional history of all countries, and you may find it useful for reference.

I like your Essay on the Colonies² very much, though I do not go the length of all you say respecting their advantages. But I agree in many of your arguments and in your conclusion. I have not seen the reply to "Utilitarianism".³ The author has not sent it to me, and most of the new books on the foundations of morality are such trumpery that it would be waste of money to buy any of them without first seeing it, or being credibly informed that it is worth reading. I shall endeavour to see it, however, and the more so if you determine on reviewing it, that I may be better able to appreciate your review. Your letter in this week's Penny Newsman⁴ is well calculated for the effect you wish to produce by it.

My daughter and I join in best remembrances to Mrs Plummer, and I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

679.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 14. 1864.

Dear Chadwick

I had already read Mr Christie's paper,² and liked it very much. I should be very well disposed to become a member of such an association³ as is projected if it were started with a fair prospect of support from influential persons of the bribing classes.

Ever Yrs Truly

J. S. Mill

680.

TO THOMAS BAYLEY POTTER¹

Blackheath Park

14 March 1864

I am grieved that there is a prospect of a discontinuance of the Co-operator;² which is so valuable for the means of keeping before the minds of Co-operators the principles and rules on which their success depends. I hope there will be a few subscriptions towards paying the debt; which is the immediate difficulty: but the Co-operative Societies ought to feel the value of such an organ and not to leave it dependent on outsiders for its existence.

681.

TO THOMAS BAYLEY POTTER¹

Blackheath

March 17. 1864

Dear Sir

Since receiving your letter of the 14th, I have thought a good deal about the scheme for a Political Science Association.² It has prima facie much to recommend it, and your willingness to encounter the many difficulties and great trouble of starting it is worthy of the energy and zeal in a good cause of which you have already given so many proofs. There are, however, many things to be considered before embarking in such an experiment. If the thing cannot be made a decided success, an abortive attempt would only do harm; while, even in case of success, if the composition of the Society and the character of its proceedings were such as to identify it in appearance with any particular set of opinions, it would be equally a failure as to the end proposed, which I understand to be, not a Parliamentary Reform League but a public arena for the discussion of general principles and their applications. The success of the Social Science Association I take to be owing to the fact that it really brings together persons of all opinions consistent with the profession of a desire for social improvement. To be successful, the Society you propose must do the same; to admit all varieties of opinion is not enough, it must be able really to succeed in bringing them together. There is another principle of the Social Science Assocⁿ, adherence to which seems to me indispensable. That body has made a great step in advance by admitting women, in theory and in practice, to take part, equally with men, both in its administration and in its proceedings. Not to do the same in founding a rival society would be a step back, and (speaking for myself) would prevent my feeling justified in giving my adhesion to the project. In any case, while I feel the very high compliment of your thinking of me for such a position as that of President, I must beg to be excused from accepting it. I am convinced that with the same amount of time and trouble I can do more for my opinions as an individual writer than by taking an active part in any Association. Neither is a person with such decided opinions as mine, desirable as President. It would be injurious to the Society to be identified with any unpopular opinions, while it would be a disadvantage to the opinions to be held accountable either for the failure of the Society, or for anything in its proceedings which might be disliked. The sort of President you require would be some one known to be liberal in a general way, and on questions generally (not on some kinds of

questions only) but not strongly connected in the public mind with any special opinions which are in a small minority—in a sort of neutral position as to politics, and of a standing and personal position to be looked up to independently of his opinions. After much consideration, I can think of no one but Lord Stanley³ who would suit your purpose. What chance there would be of his consenting I have no means of knowing. You could not make the proposal to him without having a good list to shew of persons who would consent to be Vice Presidents if he would be President; and it is of importance that these should be of as various a character as possible. I am quite willing to be one of these (if the plan, when matured, seems to me a good one) as that would only shew general approbation, without the grave responsibility necessarily attaching to the President, and which I could not undertake unless I were prepared to give an amount of time and thought to the conduct of the Association which I sincerely think would not, in my case, be attended with any equivalent benefit to its objects.

I return the letters which you inclosed—Mr Cobden's suggestions seem to me, as far as they go, very right and judicious.

I am not acquainted with M. Renan,⁴ otherwise I would with great pleasure have given you an introduction to him. I should think you could easily obtain one.

The Cooperator is most welcome to any use it can make of my note.⁵

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

T. B. Potter Esq.

682.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]. March 18, 1864

Dear Bain—

I was much delighted by receiving your new edition.² You must have worked very hard to get it out so soon. I have not yet come to much of the new matter as I am reading the book regularly through from the beginning, but the remaining portion of my task with Hamilton will now be plain sailing. I am very glad the additions are considerable as they will all tend to the more complete clearing up of difficulties.

I have read your Grammar³ with considerable care & attention. It is a great improvement on any other grammar that I have seen & as far as I can judge I think

you right on all the questions of theory. Nobody has so completely got to the bottom of Shall & Will.⁴ As to minute details I found myself every now & then differing from you—chiefly though not always in cases where you seemed to me to draw grammatical principles too tight, to the exclusion of modes of speech which have a real *raison d'être*. But all these are points open to discussion & I should not have much confidence in my own impressions if you did not agree with them when stated. I have not written them down, but I have made references by which I can recal[l] them if wanted.

In consequence mainly of your last letter I have been reading Spencer's First Principles over again. On the whole I like it less than the first time. He is so good that he ought to be better. His *a priori* system is more consistent than Hamilton's, but quite as fundamentally absurd—in fact there is the same erroneous assumption at the bottom of both. And most of his general principles strike me as being little more than verbal or at most empirical generalisations, with no warrant for their being considered laws. As you truly say, his doctrine that the Persistence of Force is a datum of Consciousness is exactly Hamilton's strange theory of causation. But how weak his proof of it. We cannot (he says) conceive a beginning because all consciousness is consciousness of difference, & when the two terms of the comparison are Something & Nothing, one of the two is not a possible object of consciousness at all. This is surely a play on the word Nothing, very like the one which Hamilton shews up in his discussion of the different theories of Causation. "Nothing" cannot be an object of consciousness, but the *absence of Something* may be. We can be conscious of x, & conscious of the universe minus x, or of ourselves minus x, and the difference between these two states is the difference required by the law of Consciousness.

Neither does Spencer, any more than Tyndall,⁵ remove any of my difficulties about the Conservation of Force. The law of Conservation as exhibited in the cases which go farthest to prove it, consists in this—that one form of force only ceases to manifest itself when a force equivalent in quantity, but of a different form, manifests itself instead. When a ball strikes another ball, the force which the first ball loses does not become latent; the motion lost is either transferred entire to the other ball, or if any of it is lost sight of, the corresponding amount of force reappears in an increase of temperature. As, however, we know that there is latent heat, I can conceive that force in general may become latent, & remain unmanifested even for many geological periods, reappearing identical in quantity at their close. But I have not seen the formulae of the theory so expressed as to place such a fact as this in a rational & comprehensible light. I require a great many explanations respecting the molecular motion which is supposed to be the material antecedent of the phenomenon heat. Force may be latent, but what is the meaning of latent motion? Is the molecular motion supposed to continue during the period of latency? When an object is at a fixed temperature, is then a fixed degree of molecular motion always taking place in it? Spencer's doctrine, as a connected theory, fails entirely if there is not. Yet surely all that can be proved is that a molecular motion takes place at every *change* of temperature, and surely it is contrary to all our knowledge of material forces to suppose that a motion either of bodies or of particles can be perpetually going on for a cycle of ages in a resisting medium without diminution.

With regard to the general theory, difficulties multiply⁶ round me the longer I consider it. Spencer says, “Just that amount of gravitation force which the sun’s heat overcame in raising the atoms of water is given out again in the fall of those atoms to the same level,”⁷ thus implying that the force of gravity is not acting all the while & kept in equilibrium by a counter force, in the cessation of which it again manifests itself, of course neither increased nor diminished in amount; but is actually (so to speak) absorbed & again restored by the annihilation of an equivalent quantity of heat. Now if this be so, none of the heat can be expended as heat; for if the agent which destroys the heat, has its own temperature raised by the process (which it surely has), there remains so much the less heat to be reconverted into gravitation, & the body will not fall, as I apprehend it does, with a force exactly equal to that which was overcome in raising it.

Again, Spencer says “The investigations of Dulong,⁸ Petit,⁹ & Neumann¹⁰ have proved a relation in amount between the affinities of combining bodies & the heat evolved during their combination.”¹¹ I should much like to know the numerical law of this relation, as it could not fail to enlarge our conception of the meaning of the negative sign. It would be interesting to know what strength of the affinity corresponds to the “heat evolved” by a freezing mixture.

Again, I do not understand how the theory adjusts itself to the ordinary phenomenon of accelerating force. If the earth were falling into the sun, it would, when it had passed through half the distance, be acted upon by four times the original force to begin with, & in addition, by the enormous momentum generated by the acquired velocity. In what antecedent form did this enormous additional force exist? Is it all acquired at the expense of heat? & would its development be attended by an inconceivably great amount of diminution of temperature? If these are not difficulties to you their being so to me can only arise from my ignorance of the subject; but as I desire very much to understand it, I warn you of the demand which will be made upon your didactic faculties when we have the opportunity of discussing it together.

I am particularly glad that you will be in London up to a later date than last year, as I shall not return to England so early in June as usual; notwithstanding which we shall now have plenty of time for discussion and comparison of notes. I hope to have at least some chapters of the Hamilton in a state to shew to you when we meet.

With Kind Regards To Mrs Bain

683.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

March 18, 1864

Dear Chadwick

Many thanks for your kind proposals. I have, however, declined the invitation of the Duc d'Aumale.² The fact is, my sympathies with the Republican party in France are so strong that I cannot willingly place myself under an obligation to a conspicuous person of any other party, however high a respect I may have for him individually, and however glad I should be to meet him at any other person's house.

I hope we shall find some other opportunity for a walk together. I am

Dear Chadwick
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

684.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

March 28. 1864

Dear Sir

I thank you very much for the opportunity of reading Mr Loring's two letters. I do not see how our Government can get over the breach of international obligation (even on the principles of *Historicus*)² in not interdicting to the Alabama all British ports. The question of culpable negligence in letting her get out originally, like all questions which turn on degree, is open to endless dispute, but on the other I cannot see that there is a word to say.

On the question in your postscript, so far as I am qualified to have an opinion, it agrees with yours. Several copies of Loring's pamphlet³ have been sent to me from different quarters, so if you want one or two, I can supply you. Do you wish the Boston papers to be returned to you? and in what way shall I return the Bombay documents⁴ which I am indebted to you for the pleasure of reading?

"Plutology"⁵ has been sent to me, but I have not yet had time to look into it, and shall now think many other duties more urgent than that of reading it. I should ascribe the opinions given of it by the Spectator and Reader not to defects of honesty, but to sheer ignorance and incompetence on the subject.

I am very happy to hear of your intended volume of Essays.⁶ Thornton's book is out of print.⁷ In consequence of the popular attention now, for the first time in England, raised on the subject I have urged the author to reprint it, which he will probably do.

Meanwhile I will either find you a copy, or send you mine. The discussion of the subject at the Club⁸ was interesting and well supported, but, like all discussions by that body of the questions of the future as distinguished from those of the past, it was a sad exposure of the nakedness of the land. I almost think we need a Junior Political Economy Club. But the same end may be better attained by getting good recruits into this. I do not yet know what will be the question for April 8th. Is there a chance of your being there? I shall; but it will be my last time until July.

Yours Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

685.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

March 29. 1864

Dear Sir

I thank you very much for the various writings of yours that you have lately sent me, and which I have read with the usual pleasure. The number of the National Magazine which contained two of your papers² that you might like to give the benefit of to others besides us, I included in a parcel which I made up for you, containing the last Westminster Review and some numbers of Fraser. But by the mistake of a servant, it was taken to the office of the London Parcels Delivery Company instead of the Railway Office, and I am afraid that it may not have reached you.

As I have another copy of Herbert Spencer's "Essays, Scientific, Political and Speculative," I beg that you will accept as a gift the copy I lent you. I neglected to make a note of the books I lent you, but I think Herbert Spencer's volume on Education³ was one: this, and the two volumes of Buckle, are the only books, so far as I remember, which I wish returned; but about those there is not the smallest hurry.

We leave England for the spring about the 10th of April.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer

Believe Me Always
Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

686.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 30 mars 1864

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je serais bien aise de lire la préface de Saint-Simon, sachant bien qu'Auguste Comte a été injuste envers lui,² comme en général envers tous ceux qui avaient cessé de lui plaire. Du reste, ne vous donnez pas la peine de la faire copier d'abord parceque je ne puis pas encore m'occuper du travail sur Comte,³ et je pense bien que je vous reverrai auparavant; secondement, parceque dans ce travail il sera peu question de la biographie de Comte; d'autant plus que ceux qui disputent autour de son tombeau sont tellement en désaccord sur les faits, que je désespère d'arriver à la vérité.

J'ai trouvé excellente votre lettre à M. Guérault,⁴ et j'ai vu avec grand plaisir que vous vous proposez de la faire suivre par d'autres lettres ou articles sur le Saint-Simonisme.

Lord Houghton⁵ est, comme il vous a paru, un homme d'un mérite réel. Connaissez-vous ses poésies?⁶ Il y en a gré méritant de vivre. Comme homme politique, il a toujours eu une conduite très louable, malgré une famille et une éducation Tory de vieille trempe.

Veillez bien remercier votre frère de son travail sur les banques.⁷ Sans partager toutes ses doctrines, je trouve son livre très utile, et fait pour dissiper les nuages qui dans la plupart des esprits français obscurcissent encore les principes les plus élémentaires de la thèse du crédit.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

687.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

April 1. 1864

Dear Chadwick

There is great justice in what you say in your letter, and the question altogether is an unfortunate one to be presented to the working people. But since the Mazzini and Stansfeld affair² has forced the subject on, it seems neither right in itself nor just to individuals that it should be discussed as if there was only one side to it. We think that what you have done is exactly the best that could be done, viz. to publish, from a correspondent, one side, accompanied by your own strong adhesion to the other.³

I meant to attend the discussion at the Law Amendment Society⁴ even before I heard from you. If it would suit you to take dinner here on Monday at five, we could go to the meeting together, and could thus get an opportunity for a little talk. We leave for Avignon in about a week

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

688.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

April 2. 1864

Dear Sir

I write at once to say that it is needless to send the N. American Review,² as I also have received a copy of it, which I have not yet had time to read.

Mr Loring's last letters³ seem to me very inferior to his first.⁴ His line of argument is sometimes almost silly. How absurd to say that England ought not to recognise the South as belligerents because they have no ports. Have they no ports because their ports are just now blockaded, a blockade which may cease at any moment, or become merely nominal?⁵ Besides they were not, I believe, even blockaded when the recognition took place. Again, are inland countries never to be recognised as belligerents? It seems to me that drawing attention to such weak productions would do more harm than good to the cause.

The change of the New York Herald on the subject of slavery⁶ is indeed most significant. The Times article⁷ is also a valuable indication though it will not prevent, and has not prevented the Times, a day or two afterwards, from returning to the old tone. And such is the obtuseness of the public that it will not discover any contradiction.

I, also, suspect that L.S. is Leslie Stephen,⁸ but as I have no proof of his knowledge of the subject, and great proof of yours, I have little doubt that he has in this case shewn ignorance of it.

I will send to you by post two of the three copies of Loring which I believe I possess.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

689.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath

April 3. 1864.

Dear Sir

I am fortunately able to send you the letter you want.² No Englishman who has read both you and Comte, can suppose that you have derived much from him. No thinker's conclusions bear more completely the marks of being arrived at by the progressive development of his own original conceptions; while, if there is any previous thinker to whom you owe much, it is evidently (as you yourself say) Sir W. Hamilton. But the opinions in which you agree with Comte, and which as you truly observe, are in no way peculiar to him, are exactly those which would make French writers class you with him; because, to them, Comte and his followers are the only thinkers who represent opposition to their muddy metaphysics.

I myself owe much more to Comte than you do, though, in my case also, all my principal conclusions had been reached before I saw his book. But in speculative matters (not in practical) I often agree with him where you do not, and, among other subjects, on this particular one, the Classification of the Sciences.³ The fact you mention, of your having read only a portion of his Cours de Phil[osophie] Positive, explains some things to me which I did not understand previously: for, if you had read the entire book, I think you would have recognised that several of the things which you urge as objections to his theory, are part of the theory.

I have lately had occasion to re-read, and am still reading, your Principles of Psychology. I do not agree any more than I did before with the doctrine of the Introduction; but as to the book itself, I cannot help expressing to you how much my opinion of it, though already high, has been raised (I hope from a progress in my own mind) by this new reading. There is much in it that did not by any means strike me before as it does now: especially the parts which shew how large a portion of our

mental operations consists in the recognition of relations between relations. It is very satisfactory to see how you and Bain, each in his own way, have succeeded in affiliating the conscious operations of mind to the primary unconscious organic actions of the nerves, thus filling up the most serious lacuna and removing the chief difficulty in the association psychology.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

690.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 10. 1864

Dear Bain—

I hope you have received the number you wanted of the *Revue des [Deux] M[ondes]*.² If not, let me know. I shall wish it returned, as we keep the review for binding, but it will be time enough when you come to London, or later if you have need of it longer.

I have finished your new edition.³ I have not compared it minutely with the old, but I think you have greatly improved the book; both as to the thoughts & the mode of exposition. The only point on which I find much matter for comment is the account you give of Association by Contrast.⁴ No doubt, the relativity of all Consciousness (in your sense of relativity, which is not the same as Hamilton's) accounts for part of the phenomena, & seems to be the real explanation of some cases which you have very successfully analysed. But I do not think it will do as a general explanation, nor do I think it fits your leading instances. According to the law of relativity the correlative which sh^d be suggested by large is not small but ordinary. If a thing is only large relatively to what is small we do not call it large, simply. I am myself inclined (I speak under correction) to solve the question of Contrast as a source of Association by denying its existence. I cannot find in myself that present suffering has any tendency to recall my idea of former happiness. On the contrary, it tends, I think, as one might suppose beforehand, in the way of obstructive association to exclude that idea. What is real in the case is, I think, that during the state of suffering, the idea of previous enjoyments may be recalled by something which is associated with it in the way of resemblance or contiguity, & that then the clashing of the two simultaneous emotions arrests the attention upon them, intensifies the consciousness of them both, suggests the additional idea of change or vicissitude, & the painful one of change for the worse, & all this being intimately mixed up with the state of present suffering, people

fancy it is the suffering which suggested the remembrance when, in truth, it was an obstacle to it.

I have also read through Spencer's *Princ. of Psychology*, which is as much better than I thought, as the *First Principles* are less good. He is, no doubt, a great deal too certain of many things, & on some he is clearly wrong, but much less so than I fancied (barring the *Universal Postulate*,⁵ on which he now tells me that my difference from him is chiefly verbal, but I do not think so). He has a great mastery over the obscurer applications of the associative principle. As you say, he is particularly good on the subject of resistance & extension. Still his argument against Hamilton does not thoroughly satisfy me. There seems to be an occult *petitio principii* in it. He argues that we cannot acquire the idea of extension from sight alone because that idea involves muscular feelings, which last is just the point to be proved. Of course the idea *such as we now have it* involves muscular feelings, & any idea we could have got from sight must have been very unlike our *present* notion of extension; but that distinction is perfectly well drawn by Reid, in his *Geometry of Visibles*.⁶ What I want to know is, exactly what idea of one thing as outside another we could have obtained by sight: whether merely the vague feeling of two simultaneous colours or what more than this. A similar question arises as to touch: if two distinct parts of the skin came simultaneously into passive contact with objects, should we apart from other experience distinguish two sensations or only one mass of sensation; & if we should distinguish two simultaneous sensations, is this simultaneous consciousness of a plurality of sensations what we mean by *outness*; as if so, we might acquire that idea from the simultaneity of a taste & a smell.

I cannot quite make out why you advised me to read the *Fichte*.⁷ I find nothing at all in it. It is a fanciful theory to account for imaginary facts. I do not see how his preconscious states can have had the merit even of suggesting to you or Spencer the first germ of what both of you have written with a real science & philosophy to connect our conscious with our purely organic states.

We leave this week for Avignon but it is not quite certain on what day. If you should be writing this week it does not matter whether you address your letter here or to Avignon, as if it does not find us here it will be forwarded.

691.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ROYAL HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

April 13, 1864.

Sir,—

I have the honour of submitting through you to the Council of the Royal Horticultural Society a memorial from twelve botanists, accompanied by vouchers, on the subject of the prizes offered by the Society for country herbaria;[2](#) also an original memorial from five Manchester botanists on the same subject.—I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

J. S. Mill

The Secretary of the

Royal Horticultural Society

692.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK[1](#)

Blackheath

April 15. 1864

Dear Chadwick

As I think you expressed a wish to know something about the history of the American Sanitary Commission, I have sent to you by Book Post a number of the North American Review containing a valuable account of its commencements.[2](#)

I inclose an expression of gratitude to the Penny Newsman which I have found in one of the best of the American papers—edited by the poet Bryant.[3](#)

Ever Yrs Truly

J. S. Mill

693.

TO JOHN PLUMMER[1](#)

Blackheath

Monday evening
[April 18, 1864]

Dear Sir

Your note was only delivered here at six this evening. We were a little anxious on account of your not coming, and are very sorry for the cause. I hope most sincerely that you were sufficiently better today, to be able to see Garibaldi.² Mr Thornton³ was very much pleased when he heard you were coming, and disappointed at not seeing you, but I hope he may be able to meet you here the next time you come.

We leave for Avignon on Thursday.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer, I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

694.

TO ISA CRAIG¹

Apt (Vaucluse)

April 26. 1864

Dear Madam

I learn with great satisfaction from your letter, which has only just reached me, that the funds of the Society for the Employment of Women² are really used for enlarging the number of occupations open to them; and I enclose a donation towards the object from myself and my daughter Miss Helen Taylor.

My absence from England will of course prevent me from attending the meeting on the 29th but I need hardly say that I should consider its object as a most important step in advance towards the improvement both of women themselves and of their position.

I Am Dear Madam

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Miss Isa Craig.

695.

TO EARL GREY¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

May 13, 1864

My Dear Lord

I am much obliged by the opportunity you have given me of reading the new chapters of your Essay on Parliamentary Government in the present stage of their progress.² As you have added to the honour of a very flattering mention of what I have written on the subject, that of inviting any remarks which occur to me, I readily avail myself of the invitation, though much of what I have to say has probably presented itself to your own mind.

You already know, as well as I could state, and better than I could state in a few words, in what respects we agree and differ on the general principles of the question. I presume that, my principles being such as you are aware of, what you are desirous of knowing in the present case is the impression made on me by your practical suggestions. I entirely agree with you that Parliamentary Reform is a subject which can only be usefully considered as a whole; since, the unobvious consequences of political changes being still more important than the obvious ones, a change in only one part of a political system, though in itself desirable, may do as much harm as good, while several changes made at once, and well adapted to one another, may secure all the good & guard against the harm. In your various proposals you have been guided by this just idea, and it seems to me that they have been suggested by a more enlarged conception than is at all common among politicians, both of the evils which exist, and of those which there might be danger of introducing by the remedies.

To some of your proposals I attach great importance. The first place among these, I give to the representation of minorities, which would be obtained, to a very useful extent, by the cumulative vote. Mr Hare's plan, however, seems to me vastly superior both in the direct and in the indirect benefits it would produce; and the supposed difficulty of working it would, I am almost certain, in a great measure disappear after a little experience. The plan has been several times discussed in the legislatures of the two principal Australian colonies,³ and though not yet adopted, I have been struck by the proof given in the debates how perfectly the great majority of the speakers, both Conservative and Radical, understood it, and how generally the best of them, on both sides, supported it. I feel confident that it would require nothing for success but a real desire in the public to make it succeed. This does not yet exist in England, but in a colony there is less prejudice against novelties. In Australia, Conservatives favour the plan as a check to the absolute power of numerical majorities, and Democrats because it is a direct & obvious corollary from the democratic principle.

Your proposal for allowing the House of Commons to join to itself by cooptation a certain number of members, I am more doubtful about, though quite alive to the inconvenience which it is intended to meet, that of governments with so small a majority that they cannot carry, and dare not propose, anything disliked by even a small number of their supporters. But it does not seem likely that a plan, even if adopted, would be permanent, of which the avowed object would be that a Government or a policy might have a considerable majority in the House for the remainder of a Parliament, though it had ceased to have a majority in the constituencies. This would scarcely, I think, be accepted, unless combined with a great reduction in the duration of parliaments—perhaps even to annual. But there is another mode of cooptation which though it would not attain so completely the particular object, would probably attain it partially, and would be much less objectionable in other respects, viz. that the House should elect a certain number of members, not by lists, but by a modification of Mr Hare's principle, in the mode which I have recommended for a portion of the House of Lords,⁴ and which you yourself propose in another case. This would add a very valuable class of members to the House: while it would effect the objects you have in view in your proposal for the election by Parliament of fifteen life members; a proposal open to objections, both apparent and real, which cannot have escaped your notice.

The objections I have urged against two stages of election⁵ are, certainly, considerably weakened, though not removed, by your suggestion that the election of electors should take place in the regular course of affairs, without waiting till Parliament is dissolved or a vacancy occurs in the representation. But if there is to be indirect election, an idea occurs to me which may be worth bringing under your consideration. I attach great importance to giving a vote of some sort to every person who comes up to such an educational standard as can be made accessible to all. But as long as manual labourers are a separate class, I do not wish them to have the complete command of the House. You, again, think it desirable to admit that class to a considerable, though not a preponderant influence. Might not these desirable conditions be all realised, at least for some time to come, by such an arrangement as this: The present electoral qualification, with the improvements it admits of, to remain in force for direct votes: but all the non-electors who can read, write, and calculate to be allowed to choose electors, say one in ten or one in five of their number, who should form, along with the direct electors, the parliamentary constituency? By this plan the working classes would obtain a substantial power in Parliament but not the complete control of it. And this is perhaps the only shape in which the attaching of unequal value to the votes of different electors, which I have proposed in the form of plural voting, would have much chance of being adopted.

The only remark of a non-practical character which I will make on any part of your two chapters, is, that though there are many great faults in the working of democratic institutions in America (some of which the salutary shock that the American mind is now undergoing, will have a tendency to correct) I do not think that the protective tariffs can justly be laid to the charge of democracy; for I believe that Protectionism is the creed, in America, of the majority, both of the wealthy and of the literary classes including even the political economists; & though I am far from thinking that they are

in the right, there are some things to be said for their opinion, in the circumstances of America, which are not applicable to the old countries of Europe.

Allow me to add that Mr Hare's name is not Julius but Thomas, and that his book (not pamphlet) is entitled, A Treatise on Representation, Parliamentary and Municipal. There is a pamphlet by Professor Fawcett⁶ which explains the plan more simply and clearly than the book, but I believe it is out of print. Mr Fawcett himself had however some copies a short time ago. I am

My Dear Lord
Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

696.

TO PETER ALFRED TAYLOR¹

Avignon, May 14, 1864

Dear Sir—

I do not know whether you are aware that Messrs. Currie are returning cheques sent to them for the free testimonial to General Garibaldi. I enclose the letter they have sent to me with two cheques returned, and I send them two new ones for the same amount.

I am, dear Sir, very truly yours,

J. S. Mill

697.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

May 16. 1864

Dear Sir

I was very glad to hear from you, and to hear such good accounts of your proceedings. By good luck I have two French newspapers which together contain the whole of Emile Ollivier's report.² I will send them to you either by this post or the next, and along with them some other numbers I have, containing part of the debate on the

subject in the Corps Législatif. I will also procure Casimir Périer's pamphlet³ and send it to you.

Having a great deal to do I cannot say more at present. I am

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

698.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

May 31, 1864

Dear Sir

I think your projected paper² has a chance of being very useful, and I will willingly contribute to the "Publicity Fund" £20 if it is to be paid down, or be responsible for £50 if it is a question of guarantee. About literary help I cannot as yet say anything.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

699.

TO THE NATIONAL REFORM UNION¹

Avignon

June 9, 1864

Dear Sirs

I have had the honour of viewing your communication dated June 3rd, informing me that I have been nominated one of the Vice Presidents of the National Reform Union² and requesting me to accept that office.

I entirely agree in the wish that a new movement should be commenced for Reform and feel myself much honoured in being thought, by a body of my countrymen, a fit

person to take a prominent part in it. To justify me, however, in doing so it would be necessary that my opinions, and those of the promoters of the movement, should coincide much more than appears to be the case. I do not agree in all the points of the Society programme;³ and those which I do agree in, I could not join in agitating for, unless in conjunction with others on which the programme is silent. For these reasons it is not in my power to accept your flattering proposal.

I Am,
Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill.

700.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath Park, June 26, 1864.

. . . I have now been so long without news of any kind from you, that I much wish to know how you are in health, and how you are going on in all respects. You would be very much mistaken if you thought that I feel less interested in you, or less desirous to hear from you, than before the painful circumstances which were the subject of our latest correspondence.² If these circumstances make any difference, it is the contrary way. And, besides my interest in you, I feel a strong interest in what you do. I believe you to be capable, as few are, of doing important things, both in philosophy and in erudition—the former of a kind specially required at the present time, and perhaps even more so in Germany than elsewhere: and I am anxious that such a capacity should be turned, as much as possible, to the benefit of the world.—I have little to tell you which regards us. Our life has been going on in the usual manner. I have been working hard at my book on Hamilton, and it is now well advanced towards completion. You are one of the most competent judges of such a book, and one of those whose approbation of it I most desire.—I lately saw M. Littré at Paris and, in conversing with him on the state of German philosophy, I mentioned your name. I was glad to find that he is in correspondence with you and, to the extent of his opportunities, appreciates you justly. . . .

701.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

June 27. 1864

Dear Sir

I write this to thank you for the interesting papers you sent, and to say that we are now here, that you may not send anything more to Avignon. I need hardly say that it will always give us pleasure to see you here, and renew the interesting conversations from which I am very glad that you have derived any encouragement and which have been encouraging also to me.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer, I am

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

702.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath Park

le 2 juillet 1864

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Quand aurons-nous le plaisir de vous revoir? J'espère que vous viendrez dîner avec nous quelque jour, pas trop éloigné, et je vous prie de fixer le jour qui vous conviendra. Nous dinons à 6 heures.

Tout À Vous De Coeur

J. S. Mill

703.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath Park, Kent,

July 2, 1864.

Sir:

On returning from abroad I have had the pleasure of finding the copy of the "Rebellion Record"² and of the pamphlets of the Loyal Publication Society,³ which

the distinguished body of citizens of New York, mentioned in your letter of April 26, have done me the honor to send me.

I beg to return my sincere thanks for the present in every sense so valuable; and in doing so I take the opportunity of renewing the expression of my warm admiration for the energy and constancy displayed by the people of the Free States in their present gigantic struggle, to the success of which I look forward as full of the most important consequences to humanity, stretching into the remotest future.

I Am, Sir, With Greatest Respect,
Yours Very Truly,

J. S. Mill.

704.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

July 4. 1864.

Dear Chadwick

You can of course reprint my letter² if you like it, but I should not like to print what has already appeared in one paper, as a letter addressed to another.

I go a certain length with you on the point of resistance against hopeless odds, but not the length you go. There would be a great deal more tyrannical aggression by the strong against the weak, if those who knew they were not strong enough to succeed in the struggle, gave way at once and allowed the aggressors to carry their point without its costing them anything. A big boy will think twice before tyrannizing over a little one if he expects that the little fellow will fight to the last and make him pay for his victory.

Spirit and obstinacy themselves count for much, and for how much can never be known till they are tried. The Greeks would never have resisted Xerxes nor the Dutch, Philip II if they had merely calculated numbers.

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

705.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

July 6. 1864

Dear Sir

I find in the May number of the Journal des Economistes a review of the budget of this year, 1864,² which contains the amounts of receipt and expenditure classified under general heads in a manner probably sufficient to answer your purpose. If this does not, I do not think that anything else in the Journal des Economistes will do better. I send it by this post, and I beg you to keep it as long as it can be of any use to you.

I wish you were not so far off and were not going away so soon, as I would gladly see more of you than a mere glimpse once a year.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

706.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

le 7 juillet 1864

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Parmi les trois jours que vous offrez, je choisis le plus proche—jeudi 14 juillet, anniversaire mémorable.² Nous dinons à 6 heures $\frac{1}{4}$.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

707.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

July 18. 1864

Dear Sir

I am very glad the Journal des Economistes will answer your purpose.² I am not likely to want the Plea for Peasant Proprietors,³ but as I do not know whether this will find you at Bangor or whether you would like to have the book sent there, I wait before sending it, to hear further from you respecting time and place.

The news from America looked bad, but the letter of the Daily News correspondent this morning restores one's spirits.⁴

I Am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

708.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath Park

July 18, 1864

Dear Sir

I have only recently seen, on returning from abroad, the number of the Horticultural Society's Journal which records the agitation against their offer of prizes, or rather, against the conditions on which their prizes were offered. I have been surprised to find that a passage from your letter to me, distinguishing the useful from the hurtful part of the proposal, is published in the Journal as a postscript to a letter of mine,² so that I have the appearance of tendering as mine what belongs to you. The passage had nothing whatever to do with the letter to which it has been annexed. I sent it as an inclosure in a private letter to a member of the Council, informing him that I had received it from an eminent botanist³—and I should have told him from whom, if I had not thought that it would be acting in opposition to your wish that the plan should

be brought forward by Mr Babington⁴ rather than by yourself directly. By whose mistake or improper liberty it was printed in its present form I have not learned.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

709.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath

July 29. 1864

Dear Sir

I return Mr Curtis's very interesting and encouraging letter.² Is he the same Curtis who wrote a book—a clever one I remember it was—about Egypt?

I hope Thornton's book arrived duly.³ Keep it for as long as you like; I have no prospect of wanting it for the present. I expect to derive much instruction from what you propose writing on that question in reference to Ireland.⁴ I know tolerably well what Ireland was, but have a very imperfect idea of what Ireland *is* or how far, if at all, the changes there ought to modify my former opinions as to remedial measures. And I shall soon have to give an opinion on the matter myself, in revising my *Pol. Economy* for a new edition.

I shall not fail to look into the *Victoria* for your article on Norman.⁵ I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

710.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Aug. 2. 1864

Dear Mr Fawcett

I cannot think of anything to your purpose treating directly of the question of introducing a gold currency into India. There is a very good article by Leslie in this month's Macmillan² on the gold question generally, in which that point is incidentally touched upon. I do not know that it will tell you anything on the particular point, but it is well worth reading on other accounts.

I have never read Morrison's book,³ but only reviews of it, which gave me very much the same idea of it which the book itself has given to you.

I am very glad that there is already a demand for a new edition of your Manual.⁴ I will endeavour to recollect if anything worth mentioning to you occurred to me when reading it.

You have chosen a good subject for your October lectures,⁵ and one which is worth the trouble it will cost you.

I agree with you in seeing nothing discouraging in the state of things in America. The South must be on its last legs to allow Sherman to advance as he has done; and if he has really taken Atlanta⁶ I am in hopes we are at the beginning of the end, I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

711.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath

Aug. 5. 1864

Dear Mr Fawcett

I send by this post a pamphlet published at Bombay,² and a Minute by Sir W. Mansfield, Commander in Chief of that Presidency, on the question of introducing a gold currency into India.³ The author of the pamphlet has probably prompted the author of the Minute, though they differ on some points. There are some decided mistakes in the Minute, but one did not expect to find a Commander in Chief writing so like a practised Political Economist as he does. If the paper does nothing else, it turns over the question in a great number of ways.

I send also, in case you have not seen it, the Report and Circular of the ex-Law-Amendment-Society,⁴ on measures to check Bribery and Election Expenditure. You will see their notions of what they can do, and I think we ought to give them what help we can.

I do not want any of the papers back.

Yrs Vry Truly

J. S. Mill

712.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath Park

Aug. 7. 1864

Dear Sir

The subscription I sent was intended for yourself, towards preventing you from being out of pocket by your experiment.² It was not for the paper, which, I am sorry to say, I do not like. The few numbers I received before leaving Avignon contained many things of which I disapprove, & in those you sent yesterday the first thing I saw was the monstrous assertion that a woman who says, at least in any public manner, that she is "heart-broken" must be out of her mind.³ It goes on to make a distinction between "ladies" and "women in the humbler ranks" as though it were permitted to "women" to show affectionate feelings which are inconsistent with the dignity of "ladies". What should we think of this in a Tory paper!⁴

I should very decidedly object to have my name mentioned in connexion with the paper, towards the support of which I could not conscientiously contribute, although I am happy to assist in indemnifying you against pecuniary loss.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

713.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath

le 11 août 1864

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Puisque M. Lytton² était en Angleterre, vous ne pouviez faire autrement que vous n'avez fait. Le résultat de vos démarches est très satisfaisant. Maintenant il faut espérer qu'on n'a pas trop supprimé au Foreign Office qui a depuis longtemps une mauvaise réputation à cet égard.

J'ai pris copie du Memorandum pour la communiquer à M. Hare, qui vous saura beaucoup de gré de l'avoir obtenu. M. Hare est maintenant en voyage.

Vos deux lettres sur son système qui ont paru dans Le Temps³ sont excellentes. J'espère qu'il n'y aura pas d'obstacle à la publication des autres. Elles ne pourront manquer d'être très utiles. Les tentatives de Guadet,⁴ d'Emile Augier,⁵ etc. prouvent que l'intelligence du public français se porte maintenant vers les questions de cet ordre.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

714.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

Aug. 16. 1864

Dear Sir

I have just received the enclosed note, which is a complete puzzle to me, as I never had any intention of writing anything of the kind mentioned. If you can in any way account for Mr. Barlow's² misapprehension, will you kindly explain it to me, at the same time returning the note.

I hope you and Mrs Plummer are well. Pray give our kind remembrances. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

715.

TO MRS. HENRY HUTH¹

Blackheath

Aug. 17. 1864

Dear Madam

I have this morning seen one of the Mess^{rs} Longman and have spoken to him on the subject of Mr Buckle's papers.² He seems well disposed to publish any of them that are found suitable for publication, and to take the initiative by applying to Mr Buckle's sisters for a sight of them. To enable him to do so he asked me for their address, which I was not able to give him. As you have kindly expressed so much interest in the subject, and as you are probably acquainted with the address, may I venture to beg you to make me acquainted with it, or to tell me from whom you think I am most likely to be able to obtain it.

I Am Dear Madam
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

716.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath Park

Aug. 22, 1864

Soon after I last wrote to you, I received the copy of your Philodemus,² for which I thank you cordially. It is a most beautiful edition, and your preface makes me look forward with great interest and curiosity to the dissertation which you promise and without which I scarcely hope to be able to make much of so very fragmentary a production as this wonderfully preserved treatise even now is.³—Your edition has had a short complimentary notice in the Saturday Review,⁴ which I enclose.—My book on Hamilton is now finished, with the exception of a final revisal which I shall give it a few months hence before sending it to press. The next thing I propose to write will be a paper on Comte for the Westminster Review.⁵—I saw Mr. Grote a

few days ago. He told me that part of his book⁶ was in the printers' hands and that he expected it would be ready for publication in January. I doubt not that it will be a most important accession both to history and to philosophy. Mr. Bain, who has seen a great part of the manuscript, expresses the highest admiration of it. . . .

717.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath

Sept. 1. 1864

Dear Sir

On receiving your note of Aug. 17, I wrote to Mr. Barlow as you suggested, and I now return his note.²

The particulars which you gave me at the same time about your literary occupations were very satisfactory.

I sent you today a few more periodicals on the chance of their being of use.

We leave tomorrow for Avignon, where we shall always be glad to hear from you. Letters sent here will be forwarded at least as often as weekly.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer, I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

718.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

le 6 Septembre 1864

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

J'ai lu dans le Daily News le support de M. Lytton,² et j'en suis extrêmement satisfait. Son exposition du système de M. Hare est très complète, et je n'osais pas

même espérer d’y trouver une appréciation aussi philosophique de ce système et une aussi pleine adhésion. Le système de M. Andrae³ y ressemble en effet à s’y méprendre. Je regarde la publication de ce rapport comme un événement important. Il en est de même de celle de vos lettres dans le Temps.⁴ Nous sommes à un moment où cet ordre de questions attire l’opinion publique en France. On se demande maintenant quelles sont les institutions qui conviendraient à une démocratie libre, et c’est le moment où les bonnes idées, une fois plantées, s’enracinent dans le sol. Je serais bien aise de connaître le projet de M. Simiot,⁵ mais au lieu de m’envoyer sa brochure, je vous engage à m’en donner le titre la première fois que vous m’écrirez, et je pourrai sans difficulté la procurer ici.

Tout À Vous Bien Sincèrement

J. S. Mill

719.

TO WILLIAM DOUGAL CHRISTIE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 12. 1864

Dear Sir

I have continued to read your letters in the Daily News, as well as those of your adversary.² It is a great pity that the public are not told the facts about him which your letter contains, and also those about the Rio correspondent, and the influences at work in the Times.³ The simple facts without comment are all that would be necessary: for instance, that the writer of the Times City Article, Mr Simpson,⁴ is a Director of a Brazilian railway company. For want of knowing plain facts like these, public opinion is poisoned, and not only on the particular subject in question but on others. Who can wonder, for instance, that a man personally interested in a railway leading to a great mining district worked by slaves, should be a strenuous supporter of the Confederates?⁵

Still, I do not see how I can help you by such a communication to the Daily News as you suggest. I cannot claim to have any knowledge of the subject. It adds to the difficulties, and to the merit also, of those who struggle like you to draw attention to a subject which very few but those who have a sinister interest know anything about, that you necessarily struggle almost alone, there being hardly anybody in a position to be able to cooperate with you. I am glad to see that one or two who are so, have come forward to support you by letters in the Daily News. If anything I could write could be useful at all, it would be, I think, when the subject comes up again as you expect in the next session. What is then said on the Brazilian side, collated with the facts in your volume,⁶ may admit of comments of a telling kind from a bystander who has no

peculiar sources of information. I had rather, therefore, adjourn the subject, as far as relates to my participation. I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

720.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Sept. 12. 1864

Dear Mr. Fawcett

Your note followed me here. I am sorry to have missed you, and only hope you did not take the trouble of going to Blackheath, nor were put to any other inconvenience by not receiving an answer.

We shall be here now for the remainder of the year, and I shall hope to hear from you. I was glad to see the advertisement of your elementary book.² I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

721.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 3. 1864

Dear Sir

Your letter, which has been forwarded to me here, gave me much pleasure. I was already acquainted with Mr Bemis's book,² of which, I think, I had received two copies, but from whom, I do not know. I quite agree in your estimate of it. It is a very effective piece of argument, and makes out a strong case. There are the seeds of very serious mischief in that compensation question, and our public men will probably find things as different from what they expect in regard to the liability of England for the

acts of cruisers unlawfully fitted out, as they have already found in regard to the original obligation to prevent the outfit.

The course of military events in America is going very much in favour of the right, and if Lincoln is reelected, I should think that the end is really drawing near. There are such evidences of the exhaustion of the South as there have never been before. But everything depends upon the reelection of Lincoln, or at all events upon the election of some one representing the same opinions and who will continue the same policy. It is impossible not to feel uneasy until the election is over. If the Democratic party is disunited, Lincoln is probably safe, but from the last accounts it would appear that the Peace Democrats were reconsidering their intention of not supporting McClellan.³

Lytton's report⁴ is of the greatest importance; the Danish plan is almost exactly identical with Mr Hare's, and has advanced the quota system from the position of a mere project to t[hat] of an institution actually realized and found workable. It has, moreover, caused an amount of discussion of the subject already, which we might otherwise have waited a long time for. The idea is spreading also on the Continent. It has been discussed and has received some support at the International Congress at Amsterdam,⁵ and M. Louis Blanc has published an admirable series of letters in the Temps,⁶ showing a thorough understanding of the plan, and a full appreciation of its advantages, indirect as well as direct. One is not at all surprised that English politicians do not catch at it, for when were they in advance of the public in adopting any new idea? I was, like you, disagreeably surprised not so much by Fawcett's saying nothing about representation of minorities, but by his saying things which are repugnant to the most obvious argument for it.⁷ I cannot, however, think that Fawcett meant to throw over the principle, nor does Mr Hare think so. He probably thought only of justifying himself for supporting a great extension of the suffrage without waiting until representation of minorities could be carried too. If so, he will find out his mistake by perceiving how he has made himself misunderstood, both by friends like the Spectator and by enemies like the Saturday Review.

Thornton will be much pleased by your feeling towards him, and will, I am sure, fully reciprocate it. He is a person I particularly respect and like. In perfect candour, sincerity, and singleness of mind, few men come near him.

The Journal des Economistes, I am almost sure, was duly received. Your notice of Norman⁸ I missed through its postponement, but will not fail to procure and read it.

We shall be here till January. I have much work cut out for me to do during this autumn and winter, part of which is that of correcting my Political Economy for a new edition.⁹ I should be very glad to make any improvement in it which you can suggest, and especially to know if there is anything which you think it would be useful to say on the present state of Ireland.¹⁰ My speculations on the means of improvement there have been in a state of suspended animation, from which it is almost time that they should emerge.

I Am Dear Sir
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

722.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

Avignon

Oct. 17. 1864

Dear Sir

Your note of Oct. 10 has followed me here. My abridgements of a few of Plato's dialogues have not been reprinted, nor are likely to be;² but those who wish to get, as you say, at the pith of Plato, will be sure to find it in Mr Grote's new book,³ now printing; and there will be, besides, Mr Jowett's,⁴ which, together with a full translation of the Republic, will contain, it is said, some account of all the principal dialogues.

I can assure you from my own case as well as from various others that it is quite possible to admire and enjoy, in a very high degree, both Plato and Aristotle.

I am glad of this opportunity of asking you whether your Elements of Trigonometry⁵ (which I have not been able to procure) are really out of print, and if so, whether they are likely to be soon reprinted. The philosophy of Mathematics is a favourite subject with me, and in your Algebra⁶ you have treated some of its metaphysical difficulties (especially those connected with the idea of infinity) in so highly philosophical a manner that I am very desirous to read what you have written in the Trigonometry respecting the great mystery of impossible quantities, a part of the subject which I have not yet been able completely to make out from my own thoughts. I know that the square roots of negative quantities are capable of geometrical interpretation, and I have myself found out this very day one such interpretation for them, but I cannot be sure I am right until a mathematician tells me so; and in any case I have a great deal to learn from one who has gone so deeply into these subjects as you evidently have.

I Am &C

J. S. Mill

723.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Oct. 28, 1864

Dear Chadwick

I was glad of the opportunity of reading your Address² *in extenso* though I had read with attention and interest as much of it as appeared in the Times and Daily News. You have put several important points in a striking light. I attach particular value to the display of the enormous economy which remains to be effected in the expense of distribution. It is the distributors who eat up the greater part of the produce of labour; and the success of cooperation is, no doubt, mainly owing to the minimization of that charge, and to ready money payments: though I attach also much more importance than you do to an identification of the interest of every labourer with the prosperity of the concern, more complete than mere piece work will effect, and I therefore regret, and even blame, the conduct of those Cooperative Societies which engage labourers to receive wages only. This is the sole point on which I find myself differing from your address. I have nothing to suggest except the correction of a few errors of stile. In slip 5, line 3, I would put *which* for *as*. At line 18 for *price* (of production) I would say *expense*. At line 8 from the bottom, for *of* read *with*. I find I have not marked any others.

You ask if I know any writers who have treated your points. The Socialist writers in France especially, and I believe in England also, have said a great deal about the waste from superfluous distributors. Fourier, in particular, is very strong on the point. He calls the middlemen, *en masse*, the “parasites.”³ On the other points you are much in advance of anything I have seen written elsewhere. About the economical advantage, touched upon in your letter, of a consolidation of railways,⁴ you are not likely to find any help in the French economists. They are, nearly all of them, much more hostile to consolidation and to government action than I am; and I am more so than you.

It is a great pity that the newspapers did not print your dispute with the mercantile public of Liverpool about the rams.⁵

My daughter sends, for your approval, by this post, an article suggested by Lord Stanley’s remarks on America.⁶ She had not thought of writing on Turkey until you suggested it, but will do so if anything should occur to her.

I inclose, in case you have not seen it, a circular respecting the rooms just opened in London by the United States Sanitary Commission,⁷ chiefly, it would seem, as a place of meeting and resort for Americans and friends of America. You may perhaps be inclined to make some mention of it in the Newsman. I am

Dear Chadwick
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

724.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

Saint-Véran, Avignon

Oct. 28. 1864.

Dear Sir

I thank you most heartily for the kind present of your Trigonometry,² as well as the paper from the Cambridge Transactions,³ which looks very tempting. I expect great pleasure and instruction from both.

My little bit of speculation has no pretension to be a general solution of the question as to the meaning of imaginary quantities. It relates only to a single case, and there must be hundreds of other cases similar to it. I must premise, that I have forgotten almost all my mathematics; but my memory being more retentive of methods than of results, I have kept a sufficient hold of the former to be able to find my way back to the easier general theorems without book, and I sometimes amuse myself with doing so, especially in my walks. In this way I have re-discovered for myself the general formulae of quadratures, rectifications, tangents, &c. As one of these mathematical exercises, it occurred to me to ask myself what is the curve of which the equation is $xy = a^2$? I soon came to the conclusion that it is a pair of opposite equilateral hyperbolas, referred to the asymptotes. This being the case: what is there to say about the *other* pair of hyperbolas, considered as referred to the same axes? The coordinates being in this case of opposite signs, the equation must be $xy = -a^2$, from which it follows that the parameter (in the larger sense of the word) of this last pair of hyperbolas, the constant mean proportional between the variable coordinates, has for its symbolic expression a . This (in which I hope there is no mistake) does not shew the way to any large general view of the subject, but it would, if it stood alone, suffice to shew that impossible quantities in algebra do not necessarily point to impossible operations in geometry or applied mathematics. In fact it is no more wonderful that an imaginary numerical quantity should represent a real line (or force) than that a surd should do so, since a surd also represents an impossible numerical operation: and the one like the other is only such an incident as we might expect to arise, in the attempt to represent continuous quantity by discontinuous.

It is so pleasant to be allowed to refer one's mathematical difficulties to a mathematician who *is* a psychologist, that I venture to ask whether I am right on another point. One sees it often mentioned as an imperfection and a proof of the little

progress made in the integral calculus, that there [are] such multitudes of expressions which no mathematician is able to integrate. Is not this very much as if it were made a reproach to arithmetic that there are so many numbers of which no one is able to extract the square or cube root? Have we any reason to suppose that every combination of differentials which can be put together must correspond to an integral? Is it not, on the contrary, natural, if not even demonstrable, that by far the greatest number cannot—that there must be many more possible differential expressions than possible integrals, for the same sort of reason as there must be many more numbers than there are exact square or cube roots?

I shall be anxious to see your paper on Infinity.⁴ I have a controversy with Sir W. Hamilton on that subject⁵ in a book I have been writing, which I hope to offer to you next spring. From your letter I have much hope that you will agree with at least that part of the book. You are one of those whose opinion of it I shall feel much interested in.

I am glad that Mr Baynes⁶ has a Professorship, though not the one he stood for. The change from writing leading articles (very good ones by the way) to teaching Logic, is not quite so great as that which had been made by a young scholar I met at Corfu during the Crimean war,⁷ who had just resigned an Oxford Tutorship for a place in the Commissariat.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

725.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Nov. 6. 1864

Dear Sir—

I this morning received your letter. I have finished revising the “Representative Government”² & it will be sent by the Messageries Impériales (that is, in effect, by railway), tomorrow. It can go to press as soon as you please, & if you will have the proofs sent to me here by book post I will return them without delay. I will set about the revision of the Political Economy³ and get on with it as quickly as possible.

I have no present intentions to publish cheap editions of any of my writings except the three you mention. It is very satisfactory that you are able to publish the Pol. Econ. & Repr. Gov. at the prices you mention.⁴ According to the proportion, I sh^d have

thought the Liberty could have been sold at 1/—& I sh^d be very glad if it could be so. I shall be happy to accept your offer of reducing the Pol. Econ. to 5/—after the sale of 4000 copies. As the books are to be stereotyped, it certainly does seem desirable that some duration should be fixed for the agreement, & I sh^d be glad to hear what term would, in your estimates afford a sufficient profit.

The number of copies to be printed of the dearer edition, I leave entirely to your better judgment.

It will probably be best that the three cheap editions sh^d be advertised together & published at the same time, but if you would like to print the two smaller ones at once in order to diminish the pressure afterwards I shall be happy to correct the proofs here. I expect to be in England about the end of January.

I sh^d very much like to see the papers mentioned by Mr John Buckle⁵ with the “fragmentary papers” & the Common Place books⁶ & I sh^d be obliged if you would keep them for me till I return.

726.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Nov. 8. 1864

Dear Sir

Your letter of the 13th October was as your letters always are, extremely interesting to me. I am very desirous of any suggestions that may occur to you for the improvement of this edition of my Political Economy, as it will be the foundation of a cheap popular edition which will be stereotyped.² I have just heard from the publisher that the old edition is so nearly out, as to require that the new one should be got on with sooner than I expected when I wrote to you, and I am therefore obliged to lay aside what I was writing (a paper on Comte for the Westminster Review)³ to set about the revision. Consequently, the sooner I can have even a part of your remarks,⁴ the better: but what is not ready for the revision may easily be in time to be made use of in the proofs.

I expect to learn much respecting the state of Ireland from Judge Longfield's address.⁵ But I at present feel considerably puzzled what to recommend for Ireland. It cannot be said any longer that the English system of landlords, tenant farmers, and hired labourers is impossible in Ireland, as it was in the days before the famine. But it does not seem to me to suit the ideas, feelings, or state of civilization of the Irish. And I cannot see that the changes, great as they are, have abolished cottierism. They have diminished competition for land, and the evil of rackrents, and tenants always in arrear. But I do not see that the tenant has an atom more of motive to improve, or

inducement to industry and frugality, than he had. He finds all this in America: if he could find it at home, he probably would not emigrate.

I read with much pleasure the report of your Lecture on the Colonies.⁶ The arguments for Separation could hardly, I think, be more clearly and forcibly stated. But I am more unwilling to sever the tie than you seem to be, and I do not at all agree with Goldwin Smith in thinking the severance actually desirable;⁷ my reasons for which being in print,⁸ I need not repeat them here. The confederation plan for British America seems a very good one. The opposite roads which, as you remark, Canada and the United States are taking to meet the same evil,⁹ are natural enough, since they start from opposite positions: Canada from too much union, the United States, as they seem to think, from too little; though the degree of union they have hitherto had would probably suffice them still if they were well rid of the one stumbling block, Slavery. Happily it becomes less and less doubtful that they will get rid of that. Their superiority in arms over the Slaveholders seems now permanently established and Lincoln's reelection tolerably certain. The latest opinion I have heard on the latter point is in a letter from Hamilton, (the grandson, I think, of the eminent Hamilton) who has just republished the Federalist.¹⁰ He says "I am happy to be able to *assure* you" (the underlining is his own) "that the President is firm in his purpose to extinguish slavery. He will certainly be reelected—and with him a Congress of which 2/3^{ds} will recommend a National Convention, and this body will so amend the Constitution that Slavery will cease at once." It will be worth a life, to have lived to see this done.

Merivale's¹¹ mode of disposing of Hare's plan is very like Merivale. His mind is an instrument which works well for some purposes, with as *borné* a general range as that of men who do not set up for theory at all.

Fawcett excuses himself by laying the blame on bad reporting.¹² He says that the reporters omitted what he said virtually in favour of Hare's plan. But even by his own account, it seems to have been too veiled; and some of his arguments for extending the suffrage would if well grounded have removed the most obvious and urgent reasons for representation of minorities.

I Am Dear Sir
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

727.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Saint Véran
Avignon

Nov. 21, 1864

I have read Messrs. Briggs' [2](#) prospectus with very great pleasure. They have done themselves great honour in being the originators in England of one of the two modes of Co-operation which are probably destined to divide the field of employment between them. The importance of what they are doing is the greater, as its success would make it almost impossible hereafter for any recreant Co-operative Societies to go back to the old plan of paying only fixed wages when even private capitalists give it up.

728.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES [1](#)

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 1. 1864

Dear Sir

Am I right in thinking that among the improvements consequent on the Irish famine and emigration, the desuetude of cottier tenancy is *not* one? My impression is that the land is still mainly let direct to the labourer, without the intervention of a capitalist farmer—and if so, other things in Ireland being as they are, all the elements of the former overpopulation are still there, though for the present neutralized by the emigration. I very much wish to hear from you whether I am right. [2](#)

Have you formed any opinion, or can you refer me to any good authority, respecting the ordinary rate of mercantile and manufacturing profit in the United States? [3](#) I have hitherto been under the impression that it is much higher than in England, because the rate of interest is so. But I have lately been led to doubt the truth of this impression, because it seems inconsistent with known facts respecting wages in America. High profits are compatible with a high reward of the labourer through low prices of necessaries, but they are not compatible with a high cost of labour; and it seems to me that the very high *money* wages of labour in America, the precious metals not being of lower value there than in Europe, indicates a high *cost* as well as a high remuneration of labour. Supposing profits to be lower than in Europe instead of higher, it is yet quite intelligible that interest might be higher. There is, I apprehend, in America, scarcely any unoccupied class, living on interest: almost everybody is in active business, needing all his own capital and more too. In New England even the banks have scarcely any deposits, the class who in England would be depositors being there shareholders. Consequently the loan market is hardly supplied at all from native sources, except the capital and notes of the banking companies: and when there is a great demand for loans it has to be supplied from the European money market, and therefore at a rate of interest so high as to be a temptation to foreigners. I should be much indebted to you if you could help me on this subject, as, if I have been

misleading the readers of my Political Economy, it is very desirable that the error should be corrected in this edition.

I have been obliged to read, with a view to my new edition, the most recent & most voluminous of Carey's writings, his "Principles of Social Science":⁴ because his attacks on the Ricardo political economy and on free trade are, some of them, if not new, at least made in a new shape, and I have thought it good to give a brief refutation of them, the rather as the book is a good deal thought of by some of the French political economists, and is helping to muddle their ideas. The parts of his speculations which I have had to attack are really the best parts, as it was not worth while to notice any of his errors but those which had some affinity with truths. But it really would be a useful exercise for any clearheaded and painstaking student of political economy to shew up the book, for I think I never met with any modern treatise with such an apparatus of facts and reasonings, in which the facts were so untrustworthy and the interpretations of fact so perverse and absurd. I do not imagine that it would be worth your while any more than mine to take the trouble of reviewing it, but I should very much like to see it properly done. To give a really adequate exposure of the book would be out of the question, for there would be something requiring comment in every page: but a selection might be made, in a moderate compass, which would suffice to destroy any authority the book might have. Withal I cannot dislike the man, for his feelings, and his way of thinking on general subjects, so far as I can perceive, are usually right.

I have not yet had any application from Longman to begin printing, but I think it will not be long before I have.

Lincoln's triumphant reelection is a grand event; and it is perhaps a still greater that there is now the majority in Congress necessary for the Anti Slavery amendment of the Federal Constitution. The value of this last cannot be overrated, for it ensures not only that there will be no reunion retaining slavery, but that after reunion the Federal Courts will have a right to set aside any tricky legislation in the Southern States intended to reestablish Slavery under another name. I am Dear Sir

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

729.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 1. 1864

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for your letter, and for the other things you sent, all of which arrived safely. Your own printed note² interested me historically as shewing the gradual progress of your thoughts on the subject, and the Frankfort newspaper³ as giving a glimpse of the notions of German reformers on constitutional subjects. I am glad that the note I wrote to be appended to my chapter on Personal Representation meets with your approval.⁴ I dare say you may be right in limiting your new Preface to something like the same scale, but the matter which you at first intended for the preface, if too long to be used for it, might, I should think, be useful as an Appendix at the end of the volume.

Lord Grey's book⁵ is, I believe, mainly a reprint of his old one, which I happen never to have read; but I have read the new chapters, before publication. His ideas of representation of minorities do not go beyond Marshall's plan,⁶ but the importance he attaches to it helps to stir up the subject, and I expect considerable good of that kind from the publication. The best point is his emphatic declaration that a considerable change is necessary and that changes which only consist in going further in the beaten track are neither safe nor useful; that it is necessary to have recourse to new ideas.

Our Southern climate has been scarcely recognisable this autumn; the rains have only ceased two or three days ago, and now we begin to have winter cold, generally but not always with winter brightness. You had decidedly the best week of the autumnal season during your stay.

With our kind regards to your daughters and son, I am Dear Sir

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

730.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

S[aint] V[éran] Dec.2.1864

Dear Bain—

I have not written to you since I received your answer to my note concerning Prof. Fraser's review of Abbott² & other matters. I was very glad to hear that Fraser is capable of writing anything so good & that he is editing Berkeley.³ An account of the subsequent developments of Idealism by the author of that article is likely to be good.

When I last wrote to you I believe I had not yet read Prof. Tait's articles on the Conservation of Force.⁴ They have made some parts of the theory much clearer to me

than before. I now understand better what is meant by potential energy & how the force may be said to be constantly preserved even when not acting in its usual way: but I am not sure that my way of comprehending it fits all the cases. When air is compressed a reaction equal to the compressing force exists in the form of pressure against the sides of the vessel. When a projectile is thrown into the air, the force of gravity which ultimately brings it to the ground exists all the while though counteracted, for it shows itself in retarding & finally stopping the upward motion before it begins to determine the downward one, and it is calculably the same amount of force all the time. But the force said to be latent in coal: being that which *would* be generated by its chemical combination with oxygen does not manifest itself by any pressure or tendency to motion, or neutralisation of counter force for ages on ages. Still, if it can be shewn that a force was lost, or used up, in making coal out of the carbonic acid gas of the atmosphere equal to that which is generated by the reconversion of an equal quantity of coal with carbonic acid gas, I admit that there is a virtual conservation of force, though *as* force it was non-existent during the long interval; but so, you will say, is the latent heat of the water in the ocean, & of the gases comprising the atmosphere. Therefore, though I do not know how the equality of the force lost & that reproduced is in this case ascertained, I can understand that it may be so. But I complain of a great want in Tait as well as in Tyndall,⁵ of proper clearness in making out what it is that is conserved. They speak as if the case of the compressed air or the projectile were exactly like that of the coal, when in reality it is extremely different. They would probably say that the force in the coal is alive all the time, creating molecular motion. But this unprovable hypothesis is just the part of the theory which I cannot swallow.

There is a difficulty, to my comprehension, in the old theory of heat, which I have long intended to mention to you, but have always forgotten, and I do not know whether the new theory takes it away. It relates to the common mode of explaining the law by which objects of unequal temperature tend to equalise their temperature by radiation. The theory is namely that all bodies are constantly radiating heat, & if of equal temperature radiate it in equal quantity but every body radiates in proportion to its temperature, so that all bodies constantly exchanging heat, the hotter give more than they receive & the colder receive more than they give. On this theory it seems to me that if two bodies at the temperature of the atmosphere are placed in the foci of opposite parabolic mirrors they ought both to rise in temperature: for there is nothing to make them give out less heat than previously, & they certainly receive more. Even if one of the bodies is a lump of ice it ought even then to raise the temperature of the other body instead of cooling it as it does for even the ice sends out some heat which would not have reached the other focus if it had not been collected & concentrated by the mirrors. There is probably an answer to this, but none is given in the usual explanation of the apparent radiation of cold.

The Association Psychology is decidedly getting into France. Seeing a short newspaper article of an "Etude sur l'Association des Idées" by a writer named P. M. Mervoyer, written as a thesis for the degree of Docteur ès Lettres, we sent for the book⁶ & found that it was in great part composed of translated extracts from your writings, for which he professes warm admiration, & has very well mastered a great many of the thoughts. He is a complete disciple of yours, & I may say also of mine, &

will do good, though not apparently a person of great vigour of mind, his own part of the exposition contrasting not advantageously, in clearness & precision, with his translations from us, which are very well done. I wish it may come into his mind to translate you into French. I will bring the book with me to England as you will I think be interested, as I have been, by it.

The writer in the N. American Review has followed up his article on Time & Space by one on Hamilton,⁷ the most severe one I have seen, but a striking contrast to my controversy with him, being a judgment of him from the opposite point of view: wherever H. is right the reviewer contrives to be wrong, & wherever H. is wrong, he is still more wrong than H.

I am glad you are to lecture at the R[oyal] I[nstitution],⁸ though your time of lecturing will probably fall during our absence. The managers of the Inst. seem laudably desirous of recruiting their staff with fresh notabilities. They have invited over Jules Simon to lecture,⁹ fortunately not on metaphysics.

After finishing the first draft of my first article on Comte¹⁰ I had to leave off & set about revising the Pol. Econ. for a new edition.¹¹ This I have now finished & am on the point of returning to Comte. The opportunity is a good one for saying various things that I am glad to say. It is for the April number, as it will not be in time for January.

I suppose Grote has nearly finished his printing by this time.¹²

With our regards to Mrs Bain

731.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 2. 1864

Dear Sir

Much occupation prevented me from sooner thanking you for your interesting and valuable letter of Nov. 14, as it has also hitherto from studying the Trigonometry.² I have found time to go through the paper for the Philosophical Society³ with some care, and have learnt a good deal from it, though, as you are aware, I do not go with you in regarding even the truths of pure mathematics as necessities of thought—*i.e.* necessities originating in thought, for that incessantly repeated experience has *made* them necessities I should not think of denying. Short of that, all that you were aiming at seemed to me, as far as I am a competent judge, to be right. I was much struck with the view taken in your letter of the possibilities of extension of the integral calculus, which opens a way to large and far reaching speculations, if not to great practical

applications. I am glad to find that what I ventured to write to you on that subject, as well as about imaginary quantities, was right as far as it went. I never supposed that it went very far. But I expect to be much more competent on such subjects when I have read more of your writings. The real philosophy of mathematics is now fairly launched, and in good hands.

What you say about the origin of + and - is an interesting historical curiosity.[4](#)

I keep your letters carefully for reference, and will write again when I have gone through the Trigonometry. I am with many thanks

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

732.

TO HENRY FAWCETT[1](#)

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 2. 1864

Dear Mr Fawcett

I have been a long while without answering your letter of Oct. 31, having at present more work than usual to be got through in a given time. I was sorry to hear of your attack of fever, but very glad that you were able to lecture, and had so numerous a class. It is curious that you should have had fever at Salisbury and got rid of it at Cambridge.

I do not know that your speech at Brighton[2](#) made any unfavourable impression on Hare, and the impression on me was much more favourable than unfavourable. We were struck with the contrast it presented to electioneering speeches generally, by the number of ideas it contained. What I could have wished otherwise was not the omission to speak more definitely respecting Hare's plan, but the employment of an argument which tells against the need of such a plan, and which I think unusual, namely, that the working classes are greatly divided in opinion. Like other classes they are divided on points not involving the class interests or prejudices, but not therefore less likely to be united on those which do.

It will be a great triumph of your eloquence to induce the Brighton electors to forego £2000, but there is enough latent honesty and public spirit in any large constituency to make such things possible, and when you have done it you ought to have a gold medal, or perhaps a civic crown would be preferable. I wish equal success to Christie,[3](#) but he will have still more uphill work.

We are in high spirits about America, not only on account of Lincoln's triumphant reelection, but also on account of the majority in Congress which is now sufficient to decree an appeal to popular suffrage for an amendment in the Federal Constitution interdicting slavery in the States. The great value of this is that not only will it remove all chance of the sacrifice of Abolition for reunion, but after reunion it will empower the Federal Courts to nullify any State legislation tending to restore slavery under another name: which, moreover, makes it possible to readmit the seceding States with the same constitutional rights as formerly in every other respect. Goldwin Smith's speech at the dinner given in his honour was good,⁴ and promises much valuable matter in his future contributions to the Daily News.

I Am Dear Mr. Fawcett
Vry Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

733.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Dec. 10. 1864.

Dear Sir—

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of Dec. 7. An organ such as it is intended that the Reader² should be, will be of the greatest use, & when such men as yourself, & Mr Cairnes, Mr Huxley,³ & Mr Tyndall, to mention no others, are sufficiently interested in it to take a share in its management,⁴ there need be no fear of its disappointing any reasonable hopes. With such a list of names as you have it might be possible to run it against the Saturday Review were it not that I am afraid your plan excludes temporary politics. Of course it does not exclude political philosophy, & I hope original articles will be inserted as well as reviews. I shall be happy to take a share & will pay the £80 whenever required.⁵

734.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 12. 1864

Dear Sir

I do not know how sufficiently to thank you for all you have done for me. That you should have taken the trouble to write out your thoughts so fully on so many points, only for my use, is a favour such as I should never have presumed to ask from you. It is like nothing but the philosophic correspondences in which the thinkers of the 16th and 17th centuries used to compare notes and discuss each other's opinions before or after publication—of which we have so many interesting specimens in the published works of Descartes. I shall keep the notes² carefully and return them to you, for I do not like that so much thought, so clearly worked out on paper, should have no reader but me: besides, it enables me with a better conscience to use their contents.

On most of the minor points I think you are right, and shall profit by your suggestions. On Ireland³ I shall cancel all I had newly written on that subject, and wait for the further communication you kindly promise. On the few points of doctrine on which our opinions differ, you have not, thus far, convinced me, though you have taught me much. Among these I do not count the theory of the rate of interest, for I agree entirely with your explanation of the phenomena, and the article in the North British Review⁴ appears to me excellent. I had, even before I heard from you, inserted a passage pointing out how the new gold, as long as it continues to flow in, must tend to keep down the rate of interest. We differ, I believe, only on a question of nomenclature, and at present it seems to me that the objections to your phraseology are stronger than to mine. But I have not done thinking on the subject, and I shall in any case have to modify several expressions, if nothing more.

In the matter of the operation of duties on international values, I see that I have omitted one of the elements of the question, viz. the competing demands of other commodities on the purse of the consumer; but it does not seem to me that this omission materially affects the conclusion. Suppose that I have a given sum, say £10 a year, the expenditure of which I am determined, whatever happens, to divide between two commodities, A and B. I conceive that even then, if A rises in price and B falls, the effect in the average of cases will be that I shall buy more of B and less of A.

On the Wakefield system I scarcely understand your argument.⁵ In the supposed case of the settlers, and in every other, I apprehend the separation of employments to be a real cause and indispensable condition of a larger production. It is true that territorial separation of employments, by international trade, often suffices: but the main justification of Wakefield's system is, that this trade does not take effect when families settle, each of them many miles from its next neighbour in the wilderness.

The point on which we seem to differ most, & to be least likely to come to an agreement, is the income tax.⁶ You think it fair to take from different people in a single year, an equal percentage of what their incomes, whether permanent or temporary, would sell for in that year: because (you say) the payment in each year should be compared with what the income is worth in that year to its owner. In this I agree; but I answer, that the income is, in that year, worth *to him* its capitalized value only on the supposition that he actually capitalizes it, and spends the whole value within the year. Then indeed, he will have been fairly taxed: but then, he will not have

to pay the tax in any future year, for the income will have passed into other hands. On any other supposition the income is only worth to him its capitalized value spread over the whole of its duration, that is, in each year the total amount divided by the number of years. I agree in what you say about equality of sacrifice, but in estimating this, I only exclude necessaries. I do not think a distinction can be fairly made between comforts and luxuries, or that I am entitled to call my tea and coffee by the one name, and another person's melons and champagne by the other. I allow for nothing but what is needed to keep an average person alive and free from physical suffering.

Touching colonies, I understand you to differ from me chiefly in thinking that the advantages obtained by a quasi-federal union with them might equally be obtained by an alliance. My answer to this is, that there is no such thing as an alliance. There are only coalitions between countries for a temporary purpose. No nation associates its foreign policy generally with that of another nation, unless either subject to its power, or united with it by a federal tie. As soon as the colonies separate from us, we shall have only the same chance of having them for even temporary allies, as of having any other independent nation.

I have read with the greatest interest Judge Longfield's address,⁷ and two of your articles on it in the Daily News.⁸ There may be others which I have missed, as the paper is often stopped at the French post office. Though I thought the Judge wrong in much of what he said on fixity of tenure, I agreed with, I think, every part of his address which was praised in your articles, and I think it altogether a most important paper. I give him the greatest credit for speaking out so plainly, and so much to the purpose. It is particularly timely, coming so soon after the speech in which Gladstone included remedial measures for Ireland among the things which he put in the front of his policy.⁹ We see there, as usual in Gladstone, the man who speaks from his own convictions, and not from external influences. No other minister would have put forward Ireland, any more than Reform, just at this time, when there is no public outcry about it.

Did you read Buxton's three closely printed columns in the Times about Parliamentary Reform?¹⁰ They are a sign of tendencies, and a prognostic of much that the Times and Saturday Review would like to shut their eyes to.

Ever, Dear Sir, Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

735.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 12. 1864

Dear Sir

You wished me to let you know as soon as I could find a time when I should be able to send you an article on Comte.² I find that the subject can only be treated as I wish to treat it, in two articles—one on his principal work, the other on the speculations of his later years. The first of these is all written, except two or three references which remain to be put in when I return to England at the end of January. I can therefore promise it for the April number. But it is very long; sixty pages of the Westminster, if not more; and I see no possibility of either dividing or shortening it, consistently with its being what I meant it to be. It is for you to judge whether, under these conditions, it will suit the Review. If accepted, as I wish it to be known as mine, I should be glad, if you have no objection, to put my initials.

The second article, which will probably be much shorter, I feel tolerably certain of getting ready for the next following number, should you desire it so soon. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

736.

TO ROBERT HARRISON¹

S[aint] V[éran]

Dec. 12. 1864.

Dear Sir—

Your estimate of Black's² character is true to the letter & such as all who were intimate with him would confirm.

I do not know how soon after his coming to London he knew my father. I was a child at the time & up to the beginning of 1814 my father lived so far on the north east side of London that I suppose they did not often meet. All I know is that when Black became editor of the Chronicle, in the autumn I think of 1821, they were already old friends. After that time he constantly frequented my father & no doubt often expressed opinions imbibed from him but he was far from being a mere follower of any one. As an example of this, Black as I well remember, changed the opinion of some of the leading political economists, particularly my father's respecting poor laws,³ by the articles he wrote in the Chronicle in favour of a poor law for Ireland. He met their objections by maintaining that a poor law did not necessarily encourage

overpopulation but might be so worked as to be a considerable check to it & he convinced them that he was in the right.

I have always considered Black as the first journalist who carried criticism & the spirit of reform into the details of English institutions. Those who are not old enough to remember those times can hardly believe what the state of public discussion then was. People now & then attacked the Constitution & the boroughmongers but none thought of censuring the law or the courts of justice & to say a word against the unpaid magistracy was a sort of blasphemy. Black was the writer who carried the warfare into these subjects & introduced Bentham's opinions on legal & judicial reform into newspaper discussion. And by doing this he broke the spell. Very early in his editorship he fought a great battle for the freedom of reporting the preliminary investigations in the Police Courts in which Fonblanque⁴ who just at that time began to become known occasionally helped him, but he had little other help. He carried his point & the victory was permanent. Another subject on which his writings were of the greatest service was the freedom of the press in matters of religion. His first years as editor of the Chronicle coincided with the prosecutions of Carlile⁵ & his shopmen & Black kept up the fight against those prosecutions with great spirit & power. All these subjects were Black's own. Parl. Reform, Catholic emancipation, free trade, &c, were the liberal topics of the day & on all of these he wrote frequently, as you will see by any file of the Chronicle. One of the remarkable things is that nearly all the leading articles at least in those early years, were his own writing. He now & then had an article sent to him by a friend but there was I believe for a long time no one regularly associated with him as a writer of leaders. This I believe is not generally known. He was constantly bringing into his articles curious passages & scraps of recondite information from old books which people thought must have been furnished by a host of friends behind him: But they all came from his own great miscellaneous reading. He used to walk about London, stopping at all the bookstalls & got together a large collection of books not generally known from which he had a knack of picking out & using whatever they contained that was interesting or instructive.

Why Cobbett attacked him⁶ I do not remember & it is scarcely worth knowing. Somebody said of Cobbett, very truly, that there were two sorts of people he could not endure, those who differed from him & those who agreed with him. These last had always stolen his ideas. I do not know that he selected Black for a very special object of attack. If he had a controversy with him about anything he was sure to load him with comical abuse.

I shall be happy to give you any further information I have & to answer to the best of my ability any questions, but the real source of the information you want is the Chronicle itself. He poured out his whole mind into it, as indeed he had much need to do considering how many volumes yearly he wrote in it.

737.

TO DANIEL REAVES GOODLOE¹

Saint Véran, Avignon
Vaucluse, France

Dec. 13th, 1864.

Dear Sir:

Having been absent from England some months, I have but lately received the pamphlet you did me the honor to send me. You are so clearly right as to the political economy of the question, that one is only surprised at its being necessary to take so much pains to make the matter obvious to others. But the absurdest opinions are often the most tenacious of life. What can be more ridiculous than to suppose that a laboring man is an item in the wealth of the country that possesses him, when he is owned by a fellow-man, but not an item in it when he owns himself! But great merit may be shown in explaining truths which ought not to need explanation, and that merit your pamphlet possesses in a high degree.

I am indebted to you for an excellent illustration of the point you notice in my Principles of Political Economy, which I shall not fail to make use of in a new edition which I am now preparing.²

As a native of a slave state, who twenty-five years ago saw and proclaimed the doctrine of common sense as well as justice respecting slavery, you must be highly gratified by the prospect now opened of the early realization of your utmost wishes on that subject, however painful to you in many respects may be the process by which it is coming to pass.

With sincere respects, I am,

Dear Sir, Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

Daniel R. Goodloe, Esqr.

738.

TO ROWLAND G. HAZARD¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 13, 1864

Dear Sir

I have not received your work on the Will,² nor any copy of “Our Resources”³ but that which you have now done me the favour of sending. They may have been sent to my house in England since the last parcel I received from thence.

I have read your series of papers with great interest and pleasure. You have the merit of seeing and pointing out clearly that the expense of the war can only come out of the spare produce of the national labour, and that people cannot expend this on the war and on their own indulgences too. It is a question of will, not power. A nation which has increased its wealth by 126 per cent in ten years, cannot be put to really great inconvenience by even a much larger debt than the present one. And I agree with you in thinking that a reunited nation, freed from the incubus of slavery, abundantly provided with the appliances for economizing labour, and resorted to by the superfluous hands of the old countries in so great abundance, will start forward at the end of the war at a pace hitherto unexampled. The question is not whether America can keep her engagements, but whether she will consent to pay taxes for the purpose, and of this I do not permit myself to have any doubt.

Your paper “Contraction versus Expansion”⁴ seems to me sound. I do not mean that I agree with every word of it, but I concur in the main drift of your argument. I cannot doubt that a gradual drawing in of the surplus currency is the wisest course for the general prosperity: but its practicability depends on the willingness of American citizens to pay taxes and lend money to the government. For a long time, the issue of inconvertible paper in government payments operated as a forced taxation on all holders of currency, and the reception of it back at a fixed rate in exchange for United States Bonds, redeemable and the interest payable only in specie, operated as a series of forced loans; since the paper, being legal tender, could not be refused in payment, and the holders, to avoid loss by depreciation, were glad to get rid of it by taking bonds. I do not know whether the same practice is followed by Mr. Chase’s successor;⁵ but if the Government loses this resource for raising the money indispensable to it, an equivalent can only be found in the patriotism of the monied classes and the tax payers generally. If that can be depended on, the course you propose has everything to recommend it, and the danger from further depreciation is so great that your Government cannot too soon begin the process of contraction.

I cannot close this letter without offering to you, as an American citizen, my warmest congratulations on the result of the late election, and on the present hopeful prospect of affairs. I am delighted to recognize in you feelings like my own on the subject of slavery. I am Dear Sir

Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

739.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 20. 1864

Dear Sir

I wrote to you some days ago a letter addressed Dublin and “to be forwarded,”² thanking you for the two packets of notes you kindly sent and remarking generally on their purport. I have since carefully revised all the passages you referred to, and there are very few of the notes by which I have not, to some extent, profited. In a great many cases I have entirely adopted your view. I have rewritten the fourth section of the chapter on the Rate of Interest³ and have much enlarged it; completing my exposition of the causes on which the rate of interest depends, by adopting nearly all you have said on the subject that involves doctrine. In what merely involves the mode of stating the theory, I still prefer my own: but I see that the whole truth of the subject may be expressed in either way, and may usefully be so in both. Your remarks on the definition of money⁴ I have not used, for a different reason: I cannot, in conscience, take without necessity what belongs to you. When it is for the correction of an error I have less scruple, but all I have said on this matter tended to your opinion, though less thorough and conclusive. Even on the Interest question, I should like, if you will permit me, to acknowledge my obligations to you in a note.

One of my American correspondents, Mr Barnard,⁵ of Boston, is so obliging as to send me the semiweekly edition of the New York Evening Post, the paper edited by Cullen Bryant,⁶ and under him by Parke Godwin,⁷ and, *teste* Barnard, the best paper in the Union. I send you by this post one of the numbers, on account of some fine samples of the theoretical advocacy of slavery by the public writers of the South, which you will find in the first and also in the second page. I inclose a most interesting letter from another correspondent, Mr Brace,⁸ the author of a very creditable book on “The Races of the Old World.” Perhaps after reading it, you may think [it] useful to send it, or part of it, to the Daily News or Spectator, as there are things in it which it is highly desirable to make known. To me it is most encouraging. I never expected to see already so much progress made towards the fulfilment of all I predicted. It will cheer every friend of the cause who reads it. I except, of course, from publication, the first page, and the first six lines of the second.

I have taken a share in the Reader,⁹ partly influenced by seeing your name in the subscription list, and being told that you were willing to look after the politics and political economy of the paper. With such a set of writers it may be made a most valuable organ. I have advised running it against the Saturday Review.

Ever Yours Truly,

J. S. Mill

740.

TO ROWLAND G. HAZARD¹

Saint Véran, Avignon

Dec. 26, 1864

Dear Sir

I shall be very happy to see you if you are passing through Avignon. The people at the Hotel l'Europe can tell you how to find my cottage.

I thank you by anticipation for your book,² which will probably arrive tomorrow. I am Dear Sir

Very Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale. Paper bears watermark: 1856.

[1.] MS at LSE, with a small envelope addressed in JSM's hand: Arthur Hardy Esq. / Adelaide / South Australia / and marked across: Jan. 7 1856.

Harriet Taylor Mill's favourite and youngest brother.

[2.] An educational institution for working people. See Letter 262.

[3.] Charles Gavan Duffy had left England for Australia on Oct. 8, 1855. Some time before he left he had conferred with JSM, who deplored his resignation from Parliament (see C. G. Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres*, II, 124-25).

[4.] At Nice in the autumn of 1853.

[5.] Arthur Ley, husband of Harriet's sister Caroline, and William Thomas Thornton, JSM's associate at the India House, were trustees of Harriet Mill's estate from her first husband. At this time Thornton was ill, and Harriet feared that her and her children's money might be left in Ley's hands.

[6.] Ley had said he would resign the trusteeship if Herbert, who managed his mother's financial affairs, requested him to, but Herbert declined.

[7.] A distraining writ.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to Holyoake's letter of March 26, 1856, also at LSE.

[2.] In his letter of March 26, 1856 Holyoake recalled the £10 loan he had received from JSM in 1854 (see Letter 118, n.9) and asked for his help in a new financial crisis. Holyoake explained that he had agreed to accept bills for a friend, Robert Le Blond, whose business had recently failed. Le Blond, secularist, had been active among the Chartists, and treasurer of the Political Refugee Committee. Since Le Blond was both a personal friend and a generous financial supporter of Holyoake's publishing enterprises, Holyoake felt he "could not be *the first to desert him*," though he realized the risk he was taking. Holyoake went on to explain, that Le Blond "quite lost his reason and fled the country, *ill, penniless, and insane*: and has left three bills amounting together to £130 *to meet in May*. And I am quite ruined unless aided with some loan." The *Reasoner* (Feb. 17, 1856, pp. 49-50) had reported a party given to Le Blond on Jan. 30 by the Secular Society to express sympathy for his illness and troubles.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. MS draft in Harriet's hand at LSE. In reply to Holyoake's of April 2, MS at LSE, as are also his reply of April 5 and a receipt.

[2.] George Grote. His letters of March 31 and April 6 to JSM on the subject are at LSE.

[3.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed*: Madame / Madame John Stuart Mill / Poste Restante / à Paris. *Postmarks*: ORBE / 14 / AOUT / 56, SUISSE; A PONT ??? / 15 / AOUT / 56, and one illegible. Part published in Hayek, pp. 251-52, but misdated 1855.

JSM and his wife, accompanied by Helen and Algernon Taylor, spent much of July and August in Switzerland. At the end of the trip, Harriet went on to Paris, and JSM made a side expedition of a week's walking tour of the French Jura.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed*: Madame / Madame John Stuart Mill / Poste Restante / Boulogne sur Mer / France. *Postmarks*: ??? / 18 / AOUT / 56, LOCLE / 19 AOUT / 56, and others illegible.

[2.] This letter has not been located

[3.] Tête de Rang.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Holyoake's reply of Sept. 26, 1856.

[2.] "Enfranchisement of Women." See Letters 28 and 35.

Holyoake reprinted and sold as a pamphlet many thousand copies of the article, under

the title, “Are Women Fit for Politics? Are Politics Fit for Women?” In his autobiography, *Sixty Years of an Agitator’s Life* (2 vols., London, 1892), I, p. 225, Holyoake, forgetting this rebuke, says that he obtained permission from Mrs. Mill, through JSM, to circulate her article.

[3.] The Women’s Rights Convention discussed in the article, at Worcester, Mass., in Oct., 1850.

[4.] In the next-to-last paragraph of her article Mrs. Mill attacks sentimentality and other vague declamatory elements in women’s struggle for the suffrage, especially in one part of the resolutions introduced at the Worcester meeting (*Dissertations*, Brit. ed. II, 448, Am. ed. III, 130).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Filed in *envelope addressed: Arthur Hardy Esq. / Adelaide / South Australia*. Fourth paragraph published in Elliot, I, 188-89.

[2.] See Letter 256.

[3.] Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862), English colonial statesman. The system he devised for the colonization of Australia provided for the sale of land at a fixed price, and for the application of the proceeds to a fund for the promotion of immigration. For JSM’s discussion of the Wakefield system, see *Pol. Econ.*, Book V, chap. xi, sec. 12.

[4.] The third and fourth volumes of Macaulay’s *History of England from the Accession of James II* were published in 1855; the first two vols. had been published in 1848.

[5.] JSM was referring to chaps. vii and xv of Macaulay’s *History*.

[6.] George Grote, *History of Greece* (12 vols., London, 1846-56). For JSM’s reviews of successive vols., see Letter 1, n. 2.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 189-90. *Note on verso in JSM’s hand:* Answer to Letter dated 3d November 1856 from the Secretary to the Sunday League.

[2.] The National Sunday League, active particularly between 1856 and 1859, sought to “obtain the opening of the public museums, galleries, libraries, and gardens on Sunday, in London, and in the towns of England, Ireland, and Scotland, for the instruction, recreation, and innocent amusement of the working class.” The League issued *The National Sunday League Record*, edited by William Duthie, and numerous pamphlets. For a summary of this propaganda, see Robert Cox, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1865), II, pp. 313 and 378-80. See also “Sunday in Great Britain,” *WR*, n.s. IX (April, 1856), 426-56. For JSM’s comments on Sabbatarian legislation, see *On Liberty*, chap. iv. JSM was elected one of the vice-presidents of the League in 1864.

[1.] MS in the National Portrait Gallery, London.

Herbert Fry (1830-1885), compiler of guide books and handbooks. At this time he was compiling his *National Gallery of Photographic Portraits* (16 Nos., London [1858]).

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 190-92. *Added in JSM's hand*: care of Messrs Longman & Co.

[2.] The pamphlet was entitled, *Currency self-regulating and elastic, explained in a letter to his Grace the Duke of Argyll; with introductory chapters on the nature of capital and of money, and an historical sketch of British Currency systems* (London, 1855).

[3.] That is, currency in which the paper bills are not convertible into coinage. In general, JSM argued against inconvertible currency because abuses in issuing paper money could lead to inflation. See his *Pol. Econ.*, Book III, chaps. xiii and xxiv.

[4.] A group proposing currency reform of an inflationary kind. Its leader was Thomas Attwood (1783-1856), author of pamphlets on political and economic matters. In 1830 he had founded the Birmingham Political Union for the Protection of Public Rights. For JSM's objections to Attwood's theories, see *Pol. Econ.*, Book III, chap. xiii, sec. 4.

[5.] Letters, with one exception headed "The Currency" and signed with pseudonyms such as "West Indian," appeared in the *Morning Post* for Nov. 4, 1856, p. 3; Nov. 6, p. 3; Nov. 7, p. 3; Nov. 18, p. 3; Nov. 20, p. 3; Nov. 21, p. 3; and Nov. 24, p. 2.

[6.] The Bank Charter Act of 1844 was passed under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel; its main provisions called for the separation of the issuing department of the Bank from the department charged with all other banking operations, and, through a complicated series of regulations, a limit upon the amount of paper money the bank could issue. Until the use of cheques late in the century and the extension of credit in other forms, the issuance of paper money was a method of advancing credit. For JSM's discussion of the provisions of this act, see *Pol. Econ.*, Book III, chap. xxiv. For his 1844 articles on the Bank Charter Question in the *Morning Chronicle*, see MacMinn, *Bibliog.*, p. 57. In 1857 he gave evidence before the Select Committee on the Operation of the Bank Acts; see *Parl. Papers, 1857, 2d session*, X, pts. i and ii; reprinted in *Collected Works*, V, 501-47.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale. Presumably a sequel to Letter 264.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 192-93. *Headed in JSM's hand*: à M. Constantin Baer, attaché au ministère de l'Intérieur à Naples. Baer's letter of May 12 to which this is a reply, is at Johns Hopkins.

Though Baer signed his name as Constantin, his published work was signed Costantino Baer. He was the author of a number of works on government and

economics, including *L'avere e l'imposta* (Torino, 1870) which JSM reviewed (see Letter 1738).

[2.] Baer in his letter said that he was sending two articles on JSM's *Pol. Econ.*, a pamphlet on gold, and one on *métayage*. None of these has been located.

[3.] The fourth edition, 1857.

[4.] *Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy* (1844); reprinted in *Collected Works*, IV, 231-339.

[5.] Cf. *Pol. Econ.*, Book IV, chap. vii, sec. 6.

[1.] MS in the Tocqueville archives. Published in Alexis de Tocqueville, *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. J.-P. Mayer (9 vols., Paris, 1951-59), vol. VI, *Correspondance Anglaise*, eds. J.-P. Mayer et Gustave Rudler (1954), pp. 349-50, (c) Librairie Gallimard. Tocqueville's letter of June 22, 1856, is in Mayer, pp. 348-49, as is also his reply to JSM of Dec. 19, 1856, pp. 350-51. *Earlier Letters* contains 14 of JSM's letters to Tocqueville.

[2.] *Ancien Régime et la Révolution* (Paris, 1856).

[3.] *Démocratie en Amérique* (4 vols., Paris, 1835-40). JSM had reviewed the first two volumes in 1835: "De Tocqueville on Democracy in America," *WR*, XXXI (Oct., 1835), 85-129; and the work as a whole in 1840: "Democracy in America," *ER*, LXXII (Oct., 1840), 1-47, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., II, 1-83, Am. ed., II, 79-161.

[1.] MS now lost. From copy of MS supplied by its owner, Professor Edward A. Shils of the University of Chicago.

[2.] Sir William Hamilton, at his death on May 6, 1856, left behind him a large body of manuscripts of lectures on logic and metaphysics which he had delivered over the twenty years of his professorship at Edinburgh. These were eventually published, not by Parker but by Blackwood, as *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic*, eds. H. L. Mansel and J. Veitch (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1859-60). JSM was later to attack Hamilton's work.

[3.] If the dating of the letter is correct, this was to be the fourth edition (1857).

[4.] Possibly *On Liberty*.

[1.] MS in the possession of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boston, Mass.

Asa Gray (1810-1888), the distinguished American botanist, was at this time the Corresponding Secretary of the Academy, to which JSM had been elected on Dec. 9, 1856.

[2.] The second oldest scientific organization in the United States, the Academy was chartered in Massachusetts in 1780. In the List of Foreign Honorary Members, JSM appears in sec. III (Political Economy and History) of class III, Moral and Political Sciences (*Memoirs of American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, n.s. VI, Part I, Boston, 1857, p. xv).

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 2.

[1.] MS in Vatican Library.

[2.] In June, 1855. See Letter 242.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Trevor / at Mrs Harkness / 437
Parliamentary Road / Glasgow. *Postmarks:* YORK / FE 14 / 1857 and GLASGOW /
FEB / 16 / 1857.

In Nov., 1856, Harriet's daughter Helen, after much discussion in the family, had been permitted to embark upon a career on the stage, provided that she kept her identity secret. She was billed as Miss Trevor, and at this time was acting in Glasgow. Desiring to visit her there, Harriet, accompanied by JSM, travelled to York on Thursday, Feb. 12 and to Edinburgh on Feb. 13. Harriet went on to Glasgow the next day, and JSM returned to London. Harriet's letter to Helen of Feb. 8 about arrangements for the trip is at LSE.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Trevor / at Mrs Harkness / 437
Parliamentary Road / Glasgow. *Postmarks:* D U / FE 16 / 1857 and GLASGOW / FE
17 / 1857.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Trevor / at Mrs Harkness / 437
Parliamentary Road / Glasgow. *Postmarks:* HV / FE-17 / 1857 and GLASGOW /
FEB 18 / 1857. Excerpt published in Hayek, pp. 253-54.

[2.] Then Chairman of the Court of Directors of the East India Co.

[3.] Mary Jane, wife of Charles H. C. Mills, a director of the Company, had died on Feb. 8.

[4.] In the style of Jean Paul Richter (1763-1825), German satirist and novelist.

[5.] Not identified.

[6.] The half-yearly meeting of the Great Western Railway Co. was held at Paddington Station on Feb. 13, but adjourned to the day of this letter. Many of the shareholders were protesting the management of the Company. For reports of the meetings, see *The Times*, Feb. 14, p. 11, and Feb. 18, p. 12.

[7.] Such a bill was introduced on Feb. 27 by JSM's friend, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, but made no progress during the Session. See H. Oliver Horne, *A History of Savings Banks* (London, 1949), pp. 150-52.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Trevor / at Mrs Harkness / 437
Parliamentary Road / Glasgow. *Postmarks:* EW / FE-18 / 1857 and GLASGOW /
FEB 19 / 1857.

[2.] Helen was evidently very busy rehearsing in the repertory company she had
joined.

[3.] See Letter 229, n. 27.

[4.] Charles Wykeham Martin (1801-1879), liberal, defeated Sir Walter Riddle,
conservative, in the election of an MP for West Kent on Feb. 19, 1857.

[5.] Which he was revising for the 4th ed. (1857).

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Trevor / at Mrs Harkness / 437
Parliamentary Road / Glasgow. *Postmarks:* 6 / FE 19 / 57 and GLASGOW / FEB 20 /
1857. Note on verso of envelope: From St. Mill to H.T. Feb 1857. Second paragraph
published in Hayek, p. 254, and in *Principles*, p. 1037.

[2.] Robson (*Principles*, p. 1037) suggests the passage in Book I, chap. vii, sec. 3
(*Principles*, pp. 102-106).

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 4.

[4.] Peter Rolandi, foreign and general bookseller, 20 Berners St., Oxford St. W.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Mill / Barry's Hotel / Edinburgh.
Postmarks: A B / FE-24 / 1857 and FEB / W 25 F / 1857. Published, all but last
sentence, in Hayek, p. 255.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Mill / Barry's Hotel / Edinburgh.
Postmarks: A C / FE-25 / ?? and FEB / H 26 F / 1857.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs. Mill / Barry's Hotel / Edinburgh.
Postmarks: E D / FE-26 / 1857 and FEB / Z 27 F / 1857.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Chadwick was presumably writing an article on the war in China, which had
arisen from reprisals by the British in the wake of a seizure at Canton on Oct. 8, 1856,
by the Canton Commissioner Yeh, of the lorcha *Arrow*, which had been registered at
Hong Kong, a British Crown Colony. The *Arrow's* British registry had expired some
ten days before the seizure, though this fact seems to have been unknown to
Commissioner Yeh. Much of the heated debate in Parliament in Feb. and March
hinged upon the question whether John Bowring, the Governor of Hong Kong, was
justified in sanctioning British attacks upon Canton when he knew that the registry of
the *Arrow* had expired. British opponents of the war charged Bowring with
“flagitious” lying. The House of Lords debated the issues at length on Feb. 24 and 26,
1857, with the Earl of Derby leading the case against the war. Richard Cobden played

a similar role in the House of Commons in the extended debate on Feb. 26 and 27, and March 2 and 3. Chadwick, who had long had a connection with the *Examiner*, may have written the article "The China Question" which appeared in that paper on March 14, 1857, pp. 163-64, in support of Bowring's actions.

[3.] Walter Coulson, a member of the Political Economy Club since its first year, 1821.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] The 4th ed. (1857). His discussion of co-operation is in Book IV, chap. vii, "On the Probable Futurity of the Labouring Classes."

[1.] MS at LSE.

Overstone was a member of the Senate of the University of London, 1850-77.

[2.] At the University of London. Bain won the election on April 1, 1857, and held the post until 1863.

[3.] Bain had assisted Professor George Glennie (d. 1845) in the Moral Philosophy course there, 1841-44.

[4.] Published London, 1855.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Mill / 60, Old Steine / Brighton.
Postmarks: DO. / AP-13 / 1857 LEADENHALL St. and BRIGHTON / AP 14.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] Established by Edward V. Neale in 1851, it failed in 1857 when it lost the support of Northern Co-operatives. It had already previously lost the active support of the Christian Socialists when their Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations failed in 1854. See G. D. H. Cole, *A Century of Co-operation* (London, 1944), chap. vi.

[3.] Probably information about France received from Nicolas Villiaumé; see Letter 287.

[4.] The 4th ed. See Letter 275.

[5.] Thomas Shorter, a watch-case finisher by trade, a Chartist who became a Christian Socialist; closely associated with Furnivall and J. M. Ludlow, he had been secretary of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. MS draft of last paragraph only at LSE. Published in Elliot, I, 194-96. In reply to Villari's of Apr. 15, MS at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 271.

[3.] Villari apparently did not make his trip to England until 1862, when he was sent as an official representative of the Italian Government to the London Exposition of that year.

[4.] He had visited Villari in Florence on June 9, 1855. See Letter 242.

[5.] For the complicated manœuvres of the English Government, generally under the leadership of Lord Palmerston during the decade, designed to establish a buffer state in Northern Italy as a balance to France and Austria and to accomplish this end without war if possible, see Herbert F. C. Bell, *Lord Palmerston* (2 vols., London, 1936), I, pp. 398-447, and II, pp. 1-242. For details on the unification of Italy, see Bolton King, *A History of Italian Unity* (2 vols., London, 1899).

[6.] Sir James Graham, as Home Secretary, 1841-46, at the request of Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Secretary, had had opened the letters of Joseph Mazzini, then in exile in England. When this action was exposed in Parliament, there was a storm of protest, and it became widely believed that the Government had supplied information that led to the brothers Emilio and Attilio Bandiera, two Italians in the service of the Austrian Navy, being caught and executed in June, 1844, for an attempt with several other Italian patriots to overthrow the government of Naples. For a summary of the pertinent documents, see King, Appendix C, "The English Government and the Bandieras," *A History of Italian Unity*, II, pp. 388-89.

[7.] For Palmerston's pressure for reforms in the kingdom of Naples, where Ferdinand II, King of the Two Sicilies, ruled from 1830-1859, see King, *A History of Italian Unity*, II, p. 34. Ferdinand, King Bomba, so-called because of his bombardment of Messina, Sicily, during an uprising in 1848, paid no heed to the remonstrances of Lord Clarendon, Palmerston's Foreign Secretary.

[8.] The *status quo*—that is, Austria's Italian provinces of Lombardy and Venetia were to remain Austrian possessions, guaranteed by a treaty of Dec. 2, 1854, signed by France, Austria, and England, as part of the manœuvring to force Austria into the Crimean War against Russia. Austria never entered the Crimean War but did force Russia into retreating from the Danubian principalities (Rumania) by mobilizing its army in 1854.

[9.] The Kingdom of Sardinia and Piedmont, ruled by Victor Emmanuel II, and under the leadership of Count Camillo Cavour as Prime Minister, entered the Crimean War on the side of France and England, and in 1856 participated in the Congress of Paris, where Cavour endorsed the attacks made by the French and English representatives upon Austrian misrule in Italy. Cavour was intent on ridding Italy of Austrian rule and in eventually unifying all Italy.

[10.] For the complicated motives and manœuvres that led to the French expedition of May-June, 1849, and the fall of the Republic of Rome, established Feb. 1849, under Mazzini and Garibaldi, see A. J. P. Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe*, p. 29.

[11.] In April, 1849, Hungary had rid itself of its Austrian rulers and established an independent state with Louis Kossuth as governor; Russia proceeded to suppress Hungary as a separate state and to return it to the rule of Austria in Aug., 1849.

[12.] During the Crimean War, Napoleon III proposed in 1855 that Poland, most of which was under the control of Russia, be restored to independence. As JSM indicates, the British government was not interested.

[13.] As the result of the opening of family archives, many unpublished writings of Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540), historian and statesman, were first made available in the year of this letter (*Opere inedite*, 10 vols., Florence, 1857-67). Two years later Villari published the first volume of his life of Savonarola—*La Storia di Girolamo Savonarola e de' suoi tempi . . .* (2 vols., Florence, 1859-61)—which made use of the Guicciardini papers, as did his later famous biography of Machiavelli—*Niccolo Machiavelli e i suoi tempi* (3 vols., Florence, 1887-92), Eng. trans. 1892.

[14.] While in exile in England Mazzini wrote at least two articles for the *LWR*: “Lives of Sarpi,” XXIX (April, 1838), 146-193, and “Prince Napoleon Louis Bonaparte,” XXXII (Dec., 1838), 85-98.

[15.] See *Pol. Econ.*, Book II, chap. i, sec. 2, 3, and 4; Book IV, chap. vii, sec. 7.

[16.] *On Liberty* was not published until Feb., 1859. (A strict censorship of liberal writings prevailed in Tuscany at this time.)

[17.] In the elections held June 21 and 22 five Republican and eight independent deputies were returned, and 660,000 votes in all were recorded against the regime of Louis Napoleon.

[1.] MS in Hollander Collection, University of Illinois. The last paragraph has been published in *Principles*, p. 1015, n. 1.

Nicolas Villiaumé (1818-1877), publicist and historian.

[2.] The 4th ed. of *Pol Econ.*, published this year.

[3.] *Nouveau Traité d'économie politique* (2 vols., Paris, 1857).

[4.] JSM added as an appendix to Vol. II of the 4th edition material extracted from Villiaumé's book, and headed “Latest Information on the French Industrial Associations.” This appendix is reprinted in full in *Principles*, pp. 1015-20. In the 5th and subsequent editions the material was incorporated in Book IV, chap. vii, secs. 5-6.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs J.S. Mill / Post Office / Fleetwood / Lancashire. *Readdressed in another hand:* Leamington / Warwickshire. *Postmarks:* AMBLESIDE / SP 13 / 1857 and PRESTON / SP 14 / 1857 and FLEETWOOD / SP ? / ? and LEAMINGTON / SP 15 / ??. Published in Hayek, pp. 256-57.

[2.] Presumably on the lands of J. Crosfield, listed as the owner of Rothay Bank, a villa near Ambleside, on p. 44 of Black's *Picturesque Guide to the English Lakes* (Edinburgh, 1851).

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs. J.S. Mill / Post Office / Leamington / Warwickshire. *Postmarks:* SETTLE / SP 16 / 1857 / A and LEAMINGTON / A / SP 17 / 57. Excerpt published in Hayek, p. 257.

[2.] Progress was slow in suppressing the Sepoy Mutiny, which had broken out the preceding May.

[3.] On Sept. 5, 1857.

[4.] The preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs J.S. Mill / Post Office / Leamington / Warwickshire. *Postmarks:* SETTLE / SP 18 / 1857 / B and LEAMINGTON / A / SP 19 / 57.

[2.] Presumably at the only public display of paintings in Manchester at this time, the Royal Institution, founded in 1823 for the promotion of literature, science, and fine arts.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs J.S. Mill / 34 Upper Parade / Leamington / Warwickshire. *Postmarks:* SETTLE / SP 19 / 1857 / A, and LEAMINGTON / SP 20 / 57. Published in Hayek, pp. 257-58.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Stamp.

[2.] Not published until Feb., 1859. See also Letters 286 and 337. The first German translation was done by E. Pickford, published in Frankfurt, 1860.

[1.] Part of MS draft at LSE. Published in Elliot, I, 196-97. See Letter 151, n. 2.

[2.] *Liberty and Necessity; in which are considered the laws of association of ideas, the meaning of the word will, and the true intent of punishment* (Philadelphia, 1857).

[3.] The MS draft at LSE ends here.

[4.] London, 1855.

[5.] London, 1855.

[6.] This was originally published in *WR*, n.s. IV (Oct., 1853), 513-50. In expanded form it appeared in the first edition of *The Principles of Psychology* as Part I, General Analysis, pp. 2-68; in the third edition (1872) it becomes chaps. xi and xii of Part VII and the first footnote discusses his differences with JSM; Spencer had criticized some of the doctrines in the *Logic* (Book II, chaps. v and vi, "Of Demonstration, and Necessary Truths"). JSM in the 4th edition of the *Logic* (1856) had added a chap. vii ("Examination of Some Opinions Opposed to the Preceding Doctrines") to answer Spencer's criticism.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Largely published in Elliot, I, 198-99.

[2.] Gold had been discovered in Australia in Feb., 1851, and the rush was on within a few months.

[3.] New South Wales had established a Council in 1852, and between 1853 and 1856 most of the essential mechanisms of parliamentary democracy had been set up in Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania.

[4.] Sinnett was then employed on the Melbourne *Argus*; he was also one of the founders of the Melbourne *Punch*. In 1859 he returned to South Australia and became Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in William Henry Smith, *Gravenhurst, or, Thoughts on Good and Evil*, 2nd ed. *Knowing and Feeling, A contribution to Psychology. With a Memoir of the Author* [by his wife Lucy] (Edinburgh and London, 1875), p. 65.

William Henry Smith (1808-1872), philosophical writer and frequent contributor to *Blackwood's*. JSM had known him for many years, probably since the days of the London Debating Society. For JSM's and Harriet's opinion of Smith's earlier play, *Athelwold*, see Appendix, Letter 344.1.

[2.] The date of the publication of Smith's *Thorndale*, referred to in the letter.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 199-200.

[2.] A Memorial presented to Lord Palmerston in Dec., 1857, calling for special representation of the educated classes in Parliament, was signed by many of the most distinguished men in Great Britain, including representatives of the nobility, the clergy, the professions, and the armed forces. The plan provided for the creation of an electorate of some 92,000 educated voters who would return seventy members from the various electoral districts to represent the educated classes. Among those who signed the Memorial were Lord Brougham, Charles Kingsley, Arthur P. Stanley, Edwin Chadwick, F. D. Maurice, J. A. Froude, and John Ruskin. See "The Educational Franchise," *The Times*, Dec. 19, 1857, p. 8, which lists the signatories, and the devastatingly critical leader on the proposal in *The Times*, Dec. 21, p. 6. JSM in his pamphlet on parliamentary reform devoted a critical note to the Memorial (*Dissertations*, Brit. ed. III, 23 n-24 n, Am. ed. IV, p. 27 n).

[3.] For JSM's views on the representation of minorities, see his *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (1859) and *Rep. Govt.* (1861), and Letters 93 and 365.

[4.] The Cumulative Vote was first advocated by James Garth Marshall in 1853. See Letter 93.

[5.] The University of London did not gain representation in Parliament until the adoption of the Reform Act of 1867.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] JSM's "Vindication of the French Revolution of February, 1848" had been published anonymously in *WR*, LI (April, 1849). Separate copies had been printed for distribution by JSM. See Letters 4 and 7.

[3.] Louis Blanc's *1848: Historical revelations. Inscribed to Lord Normanby* (London, 1858); revised and expanded years later as *Histoire de la Révolution de 1848* (2 vols., Paris, 1870).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 200-201.

John Holmes (1815-1894), a draper at Leeds who became an active leader of the co-operative movement in that area. He was the author of several pamphlets on co-operation, e.g., *Economic and Moral Advantages of Co-operation* (Leeds, 1857).

[2.] "The Economic and Moral Advantages of Co-operation in the Provision of Food," read at the first annual meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science at Birmingham, Oct. 12-16, 1857. A summary of this paper appears in the Society's *Transactions* for 1857 (London, 1858), pp. 567-69.

[3.] The first successful co-operative, the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers, established in 1844, formed the model for many co-operative organizations, and its principles are still maintained by co-operatives in England and America. The Leeds Flour Mill Society, founded in 1847, became one of the most successful of the societies, and after 1856 it broadened its activities, becoming known eventually as the Leeds Industrial Co-operative Society. For JSM's discussion of the subject see his *Pol. Econ.*, Book IV, chap. vii, sec. 6.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

Arthur Mills (1816-1898), barrister, MP for Taunton, 1852-53, 1857-65, and for Exeter, 1873-80; author of works on colonial government.

[2.] Of Mills's book *India in 1858; a summary of the existing administration, political, fiscal, and judicial, of British India* (London, 1858). In the preface to the second edition published the same year, Mills acknowledges his debt to the "friendly criticism" of JSM.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale. See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at LSE, as is also her undated letter to which this is a reply.

[2.] Probably refers to her remark: “nothing but the knowledge that you were a Christian could give me so much happiness as to know that you would be glad to see me again.” JSM eventually became reconciled with Mary.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Last two paragraphs published in Elliott, I, 201-202.

Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), the well-known Italian patriot.

[2.] JSM had known Mazzini in the early years of his exile in London (1837-48) and had accepted contributions from him for the *LWR* (see Letter 286, n. 14). Mazzini had failed in a revolutionary movement in Italy in 1849 and had returned to England in 1850. In 1857 he had failed in another effort in Italy.

[3.] Unidentified.

[4.] John Scott (1803-1859), examining physician for the East India Co., from 1845.

[5.] After Felice Orsini’s attempt to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon III on Jan. 14, 1858, Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister, at the request of the French government, sponsored a bill to permit the arrest and imprisonment of those who conspired in England against the lives of foreign rulers. The bill was defeated, and Palmerston’s government overthrown.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Not located.

[3.] Henry Ashworth (1794-1880), wealthy manufacturer, opponent of corn-laws, friend of Cobden. Presumably his paper entitled, “Cotton: its cultivation, manufacture, and uses” read to the Society for the Encouragement of Arts at its meeting of March 10, 1858.

[4.] John Forbes Royle, *Review of the measures which have been adopted in India for the improved culture in cotton* (London, 1857).

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 202-203. On verso of draft, in JSM’s hand: “Villari (2) & reply March 9, 1858. For publication. J.S.Mill”; and, in pencil: “As Lord Russell is alive [this has been crossed out] The disparaging expression about Lord Russell may be omitted at the discretion of my literary executor.”

[2.] On Feb. 12 Palmerston had introduced in Parliament a bill to transfer the government of India from the East India Co. to the Crown. JSM was responsible for the preparation of the Company’s petition against the adoption of the bill. Alexander Bain in his *John Stuart Mill: a Criticism: with Personal Recollections* (London, 1882) prints a number of passages from the petition (pp. 96-101). The petition was presented in the Commons on Feb. 9, was praised as a state paper, but the Company was

doomed. On Aug. 2 the Queen signed the Act transferring the government of India to the Crown. For other writings on the subject by JSM, see MacMinn, *Bibliog.*, pp. 90-92.

[3.] See Letter 302, n. 5.

[4.] Edward George Geoffrey Smith Stanley, 14th Earl of Derby (1799-1869), had formed a Tory ministry with Disraeli and had taken office on Feb. 21.

[5.] Russell had spoken against Palmerston's Conspiracy to Murder Bill on Feb. 9.

[6.] *On Liberty* was not published until Feb., 1859.

[1.] MS in 1965 in the possession of Joseph H. Schaffner of New York.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 204-205.

William Newmarch (1820-1882), economist and statistician, a collaborator with Thomas Tooke in vols. 5 and 6 of *A History of Prices* (London, 1857). A lectureship in economic science and statistics was founded in Newmarch's memory at University College, London, after his death.

[2.] Thomas Tooke had died on Feb. 26. The Tooke professorship of economic science and statistics was established by public subscription in 1859 at King's College.

[3.] King's College had opened in 1831 as a Church of England institution in competition with University College, a non-denominational institution, which had opened in 1828. Both colleges were incorporated into the University of London in 1836.

[4.] Andrew Bell (1753-1832) and Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838) conceived independently the idea of a national system of inexpensive popular education on a voluntary basis, employing pupils as teachers. Lancaster, a Quaker, provided for non-sectarian religious instruction, to which the Church was opposed. In 1810 the Royal Lancasterian Society, later named the British and Foreign School Society, was established, and in the following year Anglicans set up the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published, except first paragraph, in Elliot, I, 205.

[2.] Over the years Mazzini started or tried to start a great many international democratic organizations, including such groups as Young Europe, Young Germany, Young Poland, the People's International League, and the European Democratic Central Committee. What the new project was at this point is not known.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. Peter M. Jackson.

Patrick O'Callaghan, LL.D., D.C.L., F.S.A. (d. 2 Jan., 1875), at one time Chief

Medical Officer of the 11th P. A. O. Hussars, and subsequently president of the Leamington Philosophical Society. At the Sept. 1858, meeting of the British Association, he served as secretary of Section E, Geography and Ethnology.

[2.] The British Association for the Advancement of Science, modelled after German practice, first met at York Sept. 27, 1831, at the suggestion of Sir David Brewster.

[3.] The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, which held its first meeting at Birmingham in 1857, was founded under the leadership of Lord Brougham to unite “all those interested in social improvement.” JSM was a member of the General Committee. For an account of the founding of the Association see NAPSS, *Transactions*, Birmingham, 1857 (London, 1858).

[4.] The BAAS held its 28th meeting at Leeds in Sept., 1858. *Report of BAAS* (London, 1859).

[1.] MS at LSE.

John Elliot Cairnes (1823-1875), economist, B.A., Trinity College, Dublin, 1848; M.A., 1854; Whately Professor of political economy, Trinity, 1856-61. Called to the Irish bar, 1857; Professor of political economy and jurisprudence, Queen’s College, Galway, 1861-70. Professor of political economy, University College, London, 1866-72. Beginning in the year following this letter, Cairnes became one of JSM’s most frequent and valued correspondents. For a valuable article containing many excerpts from their correspondence, see George O’Brien, “J. S. Mill and J. E. Cairnes,” *Economica*, n.s.X (Nov., 1943), 273-85.

[2.] *The Character and Logical Method of Political Economy; being a course of lectures delivered in Hilary Term, 1857* (London, Dublin, 1857).

[3.] Cairnes was probably seeking an appointment as Examiner in political economy in the India Civil Service, a position which he appears not to have obtained until 1863.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 206. Written on verso: “To J. Britten July 1, 1858. For publication. J. S. Mill.”

The correspondent has not been identified.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris. Published, all but first paragraph, in Daniel Villey, “Sur la traduction par Dupont-White de ‘la Liberté’ de Stuart Mill,” *Revue d’histoire économique et sociale*, XXIV (1938), 193-231.

Charles Brook Dupont-White (1807-1878), French economist and publicist; translator of JSM’s *On Liberty* and *Representative Government*. For the most thorough treatment of Dupont-White, see Daniel Villey, *Charles Dupont-White, Economiste et*

Publiciste français (1807-1878); Sa Vie; son Oeuvre; sa Doctrine, vol. I (Paris, 1936).

[2.] *L'Individu et l'État* (Paris, 1857; 2d. ed., 1858).

[3.] "Of the Grounds and Limits of the *Laisser-Faire* or Non-interference Principle," *Pol. Econ.*, Book V, chap. xi.

[4.] Dupont-White (2nd ed., p. 150) writes the phrase as "La Grande-Bretagne *s'administrative*."

[1.] MS and draft at NLS.

In reply to letter of June 28 from Carlyle, published in *Letters of Thomas Carlyle to John Stuart Mill, John Sterling, and Robert Browning*, ed. A. Carlyle (London, 1923), pp. 184-85. Carlyle had asked JSM to receive a Mr. Russell at his office for half an hour "on Wednesday next."

This appears to be the first extant letter of JSM to Carlyle since July 9, 1845. Thirty-two letters to Carlyle are included in *Earlier Letters*.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] Poona College, later called Deccan College, was founded in 1851 as a combination of Poona Sanskrit College and Poona English School.

[4.] A small town in Scotland, between Dumfries and Carlisle. Carlyle had written, "I have taken refuge here, out of the quasi-infernal London element, for a few weeks."

[1.] MS in the possession of W. Rosenberg, University of Canterbury, N.Z. MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 208-11, and in R. S. Neale, "John Stuart Mill on Australia: A Note," *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, XIII (April, 1968), 240-42.

[2.] Victoria had received a new constitution in 1855, and in 1857 the requirement of property qualifications for members of the Legislative Assembly was abolished.

[3.] In March, 1858, Chapman had been asked to form a ministry, but, refusing to head it, he became attorney general in a new O'Shanassy cabinet, a post which he held until Oct. 27, 1859.

[4.] Manhood suffrage had been established in Victoria on Nov. 24, 1857. Chapman himself was in favour of "universal suffrage."

[5.] Victoria was the first modern state to use a system of voting by ballot. Chapman had drafted the bill for the ballot system of secret voting, later widely known and adopted as the "Australian" system, which was passed on March 19, 1856. For the best treatment of Chapman's work on behalf of the ballot, see the article by R. S. Neale cited in Letter 15, n. 1.

[6.] William Nicholson (1816-1865), Australian statesman, later (1859) premier of Victoria. He had been the mover of the original motion in the Legislative Council on Dec. 18, 1855, to include the ballot in the Electoral Act.

[7.] James Mill, *The History of British India* (3 vols., London, 1817), II, Book IV, chap. ix, p. 303.

[8.] He later discussed the Ballot in both *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (London, 1859) and in *Rep. Govt.* (London, 1861), chap. x, “*Of the Mode of Voting.*”

[9.] See *Rep. Govt.*, chap. x.

[10.] Samuel Bailey (1791-1870), philosophical writer, in his *Rationale of Political Representation* (London, 1835). A resident of Sheffield, Bailey was sometimes called “the Bentham of Hallamshire.”

[11.] See both *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* and *Rep. Govt.*, chap. vii, “Of True and False Democracy; Representation of All, and Representation of the Majority Only.”

[12.] Charles Gavan Duffy.

[13.] See Letter 304, n. 2.

[14.] One of the most important consequences of the Indian mutiny was the ending of the East India Company’s government.

[15.] See Letter 302, n. 5.

[16.] When Palmerston resigned office on Feb. 21, Lord Derby, failing to get the support of the Peelites, formed a conservative administration with Disraeli. The new Tory government promised a franchise measure.

[17.] The state of parties at this time was confused and unstable. Radicals refused to accept the leadership of Palmerston.

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 206-208. In reply to Villari’s of April 10, MS at Yale.

[2.] The bill for the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown was passed in Parliament on the day of this letter.

[3.] See Letter 304, n. 2.

[4.] According to Bain, after a chairman had been chosen, JSM was the first to be offered a place on the new council by Lord Stanley. JSM chose instead to retire later in the year.

[5.] From 1709 the Company's rule had been organized in three independent presidencies: Bombay, Madras, and Bengal. The Governor of Bengal, the largest presidency, eventually became the Governor-General of India. These appointments were made by the British government, not by the Company.

[6.] John Adam (1779-1825), Anglo-Indian statesman. His term as acting Governor-General for seven months in 1823 aroused criticism because of his efforts to control the freedom of the press.

[7.] Since 1765 the independence of Oudh had depended on the protection of Britain. After repeated warnings to the princes of Oudh to put their house in order continued to be disregarded, Lord Dalhousie in 1856 directed Lieut. General Sir James Outram to take over the administration of Oudh. It became one of the centres of the Mutiny of 1857-58.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale. MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, I, 212-13.

[2.] See Letter 297, n. 3.

[3.] Constantine Henry Phipps, 1st Marquis of Normanby (1797-1863), ambassador to France, 1846-52. His *A Year of Revolution. From a Journal kept in Paris in 1848* (2 vols., London, 1857) was attacked by Blanc as inaccurate and untrustworthy.

[4.] Representative notices may be found in *SR*, May 8, pp. 476-78; *Sp.*, April 24, pp. 445-46; and *Athenaeum*, April 24, pp. 526-28.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Stuart Mill / Blackheath Park / Kent.
Postmarks: MATLOCK BATH / A / JY 12 / 58 and SR / LONDON / JY-13 / 58.

[1.] MS at Yale.

[2.] Mt. Salève, a limestone mountain in the French Alps near the southwest corner of Lake Geneva.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Stuart Mill / Blackheath Park / Kent.
Postmarks: BASLOW / JY 13 / 1858 / A; CHESTERFIELD / JY 13 / 1858, and LONDON / AH / JY 14 / 58.

[2.] Sir William Cavendish (1808-1891), who had become the 7th Duke of Devonshire in Jan. of this year.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Stuart Mill / Blackheath Park / Kent.
Postmark: BAKEWELL / ?? / LONDON / JY - ?? / 58.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Vacancies in Parliament to be created by appointments to the new Council for India. The recently adopted India Act provided for a Secretary of State for India and a

Council of fifteen members, eight to be chosen by the government and seven by the Court of Directors of the East India Co.

[3.] The directors held their election on Aug. 9.

[4.] Ross Donnelly Mangles (1801-1877), MP for Guildford (1841-58), a director of the East India Co. (1847-58) and chairman (1857-58), was elected by the Court of Directors as a member of the new Council.

[5.] Chadwick read a paper "On the Application of Sanitary Science to the Protection of the Indian Army" at the meetings of the NAPSS at Liverpool, Oct. 11-16, 1858. It was published in the NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1858, pp. 487-504.

[6.] George Appleton, a clerk in the military department.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably either the paper referred to in the preceding letter, n. 5, or the paper he read to the Section of Economic Science and Statistics of the Brit. Assoc. for the Advancement of Science, at Leeds, Sept. 27, 1858: "On the Progress of the Principle of Competitive Examination for Admission into the Public Service," published in both the *Journal of the Society of Arts*, VI (1858), 671-73 (a condensed report), and the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, XXII (1859), 44-75.

[3.] See Letters 93 and 112.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The 4th ed., 1857.

[3.] The 4th ed., 1856.

[4.] *Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*, 1844.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] The Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers had been organized in 1844 with 28 members and a capital of £28. By 1858 it had 1950 members and a capital of £18,000. JSM discusses the society in his *Pol. Econ.*, 5th ed., Book IV, chap. vii, sec. 6. G. J. Holyoake's *Self-Help by the People—History of Co-operation in Rochdale* was published in the year of this letter. See also Letter 298.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published (first paragraph) in Gomperz, p. 268, and (plus second paragraph) in Stamp.

[2.] "Zu Euripides," in *Rheinisches Museum*, XI (1857), 470-71; and "Zu den griechischen Tragikern," *ibid.*, XIII (1858), 477-79.

[3.] This was the work that was to occupy Gomperz for the better part of his life. It was eventually published as *Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1896-1909). Published in English as *Greek Thinkers. A History of Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 1 trans. by Laurie Magnus, vols. 2-4 by G. G. Berry (New York and London, 1901-12).

[4.] William Whewell (1794-1866), Professor of Moral Philosophy and Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, whom JSM had attacked in his *Logic*, especially in Books II and III. Gomperz may have proposed adding JSM's review of Whewell's *Elements of Morality* and *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy in England* in the *WR*, n.s. II (Oct., 1852), 349-85, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. II, 450-509, and Am. ed. III, 132-92, and in *Collected Works*, X, 167-201.

Actually, the first German translation of the *Logic* was done by J. Schiel, and the Gomperz translation was not published until 1873-75. See Letter 183, n. 2 and n. 3.

[1.] MS not located. Published in G. J. Holyoake's *The Reasoner*, Jan. 23, 1859, p. 29, as from *Allen's Indian Mail*.

On the occasion of JSM's retirement as Examiner, his associates subscribed to a handsome testimonial for him in the shape of a silver inkstand. Designed by Digby Watt and manufactured by Messrs. Elkington, it was described as "a casket of oblong form, and of remarkably elegant design, having on the lid a copy in bas-relief of Raphael's picture of the 'School of Athens,' flanked by medallion heads of Apollo and Minerva, on the ends medallions of Aristotle and Plato, and on the front and back portions of the Panatheniac frieze, all in bas-relief." Inside the lid was the following inscription: "Presented to John Stuart Mill, on his retirement from the office of 'Examiner of Indian Correspondence,' in token of high admiration and esteem, and warm personal regard, by his associates in that department of the East India House." The accompanying letter, signed by twenty-nine persons, is also printed with this reply.

JSM, who on principle disliked all such demonstrations, was angry when he learned of the plan and would have none of it. According to W. T. Thornton, who originated the idea, the sponsors had to arrange with Messrs. Elkington to deliver the testimonial to Mrs. Mill's house at Blackheath. On later visits, Thornton observed the inkstand in the drawing room, but it was not mentioned again. See Packe, p. 391, as quoted from H. R. Fox Bourne, ed. *John Stuart Mill—Notices of his Life and Works* (London, 1873), no. 2, "His Career in the India House," by W. T. Thornton.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Angleterre / Miss Trevor / Post Office / Aberdeen / N.B. *Postmark:* LYON / 21 / Oct / 58.

Helen Taylor (1831-1907), daughter of Harriet; advocate of women's rights; member of London School Board, 1876-84.

[2.] JSM took advantage of the change of administration from the East India Co. to the government to retire with a generous pension of £1500 a year, more than his

salary had been until his promotion of the previous year, when it was raised to £2000. Officially his retirement did not become effective until the end of the year, but his and Harriet's health dictated their wintering in a warmer climate. They left England for the South of France on Oct. 12, 1858. Since Mrs. Mill had a cough and fever when they arrived in Lyons on Oct. 19, they stopped there.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Envelope addressed: A Monsieur / M. le docteur Gurney / à Nice.* Published in Hayek, pp. 261-62.

[2.] Preserved at Yale also is what was evidently a partial draft for the foregoing letter.

“She has had no sleep for five nights in fact is quite unable to lie down as the sensation of inability to breathe commences the moment she attempts to put the head otherwise than leaning forward. This is the one symptom which seems to me to surmount all the rest.

I am yrs very truly”

[1.] MS at Yale. Published in Hayek, pp. 262-63. JSM and Harriet arrived in Avignon on Wednesday, Oct. 27.

[1.] MS at Yale. *Addressed to: Miss Trevor / at Mrs King / 36 Union St. / Aberdeen.* Helen's reply is at LSE.

[2.] Neither Gurney nor Helen Taylor arrived in time. Mrs. Mill died in the Hôtel de l'Europe on Nov. 3.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Jules Véran: “Le Souvenir de Stuart Mill à Avignon,” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Sept. 1, 1937, p. 216.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt quoted in Bain, *JSM*, p. 169. The portion in brackets is Bain's introduction to the excerpt.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 102.

[2.] Dr. Henry Cecil Gurney. See Letters 107, n. 12, and 327.

[3.] The following sentence is cancelled in the draft: “The only consolation possible is the determination to live always as in her sight.”

[4.] This notice appeared in *The Times*, on Nov. 13, 1858, p. 1, under “Deaths.” The MS draft includes a variant of the phrase preceding “Harriet”; “to the inexpressible grief & irreparable loss of her family & the regret of all who had the happiness to know her.”

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to Gurney's of Nov. 13, also at Yale, as is Gurney's rejoinder of Dec. 1.

[2.] Sir Joseph Oliffe (1809-1869), from 1852 physician at the British Embassy in Paris, and generally regarded as the chief representative of English medicine in that city. JSM paid Gurney £1000, the sum Gurney reported that Sir Joseph had received for a professional trip to Nice.

[3.] It took Gurney a week to go from Nice to Avignon, and Mrs. Mill was dead when he arrived. See Letter 327.

[4.] His stepdaughter Helen Taylor accompanied him. She was to become his lifelong constant companion and assistant.

[5.] In St. Véran, a suburb of Avignon, where for the rest of his life he was to spend about half of each year.

[1.] MS copy at Yale. In reply to Spencer's letter of July 29, 1858, published in Spencer's *Autobiography*, II, 27-28.

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), the philosopher. Then in financial difficulties, he had asked for JSM's help in obtaining a place in the new Indian Administration which would give him leisure to continue his philosophical writing.

[2.] The death of his wife.

[3.] Edward Henry Stanley, later 15th Earl of Derby (1826-1893), was Secretary of State for India, Aug., 1858-June, 1859, in his father's cabinet. Actually, Stanley was a great admirer of JSM. Spencer eventually had a friendly letter from Stanley, dated Jan. 4, 1859, published in David Duncan, *Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer* (2 vols., New York, 1908), I, 120.

[4.] See Letter 314, n. 4.

[5.] Sir Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer-Lytton, 1st Baron Lytton (1803-1873), novelist and politician; Secretary for Colonies in the Derby Cabinet, May, 1858-June, 1859; MP for Lincoln, 1832-41, Hertfordshire, 1852-66.

[6.] Benjamin Disraeli, later 1st Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881), novelist and statesman; Chancellor of Exchequer in Derby Cabinet, Feb., 1858-June, 1859.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 213.

[1.] MS copy at Yale, as is also Spencer's letter of Nov. 27 (published in Duncan, I, 114-15) to which this is a reply.

[2.] Letter 334.

[1.] MS at King's.

[2.] Written with his wife, the manuscript had been ready for some time, and was to have had its final revision during their trip to Europe. See Letters 213, n. 11, and 304. The book was published in Feb., 1859.

[3.] *Dissertations and Discussions*; the first two volumes were published in April, 1859.

[4.] *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* (4 vols., London, 1839).

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 102. Bracketed portion is Bain's introduction to the excerpt.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

Louis Nicolas Ménard (1822-1901), scholar, poet, painter, philosopher, linguist. A liberal thinker and a warm champion of democratic ideas; in 1849, he published in *Le Peuple* "Prologue d'une révolution," for which he was jailed; he subsequently lived for a time in England, but returned to France in 1852.

[2.] Guillaumin & Cie.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Excerpt published in Gomperz, pp. 270-71. In reply to letter of Gomperz of Nov. 10, 1858, also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Ernst Friedrich Apelt (1813-1859), philosopher; the work Gomperz sent was his *Die Theorie der Induction* (Leipzig, 1854).

[3.] Probably the second part of a review of new editions of Herodotus, *Zeitschrift für die oesterreichischen Gymnasien*, X (1859), 808-29, of which the first part had appeared in 1857.

[4.] See Letter 337.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Hardy's reply from South Australia, Feb. 14, 1859, is also at Yale.

[2.] Letter 327.

[1.] MS at King's. Bears a note, not in JSM's hand: "Account to be sent at end of two years."

[2.] Bain's first volume, *The Senses and the Intellect*, had been published in 1855; for JSM's opinion of this, see Letter 282. Bain, in his *Autobiography*, p. 251, says Parker accepted JSM's proposal; the second volume, *The Emotions and the Will*, was published in March, 1859. As JSM predicted, sales of the first volume increased with publication of the second, and the offered guarantee was not needed.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale. MS draft at Yale.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The Law Amendment Society, founded in 1844 by Lord Brougham, eventually merged with the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science.

[3.] “The Chief Methods of Preparing for Legislation,” read to a joint meeting of the Law Amendment Society and the NAPSS in 1859, and later reprinted as a pamphlet. See letters 352 and 353.

[4.] *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, published in Feb., 1859, and reprinted in *Dissertations*: Brit. ed. III, 1-46, Am. ed. IV, 5-50.

[5.] The 3rd Earl Grey.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as are also her letter of Nov. 15 and an undated later one, to which this is a reply.

[2.] Letter 343.

[1.] MS at UCL. In the 3rd Earl Grey’s papers at the Prior’s Kitchen, Durham, are two sheets in Grey’s hand, headed “Substance of Mr Mill’s letter to Mr Chadwick of December 30 / 58 and of mine of January 1 / 59.”

[2.] No such paper has been located, and the reference is not to Earl Grey’s *Parliamentary Government, Considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament*, published earlier in 1858. It may have been an early version of proposals put forth by the Earl in the revised edition of his book (London, 1864). Each of the points JSM discusses here is raised in the revised edition but not in the first edition. See also Letters 347, 348, and 695.

[3.] See Grey’s revised edition, pp. 203-208.

[4.] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

[5.] *Ibid.*, pp. 220-38.

[6.] “The London General Omnibus Company,” *Daily News*, Dec. 28, 1858, p. 2.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 346, n. 2.

[3.] William Rathbone Greg. No such paper has been located, but in the 3rd Earl Grey’s papers at Durham there is a summary in the Earl’s hand, entitled “Heads of Mr. Greg’s letter of December 21 / 58 to Mr. Chadwick on my scheme of reform.”

[4.] JSM was overly sanguine. Reform bills failed in both 1859 and 1860, and none was passed until 1867.

[5.] Presumably the one referred to in Letter 346, n. 6.

[6.] See Letter 372, n. 2.

[7.] JSM made no contribution to his own election expenses when he ran for Parliament in 1865; see Letter 765.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 346, n. 1.

[3.] English women taxpayers had the right to vote in local elections, except in cities, where they were excluded by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835.

[4.] See Letter 347, n. 3.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 271, and in Stamp.

[2.] In reply to Letter 340.

[3.] A translation, *Über die Freiheit*, by E. Pickford was published in Frankfurt, 1860. Gomperz published his own translation of *On Liberty* in vol. I of his authorized translation of JSM's collected works, Leipzig, 1869.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also her letter of Dec. 24, to which this is a reply.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 344. Apparently Chadwick wanted JSM to preside over the meeting at which he read his paper on methods of preparing for legislation, but agreed to accept a letter instead.

[3.] See next two Letters.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The next Letter.

[1.] MS at UCL. Published in *Law Amendment Journal*, Feb. 3, 1859, and in *Transactions of the Law Amendment Society*, 1858-59, p. liii, with Chadwick's paper.

[2.] For title of Chadwick's paper see Letter 344, n. 3. Chadwick presented his paper on Jan. 29, 1859, introduced by Sir James Stephen; see report in *The Times*, Feb. 1, 1858, p. 10, and leader on p. 6. For a summary of Chadwick's paper see B. W. Richardson, *The Health of Nations, A Review of the Works of Edwin Chadwick* (2 vols., London, 1887), I, 126-40.

[3.] The Reform Act of 1832 admitted the £10 householder to the borough franchise, but the county figure was £50.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] “Results of Different Principles of Legislation and Administration in Europe; of Competition for the Field, as compared with Competition within the Field, of Service”; read to the Statistical Society of London, Jan. 18, 1859; published in *Journal of the Statistical Society*, XXII (Sept., 1859), 381-420; summarized in Richardson, *The Health of Nations*, I, 141-58. The paper is an attack on competition in the operation of public services.

[3.] See Letters 344 and 351.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 103. Bracketed portion is Bain’s introduction to the excerpt.

[2.] George Grote, as MP for the City of London (1832-41), had introduced four resolutions and two bills in favour of the ballot. JSM himself had earlier been an advocate of the ballot.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 103. Bracketed portion is Bain’s introduction to the excerpt.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Joseph McCabe, *Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake* (2 vols., London, 1908), I, 338. The bracketed portion is McCabe’s introduction to the quotation.

Holyoake was widely known as a freethinker. Between 1853 and 1861 he ran Fleet Street House, a publishing company, and the “British Secular Institute of Communism and Propagandism.” He also edited *The Reasoner*.

[1.] MS in Goldsmith’s Library, London.

John William Parker, Jr., oldest son of J. W. Parker, publisher.

[2.] France had concluded a treaty of alliance with Sardinia on Jan. 26, 1859. A translation of a pamphlet *Napoleon III and Italy* appeared in *The Times*, Feb. 5, 1859, p. 9; and Napoleon’s speech of Feb. 7, 1859, was reported in *The Times*, Feb. 8, p. 9.

[3.] JSM wrote for the April, 1859, issue the article “Recent Writers on Reform,” *Fraser’s*, LIX, 489-508; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. III, 47-96, Am. ed. IV, 51-100.

[1.] MS at UCL.

The seven points listed at the end are evidently JSM’s emendations of a paper of Chadwick’s prepared in connection with his unsuccessful attempt to run for Parliament at Evesham in 1859.

[2.] The Tory government borrowed from Whig proposals in the reform bill which they introduced in Parliament, and which was defeated in March, 1859.

[3.] Thomas Hare (1806-1891), political reformer, lawyer. He had been an inspector of charities since 1853; in 1872 he was appointed assistant commissioner. His book *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives Parliamentary and Municipal* (London, 1859) first acquainted JSM with Hare's plan for proportional representation, of which JSM became an ardent advocate. See Letter 365 and the Index for many later statements on the subject.

[4.] Probably the *Méthode pour analyser la pensée et pour faire des abrégés* (Paris, 1806 and 1839) by L'Abbé Louis (or Aloisius) Edouard Camille Gaultier (1745-1818), schoolmaster and textbook writer.

[5.] Probably James William Gilbart (1794-1863), leading banker and writer on banking and other subjects, including a popular book on logic and a book on *The Logic of Banking* (London, 1859).

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] JSM made a quick trip to Avignon in February to discuss his wife's tomb with Eugène Pascal, the Avignon architect.

[3.] Neither paper A nor B has been identified.

[4.] Sir Samuel Romilly (1757-1818), law reformer, was never elected MP for Bristol, though he stood for election in Oct., 1812.

[5.] Edmund Burke (1729-1797), the statesman, who represented Bristol from 1774, was rejected in 1780 because his advocacy of commercial rights for Ireland offended Bristol merchants and his religious toleration increased the discontent.

[6.] *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, published Feb., 1859.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris. Largely published in Villey, p. 206.

[2.] Dupont-White's translation of *On Liberty* was published in 1860.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 360, n. 2.

[3.] *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.

[4.] G. J. Holyoake; see Letters 363, n. 6, and 374.

[5.] See Letter 359.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. *Envelope addressed:* G. J. Holyoake Esq. / 147 Fleet Street. *Postmark:* LONDON / MR 3.

[2.] See Letter 357.

[3.] Reviews of *On Liberty* had appeared in *Sp.*, Feb. 12, 1859, pp. 189-90; *SR*, Feb. 12, 1859, pp. 186-87, and Feb. 19, 1859, pp. 213-14; *Athenaeum*, Feb. 26, 1859, pp. 281-82.

[4.] Robert Owen died Nov. 17, 1858; Holyoake attended the funeral, at which no lay speeches were permitted. Some time later Holyoake issued as a pamphlet the speech he might have made: *Life and Last Days of Robert Owen* (London, 1859).

[5.] See Book V, chap. ii, sec. 3.

[6.] Advocated in *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Arnold Ruge (1802-1880), German philosopher and political writer; he lived in England after 1850.

[2.] See Letter 360, n. 2.

[3.] To *On Liberty*.

[4.] Presumably Ruge's "Die Freiheit der Hauptvölker," *Deutsches Museum*, IX (April 1, 1859), 481-94; (April 7, 1859), 545-54; (May 5, 1859), 686-98; (May 12, 1859), 725-36. The article deals with various aspects of freedom, intellectual, social, and political, in England and Europe, but does not touch upon JSM's *On Liberty*.

[5.] *On Liberty*.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Leeds. *Envelope addressed:* Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James's Square. *Postmarks:* 8 / MR 3 / 59 and SE. Published in Elliot, I, 215-16.

[2.] See Letter 360, n. 2.

[3.] *Treatise on the Election of Representatives*; see Letter 359, n. 3.

[4.] JSM acclaimed Hare's book in his article "Recent Writers on Reform" published in April (see Letter 358, n. 3); in the second edition of his *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* later this year; and in *Rep. Govt*.

[1.] MS in Edinburgh University Library, bound in a collection of pamphlets entitled *Relative Equality 1852-1862* which belonged to Lorimer, and contains JSM's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* and "Recent Writers on Reform" (probably sent

to Lorimer by JSM, and annotated by Lorimer). MS draft at LSE. Published in Elliot, I, 214.

James Lorimer (1818-1890), jurist and political philosopher; later (1865) Professor of the Law of Nature and of Nations at Edinburgh University, Lorimer's *Political Progress not Necessarily Democratic; or, Relative Equality the true Foundation of Liberty* was one of the three books JSM reviewed in his "Recent Writers on Reform" (see Letter 358, n. 3.).

[2.] *Equal Representation, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord John Russell* (London, 1859).

[1.] MS in Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] See Letter 360, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Cornell. Grant had been stricken with what proved to be his last illness; he died on March 29. See Letter 382.

[2.] *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*. The attack was in a leader in the *Daily News*, Feb. 21, 1859, p. 4. It criticized JSM for his reversal of his earlier support of the ballot, but attacked more sharply John Austin for his opposition to any extension of the suffrage in his pamphlet *A Plea for the Constitution* (1859). Said the leader writer: "Philosophical Radicals are not practical politicians. They are the victims of closet speculations, elaborated apart from actual experience, and in ignorance of the facts to which the speculations refer . . . They are out of relation to the movements of the day, and can have little or no influence upon them either for good or ill."

[3.] A leader in the *Daily News*, Feb. 8, 1859, p. 4, highly favourable to JSM's *Parliamentary Reform*.

[4.] Not identified.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] Hayek notes (p. 296) that this accident "occurred probably early in May, 1842, when according to Helen Taylor's diary Mr. and Mrs. Taylor were thrown out of a carriage."

[3.] *Time and Faith. An inquiry into the data of ecclesiastical history* (2 vols., London, 1857). Though published anonymously, the book was by Hickson.

[4.] Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (121-180), Roman emperor and Stoic philosopher, shared the first eight years of his reign with his adoptive brother, commonly called Lucius Verus. Verus died suddenly in 169, and there was some suspicion that he had been poisoned by Marcus Aurelius. Hickson's reference to him must have been occasioned by JSM's discussion of him in chap. ii of the recently published *On Liberty*. For Hickson's attempt to exculpate Aurelius from responsibility for persecuting the Christians, see *Time and Faith*, II, 417-18, note.

[1.] Both MS draft and MS copy of the original at Northwestern. In reply to Spencer's letter of Feb. 17 published in Duncan, I, 121 (MS at Northwestern).

[2.] Spencer's article in *WR*, n.s.IV (July, 1853), 51-84. In his letter of Feb. 17 Spencer had remarked that "the strong tendency there is on the part of the working classes to Over-Legislate has given me the only qualms I have had of late years respecting the effects of increased popular power."

[3.] For Spencer's comments see his letter to JSM, March 25, 1859, in Duncan, I, 122-23.

[4.] See Letter 359, n. 3.

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. MS draft (incomplete) at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 216, except for last paragraph.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] In the last paragraph of his *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* JSM attacked the proposal to collect "the votes of the electors at their own homes, a voting paper being left at the door . . . and filled up by the voter without the trouble of going to the poll." Such a scheme had been in operation for some time in the election of poor-law guardians.

[3.] George Lillie Craik (1798-1866), journalist and literary historian, who published this same year a pamphlet on *Representation of Minorities*.

[4.] See Letter 359, n. 4.

[5.] See *ibid.*, n. 3.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope addressed:* Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James's Square. *Postmark:* 8 M / MR 12 / 59.

[2.] In Letter 365.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Part of first paragraph published in Elliot, I, 217. In reply to Bain's of March 14, MS at NLS.

[2.] See Letter 363.

[3.] See Letter 359, n. 3.

[4.] To propose writing a review of Bain's books on psychology for the *ER*. The proposal was accepted (see Letter 404, n. 3).

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale. In reply to Grant Duff's letter of March 12, 1859, MS at Johns Hopkins.

Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff (1829-1906), barrister, statesman, author, MP for Elgin district of Burghs, 1857-81.

[2.] Alexander Herzen or Herten (1812-1870), Russian revolutionary, and a prolific writer in Russian, French, and English. He was in exile in London from 1852 to 1864.

[1.] MS at NLW. *Endorsed in another hand*: Mr. Mill / March 59.

[2.] Lewis had probably commented on JSM's attack on the ballot in his *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.

[3.] JSM may not have known that Lewis was the author of an article, "History and Prospects of Parliamentary Reform," in *ER*, CIX (Jan., 1859), 264-92, which listed but did not discuss Hare's book.

[1.] MS draft and MS copy at Northwestern. In reply to Spencer's letter of March 25, largely published in Duncan, I, 122-23 (MS at Northwestern).

[2.] See Letter 334. Spencer had applied for a post in the Education Commission as well as in the new Indian Administration; he had cordial replies but no definite offers.

[3.] Spencer had said, "The present strike of the shoemakers (an intelligent body of artisans) against the sewing-machine shows that, *relatively to social phenomena*, they are no wiser than peasants."

[4.] In his letter Spencer had stressed the "propriety of insisting that those who have votes shall personally pay rates" and had objected to making public gardens and building public baths at a town's expense.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

John Plummer (1831-*ca.* 1914), factory worker, self-educated, who became a journalist. He eventually emigrated to Australia. This is the beginning of JSM's extensive correspondence with him.

[2.] *Reduction of the hours of labour . . . a reply to the Prize Essay of the United Building Trades* (London, 1859); and *Strikes: their causes and their evils . . .* (London, 1859).

[3.] *Pol. Econ.*

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 217-19.

[2.] Cf. the dedication of *On Liberty* to his wife.

[3.] Napoleon III in a meeting at Plombières July 20-21, 1858, with Cavour, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sardinia and Piedmont, had agreed to support Italy (Sardinia) in a war with Austria. See Letter 286.

[4.] It became clear later that Napoleon III's price for assistance against Austria was the cession of Savoy and Nice to France. He was also planning to establish separate kingdoms in Naples and central Italy, both to be ruled by Frenchmen.

[5.] For driving the Austrians from Italy Napoleon I was at first regarded as a liberator, but it soon became evident that he intended Italy to be ruled by France.

[6.] In the event, Napoleon III, not eager for war with Austria, accepted a Russian proposal (supported by England) of a Congress to arrange a peaceful settlement. Austria refused, sent an ultimatum to Piedmont on April 26, and declared war on April 29. Napoleon entered the war in support of Piedmont, but withdrew and made a separate settlement with Austria in July.

[7.] English official policy was to remain one of strict neutrality, but to be ever ready to exert good offices for peace. On the day of this letter the foreign secretary, Lord Malmesbury, presented to Parliament a summary of his efforts to secure a peaceful settlement.

[8.] See Letter 286, n. 13.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft (incomplete) at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Thomas Hare Esq. / 8 York Street / St James's Square. *Postmarks:* MR 29 / 59 and BLACKHEATH / TRANVALE. First three paragraphs published in Elliot, I, 219.

[2.] Possibly a reference to a speech by Lord Stanley (March 21, 1859) in a debate on a Representation of the People Bill, in which he cited both JSM's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* and G. J. Holyoake's *The Workman and the Suffrage* (London, 1859) with reference to the need of educational qualifications for voters. See *Hansard*, CLIII, col. 414.

[3.] After seven days of debate (March 21-31) the Representation of the People bill was defeated on the second reading, and on the following day the Derby ministry resigned.

[4.] William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898), then out of office, returned in June of this year to the office of chancellor of the exchequer which he had held 1855-58.

[5.] See Letters 359, 362, and 370.

[6.] See Letter 358.

[7.] See Letter 365.

[8.] The portion of the MS draft at LSE ends here.

[9.] The home he had bought after his wife's death; see Letters 333 and 341.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 272.

[2.] *On Liberty*.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] Horace Grant, JSM's colleague in the Examiner's office at the India House from 1826 to 1845, died March 29 at Fairseat.

[3.] *Dissertations*, vols. I and II, published in April, 1859.

[4.] See Letter 369.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] The Working Men's College, established in 1854, at which Furnivall taught.

[3.] Rev. John Llewelyn Davies (1826-1916), theologian, associated with F. D. Maurice, Thomas Hughes, Charles Kingsley, and J. M. Ludlow in the co-operative movement and in the establishment of the College.

[4.] Frederick Denison Maurice, then Principal of the College.

[5.] Viktor Aimé Huber (1800-1869), German economist, formerly Professor at the University of Berlin, interested in the co-operative movement. His series of articles, "The Cités Ouvrières in France," had appeared in the *Reasoner*: Feb. 6, 1859, pp. 45-46; March 13, 1859, p. 54; and March 20, 1859, p. 93.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] JSM had sent him a copy; see Letter 378.

[1.] MS in Edinburgh University Library. MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 219-20, except for last sentence.

[2.] Henry Reeve, editor of *ER*.

[3.] Two years later Lorimer reviewed JSM's *Rep. Govt.* in the *North British Review*, XXXV (Nov., 1861), 534-63.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of April 8, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] Cairnes thanked JSM for having called Hare's book on proportional representation to his attention: "That it contains a capital discovery in political science

I have no doubt, recommending itself to the mind, as its leading doctrine does, with all the force of self-evident truth.”

[3.] Cairnes had written: “Already I perceive in this country symptoms of a growing dislike amongst the thoughtful & self-respecting portion of the community to taking any part in politics, accompanied with what appears to me the most discouraging sign of the times—an almost universal acquiescence in the low tone of public morality which prevails amongst our leading parliamentary men: indeed the expectation of any higher principles of conduct in public men than those which party aggrandizement and personal ambition supply appears to be very generally regarded as utopian. A change in a democratic direction, unaccompanied by any provision for securing the representation of intelligence and worth, will not be likely to weaken these tendencies.”

[4.] “The present principle of election by majorities cannot indeed be reconciled with Mr. Hare’s principle of election by absolute quotas, but there are other features of the proposed plan which might be gradually introduced.”

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope addressed:* Angleterre / Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James’s Square / London. *Postmarks:* AVIGNON / 4 MAI / 59 and LONDON / MY 5 / 59 / PAID.

[2.] The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science; see Letter 308, n. 3.

[3.] Brougham was founder and first president of NAPSS.

[4.] John Singleton Copley, Lord Lyndhurst (1772-1863), Lord Chancellor. Although when in office for many years in Tory governments he was a reactionary, in his later years when out of office he often espoused liberal measures.

[5.] John W. Parker.

[6.] An unheaded leader, April 23, 1859, p. [2].

[7.] JSM’s article; see Letter 358, n. 3.

[8.] JSM’s fears proved to be exaggerated. Austrian troops had entered Italy on April 29, and France sent troops to oppose the Austrians. Russia stayed out, however, and France made peace with Austria in July.

[1.] MS copy (not in JSM’s hand) at LSE, in reply to Hardy’s letter of Feb. 14, which is at Yale.

[2.] In reply to Letter 341.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Not found.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, pp. 272-73, and in Stamp.

[2.] *On Liberty*; see Letters 349 and 381.

[3.] Perhaps for the E. Pickford translation published in Frankfurt in 1860.

[4.] Eduard John, author of *Einiges über das Unterrichts-Gesetz* (Marienwerder, 1861).

[5.] See Letters 379, 389, and 400.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Madelle Hélène Taylor / chez M. J. Stuart Mill / à Saint Véran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: MONTPELLIER / 26 / MAI / ??? and AVIGNON / 27 / MAI / ???.

[2.] In the winter of 1820-21, when he attended lectures at the University there, and in Dec., 1854 (see Letter 201).

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: A Mademoiselle Hélène Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmark*: MONTPELLIER / 29 / MAI / ??.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: A Mademoiselle / Hélène Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: MONTPELLIER / 30 / MAI / ?? and AVIGNON / 31 / MAI / ??.

[2.] Eugène Pascal, architect, was in charge of the plans for the monument at St. Véran to Mrs. Mill.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Dr. Henry Cecil Gurney.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Mademoiselle / Hélène Taylor / chez M / J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: LE VIGAN / 3 JUIN / 59 and AVIGNON / 4 / JUIN ?.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 273, and in Stamp.

[2.] Dr. Weinberg in her *Theodor Gomperz and John Stuart Mill* (Geneva, 1963), p. 25, says, "Of the nature of those 'unhappy events' nothing appears to be known. They may have been personal disturbances, or caused perhaps by the recent defeat of Austria at Magenta and Solferino in the war against France and Sardinia."

[3.] *On Liberty*; see Letter 392.

[4.] The last clause of this sentence is omitted in Gomperz.

[5.] The sentence in question reads: “And so long as mankind were content . . . to be ruled by a master on condition of being guaranteed more or less efficaciously against his tyranny, they did not carry their aspirations beyond this point.”

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Angleterre / Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James’s Square / London. *Postmarks:* AVIGNON / 18 / JUIN; MARSEILLE A PARIS / 18 / JUIN / 59 / B; PARIS A CALAIS / 19 / JUIN / 59 / L; LONDON / CE / JU 20 / 59 / PAID. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 220-21.

[2.] At a special meeting sponsored by the Social Science Association on Oct. 14 in Bradford, where its annual meeting was held Oct. 10-14, Hare read a paper, “On the Mode of Electing Representatives in Parliament and Municipalities.” At the same meeting A. F. Mayo read a paper, “On the Moral and Intellectual Effects of Mr. Hare’s plan for Improving the Machinery of Representation.”

[3.] Possibly refers to Disraeli’s speech in the Commons on June 7 in which he attacked Lord John Russell for introducing “a proposition hostile to the very principle on which representative Government is founded, and alien to the spirit of the constitution—representation by minorities.” In the same speech Disraeli also delivered a satiric attack on the “‘educated’ section” of Parliament. *Hansard*, CLIV, cols. 131 and 136.

[4.] See Letter 296.

[5.] Lord Palmerston became Prime Minister on the day of this letter.

[6.] The new government introduced a reform bill, but withdrew it in June, 1860.

[7.] The Whigs and Liberals had agreed with the main principles of the Derby ministry’s reform bill but did not support it.

[1.] MS in Vatican Library. MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 222, except for last paragraph.

[2.] England had tried to prevent the war then going on between Austria and Piedmont (aided by France). See Letter 379, n. 7.

[3.] Palmerston and Russell wished Austria to remain a great power, but hoped to use English moral influence to bring a settlement of the Italian question.

[4.] Napoleon III.

[5.] In England.

[1.] Quoted in letter to JSM from Mrs. Gaskell, Aug. 11, 1859; MS in the Symington Collection, Rutgers University; published in Elizabeth Haldane, *Mrs. Gaskell and Her Friends* (London, 1930), pp. 269-71. The portion in brackets is Mrs. Gaskell’s introduction to the quotation.

For explanation of the circumstances of this letter, see notes to the letter that follows.

[1.] MS draft in the Symington Collection, Rutgers University. Published in Elizabeth Haldane, *Mrs. Gaskell and Her Friends*, p. 269. The draft is in pencil on the verso of a page of Mrs. Gaskell's MS letter of July 14, 1859, to JSM; the draft was probably dictated by him to Helen Taylor, since it appears to be in her hand.

[2.] The preceding Letter.

Some time after Mrs. Mill's death, JSM had come upon a letter of Sept. 20, 1851, by Charlotte Brontë (published in Mrs. Gaskell's *Life* [London, 1857] of her friend the novelist), commenting on the 1851 *WR* article on "Emancipation of Women." Miss Brontë had said in part: "When I first read the paper I thought it was the work of a powerful minded, clear-headed woman, who had a hard, jealous heart, muscles of iron, and nerves of bend [strong ox] leather; of a woman who longed for power and had never felt affection. To many women affection is sweet, and power conquered indifferent—though we all like influence won. I believe J. S. Mill would make a hard, dry, dismal world of it; and yet he speaks admirable sense through a great portion of his article. . . . In short, J. S. Mill's head is, I dare say, very good, but I feel disposed to scorn his heart. . . ."

JSM, inferring a slight to Harriet, had written a bitter letter of complaint to Mrs. Gaskell protesting the publication of such a passage; this letter, which has not been located, appears to have survived only in the quotation from it (the preceding Letter) preserved in Mrs. Gaskell's rejoinder of Aug. 11, 1859. On July 14, 1859. Mrs. Gaskell wrote to JSM a letter of regret, saying, in part: "For after reading the dedication [to Harriet] of your Essay on Liberty I can understand how any word expressing a meaning only conjectured that was derogatory to your wife would wound you most deeply. And therefore I now write to express my deep regret that you received such pain through me. . . ."

All the relevant letters are published in Elizabeth Haldane, *Mrs. Gaskell*, pp. 265-71. Mrs. Gaskell's letters of July 14 and Aug. 11, 1859, are also published in *The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell*, eds. J. A. V. Chapple and Arthur Pollard (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 563-64 and 567-69.

[1.] MS at LSE. Excerpt published in Myers & Co. / Ltd. (Booksellers) Catalogue No. 384 (Autumn, 1955), p. 36.

[2.] In the Pyrenees; see Letter 399.

[3.] No such letter has been located.

[4.] The marble for his wife's tomb had arrived at Marseilles and JSM was called back to approve the cutting and shipping.

[5.] Presumably in reply to Letter 399; JSM replied to it on Aug. 6 (Letter 406).

[6.] See JSM's reply, Letter 407.

[7.] See Letter 405.

[8.] The first edition had been published Feb., 1859; the second edition appeared in Aug.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. All but last paragraph published in Elliot, I, 223-24.

[2.] In the fall of 1858 Bain had suffered a bad sprain which troubled him for three years thereafter. In the summer of 1859, because of his lameness, he gave up plans to attend the meetings of the British Association in Aberdeen, and decided to spend the autumn in Rothesay.

[3.] His review, "Bain's Psychology," was published in *ER*, CX(Oct., 1859), 287-321, and reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., III, 97-152, Am. ed., IV, 101-56.

[4.] "Cerebral Psychology: Bain," *National Rev.*, X(April, 1860), 500-21.

[5.] "Mill on Liberty," *National Rev.*, VIII(April, 1859), 393-425.

[6.] *SR*, VIII (July 9 and 16, 1859), 46-48 and 76-78.

[7.] The review of *The Senses and the Intellect* in *SR*, Dec. 1, 1855, was probably by Alexander, later Sir Alexander Grant. See M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review*, p. 347.

[8.] Joseph Gouge Greenwood (1821-1894), classicist, appointed professor of classics and history at Owens College, Manchester, 1850; principal, 1857-89.

[9.] See Letter 407.

[10.] For *poste restante*?

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See Letter 403.

[3.] The first two volumes of *Dissertations*.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] In reply to Letter 399.

[3.] See Letter 399, n. 2.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Charles Kingsley, *His Letters and Memories of His Life*, ed. by his wife (2 vols., London, 1877), II, 88.

[2.] Written to thank JSM for his gift of *Dissertations and Discussions* and also for *On Liberty*, which he said “affected me in making me a clearer-headed, braver-minded man on the spot.” According to Bain (*JSM*, p. 112), “Kingsley first saw the *Liberty* on the table in Parker’s shop. He sat down and read it through, there and then; and made the remark before he left the shop.”

[3.] *Laudari a laudato viro*—to be praised by a man who has himself been praised—quoted by Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares*, V, xii, 7, from unknown source.

[1.] MS at the Vatican Library.

[2.] Letter 400.

[3.] On July 11 the emperors of France and Austria, in a meeting at Villafranca on peace terms, had agreed that Lombardy should be ceded to Piedmont and Venetia retained by Austria. See Letter 379.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope addressed*: Angleterre / Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St. James’s Square / London. *Postmarks*: PARIS / [24] / AOUT / (59); and PARIS A CALAIS / 24 / AOUT / 59 / B; LONDON / [R L] / AU 25 / 59.

[2.] “On the Mode of Electing Representatives in Parliament and Municipalities”; see Letters 399 and 406.

[3.] I Corinthians, 10:15.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

Dervillé et Cie. was the firm in Paris that had contracted to supply the marble for the monument to be erected on Harriet’s grave. For an account of the series of delays involved in completing the monument, see Packe, pp. 411-12. Originally ordered in Feb., 1859, from Eugène Pascal, architect of Avignon, it was not finally erected until late March, 1860. Ten letters from the Dervillé company to JSM and Pascal, between Sept. 10 and Dec. 22, 1859, and six letters and one telegram from Pascal to JSM from Feb. 20 to Nov. 1, 1859, all concerning the marble, are at LSE. It is evident that a number of JSM’s letters to the Paris firm were written at the urging of Pascal.

[1.] First half of MS draft at LSE; the remainder at Yale. See preceding Letter.

[2.] The portion at LSE ends here.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. See preceding two Letters.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. See preceding three Letters.

[1.] MS at King’s.

[2.] Presumably for the second edition of *On Liberty*; see Letter 403.

[3.] The number for Oct.

[4.] His next article was “A Few Words on Non-Intervention,” *Fraser’s*, LX (Dec., 1859), 766-76; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., III, 153-78, Am. ed., III, 238-63.

[5.] Probably including the review of *On Liberty* in the *Examiner*, Aug. 20, 1859, pp. 532-33. For the *Guardian*, see note below.

[6.] “John Stuart Mill,” a review of *Dissertations and Discussions*, by James Martineau, in *The National Review*, IX (Oct. 1859), 474-508; reprinted in Martineau’s *Essays, Philosophical and Theological* (2 vols., London, 1883), I, 63-120, and in *Essays, Reviews and Addresses* (4 vols., London, 1890), III.

[7.] *Guardian*, April 20, 1859, p. 351.

[8.] *Ibid.*, p. 352, a review of *The Emotions and the Will*.

[9.] Not identified.

[10.] “Bacon’s Philosophical Works,” *Fraser’s*, LX (Oct., 1859), 387-409. The author has not been identified.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Part published in Elliot, I, 224-25.

[2.] On Dec. 2, 1859, James David Forbes (1809-1868), scientist, was appointed Principal of United College, St. Andrews.

[3.] As Principal of Edinburgh University.

[4.] George Cornwall Lewis was then Secretary of State for the Home Department.

[5.] See Letter 404, n. 3.

[6.] *Athenaeum*, July 23, 1859, p. 109.

[7.] *The Press*, July 30, 1859, pp. 788-90, and Aug. 6, 1859, pp. 811-12.

[8.] See preceding Letter, n. 8.

[9.] *WR*, n.s. XVI (Oct., 1859), 582.

[10.] No such review has been found.

[11.] Livy: “who has well dared to scorn vain things.”

[12.] “Christian Ethics and John Stuart Mill,” *Dublin University Magazine*, LIV (Oct., 1859), 387-410.

[13.] Eleven articles appeared, signed R.P.: Sept. 15, p. 887; Sept. 22, pp. 915-16; Sept. 29, pp. 934-35; Oct. 6, pp. 963-64; Oct. 13, pp. 986-87; Oct. 20, pp. 1007-1008; Oct. 27, pp. 1031-32; Nov. 3, pp. 1059-60; Nov. 10, pp. 1078-79; Nov. 24, pp. 1130-31; and Dec. 1, pp. 1154-55.

[14.] See Letter 414, n. 6.

[15.] See Letter 404, n. 2.

[16.] *Utilitarianism*, first published in *Fraser's*, LXIV (Oct., Nov., and Dec., 1861), 391-406, 525-34, and 659-73. Separately reprinted, London, 1863; also included in *Dissertations*, Am. ed., III, 300-391, and in *Collected Works*, X, 203-59. A cancelled passage in the MS draft includes substantially the same wording as this sentence, but adds, "to be published some time or other, but whether by itself or in a volume of Essays I have not yet determined."

[17.] The first of Bain's articles on phrenology, "Phrenology and Psychology," appeared in *Fraser's*, LXI (May, 1860), 692-708. Four other articles on the subject appeared in *Fraser's* for Sept. and Nov., 1860, and Feb. and June, 1861. The completed study appeared as *On the Study of Character, including an estimate of phrenology* (London, 1861).

[18.] John Pringle Nichol had died on Sept. 19, 1859.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. See Letter 410.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris. Two sentences published in Villey, p. 206.

[2.] See Letter 361.

[3.] Emile de Girardin (1806-1881), journalist and politician.

[4.] Armand Carrel (1800-1836), a journalist whom JSM had greatly admired (see *Earlier Letters*, pp. 194-96), was killed by Girardin in a duel.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope addressed*: Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James's Square / London / Angleterre. *Postmarks*: AVIG . . . / 31 / OCT / 9; No. 2 / 59 / LONDON; and PARIS A CALAIS / 1 / NOV / 59.

[2.] His paper on proportional representation at the Social Science Association meetings at Bradford; see Letter 399.

[3.] Henry Fawcett (1833-1884), politician and political economist, became a disciple and friend of JSM; elected Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge, 1863; MP for Brighton, 1865-74, for Hackney, 1874-84; Postmaster General, 1880-84. Fawcett, who had delivered two papers at the Bradford meeting, first met Hare there.

[4.] Fawcett had been blinded in a hunting accident in the fall of 1858. After the Bradford meeting in 1859, he went to London for an operation on his eyes, which proved there was no more hope for recovery of his sight. See Letter 448.

[5.] Fawcett lived at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Hare visited him at Christmas, 1859, and Fawcett invited JSM to join them there at that time. An excerpt of Fawcett's letter of Dec. 23, 1859, is published in Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett* (London, 1885), p. 102. Hare, on Feb. 8, 1860, introduced Fawcett to JSM (see Letter 441).

[6.] Henry Reeve.

[1.] MS in the possession of Professor Carlton F. Wells, University of Michigan.

[2.] Desiring to free himself of the debts of his publishing business and live on the proceeds of the then flourishing *Westminster Review*, Chapman proposed a stock company to be known as the Westminster Publishing Company which would take over his business. He had evidently invited JSM to invest in the venture, as George Grote and Lord Stanley had agreed to do. For an account of the collapse of the proposal, see Gordon S. Haight, *George Eliot and John Chapman* (New Haven, 1940), pp. 104-105.

[3.] Edward Henry Stanley, later 15th Earl of Derby, in politics a moderate liberal though the son of the leading conservative of the time. He advanced £600 to Chapman this month to pay an overdue loan on his business. Two years later, at Chapman's request, Stanley made the loan a gift.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] See Letters 361 and 417.

[3.] "Armand Carrel," *LWR*, VI (Oct., 1837), 66-111, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., I, 211-83, Am. ed., I, 237-308.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 225-26.

[2.] See Letter 404, n. 3.

[3.] See Letter 415, n. 10.

[4.] *Ibid.*, n. 17.

[5.] Cf. his "Of Ethology, or the Science of the Formation of Character," *Logic*, Book VI, chap. v. For references to the subject in his earlier correspondence, see Index, *Earlier Letters*.

[6.] See Letter 415, n. 16.

[7.] See Letter 414, n. 4.

[8.] Palmerston opposed the Suez project largely on the grounds that it would increase the influence of France in the Near East and possibly become a threat to England's interests in India.

[9.] Probably Robert Smith Candlish (1806-1873), Scottish Free Church leader and theological writer. Bain, a friend of Candlish, may have discussed *On Liberty* with him. No published attack by Candlish has been located.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. See Letter 410 and others to Dervillé et Cie.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. *On verso*: W. G. Ward, with his book / & reply criticizing it. / Nov. 28. 1859 / for publication / J.S. Mill. Published in Elliot, I, 227-31. In reply to Ward's of Nov. 6, MS at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] William George Ward, *On Nature and Grace. A Theological Treatise. Book I. Philosophical Introduction* (London, 1860). The version JSM had been sent was printed (not published) in Oct., 1859, and circulated among Ward's acquaintances for critical opinions (see note, p. 29); on the basis of these opinions and his own revised judgments, Ward considerably revised the text for the version published in April, 1860. No copy has been located of the Oct., 1859, version.

[3.] Including, among others, Bellarmine, Bossuet, Buffier, Fénelon, and Suarez.

[4.] See pp. 25 and 27. On the former, JSM is mentioned as 'the worthiest English representative' of the experience school of philosophy. In the Preface (p. xliii) Ward wrote of JSM: "he could not have treated me with greater kindness or courtesy, had he concurred with the main substance of my volume, instead of differing (as I fear is the case) on almost every premiss, and almost every conclusion. His comments have enabled me, I hope, to bring out my side of the controversy with greater distinctness and precision. . . . Of Mr. Mill certainly, if of any man living, it may truly be said, that he aims at doing the fullest justice to every school of thought, however remote from his own; and that the one aim, which consciously influences his intellectual exertions, is the pursuit of truth."

[5.] In the *Logic*, Book II, chaps. v and vi, "Of Demonstration and Necessary Truths."

[6.] See Letter 293, n. 6.

[7.] Chap. vii, "Examination of some opinions opposed to the preceding doctrines," was added to Book II in the 4th edition, 1856.

[8.] See Ward, *On Nature and Grace*, chap. i, sec. 1, "On Intuitions and on the Principle of Certitude."

[9.] Probably the famous passage beginning "*Quid est ergo tempus. Si nemo ex me quaerat, scio; si quaerenti explicare velim, nescio . . .*," *St. Augustine's Confessions, with an English translation by William Watts* (2 vols., Loeb Classical Library, New York and London, 1912), Book XI, chap. xiv. Watts's translation runs, in part: "What is time then? If nobody asks me, I know; but if I were desirous to explain it to one that

should ask me, plainly I know not. . . . If nothing were passing, there would be no past time; and if nothing were coming, there should be no time to come: and if nothing were, there should now be no present time. . . .”

[10.] A verb invented by Ward and first used in his book, “as corresponding in every respect with the substantive ‘intuition’ and the adjective ‘intuitive’” (p. 40). See also *Oxford English Dictionary*.

[11.] See *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (2nd ed., 2 vols., London, 1869), chaps. xxii and xxiii. The revised edition of Ward’s book makes no reference to the *Analysis*.

[12.] *Utilitarianism*. See Letter 415, n. 16.

[13.] [Thomas Arnold, Jr.], “Mill on Liberty,” *The Rambler*, ser. 3 (Nov., 1859, with a later continuation in March, 1860), 62-75, 376-85. Though it was published with only the initial A. as signature, Ward in his letter of Nov. 6 attributed the article to Acton, and it has been reprinted as by Acton in William Ebenstein, ed., *Political Thought in Perspective* (New York, 1957), pp. 502-23. That the author was really Thomas Arnold, Jr. (1823-1900), literary scholar and teacher, brother of Matthew Arnold, and a convert to Roman Catholicism, has been evident ever since Abbot Gasquet published relevant correspondence in his *Lord Acton and his Circle* (London, 1906). Gertrude Himmelfarb in her *Lord Acton, A Study in Conscience and Politics* (Chicago, 1952), p. 75 n., comments at some length on the mistaken attribution to Acton.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. See Letter 410 and others to Dervillé et Cie.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 231-32.

[2.] “Sulla Libertà per J. S. Mill,” *Rivista Contemporanea di Torino* (1859), reprinted in Villari’s *Saggi di Storia, Di Critica e Di Politica* (Firenze, 1868), pp. 217-28.

[3.] Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882), Italian patriot, who had been appointed General in Tuscany by King Victor Emmanuel. Irked by the King’s refusal to permit an attack on the States of the Church, and dissatisfied with the cession of Nice to France, he resigned his office. He proceeded, however, with plans for his successful attack upon Sicily in May, 1860.

[4.] Napoleon III.

[5.] A congress was planned for Jan., 1860, to discuss the Italian question, but never met because of opposition by the Pope and the Austrians.

[6.] The emperors of France, Austria, and Russia.

[7.] Villari held this appointment until 1862, when he became professor of the philosophy of history at the Istituto di Studi Superiori at Florence.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] This issue contained JSM's "Non-Intervention"; see Letter 414.

[3.] One was the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which in its Dec. 15, 1859 number, pp. 988-93, published an account of the *Fraser's* article by E. Forcade.

[4.] Not located, since the Brit. Mus. files of the *Daily News* lack the numbers for Dec. 1-5, 1859.

[5.] Parker evidently intended to send the leader "Mr. John Stuart Mill and Mr. Roebuck on Non-Intervention," in the *Economist*, Dec. 3, 1859, pp. 1344-45.

[6.] John Durand (1822-1908), editor and translator; editor of the *Crayon*, 1855-61, a New York periodical published weekly in 1855 and monthly, 1856-61. Permission to reprint was evidently granted, for the *Crayon* printed "Thoughts on Poetry and its Varieties" in two instalments, VII (April, May, 1860), 93-97, 123-28.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope* (torn) *addressed*: Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James's Square / London / *Anglete*. . . . *Postmarks*: PARIS / 1 / 20 / DEC / 59; PARIS A CALAIS 2 / 21 / DEC / 59; LONDON / CN / DE 22 / 59 / PAID.

[2.] Not located. It probably contained an account of Hare's speech at the Bradford meetings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. See Letter 399, n. 2.

[3.] August Frederick Mayo (1821-1869), barrister, also read a paper at the Bradford meeting: see *ibid*. Mayo's paper in *The Law Magazine and Law Review* has not been identified.

[4.] "Representation in Practice and Theory," *Fraser's*, LXI (Feb., 1860), 188-204.

[1.] MS at UCL; MS draft at LSE. First paragraph published in Elliot, I, 233.

[2.] A Whig-Liberal government under Lord Palmerston had been in power since the preceding June.

[3.] For proportional representation.

[4.] Chadwick had been defeated for Evesham the preceding spring.

[5.] John Bright.

[6.] See Letter 414, n. 4.

[7.] See Letter 426, n. 3.

[8.] See Letter 421, n. 8.

[1.] MS draft fragment at Yale. See Letter 410.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] *La Centralisation* (Paris, 1860).

[3.] *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (2nd. ed., 1859), reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., III, 1-46, Am. ed., IV, 5-50.

[4.] See Letter 359, n. 3.

[5.] The Municipal Corporations Act.

[6.] In view of the mention of Carrel in Letters 417 and 420, Dupont-White may well have called JSM's attention to the article by Albert de Broglie, "Armand Carrel et les Controverses politiques avant et après 1848," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XXI (Mai, 1859), 5-44.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Janet Ross, *The Fourth Generation* (London, 1912), pp. 73-74.

Janet Ann Duff-Gordon, later Mrs. Henry Ross (1842-1927), granddaughter of John and Sarah Austin, writer of reminiscences and works on Italy.

[2.] John Austin died on Dec. 17, 1859.

[3.] *Athenaeum*, Dec. 31, 1859, p. 890.

[4.] *A Plea for the Constitution* (London, 1859) which JSM had reviewed in "Recent Writers on Reform." See Letter 358, n. 3.

[5.] Mrs. Ross notes the lack of any mention of Mrs. Austin, from whom JSM had been estranged for a number of years: "I saw that the evidently intentional slight cut her to the heart." See JSM's characterization of her in Jack Stillinger, ed., *Early Draft*, pp. 147-48. This characterization was omitted in the final version of the *Autobiog.*

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Vêran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: PARIS / 8 / 25 / JANV / ?, and AVIGNON / 26 / JANV / 60.

[2.] Edmond François Valentin About (1828-1885), French writer and journalist, author of *La Grèce Contemporaine* (Paris, 1854).

[3.] Auguste Mutel, *Flore du Dauphiné . . .* (2d ed., 2 vols., Grenoble, 1848).

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Vêran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: LONDON / X/ JA26 / 60, and ??? / 27 / JANV / 60; and AVIGNON / 28 JANV / ???

[2.] The opening of Parliament took place on Jan. 24. The debate was on the Queen's speech from the throne.

[3.] Their housekeeper.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M.J.S.Mill / à Saint Véran / près Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON / X / JA28 / 60 and AVIGNON / 30 / JANV / 60.

[2.] Sir Charles Wood, later 1st Viscount Halifax (1800-1885), statesman, secretary of state for India, 1859-66.

[3.] W. M. Thackeray was the first editor of the new *Cornhill Magazine*, begun this year by Smith, Elder and Co.

[4.] *Macmillan's Magazine*, edited by David Masson, first appeared in Nov., 1859.

[5.] P. T. Barnum (1810-1891), the American showman, had lectured in St. James's Hall, London, in 1858 on "The Science of Money-Making, and the Philosophy of Humbug."

[6.] A magazine begun in July, 1859, under the editorship of Samuel Lucas, by Bradbury and Evans as a rival to Charles Dickens's new magazine *All the Year Round*.

[7.] Charles Kingsley had been appointed chaplain to the Queen the preceding year, and in 1860 he became professor of modern history at Cambridge.

[8.] For a study of the periodical, see Merle M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868* (New York, 1941).

[9.] Owner of the house that JSM leased.

[10.] A builder.

[11.] Probably Hugh Curry Hann, stationer of Gray's Inn Road. After the death of his wife for several years JSM used black-edged stationery.

[12.] News-vendor.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON-S.E. / 2 / JA 31 / 60, and AVIGNON / 2 / FEVR. / 60.

[2.] For his wife's grave.

[3.] Sir John Pollard Willoughby (1799-1866), in the Indian service, 1817-51; member of the Council of India, 1858-66.

[4.] "Politics of the Present, Foreign and Domestic," *Macmillan's*, I (Nov., 1859), 1-10.

[5.] J. M. Ludlow, "Moral Aspects of Mr. Tennyson's 'Idylls of the King,'" *ibid.*, pp. 63-72.

[6.] *British India, its races and its history, considered with reference to the mutinies of 1857; a series of lectures* (2 vols., Cambridge and London, 1858).

[7.] See Letter 427, n. 4.

[8.] Early in 1860 Herbert Spencer sent to friends a programme of a System of Philosophy, to be issued in periodical parts, under the headings "First Principles," "The Principles of Biology," "of Psychology," "of Sociology," and "of Morality." The programme as publicly announced in the spring of 1860 is reprinted in Spencer's *Autobiography* (2 vols., New York, 1904), II, Appendix A, 557-63.

[9.] Ellen Gurney (d.1864), sister of Dr. Cecil Gurney of Nice. She and Algernon Taylor were married in Oct., 1860.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] For proportional representation.

[3.] See Letter 427, n. 4.

[4.] Thomas Hare, "Representation of every Locality and Intelligence," *Fraser's*, LXI (April, 1860), 527-43.

[5.] Hare's Feb. article contains a great many quotations, including over a dozen from Carlyle and a few from JSM, Maurice, Ruskin, and others. See Letter 437.

[6.] "Reform Schemes," *QR*, CVII (Jan., 1860), 220-66. Its author has been identified as Spencer H. Walpole.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON / X / FE2 / 60 and one illegible.

[2.] Charles Cardale Babington (1808-1895), botanist and archaeologist, and author of *Manual of British Botany, containing the flowering Plants and Ferns arranged according to Natural Orders* (London, 1843).

[3.] See Letter 427, n. 4.

[4.] See preceding Letter, n. 6.

[5.] His *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.

[6.] Probably Helen's cousin, Marianne Laing.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Cf. Letter 389.

[3.] The 3rd Earl Grey; see Letters 346 and 347.

[4.] *Sic.* Lewis Llewellyn Dillwyn (1814-1892), proprietor of a pottery in Swansea, MP for Swansea 1855-92.

[5.] Arthur Helps; his *Friends in Council*, 2nd Series (2 vols., London, 1859) is quoted by Hare in his Feb. *Fraser's* article, p. 201 n. See Letter 427, n. 4.

[6.] Lord Stanley had been secretary of state for India in the Derby ministry which resigned in June, 1859. See Letter 334, n. 3.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON / X / FE 4 / 60 and PARIS A MARSEILLE / 5 / FEVR 60 and AVIGNON / 6 / FEVR / 60.

[2.] See Letter 342, n. 2.

[3.] See Letter 404, n. 2.

[4.] See Letter 415, n. 17.

[5.] John Tulloch (1823-1886), theologian, principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews University, from 1854.

[6.] Later this year Bain was appointed by the Crown to the new chair of Logic and English at Aberdeen.

[7.] The University of Aberdeen was created on the amalgamation of the two colleges, King's and Marischal, by the Scottish Universities Commission of 1858.

[8.] Sir George Cornwall Lewis, then home secretary.

[9.] Janet Duff-Gordon. See Letter 431, esp. n. 5.

[10.] Letter 442.

[11.] John Allen (1810-1886), archdeacon of Salop, 1847-86.

[12.] Possibly Thomas, later Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy (1804-1878), or his brother William, later Sir William Hardy (1807-1887), both antiquaries and archivists associated with the Record Office.

[13.] Possibly Léopold de Gaillard (1820-1893), publicist and politician, who had connections with Avignon.

[14.] Probably refers to the monument for Harriet.

[15.] Lady Lucie Duff-Gordon (1821-1869), daughter of John and Sarah Austin, writer and translator like her mother.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 418, n. 4.

[3.] *Mr. Hare's Reform Bill, Simplified and Explained* (London, [March] 1860).

[4.] See Letter 438.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint-Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON / X / FE / ?? / 60 and PARIS / ?? / FEVR / 60 and AVIGNON / 9 / FEVR / 60.

[2.] Of the inscription for the monument to Harriet.

[3.] Robert Bentley Todd (1809-1860), leading physician; professor of physiology and anatomy at King's College, London; writer on medical science.

[4.] *The Times*, Feb. 7, 1860, p. 10.

[1.] MS draft at Yale.

[2.] JSM had been a regular attendant of John Austin's lectures on jurisprudence at the University of London, 1829-33. See *Earlier Letters*, Nos. 32 and 40. Mrs. Austin published a second edition (1861) of her husband's *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (1st ed., London, 1832). She also edited and published from his lecture notes his *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (2 vols., London, 1863). See also Letter 576.

[3.] Sir John Romilly, later 1st Baron Romilly (1802-1874), and Sir George Cornwall Lewis had both attended Austin's lectures.

[4.] In her Preface to the second ed. of *The Province of Jurisprudence* Mrs. Austin refers, on pp. xxiv-vi, to a set of tables Austin had printed "for distribution to the gentlemen of his class." The results of her efforts to reconstruct these from notes were published in the second volume of her edition of *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. In the 4th ed. (London, 1873) of *Lectures, Tables and Notes* appear in vol. II, pp. 950-1022.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The preceding Letter.

[3.] For his wife's monument. See Letter 441.

[4.] Fawcett was elected to the Club in 1861.

- [5.] His first budget as chancellor of the exchequer in Palmerston's government.
- [6.] This measure was later defeated in the House of Lords, but was accomplished in 1861.
- [7.] The budget was combined with a proposal for a commercial treaty with France.
- [8.] George William Pierrepont Bentinck (1803-1886), MP for West Norfolk, 1852-65 and 1871-84, protested against moving too hastily.
- [9.] On March 1.
- [10.] Feb. 10, p. 10.
- [11.] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- [12.] See Letter 439.
- [13.] First published in 1850.
- [14.] Which one of the many editions, revisions, and abridgments of the English and French dictionary originally prepared by Abel Boyer (1667-1729) is not known.
- [1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON-S.E. / X / FE 14 / 60 and AVIGNON / 16 / FEVR / 60.
- [2.] Evidently securities inherited by Helen and Algernon Taylor from the portion of the Hardy estate that had been settled upon their mother.
- [3.] See Letter 440, n. 3.
- [4.] The notice in the *Bradford Review*, Feb. 11, 1860, p. 6, praised the *Dissertations* as "some of the best speculative writing of our time." Accompanying the notice was a section of "Suggestive Passages from Mill's Essays." "Their author is evidently a man of broad sympathies, of warm emotions, and of refined taste. . . . His humanity-loving nature exhibits itself in every essay."
- [5.] XIII (Oct., 1859), 270-75.
- [6.] See preceding Letter.
- [7.] Alexander William Kinglake (1809-1891), historian and traveller; MP for Bridgewater, 1857-68. On the preceding evening in the Commons Lord Palmerston had asked Kinglake to postpone a motion with reference to threatened French annexation of Savoy and Nice. Kinglake bitterly opposed the annexation in a speech in the Commons on Feb. 28.

[8.] Sir William Francis Patrick Napier (1785-1860), soldier, author of *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France* . . . (6 vols., London, 1828-40), and *The Conquest of Scinde* (2 vols., London, 1845).

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks:* LONDON / X / FE 17 / 60 and AVIGNON / 19 / FEVR / 60.

[2.] Of Thomas Hardy (*ca.* 1775-1849), father of Mrs. Mill.

[3.] Whether Arthur Ley, husband of Harriet's sister Caroline, or Arthur Hardy, brother of Harriet, is not known.

[4.] Neither Harman nor Booth has been otherwise identified.

[5.] Edward Wilson (1830-1895), barrister.

[6.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[7.] See Letter 296.

[8.] No doubt to visit his fiancée, Ellen Gurney.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] JSM's neighbour.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably Colt's firearms shop, at 14 Pall Mall, near the intersection with Regent Street. Helen had asked for a revolver. See Letters 443 and 448.

[3.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[4.] Sir Rowland Hill (1795-1879), best known as the inventor of penny postage. In 1839, as secretary of the colonization commission of South Australia, Hill had recommended the adoption in the colony of proportional representation in municipal elections. The plan, a simpler one than Hare's, was first used in Adelaide, South Australia, in 1839. The recommendation is reprinted from the *Third Annual Report of the Colonization Commissioners for South Australia*, 1839, in C. G. Hoag and G. H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation* (New York, 1926), p. 169.

[5.] In an article, "The Corporation of London and Municipal Reform," *WR*, XXXIX (May, 1843), 496-586, the writer (almost certainly Hickson, then editor of *WR*) recommends for London Hill's proposal for representation of minorities (p. 570).

[6.] Acton Smee Ayrton (1816-1886), barrister, MP for Tower Hamlets, 1857-74.

[7.] Col. Henry Clinton, of Royston, Herts., a frequent contributor to the *Reasoner*, and author of pamphlets on parliamentary reform.

[8.] Resolutions adopted at a public meeting of the Friends of Human Rights, in Belfast on Feb. 21, 1859. One John Scott was Chairman. See the *Reasoner*, XXIV (May 8, 1859), 147. See also "Political Science at Belfast," *SR*, March 5, 1859, pp. 271-72, and "Belfast and the Saturday Review," *Sp.*, March 19, 1859, p. 317.

[9.] Isa Craig, later Mrs. John Knox (1831-1903), poet and story-teller.

[10.] Bessie Rayner Parkes, later (1867) Mme Elizabeth Rayner Belloc (1829-1925), daughter of Joseph Parkes, great-granddaughter of Joseph Priestley, mother of Hilaire Belloc; founder and editor of the *Englishwoman's Journal*; writer; active in the economic section of the NAPSS.

[11.] The vote in the Commons on Feb. 20 was 293 to 230.

[12.] Edward Horsman (1807-1876), MP for Stroud, 1853-68; for Liskeard, 1869-1876.

[13.] Charles, later Sir Charles, DuCane (1825-1889), then MP for North Essex, 1857-68; later (1869-74) governor of Tasmania. DuCane's motion, presented on Feb. 21, was defeated on Feb. 24 by a majority of 116.

[14.] See Letter 445, n. 8.

[15.] A soft felt hat with low crown and broad brim.

[16.] "Lord Macaulay," *Macmillan's*, I (Feb., 1860), 241-47.

[17.] For 1859.

[18.] Possibly Letter 296.

[19.] Gilbert Urbain Guillaumin.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] In 1855 he had arrived in Athens on April 18; he left Greece at the end of May.

[3.] Published as "Strikes: their Tendencies and Remedies," *WR*, n.s. XVIII (July, 1860), 1-23.

[4.] See Letter 443, n. 5.

[5.] Largely because of his unfavourable remarks on the Maine (prohibition) law in *On Liberty*. See the review [by J. Dawson Burns (1828-1909)], "Liberty and Mr. John Stuart Mill," in *Meliora*, II (1859), 83-93, separately reprinted as *Liberty and the Liquor Traffic, a reply to Mr. John Stuart Mill*. *Meliora* was published by the United

Kingdom Alliance, founded in 1853, “to procure the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as beverages.” Burns was the first secretary of the Alliance and for many years the London superintendent.

JSM’s, Newman’s, and others’ views on the Maine law were discussed in “Intemperance; its Causes and Cures,” *National Rev.*, X(Jan., 1860), 107-43.

[6.] “Professor Newman on the Maine Law,” *Reasoner*, XXIV (July 17, 1859), 228-29. Holyoake appended to the article a statement in which he reiterated his support of JSM’s position.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: France / Mlle Taylor / chez M. J. S. Mill / à Saint Véran / Avignon / Vaucluse. *Postmarks*: LONDON / X / FE 25 / 60 and AVIGNON / 27 / FEVR / 60.

[2.] On Feb. 24.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letters 440, n. 3, and 444.

[3.] John W. Parker, Jr., editor of *Fraser’s*, did not publish Fawcett’s paper on strikes; see Letter 448, n. 3.

[4.] After his accident Fawcett made Cambridge his headquarters; he lived at Trinity Hall at this time.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] *La Centralisation* (Paris, 1860).

[3.] Gilbert Urbain Guillaumin, publisher.

[4.] Prosper Paillottet (1804-1878), political economist, co-author with Frédéric Bastiat of *Dictionnaire de l’Économie politique* (Paris, 1852) and editor of Bastiat’s works.

[1.] Text from photocopy supplied by Dennis O’Brien, Queen’s University, Belfast, of the original in the papers of Lord Overstone.

[2.] JSM had been a member of the Club since 1830. Hare subsequently did become a member.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 234-36.

[2.] See Letter 451, n. 2.

[3.] *L’Individu et l’Etat* (Paris, 1857).

[4.] Probably *Rep. Govt.*, published the following year.

[5.] Dupont-White's introduction to his translation of *On Liberty*.

[6.] "Michelet's History of France," *ER*, LXXIX (Jan., 1844), 1-39; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., II, 120-80, Am. ed., II, 198-259.

[7.] The Poor Law of that year.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Sir James Phillips Kay-Shuttleworth (1804-1877), politician and founder of English popular education. He had served as chairman of the Committee on Trades' Societies appointed by the NAPSS in Oct., 1858. The committee's report was presented at the fourth annual meeting of the Association, at Glasgow, Sept. 1860, and published with the title, *Trades Societies and Strikes* (London, 1860). Fawcett was a member of the committee. Kay-Shuttleworth had been impressed with Fawcett's paper, "The Theory and Tendency of Strikes," presented at the meetings of the NAPSS at Bradford in Oct., 1859 (see NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1859 [London, 1860], pp. 635-40).

[3.] Sir James had invited Fawcett to address a meeting of workmen on April 5 at St. Martin's Hall on "Political Economy and the Tendency of Strikes." See *The Times*, April 6, 1860, p. 10.

[4.] A parliamentary Select Committee on Masters and Operatives appointed in March to study the best means of settling labour disputes. Fawcett appeared before the committee on April 24; his testimony appears on p. 95 of the committee's report published on May 15, 1860.

[5.] In 1850, JSM had given evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes; in 1852 before a Select Committee on the Income and Property Tax; and in 1857 before a Select Committee on the Bank Acts. In 1861 he again gave evidence before a House of Commons Committee on Income and Property Tax. His evidence before these committees is reprinted in *Collected Works*, vol. V.

[6.] A Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons on Feb. 15, 1860, to inquire into the operation of the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act of 1854.

[7.] "The Reform Bill," *The Times*, March 15, 1860, pp. 10-11.

[8.] James Martineau was editor of the *National Review*.

[9.] Sir John Somerset Pakington, later (1874) 1st Baron Hampton (1799-1880), Tory MP for Droitwich, 1837-74, in his speech in the Commons on the Representation of the People Bill, on March 22, 1860, had praised Lord John Russell for his attempt in 1854 to provide for representation of minorities. Disraeli earlier in the session had attacked Russell for supporting such representation. See next Letter.

[10.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Angleterre / Thomas Hare Esq. / 8 York Street,
/ St. James's Square / London. *Postmark:* AVIGNON / 6 / AVRIL / 1860.

[2.] See preceding Letter, n. 7.

[3.] "The Reform Bill and Mr. Hare's Proposed Clause," *Economist*, XVIII (March
17, 1860), 277-78.

[4.] See especially a leader for March 23, p. 9.

[5.] See preceding Letter, n. 9.

[6.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[7.] Presumably a letter to Hare from Edward Lytton Bulwer-Lytton, MP for
Hertfordshire, in response to a request for support of Hare's plan. For the result, see
Letter 458.

[8.] See preceding Letter.

[9.] Containing Hare's "Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence," *Fraser's*,
LXI (April, 1860), 527-43.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published, with omissions, in Elliot, I, 236-37.

[2.] *Utilitarianism*. See Letters 415, n. 6, and 421.

[3.] Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection . . .*
(London, 1859).

[4.] Baden Powell, *The Order of Nature considered in Reference to the Claims of
Revelation* (London, 1859).

[5.] Powell (1796-1860), was Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford, 1827-60. For
JSM's appreciative comments on Baden Powell's *Essay on the Inductive Philosophy*,
see *Logic* (8th ed.), I, 424 n; II, 99 n-100 n (both passages added in the 4th ed., 1856).

[6.] The closest parallel located is in the fragments of Aristotle's *On Philosophy*: cf.
The Works of Aristotle, Oxford translation, ed. Sir David Ross, vol. XII, *Select
Fragments*, pp. 84-86, Frags. 12a, 12b, and 13 of *On Philosophy, Metaphysics*, a,
1075a 11 ff., also contains the statement that the universe is "orderly"; cf. W. Jaeger,
Aristotle, trans. by R. Robinson (Oxford, 1948), p. 388.

[7.] See *The Order of Nature*, Essay IV, "Theological Views of Miracles," sec. II,
"General Argument from the Belief in Miracles."

[8.] Cf. Voltaire, *Œuvres Complètes*, vol. XXXVII, *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, vol. V (Paris, 1819), pp. 295-319, esp. sec. IV, pp. 308-19, “de ceux qui ont eu la témérité impie de nier absolument la réalité des miracles de Jésus Christ.”

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See accompanying letter to Hare, same date. Perhaps for use in Hare’s testimony before Earl Grey’s committee, mentioned below.

[3.] A Select Committee in the House of Lords to institute an inquiry on amendments to the Representation of the People Bill. Earl Grey introduced the motion for his committee on March 1, and the committee was finally approved on April 19, 1860. *Hansard*, CLVII, cols. 1920-74. Letters of Grey to Hare of April 24 and May [16?], 1860, on the subject are in the Brit. Mus.

[4.] Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer-Lytton, in his speech on the Representation of the People Bill, April 26, 1860. *Hansard*, CLVIII, cols. 143-66.

[5.] John Walter (1818-1894), proprietor of *The Times*, and MP for Nottingham, 1847-59, for Berkshire, 1859-65 and 1868-85, in his speech on the Representation of the People Bill, April 30, 1860. *Hansard*, CLVIII, cols. 350-59.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 454, n. 2 and n. 3.

[3.] William Nathaniel Massey (1809-1881), barrister, historian, and MP for Newport (1855-57), for Salford (1857-63), for Tiverton (1872-81). For his “move” see *Hansard*, CLVII, cols. 1067-76.

[4.] Charles William Gordon (1817-1863), captain in the Madras cavalry; MP for Berwick-on-Tweed, 1859-63.

[5.] See Letter 458.

[6.] See *ibid.*, n. 3.

[7.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[8.] Probably the number for April 11, 1860, p. 1, containing a review of Fawcett’s pamphlet.

[9.] JSM was over-sanguine. The Representation of the People Bill introduced on March 1 was withdrawn June 11, 1860.

[10.] Richard Jones (1790-1855), political economist; professor of political economy and history, succeeding Malthus, at the East India College at Haileybury; a critic of

Ricardo; author of *An Essay on the Distribution of Wealth, and on the Sources of Taxation* (London, 1831).

[1.] MS at Pierpont Morgan Library.

John Nichol (1833-1894), Professor of English Literature at Glasgow University, 1861-89. Son of John Pringle Nichol, astronomer, with whom JSM corresponded earlier; see *Earlier Letters*.

[2.] John Nichol, *Fragments of Criticism* (Edinburgh, 1860), printed for private circulation.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, I, 237.

[2.] A home defence force, known as the Volunteer Movement, began to grow in 1859, largely as the result of British alarm over the activities of Napoleon III. The government supplied rifles, and military reviews found new favour at Court.

[1.] MS in the Hollander Collection, University of Illinois.

George Woodyat Hastings (1825-1917), attorney; hon. sec. to the NAPSS, 1857-68 and chairman of its Council, 1868-83; MP for East Worcester, 1880-92; expelled from the House of Commons on having been sentenced to a term of imprisonment for fraudulent conversion.

[2.] The 1860 meeting was held in Glasgow in Sept.; the 1861 meeting, in Dublin.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[1.] MS in 1943 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts. *Envelope addressed:* Thomas Hare Esq. / 8 York Street / St. James's. *Postmark:* LONDON SE / 3 / JY / 18 / 60.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. First and last paragraphs published in Elliot, I, 237-38.

Thomas Edward Cliffe Leslie (1826-1882), political economist; professor of jurisprudence and political economy at Queen's College, Belfast, 1853-82.

[2.] "The Future of Europe Foretold in History," *Macmillan's*, II (Sept., 1860), 329-38; reprinted in Leslie's *Essays on Political and Moral Philosophy* (Dublin and London, 1879), pp. 94-110. Leslie had evidently sent JSM either the manuscript or proof sheets of the article, which was published the next month.

[3.] The word is not fully legible. Leslie does mention in the article (*Essays*, p. 97) Roussillon, one of the old provinces of France, ceded to the French crown in 1659 after having been under Spanish rule for 400 years.

[4.] Leslie kept the reference to Nice and Savoy, but in a footnote added that they “cannot, even now, be regarded as irrevocably annexed to France” (p. 97).

[5.] As published (p. 98): “The genuine traditions of French policy no more recognize the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees as the natural boundaries of France than the Oise, the Marne, and the Cevennes, the Rhone, the Loire, and the Garonne, or the Vosges and the Saone, which have been successively crossed.”

[6.] As published (p. 98): “Upon the same principle the French should celebrate their Terminalia, not at Utrecht, Coblenz, or Genoa, but near the fourth milestone on the road from Paris to St. Denis”

[7.] Henry Thomas Buckle (1821-1862), author of *History of Civilisation in England*, the first volume of which had appeared in 1857; vol.2 was to appear in 1861.

Leslie’s first published article, “The Question of the Age—Is it Peace?,” had been published in *Macmillan’s*, II (May, 1860), 72-88 (reprinted in his *Essays*, pp. 62-93). It was in large part an attack on Buckle’s generalization that wars were declining in frequency and might be expected to cease.

[1.] MS at Johns Hopkins. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Taylor / at J. S. Mill’s Esq / Blackheath Park / Kent.

[2.] Alexander Irvine (1793-1873), botanist; author of *The London Flora* (London, 1838), *Introduction to the Science of Botany* (London, 1858), and *Illustrated Handbook of British Plants* (London, 1858).

[1.] MS at Johns Hopkins. *Envelope addressed:* Miss Taylor / at J. S. Mill’s Esq / Blackheath Park / Kent. *Postmark:* FOLKESTONE / A SP 6 / 60.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably the paper Fawcett read at the meeting of the BAAS at Oxford this year in which he attacked Whewell’s preface to Richard Jones, *Literary Remains; consisting of lectures and tracts on political economy . . .*, ed., with a prefatory notice by William Whewell (London, 1859).

Fawcett’s paper “Dr. Whewell on the Method of Political Economy,” was apparently never published; it is listed on p. 191 of “Transactions of the Sections” in the Statistical Science Section of *Report of the 30th Meeting of BAAS, June and July, 1860* (London, 1861).

[3.] Fawcett attended the Sept., 1860, meeting of the NAPSS in Glasgow, participated in the meeting of the committee on strikes, and read two papers. There is no mention of Hare’s plan in the NAPSS *Transactions* of that meeting of the Association.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft in the Berg Collection of NYP. Published in *Hospitals*, X, No. 7 (July, 1936), 79. In reply to Miss Nightingale's of Sept. 5, *ibid.*, 78. The following paragraph at the end of the draft was crossed out by JSM:

“It is very agreeable to me that you should have found my Logic of so much use to you, & particularly the chapter on Free Will & Necessity, to which I have always attached much value as being the writing down of a train of thought which had been very important to myself many years before, & even (if I may use the expression) critical in my own development.”

[2.] *Suggestions for Thought to the Searchers after Truth among the artizans of England* (3 vols., London, 1860). Privately printed, but not published.

Profoundly religious, Miss Nightingale was “anxious to find some theological sanction . . . for her religion of practical service.” She worked on this book before undertaking her famous mission in the Crimea, took it up again in 1858-59, rewrote and added, and began printing at the end of 1859. A few copies were printed in 1860. She thought of publishing, and consulted Benjamin Jowett as well as JSM. See E. T. Cook, *Life of Florence Nightingale*, I, 468-90.

[3.] In her letter of Sept. 5 Miss Nightingale wrote in a postscript: “I acknowledge the justice of your animadversion (of which Mr. Chadwick wrote to me) upon a passage of my little book on Nursing, *if I meant what you think which I did not*. If my words bear that interpretation, and you will kindly point them out to me, I shall be glad and grateful to alter them.” See also Letter 467A in Appendix II.

The passage in question: “I would earnestly ask my sisters to keep clear of both the jargons now current everywhere (for they *are* equally jargons); of the jargon, namely, about the ‘rights’ of women, which urges women to do all that men do, including the medical and other professions, merely because men do it, and without regard to whether this *is* the best that women can do; and of the jargon which urges women to do nothing that men do, merely because they are women, and should be ‘recalled to a sense of their duty as women,’ and because ‘this is women’s work,’ and ‘that is men’s,’ and ‘these are things which women should not do,’ which is all assertion, and nothing more. Surely woman should bring the best she has, *whatever* that is, to the work of God’s world, without attending to either of these cries. . . .” *Notes on Nursing*, p. 135.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 116.

[2.] At this time Thornton was secretary to the Public Works Department in the India Office.

[3.] By the transfer in 1858 of the rule of India from the East India Co. to the Crown.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft in the Berg Collection of NYP. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 238-41, and in full in *Hospitals*, X, No. 7 (July, 1936), 79-80. In reply to Miss Nightingale's of Sept. 12, *ibid.*, p. 79.

[2.] See Letter 472, n. 2.

[3.] On Benjamin Jowett's advice, vols. 2 and 3 were addressed instead to "Searchers after Religious Truth."

[4.] Her ill health.

[5.] In her letter of Sept. 12, referring to her remarks in the *Notes on Nursing* on the "jargons" commonly used in talking about women's rights (see Letter 472, n. 3), Miss Nightingale said: "To every word of an article, called by your name [presumably Mrs. Mill's 1851 article on "Emancipation of Women"], on this subject, I heartily subscribe and defer. This is *not* the 'jargon' I mean. I refer to an American world, consisting of female M.D.'s, etc., and led by a Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, and though the latter is a dear and intimate and valued friend of mine, I reassert that her world talks a 'jargon', and a very mischievous one—that their female M.D.s have taken up the worst part of a male M.D.ship, of 30 years ago—and that, while Medical education is what it is . . . instead of wishing to see more Doctors made by women joining what there are, I wish to see as few Doctors either male or female as possible, for mark you, the women have made no improvement—they have only tried to be 'men' and they have only succeeded in being third-rate men. They will not fail in getting their own livelihood but they fail in doing good and improving therapeutics."

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft in the Berg Collection of NYP. Published in Elliot, I, 241-42, with omissions, and in *Hospitals*, X, No. 7 (July, 1936), 81-82. In reply to Miss Nightingale's letters of Sept. 28 and 29, in *ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

[2.] See Letter 472, n. 2.

[3.] In her letter of Sept. 28 Miss Nightingale had expressed the hope that JSM would write her again, and added "And then, as Frederick the Great's General said to God, 'Grant me this one thing and I promise never to pray to you any more.'"

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 242-44. On *verso* in JSM's hand: To Villari / Nov. 6. 1860.

[2.] The struggle for Italian unification had advanced greatly this year. In May Garibaldi had invaded Sicily and, after overthrowing the Bourbon government there, had entered Naples on Sept. 7 and proclaimed himself dictator of the kingdom. Garibaldi and King Victor Emmanuel had met on Oct. 29, and on the day following this letter the two entered Naples together. Garibaldi then resigned his authority into the king's hands and retired.

[3.] Mazzini's great contributions to the cause of Italian unity over many years were not acknowledged officially in Italy until after his death in 1872.

[4.] Italy did not become involved again in war with Austria until 1866.

[5.] When Napoleon III was ceded Savoy and Nice in return for French help against Austria.

[6.] Presumably Count Cavour.

[7.] King Victor Emmanuel II.

[1.] MS at Huntington. Published in *Principles*, p. 1032.

[2.] See earlier negotiations with Furnivall about reprinting this chapter, beginning with Letter 129.

[3.] The 5th edition of *Pol.Econ.*, 1862.

[4.] See Letter 323, n. 3.

[5.] John Bright in a speech on the Representation of the People Bill on June 7, 1860, spoke favourably about the progress of co-operative societies as evidence of the growing sense of responsibility on the part of the working classes. *Hansard*, CLIX, cols. 94-95.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris. Third paragraph published in Villey, pp. 229-30.

[2.] Of *On Liberty*. See Letters 361, 417, and 451.

[3.] Eventually published as “Centralisation,” *ER*, CXV (April, 1862), 323-58.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] On Nov. 9, 1860, Fawcett, hearing that the Southwark electors were looking for an independent candidate, offered to stand. He fought a hard campaign but withdrew just before the poll on Dec. 10.

[3.] *The Times*, “Election Intelligence, Southwark,” many stories, e.g. Nov. 28, p. 12; Dec. 1, p. 12; Dec. 10, p. 5; results, Dec. 11, 1860, p. 6.

[4.] “Election Intelligence—Southwark,” *Evening Mail*, Nov. 26-28, Dec. 5-10, 1860, p. 7.

[5.] Austen Henry Layard was elected.

[6.] Fawcett fought the campaign for one month for less than £250. In an earlier election the incumbent for the district had been forced to spend £10,000.

[7.] “Co-operative Societies: their Social and Economical Aspects,” *Macmillan's*, II (Oct., 1860), 434-41; and “A Popular Exposition of Mr. Darwin’s ‘Origin of Species’,” *Macmillan's*, III (Dec., 1860), 81-92.

[8.] *Considerations on Representative Government*, published in April, 1861, and *Utilitarianism*, which was at least partly written in 1854, rewritten late in 1859,

revised in 1860, and first published in *Fraser's*, LXIV (Oct.-Dec., 1861), 391-406, 525-34, 659-73, and in book form in 1863.

[9.] Probably *The Subjection of Women*, finished in 1861, published in 1869.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Envelope addressed*: Thomas Hare Esq / 8 York Street / St James's Square / London. *Postmarks*: AVIGNON / 24 / DEC / 60 and LONDON E / C / DE 26 / 60.

[2.] "On the Application of a new Statistical Method to the Ascertainment of the Votes of Majorities in a more exhaustive manner," a paper read before the Statistical Society, June 19, 1860, and published in *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, XXIII (Sept., 1860), 337-53.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, p. 159. Bracketed portion is by Bain.

[2.] Probably in Oct., 1840. See *Earlier Letters*, p. 448.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 244-45.

Gustave de Beaumont de la Bonninière (1802-1866), politician and writer, friend of Tocqueville who accompanied him to America and collaborated with him in writing their *Du Système pénitentiaire aux Etats-Unis et de son application en France* (Paris, 1833).

[2.] *Œuvres et Correspondance inédite de Alexis de Tocqueville*, ed. Gustave de Beaumont (2 vols., Paris, 1861).

[3.] Tocqueville had died on April 16, 1859, at the age of 54. For a number of JSM's letters to him, see *Earlier Letters*.

[4.] *L'Ancien Régime et la révolution* (Paris, 1856). Seven chapters of a projected second volume were eventually found, and published in vol. 7 of the *Œuvres complètes* . . . publiées par Madame de Tocqueville (9 vols., Paris, 1864-66). Henry Reeve published the seven additional chapters in the second edition of his translation: *The State of Society in France before the Revolution of 1789* (London, 1873).

[5.] Some of the remaining correspondence was published in the *Œuvres complètes*.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. *Endorsed in JSM's hand*: For publication / J.S.Mill. Published in Elliot, I, 245-46.

[2.] Presumably the letter to Nassau Senior published in the Report of the Education Commission (*Parl. Papers, 1862*, vol. XLIII, p. 1), explanatory of Chadwick's paper entitled "Communications on Half-Time Teaching and on Military Drills." Senior was a member of the Royal Commission for Education from Nov., 1858 to June, 1861.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] A review of Dupont-White's translation of *On Liberty* by Léon de Wailly, *L'Illustration*, Feb. 16, 1861, pp. 102-106.

[3.] Another review of *On Liberty*, by Eugène Paignon, *La Presse*, Feb. 21, 1861, p. 3.

[4.] H. Taine, "Philosophie Anglaise Contemporaine—John Stuart Mill et son système de logique," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XXXII (Mar. 1, 1861), 44-82.

[5.] See Letter 478, n. 3.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris. First two sentences published in Villey, p. 230.

[2.] M. E. Yung, "La Liberté Moderne," *Revue nationale et étrangère*, III (March 10, 1861), 5-26, a review of Dupont-White's translation of *On Liberty*.

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 4.

[4.] The budget for ecclesiastical matters.

[1.] MS not located. Published in H. Taine, *Sa Vie et sa correspondance* (4 vols., Paris, 1902-1907), II, 382-83. Taine quoted a portion of this letter in his Preface to his *Le Positivisme Anglais, étude sur Stuart Mill* (Paris, 1864), pp. v-vi. A translation incorrectly dated Jan., 1864, appears in *Life and Letters of H. Taine* (3 vols., New York and London, 1902-1908), II, 322-23.

Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893), literary critic and historian.

[2.] See Letter 484, n. 4.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] Dupont-White's translation, *Le Gouvernement représentatif*, was published in Paris in 1862.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] *Journal des Débats*, April 27, 1861, pp. 2-3, a review of Dupont-White's translation of the *On Liberty*.

[3.] Henri Joseph Léon Baudrillart (1821-1894), political economist; he had succeeded Joseph Garnier as editor of the *Journal des Économistes* in 1855.

[4.] *The Rep. Govt.*

[5.] See Letter 489.

[6.] Camille Hyacinthe Odilon Barrot (1791-1873), politician and lawyer, had just published his *La Centralisation et ses effets* (Paris, 1861).

[1.] MS not located. Published in Ethel E. Ellis, *Memoir of William Ellis* (London, 1888), pp. 143-44, dated as of May 1, 1860. JSM was clearly not in Avignon on that day.

William Ellis (1800-1881), economist, insurance company director, founder of the Birkbeck schools, writer on educational and economic subjects. He had been associated with JSM as a young man in the Utilitarian Society and also in the study group that met at George Grote's; see *Autobiog.*, chaps. iii and iv.

[2.] According to the *Memoir*, Ellis had sent him the first volume of his *Philo-Socrates* (4 vols., London, 1861-64).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 451, n. 2, and 453, n. 3.

[3.] See Letter 478, n. 3.

[4.] See preceding Letter, n. 6.

[5.] See Letter 286, n. 13.

[1.] Copy from original supplied by Mr. T. J. Hart of Bristol in 1946.

[2.] Rev. J. Crompton; see Letter 43, n. 5.

[3.] See Letter 119, n. 17.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Apparently Leslie agreed to write for Chapman's *WR*. See Letter 497, n. 5.

[3.] *Rep. Govt.*, published in April, 1861.

[4.] "A Few Words on Non-Intervention," see Letter 414, n. 4.

[5.] The promises made by the Ottoman Empire in 1856 to the European powers to institute reforms giving Christians the protection of the law had not been fulfilled. In 1860-61 the Turkish Army was suppressing a revolt in Montenegro and Herzegovina.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of May 14, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] William Nesbitt (1824-1881), classicist; professor of Latin, 1849-54, and of Greek, 1854-64, at Queen's College, Galway; professor of Latin at the Belfast branch of Queen's University, 1864-81. Nesbitt was a close friend of Cairnes, and their wives were sisters. Nesbitt's article, "The Irish Education Question," *WR*, n.s. XVIII (July, 1860), 94-133, was reprinted, with additions, as a pamphlet the same year.

[3.] *Rep. Govt.*

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] "John Stuart Mill," *La Revue nationale et étrangère*, IV (May 10, 1861), 5-35, a review of the Dussard and Courcelle-Seneuil trans. of *Pol. Econ.*

[3.] Probably Auguste Picard. See Letter 532, n. 2.

[4.] Akbar Jelladin Mahommed (1542-1605), Mogul emperor known for his progressive, liberal principles.

[5.] See Letter 489.

[6.] "Popular Education in England," *ER*, CXIV (July, 1861), 1-38. For JSM's review of Dupont-White, see Letter 478, n. 3.

[7.] Paris, 1861.

[8.] *Essai sur les relations du travail avec le capital* (Paris, 1846).

[1.] MS in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. *Envelope addressed*: George W. Childs Esq. / Publisher / Philadelphia / United States. *Postmark*: JU 10 / 61.

George William Childs (1829-1894), publisher, philanthropist. In 1860-61 Childs was a member of J. B. Lippincott, publishers in Philadelphia.

[2.] *Rep. Govt.*

[1.] MS in 1943 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts. *Envelope addressed*: Thomas Hare Esq. / 8 York Street / St. James's Square. *Postmark*: LONDON / 3 / JY5 / 61.

[2.] Additions were made to chap. 7, "Of True and False Democracy; Representation of All, and Representation of the Majority Only," in the 2nd edition (1861) of *Rep. Govt.*

[3.] Hare's plan of proportional representation had a number of supporters in Australia. Perhaps Hare's correspondent was the Mr. G. K. Holden referred to by JSM in Letter 536.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. MS draft at Leeds. Published in *The Works of Sir Henry Taylor* (5 vols., London, 1878), V, 314-16, and in Elliot, I, 246-47. In reply to Taylor's letter of May 28, 1861 (*Works*, V, 305-14), discussing JSM's *Rep. Govt.*

[2.] JSM had sent Taylor a copy of *Rep. Govt.*

[3.] Taylor had remarked: "I should think the doctrines of the book would be still more useful on the Continent than in this country."

[4.] Taylor had had a severe attack of asthma in 1859.

[5.] In his letter Taylor had recalled “the weekly breakfasts in Suffolk Street or elsewhere” which he and JSM had attended more than thirty years earlier.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] “Equatorial Africa, and its Inhabitants,” *WR*, n.s. XX (July, 1861), 137-87, a review of books by Paul du Chaillu and John Petherick, which includes a discussion of evolution, Owen, and Huxley.

[3.] “Mr. Buckle’s History of Civilization in England,” *ibid.*, pp. 187-207, by Justin McCarthy. See Letter 1012.

[4.] “Mr. Mill on Representative Government,” *ibid.*, pp. 91-114. The article calls JSM “the greatest of English thinkers” and says that no other living writer “has exercised so great and profound an influence on his contemporaries.”

[5.] T. E. C. Leslie, “Income-Tax Reform,” *WR*, n.s. XXI (Jan., 1862), 97-127.

[6.] *Report and Minutes of Evidence on Income and Property Tax*, London, published Sept., 1861. JSM gave evidence before this parliamentary committee; see Letter 507.

[1.] MS draft at Northwestern.

[2.] In his *Autobiography* (II, pp. 74 ff.) Spencer speaks of “nervous relapses,” “head-symptoms,” and “cerebral congestion” persisting from March, 1861, until the end of the year.

[3.] Spencer completed *First Principles* in June, 1862.

[4.] During his illness, Spencer decided to republish four articles on education, which had appeared originally in *WR*, *North British Rev.*, and *British Quarterly Rev.*, between 1854 and 1859. The revised articles were published as a book entitled *Education*, in June, 1861, in London.

[5.] Chap. iv, “Physical Training.”

[6.] See Letter 483, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Mrs. Grote in her biography of her husband (p. 253) says he had a “distempered condition of the blood” in July and August, 1861.

[3.] The Grotes were at Barrow Green, Oxted, for the summer. Mrs. Grote reports among their weekend visitors at this time JSM and his stepdaughter, Mr. and Mrs. Bain, and Dr. and Mrs. Neil Arnott. *The Personal Life of George Grote*, p. 253.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Chapman's of Aug. 1 enclosing a letter by Frederic Harrison of Aug. 1 to Chapman (both MSS at Yale). Harrison hoped to gain JSM's support for the strikers.

[2.] *Daily News*, Aug. 1, 1861, p. 3. A defence of the position of London workmen against the hour system in the building trades.

[3.] See Letter 448, n. 3.

[4.] A building strike, which began in 1859-60, was renewed in 1861-62. The men were asking for the introduction of a nine-hour day. Some builders countered by proposing to hire workmen by the hour rather than the day, which implied the end of collective bargaining, doing away with the idea of a normal day, and making separate agreements with individual workmen. A compromise was reached on payment by the hour, but with strict limitation of the working day.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] The NAPSS meeting in Dublin, Aug. 1861.

[4.] One of them may have been "On the Application of Sanitary Science to Public Works of Irrigation, and Works for the Relief of Towns," NAPSS, *Transactions*, Dublin 1861 (London, 1862), pp. 563-68.

[5.] Louis Gabriel Léonce Guilhaud de Lavergne (1809-1880), economist and politician.

[6.] Letter 503.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] Which had arisen in the course of his translation of *Rep. Govt.*

[3.] *Shibboleth*, a Hebrew word meaning an ear of corn or a stream or river, used as a testword to distinguish the Ephraimites, who could not pronounce the "sh," from the men of Gilead (Judges, XII, 6).

[4.] See Letter 223, n. 5.

[5.] Used in the oft-quoted phrase of JSM about "The Conservatives, as being by the law of their existence the stupidest party" (chap. vii, "Of True and False Democracy").

[6.] Meaning "take this or nothing"; origin: The Cambridge-London carrier, Thomas Hobson (1544-1630), when letting his horses for hire, refused to allow any animal to leave his stable out of its turn. John Milton's poem "On the University Carrier" is about Hobson.

[7.] Presumably a reference to French hopes that Italy might be persuaded to cede Sardinia. The House of Commons had debated the question on July 19, 1861 (see *Hansard*, CLXIV, cols. 1189-1242).

[1.] MS at LSE. See Letter 501.

[2.] *Logic*, 5th edition (London, 1862).

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Aug. 1, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] The MS of Cairnes's course of lectures on slavery delivered in the spring term of 1861 at the University of Dublin, which became the basis of his important book, *The Slave Power, its character, career and probable designs* (London, 1862). See Letter 517.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Excerpt published in Gomperz, I, 304-305. In reply to Gomperz's letter of Aug. 1, also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Gomperz wrote that his translation of JSM's *On Liberty* had been impeded by disorders which had caused him to fall into a state of apathy and lethargy of mind.

[3.] Gomperz had published a series of articles in the *Neueste Nachrichten* (Feb. 12, 13, and 15, 1861) under the title "Oesterreichs Desorganisation und Reorganisation" on the history of the relation between Hungary and Austria in which he defended the justice of Hungary's claims. A fourth article, in which he proposed voluntary participation of the Magyars in the government of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in return for the guarantee of self-government in all their affairs, was not acceptable to the editor of the *Neueste Nachrichten* and was not published until 1904, when it appeared, together with a reprint of the first three, in *Deutsche Worte*, Monatshefte, XXIV. See A. Weinberg, *Theodor Gomperz and John Stuart Mill*, p. 25.

[4.] *Ueber die Freiheit*. Aus dem Englischen von. E. Pickford (Frankfurt a. M., 1860).

[5.] An anonymous translation published by Gerhard (Leipzig, 1861) as vol. 15 of a collection entitled *Russian Library*.

[6.] See Letter 361.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] The question may have arisen with respect to chap. viii, "Of the Extension of the Suffrage," in *Rep. Govt.*, which Dupont-White was translating.

[3.] Some of the problems of governing India are discussed in chap. xviii, "Of the Government of Dependencies by a Free State."

[4.] *Rep. Govt.* (2d. ed.), p. 170.

[5.] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[6.] *Ibid.*

[7.] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

[8.] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

[1.] MS and MS draft at LSE. In reply to Courtney's of Sept. 17, also at LSE, along with Courtney's rejoinder of Sept. 20.

Leonard Henry Courtney, later 1st Baron Courtney of Penwith (1832-1918), journalist and statesman. At this time a student of politics and political economy. From 1865 to 1881 a writer of leaders in *The Times*.

[2.] JSM had testified before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Income Tax on May 17 and 20, 1852; see *Parl. Papers, 1852*, IX, Second Report, 284-95, 298-324, and again on June 18, 1861: *Report and Minutes of Evidence on Income and Property Tax. Reports from Committees*, VII (1861), 212-32. See *Collected Works*, V, 463ff., 549ff.

[3.] Committee on Income and Property Tax, headed by John Gellibrand Hubbard, later 1st Baron Addington (1805-1889), MP, banker. See *Collected Works*, V, 549ff.

[1.] MS at King's.

[2.] Presumably the second instalment of his *Utilitarianism*, which appeared in *Fraser's* in three instalments in Oct., Nov., and Dec., 1861, and in 1863 as a separate volume. Froude had become editor of *Fraser's* the preceding year.

[1.] MS at the Mitchell Library, Sydney.

Henry Parkes (1815-1896), Australian statesman. Born in Warwickshire, he emigrated to New South Wales in 1839, achieved eminence as a journalist in Sydney, and was first elected to the legislature in 1854. Thereafter he held various offices, and beginning in 1872 served as prime minister five times. In 1861 he went to England as one of two commissioners of emigration; during his year there he became a friend of Carlyle, Cobden, Bright, and Hughes. Parkes became an ardent advocate of free trade.

[2.] The reports sent to JSM evidently included one which Parkes had prepared as chairman of a select committee in 1859-60 to enquire into the condition of the working classes of Sydney. See Charles E. Lyne, *Life of Sir Henry Parkes* (London, 1897), chap. xv.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] At Manchester earlier this month, Fawcett had read two papers: "On the Method of Mr. Darwin in his Treatise on the Origin of Species," in *Report of 31st Meeting of BAAS, Manchester 1861* (London, 1862) in "Transactions of Sections," pp. 141-43; and "On the Economical Effects of the Recent Gold Discoveries," *ibid.*, p. 269.

[3.] Fawcett had begun work on his *Manual of Political Economy* (London & Cambridge, 1863).

[4.] See Letter 508, n. 2.

[5.] The 5th ed., 1862.

[6.] See Letter 448, n. 3, and *Principles*, pp. 932-33.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] To his translation of *Rep. Govt.*

[3.] See Letter 508.

[4.] See Letter 493, n. 8.

[5.] Probably Louis de Ronchard, *Phidias, sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1861).

[6.] Charles Ernest Beulé (1826-1874), eminent French archaeologist. His “L’Atelier de Phidias, Étude tirée de l’antique,” *Revue des Deux Mondes* (March 15, 1861), pp. 292-331, is in the form of a drama.

[7.] Eugène André Despois, “Les Poètes à Athènes,” *Revue nationale et étrangère*, IV (June 25, 1861), 573-87.

[8.] Jules Augustin Girard, “Hypéride: sa vie et son éloquence,” *Revue nationale et étrangère*, V (July 25, 1861), 219-63.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, *JSM*, p. 118. Bracketed portion is Bain’s introduction.

[2.] No such article appeared, but later JSM published *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton’s Philosophy* (London, 1865). See also Letter 518.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Leslie’s article, “Income-Tax Reform,” *WR*, n.s. XXI (Jan., 1862), in a footnote on pp. 114-15. Referred to by JSM in Letter 521, par. 2. The bracketed portion is Leslie’s introduction to the quotation.

[2.] The rest of Leslie’s footnote follows: “This remark contains a valuable principle, but does not prove that if the rich man foregoes the advantage of being rich, the State should forego it likewise, to the disadvantage of the poor man.”

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, *JSM*, p. 118. Bracketed portion is Bain’s introduction.

[2.] I.e., a month before a December letter Bain has previously cited.

[1.] MS in Edinburgh University Library (cf. Letter 366).

[2.] “Mr. Mill on Representative Government,” *North British Rev.*, XXXV (Nov., 1861), 534-63. Bound immediately before this letter in Lorimer’s collection of pamphlets in Edinburgh University Library.

[3.] *Rep. Govt.*

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to letter by Paull of Nov. 19, 1861, also at LSE. Samuel Paull, lawyer, and Fellow of the London Statistical Society.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Nov. 21, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 504, n. 2. The book was dedicated to JSM.

[3.] Passage from Letter 504; probably the passage beginning: “As you have shewn, more powerfully than had been done before. . . .”

[4.] See the postscript.

[5.] Auguste Laugel, “Les Causes et Caractères de la Guerre Civile aux États-Unis,” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XXXVI (Nov. 1, 1861), 140-62.

[6.] E. D. de Pressensé, “De Quelques publications récentes sur la Question de l’Esclavage,” *Revue nationale et étrangère*, VII (Nov. 10, 1861), 85-91.

[7.] Edmond Dehault de Pressensé (1824-1891), Protestant clergyman and writer.

[8.] Comte Agénor Étienne de Gasparin (1810-1871), publicist and politician. His *Les États-unis en 1861: un grand peuple qui se relève* (Paris, 1861) was published in an abridged version in London in the same year.

[9.] See Letter 508.

[10.] “In Chap. 4. when considering of what sort of proof the principle of utility is susceptible, you state the question to be ‘whether human nature is so constituted as to desire nothing which is not either a part of happiness, or a means of happiness; and having shown that this is the constitution of human nature, you say it necessarily follows that happiness is the criterion of morality.’ Now it strikes me that this statement of the question would not be accepted by an advocate of the *a priori* doctrine. The disciple of Butler would distinguish between the authority of the several faculties, and, while granting that happiness, or something which is the means of happiness, is the object of all the faculties, he would yet deny that a course of conduct being desired by a certain set of faculties, or by all the faculties *minus* the moral one, would place us under an obligation to pursue it; because he would say the moral faculty might disapprove of it, and the moral faculty asserts its own inherent superiority over all the others. In short the Butlerian, as it seems to me, would regard your mode of stating the question as tantamount to begging it. . . . But I venture to think that the difficulty may be evaded by approaching the problem from a different side—e.g. thus. Two people, each an adherent of the transcendental theory, disagree in a moral judgment, and they appeal to an abstract principle of right. Such an appeal,

if it mean anything must mean an appeal to what would be the verdict of the moral faculty of some imaginary human being—‘the impartial spectator’—supposing it to be healthy and enlightened in the highest degree. Now, if this be so, the question of the criterion of morality resolves itself into this:— what is that standard which in the progress of enlightenment is found to govern the moral judgments of men? If all the cardinal rules of morals are found to agree in this—that they are useful: if the limitations and qualifications which in progress of discussion they receive coincide with those which utility would prescribe; if the alterations which the moral codes of progressive nations and individuals have undergone may all be traced to a change in their views respecting the consequences of actions in relation to human happiness; then I think the conclusion must be allowed to be irresistible that the rule derived from a calculation of the effects of actions upon human happiness is that which a healthy moral faculty enlightened in the highest degree would prescribe; which is in other words to say that the utilitarian theory furnishes the standard which transcendental moralists implicitly admit to be the only criterion to which in the discordance of moral judgments they can appeal.”

[11.] These first two sentences were used by Parker, the publisher, in advertising Cairnes’s book. See *Examiner*, May 31, 1862, p. 352.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Bain, *JSM*, p. 118. Bracketed portion is Bain’s summary.

[2.] See Letter 512.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] A term used in *Rep. Govt.*, chap. ii, “The Criterion of a Good Form of Government,” p. 42, in a discussion of the role played by the Prophets in the political development of the ancient Jews.

[3.] No such paper by Emile Littré has been located.

[4.] See Letters 489 and 493, n. 6.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to a letter from Greene of Dec. 11, 1861, also at LSE. Greene has not been identified.

[2.] Founder of Perso-Iranian religion.

[3.] Plato, *Timaeus*, 47e-48a. Cf. F. M. Cornford, *Plato’s Cosmology; the Timaeus of Plato, trans. with a running commentary* (New York, 1937), pp. 159-77.

[4.] Pierre Simon, Marquis de Laplace (1749-1827), mathematician and astronomer. Laplace proposed a solution of the mechanical problem of the solar system in his *Mécanique Céleste* (5 vols., Paris, 1799-1825). Probably JSM is referring to Laplace’s shorter, more popular work, *Exposition du système du monde* (Paris, 1796), where his “nebular hypothesis” makes its first appearance.

[5.] Auguste Comte, *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (6 vols., Paris, 1830-42).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published, with omissions, in Elliot, I, 248-49.

[2.] "Income-Tax Reform," *WR*, n.s. XXI (Jan. 1862), 97-127.

[3.] See Letter 513, n. 2.

[4.] John G. Hubbard. See Letter 507, n. 2 and n. 3.

[5.] "English Jurisprudence," *ER*, CXIV (Oct., 1861), 456-86, a review of John Austin's *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (2nd ed., London, 1861), and of Henry Sumner Maine's *Ancient Law* (London, 1861). The writer is identified in the *Wellesley Index* as Fitzjames Stephen.

[6.] Possibly the article published nearly three years later, "Modern Phases of Jurisprudence in England," *WR*, n.s. XXVI (Oct., 1864), 261-76, which reviews Austin's *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (3 vols., London, 1863), Maine's *Ancient Law* (2nd ed., 1863), and J. F. Stephen's *A General View of the Criminal Law of England* (London, 1863).

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to Greene's letter of Dec. 21, 1861, at LSE, as is also Greene's answer of Jan. 1, 1862. See also Letter 520.

[2.] Greene had written in his letter of Dec. 21, 1861: "It is impossible for example to hold the Catholic doctrine as a matter of opinion; for exclusiveness and intolerance are of the very essence of it: and this . . . is the grand argument for its truth, as against all other pretending systems of revealed Religion. For assuredly, no consistent person, who professed to have found the truth in a matter of such vital importance, ever told others that it was a matter of indifference and option whether they believed it or not."

[1.] MS at LSE. *Paper watermarked*: 1861.

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] Professor Villey in his *Charles Dupont-White*, p. 48, says that Dupont-White had offered to facilitate JSM's entering into an arrangement with the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

[3.] The *Assemblée nationale Constituante*, the first legislative assembly of France, which sat from June 17, 1789 to Sept. 30, 1791. The point may have arisen with respect to chap. ix of *Rep. Govt.*, "Should there be two stages of election?"

[4.] See Letters 489 and 493.

[5.] See Letter 508.

[1.] MS offered for sale by Dawsons, Pall Mall, London, in May, 1971. MS draft at Leeds; published, with omissions, in Elliot, I, 249-51. In reply to Grote's of Jan.,

1862, partly published in Harriet Grote, *The Personal Life of George Grote* (London, 1873), pp. 257-58.

[2.] In his reply to an invitation from JSM to join him and Helen Taylor in a tour of Greece, Grote reported that his health depended upon “continued neighbourhood to good medical aid,” and that he could not “endure the fatigue of horse and foot exercise which an excursion to Greece must inevitably entail.”

[3.] Mrs. Grote has omitted this part of her husband’s letter, and the MS has not been located.

[4.] In *Fraser’s*; see Letter 508.

[5.] Edmond Henri Adolphe Schérer (1815-1889), protestant theologian, Hegelian, literary critic, and politician.

JSM’s account of him is not wholly accurate. Schérer had relinquished a professorship at an evangelical institution in Geneva in 1850 because of disagreement with orthodox Protestant views. He then moved to Strasbourg and became a leader of a new school of liberal theology and editor of *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie Chrétienne*, 1850-60. In 1861 he left for Versailles to become editor of a new journal, *Le Temps*.

[6.] Schérer published two articles in the *Revue* in 1861: “Hégel et l’Hégélianisme,” XXXI (Feb. 15, 1861), 812-56; and “La Crise du Protestantisme en Angleterre” (an article occasioned by the controversial *Essays and Reviews*), XXXIII (May 15, 1861), 403-24. In neither article, however, is there a discussion of utilitarian ethics.

[7.] See Letter 512. Grote eventually reviewed JSM’s *Hamilton* in *WR*, n.s. XXIX (Jan., 1866), 1-39.

[8.] *Plato and the other companions of Sokrates* (3 vols., London, 1865).

[9.] “Centralisation,” *ER*, CXV (April, 1862), 323-58.

[10.] The famous case of the Confederate commissioners Mason and Slidell, who on Nov. 8, 1861, had been removed from the British packet *Trent* by the sailors of the U.S. warship *San Jacinto*. War between England and the U.S. threatened until President Lincoln ordered the release of the two Confederate emissaries.

[11.] *On the Study of Character, including an estimate of phrenology* (London, 1861).

[12.] Plato, *Protagoras*, 349-62.

[1.] MS in the possession of W. Rosenberg, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Published in R. S. Neale, “John Stuart Mill on Australia: A Note,” *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, XIII (April, 1968), 242-44.

[2.] Chapman was Melbourne correspondent of *The Times*.

[3.] Victoria, the colony in which Chapman lived, had been granted a Constitution in 1855 which provided for a bicameral legislature. Property and literacy qualifications were established for both electors and legislators, but the property qualifications for the lower house were so inconsequential that there was virtual manhood suffrage.

[4.] Napoleon, outraged by the active leadership given by Louis Antoine Henri, Duc d'Enghien, to the émigré armies against France, sent troops into Ettenheim, Baden, to seize the Duke. He was court-martialled and executed on March 21, 1804.

[5.] General Edwin V. Sumner, en route to Washington, D.C., from California with troops of the U.S. Army, arrested on board the *Orizaba* William McKendree Gwin, Calhoun Benham, and J. L. Brent, whom Sumner suspected of planning to join the Confederate envoys Mason and Slidell. Despite protests from the New Granada (later Panama) authorities against invasion of neutral territory, General Sumner conducted the arrested men across the isthmus and delivered them to Washington on Nov. 16, 1861.

Gwin, U.S. Senator from California (1850-61), had conspired for the Confederate cause in that state. Benham had been attorney-general for California during President Buchanan's administration. J. L. Brent is otherwise unidentifiable. JSM may have read the account of the incident in *The Times*, Dec. 2, 1861, p. 7, and in a *Times* leader of Dec. 5, 1861, p. 6, which bracketed it with the *Trent* affair.

[6.] William H. Seward (1803-1881), the American Secretary of State. See Letters 525, n. 10, and 540, n. 5.

[7.] In Jan., 1861, Chapman had been elected to the Victoria Legislative Assembly. He served there till Feb., 1862, when he became an acting judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

[8.] Henry Brewer Chapman (1841-1866), matriculated at Cambridge, Lent term, 1861; LL.B., 1864. Drowned in the wreck of the S.S. *London*, Jan. 11, 1866.

[9.] A Melbourne daily newspaper.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn. The portion in brackets and the name of the correspondent are on the MS in another hand.

Herman Merivale (1806-1874), under-secretary for India, 1859-74; prolific writer on colonial and economic questions.

[2.] The principal discoveries before 1862 were: California (1849), Australia (1851), and Nova Scotia (1861).

[3.] In the eighteen years after JSM's retirement in 1858 the export value of food grains from India nearly tripled. See Romesh Dutt, *The Economic History of India in the Victorian Age* (7th ed., London, 1950), p. 348.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] William John Blake (1805-1875), barrister; MP for Newport, 1837-41; member of the Club from 1835, and hon. secretary, 1854-65.

[3.] The proposal was adopted, and Cairnes was elected an honorary member.

[4.] *The Slave Power* (see Letters 504 and 517).

[5.] See Letter 525, n. 10.

[6.] "The Contest in America," *Fraser's*. LXV (Feb., 1862), 258-68; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., III, 179-205, Am. ed., I, 1-27. Two editions of a separate reprint were published in Boston, 1862.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, I, 252-54.

Célestin le Barbier de Blignières (1822-1905), positivist philosopher.

[2.] His *Exposition abrégée et populaire de la philosophie et de la religion positives* (Paris, 1857).

[3.] The extent of JSM's disagreement with Comte was made public in his later published *Auguste Comte and Positivism. Reprinted from the Westminster Review* (London, 1865).

[4.] See Letter 487, n. 2.

[5.] JSM and Helen Taylor left Avignon at the end of Jan. for a tour of Greece. They stayed there until June, then visited Smyrna, Constantinople, Vienna, and Switzerland, and returned to Avignon in Sept.

[1.] MS in 1969 in the possession of Professor Artine Artinian of Miami, Florida.

Louis Rey (d. ca. 1936 at the age of 99), pastor of the local Protestant church. Author of *John Stuart Mill en Avignon* (Vaison, 1921), and "The Romance of John Stuart Mill," *Nineteenth Century*, LXXIV (1913), 502-26, which was also published as *Le Roman de John Stuart Mill* (Paris, 1913). For further information on Rey, see Jules Véran, "Le Souvenir de Stuart Mill à Avignon," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XLI (Sept. 1, 1937), 211-22.

[1.] MS draft of last two paragraphs at Leeds. Published, except last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 254-56.

[2.] *L'Italia, la civiltà latina e la civiltà germanica* (Firenze, 1861).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in part in Elliot, I, 256-58.

[2.] Probably Auguste Picard, author of *Du Comptoir national d'escompte d'Avignon et des améliorations dont il est susceptible* (Avignon, 1850) and of other pamphlets, chiefly on economics and agriculture.

[3.] Léonce de Lavergne, *Economie rurale de la France depuis 1789* (Paris, 1860).
For JSM's use of this work, see *Principles*, p. 1122.

[4.] *Economie rurale*, p. 454, l. 11.

[5.] Charles John Canning, Earl Canning (1812-1862), governor-general of India and first viceroy, 1856-62.

Among the problems faced by Canning in the reorganization of the Indian government, was to increase European settlement in India. Most prospective settlers wanted land exempted from payment of land revenue, which was the chief base of the Government's income. Canning in Oct., 1861, proposed that a lump-sum payment of twenty times the annual assessment should be accepted in lieu of the annual levy. The plan was put into effect in Aug., 1862, and led to a considerable increase in settlement in India. See Michael Maclagan, *'Clemency' Canning* (London, 1962), p. 280.

[6.] See Letter 528, n. 6.

[7.] Unidentified.

[1.] MS in 1965 in the possession of Joseph H. Schaffner of New York.

[2.] See Letter 528, n. 6.

[3.] For the 5th editions of each book, both published in 1862.

[1.] MS at Pierpont Morgan Library.

John Nichol became the first occupant of the Chair of English Language and Literature at Glasgow. He was appointed in April, 1862, and delivered his inaugural address Nov. 17, 1862.

[2.] Sir George Grey.

[3.] James Moncreiff, later 1st Baron Moncreiff of Tulliebole (1811-1895).

[1.] MS in 1966 in the possession of M. Pierre-Sadi Carnot of Paris.

[2.] See next Letter, n. 11.

[3.] His translation of JSM's *Rep. Govt.*

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 528, n. 6.

[3.] This petition, designed to open university fellowships to Dissenters, was subsequently presented to the House of Commons by Edward Pleydell Bouverie on June 1, 1862, to repeal those provisions of the Act of Uniformity which required all

those admitted to fellowships at universities first to sign declarations of conformity with the liturgy of the Church of England. For details see D. A. Winstanley, *Later Victorian Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1947), pp. 42-47.

[4.] *Manual of Political Economy* (London and Cambridge, 1863), a popular book which went through eight editions.

[5.] Henry Fawcett, "On the Present Prospects of Co-operative Societies," *Macmillan's*, V (Feb., 1862), 335-342.

[6.] The 5th edition, 1862.

[7.] Fawcett probably attended the meeting of Nov. 21, 1861, at which Austen Henry Layard, MP for Southwark, reported to his constituents on the session of Parliament prorogued Aug. 6, 1861. Fawcett electioneered for this constituency from Nov. 10, 1860, to Dec. 8, but retired before going to the polls, when it became clear that Layard had more powerful Liberal support. At the meeting Layard defended the policy of neutrality pursued by the British government, but made clear his own sympathy for the United States in its struggle with the Confederacy. Layard's remarks were cheered. "Mr. Layard and His Constituents," *The Times*, Nov. 22, 1861, p. 10.

[8.] "Suggestions for the Improvement of our Representative System: the University Elections Act of Last Session," *Macmillan's*, V (Feb., 1862), 295-301.

[9.] "New South Wales," *The Times*, Feb. 17, 1862, p. 10.

[10.] George Kenyon Holden (1806-1874), emigrated to Australia, 1831; became a lawyer and a member of the Legislative Council, the upper house of the Parliament of New South Wales. See Letters 580, 592, and 1266.

[11.] On Feb. 12, 1862, the garrison of Nauplia, led by young officers, revolted. The uprising spread to Argos, Tyrus, and Acre, but was quickly suppressed except at Nauplia, which did not surrender until April 20. The revolt was a prelude to the Oct., 1862, revolution which overthrew the monarchy and established a provisional government.

[12.] King Otto, formerly Prince Otto of Bavaria, had been chosen king of Greece, after the kingdom was established by Great Britain, France, and Russia at the London Conference of 1832. Otto ruled from 1833 until 1862, and the provisional government of 1862-63 was replaced by the kingdom organized under the constitution of 1864. The British government chose as king Prince William George of Denmark, who ruled as George I.

[13.] Both Leslie and Cairnes were elected honorary members of the Political Economy Club in 1862. See Letter 544.

[14.] Rowland Williams (1817-1870), Anglican divine, had been prosecuted for heterodoxy in writing "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," one of the reviews in the controversial *Essays and Reviews* (1860). The hearing before the Arches Court of

Canterbury was held Dec. 19-21, 1861, and Jan. 7-16, 1862, but judgment was deferred until June 23, 1862. Williams was found guilty on three counts and was suspended for one year from his living at Broad Chalke, near Salisbury. The judgment was eventually reversed on Feb. 8, 1864, after an appeal to the judicial committee of the privy council.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt quoted by Hare in his paper on June 11 at the 1862 meeting of the NAPSS on “The Election of Representative or Governing Bodies by Exhaustive Majorities and Unanimous Quotas of the Constituencies,” NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1862 (London, 1863), pp. 110-12. The portion in brackets is Hare’s introduction to the excerpt.

[1.] MS at Yale.

[2.] See Letter 536.

[3.] Sir Thomas Wyse, minister to Greece, 1849-62, died in Athens on April 15. Miss Wyse was Winifred Mary, Sir Thomas’s niece.

[4.] Sphacteria or Sphagia, the island outside the harbour of Navarino, where the Spartans were surprised and signally defeated by the Athenians in 425

[5.] See Letter 536, n. 12.

[6.] *Sic.* Karl Gottlieb Wilhelm Bötticher (1806-1889), architect and archaeologist.

[7.] Ernst Curtius (1814-1896), archaeologist and historian.

[8.] George Finlay, the historian.

[9.] JSM wrote Villari on this same day, no doubt in part about Villari’s mission. The letter is listed in Villari’s letter of Feb. 9, 1874, to Helen Taylor (MS at LSE), but has not been located.

[10.] See Letter 184.

[11.] See Letter 286, n. 13.

[12.] Not identified.

[13.] Catherine Stanley (1792-1862). The notice of her death on March 5, 1862, is in *The Times*, Mar. 7, 1862, p. 9. Mrs. Stanley was the widow of Edward Stanley (1779-1849), bishop of Norwich, and mother of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley (1815-1881), later dean of Westminster.

[14.] See Letter 525, n. 8.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Last paragraph published in Elliot, I, 259, but dated as of June 11, 1862.

[2.] See Letter 536, n. 11.

[3.] American spiritualists in some numbers became fashionable among the English upper classes during the 1860's and 1870's. One of the spiritualists, a Mr. Forster (or Foster) was the subject of a news story, an editorial, and an angry letter in *The Times*, Mar. 13, p. 6, Mar. 15, p. 11, and Mar. 17, p. 12, 1862. For a general history see Frank Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism* (2 vols., London, 1902), esp. II, pp. 47-62. According to the latter, the American medium in question was named Foster rather than Forster.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of March 4, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] *The Slave Power* (London, 1862).

[3.] During the spring of 1862, Major General George McClellan's Army of the Potomac had some success in the Peninsular campaign, and Commodore David Farragut and Major General Benjamin Butler led the forces which captured New Orleans in April.

[4.] JSM's article "The Contest in America," *Fraser's*, LXV (Feb., 1862), 258-68, had been attacked in the *Economist* twice: "J. S. Mill on the American Contest," Feb. 8, 1862, pp. 143-45, and "Prospects of Slavery, as Affected by the Success of the North and South Respectively," Feb. 15, 1862, pp. 170-72. Cairnes defended JSM's views in a letter, "Negro Slavery and the American Civil War," *Economist*, March 1, 1862, pp. 231-32.

[5.] The dispatch dated Dec. 26, 1861, to Richard Lyons, 2nd Baron and 1st Earl Lyons, British minister to the United States. For the text, see Mountague Bernard, *A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War* (London, 1870), 201-13. See Letter 525, n. 10.

[6.] Charles Sumner (1811-1874), U.S. senator from Massachusetts, 1852-74.

[7.] "The Trent Case, and Maritime Rights," delivered in the Senate, Jan. 9, 1862. For the text, see *The Works of Charles Sumner* (15 vols., Boston, 1874), VI, 169-218.

[8.] Edward Antoine Thouvenel (1818-1866), minister of the Emperor for foreign affairs, 1860-62, in a dispatch dated Dec. 3, 1861, informed Henri Mercier, minister of the Emperor at Washington, of the French Government's disapproval of the invasion of neutrality by the seizure of Mason and Slidell. The dispatch was forwarded to William H. Seward, secretary of state. For the text, see Executive Documents, second session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress, 1861-1862, Senate, Executive Document No. 8, pp. 13-15.

[9.] Goldwin Smith (1823-1910), historian and publicist, published, in 1862 and 1863, a series of letters in the *Daily News* advocating independence for mature colonies. The letters were collected as *The Empire: A Series of Letters published in the Daily News, 1862, 1863* (Oxford and London, 1863).

[1.] MS at LSE. A MS copy of Cairnes's reply to this and to JSM's of June 15 is also at LSE.

[2.] *The Slave Power*.

[3.] The *Daily News* had already published three long review articles on Cairnes's book, "Professor Cairnes' Practical View of the American Case," on June 11, 14, and 17, 1862.

[4.] *Macmillan's* did not publish a review until the following Feb.: "The Wealth of Nations and the Slave Power," by a professor of political economy [T. E. Cliffe Leslie], VII (Nov., 1862-Apr., 1863), 269-76, reprinted in Leslie's *Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy* (Dublin and London, 1879), pp. 51-61.

[5.] A sympathetic review article, entitled "The Slave Power and the Secession War," appeared in the July, 1862, issue of the *National Review*, XV, 167-98.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Miss Harriet Mill / care of John Paterson Esq. The envelope has not gone through the post.

Harriet Isabella Mill, JSM's third sister (1812-1897).

[2.] James Bentham Mill, JSM's brother, who had been in the Indian civil service, had died of paraplegia on June 8, 1862, at Edinburgh, after a six months' illness. He had previously been living in the remote island of Unst, Zetland. The editors are indebted to Professor Anna J. Mill of Edinburgh for this information.

[3.] Dymock and Paterson, solicitors-at-law, 56 George St., Edinburgh.

[4.] Harriet was appointed executrix and heir.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 320.

[2.] Gomperz subsequently guided JSM and Helen around Vienna for several days, took him to a session of the *Reichstag*, introduced him to the American historian Motley, who was then ambassador to Austria, and accompanied them to Bad Ischl to escape the heat in the city.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 536, n. 14. For the judgment, see *The Times*, June 26, 1862, p. 9.

[3.] For a history of the Co-operative Cotton Mills, which were not as successful as JSM's comment implies, see Benjamin Jones, *Co-operative Production* (London, 1894), pp. 252-338.

[4.] *The Slave Power*.

[5.] See Letter 541, n. 5.

[6.] Henry Thomas Buckle died of typhus on May 29, 1862, at Damascus.

[7.] John Stuart Stuart-Glennie, author of *Pilgrim Memories, or Travel and Discussion in the Birth-Countries of Christianity with the late Henry Thomas Buckle* (London, 1875), a pretentious and misleading book about Buckle's trip to the Near East. See Giles St. Aubyn, *A Victorian Eminence* (London, 1958), pp. 89-90, 190-94. For Stuart-Glennie's account of his meeting with JSM in Athens, see his article "James and John Stuart Mill: Traditional and Personal Memorials," *Macmillan's*, XLV (April, 1882), 490-98.

[8.] See Letter 536, n. 4.

[9.] The NAPSS held its sixth annual meeting from June 5 to 13, 1862, in London. JSM may well have read the reports in *The Times*: June 6, 1862, p. 5; June 7, p. 11; June 9, p. 9; June 10, p. 9; June 12, p. 10; June 13, p. 6; June 14, p. 12.

[10.] JSM was referring to Hare's paper at the June, 1862, meeting of the NAPSS. See Letter 537. The discussion of Hare's paper is summarized in NAPSS, *Transactions*, London Meeting, 1862 (London, 1863), pp. 204-206.

[11.] Frances Power Cobbe (1822-1904), author and feminist, delivered a paper on "Female Education, and how it would be affected by University Examinations," published separately in London, 1862. The paper advocated the granting of university degrees to women. Other papers on women's problems were delivered, chiefly on the employment of women. See NAPSS, *Transactions*, pp. 808-13.

[12.] JSM was over optimistic. The London University opened its degrees to women in 1878, but Oxford did not admit women to full membership and degrees until 1920, and Cambridge not until 1948.

[13.] James (later Sir James) Fitzjames Stephen (1829-1894), writer, lawyer, judge; brother of Leslie Stephen. He became a member of the Political Economy Club in this year. His later published *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* (London, 1873) attacked many of JSM's doctrines, but in an obituary article (*Pall Mall Gazette*, May 10, 1873, pp. 1-2) he wrote of JSM, "When he died, one of the tenderest and most passionate hearts that ever set to work an intellect of iron was laid to rest."

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Sir Edward Cook, *The Life of Florence Nightingale* (2 vols., London, 1914), II, 26. The portion in brackets is Cook's introduction to the excerpt.

[2.] In the summer of 1862, Miss Nightingale obtained for private distribution to influential persons a large number of her "Observations . . . on the Evidence contained in Stational Returns sent to her by the Royal Commission on the Sanitary State of the Army in India." The "Observations" constitute 23 pages of the two-thousand-page *Indian Sanitary Commission's Report*, published in the following year. For an excellent account of Miss Nightingale's activities on behalf of improving sanitary conditions for the army in India, see Cook, II, 18-58.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] Chapman accepted the offer, and published JSM's essay, "The Slave Power," *WR*, n.s. XXII (Oct. 1862), 489-510. Reprinted in the American ed. of *Dissertations*, III, 264-99, but not in the British ed.

[3.] George Manwaring, a young businessman, was the publisher of the *WR* for Chapman in 1860-61. For his complicated financial dealings with Chapman, see Gordon S. Haight, *George Eliot and John Chapman* (New Haven, 1940), pp. 104-105 and 110-11.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS copy at LSE.

Henry Huth (1815-1878), banker and bibliophile; a friend of Buckle from 1857.

[2.] See Letter 544, n. 6.

[3.] Augusta Westenholz Huth (d.1899), wife of Henry Huth.

[4.] Edward Huth (1847-1935), and Alfred Henry Huth (1850-1910), the latter the biographer of Buckle—*Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle* (2 vols., London, 1880)—and a founder and one-time president of the Bibliographical Society. Edward and Alfred Henry had accompanied Buckle on his trip to the Near East during which he died.

[1.] MS at Mitchell Library, Sydney. *Envelope addressed: Angleterre / Henry Parkes Esq. / 390 Ashley Place / Bristol Road / Birmingham. Postmarks: AVIGNON / 2 / SEPT / 62, LONDON / SP / 4 / 62, and BIRMIN . . . /*

[1.] MS draft at Yale.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 546, n. 2.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Bears no indication of intended recipient. Published in Elliot, I, 259-61.

Probably Ebenezer R. Edger, associate of G. J. Holyoake in the promoting of the co-operative movement, writer for *The Secular World* and author of tracts on co-operation.

[2.] Elliot identifies this as a work entitled "Social Freedom." J. C. Rees in his *Mill and his Early Critics* (Leicester, 1956), p. 63, suggests that this may be the MS that has been mistakenly identified as by JSM. It was published in the *Oxford and*

Cambridge Review for June, 1907, and has been separately published as JSM's by Dorothy Fosdick, *On Social Freedom* (New York, 1941). The MS was sold at Avignon in May, 1905, and at the time of Rees's study was in the possession of Sir David Kelly. The evidence now appears conclusive that it is not by JSM. How it remained among his papers for over thirty years after his death has not been explained.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Strictly cash trading was one of the seven principles of the founders of the Rochdale Pioneer Society Store, which opened Dec. 21, 1844.

[3.] The 5th edition, 1862. See *Principles*, pp. 785-96.

[1.] MS not located. Part published in Gomperz, pp. 324-25, 326.

[2.] See Letter 546, n. 2.

[3.] The series ran from April to Sept., 1862: *Macmillan's*, V, 453-63; VI, 16-29, 138-53, 177-91, 284-97, 408-20.

[4.] JSM appears to have been wrong about the date of publication as a book; it was not published until April, 1863. It was dedicated, "by permission," to JSM.

[5.] Edward (later Sir Edward) Dicey (1832-1911), author and journalist. His *Rome in 1860* was published in 1861.

[6.] The cause of the North was faring badly at this point (Washington was threatened with capture), and *The Times* was predicting eventual victory for the South. JSM was perhaps referring to the comments on Lincoln's attitude towards slavery in "The Civil War in America," *The Times*, Sept. 8, 1862, p. 9.

[7.] At Aspromonte on Aug. 27 Garibaldi had been wounded and captured by the Italian government forces under the leadership of Enrico Cialdini. Garibaldi was soon liberated under an amnesty.

[8.] Urbano Rattazzi (1808-1873), Italian politician, had been prime minister of Italy since March, but was driven from office in Dec., 1862, because of the popular reaction against his treatment of Garibaldi at Aspromonte.

[9.] This is a reference to Gomperz's desire to become engaged to Helen Taylor, though that wish was as yet unknown to JSM. Gomperz read more encouragement into the postscript than might have been intended, and overlooked the fact that JSM did not mention his daughter at all.

[1.] MS once in the possession of Lady Charnwood and published in her *An Autograph Collection and the Making of It* (London, 1930), pp. 127-28; present location of the MS is unknown. Published in George W. Curtis ed., *The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley, D. C. L.* (2 vols., New York, 1889), II,

91-92.

John Lothrop Motley (1814-1877), American historian and diplomat; U.S. minister to Austria, 1861-67. JSM had met him in Vienna during the summer.

[2.] See preceding Letter, n. 3 and n. 4.

[3.] *Ibid.*, n. 4.

[4.] See Letter 546, n. 2.

[5.] The letter, dated July 1, 1862, appeared in *The Times*, July 22, 1862, p. 8, under the title "Mr. Thurlow Weed upon England."

Thurlow Weed (1797-1882), politician and journalist, had been a member of a quasi-official commission sent to England and France to gain sympathy and understanding for the North. In recognition of Weed's services to his country, the Common Council of New York upon his return in June, 1862, conferred upon him the freedom of the city. The letter referred to was Weed's acknowledgment of the honour. For details of the mission, see Thurlow Weed Barnes, *Memoir of Thurlow Weed* (Boston, 1884), pp. 348-417.

[6.] *England during our War* ([Boston ?] 1862), first published in the *New Englander*, XXI (July, 1862), 556-86, by Joseph Parrish Thompson (1819-1899), clergyman, author, and one of the founders of the *New Englander*.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] See Letter 546, n. 2.

[3.] This was eventually accomplished in 1870.

[1.] MS in 1943 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts.

[2.] Eugène Véron (1825-1889), author and journalist, reviewed Charles Dupont-White's translation (1862) of JSM's *Rep. Govt.* in the June, 1862, issue of *Journal des Economistes*, s. 2, XXXIV, 400-430.

[3.] *Usque ad Coelum. Thoughts on the Dwellings of People, Charitable Estates, Improvement and Local Government in the Metropolis* (London, 1862).

[4.] George Peabody (1795-1869), American-born banker and philanthropist, who between 1862 and 1868 gave £500,000 to a trust for the building of large blocks of flats for workers in various sections of London.

[5.] Hare's book (see n. 3 above) was favourably reviewed in the *London Review of Politics, Literature, Art and Society*, July 26, 1862, pp. 78-79, and in the *Nonconformist*, July 30, 1862, p. 661.

[6.] Antoine Morin (b.1800) wrote on Swiss historical and political subjects. The pamphlet referred to was probably *De la Représentation des Minorités* (Geneva, 1862), from which Hare published extracts as Appendix A of his *The Election of Representatives Parliamentary and Municipal* (3rd ed., London, 1865).

[7.] President Lincoln issued the proclamation of intention on Sept. 22, 1862; the Emancipation Proclamation on Jan. 1, 1863.

[1.] MS draft at King's. Published in Elliot, I, 263-66, and in Motley, II, 95-98.

[2.] At Vienna in the summer of 1862.

[3.] After the bloody battle of Antietam, Sept. 16-17, 1862.

[4.] See preceding Letter, n. 7.

[5.] Many of the governors met at Altoona, Pa., Sept. 24, 1862, two days after President Lincoln's issuing of the preliminary proclamation of the emancipation of slaves. An Address, which fifteen governors eventually signed, approving the proclamation, was forwarded to Lincoln. Of the fifteen who signed, only three had originally been Democrats—Tod of Ohio, Sprague of Rhode Island, and Salomon of Wisconsin. Among those not signing were the governors of Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, and Delaware—all border states. See William B. Hesseltine, *Lincoln and the War Governors* (New York, 1948), pp. 249-72.

[6.] The proclamations on emancipation promised compensation to the owners of slaves in such states.

[7.] For examples of anti-Proclamation writing in England, see *The Times*, Oct. 7, 1862, p. 9, Oct. 21, 1862, pp. 8 and 9, and *SR*, XIV (Oct. 11, 1862), 425-26 and 436-38.

[8.] See Letter 504, n. 2.

[9.] See Letter 554, n. 4 and n. 5.

[10.] Harriet Martineau, "The Brewing of the American Storm," *Macmillan's*, VI (June, 1862), 97-107.

[11.] John Malcolm Forbes Ludlow (1821-1911), reformer and Christian socialist, wrote anti-slavery articles for the *ER*, *Fraser's*, *Macmillan's*, the *Fortnightly*, and the *Contemporary Review*. In 1862 his book *A Sketch of the History of the United States from Independence to Secession* was published.

[12.] Thomas Hughes (1822-1896), novelist, Christian socialist, and politician, delivered two lectures at the Working Men's College on "The Struggle for Kansas," which were reprinted at the end of Ludlow's history of the United States.

[13.] The *Daily News*, consistently favourable to the North, in Nov. and Dec., 1862, published a correspondence between Cairnes and George M'Henry, which was reprinted as a book: *The Southern Confederacy and the African Slave Trade. The Correspondence between Professor Cairnes and George M'Henry*, introd. and notes by the Rev. G. B. Wheeler (Dublin, 1863).

[14.] See Letter 554, n. 3, and n. 10 above.

[15.] The *Morning Star*, Oct. 6, 1862, p. 4, called the Emancipation Proclamation "indisputably the great fact of the war—the turning point in the history of the American commonwealth . . . a gigantic stride in the paths of Christian and civilized progress."

[16.] "The American Belligerents: Rights of Neutrals," *WR*, n.s. XXI (Jan., 1862), 200-24.

[17.] *The London Review and Weekly Journal of Politics, Society, Literature, and Art* (1860-69), conducted by Charles Mackay. For its pro-Northern views, see Leonard Courtney's favourable review of Cairnes's *The Slave Power*, IV (June 14, 1862), 549-51; "The Recognition of the South," V (Oct. 18, 1862), 331-32, and "Southern Independence," V (Oct. 25, 1862), 355-56.

[18.] Thomas Ellison (1833-1904), expert on the cotton trade, whose *Slavery and Secession in America* appeared in London, 1861; a second enlarged edition, in 1862.

[19.] *Exchange*, a home and colonial monthly review of commerce, manufactures, and general politics, published in London, 1862-63.

[20.] JSM was mistaken. The article was written by François Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie d'Orléans (1818-1900), Prince de Joinville, uncle of the Comte de Paris: "Guerre d'Amérique—Campagne de l'Armée du Potomac (Mars-Juillet 1862)," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XLI (Oct. 15, 1862), 798-867, reprinted as a book in Paris, 1863, and transl. in New York, 1862, as *The Army of the Potomac*.

[21.] "The ignorance of the public was shared by the Foreign Minister, whose official attitude in reference to the contest has been everything which it ought to be, but who did unspeakable mischief by the extra-official opinion, so often quoted, that the Southern States are in arms for independence, the Northern for dominion," "The Slave Power," *WR*, n.s. XXII (Oct., 1862), 505. Lord John Russell, foreign secretary in Palmerston's cabinet from 1859 to 1865, at a banquet at Newcastle, on Oct. 14, 1861, said in part: ". . . and we now see two parties contending together, not upon the question of slavery though that, I believe, is the original cause of the conflict—not contending with respect to Free Trade and Protection, but contending as so many States of the Old World have contended, the one side for empire and the other for power." *Sp.*, Oct. 19, 1861, p. 1135.

[22.] On Oct. 7, 1862, at a banquet at Newcastle, W. E. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a long speech made this comment: "We may have our own opinions about slavery; we may be for or against the South; but there is no doubt that Jefferson

Davis and other leaders of the South have made an army; they are making it appears, a navy; and they have made a nation.” For details, see John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), II, 77-81, and Charles Francis Adams, “A Crisis in Downing Street,” *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, XLVII (1913-14), 372-424.

[23.] Nassau, in the Bahamas, was a trans-shipping port for all kinds of goods. Confederate agents there arranged for the shipment of goods to and from the Confederacy, the carriers being blockade runners. Under an Act of Congress, passed May 26, 1862, collectors at northern ports were authorized either to refuse clearance of vessels laden with goods that might be intended for the Confederacy, or to post bonds that the goods would be delivered to the destination on the bills of lading. See Mountague Bernard, *A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War*, pp. 300-306.

[24.] Queen Victoria issued the Proclamation of Neutrality on May 13, 1861.

[25.] The *Tuscarora*, a warship of the United States, attempted to blockade the *Nashville*, a warship of the Confederacy, in the port of Southampton. The *Tuscarora* was ordered to leave Southampton on Jan. 28, 1861. See Bernard, pp. 269-75.

[26.] The *Sumter*, a Confederate warship, eluded the *Iroquois*, a United States warship, on Nov. 23, 1861, when the *Sumter* left the port of St. Pierre, Martinique, in which the *Iroquois* had attempted to blockade her. See Bernard, pp. 275-82.

[27.] By a Proclamation, issued Dec. 4, 1861, signed by Queen Victoria, all exports of arms and materials of war were prohibited.

[28.] Major General Benjamin Franklin Butler (1818-1893), the United States commander in the captured city of New Orleans, issued on May 15, 1862, a general order which in part read: “when any female shall by word, gesture or movement, insult or show contempt for any officer or soldier of the United States, she shall be held liable to be treated as a woman of the town plying her vocation.”

[29.] Allegedly “Beauty and Booty” was the watchword given out by Sir Edward Michael Pakenham (1778-1815), commander of the British army at the battle of New Orleans, 1815, who was killed during the final, unsuccessful assault on the American entrenchments.

[30.] Allegedly one watchword for the uprising of June, 1848, against the Second Republic was: “Vainqueurs, le pillage—vaincus, l’incendie.” See the Marquis of Normanby, *A Year of Revolution, From a Journal kept in Paris in 1848* (2 vols., London, 1857), II, 55.

[31.] A reference to Napoleon’s Berlin Decrees of 1806 and the British Orders in Council of 1807. The intent of both measures was the same: to destroy the commerce of the opposing country. The British Orders in Council called for the landing of all American exports to Europe, except those to Sweden, in British ports and the payment

of duties upon them before their re-export. For details, see Paul Frischauer, *England's Years of Danger* (New York, 1938), pp. 177-81.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published in Elliot, I, 266-67.

Nikolai Platonovich Ogarev or Ogareff (1814-1877), poet, writer, and co-worker of Alexander Herzen, with whom he published, through the Free Russian Press, works that could not be published in Russia. He was in exile from 1856, living mostly in London and Geneva.

[2.] *Essai sur la situation russe. Lettres à un Anglais* (London, 1862).

[3.] JSM is probably referring to the emancipation of the serfs in 1855, the land reforms of 1861, and the judicial reforms of 1862.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to a letter of Nov. 28 from the Monastère du Bon Pasteur, Avignon (MS also at Yale), requesting an annual contribution of five francs.

Sister Marie de St. Elie, the superior of the order.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of July 8, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 558, n. 13.

[3.] "The American Revolution," *The Times*, Nov. 1, 1862, p. 11. The lecture was delivered at Metropolitan Hall, Dublin, Oct. 31, 1862. It was printed as *The Revolution in America* (Dublin, 1862), and reprinted in Cairnes's *Political Essays* (London, 1873), pp. 59-108.

[4.] See Letter 546, n. 2.

[5.] "The American Revolution," *ER*, CXVI (Oct., 1862), 549-94, in opposition to Cairnes' position and in part a direct criticism of *The Slave Power*. In his letter of July 8, 1862, Cairnes had said that Henry Reeves, editor of the *ER*, had not agreed with his conclusions. Cairnes also remarked: "I find that in some quarters a strong impression unfavourable to the designs of Northern Statesmen has been produced by some M.S. reports of conversations with Americans which have been circulated by Mr. Senior. The drift of these is to represent the Northern leaders as actuated purely by ambition, and as designing to employ slavery abolition (if they had recourse to this measure at all) merely as an expedient for welding together and consolidating the Federal Power over the whole American Continent—a result which is regarded with evident apprehension."

[6.] *The Wellesley Index* identifies the author not as Nassau Senior but as Sir Edmund Walker Head (1805-1868), statesman and art critic.

[7.] "Universal Suffrage in the United States, and its Consequences by a White Republican," *Fraser's*, LXVI (July, 1862), 21-31, an attack on universal suffrage as the cause of the difficulties in the United States. Cairnes called it "the worst

contribution to the discussion which I have seen.” Three other anti-Northern pieces, all by the same writer, appeared in Sept., Oct., and Nov., 1862. The writer was Hiram Fuller, an American self-exiled from New England because of his pro-Southern sympathies. See Waldo H. Dunn, *James Anthony Froude* (2 vols., Oxford, 1961-63), II, 332-35.

[8.] The editor, James Anthony Froude, was also currently publishing John Ruskin’s attacks on political economy, “Essays on Political Economy,” later collected as *Munera Pulveris*.

[9.] The question discussed was, “What kind of taxes are best adapted to a British colony in the situation of Canada at this time?”

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] The MS is dated *Blackheath, September 13, 1862*, but JSM was clearly at Avignon on that date. The letter is docketed in another hand, however, as Dec. 13, 1862, when JSM was at Blackheath.

[3.] Probably an article by Helen Taylor, perhaps “Greece and the Greeks,” *WR*, n.s. XXXIII (Jan., 1863), 183-202.

[1.] MS copy at UCL.

[2.] The reference is to the *Logic* (5th ed., 1862), Vol. II, Book III, chap. xxiii, “Of Approximate Generalizations, and Probable Evidence.” JSM in the 6th ed. (1865) added a footnote giving De Morgan credit for his suggestion (see 8th ed., II, 136 n.-137 n.; see also Letter 877, n. 3).

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 329.

[2.] Presumably *Hamilton*; cf. chap. xxi.

[3.] “The Contest in America.” The abstract by Gomperz has not been located.

[4.] The question sheet with JSM’s answers includes, first of all, a request for permission to mention on the title page of the translation of the *Logic* that it was done “with the consent and cooperation” of the author; this is followed by specific questions regarding the translation.

[5.] Gomperz planned a thorough study of a library of papyri found at Naples in 1803, brought to England by John Hayter, and deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. This plan marked the beginning of Gomperz’s great work *Griechische Denker: Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1893).

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Dec. 8, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] "England and America," *Daily News*, Nov. 27, 1862, p. 5. For Goldwin Smith's efforts on behalf of the North, see Elisabeth Wallace, *Goldwin Smith, Victorian Liberal* (Toronto, 1957), pp. 28-41.

[3.] A report of President Lincoln's message to Congress, Dec. 2, 1862, in which Lincoln recommended a Convention of the States to revise the Constitution, to provide for the emancipation of all slaves before 1900, to give compensation to slaveholders according to the census of 1860, unless the owners forfeited this right by rebellion. *The Times*, Dec. 16, 1862, p. 8.

[4.] A subscription for factory operatives out of work because of the cotton famine. *The Times*, Dec. 16, 1862, p. 9.

[5.] Presumably Max Kyllmann (1832-1867), a native of Germany who lived in Manchester, 1852-67, and was a founder of the Union and Emancipation Society. He was a friend of George Jacob Holyoake and was himself interested in co-operatives. See Letter 568.

[6.] The meeting was held Dec. 31, 1862, at Free Trade Hall, Manchester. See the *Liberator*, Jan. 23, 1863, p. 4. The *Liberator*, an abolitionist newspaper published in Boston, kept track of such meetings whether held in the United States or in England.

[7.] Newman was an ardent abolitionist, and became a member of the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society, organized in Jan., 1863.

[8.] Edward Hooson, a Manchester leader in the co-operative movement, was seconder of the resolution in support of the Emancipation Proclamation.

[9.] John C. Edwards, also a leader in the co-operative movement, moved the resolution in support of the Emancipation Proclamation at the meeting in Manchester (see n. 6 above) and served from Jan., 1863, until the dissolution of the society as one of the honorable secretaries of the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society. See Goldwin Smith, *The Civil War in America. An Address Read at the Last Meeting of the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society* (Manchester and London, 1866), p. 95.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Dec. 18, MS copy also at LSE, as is Cairnes's rejoinder of Dec. 23, 1862.

[2.] In his letter of Dec. 18 Cairnes asked permission to use a suitable quotation, identified as by JSM, from his review (see Letter 546, n. 2) of *The Slave Power*, for advertising the second and enlarged edition (London, 1863). The advertisement was to be placed in a blank page of a new edition of Cairnes's lecture, published as *The Revolution in America*. The lecture, which went through seven editions in 1863, was widely circulated through emancipation societies in England.

[3.] "The Policy of a Negro Army for the North," *Sp.*, Dec. 13, 1862, pp. 1377-78.

[4.] See Letter 561, n. 3.

[5.] See n. 2 above.

[1.] MS draft (incomplete) at LSE. Part published in Elliot, I, 267-68.

[2.] This memoir on land taxation in Greece has not been found, but for Finlay's opinions, see his *A History of Greece* (7 vols., Oxford, 1877), VII, 243-47.

[3.] Peter Campbell Scarlett (1804-1881), diplomat, appointed envoy extraordinary to Greece in June, 1862.

[4.] The draft ends here. Prince Alfred (1844-1900), second son of Queen Victoria, was elected King by the people of Greece, but could not accept because the three protecting powers had agreed to exclude any member of their ruling families.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 268-69.

[2.] For a probable quotation from one of these letters, see Letter 565.

[3.] See *ibid.*, n. 6.

[4.] Two resolutions and an address to President Lincoln were passed at the meeting at Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on Dec. 31, 1862. The objectionable phrase "rights of husbands" was not struck. The resolutions and the address are printed in the *Liberator*, Jan. 23, 1863, p. 4. The address has been reprinted in Belle Becker Sideman and Lillian Friedman, eds., *Europe looks at the Civil War* (New York, 1960), pp. 198-201.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 269-70.

Joseph (later Sir Joseph) Napier (1804-1882), Irish Protestant lawyer, lord chancellor of Ireland (1858-59). Author of two volumes of *Lectures on Butler's Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (Dublin, 1864).

[2.] William Fitzgerald, bishop of Killaloe (1814-1883), published two editions of Butler's *Analogy*; Dublin, 1849, and London and Dublin, 1860.

[3.] *Logic*, Book III, chap. xxv. In the 7th ed. (1868) JSM added an explicit reference to Butler; see 8th ed., II, 175. See also Letter 582, n. 2.

[4.] George Campbell (1719-1796), professor of divinity at Marischal College, author of *Dissertation on Miracles; containing an examination of the principles advanced by David Hume, Esq.: in an Essay on Miracles* (Edinburgh, 1762, and many later editions). JSM refers to Campbell on miracles in his "Theism"; see *Collected Works*, X, 470.

[5.] Napier quoted this paragraph in his lecture, "Analysis of Bishop Butler's Argument on Presumption Against Miracles," reprinted in *The Lectures, Essays and Letters of the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, Bart.* (Dublin and London, 1888), pp. 416-17.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester, as is also part of a copy of Holyoake's letter of Dec. 26, to which this is a reply.

[2.] William Coningham (1815-1884), MP for Brighton, 1857-64, and a cousin of John Sterling.

[3.] Either Manfred G. Holyoake or Malthus Holyoake.

[4.] Sir Henry Bouverie Brand, later 1st Viscount Hampden and 23rd Baron Dacre (1814-1892), politician, then parliamentary secretary to the Treasury. Holyoake in his letter of Dec. 26 had said that Coningham had agreed to recommend the son to Brand.

[5.] Sir James Stansfeld (1820-1898), politician, liberal MP for Halifax, 1859-95.

[6.] Sir Charles Wood, then secretary of state for India.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed:* Mrs Huth / 12 Sussex Place / Regent's Park / N.W. *Postmark:* LONDON SE / 4 / DE 30 / 62.

[2.] See Letter 548, n. 4.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published with omissions in Elliot, I, 271-74.

[2.] Sir William Hamilton (1788-1856), professor of logic and metaphysics at the University of Edinburgh, 1836-56, in his day the leading philosopher of the "Idealist" school in Britain. The works of Hamilton with which JSM was chiefly concerned were: *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform, chiefly from the Edinburgh Review* (Edinburgh, 1852); *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic*, eds., H. L. Mansel and J. Veitch (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1859-60); and his edition of *The Works of Thomas Reid . . .* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1846).

[3.] *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy and of the Principal Philosophical Questions Discussed in his Writings* (London, 1865), hereafter cited as *Hamilton*.

[4.] *Hamilton*, chaps. x, xi, xii.

[5.] Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854).

[6.] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831).

[7.] Henry Longueville Mansel (1820-1871), metaphysician, theologian, Oxford professor, follower of Sir William Hamilton. His *The Limits of Religious Thought* (Oxford and London, 1858) was delivered as the Bampton Lectures for 1858. Mansel reciprocated JSM's dislike; he thought JSM's teaching "utterly mischievous."

[8.] James Frederick Ferrier, *Institutes of Metaphysic, the Theory of Knowing and Being* (Edinburgh and London, 1854). See Letter 194.

[9.] Herbert Spencer, *First Principles* (London, 1862), Part I, chap. iv, “The Relativity of all Knowledge.” For JSM’s summary of his controversy with Spencer on these matters, see *Logic* (8th ed.), I, 301 ff. (III, vii).

[10.] Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Psychology* (London, 1855), Part I.

[11.] “The Persistence of Force,” *First Principles*, Part II, chap. viii.

[12.] According to Bain, Grote most cogently discussed the relativity of knowledge in his “Aristotle on the Origin of Knowledge,” a work not published until it appeared in Bain’s *Mental and Moral Science* (London, 1868), Appendix pp. 33-44. See preface to 3rd ed., p. 4. See also *The Minor Works of George Grote*, ed. A. Bain (London, 1873), 117.

[13.] *Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates* (3 vols., London, 1865).

[14.] In *Plato*, II, chap. xxvi.

[15.] *Homo Mensura*, discussed in *Plato*, II, chap. xxvi.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Mrs Huth / 12 Sussex Place / Regent’s Park / N.W. *Postmark*: LONDON S. / JA 7 / 63. See also Letters 548 and 571.

[2.] Edward Huth eventually went to Exeter College, Oxford, B.A. 1871, M.A. 1877; Alfred Henry Huth, to Rugby and the University of Berlin.

[3.] Benjamin Jowett.

[4.] Thomas Hewitt Key (1799-1875), Latin scholar, joint headmaster, 1833-42, headmaster, 1842-75, of University College School.

[5.] In letters written by Buckle on his trip to the Near East in 1861-62 accompanied by Mrs. Huth’s sons. A portion of one of these letters may be found in Alfred Henry Huth, *Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle* (2nd ed., 2 vols., London, 1880), II, pp. 130-34.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Dec. 23, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] In his letter to JSM, Cairnes had quoted from a letter he had received from Goldwin Smith, who gave permission for the use of his name as the author of the letter signed “Anglo-Saxon” in the *Daily News* of Nov. 27, 1862. See Letter 565, n. 2.

[3.] See Letter 566, n. 3.

[4.] In the *Daily News*, Dec. 18, 1862, p. 4, in an article entitled “The Southern Confederacy and the African Slave Trade,” Cairnes answered the pro-South arguments of “The Migration of Slavery,” in *SR*, Dec. 13, 1862, 706-707.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in the *Co-operator*, III, No. 36 (Feb., 1863), 145. See also Letter 680.

Henry Pitman (1826-1909), journalist, and editor of the *Co-operator*, which was published in London and Manchester, 1860-71.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Henry Reeve, nephew of Sarah Austin, was clearly JSM's choice as an intermediary between himself and her. He had been estranged from her since 1848, partly because of differing opinions on the French Revolution of 1848 but mainly because of presumed slights to his wife.

[2.] The lectures John Austin delivered 1829-33 while holding the chair of Jurisprudence and the Law of Nations at London University. Austin had published six of these lectures as *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (London, 1832). JSM is referring to the proof sheets of the 2nd edition, also bearing that title, but including a great many more lectures, all that Sarah Austin was able to edit and arrange from the notes Austin left. See John Austin, *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (2nd ed., 3 vols., London, 1861-63). Vols. II and III carry the title *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. See also Letter 442.

[3.] Lecture XL was first published in the third edition, the title of the work with this edition being changed: John Austin, *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (3rd ed., revised and edited by Robert Campbell, 2 vols., London, 1869). In a headnote to Lecture XL, in Vol. III, Campbell acknowledged that the notes for Lecture XL and for the latter portion of Lecture XXXIX on codification had been supplied by JSM in response to the appeal in the text of the 2nd edition and referred to by JSM in this letter to Reeve.

[4.] Incorporated in the 3rd edition as part of Lecture XXXIX. See n. 3 above.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See preceding Letter, n. 2 and n. 3.

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 4.

[1.] MS at Cornell. Possibly addressed to Peter Alfred Taylor (1819-1891), mercer and manufacturer, MP for Leicester, 1862-84, with whom JSM corresponded later. Taylor was a member of the executive committee of the London Emancipation Society.

[2.] Probably the very large meeting, sponsored by the London Emancipation Society, which was held at Exeter Hall on Jan. 29, 1863. A resolution expressing gratification that Lincoln had issued the Emancipation Proclamation on Jan. 1, 1863, was passed. See *The Times*, Jan. 30, 1863, p. 7, and the *Liberator*, Feb. 20, 1863, p. 31.

[3.] A deputation, including Taylor, from the executive committee of the London Emancipation Society called on Charles Francis Adams (1807-1886), U.S. minister to

England, 1861-67. Adams replied to speeches congratulatory upon the Emancipation Proclamation by saying, in part, "I am very much encouraged by the circumstance that there is growing here, and in Europe generally, a better conception than has heretofore prevailed of the principles involved in the struggle." *The Times*, Jan. 17, 1863, p. 9.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 274-76.

[2.] *On the Received Text of Shakespeare's Dramatic Writings and its Improvement* (London, 1862). A second volume was published in 1866.

[3.] *Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (London, 1863), the third volume of a series of which vol. I was published in 1855, and vol. II in 1858.

[4.] "M. Comte on Psychology," *Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, III, 1-13. See Auguste Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive*, I (Paris, 1830), 35-38.

[5.] *Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, III, 14-27.

[6.] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-192.

[7.] *Ibid.*, pp. 193-241.

[8.] *Utilitarianism*. See Letter 508, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See Letter 536, n. 10.

[3.] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, Nov. 14, 1862, carried an account of a debate in the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales on the second reading of a bill to change the method of selecting members of the Legislative Council, the upper house. Hare's plan for plural voting was presented as an effective means of electing the Council, which, composed of men with high property qualifications, was organized as an elite chamber. The Bill was passed on the second reading, but was discharged on Nov. 26. Hare in his *The Election of Representatives* (3rd ed., London, 1865) excerpted in Appendix F, pp. 317-23, those portions of the debate which concerned his plan.

[4.] William Forster (1818-1882), Premier and Colonial Secretary, 1859-60.

[5.] Robert Crichton Wyllie (1798-1865), minister for foreign relations for the kingdom of Hawaii, 1845-65.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Motley, II, 111-16, and, except for first paragraph, in Elliot, I, 276-81.

[2.] As a result of Thomas Jefferson's work as a legislator and governor of Virginia, 1776-81, entail was abolished, religious freedom guaranteed, and the State Church, once a branch of the Church of England, was disestablished.

[3.] The *Alabama*, a Confederate privateer which was built at Liverpool and escaped detention by leaving on July 28, 1862, while presumably on a trial run, was at the time of the letter still preying on United States merchant shipping.

[4.] The Federal army under Major General William Rosecrans repulsed the Confederate army under General Braxton Bragg at Murfreesboro, Tenn., on Jan. 2, 1863.

[5.] The Confederate forces surrendered Vicksburg, Miss., on July 4, 1863, to General U. S. Grant.

[6.] By July 16, 1863, the Mississippi River was under the control of the Federal forces from St. Louis to New Orleans, and Arkansas and Texas were thereby cut off from the other states of the Confederacy.

[7.] The Missouri Convention, part of the provisional government for the state during the Civil War, passed an ordinance freeing the slaves, which was approved by the Governor on July 1, 1863. For details, see Edwin C. McReynolds, *Missouri; A History of the Crossroads State* (Norman, Okla., 1962), pp. 260-63.

[8.] See Letter 557, n. 7.

[9.] Charles Francis Adams, then Minister to England.

[10.] See Letters 565, n. 2 and 574, n. 2.

[11.] William Whewell.

[12.] See the leaders, *The Times*, Jan. 6, p. 8, and Jan. 24, 1863, p. 6, and the articles entitled "The Civil War in America," *The Times*, Jan. 3, p. 7, Jan. 14, p. 9, and Jan. 15, 1863, p. 9.

[13.] In the *SR*, see the following, "American Prospects," Jan. 3, pp. 5-6; "The Church and Mr. Lincoln," Jan. 3, pp. 16-17; "America," Jan. 10, pp. 34-35; "America," Jan. 17, pp. 67-68; "Carnival of Cant," Jan. 24, 1863, pp. 98-99.

[14.] On Saturday, Jan. 17, 1863; it was reported in the *Daily News*, Jan. 19, p. 3.

[15.] James Spence (b. 1816), a Liverpool merchant, author of the pro-Confederacy *The American Union* (London, 1861), unsuccessfully opposed at the Liverpool meeting on Jan. 17 a resolution of sympathy with the federal government for issuing the Emancipation Proclamation.

[16.] Thomas Milner Gibson (1806-1884), from 1859 to 1866 president of the Board of Trade, delivered a pro-Northern speech to his constituents, in Town Hall, Ashton, Jan. 21, 1863; reported in *The Times*, Jan. 22, 1863, p. 9, and commented upon in a leader, *The Times*, Jan. 23, 1863, p. 8.

[17.] George Douglas Campbell, 8th Duke of Argyll (1823-1900), spoke in denunciation of the southern bishops of the Episcopal Church of America for denying Christianity to Negroes, at a meeting of the National Bible Society of Scotland in Edinburgh, Jan. 20, 1863. See *The Times*, Jan. 22, 1863, p. 10.

[18.] See Letter 561, n. 3.

[19.] *The Slave Power* (new and enlarged edition, with new preface, London, 1863).

[20.] In the preceding year, 1862, *The Times* had published leaders on competitive examinations for the civil service on March 22, April 3, 19, and 21, and Sept. 19.

[21.] Favourable leaders on the Revised Educational Code appeared almost daily in *The Times* between Feb. 13 and March 27, 1862.

[22.] Alexander James Beresford Hope (1820-1887), publisher of the *Saturday Review* from 1855, and author of the following pro-Southern works: *A Popular View of the American Civil War* (London, 1861); *England, the North and the South* (London, 1862); *The Results of the American Disruption* (London, 1862); he also was chairman of the Southern Independence Association, organized Jan., 1864.

[23.] A John Patterson replied “with much eloquence and force” to James Spence at the Liverpool meeting (see n. 14 and n. 15 above, and *Daily News*, Jan. 19, 1863, p. 3).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 281-82, except for last two sentences of last paragraph.

[2.] See Letter 569. Chap. ii of Part II of the *Analogy* is entitled “Of the supposed Presumption against a Revelation, considered as miraculous”; it includes a note on “The Improbability of Miracle.” For JSM’s argument, see *Logic* (8th ed.), II, 173-75 (III, xxv, 4); “Theism,” in *Collected Works*, X, 470 ff.; and JSM’s note to his edition of Bentham’s *Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, I, 137.

[1.] MS not located. Extract published in the *Co-operator*, III, No. 38 (April, 1863), p. 179.

Wilson, not otherwise identified, was president of the association named in the letter.

[1.] MS draft (incomplete) at LSE. All but last paragraph published in Elliot, I, 282-83.

[2.] For the throne of Greece. The previous year, King Otto, who had ruled since 1832, was deposed. Ernst II (1818-1893), Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha since 1844, did not gain the Greek throne. Instead, later in 1863, the second son of the Crown Prince of Denmark, Prince William George (1845-1913), became George I of Greece.

[3.] See Letter 567, n. 4.

[4.] Leopold I (1790-1865) had been King of Belgium since 1831. He had refused the throne of Greece in 1830.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 283-84, in John Rae, *The Sociological Theory of Capital*, ed. Charles Whitney Mixter (New York, 1905), pp. xxxiv-xxxv, and in R. Warren James, *John Rae* (see n. 3 below), I, pp. 462-63.

[2.] John Rae, the political economist.

[3.] “Thoughts on the System of Legislation which has prevailed in the Hawaiian Islands for the last forty years; on the evils that have arisen from it; and on the possible remedies for these evils,” originally published in six instalments in the *Polynesian* for Feb. 2, 9, 16, March 16, 30, and April 20, 1862; reprinted in R. Warren James, *John Rae, Political Economist. An account of his life and a compilation of his main writings* (2 vols. Toronto, 1965), I, 327-67.

[4.] “Polynesian Languages,” originally published in three instalments in the *Polynesian* for Sept. 27, Oct. 4 and 11, 1862, and reprinted in R. W. James, *John Rae*, pp. 368-99. The article was addressed to Wyllie.

[5.] Friedrich Max Müller (1823-1900), orientalist and philologist, professor at Oxford, 1854-1900. R. W. James notes (p. 119) that JSM’s suggestion may have been followed, for Müller made some observations on Rae’s article in his *Lectures on the Science of Language*, second series (London, 1864), pp. 10-11.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Feb. 4, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] George William Curtis (1824-1892), American man of letters and friend of Emerson. As editor of *Harper’s Weekly*, he pursued a vigorous anti-slavery policy. His letter to Cairnes of Jan. 18, 1863, is at NLI.

Curtis had been “the first trans-atlantic reader” of Cairnes’s *The Slave Power*, having happened to be at Harper’s when the book arrived from London. He wrote Cairnes in a letter of Nov. 16, 1862 (now at NLI): “no work that we have seen sets forth so clearly & calmly as yours the nature and operation of the slave system and its vital relations to our political development. We all delight to acknowledge our debt to Mr. Mill, Mr. Forster and a few more in England, and M. Gasparin and M. Laboulaye in France; but no one has rendered us and our cause, which is simply the old British cause of Liberty under Law, so signal and permanent a service as you.” Quoted in Adelaide Weinberg, *John Elliot Cairnes and the American Civil War* (London, 1970), p. 52.

[3.] These meetings were held “to express approval of and sympathy with the Anti-Slavery policy of President Lincoln and the Federal Government of the United States of America.” The largest meeting filled Exeter Hall and the surrounding streets on Jan. 29, 1863. The preceding Liverpool meeting was held in the Music Hall on Jan. 19; the Leeds meeting on Feb. 4; the Bradford meeting at St. George’s Hall on Jan. 29

(the same night as the Exeter Hall meeting), and the meeting in Bristol at Broadmead-Rooms on Jan. 28.

[4.] On Dec. 31, 1862, there had been a meeting in Manchester at the Free Trade Hall for the purpose of sending a letter approving President Lincoln's emancipation of the slaves. On Feb. 9, 1863, Abel Heywood, the mayor of Manchester, received through Charles Francis Adams, American Minister to England, an enthusiastic reply from the President, but there is no record of a meeting organized "on the receipt of Lincoln's answer to the Manchester address." See Letter 588, n. 9.

[5.] Robert Hutchinson was mayor of Liverpool at this time (*The Times*, Oct. 31, 1862); he was replaced by C. Mozley later in 1863 (*The Times*, Nov. 11, 1863).

[6.] Dr. Simon F. Bernard (1817-1862), a French exile living in London, manufactured the bombs which were used in an attempt to assassinate Emperor Louis Napoleon in Paris on Oct. 14, 1858. Though the emperor escaped injury, two persons were killed. Felice Orsini and several of his conspirators were convicted of murder and executed in France. Pressure was brought upon the English government by France to try Dr. Bernard for murder. His trial, which began on April 12, 1858, at the Central Criminal Court in London, ended with his acquittal on April 17, even though his active participation in the plot was evident. The British jury clearly resented the interference of France. *The Times* on April 19 criticized the jury's verdict, but on the very next day questioned the validity of the trial and praised the jury's decision. See M. St. J. Packe, *The Bombs of Orsini* (London, 1957).

[7.] About the time of King William IV's dismissal of the Whig government in Nov., 1834.

[8.] Thomas (later Sir Thomas) Bazley (1797-1885), cotton spinner and merchant; MP for Manchester, 1858-80.

[1.] MS draft (possibly incomplete) at LSE. Published, with errors and omissions, in Elliot, I, 284-87.

[2.] See Letter 572, n. 8.

[3.] *First Principles*, Part I "The Unknowable."

[4.] Sec. II, "The Agnoiology, or Theory of Ignorance." Proposition I. "Ignorance is an intellectual defect, imperfection, privation, or shortcoming."

[5.] For the first time as a separate volume. See Letter 508.

[6.] Sir Charles Lyell, *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with remarks on theories of the origin of species by variation* (London, 1863).

[7.] Emile Littré, *Auguste Comte et la philosophie positive* (Paris, 1863).

Littre (1801-1881), scholar, philosopher, lexicographer, and one of Comte's most ardent disciples.

[8.] *History of Greece*. A new edition. 1862.

[9.] *Methods of Debate, an Address to the Aberdeen University Debating Society* (Aberdeen, 1863).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 287-89.

[2.] For proportional representation.

[3.] The Co-operative Shareholders' Relief Committee of the Haslingden Union sought to aid workingmen who had invested in new co-operative mills and were therefore refused relief by local authorities. All of Lancashire was in distress because of the cotton famine brought on by the Civil War in America. See Letter 568. The *Bury Times* for Jan. 24, 1863, carries a letter and an advertisement from the Relief Committee.

[4.] Charles Bradlaugh (1833-1891), free-thought advocate and politician; proprietor and editor of the *National Reformer*; JSM's later support for him in his campaign for election to Parliament in 1868 contributed to JSM's defeat that same year.

[5.] The Anthropological Society of London was just being organized; it held its first meeting on Feb. 24, 1863. It began publication this year of six volumes of papers and of the *Anthropological Review*, which continued until 1870, when the Society merged with the Ethnological Society to form the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.

[6.] The Ethnological Society published a *Journal*, 1848-56, and *Transactions*, 1861-69.

[7.] Richard (later Sir Richard) Francis Burton (1821-1890), explorer, scholar, and writer, especially known for his books of travel in Africa and the Orient.

[8.] Luke Burke (d. 1885), editor of the *Ethnological Journal*, 1848-49, 1854, and 1865-66.

[9.] To the Manchester resolution (see Letter 586, n. 4). For the text of his "Letter to the Workingmen of Manchester, England," see Abraham Lincoln, *Complete Works*, ed. J. G. Nicolay and John Hay (2 vols., New York, 1894), II, 301-302.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Probably "Work and Wages," *Coventry Herald*, Feb. 13, 1863, p. 5.

[3.] William Brownsword Chorley, *A Handybook of Social Intercourse. Political Economy for the Million* (London, 1862).

[1.] MS not located. Published in *Daily News*, Feb. 24, 1863, p. 7, and in *SR*, XV (March 7, 1863), p. 302, in an article, "Mr. Mill on America," attacking JSM's support of the North; also in the *Liberator*, March 20, 1863, p. 47, and the *New York Times*, March 13, 1863, p. 8.

[2.] At a dinner held Monday, Feb. 23, 1863, at St. James's Hall, London, attended by about 120 persons. Among others, Charles Francis Adams, the American Minister, spoke, and JSM's letter was read. See the *Daily News* and the *New York Times* as cited in n. 1.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 289-90.

Charles Amos Cummings (1833-1905), an architect of Boston, Mass.

[2.] The number contained an article on "The Later Writings of John Stuart Mill," *Christian Examiner*, LXXIV (Jan., 1863), 1-43, a review of *On Liberty, Rep. Govt., Dissertations*, and "The Contest in America."

[3.] JSM was editor of *WR* after its merger with his *London Review* in 1836, and proprietor from 1837 to 1840.

[1.] MS in the possession of W. Rosenberg, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Published in R. S. Neale, "John Stuart Mill and Australia: a Note," *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, XIII (April, 1968), 244-45.

[2.] See Letter 580.

[3.] William Ellery Channing (1780-1842), leading Unitarian clergyman and writer, long-time editor of the *Christian Examiner*.

[4.] In the review (p. 31) of JSM's writings (see preceding Letter, n. 2).

[5.] See Letter 544, n. 6.

[6.] JSM finally had a photograph taken in the summer of 1865 (see Letters 846 and 862).

[7.] See Letter 526, n. 8.

[1.] MS at Yale.

William James Linton (1812-1898), wood-engraver, political reformer, printer, and poet. Born in London, Linton died in the United States, to which he emigrated in Nov., 1866.

[2.] A meeting on Feb. 27 of sympathizers with the cause of the Polish insurrection, to establish the Central Polish Committee, which would arrange for a public meeting. See report of the meeting in *Daily Telegraph*, Feb. 28, 1863, p. 5, and the letter of W. E. Adams, secretary of the Committee, in *The Times*, Feb. 28, 1863, p. 12. A public

meeting, apparently under different sponsorship, was held at the Guildhall on March 17, as reported in *The Times*, March 18, p. 10.

[1.] MS draft and MS copy at Northwestern. Published, except for last sentence, in Duncan, I, 141-42. In reply to a protest from Spencer (letter of Feb. 24, MS at Northwestern) at being classed as an Anti-utilitarian in JSM's *Utilitarianism*; Spencer prints most of his own letter in his *Autobiography* (2 vols., New York, 1904), II, 100-102, and Alexander Bain printed the same passages in his *Mental and Moral Science* (3rd ed., London, 1872), pp. 721-22.

[2.] The note was added, near the end of chap. 5 (see next Letter), and is always included in reprints; it reads, in part, "Mr. Herbert Spencer, in a private communication, objects to being considered an opponent of Utilitarianism, and states that he regards happiness as the ultimate end of morality; but deems happiness only partially attainable by empirical generalizations from the observed results of conduct, and completely attainable only by deducing, from the laws of life and the conditions of existence, what kinds of action necessarily tend to produce happiness, and what kinds to produce unhappiness. With the exception of the word 'necessarily,' I have no dissent from this doctrine. . . ."

[1.] MS draft at Northwestern. In reply to Spencer's letter of Feb. 25, also at Northwestern. Spencer's reply of Mar. 1 is in Duncan, I, 142.

[2.] Of his *Utilitarianism*.

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 2.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] "To the Editor of the Penny Newsman," signed J.S.M., *Penny Newsman*, March 15, 1863, p. 9. The letter sought to correct some misapprehensions about the Polish revolution found in an article "The Polish Insurrection," *Penny Newsman*, March 8, 1863, p. 1. JSM believed the movement in Poland to be popular, not aristocratic in origin, and intended to bring genuine reforms in government and land policy.

[3.] "Greece," *Penny Newsman*, March 22, 1863, p. 1, expresses hope that the final result of the recent revolution "will be the establishment of a good and popular government."

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[3.] In his introduction to JSM's letter Chadwick complied with this request.

[4.] JSM had written: "The Insurrectionary Committee have entered into a public engagement that the land . . . shall be given absolutely . . . to the peasants who have hitherto tilled it; and that the landowners shall receive compensation at the cost of the State. . . ."

“If you would inquire what is thought and felt by the Editors of the *Bell*, Mr. Herzen and Mr. Ogareff, who by their newspaper, clandestinely circulated at St. Petersburg, are already shaking the whole fabric of Russian despotism . . . you will no longer mistake one of the most unanimous and profoundly popular political manifestations in history for a class movement to perpetuate the domination of an aristocracy.”

[1.] MS at the Royal Library, Copenhagen.

Jones has not been identified.

[2.] Alexander Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea: its origin and an account of its progress down to the death of Lord Raglan* (8 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1863-87). The first two volumes had been published on Jan. 17, 1863.

[3.] *An Inquiry into the Theories of History, with special reference to the principles of Positive Philosophy* (London, 1862).

[1.] MS at Iowa State Dept. of History and Archives.

[2.] Presumably for *Utilitarianism*, published in May by Parker’s firm.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] See Letter 587, n. 7.

[3.] Eventually published as “The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte,” *WR*, n.s. XXVII (April, 1865), 339-405; and “Later Speculations of Auguste Comte,” *WR*, n.s. XXVIII (July, 1865), 1-42. The two articles were republished by Trübner as a volume entitled *Auguste Comte and Positivism* (London, 1865), reprinted in *Collected Works*, X, 261-368.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, p. 336.

[2.] Theodor Gomperz intended to translate *Utilitarianism*, but his plan was never carried out. The book was ultimately translated by Dr. Adolf Wärmund, under the supervision of Gomperz.

[1.] MS at UCL. The year is pencilled in in another hand.

[2.] Probably Nassau Senior’s recently published *Biographical Sketches* (London, 1863).

[3.] Prince Petr Vladimirovich Dolgoroukov (1807-1868), Russian writer. JSM may be referring either to *La Vérité sur la Russie* (Paris, 1860) or to *Des Réformes en Russie; suivi d’un aperçu sur le système électif en Russie et sur les États Généraux russes au XVIe et XVIIe siècles* (Paris, Bruxelles, 1862).

[4.] This appears not to have been published in the *Penny Newsman*.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably the long letter from America in the *Daily News*, March 10, 1863, pp. 5-6. The correspondent was probably Edwin Lawrence Godkin (1831-1902), later best known as editor of the *Nation*.

[3.] William E. Forster (1818-1886), MP for Bradford, 1861-86, spoke in Parliament on Friday, March 27, 1863. *The Times* the next day (p. 3) reported that Forster called the attention of the Government “to the danger to our friendly relations with the United States, resulting from the fitting out in our ports of ships of war for the service of the self-styled Confederate States, in contravention of the Foreign Enlistment Act and the policy of neutrality adopted by this country.”

[4.] *The Times* of Friday, March 27, 1863, p. 12, reported the meeting of the previous evening and noted that JSM was “present on the platform.”

[5.] The professorship of political economy, which had been held by George Pryme (1781-1868) from 1828 to 1863. There were four candidates: Henry Fawcett, Joseph Bickersteth Mayor (1847-1916) of St. John’s; Leonard H. Courtney, also of St. John’s; and Henry Dunning MacLeod (1821-1902) of Trinity. Fawcett was elected.

[6.] His *Manual of Political Economy* (see Letter 613).

[7.] No question by Cairnes appears to have been discussed at the Political Economy Club until the meeting of June 2, 1865 when the question was: “What is the true relation of Money to the rate of Interest?” At the March 27, 1863, meeting the question discussed was by JSM: “What is the best definition of Productive and Unproductive Labour, and of Productive and Unproductive Consumption?”

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 559, n. 2.

[3.] *Manual of Political Economy*.

[1.] MS draft at LSE bears no indication of the intended recipient. Published, with errors, in Elliot, I, 291.

[2.] “The Working Men’s Club and Institute Union, 150, Strand, for promoting the social, mental, and moral improvement and recreation of the working classes, is formed for the purpose of helping workingmen to establish Clubs or Institutes where they can meet for conversation, business, and mental improvement, with the means of recreation and refreshment, free from intoxicating drinks . . .” (*Victoria Magazine*, I [1863], 91).

[1.] MS draft (possibly incomplete) at Leeds. Published in part in Elliot, I, 291-92.

[2.] When JSM returned from his year in France in July, 1821, he rejoined his family at Marlow, where they were spending their summer vacation.

[3.] Iphigenia is not mentioned in *Utilitarianism*; her case must have been discussed in Thornton's letter. In Greek legend, Iphigenia, the daughter of Agamemnon, had to be sacrificed to Artemis before the Greek fleet could sail for Troy. Thornton years later discussed the case in his article "Anti-Utilitarianism," *FR*, n.s. VIII (Sept. 1, 1870), 314-37, esp. pp. 322-23.

[4.] "While I dispute the pretensions of any theory which sets up an imaginary standard of justice not grounded on utility, I account the justice which is grounded on utility to be the chief part, and incomparably the most sacred and binding part, of all morality." *Utilitarianism*, chap. v.

[5.] In 195 the Romans demanded the surrender of Hannibal by the Carthaginians, who gave him only grudging support. Hannibal solved their dilemma by going into voluntary exile.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Largely published in Elliot, I, 293, and in Gomperz.

[2.] At this point in the draft, the following passage has been cancelled: "To most people, I believe, society is a relaxation; we, on the contrary, need relaxation *from society*; & to pass half our time in the virtual solitude in which we live here is not merely a luxury but a necessity to us."

[3.] Gomperz had fallen in love with Helen Taylor in the summer of 1862 when she and JSM visited him in Vienna, on their way home from Greece. Gomperz followed them to London in the winter, but Helen and JSM left for Avignon before he could propose. He then suggested a visit to them. The coldness of this reply by JSM plunged him into despair and subsequently led to a nervous breakdown, from which, however, he fully recovered. The visit did take place at a later date. (Elliot in his edition of the *Letters* asserts that Gomperz never fully recovered, and Packe, in his biography, repeats the error; when Elliot's edition was published in 1910, Gomperz wrote him in protest, to which Elliot replied ". . . I thought you were dead long ago" (see Gomperz, p. 352).

[4.] Cf. Gomperz's remarks on Grote in a letter to Josephine von Wertheimstein, March 29, 1863 (Gomperz, p. 339).

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] "The Greek Kingdom and the Ionian Islands," *Penny Newsman*, May 3, 1863, p. 8.

[3.] Articles by Victor Langlois, XLIII (15 Feb., 1863), 960-91, and by M. George Perrot, XLIV (April 1, 1863), 571-608 and (15 April), 896-929.

[4.] William Scholefield (1809-1867), liberal politician, first mayor of Birmingham, 1838; MP, 1847, 1852, 1857-67. He sponsored a Partnership Law Amendment bill, at the second reading of which, on March 24, 1863, he said that its purpose was "to

extend the principle of limited liability to private partnerships, and to enable clerks to share in the profits of a concern without incurring the liability of partners.”

[5.] *SR*, April 4, 1863, pp. 428-29.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 293-94.

[2.] Leslie’s question for the June 5 meeting of the Political Economy Club was, “Has the Discovery of New Gold Mines made any change in the conditions of International Trade?”

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably “Servia and the House of Commons,” *Penny Newsmen*, May 24, 1863, p. 8, an article criticizing Parliament for its indifference to the cause of Servian independence from Turkey.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, p. 353.

[2.] See Letter 607.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] *Manual of Political Economy* (see Letter 536, n. 4). For the testimonial, see next Letter.

[3.] At the May 1 meeting of the Political Economy Club, the question, proposed by Fawcett, was, “To what extent is the principle of Co-operative Trade Societies among the Working Classes economically sound?”

[4.] See Letter 610.

[5.] John Roebuck, MP for Sheffield, in his speech in the Commons on April 23, objected to American interference, under Admiral Wilkes, with British ships bound for neutral ports. Roebuck described the conduct of the North as “unfit for the courtesies and the community of the civilized world,” and declared that he was “prepared for war.” *Hansard*, CLXX, cols. 576-79.

[6.] Edward Horsman, then MP for Stroud, was violently pro-Southern in the debate on April 24 on the British Government’s seizure of the British-built *Alexandria* at Liverpool, to prevent its being used as a Confederate ship. *Hansard*, CLXX, cols. 736-48.

[7.] Actually, Grant did not take Vicksburg until July 4.

[1.] MS at the Women’s Service Library, London.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] John Nicolaus Trübner (1817-1884), of German birth, became a naturalized British citizen; publisher, author, translator, and editor. In 1865 he published JSM's *Auguste Comte and Positivism*.

[3.] The firm headed by William Longman (see Letter 659).

[4.] The close of the letter is missing.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, p. 369.

Gomperz, whose movements at this time were erratic because of an incipient nervous breakdown, apparently failed to receive this invitation in time to accept. JSM then sent a second invitation (the next Letter) which Gomperz and Eduard Wessel, who had been called to England to take care of his friend, accepted.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, p. 370.

[2.] Eduard Wessel (1822-1879), journalist and teacher, close friend of Gomperz, who had joined him in England. A memorial tribute by Gomperz to Wessel was published in the *Neue Freie Presse* of Jan. 29, 1879, and is reprinted in Gomperz's *Essays und Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1905), pp. 103-105.

That this invitation was accepted is established by a letter of Gomperz to his sister, June 15, 1863, in Gomperz, p. 370.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, pp. 371-72.

[2.] Gomperz seems to have been suffering delusions of persecution in the mental disturbance following his frustrated love for Helen Taylor (see Letter 607).

[3.] To marry Helen Taylor.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Dr. Max Schlesinger (1822-1881), co-editor of a political news agency in London. His house was a meeting place for Germans living in England, and he had been of help to Gomperz at the time of his crisis.

[1.] MS not located. Extract published in the *Co-operator*, IV, No. 43 (Sept., 1863), p. 56. Jones was secretary of the London Association for the Promotion of Co-operation. For a brief history of this co-operative association, see G. D. H. Cole, *A Century of Co-operation* (London, 1944), p. 156.

[2.] A venture into wholesaling which failed.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Penny Newsman*, July 12, 1863, p. 3.

The letter was read at the annual meeting on July 10, 1863, of the Society for Promoting the Employment of Women, in connection with the NAPSS, at Willis's Rooms. Lord Shaftesbury presided, and among those on the platform were Arthur Kinnaird, MP; Monckton Milnes, MP; Sir Francis Goldsmid, and George Hastings. Among the ladies present were Mrs. Locke King; Miss Bessie Parkes; Mrs. Barbara Bodichon; Mrs. Edwin Lankester; Miss Isa Craig, and Miss Jessie Boucherett, a co-founder of the Society in 1859 with Miss Adelaide Proctor. For a history of the organization, see Jessie Boucherett, "The Industrial Movement," in *The Woman Question in Europe*, ed. Theodore Stanton (New York, London, Paris, 1884), pp. 97 ff.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The Political Economy Club. For the meeting, JSM had proposed the question: "Is the word Capital most properly used to designate certain kinds of Wealth, namely Food, Implements, and Materials; or should it rather be applied to all Wealth, of whatever kind, which is, or is intended by its owner to be, applied to the purpose of Reproduction?"

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, I, 294-95, and in Gomperz, pp. 374-75.

[2.] From his nervous breakdown (see Letter 607).

[3.] Including John Elliot Cairnes and Alexander Bain.

[4.] Cicero, *Pro Archia poeta*, vii, 16.

[5.] Josephine von Wertheimstein (1820-1894), the sister of Gomperz.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Dated by JSM's botanical notebook at LSE, his plans mentioned in Letter 622, and by the reference in the last paragraph.

[2.] Of Peppercorn and Price, stock and share brokers, 2 Royal Exchange.

[3.] Alexander Irvine.

[4.] Revolutionary activity which had broken out in Athens at the beginning of July was reported briefly in *The Times* on July 7, p. 14, and more fully on July 15, p. 3.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] *The Slave Power*.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. In reply to d'Eichthal's of June 26, MS at Johns Hopkins.

Gustave d'Eichthal (1804-1886), an early adherent of the Saint-Simonian movement, scholar, and writer on ethnographic, religious, and linguistic topics. JSM and d'Eichthal first became acquainted in 1828 and corresponded frequently until 1842; *Earlier Letters* contains 30 letters to d'Eichthal. This letter marks the resumption of the correspondence, apparently after a lapse of 21 years.

[2.] *Les Évangiles. Première partie. Examen critique et comparatif des trois premiers évangiles* (2 vols., Paris, 1863).

[3.] Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin, *père* of the Saint-Simonian order during its existence.

[4.] Rather, Enfantin's address as the Saint-Simonians went *into* monastic retreat at Ménilmontant. JSM translated the address. See *Earlier Letters*, p. 109, n. 6.

[5.] Adolphe d'Eichthal.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 296.

John Gorham Palfrey (1796-1881), Unitarian minister, 1818-30; professor of sacred literature at Harvard, 1831-39; editor and proprietor of the *North American Review*, 1835-43; member of Congress, 1847-49; historian; postmaster of Boston, 1861-67.

[2.] The first two of four volumes of his *History of New England* (New York, 1858-75). A fifth volume was published posthumously in 1890.

[3.] *Papers on the Slave Power*, first published in the *Boston Whig* (Boston [1846]).

[1.] MS at Arsenal.

[2.] See Letter 628.

[3.] Joseph Salvador (1796-1873), two of whose books JSM had bought in 1841 on d'Eichthal's recommendation (see *Earlier Letters*, p. 468).

Presumably JSM is referring to *Jésus-Christ et sa doctrine. Histoire de la naissance de l'Eglise, de son organisation et de ses progrès pendant le premier siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1838).

[4.] "Saint-Simon and his Disciples," *WR*, n.s. XXIV (July, 1863), 109-37.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 296-99.

[2.] John Tyndall (1820-1893), mathematician and physicist; professor of natural philosophy at the Royal Institution, 1853-87, and superintendent there, 1867-87.

[3.] Glennie had published several papers on the principles of motion in the *Philosophical Magazine* for 1861.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] David Masson (1822-1907), scholar and man of letters, edited *Macmillan's Magazine* from its beginning in 1859 until 1867.

No contribution by Plummer is identifiable in the period 1863-64.

[3.] *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy* (1844).

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, pp. 376-78.

[2.] See Letter 618, n. 2.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester.

[2.] See Letters 676 and 677.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letters 587, n. 7, and 600.

[3.] Presumably Chapman's development of a spinal icebag, by which he claimed to cure "not only functional maladies but diarrhoea, epilepsy, paralysis, and diabetes" (G. H. Haight, *George Eliot and John Chapman* [New Haven, 1940], p. 114). Chapman later described his invention in his *Sea Sickness, and How to Prevent it: an Explanation of its Nature, and Successful Treatment through the Agency of the Nervous System, by means of the Spinal Ice-Bag. With an Introduction on the General Principles of Neurotherapeutics* (2nd ed., London, 1868). In a review of the pamphlet in *WR*, n.s. XXXIV (Oct., 1868), 477, the device was described as "a bag . . . made of india rubber . . . divided into three compartments"; the three divisions were filled with ice, and in cases of sea-sickness the bag was applied from the top of the neck to the lower part of the back.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Leslie Stephen (1832-1904), later well known as a man of letters and as first editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, was a close friend of Fawcett and eventually wrote his biography. Stephen visited the United States in the summer of 1863; his letters from there to his mother were intended to be passed on to Fawcett. F. W. Maitland, in his *Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (London, 1906, pp. 112-15), prints portions of Stephen's letter of July 21, 1863, which appears to be the letter JSM is referring to.

[3.] For the cordial reception given to the Fifty-fifth (coloured) regiment as it marched to its embarkation pier in Boston, see the *Liberator*, July 24, 1863, p. 119.

[4.] For the complicated history of attempts in Missouri to free the slaves, see Duane Meyer, *The Heritage of Missouri* (St. Louis, Mo., 1963), pp. 383-86.

[5.] The North had both won the Battle of Gettysburg and captured Vicksburg in the first week of July.

[6.] Reported in *The Times*, Aug. 12, p. 10. A convention of prominent Negroes had met at Poughkeepsie, New York, on July 16, and had issued a call for 200,000 black soldiers to fight for the North.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale. Most of the 2nd par. published in Edouard Renard, *Louis Blanc, Sa vie—son œuvre* (Paris, 1923), pp. 201-202.

[2.] *Histoire de la Révolution française* (12 vols., Paris, 1847-62).

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, pp. 379-80.

[2.] Theodor Gomperz. See Letters 618 and 633.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] See Letter 632.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

JSM's long-time friendship with George Grote and his wife Harriet had been strained after JSM's marriage to Harriet Taylor (see Letter 111), but after his wife's death JSM gradually resumed his intimacy with the Grotes.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] See Letters 587, n. 7, 600, and 635.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. All but last paragraph published in Elliot, I, 299-300.

[2.] Henry Fawcett read a paper, "On the Effects of the recent Gold Discoveries," for the Section on Economic Science and Statistics of the British Association for the Advancement of Science on Aug. 29, 1863, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. His paper was reported in *The Times*, Aug. 31, pp. 7-8, and was the subject of leaders on Sept. 1, p. 8, and Sept. 5, p. 8. His paper is not included in the Brit. Assoc. *Reports* of the meeting.

[3.] *The Times*, Sept. 3, p. 9, signed W.M.J., L.V.H.; Sept. 4, p. 5, signed F.C. and W. Stanley Jevons; Sept. 5, p. 10, signed J.A.; Sept. 7, p. 5, signed H.L.R., J.A.; Sept. 9, p. 4, signed T. Crawford, J. E. Cairnes, and Plautus; Sept. 10, p. 9, signed D. C.; Sept. 12, p. 10, signed Henry Fawcett, W.M.J.

[4.] *Daily News*, Aug. 31, 1863, p. 2.

[5.] Letters signed W.M.J., Sept. 3, p. 9, and Sept. 12, p. 10.

[6.] In letter of Sept. 9, p. 4.

[7.] “To give an idea of the argument, let us compare the influx of gold to the irruption of water. The water would flow over the area opened to it, but before settling on the surface it would fill up the hollows, and it would be only when these were filled that the general depth of the flood would be calculable. In the 16th century England was a hollow, with but little water at the bottom, and the golden flood rushed into it accordingly. At the present time England is a high table-land, and many a hollow must be filled before we shall find much experience of the flood. Prices will rise, no doubt, but it is elsewhere, and to our level, that they will rise.” *The Times*, Sept. 5, p. 8.

[8.] Not in the letters to *The Times*.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, pp. 380-81.

[2.] Letter 607.

[3.] That Gomperz had wanted to marry Helen Taylor.

[4.] Of the omitted paragraph, H. Gomperz (p. 381) says: “The last paragraph of the letter refers to the recently expressed intention of Th.G. to translate Mill’s “Utilitarianism” into German, which Mill welcomes warmly. He encloses the following authorisation to be sent to a publisher: ‘Mr. Theodor Gomperz has my full approbation and sanction for publishing a translation of my book entitled *Utilitarianism*. Avignon, Sept. 17, 1863. J. St. Mill.’”

[1.] MS at LSE. *Envelope addressed*: Miss Harriet Mill / 30 Moray Place / Edinburgh / Angleterre. *Postmarks*: AVIGNON / 18 / SEPT / 63; PARIS A CALAIS / 19 / [. . .] / 63; LONDON / SP 20 / 63 / ; and EDINR / 1 / SP 21 / 63.

[2.] Presumably in her role as executrix in settling the estate of James Bentham Mill on the island of Unst. See Letter 542.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] On Comte; see Letter 642.

[3.] Jean François Eugène Robinet, *Notice sur l’œuvre et sur la vie d’Auguste Comte* (Paris, 1860).

[4.] Emile Littré, *Paroles de philosophie positive* (Paris, 1859; 2nd ed. 1863).

[5.] See Letter 529.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 300-302.

John Appleton (1804-1891), associate justice (1852-62), and chief justice of the Supreme Court of Maine (1862-83); disciple of Bentham and legal reformer. There may have been earlier correspondence with Appleton; the *Bangor Daily Whig and Courier* for March 4, 1862, reported that he had received advance sheets of JSM's *The Contest in America* (the Boston reprint of 1862).

[2.] See leaders in *The Times*, Aug. 28, p. 6; Sept. 7, 1863, p. 6.

[3.] Not identified.

[1.] MS at Canberra.

[2.] See Letter 646.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. *Envelope addressed:* G. J. Holyoake Esq. / Dymake Lodge / Regent's Park / London NW. *Postmarks:* AVIGNON / 26 SEPT and LONDON / SP / 28.

[2.] See Letter 634.

[3.] Perhaps papers relating to the recent meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; see Letter 643.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] At the seventh annual meetings of the NAPSS, Oct. 7-14, Plummer read two papers: "On the Past and Present Aspects of Co-operation" and "Decimal Notation" (see NAPSS, *Transactions* for 1863 [London, 1864], pp. 752 and 875).

[3.] *The Penny Newsman*.

[4.] See Letters 632 and 655.

[5.] Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics, or, The Conditions essential to human happiness, specified, and the first of them developed* (London, 1851).

[6.] Book V, chap. vi, "Of the Grounds and Limits of the *Laisser-Faire* or Non-Interference Principle."

[1.] MS in the possession of W. Rosenberg, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.

[2.] See Letter 526, n. 8.

[3.] Henry Chapman (1770-1863), a civil servant in the department of defence construction in the United Kingdom.

[4.] The two books that perhaps did more than any others in this period to arouse interest in religious questions were *Essays and Reviews* (1860) and Bishop J. W. Colenso's *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined*, the first of seven parts published in 1862. *Essays and Reviews* appeared in at least ten editions within two years; Bishop Colenso's sold 10,000 copies and is said to have provoked at least 130 published replies.

[5.] John W. Parker in 1863 sold his business to Messrs. Longman, who thereby became JSM's publisher.

[6.] His book on Sir William Hamilton.

[7.] "Austin on Jurisprudence," *ER*, CXVIII (Oct., 1863), 439-82.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably Stephen's letter of Sept. 28, a portion of which is printed in Maitland, p. 123. See Letter 637, n. 2.

[3.] Major General William S. Rosecrans (1819-1898), suffered a defeat at the battle of Chickamauga in northwestern Georgia, Sept. 19-20, 1863.

[4.] At the 1863 meeting, held in Edinburgh, Oct. 7-14, of the NAPSS, Fawcett took part in the discussions on emigration, co-operation, conditions in the cotton district, and trade and international law. See NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1863 (London, 1864), pp. 749, 753, 757, 865, and 886, and *Daily News*, Oct. 10, p. 3; Oct. 12, p. 2; Oct. 13, p. 2; and Oct. 14, p. 3.

[5.] NAPSS, *Transactions*, pp. 354-61.

[6.] George Woodyatt Hastings, general secretary of the NAPSS, 1857-68.

[7.] Oxford and Cambridge local examinations were established in 1858 as standards against which students in secondary schools could measure their attainments in specified subjects. According to H. C. Barnard, *A History of English Education from 1760* (London, 1961), p. 339, girls were not regularly admitted to Cambridge locals until 1866.

[8.] See Letter 643, n. 2.

[9.] *The Times*, Sept. 9, p. 4, and Oct. 1, p. 10.

[10.] Letter signed W.M.J., *The Times*, Sept. 3, p. 9.

[11.] The metaphor was first employed in a leader in *The Times*, Sept. 5, p. 8, and then used in a second letter by W.M.J. on Sept. 12, p. 10. See Letter 643, n. 7.

[12.] Cairnes's letter of Sept. 9, p. 4.

[13.] Not identified. For Cairnes's articles on gold, see his *Essays in Political Economy* (London, 1873), pp. 1-165, a collection of articles originally published in periodicals.

[14.] "Fawcett's Manual of Political Economy," *SR*, Sept. 26, 1863, pp. 432-34.

[15.] The professorship of political economy to which Fawcett was elected on Nov. 27, 1863.

[16.] "England and America," *Fraser's*, LXVIII (Oct., 1863), 419-37, a review of Cairnes's *The Slave Power*, in which Stephen urged England to be neutral.

[17.] Which of two prominent Manchester business men and politicians cannot be ascertained with certainty. Edmund Potter (1802-1883), one of the greatest cotton manufacturers of the world; president of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, 1852-61; F.R.S.; MP for Carlisle, 1861-74; he had addressed the NAPSS meetings Fawcett had just attended, "On the Position of the Cotton Districts," *Transactions* for 1863, pp. 649-60. The other possibility is Thomas Bayley Potter (1817-1898), Manchester business man; founder in 1861 of the Union and Emancipation Society; MP for Rochdale, 1865-95; founder of the Cobden Club, 1866.

[18.] Max Kyllmann delivered a paper, "Co-operation in Germany," at the NAPSS meetings (see *Transactions*, pp. 630-40).

[19.] In Appendix L of his *The Election of Representatives* (3rd ed., London, 1865), Hare identifies one pamphlet, *True and False Democracy* (Boston, 1862). He also locates and quotes from three articles published in America which discuss his plan.

[1.] Portions of MS draft at King's, Leeds, and LSE. Partly published in Elliot, I, 303-304.

[2.] His article was eventually published as "Strikes and Industrial Co-operation," *WR*, n.s. XXV (April, 1864), 349-83.

[3.] Earlier in 1863 Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, had included in his Budget a clause subjecting charities to income tax; he defended the clause in a speech on May 4, but later had to withdraw it.

[4.] Hare held an appointment as inspector of charities.

[5.] Thornton had in fact attacked some of JSM's views on income tax in a paper "On the Income Tax," delivered at the 1862 meetings of the British Assoc. for the Advancement of Science; see abstract in *Report* for 1862 (London, 1863), "Transactions of the Sections," pp. 175-78.

[6.] Charles Mackay (1814-1889), poet, journalist, special correspondent of *The Times* in New York, Feb., 1862-Dec., 1865.

[7.] See Letter 637, n. 2.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letters 643 and 652.

[3.] “Quoi qu’en dise son pasteur, le paysan range l’argent monnayé au nombre des trésors que ne rongent ni les mites, ni la rouille, et il amasse; craint-il des voleurs qui pourraient découvrir son magot, il a une cachette toute prête sous les planches de son poêle ou de son grenier. Ce sont les moeurs de l’Orient en plein Occident. La population des campagnes a été dans les huit dernières années comme une éponge qui s’est gorgée d’argent. Des statisticiens ont calculé que dans un seul canton à blé l’Allemagne du Sud, lequel ne compte que quelques milles* carrés, on a thésaurisé dans le cours de dix dernières années au moins un million de florins d’argent comptant qui n’est pas rentré dans le commerce.” *Revue Germanique et Française*, XXVII (Oct., 1863), 205.

[4.] The original article, entitled “Die Besoldungsfrage, ihr Charakter und ihre Lösung,” had appeared in *Deutsche Vierteljahrs-Schrift*, I (1857), 296-372. For the passage quoted by JSM, see p. 315.

[5.] See Letter 652, n. 4.

[6.] See *ibid.*, n. 15.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] See Letters 632 and 650.

[3.] “Co-operative Societies,” *QR*, CXIV (Oct., 1863), 418-48. The author is identified in the *Wellesley Index* as Alfred Hill (1829-1907), barrister.

[4.] See Letter 653, n. 2.

[5.] See Letter 650, n. 2.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 304-306.

Henry Chenevix (b.1842), B.A., Oxford, 1864; MA, 1867; a member of the University as late as 1913.

[2.] *Logic*, Book III, chap. xxv, sec. 2, last paragraph.

[3.] Cf. S. T. Coleridge, *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* in *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. W. G. T. Shedd (7 vols., New York, 1853), V, 588, 602, and 616; also cf. *Table Talk*, in *Works*, VI, 296.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, I, 306-307.

Antoine Élisée Cherbuliez (1797-1869), Swiss economist, appointed professor of political economy at l’École polytechnique fédérale at Zurich in 1855.

[2.] *Précis de la science économique* (2 vols., Paris, 1862).

[3.] The Poor Law of 1834.

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published in Elliot, I, 307-309. *Bears note in JSM's hand: To Leslie / Nov. 14, 1863 / For publication / J. S. Mill.*

[2.] Evidently the MS of the article that appeared as "The Distribution and Value of the Precious Metals in the Sixteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," *Macmillan's*, X (Aug., 1864), 301-19; reprinted in Leslie's *Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy* (Dublin and London, 1879), pp. 264-95.

[3.] Which of Cairnes's articles on the gold question JSM refers to is not clear. Leslie in the above article cites the following writings of Cairnes: "The Laws, according to which a depreciation of the precious metals consequent upon an increase of supply takes place, considered in connection with the recent Gold Discoveries" [read before the British Association, Sept., 1858], *Journal of the Dublin Statistical Society*, II, Part xii (Jan., 1859), 236-69; "Essays towards a Solution of the Gold Question," *Fraser's*, LX (Sept., 1859), 267-78, and LXI (Jan., 1860), 38-53; and letters to the *Economist* (May 30, 1863) and *The Times*, Sept. 9 and Oct. 1, 1863. Cairnes reprinted the articles (not the letters) in his *Essays in Political Economy, Theoretical and Applied* (London, 1873), pp. 1-165.

[4.] Leslie, *Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 285-92.

[5.] J. G. Courcelle-Seneuil, *Etudes sur la science sociale* (Paris, 1862).

[6.] *Traité théorique et pratique d'économique politique* (2 vols., Paris, 1858).

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] See Letter 615.

[3.] The first of JSM's books to bear the Longman imprint was the 2nd ed. of *Utilitarianism* (1864).

[1.] MS draft at Leeds. Published, in part, in Elliot, I, 310-12.

[2.] Alexander Bain, *An English Grammar* (London, 1863).

[3.] *The Senses and the Intellect* (London, 1855; 2nd ed., 1864).

[4.] See Letter 572.

[5.] See *Hamilton*, I, chap. xiii, "The Psychological Theory of the Primary Qualities of Matter," in which JSM quotes from both the first and second editions of *The Senses and the Intellect*.

[6.] *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic*, eds. H. L. Mansel and John Veitch (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1882), II, 168-84. See also the discussion of Extension, in chap. xiii of JSM's *Hamilton*.

[7.] Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Psychology* (London, 1855), chap. xx, "The Relations of Coextension and Non-coextension."

[8.] See Letter 293, n. 6.

[9.] *Psychology*, Part II, chaps. i and ii, "Compound and Quantitative Reasoning."

[10.] Cf. Spencer, *First Principles*, chap. viii, "The Persistence of Force."

[11.] Cf. *ibid.*, chap. xix, "The Instability of the Homogeneous," sec. 152.

[12.] The table is not included in the MS draft.

[13.] Immanuel Hermann von Fichte (1796-1879), philosopher, son of the more famous philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814). The work Bain had recommended may have been *Anthropologie. Die Lehre von der menschlichen Seele. Neubegründet auf naturwissenschaftlichem Wege* (Leipzig, 1856, 2nd enlarged ed. 1860).

[14.] Karl Christoph Vogt (1817-1895), German naturalist and geologist; professor at Geneva; voluminous writer. His *Vorlesungen über den Menschen . . .* was translated and published in English as *Lectures on Man, his place in Creation and in the history of the Earth*, ed. J. Hunt, by the Anthropological Society of London (London, 1863).

[15.] *Sic.* Jacob M. Moleschott (1822-1893), physiologist of Dutch origin; professor at Turin, 1861-79, and at Rome; author of many treatises.

[16.] John Tyndall, *Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion: being a course of twelve lectures delivered at the Royal Institution in 1862* (London, 1863).

[17.] See Tyndall, Lecture VIII, pp. 263ff.

[18.] The sixth edition was published in 1865.

[19.] Thomas Clark (1801-1867), professor of chemistry at Marischal College and at the University of Aberdeen. JSM later, as Rector of St. Andrews, appointed him as Assessor in the University Court of that institution. His writings on the Gospel were never published. Bain published memoirs of Clark in the *Journal* of the Chemical Society, 1868, and in *Transactions* of the Aberdeen Philosophical Society, vol. I, 1879.

[20.] See Letter 628.

[21.] Michel Nicolas, *Etudes critiques sur la Bible, Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1863).

[22.] Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860), theologian, historian, and biblical critic, professor at the University of Tübingen.

[23.] Robert William Mackay (1803-1882), author of *The Tübingen School and its Antecedents, a review of the history and present condition of modern theology* (Hertford, 1863).

[24.] Bain is mentioned on p. 363 of Littré's *Auguste Comte et la philosophie positive* in a quotation from Comte's letter to JSM of June 27, 1845.

[25.] JSM to Comte, June 21, 1845, *Earlier Letters*, p. 667.

[26.] Who had bought out J. W. Parker's publishing business.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Originally dated Nov. 4, but redated Nov. 23. Another draft, almost identical with this one, is at Yale, dated Nov. 4. *The latter bears this note in JSM's hand:* A MM. les administrateurs des Hospices d'Avignon asking to rent the cutting of trees in front of the house &c. Nov. 4. 1863. See Letter 663.

[1.] MS at University of Liverpool.

William Rathbone, Jr. (1819-1902), sixth of the name, merchant of Liverpool, philanthropist, and Liberal MP for Liverpool, 1868-80.

[2.] The bill of 1860. For details on Lord John Russell's measure and its defeat, see *Annual Register* for 1860, "History," pp. 98-127.

[3.] JSM had advocated a system of plural voting in his *Rep. Govt.*

[1.] MS draft at Yale.

[2.] Letter 661.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] As professor of political economy at Cambridge on Nov. 27.

[3.] William Whewell may well have been offended by Fawcett because of an encounter between them at the British Association meeting at Oxford in 1860, in which Whewell was humiliated. See Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett*, p. 119.

[4.] Joseph Bickersteth Mayor (see Letter 603).

[5.] "L' Association Co-opérative et Le Crédit Populaire," *Journal des Economistes*, XL (Nov., 1863), 177-99. J. Edouard (originally Ignaz Einhorn) Horn (1825-1875), exiled Hungarian economist then resident in Paris.

[6.] *Sic.* Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch (1808-1883), called "the Father of German Co-operation."

[7.] *Kreditgenossenschaften*. A useful paper on the co-operative movement in Germany by Professor Huber of the University of Berlin may be found in the *Transactions* of the NAPSS for 1862 (London, 1863), pp. 735-44.

[8.] See Letter 653, n. 2

[9.] The book on Sir William Hamilton.

[10.] The Political Economy Club.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] See Letter 655.

[3.] "Co-operation in Lancashire and Yorkshire," *Companion to the Almanac . . . , a supplement to the British Almanac of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* (London, 1862), pp. 58-80.

[4.] "The Genesis of Science," originally published in *British Quar. Rev.*, XX (July, 1854), 108-62, reprinted in *Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative* (1st series, London, 1858).

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Dec. 9, MS copy at LSE.

[2.] MS copy is at LSE.

[3.] "The Effects of the Gold Discoveries" (a review of W. S. Jevons's *A Serious Fall in the Value of Gold ascertained . . .* [London, 1863]), *National Review*, XVII (Oct., 1863), 447-64. See also Letters 643, 652, and 658.

[4.] See Letters 652, n. 11, and 668.

[5.] "Letters from a Competition Wallah," *Macmillan's*, VIII (1863), 80-87, 197-206, 267-79, 341-53, 421-36; IX (1863-64), 16-31, 117-35: a series of letters on Indian life and British rule in India. Published as a book (London, 1864). The author was George Otto Trevelyan (1838-1928), later the well-known historian, man of letters, and statesman.

[6.] Letter III of "Letters from a Competition Wallah," *Macmillan's*, VIII, 267-79, contains an attack upon "The Opium Revenue of India considered in connexion with Mr. Laing's last Budget," an essay in *Fraser's*, LXVI (Oct., 1862), 399-417. Very probably this essay is by Sir Alexander Grant (1826-1884), who in 1863 was vice-chancellor of the University of Bombay. Grant had been professor of history and political science at Elphinstone Institute, Bombay.

[7.] Charles Greeley Loring (1794-1868), *Neutral Relations of England and the United States* (Boston, 1863), which Cairnes reviewed in *Macmillan's*, IX (Jan., 1864), 260-72. A letter from Cairnes had originally motivated Loring to write the pamphlet.

[8.] Cairnes had written: "I have already written to Mr Goldwin Smith, but he although agreeing with me in opinion as to the merit of the [Loring] pamphlet, seems to think that nothing is to be done in the matter by argument." Letter of Dec. 9.

[9.] The building of gunboats in the Liverpool dockyards for the Confederacy, the best known being the *Alabama*. See Letter 581, n. 3, and A. Mountague Bernard, *A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War*, pp. 337-70.

[10.] See Letter 581, n. 17, and Letter 675.

[11.] See Letters 669 and 670.

[12.] William (later Sir William) George Granville Venables Vernon Harcourt (1827-1904), statesman, contributor to *The Times* of letters on international law and the American Civil War under the name of "Historicus"; contributor to *SR*, 1855-59; Whewell professor of international law, Cambridge, 1869-87.

[13.] See n. 7 above.

[14.] "Ireland," *ER*, CXIX (Jan., 1864), 279-304.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester.

[2.] See Letters 634 and 649. The People's Edition was first published in 1865.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 666, n. 7.

[3.] Cf. *Proverbs* 11:5, 6.

[4.] A long and acrimonious controversy arose between Richard Cobden (1804-1865), MP for Rochdale, and *The Times*, over the meaning of the following paragraph of a speech given by Cobden to his constituents, Nov. 24, 1863, at Rochdale, and reported in *The Times*, Nov. 25, 1863, p. 9. "You have no other peasantry but that of England which is entirely divorced from the land. There is no other country where you will not find men holding the plough and turning up the furrow upon their own freehold. I don't want any agrarian outrages by which we would change all this." In a leader on Nov. 26, 1863, p. 8, *The Times* accused both Cobden and John Bright, who shared the platform with Cobden, of wishing to divide the land of the rich among the poor. Cobden denied the charge. For the various exchanges, letters on the subject, excerpts from other newspapers, and further leaders, see the following issues of *The Times*: Nov. 27, p. 6; Dec. 10, p. 10; Dec. 11, p. 3; Dec. 12, p. 6; Dec. 15, pp. 8 and 9; Dec. 16, p. 9; Dec. 18, p. 6; Dec. 21, p. 9; Dec. 22, pp. 6 and 7.

[5.] Of Sept. 22. See Letter 666.

[6.] See Letter 643, n. 7.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Addressed*: The Right Honourable / W. E. Gladstone, M.P. / &c &c. On *verso*: 26 Dec 63 / Mr John S. Mill / with pamphlet on / England's neutral / relation with U.S.

[2.] See Letter 666, n. 7.

[1.] MS draft of first four and last two paragraphs at Leeds. MS draft of remainder at King's. Published in Elliot, II, 1-3. In reply to Gladstone's of Jan. 8, MS copy at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See Letters 666 and 669.

[3.] For Loring's discussion of the case of the *Santissima Trinidad*, a vessel that had preyed on shipping out of Brazil and had been forced to restore its captured property through a United States Supreme Court decision of 1822, see his *Neutral Relations of England and the United States*, pp. 26-28.

[4.] See Letter 666, n. 7.

[5.] One of Gladstone's favourite forms of entertainment. JSM attended such a breakfast in July, 1864. See Lionel A. Tollemache, *Talks with Mr. Gladstone* (London, 1898), p. 22.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 666, n. 7.

[3.] The preceding Letter.

[4.] *Ibid.*, n. 3.

[5.] The MS of the Duke's cordial reply of Feb. 2, 1864, is at Yale, but JSM's letter to him does not appear to have survived.

[6.] *The Times*, Jan. 19, 1864, reported "the usual handshaking *levée* at the White House on New Year's Day. . . . It was remarked as a novelty that there were no less than four negroes in the crowd, and that the President received them with special good humor. It is the first time in the existence of the Republic that a black man has dared to mingle in the throng on such an occasion. . . ."

[7.] In the preliminaries of the war of 1864 by Prussia and Austria against Denmark, the German Diet had voted on Jan. 18 to occupy Schleswig and Holstein.

[8.] As the result of a decree issued in Nov., 1863, by Napoleon III, the powers of parliament were somewhat increased and thereafter the Empire was conducted as a more liberal government. JSM may well have read of the debate reported in *The Times* on Jan. 22, 1864, pp. 9 and 10, on the attempted amendment of the repressive Press Law of 1852, and of expressions of sympathy in the French Parliament for the Polish nationalists in their revolt against Russian domination.

[9.] On Feb. 5, 1864.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Political Economy Club, Feb. 5, 1864.

[1.] MS in 1943 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts.

[2.] *Methode bei jeder Art von Wahlen sowohl der Mehrheit als den Minderheiten die ihrer Stärke entsprechende Zahl von Vertretern zu sichern.* Dargestellt von Dr. Gustav Burnitz und Dr. Georg Varrentrapp (Frankfurt a.M., 1863). See Thomas Hare, *The Election of Representatives* (London, 1865), pp. 298-301.

[3.] "The Reforms of the Future," *Fraser's*, LXVIII (Dec., 1863), 713-29. JSM's endorsement of Hare's plan is mentioned on p. 718.

[4.] Probably the unsigned article, "The Land Tenure Question," *Fraser's*, LXIX (March, 1864), 357-77.

[5.] See Letter 668, n. 4.

[6.] For a listing of the 43 leading articles written by JSM on Irish affairs for the *Morning Chronicle* in 1846-47, see MacMinn, *Bibliog.*, pp. 60-68.

[7.] As an inspector for the Charity Commission, Hare was engaged in investigating various charitable foundations, including that of Christ's Hospital, the endowed school which S. T. Coleridge, Charles Lamb, and Leigh Hunt had attended. At the Edinburgh meetings of the NAPSS in Oct., 1863, Hare had delivered a paper on "The Injustice and Impolicy of exempting the Income of Property, on the Ground of its Charitable or Meritorious Employment, from the Taxation to which other like Property is Subject." See NAPSS, *Transactions* for 1863, pp. 733-39.

[8.] Gladstone as Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget presentation on May 4, 1863, had attacked indiscriminate exemption from taxation accorded to endowed charitable foundations. See David E. Owen, *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 330-32.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably the March 4, 1864, meeting of the Political Economy Club, for which Chadwick supplied the question for discussion: "Is the ownership of Land, with the intent to its Culture by the labour of the Owner, and the members of his family, economically expedient?"

[3.] Chadwick had been elected a correspondent (Section de Morale) of the Académie des sciences morales et politiques of the Institut Impérial de France, at the meeting of Feb. 13, 1864, to replace Archbishop Richard Whately, who had died on Oct. 1, 1863.

[4.] For Chadwick's various contributions to the Institute, see *Table Générale . . .*, vol. II, n.s., p. 7 (1874, second semestre) *des Séances et Travaux de L'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques (Institut de France)*. These papers are not listed in the bibliography of Chadwick's writings in S. E. Finer's biography of him.

[5.] Nassau Senior had been elected a correspondent (Section d'économie politique) of the Académie on March 4, 1843. For Senior's connections with France, see S. Leon Levy, *Nassau W. Senior* (Boston, 1943), pp. 140-46, 167-69, 298-302, 313-14.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] "Ireland," *ER*, CXIX (Jan., 1864), 279-304.

[3.] The question discussed at the Feb. 5 meeting of the Political Economy Club had been proposed by Thompson Hankey, banker and MP: "To what extent is the power of a Country to make or carry on War destroyed or diminished by what are called Financial Difficulties?"

[4.] Letter 670.

[5.] Thomas Emerson Headlam (1813-1875), MP for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1847-74; judge advocate-general, 1859-66.

[6.] See Letter 671, n. 5.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's letter of Feb. 22 to which this is a reply.

William Longman (1813-1877), of the well-known publishing family.

[2.] Longman had estimated that a double-column edition of *Pol. Econ.*, in two vols. of 360 pages each, could be sold for five shillings a vol.; *Rep. Govt.* in one vol. of 180 pages for 2/6; and *On Liberty* in 80 pages for 1/6.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, in reply to Longman's of Feb. 26, 1864, also at LSE.

[2.] See preceding Letter. After recalculating costs for a double-column edition of *Pol. Econ.*, Longman had now reported that it could be published in one volume to sell for 8/6.

[3.] William Stebbing (1832-1926), journalist and miscellaneous writer; for nearly thirty years a leader writer on *The Times*, and assistant editor under Delane. His *Analysis of Mr. Mill's System of Logic* was published this year.

[1.] MS in the Fisher Library, University of Sydney. The letter was found some years ago in the first volume of Henry Brougham's *Political Philosophy* (3 vols., London, 1853), which Plummer had presented to the Library (see "Some Reminiscences—John Stuart Mill," *Sydney Morning Herald*, Oct. 29, 1910). The volumes contain marginal annotations by JSM.

[2.] *Our Colonies; being an essay on the advantages accruing to the British Nation, from its possession of the Colonies . . .* (London, 1864).

[3.] Probably *Utilitarianism explained and exemplified in moral and political government* (London, 1864).

[4.] "The Labour Question Again—the South Yorkshire Colliers," *Penny Newsman*, March 6, 1864, p. 9.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] On Feb. 24, William Dougal Christie (1816-1874), diplomat and man of letters, at a meeting of the Jurisprudence Department of the NAPSS had read a paper, "Suggestions for an Organization for the Restraint of Corruption at Elections," published later in the year by the Association. For a discussion of the subject, see F. D. Maurice, "Corruption at Elections: 'Mr. Christie's Suggestions,'" *Macmillan's*, X (July, 1864), 192-98; an attack on Christie and Maurice, "Bribery," *SR* (Sept. 3, 1864), 292-93; and W. D. Christie, "Corruption at Elections and the 'Saturday Review,'" *Macmillan's*, X (Oct., 1864), 517-20. See also Letter 687.

[3.] JSM served with Maurice, Chadwick, W. E. Forster, Christie, Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Russell, Lord Lyttleton, Lord Stanley, and others on the committee for the movement.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in the *Co-operator*, No. 51 (May, 1864), p. 179.

[2.] See Letter 575. JSM and Helen Taylor each contributed £10 to help the magazine continue publication (see the *Co-operator*, No. 50 [April, 1864], p. 168).

[1.] MS at the Manchester Central Library.

[2.] The idea does not appear to have materialized.

[3.] Edward Henry Stanley, later 15th Earl of Derby.

[4.] Ernest Renan (1823-1892), French philosopher, philologist, and historian, best known for his *Life of Jesus*.

[5.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS draft of first part at Leeds; of second part at LSE. Largely published in Elliot, II, 3-6.

[2.] *The Senses and the Intellect* (2nd ed., London, 1864).

[3.] See Letter 660, n. 2.

[4.] Bain, *Grammar*, pp. 99-104.

[5.] See Letter 660.

[6.] The MS portion at LSE begins here.

[7.] Pt. II, chap. ix, “The Correlation and Equivalence of Forces,” *First Principles* (1862 ed.), p. 270. Spencer has “gravitative force.”

[8.] Pierre Louis Dulong (1785-1838), chemist.

[9.] Alexis Thérèse Petit (1791-1820), physicist.

[10.] Franz Ernst Neumann (1798-1895), physicist, mineralogist, and mathematician.

[11.] *First Principles* (1862 ed.), p. 264.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Henri Eugène Philippe Louis d’Orléans, Duc d’Aumale (1822-1897), fourth son of King Louis Philippe. From 1848 he was in exile in England.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Vernon Harcourt. See Letter 666, n. 12.

[3.] See Letter 666, n. 7.

[4.] See *ibid.*, n. 5 and n. 6.

[5.] *Plutology; or the Theory of the Efforts to Satisfy Human Wants*, by W. E. Hearn, professor of history in the University of Melbourne (London, 1864). Reviewed in *Sp.*, XXXVII (March 5, 1864), 276, and in the *Reader*, III (March 19, 1864), 357-58. The latter review is signed L.S. (Leslie Stephen?). Hearn (1826-1888) was primarily a jurist and economist.

[6.] Cairnes did not publish a volume of essays until 1873.

[7.] W. T. Thornton, *A Plea for Peasant Proprietors; with the Outlines of a Plan for their Establishment in Ireland* (London, 1848).

[8.] See Letter 674.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] The March number contained a signed article, “Our Wayside Poets: John Askham—J. A. Leatherland,” *National Magazine* (XV 1864), the third of a series on poets of humble origins, pp. 176-79, and an unsigned article, probably “The Transportation Question,” pp. 185-87.

[3.] *Education: intellectual, moral, and physical* (London, 1861).

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Published in part in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 201-202, and in *Cosmopolis*, IX (1898), 781.

[2.] Possibly the "Préface Personnelle" to vol. 6 of *Cours de philosophie positive* (Paris, 1842). A note on pp. vii-ix is very unjust to Saint-Simon. A second edition of the *Cours* was published in Paris, 1864.

[3.] See Letter 600.

[4.] "Lettre de Gustave d'Eichthal," *L'Opinion Nationale*, March 19, 1864, p. 1. Adolphe Guérout (1810-1872), journalist and politician, as a young man a Saint-Simonian; founder and editor of *L'Opinion Nationale* (1859-76). D'Eichthal wrote to protest an article in *L'Opinion Nationale* on Jean Reynaud by Ernest Wilfred Legouvé (1807-1903), in which Legouvé criticized contemporary disciples of Saint-Simon for having failed the cause. D'Eichthal affirms his continued support of Enfantin and quotes his letter to Legouvé.

[5.] Richard Monckton Milnes, 1st Baron Houghton (1809-1885).

[6.] *Selections from the Poetical Works of Lord Houghton* had been published in 1863. Years earlier JSM had reviewed Milnes's *Poetry for the People* unfavourably in *WR*, XXXIV (Sept., 1840), 511-13.

[7.] Adolphe d'Eichthal, *De la Monnaie de papier et des banques d'émission* (Paris, 1864).

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] James Stansfeld, MP for Halifax and junior admiralty lord, resigned his office shortly after the Procureur Impérial of France revealed that Stansfeld's address had been used by Joseph Mazzini, under an alias, to receive mail from fellow conspirators. Lord Palmerston's ministry narrowly escaped a vote of censure on March 18. See *The Times*, March 19, p. 11. Stansfeld, who had been a friend of Mazzini for a long time, resigned in order to save the government further embarrassment, even though Lord Palmerston had refused to accept the resignation. See *Annual Register*, 1864, pp. 62-66.

[3.] The *Penny Newsman*, March 27, 1864, had carried a leader entitled "Shall the Abettors of the Practice of Assassination be Countenanced in England?" which condemned political assassination and called upon Stansfeld to obtain from Mazzini a disavowal of such a policy or to repudiate his connection with the Italian patriot. Helen Taylor in a letter to the Editor signed H. T. and headed "Mr. Stansfeld and M. Mazzini," *Penny Newsman*, April 3, 1864, p. 9, objected to the March 27 leader and defended the right of a member of the English government to associate with persons "obnoxious to the despotic governments of the Continent." Chadwick appended to the letter a defence of the position taken in the March 27 leader.

[4.] The Law Amendment Society, founded in 1844, met on Monday, April 4, 1864, with Chadwick presiding. The subject for discussion was "Corruption at Elections," a

paper given by W. D. Christie. JSM participated in the discussion. See the *Law Times*, April 16, 1864, p. 277; the *Beehive*, April 9, 1864, p. 2; and the *Social Science Rev.*, n.s. I (May 1, 1864), 467-70. On Jan. 18, 1864, the Society had become the Law Department of the NAPSS. See also Letter 679.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Reviews of Goldwin Smith's *Does the Bible sanction American Slavery?* and of JSM's *Pol. Econ.* (2nd Am. ed.) appeared in *No. Am. Rev.*, XCVIII (Jan., 1864), 48-74, 270-73.

[3.] *England's Liability for Indemnity: Remarks on the Letter of "Historicus", dated Nov. 4, 1863; printed in the London "Times", Nov. 7 . . .*, published as letters in *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 1, 3, 7, 9, 14, 1864, and as a pamphlet (Boston, 1864).

[4.] See Letter 666.

[5.] See *England's Liability for Indemnity*, pp. 21-22.

[6.] The *Herald* had shifted from an anti- to a pro-abolition position.

[7.] A pro-abolition leader in *The Times*, March 24, p. 8.

[8.] Probably refers to the *Reader* review of W. E. Hearn's *Plutology* (see Letter 684, n. 5).

[1.] MS draft and MS copy at Northwestern. Published in Duncan, I, 149-50. Spencer's answer of Apr. 8 (MS at Northwestern) is in Duncan, I, 150-51.

[2.] Identified by Duncan as Spencer's letter of July 29, 1858, which was later published in Spencer's *Autobiography*, II, 27-28.

[3.] Herbert Spencer, *The Classification of the Sciences; to which are added reasons for dissenting from the philosophy of M. Comte* (London, 1864).

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published, except for first and last paragraphs, in Elliot, II, 6-8.

[2.] Possibly the Feb. 15, 1864, issue which contains an article, pp. 930-57, by Auguste Langel, "Les Etudes Philosophiques en Angleterre—M. Herbert Spencer, First Principles."

[3.] See Letter 682, n. 2.

[4.] *The Senses and the Intellect*, 2nd ed., pp. 579-84.

[5.] See Letter 293, n. 6.

[6.] See Thomas Reid, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense* (Edinburgh, 1764, and many later editions), chap. vi, sec. IX.

Thomas Reid (1710-1796), Scottish philosopher.

[7.] See Letter 660, n. 13.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *Proceedings* of the Royal Horticultural Society, London, IV (1864), 93-94. The Secretary at this time was William Wilson Saunders (1809-1879). The letter, as published, carried the following postscript, which JSM later disavowed as his (see Letter 708):

“P.S.—Prizes offered for collections of wild plants, properly dried and named, will tend to encourage young gardeners and others in endeavours to acquire some knowledge of scientific botany. So far, good. But *full* county collections will tend to destroy rare or local species, waste the time and money of the collectors, and limit the competition to those who can spare time and expense. So far, bad.

“If the prizes were offered for the best collections (as to names, conditions, &c.) of 300 of the *commoner* species of the country, very local or rare species *not* being counted or allowed, all the good, and none of the bad, would result.

“On the average, common species will yield as much botanical instruction as rarities can do. And it is better for gardeners, farmers, and others to know the plants which they usually see, than to run about collecting rarities. J.S.M.”

[2.] The Minutes of the Council of the Society, April 15, 1864, report the reading of “A letter signed by Sir William Hooker, Dr. Hooker, and other officers at Kew, Mr. Bentham, &c.; also various memorials signed by Dr. Babington, from numerous other eminent botanists, remonstrating against the possible effects of the prizes offered by the Horticultural Society for collections of dried plants, on the ground that the encouragement thus held out to the collecting of rare plants might lead to their extermination in particular localities.”

The Council resolved that they “in deference to the remonstrance of those whose opinion is entitled to so much weight, have determined to intimate to the competitors (1) that the number of plants in the collections need not be numerous, and should not exceed in any case 200; (2) that the presence of rare plants in the collections is not desired, and will not in any way enhance the competitor’s prospects of success; and (3) that each plant should be prepared showing various *stages* of development. . . .” See *Proceedings*, IV (1864), 90-91.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] “The Sanitary Commission,” *No. Am. Rev.*, XCVIII (Jan., 1864), 153-94. A second article with the same title appeared in the April number, pp. 370-419. The United States Sanitary Commission had been established in the late spring of 1861 to assist in meeting the medical needs arising from the War. The *Daily News* of April 3,

1865, p. 3, reported from Boston papers that JSM “who has all along been a good friend of the United States, has directed that whatever copyright may be allowed by the American publishers of his works shall be given to the Sanitary Commission or some similar object of national charity.”

[3.] William Cullen Bryant (1794-1878), editor of the *Evening Post*, New York, 1829-78. The compliment to the *Penny Newsman* has not been located.

[1.] MS at Melbourne. Dated by the reference to Garibaldi’s visit to London, and by JSM’s departure for Avignon.

[2.] Garibaldi arrived in England on April 3, 1864, and departed on April 22. See *The Times*, April 4, p. 9, and April 23, p. 11.

[3.] Presumably William Thomas Thornton.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The Society for Promoting the Employment of Women, founded in 1859, included among its enterprises the Victoria Press, a printing office opened in March, 1860, which employed female compositors. A leader in the Society, Emily Faithfull (1836-1895), was editor and publisher of the *Victoria Magazine*, 1863-80.

[1.] MS in the papers of the 3rd Earl Grey, at the Prior’s Kitchen, The College, Durham, England. MS draft at Leeds. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, II, 8-11. In reply to Grey’s of May 6, MS at Yale (*bears note in another hand: Recd 17th / Ansd 19th*).

[2.] Henry George Grey, 3rd Earl Grey, was preparing a new edition of his *Parliamentary Government considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament* (London, 1858), published later this year; see Letter 346. The new edition contained proposals for the improvement of the representative system, and an examination of the Reform Bills of 1859 and 1861.

[3.] See Letter 580.

[4.] See “Of a Second Chamber,” *Rep. Govt.*, chap. xiii.

[5.] “Should there be two Stages of Election?” *Ibid.*, chap. ix.

[6.] See Letter 440, n. 3.

[1.] MS not located. Published in a letter of May 18, 1864, from P. A. Taylor, Hon. Treasurer of the Garibaldi Testimonial Fund, to the Editor of the *Morning Star*, and printed in that paper on May 19, 1864.

Taylor in his letter reported that Mill had been advised by Messrs. Currie and Co. that the subscription for the testimonial to General Garibaldi had been abandoned. This Taylor denied in an appeal for further contributions.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Emile Ollivier (1825-1913), liberal politician, had reported to the chamber of deputies on a law to amend articles of the penal code which in effect prevented trade unions. The law was passed May 25, 1864, after a long debate, the liberal members claiming the law did not give workers sufficient liberty, the conservatives that it gave them too much. JSM noted with approval the 1864 change in the law (see *Principles*, p. 929c-c, for the variant introduced in the 6th ed., 1865).

[3.] *Les Sociétés de coopération: la consommation, le crédit, la production, l'amélioration morale et intellectuelle par l'association* (Paris, 1864) by Auguste Casimir Victor Laurent Casimir-Périer (1811-1878), diplomat and politician. JSM cites the work, *Principles*, p. 785 n.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. *Envelope addressed:* G. J. Holyoake Esq. / 282 Strand / London WC. *Postmarks:* AVIGNON JU / 64 and LONDON JU 2 64.

[2.] Holyoake founded a new weekly, *The English Leader*, in June, 1864. A liberal political and general magazine, which gave especial attention to co-operation, it failed after twenty numbers. See Letter 712.

[1.] MS in 1960 in the possession of Professor Jacob Viner, Princeton University.

[2.] The National Reform Union was formed at a conference held at Manchester, April 19, 1864, which 400 delegates attended. George Wilson (1808-1870), formerly chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League, was elected president. The Union advocated: (1) suffrage for all males who paid rates for the support of the poor; (2) redistribution of parliamentary seats; (3) vote by ballot; and (4) parliamentary sessions of three years' duration as a maximum. See *The Times*, April 21, 1864, p. 12. With John Bright as one of its leaders, the Reform Union might be labelled as the right wing of the movement for extension of the franchise. The left wing included the Reform League. Founded the following year with the support of trade union leaders, the League sought universal manhood suffrage.

[3.] *E.g.*, on the ballot.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Gomperz, pp. 393-94.

[2.] See Letters 618, 633, and 644.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[1.] MS not located. Published in "Letters from Europe touching the American Contest and Acknowledging the Receipt from Citizens of New York, of Presentation Sets of the 'Rebellion Record', and 'Loyal Publication Society' Publications," *Loyal Publication Society Pamphlet, No. 70* (New York, 1864), p. 12.

A group of New York citizens, a list of whom appears on pp. 3-4 of Pamphlet No. 70, subscribed to the sets of *Rebellion Record* and the *Loyal Society Publications* and arranged to have them sent to prominent citizens abroad. Among the recipients, in addition to JSM, were Cobden, Bright, Goldwin Smith, Cairnes, Harriet Martineau, and Nassau Senior. A complete list is on pp. 4-5 of the pamphlet.

[2.] *The Rebellion Record* (12 vols., New York, 1861-66), ed. Frank Moore, was a collection of documents, speeches, poetry, and pictures of eminent men together with a diary of events, all pertaining to the Union side of the Civil War.

[3.] The Loyal Publication Society issued monthly pamphlets from New York City in support of the North, from Feb., 1863, through Jan., 1866. The Society was maintained by subscriptions.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably "England and Europe," a letter signed JSM in the *Daily News*, July 1, 1864, p. 5.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Paul Boiteau, "Le Budget de 1865 et la situation financière," *Journal des Economistes*, 2nd series, XLII (May 15, 1864), 269-90.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale. A sequel to Letter 702.

[2.] The fall of the Bastille, 1789.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 705.

[3.] See Letter 684, n. 7.

[4.] In the long report dated July 5, in the *Daily News* of July 18, 1864, p. 5, the two most encouraging items of news to JSM may have been that of a cavalry raid on the Danville railroad, which connected Richmond with the rest of the South, and the information that General Sherman was within eight or nine miles of Atlanta, Georgia.

[1.] MS at Harvard. *Endorsed in another hand*: 18 July 1864 / J. S. Mill repl.

[2.] Letter 691.

[3.] Not identified.

[4.] Charles Cardale Babington.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] George William Curtis to Cairnes, July 7, 1864; MS at NLI. The letter is summarized in Adelaide Weinberg, *John Elliot Cairnes and the American Civil War* (London, 1970), p. 97. Curtis was the author of the book referred to: *Nile Notes of a Howadji* (New York and London, 1851).

[3.] See Letters 684 and 707.

[4.] *Notes on the State of Ireland for J.S.M.* for his use in revising *Pol. Econ.*, printed in *Principles*, pp. 1075-86.

[5.] "Our Financial Burthen," a review of George Warde Norman, *An Examination of some Prevailing Opinions as to the pressure of Taxation in this and other countries* (4th ed., London, 1864), *Victoria Magazine*, III (Sept., 1864), 385-95. The review was signed J.E.C.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 658, n. 2.

[3.] Probably William Hampson Morrison, *Observations on the System of metallic currency adopted in this country* (London, 1837).

[4.] Of Political Economy. See Letter 536, n. 4. A 2nd ed. appeared in 1865.

[5.] Published in part, under the title *The Economic Position of the British Labourer* (Cambridge and London, 1865).

[6.] Atlanta was not occupied until Sept. 3, 1864.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Not located.

[3.] Sir William Rose Mansfield, later Baron Sandhurst (1819-1876), commander of Bombay Presidency, 1860-65, author of *Minute on the Introduction of a Gold Currency into India* (Bombay, 1864).

[4.] See Letter 687, n. 4.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. MS draft at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 698.

[3.] *The English Leader* for Aug. 6, 1864, p. 1, under the heading "Public Topics" reported the Queen "very much unsettled by the painful bereavement she has sustained [the death of the Prince Consort in 1861]. . . . Only last week she is reported to have sent a Bible to Australia, and inscribed it as from 'a heart-broken' Queen. If this is true, it is not a thing to be reported by loyal persons. Ladies, or even women in

the humbler ranks, do not thus publish their private sorrows. The example is not one which Her Majesty would set if in ordinary health. . . .”

[4.] In the MS draft the preceding two sentences are in Helen Taylor’s hand.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] Edward Robert Bulwer-Lytton Lytton, later (1873) 1st Earl of Lytton (1831-1891), diplomatist and poet (pseudonym “Owen Meredith”), then Secretary of Legation at Copenhagen. He was the author of “Report by Her Majesty’s Secretary of Legation on the election of representatives for the Rigsraad, dated 1st July 1863,” *Parl. Papers, 1864*, LXI, 576.

[3.] See especially Blanc’s “Lettre de Londres” (signed Le François) for Aug. 3, 1864, which reports his discussion with Lytton on Hare’s plan.

[4.] Joseph Guadet (1795-1881), playwright and novelist, author of *De la Représentation nationale en France* (Paris, 1863).

[5.] Emile Augier (1820-1889), author of *La question électorale* (Paris, 1864).

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Not identified.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Eventually edited by Helen Taylor, *Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle* (3 vols., London, 1872).

[1.] MS not located. Published in Gomperz, p. 394.

[2.] *Philodemi Epicurei de ira liber*, ed. T. Gomperz (Lipsiae and London, 1864). See Letter 564, n. 5.

[3.] The work was among those recovered from the ruins of Herculaneum.

[4.] SR, Aug. 20, 1864, p. 252. JSM copied out the notice for Gomperz.

[5.] See Letter 600.

[6.] *Plato*.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] See Letter 714.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] “The Danish Electoral System (From the Report by Mr. Lytton . . .),” *Daily News*, Aug. 30, 1864, p. 3, and Aug. 31, 1864, p. 3. See Letter 713.

[3.] C. G. Andrae (1812-1893), Danish statesman and mathematician, inventor of the method of proportional representation which was adopted in the Danish Electoral Law of 1855. Andrae’s system thus antedated Hare’s by four years. JSM in *Rep. Govt.*, 3rd ed. (1865), p. 161, notes that Mr. Hare’s plan “may now be also called Mr. Andrae’s.” See Poul Andrae, *Andrae and his Invention, The Proportional Representation Method*, trans. (Philadelphia, 1926).

[4.] See especially Blanc’s “Lettre de Londres” for Aug. 18, 1864, which discusses the theory of minority representation.

[5.] Alexandre Etienne Simiot (1807-1878?), French politician, author of *Réforme de notre système d’élection. Place légitime des minorités au Parlement* (Bordeaux, 1862).

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[2.] Christie, who had been the British minister to Brazil from 1859 until 1863, when that country broke off diplomatic relations with Great Britain, published in the *Daily News* from July 2 to Oct. 5, 1864, a series of letters signed “C” in defence of British policy in Brazil. The letters were attacked by a correspondent who signed himself “A Friend to both Countries.” The substance of Christie’s letters was later published in book form, *Notes on Brazilian Questions* (London and Cambridge, 1865). Christie had also published anonymously *The Brazil Correspondence in the Cases of the “Prince of Wales” and Officers of the “Forte”*, *Reprinted from Papers Laid before Parliament* (London, 1863). In it he identified his adversary as W. H. Clark, one time registrar of the Great Northern Railway, member of the Reform Club, paid correspondent of the Rio *Jornal do Commercio*, and coffee broker for a Rio firm. See also Alan K. Manchester, *British Preëminence in Brazil, Its Rise and Decline* (Chapel Hill, 1933).

In 1863 and 1864 there had been bitter attacks in Parliament on Christie’s conduct of the embassy in Brazil and on the Russell-Palmerston policies towards that country. Chief among the critics had been those who had financial interests in Brazil; in Parliament the chief spokesmen for those interests were Bernal Osborne, Seymour Fitzgerald, J. Bramley Moore, and Sir Hugh Cairns. Christie was chiefly interested in Brazil’s evasion of its pledges to abolish slavery. He estimated that there were approximately 3,000,000 slaves in a population of about 7,500,000.

[3.] For an example of *The Times*’s views on the Brazilian question, see a leader of July 19, 1864, p. 11c.

[4.] Probably a mistake for Sampson.

Marmaduke Blake Sampson (d. 8 Oct., 1876), city editor and writer of the money article in *The Times*, 1846-73. Defendant in a famous libel suit in 1875; see *Annual*

Register, 1875, pp. 159-73. See also *History of the Times* (London and New York, 1939), vol. II, 543 and 595.

[5.] In the American Civil War.

[6.] *Notes on Brazilian Questions*, referred to in n. 2.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] His *Manual of Political Economy*. See Letter 710, n. 4.

[1.] MS at LSE, as is also a MS copy of Cairnes's reply of Oct. 13. Last paragraph published in *Principles*, p. 1039. Excerpt from Cairnes's reply is in *Principles*, p. 1040.

[2.] George Bemis, *Precedents of American neutrality, in reply to the speech of Sir Roundell Palmer, attorney-general of England, in the British House of Commons*, May 13, 1864 (Boston, 1864).

[3.] George Brinton McClellan (1826-1885), General of the U.S. Army, was the unsuccessful candidate for the Presidency against Lincoln in this year. See "America," *SR*, Oct. 1, 1864, pp. 410-11.

[4.] See Letters 713, n. 2 and 718.

[5.] Third International Congress for the Progress of the Social Sciences, at Amsterdam, Sept. 26 to Oct. 1, 1864. For an account see Maurice Block, "Congrès International des Sciences Sociales," *Journal des Economistes*, ser. 2, XLIV (Oct., 1864), 66-87.

[6.] See Blanc's "Lettre de Londres" (signed "Le François") for Aug. 3, 1864, which reports a discussion with Edward Lytton on Hare's plan, and Blanc's "Lettre" for Aug. 18, 1864, which discusses the theory of minority representation. See also Letter 713.

[7.] Fawcett, in a speech on parliamentary reform on Sept. 13, 1864, at Brighton, argued that extending the franchise to working men would not be dangerous, for they have sufficient diversity of opinion not to vote as a bloc. By implication this argument is against plural voting, for it does not concede that minorities need to be protected by a scheme of proportional representation. For accounts of the speech, see *Sp.*, Sept. 17, 1864, pp. 1063-64, and *SR*, Sept. 17, 1864, pp. 357-58.

[8.] See Letter 709, n. 5.

[9.] The 6th, 1865.

[10.] See Letter 709, n. 4.

[1.] MS draft in Helen Taylor's hand at Yale. MS copy at UCL. In reply to De Morgan's of Oct. 10, MS copy also at Yale, published in Sophia De Morgan, *Memoir of Augustus De Morgan* (London, 1882), pp. 327-28.

[2.] Published in the *Monthly Repository* under the title "Notes on some of the More Popular Dialogues of Plato": 1. "The Protagoras," VIII (1834), 89-99, 203-11; 2. "The Phaedrus," VIII, 404-20, 633-46; 3. "The Gorgias," VIII, 691-710, 802-15, 829-42; 4. "The Apology of Socrates," IX (1835), 112-21, 169-78. Reprinted in *Four Dialogues of Plato*, trans. JSM, ed. Ruth Borchardt (London, 1946). Five further translations with notes (the Charmides, Euthyphro, Laches, Lysis, and Parmenides), the MSS of which are in the New York Public Library, have never been published.

[3.] See Letter 525, n. 8.

[4.] *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (4 vols., Oxford, 1868-71).

[5.] *Elements of Trigonometry and Trigonometrical Analysis* (London, 1837; new ed., 1849).

[6.] *Elements of Algebra preliminary to the Differential Calculus* (London, 1835).

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] "Address on Economy and Trade," NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1864 (London, 1865), pp. 69-105. Delivered as a major address at the York meeting of the Association. Reported in *The Times*, Sept. 29, 1864, p. 12, and the *Daily News*, Sept. 29, p. 2. Reprinted in the *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, XXVIII (March, 1865), 1-33.

[3.] See Charles Fourier, *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements et des Destinées Générales* (Lyon, 1808), Troisième Partie, IV and V.

[4.] For Chadwick on railroads, see his remarks at a meeting of the Royal Society of Arts, Feb. 7, 1866, in *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XIV (Feb. 9, 1866), 198-207, and at the 1865 meeting of the NAPSS, *Transactions* (London, 1866), pp. 538, 547, 548, 555. See also Letter 744.

[5.] Two steam-powered iron-clad rams, being built for the Confederacy by the Laird shipyards at Birkenhead, were seized on Oct. 8 and 9 by order of Lord John Russell, the foreign secretary.

[6.] Helen's article appears to have been forestalled by a leader, "Lord Stanley on the American Civil War," in Chadwick's *Penny Newsmen*, Oct. 30, 1864. Lord Stanley, Edward Henry Stanley, 15th Earl of Derby, in a speech to his constituents, at King's Lynn, Oct. 19, stated that he was for absolute neutrality towards the American Civil War. As reported in *The Times*, Oct. 20, 1864, p. 8, he opposed English mediation, and was certain of the North's victory. The tone of his remarks is pro-Southern.

[7.] The volunteer civilian organization that brought medical aid, financial relief, and material and spiritual comfort to the soldiers and sailors of the Union forces. See Letter 692.

[1.] MS at UCL. MS copy in Helen Taylor's hand at Yale. In reply to De Morgan's of Oct. 23, MS copy also at Yale.

[2.] Presumably his *Elements of Trigonometry* (see Letter 722) but possibly *Trigonometry and Double Algebra* (London, 1849). See Letter 743.

[3.] This paper has not been identified. Presumably it was not one of the two papers De Morgan had presented at the Cambridge Philosophical Society meeting of May 16, 1864, since these were not published until 1871: "On Infinity, and on the Sign of Equality," *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, XI (1871), 145-89; and "A Theorem relating to Neutral Series," *ibid.*, pp. 190-202. For a bibliography of De Morgan's published work see Sophia Elizabeth De Morgan, *Memoir of Augustus De Morgan*, pp. 401-15.

[4.] De Morgan in a letter to JSM, Nov. 16, reported that he expected to receive soon proofs of his paper on Infinity mentioned in the preceding note.

[5.] See *Hamilton*, chap. iv.

[6.] Thomas Spencer Baynes (1823-1887), assistant editor of the *Daily News* from 1858 to 1864, when he was appointed professor of logic, metaphysics, and English literature, at St. Andrews.

[7.] See Letter 230, n. 11.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to Longman's of Nov. 4, also at LSE.

[2.] The 3rd ed., published Feb., 1865.

[3.] The 6th ed., 1865, and the People's ed., 1865.

[4.] Longman had proposed that the cheap edition of *Pol. Econ.* might sell at seven shillings (five, after 4,000 copies were sold); of *Rep. Govt.* at two shillings; and *On Liberty* at 1s./4d.

[5.] John Buckle, first cousin of Henry Thomas Buckle. See Giles St. Aubyn, *A Victorian Eminence*.

[6.] See Letter 715, n. 2.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Oct. 13, MS copy also at LSE, published in part in *Principles*, p. 1040. First two paragraphs published in *Principles*, p. 1041.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[3.] See Letter 600.

[4.] See Letter 709, n. 4.

[5.] An address on Ireland for the opening of the approaching Nov. 26 session of the Dublin Statistical Society, as reported in Cairnes's letter of Oct. 13. Mountifort Longfield (1802-1884), Irish judge; first professor of political economy at Trinity College, Dublin, 1832; Regius Professor of feudal and English law, University of Dublin, 1834; judge of the landed estates court, 1858-67; assisted in drafting Irish measures of the first and second Gladstone governments.

[6.] "Colonization and Colonial Government: a lecture," *Lectures delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association in Connexion with the United Church of England and Ireland during the year 1864* (Dublin, 1865).

[7.] For Smith's advocacy of colonial emancipation, see his letters in the *Daily News*, 1862-63, published in book form as *The Empire* (Oxford and London, 1863).

[8.] *Rep. Govt.*, chap. xviii.

[9.] In his letter of Oct. 13, 1864, Cairnes said, "I see two communities, dwelling side by side, resorting to exactly opposite remedies for the cure of the same evil; for the difficulty of the Southern States in the one case and that of Lower Canada in the other are identical in this respect, that both arise from the presence in a large community of a section occupying a lower, or at all events a different stage of civilization from that reached by a majority of the people." For an account of the 1864 Quebec Conference that led to confederation, see P. B. Waite, *The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867* (Toronto, 1962), pp. 87-103.

[10.] John Church Hamilton (1792-1882), son of Alexander Hamilton, editor, *The Federalist* (Philadelphia, 1864).

[11.] Herman Merivale, in his *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies delivered before the University of Oxford in 1839, 1840, & 1841* (new and revised ed., London, 1861), pp. 647-48, dismissed as impracticable for such colonies as Australia both Hare's plan for the representation of minorities and JSM's for cumulative votes.

[12.] See Letter 721, n. 7.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in the *Reasoner*, XXVIII (Dec. 1, 1865), 71, and in G. J. Holyoake, *The History of Co-operation in England: its Literature and its Advocates* (2 vols., London, 1875, 1879), II, 275-77.

[2.] Proprietors of the Whitwood Collieries, who had adopted a plan of co-operative partnership with their employees. Holyoake (*History of Co-operation*, II, 276) says he solicited opinions from JSM, Fawcett, Louis Blanc, and others, and published the letters he received. He reports that the plan failed, and that Messrs. Briggs went back to a fixed wage plan.

[1.] MS at LSE. Cairnes's letter of Nov. 29 (MS copy at LSE) enclosing ten pages of notes on Ireland, had evidently not yet reached JSM. Cairnes's reply of Dec. 6, 1864, is also at LSE. Parts of both of Cairnes's letters are published in *Principles*, pp. 1041-42, and 1056-58, as is part of this Letter, pp. 1055-56.

[2.] For Cairnes's suggestions about Ireland and JSM's revisions, in response to these suggestions, of the 6th ed. of *Pol. Econ.* (1865), see *Principles*, pp. 334-36 and Appendix H, 1082 ff. See also Letter 709, n. 4.

[3.] See Letter 761, and *Principles*, pp. 414-15.

[4.] Henry Charles Carey, *Principles of Social Science* (3 vols., Philadelphia and London, 1858). For JSM's addition to *Pol. Econ.* in reaction to reading Carey's book, see *Principles*, pp. 919-21. For similar judgments of Carey expressed to an American visitor, see James K. H. Willcox, "A Visit to John Stuart Mill at Avignon," *Appleton's Journal*, IX (June 14, 1873), 787. See also *Earlier Letters*, p. 658.

[1.] MS in 1943 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts. Dated 1866 in the transcript by Professor Hayek, but internal evidence indicates 1864. MS no longer available for examination.

[2.] Possibly the note on p. xxxvi of *The Election of Representatives* (London, 1865), 3rd ed.

[3.] In "Appendix H" of the 3rd ed., Hare recorded references to articles on his plan in the German newspapers *Die Zeit* and *Frankfurter Reform*, and reprinted one article from the *Frankfurter Reform*.

[4.] The final note to chap. vii, *Rep. Govt.* (3rd ed., 1865).

[5.] See Letter 695.

[6.] See Letter 112.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published except for opening and last two paragraphs in Elliot, II, 11-14.

[2.] "Berkeley's Theory of Vision," *North British Review*, XLI (Aug., 1864), 199-230: a review of Thomas Abbott, *Sight and Touch: An Attempt to Disprove the received (or Berkleian) Theory of Vision* (London, 1864).

[3.] Alexander Campbell Fraser (1819-1914), professor of logic and metaphysics at Edinburgh, 1856-91. His edition of *The Works of George Berkeley* was published at Oxford in four volumes, in 1871. He reviewed JSM's *Hamilton* in *North British Review*, XLIII (Sept., 1865), 1-58.

[4.] "The Dynamical Theory of Heat," *North British Review*, XL (Feb., 1864), 40-69, and "Energy," XL (May, 1864), 337-68. These are items 24 and 25 of the Bibliography prepared by Peter Guthrie Tait (1831-1901), professor of natural

philosophy at Edinburgh, 1860-1901, and included on pp. 350-55 in Cargill Gilston Knott, *Life and Scientific Work of Peter Guthrie Tait* (Cambridge, 1911). The bibliography should be consulted for items on energy dated before 1864.

[5.] John Tyndall delivered a paper "On Force," June 6, 1862, at a meeting of the members of the Royal Institution. See *Proceedings of Royal Institution of Great Britain*, III (1858-62), 527-36.

[6.] Pierre Maurice Mervoyer, *Etude sur l'Association des Idées* (Douai, 1864).

[7.] "Philosophy of Space and Time," *No. Am. Rev.*, XCIX (July, 1864), 64-116, and "The Conditioned and Unconditioned," *ibid.* (Oct., 1864), 402-48.

[8.] At the General Monthly Meeting of the Royal Institution on Dec. 5, 1864, in announcing the schedule for the coming season it was reported that Bain would deliver three lectures after Easter, 1865, "On the Physical Accompaniments of Mind." See *Proceedings*, IV (1862-66), 328. There appears to be no record that these lectures were delivered.

[9.] Jules Simon (1814-1896), philosopher and statesman. It was also announced on Dec. 5 that he would give three lectures (in French) "On the Physical and Moral Condition of Workmen." Like Bain's these lectures do not appear to have been given. Simon in the same year as JSM's *On Liberty* had published his *La Liberté* (2 vols., Paris, 1859).

[10.] See Letter 600.

[11.] See Letter 721, n. 9.

[12.] Of his *Plato*.

[1.] MS and MS copy at UCL. In reply to De Morgan's of Nov. 16, 1864, MS copy at UCL.

[2.] See Letters 722 and 724.

[3.] See Letter 724.

[4.] De Morgan on Nov. 28, 1864, read a paper "On the Early History of the Signs + and -," eventually published in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, XI (1871), 203-12. He mentioned the subject in his letter of Nov. 16.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 721, n. 7. Fawcett was defeated for Brighton on July 12, 1865.

[3.] William Dougal Christie was defeated as a Liberal candidate for Cambridge in the election of 1865.

[4.] A dinner in honour of Goldwin Smith was held at the Union League Club, New York City, Nov. 12, 1864. For a report of the dinner and the speech, see the *Daily News*, Nov. 29, 1864, p. 7.

[1.] MS draft at Northwestern. In reply to Spencer's of Dec. 7, MS also at Northwestern, published in his *Autobiography*, II, 138-39.

[2.] Spencer had announced plans to purchase and reorganize *The Reader: A Review of Current Literature*, a weekly which had begun publication on Jan. 3, 1863, under the editorship of John Malcolm Ludlow, David Masson, John Dennis, and Thomas Bendyshe.

[3.] Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895), the well-known biologist and controversialist.

[4.] Spencer had reported that Huxley, aided by John Tyndall, would edit the department of Science; Francis Galton, the department of Travels and Ethnology; Cairnes, Political Economy and Political Philosophy; and Frederick Pollock, Belles Lettres.

[5.] Forty shares of £100 were to be issued, calling up £80 on each.

[1.] MS at LSE. Published in part in *Principles*, pp. 1072-73. In reply to Cairnes's of Dec. 6, MS copy at LSE, published in part in *Principles*, pp. 1056-58.

[2.] Cairnes's notes have been published in *Principles*, pp. 1042-55, and 1058-72.

[3.] See Letter 728, n. 2.

[4.] Cairnes sent JSM a copy of his article "Capital and Currency," *North British Review*, XXVIII (Feb., 1858), 191-230, with his letter of Dec. 6.

[5.] For Cairnes's comments on E. G. Wakefield's colonial system, see *Principles*, p. 1046.

[6.] For Cairnes's comments on income tax, see *Principles*, p. 1051.

[7.] See Letter 726, n. 5.

[8.] "Statistical Society of Dublin," *Daily News*, Nov. 29, 1864, p. 5, and "Judge Longfield on Ireland," *Daily News*, Dec. 1, 1864, p. 2.

[9.] In a speech at Manchester on Oct. 14, Gladstone for the first time publicly called attention to the need for reform in Ireland: "We cannot look across the Channel to Ireland, and especially to the state of feeling in Ireland, and say that that state of feeling, taken as a whole, is becoming for the honour and for the advantage of the United Kingdom. . . . We cannot say that there duty to the people has been discharged." *The Times*, Oct. 15, 1864, p. 8.

[10.] “The Liberal Dilemma,” *The Times*, Dec. 9, 1864, p. 5, a letter from Charles Buxton (1823-1871), Liberal MP for Maidstone. Buxton characterized the dilemma of the Liberals as that of being caught between a theoretical desire to extend the franchise and a fear of extending it to the great masses of working men. Buxton proposed a system of plural voting in which the number of votes a man was entitled to should depend upon the amount of property he rented or owned. No man was to be entitled to more than two votes.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 600.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Harrison’s letter of Dec. 8 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 14-16.

Robert Harrison (1820-1897), librarian of the London Library, 1857-93. Contributor to the *Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography* and to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, for which he wrote a sketch of John Black which includes most of this letter as from a “Private Letter, 1864.”

[2.] John Black (1783-1855), journalist, editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, 1821-43. See JSM, *Autobiog.*, chap. iv.

[3.] James Mill had condemned Poor Laws in his article on “Beggars” in the *Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica* (1816-23), but defended the Poor Law of 1834.

[4.] Albany Fonblanque (1793-1872), editor of the *Examiner*, 1830-47.

[5.] Richard Carlile (1790-1843), free-thinker and publisher. See *Autobiog.*, chap. iv. One of JSM’s earliest published letters was “To Mr. R. Carlile, Dorchester Gaol,” *Republican*, VII (Jan. 3, 1823), 25-26.

[6.] William Cobbett (1762-1835), essayist, radical reformer. See the following attacks on Black, examples of the many which appeared in *Cobbett’s Weekly Political Register*, LXI, Jan. 6, 1827, cols. 115-17; Feb. 3, 1827, cols. 361-75; Feb. 24, 1827, cols. 544-61; LXIV, Nov. 3, 1827, cols. 321-56; Dec. 8, 1827, cols. 648-69.

[1.] MS not located. Published in S. B. Weeks, “Anti-Slavery Sentiment in the South,” *Publications of the Southern History Association*, II (April, 1898), 120-21.

Daniel Reaves Goodloe (1814-1902), southern-born abolitionist and journalist; author of a number of pamphlets on slavery, including *Inquiry into the causes which have retarded the accumulation of wealth and increase of population in the southern states: in which the question of slavery is considered in a politico-economical view*. By a Carolinian (Washington, D.C., 1846, and later editions); this is presumably the work that had been sent to JSM.

[2.] Weeks at this point subjoins the following note by Goodloe: “I will add that the ‘point noticed’ by me in my letter to Mr. Mill, to which he refers, is in his preliminary remarks to his *Political Economy*. He lays down the proposition that in estimating the wealth of nations, it is a mistake to add the stock held by individuals in the National Debt, for the reason that the National Debt is only a mortgage on the property of the people. For the same reason, he objects to the addition of private mortgages to the aggregate of property in the Nation. This reasoning is exactly parallel with my statement in the pamphlet which I sent him, that the value of slaves should not be added in as a part of the national or State’s wealth, since the slave was no more valuable than a free laborer. Therefore, neither, or both should be counted as property. But Mr. Mill had failed to see the analogy in his brief chapter on slavery.” [*Pol. Econ.*, Book II, chap. v]—D.R.G.

For JSM’s addition to the 1865 ed., see *Principles*, II, 9 $w-w$.

[1.] MS at the Rhode Island Historical Society. MS copy at Columbia.

Rowland Gibson Hazard (1801-1888), of Peacedale, Rhode Island, woollen manufacturer and writer on philosophical subjects. See also Letter 741.

[2.] *Freedom of Mind in Willing; or, Every Being that Wills a Creative First Cause* (New York and London, 1864).

[3.] *Our Resources. A Series of Articles on the Financial and Political Condition of the United States* (New York and London, 1864).

[4.] The last essay in *Our Resources*.

[5.] Salmon P. Chase (1808-1873) resigned as Lincoln’s Secretary of the Treasury in June, 1864, and later in the year was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. His successor as Secretary was William P. Fessenden (1806-1869).

[1.] MS at LSE. First paragraph published in *Principles*, pp. 1073-74.

[2.] Letter 734.

[3.] See *Principles*, Book III, chap. xxiii, pp. 647-59.

[4.] See *Principles*, Appendix H, pp. 1064-68.

[5.] James Munson Barnard (1819-1904), philanthropist.

[6.] See Letter 692.

[7.] Parke Godwin (1816-1904), writer on public affairs, son-in-law of William Cullen Bryant.

[8.] Charles Loring Brace (1826-1890), philanthropist; founder of the Children's Aid Society, 1853, in New York City; author of *The Races of the Old World: A Manual of Ethnology* (New York, 1863).

[9.] See Letter 733.

[1.] MS in Wellesley College Library.

[2.] See Letter 738, n. 2.

[3.] "Quoi qu'en dise son pasteur, le paysan range l'argent monnayé au nombre des trésors que ne rongent ni les mites, ni la rouille, et il amasse; craint-il des voleurs qui pourraient découvrir son magot, il a une cachette toute prête sous les planches de son poêle ou de son grenier. Ce sont les moeurs de l'Orient en plein Occident. La population des campagnes a été dans les huit dernières années comme une éponge qui s'est gorgée d'argent. Des statisticiens ont calculé que dans un seul canton à blé l'Allemagne du Sud, lequel ne compte que quelques milles* carrés, on a thésaurisé dans le cours de dix dernières années au moins un million de florins d'argent comptant qui n'est pas rentré dans le commerce." *Revue Germanique et Française*, XXVII (Oct., 1863), 205.

[*] German miles, of 5 English miles each. (JSM's note to the enclosed passage)