

The Online Library of Liberty

A Project Of Liberty Fund, Inc.

John Stuart Mill, *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XVII - The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1849-1873 Part IV* [1869]



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 XVII - The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1849-1873 Part IV, 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. 17 of the 33 vol. Collected Works contains Mill's letters written between 1869-1873.

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, 1869-1873	
1869, 1535 1870, 1676 1871, 1792	
1872, 1866 1873, 1931	
APPENDIX I	
Additional Earlier Letters	1954
APPENDIX II	
Additional Later Letters	2009
INDEXES	
General Index	2017
Index of Correspondents	2078
Detail of original Watts portrait of Mill facing page	1535

Table Of Contents

[Abbreviations and Short Titles](#)

[The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill 1869-1873](#)

[1869](#)

[1870](#)

[1871](#)

[1872](#)

[1873](#)

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

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

1869-1873



Detail of original Watts portrait of Mill
From photograph in the National Portrait Gallery
In the possession of the City of Westminster (see Letter 1780)

>Detail of original Watts portrait of Mill

From photograph in the National Portrait Gallery

In the possession of the City of Westminster (see Letter 1780)

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

1869

1370.

TO PARKE GODWIN¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 1. 1869

Dear Mr Godwin—

It gave me great pleasure to hear from you & especially to receive a letter shewing so fundamental an agreement in our mode of thinking on the great questions of the future. The emancipation of women, & cooperative production, are, I fully believe, the two great changes that will regenerate society. But though the latter of these may grow up without much help from the action of Parliaments & Congresses, the former cannot. I have always thought with you that the abstinence of many of the best minds in America from political life was to a great degree accounted for by the fact that America, as a rule, needs very little governing. But the present is surely a time in which, even in America, the action of legislation & administration is of transcendent importance; & in the old & complicated societies of Europe the need of political action is always, more or less, what exceptional circumstances make it in America at present. Moreover, a place in Parliament is, in England, a vantage ground from which opinions can be promulgated to a larger audience & with a far greater probability of being listened to, than from any other position except perhaps that of the editor of a widely circulated daily paper. It was with this hope principally that I accepted a seat in Parliament, & on the one subject at least, the political enfranchisement of women, the results have far exceeded my expectation. It is doubtful whether there remains anything of the first importance which I could more effectually help forward by being in Parl^t. Personal representation, the greatest political improvement after women's suffrage which remains to be made, I can help, perhaps as effectively, by my writings. I am therefore quite content on public grounds to be no longer a member of the House, while on private my release justifies and more than justifies, your congratulations.

If you are in England in March or April I shall hope to see you & to compare notes with you on many subjects both American & general.

1371.

TO HENRY MAINE¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 1. 1869

My Dear Sir—

The painfully interesting papers² which you kindly forwarded to me have impressed me with a very strong sense of the degree in which official opinion has retrograded in India since I ceased to be a regular reader of Indian official correspondence.³ When I left the India House the feeling that the actual cultivators had claims upon us which we could not ignore was leading to plans for revising in their favour, so far as was still possible even the system established by Lord Cornwallis in Bengal proper;⁴ Act 10 of 1859,⁵ with the provisions of which I am very imperfectly acquainted, was, I believe the fruit of this movement. Now, however, there seems to be a reaction towards landlordism of the present English type, at the very time when in England opinion is, though slowly, beginning to turn the contrary way. And, what is most of all deplorable, this reaction seems to be chiefly among the younger men. I do not maintain that the evil is to be ascribed to the constitutional change made in 1858,⁶ for it is very probable that the mutiny & its consequences would have wrought the same change for the worse if the old organ of government had continued. The greater fear of the natives, & desire of conciliating the natives, which have existed since the mutiny (“the natives” being as usual a mere synonym for the powerful classes, the great landholders) have discredited the ideas of protection to the interests of the great mass of the population which in a more or less enlightened shape had been the animating principle of Indian government for a whole generation. The Talockdars of Oude, the very men whose atrocities were the defence pleaded for the annexation of the country,⁷ have been made by us greater men than they ever were; & now everybody, even though a peasant, on whom it is possible to fasten the name of a proprietor is in the opinion of an apparently powerful party, to be treated as if the land & its inhabitants only existed for his benefit. These notions, which I am afraid are ruling the local administration of the Central Provinces as well as the Punjab, naturally find warm support from the ignorant, arriéré, prejudiced & bigotted Toryism of Sir W. Mansfield.⁸ Until now the strong contrary convictions of Sir John Lawrence⁹ have moderated the mischief, but India has now got an Irish landlord to rule over her:¹⁰ & it is quite uncertain whether his official superior the Duke of Argyll will be any check upon his landlordism.¹¹ There has been no more determined defender than the Duke, of the evictions, in utter defiance of customary & traditional ideas of rights, which have depopulated the North of Scotland.

To look at the matter on another side: is it not monstrous that young settlement officers¹² should have had it in their power, without express authorisation or instructions from the Government to reduce to the condition of mere tenants at will in a single district 46000 out of 60000 cultivators who had been declared at the former

settlement to have rights of occupancy?¹³ & that too when they had been so declared on the ground, equitable enough under the circumstances, of continuous occupation for a minimum period of 12 years, which 10 or 15 years additional occupancy under our rule had increased to a quarter of a century. All this disturbance of recognised rights and authorised expectations, so great an evil anywhere & one of the greatest in India, is incurred for the sake of a retrograde step in economics & social organisation! I hope I am not wrong in collecting from the discussion in Council that these divisions of the Settlement officers will not be upheld unless when they would have been valid divisions under the Act just passed.¹⁴ A great part of these however would have been valid under the Act, especially in the case of tenants who have at any time made an admission of their having no rights of occupancy, which I perceive they did in 19000 out of the 46000 cases, & I agree with you in profoundly distrusting these admissions; not only for the very sufficient reasons stated by you in Council, nor only from the great probability that the admissions were often obtained by unfair means, but also from the little value which the natives of India habitually attach to admissions against their own interest, because they have not been accustomed to expect that they will be held bound by them.

Except the exclusion of so large a number of cases from its benefits, I do not see much to complain of in the terms of the compromise established by the new Act. The distinction between Khoodkaust ryots & Pyekaust ryots¹⁵ is familiar to all administrators of Northern India, the former being understood to have an inherited right of occupancy of ancient date, while the latter belong to families who have arrived at a comparatively late period & remained on tolerance; though I am not sure that the Pyekaust ryots are always strictly tenants at will. Supposing then that all are allowed rights of occupancy who have a just claim to them, then, when there is no evidence of a right to hold at a fixed rent, it seems as much as they could expect that their rent should be fixed by law at 15 per cent less (your letter by a *lapsus calami*¹⁶ says 15 per cent more) than the rent paid by tenants who have no right of occupancy. It is however a defect that while there is a power given to the proprietor to buy out, on certain terms of compensation the rights of the tenant, the Act gives no power to the tenant to buy out the rights of the landlord. As was well said in the discussion, this is as if the English Copyhold Commission,¹⁷ instead of enabling the copyholder to redeem the legal claim of the lord of the manor, had empowered the lord to turn out the copyholder for a compensation. This omission in the Act admits of being corrected by subsequent legislation. But unless it is done this year you will not be there to do it, & who can tell how your place may be filled?

It has given me great pleasure that your health does not seem to have suffered from your residence in India. You will find abundant work for one like you in England, much of it such as few have anything like your qualifications for performing. I hope that such personal acquaintance with you as I have ever had the good fortune of enjoying¹⁸ will be not only renewed but greatly improved after your return to Europe.

1372.

TO DUNCAN McLAREN¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 3. 1869

Dear Mr M^CLaren—

I need hardly say that I am very much gratified by your kind letter. I know that you & Mrs M^CLaren acted for the best & I agree with you that the publication of my letter to her may do some good.² As a rule however I prefer that my letters should not be made public unless they were written with a view to the contingency of their being so, & I have seen with regret several recent instances in which publicity has been given to them without my consent:³ not that I shrink from exposure to criticism, which any public man, even any writer, ought to welcome, from however hostile a quarter; but because, when writing confidentially to friends who feel as one does oneself, one takes many things for granted which would require explanation to general readers, & one does not guard one's expressions as prudence & courtesy would require one to do in addressing oneself to those who differ from one. All the letters of mine which have lately been published have been treated by the newspapers exactly as if they had been written for the public & sent to the editors by myself.

It is, as a general rule, best, I think, to ask the writer's consent before publishing a letter. This is so flattering a thing to do that there can never be any difficulty in doing it.

I am particularly pleased at your approbation of the last sentence of my letter⁴ because I can share in it myself, for it was dictated to me as I wrote it word for word by my dear daughter. We always agree in sentiments but she sometimes can find better words to put them in than I can myself.

1373.

TO MANTON MARBLE¹

Avignon

Jan 5, 1869

Dear Sir

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Nov. 7. I did not before know to whom I was indebted for the copies of the World. I could perceive that they were sent on account of the reports of the proceedings of the Labour Congress,² and I availed myself of

them to look through those reports, which are doubly interesting to me, by the indications they afford of what is going on in the minds of Americans and in those of the working men. In regard to the other matters touched on in your letter, I am very glad to have your assurance that the payment of the debt in greenbacks is not supported by the Democratic party.³ It is satisfactory at all events, to know that so influential a democratic journal as the World is opposed to it. On the subject of free trade, I have always counted on finding the Democratic party the sounder of the two: and when the question of reconstruction is settled (which, to my thinking, it can never be on the principles of the Democratic party) I look forward to a rearrangement of parties, in which free trade will come into the first rank, and in which representation of minorities may also become prominent: and I may then perhaps be more in sympathy with the Democratic party, and less with those who oppose it, than I now am. Even now I have friends and correspondents among the Democratic party, and I am as desirous to do full justice to that party as I am to all parties in my own country. Neither do I see that any injustice was done them in my published letter.⁴ If they allow their elected Convention to profess, for electioneering purposes, doctrines which are not theirs, a stranger is not in fault if, until those doctrines are disavowed, he concludes them to be the doctrines of the party: but I did not do so; I merely expressed my alarm at their being in the programme.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

Manton Marble Esq

1374.

TO GEORGE W. SMALLEY¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 6. 1869

Dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for sending me the Tribunes.² I need hardly say that your letters are most gratifying to myself personally, & that I have read with great interest the picture of the elections as they presented themselves to your mind. In regard to the West^f election I think your first impression of the cause of my defeat was more correct than your subsequent one.³ I may have lost a good many votes by the Bradlaugh business, but not so many as to account for the great difference between Smith's number at the poll & mine.

On one point I ought to correct your impression. You say it is reported that I spent a great deal of money, some £1100, on my first election & was expected to spend as much more on the second. I was not aware that such things had been said or thought by any one. It is a literal fact that neither of my contests has cost me one penny directly or indirectly. You are right in thinking that I both could and would have paid the expenses had I thought it desirable on public grounds to do so; but having said that I would not I thought it right to adhere to my word, for nothing does more mischief than high-flown professions which are only intended to be taken *cum grano salis* by the initiated.

Republican opinions certainly seem to have a much greater number of partisans in Spain than was supposed,⁴ & the number is likely to increase as the prospect becomes more familiar to people's minds in the absence of any generally acceptable candidate for the throne.⁵ But it strikes me that it would be a great mistake on the part of the Republicans to include a President in their programme. They should have a mere Prime Minister, removable by the Cortes. Even in America the inconvenience is very great of having a President & a Congress who if hostile to one another, cannot either of them get rid of the other for what may be several years: & in any Continental European country the almost certain consequence of discord between the two authorities would be a coup d'état by the one which has troops under its command. There is nothing in Prim's⁶ career which gives me the smallest confidence in his being, that rarity among Spanish politicians, a man of principle; & if he becomes President of a Spanish Republic it will be very likely with the full intention to take the first opportunity of playing the game of Napoleon the Third,⁷ after which Spain will be a Republic after the fashion of those of Spanish America,—a perpetual succession of military dictators each supplanting his predecessor by a pronunciamento or a civil war. That at least is my impression, grounded no doubt on very imperfect knowledge.

1374A.

TO EDWARD LYULPH STANLEY¹

Private.

Avignon

Jan. 7. 1869

Dear Mr Lyulph Stanley

When, during your assiduous attendance at the election proceedings in Westminster, you spoke to me on the subject of an Association to claim for the working class electors the right to an equal voice in the selection of Liberal candidates,² I asked for time for consideration before I could give a positive opinion as to the *present* expediency of such an Association. The result of such consideration is, that I think the time *is* come for such a movement. The defeat of the working classes in the elections, and the subordinate position which has consequently been assigned to the men of

advanced opinions in the formation of the government,³ have been so much noticed and commented on by friends and enemies, that neither the working classes themselves, nor their political allies, would be open to any fair accusation of causing dissension by acting upon a fact so universally recognised; but would rather be in danger of being supposed to acquiesce in it as right and necessary, if they did not make some demonstration against it. When I happen to be in correspondence with any organs of the working classes on political matters, I now make a point of inculcating on them the justice and expediency of standing out for the choice of one of the Liberal candidates when there are two seats, and for their claim to be consulted when there is only one.⁴ And I should be happy at once to join the Association proposed by you and your friends, whenever you are disposed to go on with the project. Only I should not like to be (as you proposed) President of the Society, in as much as, many of my personal friends being likely to be among its most active members, it would be supposed that it [had] been set going by me in order that by its means I might be reelected to Parliament; which would not be a desirable impression to give, either for the Society or for myself. I am

Dear Mr Lyulph Stanley
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1375.

TO ROBERT NICHOLSON¹

Jan. 8. 1869

Sir

It would give me great pleasure if I were able to comply with the flattering request of the President of the Philomathic Society² that I sh^d be present at the annual dinner of the Society & it is from no indifference to the kind feelings of the members towards me, expressed in your letter, that I beg to be excused from accepting that honour. It is because I do not see my way to making a suitable return for it by delivering such an address on any subject of general interest as the Society is accustomed to hear from its invited guests on the occasion of its annual festivals without the employment of an amount of time & labour which I can ill spare from occupations on which I am now & shall be for some time engaged.

1376.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

Jan. 9. 1869

Dear Sir

I have heard from Mrs Max Kyllmann in answer to the letter I wrote to her asking for a list of the names of those who subscribed the £120 to the Review at Mr Kyllmann's request.² She says that she should be very glad to send their names if she "thought it could be of any use to D^r Chapman to open communication with them; but, far from being friends of the Review, they none of them take interest in it, and they merely subscribed to oblige Mr Kyllmann, who had failed to obtain help in other quarters. Did I not know the difficulty my husband had at the time, I would gladly volunteer to raise subscriptions. I need not say that I shall seize every opportunity that may offer itself, and if a subscription of £5 can be of any good, I shall be very glad to hand it to D^r Chapman."

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

D^r Chapman

1377.

TO PHILIP HENRY RATHBONE¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 9. 1869

Dear Sir

I must beg you to excuse my delay in answering your letter, which has arisen from my great reluctance to answer in the negative² and my desire before doing so to consider well all the topics which it would be possible for me to take up, and the points of view from which they could be treated.³ I quite feel the force of your remark that to put forth opinions which at first startle people often stimulates & prepares their minds better than anything else that can be done. This is the principle I myself act upon, and [*several illegible words*] I think with some success last year in my proposals on the land question in Ireland,⁴ which while they were almost universally decried as violent & extreme have had the effect of making other proposals, up to that time considered extreme, be considered comparatively moderate & practicable.

Still it so happens that at the present juncture I can see no topic on which the public mind is sufficiently prepared to welcome anything I might have to say on which it is

not already so far convinced that what I could say would be of little practical use; and it is not on such an occasion as this that one would like to put oneself in a position of antagonism to one's listeners, and insist on enforcing what one cannot but feel to be unwelcome even if one is convinced that they are salutary truths.

Your great kindness, and that of the other gentlemen who have the management of the P.S. in being willing to put off if necessary their annual festivals till a later date than usual to suit my convenience makes me doubly reluctant to decline your kind invitation, and I hope that you and they will not ascribe it to a want of appreciation of so flattering a compliment but I feel myself compelled respectfully to decline their application.

1378.

TO STANDISH O'GRADY¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 16. 1869

Private

Dear Sir—

The reason why I think that a miracle could not prove supernatural power to any one who did not already believe in the existence of some such power,² is this, that we never can know that any seeming miracle implies supernatural power. The achievement of apparently impossible results by strictly natural means is a fact not only within experience but within common experience. It is not even necessary to suppose the employment of a law of nature not previously discovered. It is sufficient to bear in mind the innumerable & truly wonderful exploits of jugglers, and, supernatural power not being proved by the miracle, a fortiori it would not be proof of a God.

If, however, any man possessed the apparent power of controlling not some particular laws of nature but all laws of nature—if he actually stopped the course of the sun, arrested the tides, changed the water of the sea instantaneously from salt to fresh, & so on without limit; then indeed he would prove by the direct testimony of sense that there existed a supernatural power & that he was possessed of it. The fact is that this would be an experience as complete as, & the exact counterpart of, that which we should have of creation if we had ocular demonstration of worlds similar to our own called into existence by a Will.

But if the apparently supernatural power only manifests itself in the seeming supersession of a limited number of natural laws, the hypothesis of its being done by means of other natural laws would be, as it seems to me, intrinsically so much more probable, that nothing but the proved impossibility of this could warrant the

conclusion that the power was supernatural. And this proof of impossibility it is evident could never be obtained, in the existing or very probable future state of human knowledge.

1379.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Avignon

Jan. 16, 1869

Dear Mr Plummer

A lady² who has been exerting herself very much, and done a great deal, in the cause both of the education of women and of the agitation for the suffrage for women in Ireland, has lately published a novel, and has written to my daughter to ask her to use any influence she can to make it known. Knowing how kindly you are disposed to exert yourself in favour of new writers, it occurs to us that if you think the work good, you would very likely be both able and willing to review it favourably in the Daily News or elsewhere, and so help to give it circulation.³ (Miss Robertson says that she scarcely knows any one connected with the press, but has always hitherto let her books take their own chance, yet has not fared very badly, her last novel, "The Story of Nelly Dillon" having got a long favourable review in the Athenaeum.)⁴

We have not yet read the work ourselves, but from what we know of Miss Robertson's writings we should suppose it to be good, and it is certain that she is an industrious and public spirited writer. I have directed a copy of the novel in question ("Society in a Garrison Town") to be sent to you. I am

Dear Mr Plummer

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1380.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 16. 1869

Dear Thornton—

I have to thank you again for one of your pleasant letters. I congratulate you on having brought your book² to a happy termination & most heartily wish it the success with the public which I am sure it deserves. Your description of your feeling of recovered liberty after the completion of your book would seem to describe my feeling at having recovered the free disposal of my time. I also like you have a great arrear of miscellaneous reading to bring up, & this is not yet getting itself done very quickly in consequence of other arrears. The printer is making good progress with the Analysis³ & I hope to succeed in the attempt to get it published by or soon after the 1st of March. From what you say I hope to have read your book before that time. I have a good deal to read and study before I next revise my Pol Economy for another edition.⁴

What you say of Sir S. Northcote's weakness of character, giving up good reasons of his own to bad ones of other people, explains to me much of his political life: how the more vigorous will of Sir C. Trevelyan kept him true to his convictions as to competitive examinations⁵ & how his honesty of purpose did not hinder him from going all lengths with Disraeli though Disraeli did not convince his reason. I do not know what sort of a Minister the D. of Argyll will turn out⁶ but I am glad you have not got Bright⁷ who would have had much to unlearn, & very little disposition to unlearn it. The two members of Council⁸ you mention are not good average specimens, having been selected by the old body out of their own number in consequence chiefly of their personal popularity, which was in itself not undeserved.

We are glad you share in our estimate of our terrace,⁹ which so far from being suppressed, has been nearly doubled in size, we having increased the part of the house of which it is the roof, & added a bath room thereto. Moreover Helen has carried out her long cherished scheme (about which she tells me she consulted you) of a "vibratory"¹⁰ for me, & has made a pleasant covered walk some 30 feet long where I can vibrate in cold or rainy weather. The terrace, you must know, as it goes round two sides of the house, has got itself dubbed the "semi-circumgyratory."¹¹ In addition to this, Helen has built me a *herbarium*—a little room fitted up with closets for my plants, shelves for my botanical books, & a great table whereon to manipulate them all. Thus you see with my herbarium, my vibratory, & my semi-circumgyratory I am in clover & you may imagine with what scorn I think of the H. of C., which, comfortable club as it is said to be, could offer me none of these comforts, or more properly speaking these necessaries of life. Helen says *your* room is not finished yet, because as she is an architect & master mason all in one, she is carrying on the improvements very slowly, not letting the attention to them interfere too much with her other work. But you may be sure we have not altered the outward aspect of our dear little cottage, which looks as small as ever, & you may be equally sure that I am lost in wonder & admiration of the ingenuity with which Helen has contrived to manage it all. You will not be surprised to learn that among the other additions there is a Puss-House. Altogether we are very comfortable, & only wish everybody could be as comfortable as we are. The weather this year, though cloudy & wet, is still so delightfully mild that we can still spend hours upon the terrace.

1381.

TO EDWARD JONES¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 19. 1869

Dear Sir—

I thank you for your pamphlet.² It is truly a frightful consideration that the annual number of pupils who pass the highest grade in the schools aided by Gov^t, i.e. who leave the schools able to read a newspaper with understanding, is less than the number of teachers (including pupil teachers) employed in the schools. To remedy such a state of things as this requires a most earnest devotion of the administration & probably of the legislative mind to the purpose. There is no doubt that, as you say, a simplification of English orthography would facilitate considerably the task of learning to read. A language which like the Spanish of the present time has reduced its spelling to a perfectly uniform system has a great advantage over others. But it would take a much longer time to effect a change in orthography than would be required to teach every child in the United Kingdom to read with facility. There certainly is no necessity that it should take “seven years of the best learning period of a child’s life” to teach him to read. So great a waste of time only proves the wretchedness of the teaching. I myself cannot remember any time when I could not read with facility & pleasure; & I have known other children with whom this was the case. Such essays as yours, however, do good, both by causing discussion, & by promoting useful though gradual change. The Commission you propose would be useful in a similar manner but the Gov^t may perhaps not think that a subject which does not come within the province of direct legislation is a suitable subject for a Government inquiry.³

1382.

TO HENRY VILLARD¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 19, 1869

Dear Sir—

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of the 21st ul^{to}, proposing on the part of the American Social Science Association² that I sh^d visit the United States as their guest, & make a lecturing tour through the Northern States under their auspices.

Few things could be more flattering to me than the high honour of such an invitation from such a body; & your letter also contains proposals of a pecuniary nature on such a scale of liberality as to convert a visit to the U.S. from an expensive pleasure into a source of great personal profit.³

The shortness, however, of life & the numerous unexecuted literary projects which the public duties on which the greater part of my life has been occupied have left on my hands, & which require all the leisure of my remaining years for their fulfilment admonish me of the necessity of dividing such time as I am able to dispose of between those undertakings & a rest more complete than would be afforded by a journey such as that to which I am so flatteringly invited.

These are the considerations which compel me to decline an invitation so honourable, & which if I had more leisure & a greater number of years of life in prospect, would have been so welcome to me.

Allow me in conclusion to express to yourself personally my sincere acknowledgments of the friendly & courteous terms in which you have communicated to me the proposal of the Association.

1383.

TO MRS. PHILIPPINE KYLLMANN¹

[After Jan. 22, 1869]

My Dear Mrs Kyllmann—

I sh^d have answered your letter much earlier than this, but that ever since I received it I have been so indisposed with a bad cold & headache as to have been quite unable to write.

Like you we regret that your efforts to improve the Manchester Com^{ee} were not more successful, but what you have done may perhaps prove of use in the future.

Mr Mill & I are members of the London Com^{ee} & like the manner in which it is carried on, & have much confidence in Mrs Taylor.² We are sorry that you see anything to object to in the form of petition used by the London Com^{ee}, because it was drawn up by myself & approved by Mr Mill before it was adopted. I do not think that if you examine it closely it will be found in any degree to prejudge the question of the admission of married women to the franchise. Mr Mill & I considered the wording of it carefully, & it was written with the intention of leaving that question open so that it could be signed both by those who do & by those who do not approve of the admission of married women. It was certainly not the intention of the London Com^{ee} to express any opinion on the point, or to petition for the unmarried only. If there is any defect in the wording, it is my fault, & Mr Mill's (for we considered the wording of this paragraph together) but I do not think that if the words are well

weighed with a precise attention to their meaning they will be found open to this objection. At all events we used what power we have over the English language to leave the question quite unsettled; & it was on the assumption that we had been successful in doing so, that the London Com^{ee} adopted the form. We have found that some persons have refused to sign the petition on the contrary ground to yours, because they disapprove of the admission of married women.

The West. Review has been since its first establishment the organ of the most advanced radical party in England both as regards politics & religious speculation; & it was for a very long time the only organ in which anything of a very decidedly liberal character could appear in print, & is still the only one in which articles of its length can appear. It has been consistently of such (what are commonly called “extreme”) opinions that it has been impossible to obtain a sufficiently large circulation to make it profitable. It has often been carried on at a pecuniary loss, & it is still not without great difficulty that the editor is able to manage it. This of course it is not thought good for its interests to make publicly known, but it has been necessary on several occasions to have recourse to the friends (& unfortunately they are but few in England) of free speculation in politics & religion to tide over difficulties.³

We are very sorry to hear that your health is not good; we hope that your visit to Germany may prove beneficial. We expect to be in England by the middle of March, & sh^d be happy to see you at Blackheath if you do not start before then and if you sh^d pass through London on your way.

1384.

TO JOHN TULLOCH¹

Avignon

Jan. 30. 1869.

Dear D^R. Tulloch

The three Essays which have been written this year for the Rectorial Prize are of a high average of merit, though no one of them shows powers of original thought quite equal to either of those to which the prize was awarded in the two previous years. The one which stands highest in this respect is that which bears the motto *Quære verum* and as its other merits are at least equal to those of either of the others, I think it the most worthy of the Prize.² But the inferiority of the other two Essays is not very great; and I should like to know the names of all the writers, as it would be a pleasure to me to communicate with them and to send them some of my Books. There is no part of my connexion with the University to which I look back with more satisfaction than the response which has been made to my attempt to co-operate with the University Authorities in encouraging a serious study of the Philosophy of Mind. I hope that they are as well satisfied as I am myself with the results which have been elicited.

1385.

TO HEWETT C. WATSON¹

Avignon

Jan. 30. 1869

Dear Mr Watson

I am much obliged to you for your kind present. You are right in thinking that my absence from Parliament will give me more time for botany. I am now looking through my herbarium for the first time since the winter of 1864/5. But the scientific interest of your book² gives it a value to me beyond the purely botanical.

In regard to the Darwinian hypothesis,³ I occupy nearly the same position as you do. Darwin has found (to speak Newtonially) a *vera causa*, and has shewn that it is capable of accounting for vastly more than had been supposed: beyond that, it is but the indication of what may have been, though it is not proved to be, the origin of the organic world we now see. I do not think it an objection that it does not, even hypothetically, resolve the question of the first origin of life: any more than it is an objection to chemistry that it cannot analyze beyond a certain number of simple or elementary substances.

Your remark that the development theory naturally leads to convergences as well as divergences⁴ is just, striking & as far as I know, has not been made before. But does not this very fact resolve one of your difficulties, viz. that species are not by divergence, multiplied to infinity? since the variety is kept down by frequent blending. The difficulty is also met by the fact that the law of natural selection must cause all forms to perish except those which are superior to others in power of keeping themselves alive in some circumstances actually realized on the earth. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

H. C. Watson Esq

1386.

TO EDWARD LOGAN¹

A[vignon].

Feb. 3. 1869

Dear Sir.

I do not believe nor I fancy does any one in the present day except Mahometans & some other Orientals believe, that there is such a thing as destiny in the sense in which you understand it. The only necessity in events is, that causes produce effects, & means accomplish ends. Effects never come but through their causes. By avoiding, to the utmost of one's power, all the causes of an effect, one greatly increases one's chance of avoiding the effect. And if one desires an end, one greatly increases one's chance of obtaining it by adopting some known means. It is true, what we desire sometimes comes to pass without any effort of ours, & what we dislike sometimes happens in spite of all we can do to avert it: but our conduct has on the average many times more effect on the fate of such of us as are not under the control of other people, than all other circumstances put together. There is no doubt that if you adopt a sailor's life you have a greater chance of being drowned than in most other occupations, because the causes which operate in that direction occur oftener & are less (though still very much) under human control. It is not therefore by any argument founded on destiny that you can hope to overcome the scruples of your parents but rather by urging that all occupations are exposed to some evil chances, that one may be too much afraid of death, & that if persons of good health & strength were to avoid a really useful employment like that of a sailor because of its dangers the world's affairs could not be carried on.

1387.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Avignon

Feb. 3 1869.

Dear Mr. Spencer

I am much obliged to you for the opportunity of reading your reply to the criticisms of the writer in the North American Review.² It supplies some very useful elucidations of your general doctrine, while it greatly increases my desire to know that as yet unpublished part of your speculations which in the scientific order would have come between "First Principles" and "Biology." I have no doubt, however, that you judged wisely in giving precedence to Biology and Psychology.

I extremely regret that your health should again have failed, but I earnestly hope you will not allow any impatience at the interruption of your work to prevent you from giving your brain as complete rest as is necessary to restore its tone. I am dear Mr. Spencer

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Herbert Spencer Esq.

1388.

TO JAMES BEAL¹

A[vignon].

Feb. 8. 1869

Dear Sir—

I certainly do think your original plan of municipal government for London,² preferable to that of a single municipal government for the whole metropolis. When I first heard of your plan it at once struck me as that which best met the real difficulties of the case while it had also the advantage of being less open to unreasonable as well as reasonable objections: this opinion has been confirmed by the additional consideration which since the receipt of your letter I have given to it. I will endeavour to put down what occurs to me, for any use you like to make of it except sending it to the press. I rather regretted that you published the letter I sent you about police,³ not that there was anything in its substance that I could wish to withhold from publicity, but because in a mere memorandum for a friend, with whom one agrees generally in opinion, intended to be used by him for what it may be worth as materials for forming his own judgment, the same things are said in a different manner from that in which one would address the public. Accordingly, though you used the precaution of stating that the letter was to a private friend, the newspapers took no notice of that, but judged the letter exactly as if it had been written for the public, & charged it with dogmatism, arrogance, & what not. These accusations are not a very great evil, but there are so many purposes for which one is bound to risk them that it is better not to court such occasions unnecessarily and in the case of the letter I am now writing there are special reasons against communicating it to those who are not to be taken into practical council, which will appear in the very first things I have to say.

It is to my mind certain that Parliament will not tolerate the existence in its immediate vicinity of another assembly resting on a broad basis of popular election, wielding the power & disposing of the great amount of revenue which would belong to a single body carrying on every branch of local administration for the whole of London. The idea excited would be that of the “Commune de Paris” during the Revolution. If therefore the plan adopted is that of a single assembly, one of two things will happen. Either, first, the power of the body will be extremely curtailed. This may be done in one or both of two ways: by leaving much of the administration in the hands of the parochial bodies, the vestries & local boards, whom it is a great object to extirpate,

root & branch; or by withholding many of the most important parts of the local administration from the Council, & either leaving those parts in their present state of general neglect varied by fitful parliamentary activity, or turning them over to a department of the central government. These are modes in which the *powers* of the municipal body may be brought within what Parliament would tolerate. The other course which may be adopted is that of spoiling its *constitution*: either by adopting a high electoral qualification, or by joining to the elected members a certain number of members nominated by the government, or by making the assent of a Minister necessary to their more important acts. All these systems would be more intolerable to you & me & to most of those who think with us on general politics than even the present irregularity & want of system, & would be far more likely to last. These prudential reasons should, I think, prevent our friends from encouraging, or consenting to support, any plan for a single municipality.

But even in itself, a single municipality in so enormous a city seems to me unlikely to work well. There is far too much work to be done; the mass of details affecting only particular neighbourhoods, would leave too little time or energy to the council for maturing & carrying out general plans of improvement, and would, moreover, require it to be more numerous than is quite consistent with that purpose. Those who hold up as an example the local administration of Paris do not know what that administration is. Letting alone the fact that every single person connected with it is a Government nominee, it is not the fact that all Paris is under a single municipal administration; there is indeed but one Council, but there are 20 mayors, each of whom administers one of the 20 arrondissements. It is as much a double administration as that which would be given by our two bills, except that England being a free country, our mayors must have councils, and popularly elected ones, to assist & control them. I confess also I sh^d not like to restrict to a single popular body all that exercise of the business faculties on public concerns which does take place under the present local institutions with all their imperfections & which in England, & still more in America trains many men of no great ability or reach of thought to be quite capable of discharging important public functions & of watching & controlling their discharge by others. This is one of the great differences between free & unfree countries—practical intelligence in public affairs not confined to the government & its functionaries but diffused among private citizens. Our Vestries are bad schools, but yet those who organize public movements & bring the people of the locality to act together for one object, have mostly gained their first experience in the capacity of vestrymen & it might easily happen that the too great concentration of municipal action might leave London without a sufficient number of such persons.

1389.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 8. 1869

Dear Mr. Leslie—

I have read your first letter in the [Economist](#)² with great pleasure & your paper on La Creuse³ with much interest & instruction. It is very important to put such points as it contains before the conceited Englishmen who fancy they understand all that relates to the land & politics of France when they do not know the first rudiments of it, much less the many important matters you discuss. I look forward with great expectation to the other papers which you announce as in prospect,⁴ & shall not fail to weigh well what they say on political economy.

Many thanks for the trouble you have taken for M. Chauffard's Mittermaier.⁵ I agree with you in going the complete length with Bentham as to the admissibility of evidence.⁶ There are I believe frequent cases like that you mention, of practical mischief both to the accused & to others from his not being examined as a witness. The one point on which alone B seems to me to be wrong is in allowing the judge to interrogate. But I have recently seen it stated that the prodigious abuse of this power which takes place in France, is in part owing to the fact that men are almost always made judges from having been public prosecutors, i.e. persons the whole business of whom it has been to find evidence of guilt: & not as with us from among barristers who have equally often had the duty of finding evidence of innocence. The reason is that the salaries of judges are not worth the acceptance of an advocate in good practice, & the salaries are small because in France there are everywhere courts of five judges or more where a much smaller number & in general one judge would suffice: thus does a single error in a system engender a series of others.

The physical illustrations in my [Logic](#)⁷ were all reviewed & many of them suggested by Bain, who has a very extensive & accurate knowledge of physical science. He has promised me to revise them thoroughly for the next edition,⁸ & to put them sufficiently in harmony with the progress of science, which I am quite aware that they have fallen behind.

1390.

TO JOSIAH SHERMAN¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 8, 1869

Dear Sir—

Your letter & the proposed address enclosed in it, reached me several days after the meeting to which you invited me.²

I do not think I could go to the full length of what is claimed in the address. I am very doubtful if the Gov^t ought to release all who may lie in prison for being connected for

instance with the Clerkenwell outrage,³ or for having joined in the Fenian invasion of Canada.⁴ To those political prisoners who have shed no blood, or have shed it in the way of what may be called fair or legitimate insurrection on Irish soil I would, simultaneously with a fresh act of justice to Ireland, grant a full pardon with a public declaration that it is done from the hope that the willingness practically shewn to redress Irish injuries by legislation would induce the Irish in future to seek for redress only in that way & would thus render legal punishment unnecessary: But in rebellion as in war it seems to me that a distinction sh^d be made between fair weapons or modes of warfare & foul ones. And a good deal of thought would be required to decide exactly where the line should be drawn.

1391.

TO CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Feb. 9, 1869

My Dear Sir—

Ever since reading your book,² which a variety of occupations prevented me from doing until very lately, I have felt desirous of expressing to you the very high sense I entertain of its merits, and the great pleasure which, as one who has turned much of his attention to the same subjects, I have felt at seeing such a number of sound judgments and such a sustained tone of right and worthy feeling, sent forth to the world in a style so likely to command attention, and by one who has now the additional vantage-ground of a seat in Parliament. It is long since any book, connected with practical politics, has been published, on which I build such high hopes of the future usefulness and distinction of the writer; showing as it does that he not only possesses a most unusual amount of real knowledge on many of the principal questions of the future, but a mind strongly predisposed to what are (at least in my opinion) the most advanced and enlightened views of them.

There are so few opinions expressed in any part of your book with which I do not, as far as my knowledge extends, fully and heartily coincide, that I feel impelled to take the liberty of noting the small number of points, of any consequence, on which I differ from you. These relate chiefly to India; though, on that subject also, I agree with you to a much greater extent than I differ. Not only do I most cordially sympathize with all you say about the insolence of the English, even in India, to the native population, which has now become, not only a disgrace, but, as you have so usefully shown, a danger to our dominion there; but I have been much struck by the sagacity which, in so short a stay as yours must have been, has enabled you to detect facts which are as yet obvious to very few: as, for instance, the immense increase of all the evils and dangers you have pointed out, by the substitution of the Queen's army for a local force of which both men and officers had at least a comparatively permanent tie in the country; and again, that the superior authority in England, having the records of all the

Presidencies before it, and corresponding regularly with them all, is the only authority which really knows India; the local governments and officers only knowing, at most, their own part of it, and having generally strong prejudices in favour of the peculiarities of the system of government there adopted and against those of the other parts. I observe that your preferences seem to be, as mine are, for the systems which give permanent rights of property to the actual cultivator, which is best done in the modern Bombay ryot-war system. I am sorry to say that there is at present a strong reaction in favour of setting up landlords everywhere,³ and what is worst, I am told, that this prevails most among the younger men (the hide-bound Toryism of Sir William Mansfield assisting); and there is great mischief of this kind in progress both in the Punjab and in the Central Provinces, notwithstanding the contrary predilections of Sir John Lawrence. What will happen under the Irish landlord who is now Viceroy,⁴ I dread to think.

But have you not, on the questions which concern the English planters, leant too much to their side? You have yourself stigmatized their treatment of the natives; and what better can be expected in a country where a station master kicks and cuffs the passengers and a captain of a steamer kicks the pilot round the deck whenever the vessel runs aground?⁵ If it could be right to make the breach of a contract to labour for the planters, under habitual treatment of this sort from them and their low nigger-drivers, a penal offence, the evil could not be so flagrant as your book shews it to be, and as it undoubtedly is: Another thing to be considered is that either a most unjust advantage would be given to European over native landholders and employers of labour, or the same legal remedy must be granted to both; and I suppose, even those who think that an English indigo planter and his underlings would not suborn witnesses to depose falsely in a criminal court, will admit that a native landowner would.

In your plan for the improvement of the organ of Indian government in England, you shew a just and enlightened appreciation of the necessity of making the organ a permanent one, in the sense of not going out with the Ministry. But this will not, and cannot be, if the organ is a Secretary of State, or any member of the Cabinet. No one who does not go out when the majority in Parliament changes, will, or ought to have a voice in the Cabinet which decides the general policy of the country. Neither is it likely to be thought right, nor indeed would it be right, that the Government of the empire should have no voice, not even a negative one, in the administration of its greatest dependency. If, then, the head administrator of India were not to be in the Cabinet, we should find that a Cabinet minister would be set over him to control him, as one was set to control the Court of Directors: and the nominal administrator, being only one person, and that one of inferior official rank, would have no power of resistance and would sink into a mere deputy. Would this be any improvement? I have always myself thought that a Board or Council for India, with a Cabinet minister to control them but not to sit among them, was the really best system for India: and I have given my reasons for this in the concluding chapter of my book on Representative Government.⁶ It is, however, impracticable to go back to this: and under the present system I think your own opinions will lead you to the conclusion that the Secretary of State must necessarily change with the Government and that the real knowledge of India which you hope to obtain in him by making him permanent,

can only be found in a Council of advisers with at least as great powers as the present Council. It is quite another question whether the Council ought not to be more rapidly renewed. I am much disposed to think with you that its members should only be appointed (and should, *exceptis excipiendis*, only hold their seats) for five years: but, I think, they ought to be fully as numerous as at present, that all the different systems of administration in India may have somebody there who knows them well enough and has sufficient sympathy with them to correct any misunderstanding to their advantage.

You suggest that we should issue a proclamation declaring that for the future we will “invariably recognize the practice of adoption of children by the native rulers, as we have done in the case of the Mysore succession.”⁷ But this is what was actually done by Lord Canning’s famous Proclamation:⁸ and the hesitation about Mysore only arose from a doubt whether the great peculiarities of that case did not afford to those who disliked the Proclamation, some ground for contending that to that particular ruler (or nominal ruler) our faith was not pledged: It is a significant fact that not a single native ruler, with the doubtful exception of Dharwar, and the certain one of a few Delhi Jagendars to whom had been granted some amount of independent jurisdiction, went against us in the mutiny.⁹ The Hyderabad State did us real service by standing by us. The native princes are much more influenced by fear of anarchy, and of possible Sivajees¹⁰ and Hyder Ali’s,¹¹ than by dislike of us.

I have noticed a few minor inaccuracies of fact on Indian matters; surprisingly few, considering all the circumstances. You say that the Persians and Afghans are Sheeahs, while our own Mussulmans are orthodox.¹² The Afghans, unless my memory totally deceives me, are firm Soonees, the only Sheeahs in Afghanistan being the Kuzzilbashes, i.e. the Persian traders and settlers. Again, there are a good many Sheeahs in India, and I even think that the royal family of Oude were so.

It is rather harsh to call the Bengalees (p. 366) mere savages. As you doubtless know that some of them are the most cultivated of all the Hindoos, I conjecture that the Bengalees you mean are the Southals, or the wilder Garrows, Kookees, &c. and “the tribes of Central India” in the same passage are the Goands, Coles and other Aborigines. “Central India” includes the large province of Nagpore, or Berar, and the Sanger and Nerbuddo districts formerly attached to it; territories as popular, peaceable, and highly cultivated as most parts of India.

The working of the system of native assessors in courts of justice I only know practically in the case of the criminal international tribunals we have established in many districts—and in which the assessors are persons of some consequence: and there, having reviewed hundreds of the trials, I can testify that their opinion is often given against that of the presiding British officer, and that he shews considerable practical deference to it, especially as to the amount of punishment, for the sake of reconciling the native chiefs to these tribunals.

I was puzzled when I came, at p. 382, to the assertion, that “Switzerland is the home of the worst of bigotry and intolerance.” This is quite contrary to my impression of the religious condition of Switzerland.

You see that in order to find fault with anything, I have very soon got down to extremely small points, or to such as have very little to do with the general scope of the work. If there is any criticism of a somewhat broader character that I could make, I think it would be this—that (in speaking of the physical and moral characteristics of the populations descended from the English) you sometimes express yourself almost as if there were no sources of national character but race and climate—as if whatever does not come from race must come from climate, and whatever does not come from climate must come from race. But as you shew, in many parts of your book, a strong sense of the good and bad influences of education, legislation, and social circumstances, the only inference I draw is that you do not, perhaps, go so far as I do myself in believing these last causes to be of prodigiously greater efficacy than either race or climate or the two combined.

Thanking you most sincerely for the great pleasure and the very valuable information I have received from your book, I am

My Dear Sir,
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill

C. W. Dilke Esq. M.P.

1392.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

Feb. 16, 1869

Dear Sir

When your letter reached me, I happened to be particularly busy, and some days elapsed before I had time to read the article of which you forwarded to me a proof. My opinion of the article is such as it would be very painful to me to express to a writer your account of whom excites so much personal sympathy, and whose errors, if they be so, are on the side of Liberty; but I differ so completely from the practical conclusions of the article, not only on the points you mention but on almost every other, and a great proportion of its arguments both when I do not, and in the few cases in which I do agree with it, seem to me so weak and shallow, that I should regret to see the Westminster Review identifying itself with the writer's opinions. A review in which the writers assumed the sole responsibility of their articles by affixing their signatures, would be in a rather different position. The Westminster used to have a department for articles which it thought worthy of publication without wishing to

commit the Review to any greater degree of approval. Would it not be possible to put the article into that department?²

Respecting the French system of relief of the poor,³ what inaccuracy there is in the statements of the article is in saying that the French government “leaves the relief of the poor to private benevolence.” The poor have in France no legal right to relief, nor is relief granted (any more than in England) directly by the State; but very large sums, raised by taxation, are annually granted by the municipal councils, which are not, as in England, confined to a few towns, but cover the whole country; and these bodies also undertake the expenditure of sums contributed for the purpose by individuals. That the French poor are ‘quite as well if not better off than in England’ is difficult either to prove or disprove: the question has too many meanings, and requires consideration of so many circumstances. But if they are better off, it certainly is not for the reason alleged, for the public and private charity of France has precisely the same demoralizing effects as an ill administered poor law.

Your idea respecting Mr Peabody⁴ is good. I think the best mode of carrying it out would be to endeavour to interest him in the position of the Review without making a direct application for money, as he must be so overwhelmed with the number of such applications that his spontaneous impulse must always be to reject them. I am not acquainted with Mr Peabody, and cannot give an introduction to him; but one of my friends and correspondents at New York. Mr Brace⁵ (whom perhaps you know) seems to me a likely person to be able to judge in what manner it may be best to approach him; and, if you approve, I will advise with Mr Brace on the subject.

With regard to the new edition of my father’s Analysis,⁶ there is, fortunately for the book, but unfortunately for the Review, a serious obstacle to Mr Grote’s writing a review of it, namely that he is himself the author of some of the notes. I should have no difficulty in getting the sheets beforehand, and the book itself will, I hope, be published very early in March.⁷

I Am
Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

1393.

TO CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Feb. 19. 1869

Dear Sir—

If my letter gave you pleasure, yours has repaid it, not merely by the good part in which you have taken my criticisms, but because it contains things which confirm the best points of the conception I had formed of you from your book. What you call a “traveller’s trick” of gathering information from prejudiced and interested persons on both sides of every question is a trick which I wish many travellers would imitate, for it is simply the only way to form even an approximate judgment of the truth. But this mode of enquiry though the only one which brings out the most precious materials of knowledge, very much disturbs the process of adopting opinions ready made.

My object, however, in writing, is not to say this, but to express the pleasure it will give me to see you when I return to England, which will be in the course of next month, and to answer, as well as I can, your question about Tocqueville’s manuscripts.² The person who is sure to possess full information about them and who probably has them in his charge is M. Ch. Revel,³ ancien Conseiller d’Etat whose address when I last corresponded with him (which however was several years ago) was 8 Rue du Marché d’Aguesseau, Paris. Or you might apply to the publisher of the collected edition of Tocqueville’s Works,⁴ Michel Lévy,⁵ Rue Vivienne.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

C. W. Dilke Esq. M.P.

1394.

TO FRANCES POWER COBBE¹

Avignon

Feb. 23rd, 1869

Dear Miss Cobbe,

I have lately received communication from the American publisher Putnam,² requesting me to write for their Magazine, and I understand that they would be very glad if you would write anything for them, more especially on the Women question,³ on which the Magazine (a new one) has shown liberal tendencies from the first. The communications I have received have been through Mrs. Hooker,⁴ sister of Mrs. Stowe⁵ and Dr. Ward Beecher,⁶ and herself the author of two excellent articles in the Magazine on the suffrage question,⁷ by which we had been much struck before we knew the authorship. I enclose Mrs. Hooker’s last letter to me, and I send by post

copies of Mrs. Hooker's articles and some old numbers of the Magazine, the only ones we have here; and I shall be very happy if I should be the medium of inducing you to write on this question for the American public.

My daughter desires to be kindly remembered, and I am,

Dear Miss Cobbe,
Very Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

P.S.—May I ask you to be so kind as to forward Mrs. Hooker's letter to Mrs. P. A. Taylor, as she will see by it that Mrs. Hooker has no objection to put her name to a reprint of her articles.

1395.

TO HEWETT C. WATSON¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 24. 1869

Dear Sir—

The mode in which Convergence² seems to me to combine itself with divergence in the generation of species, resembles what happens in the growth of a tree. The shoots from one of the larger branches approach & meet those from another, so that a large part of the growth of both is in the direction contrary to divergence, while yet the general circumference constantly enlarges, so that divergence, though limited by the counter-principle is yet in respect of the distance between its extremes, perpetually widening.

I do not understand that when Darwin adopted as his title "The *Origin* of Species by means of Natural Selection" he meant by "origin of species" the cause of there being any species, or any diversity in organic nature. He seems to me to mean what you mean by the *Formation* of Species,³ viz. the origin of the species which now exist on the earth.

But I have not yet read, though I hope soon to have time to read, his latest & longest work.⁴

1396.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Avignon

Feb 24, 1869

Dear Sir

Want of time has prevented me from immediately answering or acknowledging your letter of Jan 31; but you must not suppose, when this is the case, that I overlook your letters or that they are not both interesting and useful to me.

I have not forgotten the list of books which you wished for; but hitherto when I have seen one of them in a bookseller's catalogue and have had time to go for it (not liking to buy a book without seeing it) I have found it gone. I may be more successful now, when my time will not be occupied by Parliament. It is unlucky that all the books you ask for the loan of, are books that I have not got. I wish there were any good history of the period you mention in England. Some portions of that period have been written about, but I do not know what books to recommend.

I am not acquainted with the letter you mention of Mr. Odger;² but though he may have made an occasional mistake of judgment, I have a very high opinion of him both as to intentions and intelligence. Mr. Hartwell³ was not one of those working men whose candidature I helped though I was asked to do so: but though I myself knew nothing to his disadvantage, I had not evidence in his favour, as I had in the other cases. With regard to yourself, I have now had considerable means of judging of you from your letters, and as far as those means extend I should certainly say that you are one of the working men whom I should be glad to see in Parliament.

I am afraid, however, we should differ about the Factory Laws; though I doubt not that there are points in their working which require to be looked to, and probably defects which you would be able to point out. You seem, however, to object to their principle when you say they imply "either that the English manufacturer is of such a grasping spirit that he must needs be curbed lest he should overwork the juvenile portion of his employes as to deteriorate the population of the country; or, on the other hand, that the English parent is so needy or sordidly ignorant or brutishly cruel that he may not be trusted with the care and welfare of his own children, but that the State must undertake these duties for him." Of the two things which you thus put alternatively, I believe both to be true: not, of course, true in all cases, or up to any extreme, but true to a sufficient extent and of a sufficient number to make it disastrous to leave the children, without legal protection, to the mere discretion of any kind of parents and any kind of employers of labour.

With regard to Boards of Arbitration, I do not as far as I am able to judge of the subject, think it possible to constitute an authority sufficiently capable, sufficiently

trustworthy, or sufficiently likely to be trusted by both sides, to make it at all admissible that their award should be legally obligatory, unless the two parties to the dispute have beforehand voluntarily agreed to be bound by it. In this case they should of course be held to their pledge.

I am, however, so much occupied, that I have not time to write out my ideas on either of these subjects, and am forced to be content with a brief indication of them, which I do not wish published. I am

Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Mr William Wood

1397.

TO JOSEPHINE BUTLER¹

[March, 1869]

I am of the opinion that every kind of effort, whether social or political, in favour of women should be encouraged, so long as it is honest and genuine; and I am persuaded that those who are in earnest will inevitably be led by experience to see the absolute necessity of political enfranchisement as both the foundation and the safeguard of human worth and happiness.

1398.

TO EDWARD LIVINGSTONE YOUMANS¹

[March? 1869]

Dear Sir—

I have delayed answering your letter until I could tell you that the book on “The Subjection of Women” has gone to press. Mr Longman is apprised that Messrs Appleton accept his terms for this work, & he will make the necessary arrangements with their London agent respecting the plates &c.² It will rest with Messrs Appleton to authorize the publication of any extracts in anticipation in the Journal.³ To me it cannot be otherwise than agreeable. The book will be published in London some time in May.⁴

I inclose in the form of a short letter to yourself,⁵ what you wished me to write on the subject of Mr Herbert Spencer's works.

1399.

TO EDWARD LIVINGSTONE YOUMANS¹

[March? 1869]

Dear Sir—

You ask my opinion concerning Mr Spencer's "First Principles" & "Principles of Biology" as contributions to the advance of thought.² I answer that I attach to them, in that respect, the very highest value. I am the more completely disinterested in this high estimation of them, as their line of investigation is extremely different & remote from my own, & I am far from being prepared (I do not know if Mr Spencer himself is prepared) to consider the long series of his conclusions as definitively proved. Still, it is not solely as a wonderful exhibition of connected & systematic thought, that these works appear to me worthy of admiration. They seem to me to hold a most important place in the scientific thought of the age. Within the present generation several large & comprehensive generalizations have made their way into Science—the Unity & Conservation of Force, the Darwinian theory of organic development, & (though this is rather a branch of the last) the hereditary transmission of acquired faculties. All these theories rest, in part, on well ascertained facts, while all of them, even the first, & much more the two others still remain hypothetical as to a great part of the extent & the application claimed for them. At this critical period in what will probably turn out to be one of the great transformations in Science, nothing could be more fortunate than that some person, with faculties so peculiarly adapted to the purpose as Mr Spencer's sh^d have taken up the explanation of Nature on the new principles synthetically, setting out from them as true, & working out in detail what sort of an explanation they are capable of affording of the complicated world in which we live. Until this attempt was made, the theories in question, considered as universal laws of nature, could be neither verified nor disproved. And arduous as the attempt is, no one who studies these works of Mr Spencer is likely to deny that it has been made by a mind equal to it, & that it will mark a step in the progress of thought even if posterity should pronounce it (which I certainly do not expect) to be a splendid failure. Of Mr Spencer's other writings it is unnecessary at present to say more than that I consider the contributions made to the analytic study of the human mind by the "Principles of Psychology" alone an ample foundation for a distinguished philosophical reputation.

1400.

TO GEORGE LAIDLAW¹

Black Heath Park
Kent

March 7, 1869

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 8th ultimo, with its inclosures respecting a plan for systematic emigration to Canada. The time is very favourable for the reception of such a plan in this country, as attention has of late been called in an unusual degree to the miserable state of the English agricultural laborers, and to the possibility of making emigration available for their relief; and Mr. Goschen,² the new President of the Poor Law Board, has declared in Parliament that the subject is under his consideration, with a view, however, to the United States rather than to Canada.³

It would be highly desirable that the promoters of your plan should enter into direct communication with Mr. Goschen, and that he should be enabled as soon as possible to judge what amount of assistance the Canadian Government may be willing to offer toward the cost of the emigration.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Very Faithfully,

J. S. Mill

G. Laidlaw, Esq.

1401.

TO THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 9, 1869

My Dear Mr Huxley

It gives me great pleasure to cooperate with you in so useful a project.² My daughter Miss Helen Taylor, and I, request that we may be put down as members, and I inclose our subscriptions for the first year and a donation of £5.

If you are disengaged on Sunday next, will you give us the pleasure of taking an early dinner with us at five? There is a North Kent train from Charing Cross at 4.5, and my house is about ten minutes walk from the Blackheath station at the extreme further end (the last house but one) in Blackheath Park. I am

My Dear Mr Huxley
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Professor Huxley

1402.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

March 11, 1869

Dear Sir—

Immediately on receiving your letter of January 19, I wrote to Sir Charles Trevelyan, who is the principal author of Competitive Examination as applied to the Civil Service in England and India.² He at once undertook to write to you, and to furnish you with all the information in his power, and I presume he has done so before this time. The question seems to me, if possible, even more important in the United States than in this country. I have long thought that the appointments to office, without regard to qualifications, are the worst side of American institutions: the main cause of what is justly complained of in their practical operation, and the principal hindrance to the correction of what is amiss; as well as a cause of ill-repute to democratic institutions all over the world. If appointments were given, not by political influence, but by open competition, the practice of turning out the holders of office, at every change in politics, in order to reward partisans, would necessarily cease, and with it nearly all the corruption and the larger half of the virulence of mere party conflict. I have been delighted to see that Mr. Jenckes' measure³ meets with increasing support from disinterested opinion, though it will have to encounter the utmost hostility from the professional politicians who are the great perverters of free government. . . .

J. S. Mill

1403.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 12. 1869

Dear Sir—

D^f Youmans probably thought (as I did myself) that time did not allow of making any arrangement for the Analysis. But he hopes to do so for any of my future writings & he has no objection to your conditions.²

You are a much better judge than I can be of what publication it is advisable to send copies to. Only I should recommend adding the Revue des Deux Mondes, and I wish two copies each instead of one to be sent to Mr Bain, Mr Findlater & Mr Grote; at my expense if necessary. I inclose an additional list of persons & public bodies to whom I wish presentation copies to be sent on my account.

I was not aware that you were waiting for instructions as to the payment of the balance into Prescott's³ but I will attend to the matter in future.

1404.

TO JOHN TULLOCH¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 12.1869

My Dear Sir

I send today by book post to your address, the three Essays which competed for this year's prize.² Would you kindly inform me whether books addressed simply at the University of St Andrews, would reach the writers?

I have directed Mess^{rs} Longman to send you a copy of the new edition of my father's "Analysis" of which I beg your acceptance, and also a copy to the University. I wish to send copies to the gentlemen who gained the previous year's prizes, but I have unluckily mislaid the address of Mr. Stewart. I should be much obliged to you if you would kindly send it to me. I am

My Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

The Very Reverend

Principal Tulloch, D.D.

1404A.

TO JOHN VENN¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 15. 1869

Dear Sir

Your letter reached Avignon after I had left for England, but has followed me here. In reply I beg to say that you are free to make unrestricted use of my former letter,² and it would give me much pleasure to hear of your success.

I Am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

J. Venn

1405.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

Blackheath Park, March 16th
[1869]

Dear Sir,

Would it suit the "Edinburgh Review" to take an article from me on Mr. Thornton's book on Labour?² The book is of great ability; and, though there is much of it with which I do not agree, I think it a really important contribution to political economy, as well as to the particular subject of which it treats. My object would be to recommend the book to the consideration of thinkers, pointing out at the same time how far, and in what, I think it erroneous; which is chiefly in some of its premises, for I agree generally in its conclusions, respecting trades-unions, co-operation, and the ultimate future of labour.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1406.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Blackheath Park Kent

March 17. 1869

Dear Sir

The National Society for Women's Suffrage has decided to try to get up a petition to Parliament this year from every borough in England in favour of Women's Suffrage,² to be sent up to one of the members for each borough. The Society has found friends and correspondents in all but about ninety boroughs, and a list of these ninety has been sent to my daughter that she may endeavour to find friends in some of them who will interest themselves in getting signatures to a petition. Among these boroughs which the Society has as yet no correspondents is Stoke upon Trent, and remembering the interest you expressed in the subject last year, my daughter has asked me to ask you if you will take up the matter. What is wanted is simply to give away copies of the pamphlets circulated by the Society, to such people as you think will be influenced by them or who will give them away in turn among their friends, and to solicit signatures to the petition as widely as possible, giving a copy of the petition to be filled in with signatures to everybody who you think will be willing to interest him or herself in getting it filled. There is no need that the petition should be sent up for two or three months, so that there is time to get in plenty of signatures, and the London Society will be happy to send down any number of pamphlets, circulars, and printed copies of the petition for signature. We forward by this post some copies of all of these, and if your Mother and yourself will in this manner procure a petition, even if it be not numerously signed it will be rendering a useful service to this great cause. I am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Mr William Wood

1407.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

March 18th [1869]

Dear Sir—

I shall have much pleasure in writing a notice of Mr. Thornton's book for the "Edinburgh Review,"² and shall, of course, put what I have to say in a form somewhat different from that in which I should write for another publication. My own point of view does not exactly coincide either with that of Mr. Thornton or with that of the "Edinburgh" Reviewer to whom he refers;³ and, of course, I must be free to express my own view, and that only. Mr. Thornton is certainly a defender of trades-unions, to the extent of thinking that their existence is an important defence and protection to the operatives, and that they often cause a rise of wages when, though right and desirable, it would not otherwise have taken place. On these points, I think, Mr. Thornton has fully made out his case. On the other hand, he condemns some of the aims and rules of trades-unions; and is quite alive to their liability to carry their legitimate aims (rise of wages and diminished hours of work) to a length which may injure both themselves and their employers by driving the trade elsewhere. For the correction of this evil he looks to the lessons of experience and increased intelligence, and to amiable discussion between the parties. In these various opinions I entirely agree, and I should feel bound to express them in anything I write on the subject. It is for you to decide whether they would be unsuitable for publication in the "E. Review."

With regard to your suggestion for reviewing the Report of the Commission,⁴ do you purpose that this should be done in the same or in a separate article? Since, in that case, it would be necessary to express an opinion on the question of prohibiting by law those employments of trades-union funds which may be decided to be illegitimate; and, moreover, of giving efficacy to the legal prohibition by the appointment of a public prosecutor expressly for its enforcement. These are very grave questions, and I am not yet prepared to give a final opinion on every part of them, though I am clearly against adopting some of the recommendations of the majority of the Commission, as reported in to-day's papers.⁵ I think that the systematic enforcement of legal penalties against strikes, even for undesirable objects, would be the commencement of a feud between employers and workmen, and between workmen and the Government, more internecine than we have ever yet seen.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

1408.

TO CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 19 [1869]

Dear Sir

If you are in town at Easter, I should be very glad to see you, if you would like to come down and dine with me on Easter Sunday. I dine at five, and there is a train by the North Kent railway from Charing Cross at 4.5. My house (the last but one at the further end of Blackheath Park) is about ten minutes walk from the Blackheath station.

Or I shall be here either of the two following Sundays April 4 and 11, and should be happy to see you on either day, either in the morning or to a five o'clock dinner; but after that, I am returning to Avignon for a month or two.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

C. W. Dilke Esq., M.P.

1409.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 19. 1869

J'avais remarqué, mon cher M. Villari, que depuis longtemps je n'avais pas de vos nouvelles; cette intermission n'est que trop expliquée par la lettre que je viens de recevoir. La sympathie la plus vive et la plus sincère ne peut presque rien pour consoler dans un si grand malheur.² Dans l'affreuse souffrance des premiers temps c'est presque une moquerie que d'en offrir. Maintenant le temps est venu pour vous de ce profond abattement, cette perte de tout intérêt dans la vie, que je comprends si bien, et qui serait presque aussi dur à supporter, s'il n'y avait un moyen un seul, de soulagement, pour celui qui est capable de trouver un attrait dans le travail désintéressé pour le bien des autres. Ceux qu'une grande douleur privée a dégoûtés de tous les intérêts personnels, ont souvent fini par trouver une véritable consolation et un renouvellement d'énergie dans la concentration de leur sensibilité et de leur intelligence sur des travaux ayant pour but l'amélioration morale, intellectuelle ou physique de leur semblables. C'est là ce que j'espère pour vous. Vous êtes un homme très précieux pour votre pays, très supérieur par la pensée et par les talents au niveau commun des hommes dans quelque pays que ce soit. Nul pays plus que le vôtre n'a besoin de ces qualités dans ses citoyens et aucun n'offre un champ plus vaste et plus propice pour les exercer. Vous avez un amour de votre pays qui je suis sûr, n'a pas sombré dans le naufrage de votre bonheur personnel. Tout ce qu'il y a de soulagement possible dans un malheur comme le vôtre, vous l'éprouverez quand vous vous

sentirez capable de vous remettre à quelque travail important pour le bien général, et de nature à exiger toutes vos forces intellectuelles.

Vous trouverez peut-être que je parle bien à mon aise de travail à un homme accablé de douleur, étant moi même dans un état de contentement personnel que je n'avais éprouvé de longtemps. En effet, je suis comme un soldat licencié qui retourne à ses foyers pour y jouir du plus grand privilège qu'une vie de travail puisse offrir, le libre choix de ses occupations. Pendant que j'étais député je ne jouissais cette liberté que pendant trois ou quatre mois de l'année. Pendant ce temps je vaquais à mes études philosophiques, et j'avais préparé une nouvelle édition du grand traité de psychologie de mon père,³ avec des notes par moi même et par d'autres de ses successeurs dans la même école philosophique. Cette nouvelle édition vient d'être livrée au public, et l'exemplaire que je vous avais envoyé avant de recevoir votre lettre, vous parviendra, j'espère, en peu de jours. Maintenant je vais publier un travail où la question des femmes⁴ est traitée avec plus d'étendue que dans tout ce qui a paru jusqu'ici en faveur de leur affranchissement. Cette cause fait ici un progrès très rapide, et un si grand nombre de femmes, et des plus distinguées, ont répondu à l'appel qui leur a été fait, que le succès, bien qu'encore éloigné, ne me le paraît plus autant qu'il y a trois ans. Ce petit traité vous parviendra, j'espère, peu de temps après l'autre.

Je tiens plus que jamais à avoir de vos nouvelles, et je vous prie de m'en donner fréquemment. De mon côté j'espère avoir à l'avenir plus de loisir pour vous écrire.

1410.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 22. 1869

Dear Mr Fawcett

I have considerable difficulty in judging from outside of any question of political tactics, during the present transitional state of politics. And the questions you put to me are essentially questions of tactics;² for, on the substantial issues, there can hardly be any difference of opinion. The landlords undoubtedly get what they have no right to; for though they are charged a fair price for the tithe, the State, in one sense of the word, pays that price for them, by lending them money at a much lower rate than they themselves can borrow at; just as it lends them its money or credit for the improvement of their land. Thus it undoubtedly makes a present to them; but as that present costs itself nothing, consisting only in giving them the benefit of its better credit, the Government may be right, as a matter of tactics, in granting them this advantage, which costs nothing to anybody. Again, to employ the resumed national property, or a part of it, in education, would be a far better application of it than the one proposed; but the measure would then no longer tend to a reconciliation of

religious differences. The application of any of the money to the Queen's Colleges or to undenominational schools, would be vehemently opposed by the whole Catholic party. The battle of unsectarian education will have to be fought, but we may hope to fight it with better support if this measure has first passed, retaining completely the character of a healing measure. It seems to me too that Ireland has a just claim on the general taxation of the empire for all that it requires in the way of education: and inasmuch as unsectarian education is contrary to the wish of the great majority of the Irish people, *that* at least can with much greater propriety be charged upon general taxation, than upon a fund belonging to Ireland, as the Church property does. What can be said on the other side of both these points will occur to yourself; and I am by no means against criticising these provisions of the Bill in a speech. With regard to any directly hostile movement against them (which would certainly be unsuccessful) I doubt if any advantage would arise from it equivalent to the bad effect of an apparent want of unanimity in the Liberal party in carrying through this measure. I do not feel able to give a more positive opinion on the subject.

My daughter desires to be kindly remembered to Mrs Fawcett and yourself, and I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Henry Fawcett Esq. M.P.

1411.

TO ALFRED HYMAN LOUIS¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 22, 1869

Dear Sir—

The idea of an Academy of Moral & Political Science has often presented itself to my mind; as it could hardly fail to present itself to any one who has been all his life speculating & thinking on social questions & who has studied the institutions and ideas of foreign countries. But the result of the thought I have given to the subject, has always been unfavourable.

The Society, or Academy, would either be a public body, or a mere private association. If a public body, the original members would be named by the Government; subsequent vacancies might be filled up, as in France, by the votes of the body itself. If the Gov^t acted honestly in the matter, which we will suppose it to do, it would appoint the persons of highest reputation as writers or thinkers on moral,

social, & political subjects without (it is to be hoped) any regard to their opinions; for to pay any regard to these would simply mean to exclude all whose opinions were in advance of the age. This then being supposed, what sort of a body would be the result? An assemblage of persons of utterly irreconcilable opinions, who would hardly ever be sufficiently unanimous on any question to exercise, as a body, any moral or intellectual influence over it; while amidst this medley of opinions there would be an assured majority in favour of what is conservative & commonplace, because such is invariably the tendency of the majority of those whose reputation is already made. In consequence, the subsequent elections by the members, to fill vacancies, would be decidedly worse than we are supposing the original choice to be; for men of the highest eminence would often not be elected if any of their opinions were obnoxious to the *arriéré* majority. Guizot,² Thiers,³ & Cousin⁴ while he lived, ruled the French Academy of Moral & Political Sciences & very few who were not of their opinions were, or now are, admitted into it.⁵ The Académie Française rejected Littré,⁶ the man who by his single efforts was doing admirably the whole work which the Academy was specially appointed to do. Even Academies of physical science in which there is less difference of opinions, always consist, in majority, of trained mediocrities, while the men whose footsteps mark the great advances in science often do not succeed during their whole lives in obtaining admission. Originality, scientific genius, is in general looked shyly upon by the majority of scientific men; & it is of the majority that Academies, however honestly constituted, will be the representatives.

If, on the other hand, the Society was not a public organised body, but was composed of volunteers rallying round some common standard, it would not materially differ from any voluntary association of persons agreeing in some of their opinions & would carry no more weight than any other set of men who unite to assist and back one another in the propagation of their particular doctrines.

It does not seem to me possible by any combination, to make the collective force of scientific thought available as a power in social affairs. The French Academies never have been such a power: the Academy of Moral & Political Sciences is neither consulted, nor, as a body, puts forth any opinions, or exercises any moral or political action, except by offering prizes for Essays. Its Transactions, consisting of the papers read before it, are published, but one seldom sees them quoted or referred to. Its individual members have such influence as their talents or character may give them, but collective influence it has none.

Having given you the reasons which make me fear that the results you anticipate from the formation of an Academy of M. & P.S. would not be realised, allow me now to express the great pleasure which our short conversation gave me & the satisfaction I should have in cooperating with you on the subject of the Alabama claims⁷ & I doubt not, on many other important matters. There is such a lack of energy & earnestness in all classes above manual labourers, & those who have any wish or capacity for improved ideas are so shrinkingly afraid of what will be said of them & so daunted by the smallest obstacle that it is a *dies albo notandus*⁸ on which one meets with any man of intelligence who feels and thinks as you did both in the Commons Soc^y,⁹ in our conversation afterwards & now in your letter.

1412.

TO HENRY REEVE¹

March 22nd [1869]

I was much surprised at what seemed like a proposal on your part to write reviews both of the Trades-Union Commission Report and also of Mr. Thornton's book;² and I am not at all surprised to find that your meaning was to include a review of both in one article. This, however, will not suit me, nor, indeed, could I undertake a review of the Trades Commission Report,³ even separately, for a considerable time to come; and I do not intend to defer writing on Mr. Thornton's book until I write on the Trades Commission Report. For this and various other reasons, with many apologies for the trouble I have given you, I decide to withdraw my proposal altogether. I am much obliged to you for your willingness to insert an article by me on a subject in which there are considerable differences of opinion between us, and remain, dear Sir, yours very truly,

J. S. Mill

1413.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Blackheath Park

March 23, 1869

I am not sure whether, when I last wrote to you, I mentioned the work in which I was engaged, of preparing a new edition of my father's "Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind" with Notes, bringing up the subject to the latest improvements in psychology. This is now complete, and the notes, to which Mr Grote has contributed, and in which Mr Bain has given, in a condensed form, the most important thoughts of his systematic treatises, form I think a very valuable addition to the original work. I hope you have received the copy I directed the publisher to send. . . . How is the edition (of the translation)² proceeding? . . .

1414.

TO WILLIAM GEORGE WARD¹

29th March, 1869.

The purpose of those who have projected the Society² mentioned in your letter is a laudable one, but it is very doubtful whether it will be realised in practice. Oral discussion on matters dependent on reasoning may be much more thorough than when

carried on by written discourse, but only I think if undertaken in the manner of the Socratic dialogue, between one and one. None of the same advantages are obtained when the discussion is shared by a mixed assemblage. Even, however, as a kind of debating society on these great questions the Society may be useful, especially to its younger members. But my time is all pre-engaged to other occupations, and I do not expect any such benefit, either to others or to myself, from my taking part in the proceedings of the Society, as would justify me in putting aside other duties in order to join it.

It is very natural that those who are strongly convinced of the truth of their opinions should think that those who differ from them do not duly weigh their arguments.³ I can only say that I sincerely endeavour to do the amplest justice to any argument which is urged, and to all I can think of even when not urged, in defence of any opinions which I controvert.

1415.

TO EDWARD WILLIAM FITHIAN¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 6. 1869

Dear Sir

Under the explanation given in your note, and in the understanding that the local Committee are to act in concert with, and under the general guidance of, the Committee of the Commons Preservation Society, I am willing to be a member of the Blackheath Committee, though unable to attend its meetings. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

E. W. Fithian Esq.

1416.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Blackheath Park Kent

April 6. 1869

Dear Sir

It is not desired that the petitions should be presented simultaneously.² They are presented as they come in; and there is seldom a sitting of the House at which one or more are not presented. But as they will not be too late any period of the session, it is worth while to keep them back as long as there seems a prospect of obtaining more signatures to them.

The rules of the House require that petitions should be in manuscript not print. The printed copies are circulated for signature, and the signatures afterwards cut off, and pasted or gummed on to the manuscript; not forgetting, however, that there must be at least one signature on the very sheet on which the petition is written.

When I leave unnoticed any point in your letter, you may safely ascribe it to want of leisure. Your views on the registration of voters being very much in accordance both with my own, and with those which seem to me to be generally entertained by the Liberal party, I had no particular reason for dwelling on the subject.

I am glad we do not differ fundamentally on the subject of the Factory Acts. I am quite prepared to find that the provision for education in those Acts, though effectual in some cases, is almost inoperative in others, and that even as regards hours of labour the machinery of the Acts is often not efficacious.

I return Mr Melly's³ letter, and am

Dear Sir Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Mr William Wood

1417.

TO LORD AMBERLEY¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 9, 1869

Dear Lord Amberley

It gave me much pleasure to hear from you, and to find my anticipation confirmed, that you would enjoy your liberation from trammels as much as I do myself.² There certainly is no blessing in human life comparable to liberty; for those at least, who having any good uses to put it to, can indulge themselves in it with a good conscience.

I envy you the pleasure of having got to a Latin classic.³ I hope to be able to give myself the same satisfaction by and by. I have not read a Greek or Latin book for at least half a dozen years, with the exception of Plato, whom I read quite through preparatory to reviewing Mr Grote's account of him.⁴ Cicero's philosophical writings are very pleasant reading and of considerable value historically, as our principal authority for much of the speculations of the Greek philosophical sects, and a brilliant specimen of the feelings of the best sort of accomplished and literary Romans towards the close of the Republic: but as philosophy they are not worth much, and I like his Orations and Letters better. It is true I am much interested in everything that relates to that great turning point of history, the going out of what was left of liberty in the ancient world; and that calm after the storm, that tragical pause at the beginning of the down-hill rush, which is called the Augustan age—so solemn in its literary monuments,⁵ so deformed by the presence of Augustus in it.⁶ No historian has treated that cunning, base, and cruel adventurer as he deserved, except Arnold in the Enc. Metropolitana,⁷ and Ampère in "L'Empire Romain à Rome":⁸ merely because Virgil and Horace flattered him.

But this kind of reading after all is but recreation, unless one is making a particular study of history in order to write it, or for some philosophical purpose. Psychology, ethics, and politics in the widest sense of the term, are the really important studies now, both for one's own instruction, and for exercising a useful influence over others.

The Endowed Schools Bill⁹ will do a great deal of good, if the proper use is made of the powers which it assumes; and Forster's speech¹⁰ shews that he at least intends to do the best. Let us hope that he will have sufficient firmness of his own, and sufficient support from others, not merely to carry the Bill, for that is little, but to work it according to the recommendations of the School Inquiry Commissioners.¹¹ I honour D^r Temple¹² and Acland¹³ for producing so good a report, for I have no doubt it is mainly their doing.

It will be very pleasant to see you and Lady Amberley at Avignon,¹⁴ if we do not sooner. With our kind regards to her I am, Dear Lord Amberley

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1418.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park

April 9, 1869

Dear Mr Cairnes

First and foremost let me express the great pleasure it gives me to hear of the progressive improvement in your health. Seeing how well the dry and stimulating climate of Nice seems to have agreed with you, and that it has not disagreed with M^{rs} Cairnes, I confess to some misgiving as to the prudence of your passing next winter in the damp and depressing climate of this island, which is dampest and cloudiest when it is mildest. But you, and your medical adviser, are better judges than I can be.

With regard to the “Analysis”,² for which you thank me so warmly, I know no one on whom it is better bestowed, nor any one to whom it was a greater pleasure to offer it. I shall have another book to offer you very soon; a volume of about the size of the “Liberty”, on the “Subjection of Women.” It is not specially on the Suffrage question, but on all the questions relating to women’s domestic subordination and social disabilities, all of which it discusses more fully than has been done hitherto. I think it will be useful, and all the more, as it is sure to be very bitterly attacked.

I am on the point of sending to the Fortnightly the first part of a review of Thornton’s book;³ the purely economical part. I shall be very desirous of knowing whether you agree with my judgment of the book from the purely scientific point of view. I feel pretty sure you will concur in what I have written on the so-called wages fund, a subject on which I expressed myself in my Political Economy as inaccurately as other people, and which I have only within the last two or three years seen in its proper light. On the other subject on which you think Thornton vulnerable, the losing sight of the population principle, it would have been better, perhaps, if he had added a few pages on the relation of that question to his doctrine; but I have no idea that he has changed any of the opinions which are so strongly expressed in his former writings on that subject.⁴ Most of the notices of his book have been just what you describe: but there have been two lately, which probably you had not yet seen—a most crabbed and cantankerous one in the Spectator,⁵ and a very friendly and generous one (apparently by Mr Hill) in the Daily News.⁶ It is very amusing in this and other cases to see how the tyros in Political Economy think themselves bound to give no quarter to heresies, being afraid to make any of the concessions which their masters make.

With regard to Gladstone’s bill, it was at first a disappointment to find that nothing better was to be done with the Church property than what is proposed.⁷ But I do not know how to complain; for the only better use to which the funds could be put is Education, and it was hardly to be desired that the Government should force on the fierce quarrel about Irish Education with the Church question still unsettled.⁸ Besides the probability that to do so might have compromised the passing of the measure it would, even when carried, have no longer been of any efficacy in allaying Irish discontent, unless, indeed, a complete surrender had been made of education to the priests. At present, this bill, at least, has been made completely satisfactory to Catholic feeling, and it will be all the more practicable to fight the education question hereafter—when there is some hope that English elementary education may first have been settled, on something like an undenominational basis.

Another reason against throwing any avoidable difficulty in the way of Church disendowment, is that its completion will open the way for the land question. It has been for some time apparent that when the religious supremacy of Protestantism is at an end, the Presbyterians of the North, and even many Orangemen, will join hands with the tenantry of the South on the land question, and the junction is coming to pass, even more quickly than could have been expected. The motion brought forward by Johnstone⁹ and seconded by the O'Donoghue for the repeal of the Party Processions Act, is a very significant incident.

I agree with you that the tithe rent charge is a very good tax; but it could not have been taken for state purposes, and it would have been a very inconvenient property to be held by Commissioners for the management of Hospitals, &c.

I look forward with great pleasure to seeing you but not at Blackheath in May, for it would be making little use of our recovered liberty not to spend in the South, for the first time since 1865, the beautiful spring months. We leave for Avignon next Tuesday, and expect to be back here early in July.

I Am
Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

J. E. Cairnes Esq.

1419.

TO WILLIAM FRASER RAE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 9, 1869

Dear Mr Rae

I have not seen Mr M^cLean's pamphlet,² nor have I any pamphlets or other works expressing the Protectionist doctrines held in Canada or Australia. I have only seen these doctrines put forth in newspapers which I have not kept. But there is a very good summary in Mr Dilke's "Greater Britain"³ of the arguments which he himself heard used in the Colonies, particularly in Australia, and which he considers to be those which are mainly influential with the supporters of Protectionism there.

The pseudo-scientific arguments for Protection are given at wearisome length in H. C. Carey's "Social Science",⁴ which, take it for all in all, I consider to be about the worst

book on political economy I ever read: an opinion which I was amply prepared to justify immediately after toiling through it. This book gives Protectionism the prestige of scientific authority in the United States, but its elaborate reasonings are not likely to be those which carry conviction to the multitude. I take it that the popular argument is, as stated to me by Mr Wells,⁵ and in the Essay by D^f Leavitt⁶ to which the Cobden Club has given its medal—that if American labourers are compelled to compete with the pauper labour of Europe, they also will be reduced to pauperism. The fallacy is plausible, and a good many of the English freetraders would be puzzled to give it a satisfactory answer. If you can make the answer such as the general reader will understand, you will do a very valuable work.

I Am Dear Mr Rae
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

W. F. Rae Esq.

1420.

TO THOMAS CARLYLE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 12. 1869

Dear Carlyle

I have just received, through Mrs Grote, the two volumes of Evelyn,² together with your kind note. The former I had entirely forgotten. The latter would have revived, if they had ever been dormant, many old memories and feelings.

Blackheath Park, Kent, is a sufficient address. We are, however, going abroad tomorrow, but mean to return in the summer; and any communication from you—not to mention your bodily presence—would be always most welcome to

Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

Thomas Carlyle Esq.

1421.

TO JOSHUA GIRLING FITCH¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 12. 1869

Dear Sir

I am very happy to learn from your letter of April 10 that our opinions do not differ so materially as I was afraid they did. May I be permitted to suggest the good which you might do by putting the substance of your letter into a communication to the Editor of the Fortnightly,² who I have no doubt would be happy by inserting it to correct whatever unintended injustice my article may have done you & at the same time to give the benefit of your high authority to the essential doctrines of the article.

1422.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

le 18 avril 1869

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je n'étais pas à St. Véran lorsque votre lettre du 30 mars y est parvenue, et je l'ai reçue trop tard pour me servir du bulletin de vote que vous m'avez adressé: Du reste, l'association² n'avait pas besoin de mon vote. Le choix du personnel doit ordinairement rester à ceux qui prennent une part active aux travaux. Quant à moi, je suis un membre très inutile de l'Association, bien que vivement intéressé à son but.

Si je reste quelquefois longtemps sans donner de mes nouvelles à un ancien ami comme vous, il ne faut l'attribuer qu'au manque de loisir. Je reçois, pour mon malheur, un très grand nombre de lettres, dont beaucoup ont besoin d'une réponse, et même d'une réponse réfléchie et soignée, portant sur des choses publiques ou privées où je suis personnellement désintéressé; et lorsque j'ai, à grand peine, distrait de mes occupations le temps nécessaire pour remplir ce devoir, il ne me reste, en général ni le temps ni l'énergie d'écrire à mes propres amis à moins d'une nécessité pressante. J'ai donc à les prier d'user de l'indulgence envers moi, et de ne me conserver pas moins leurs bon sentiments.

Je vous envoie un mandat de poste pour la souscription annuelle. Si je la dois plus d'une année, je vous prie de vouloir bien m'en avertir. J'ai lu tous vos articles dans le Temps,³ et je vous félicite du progrès de l'Association. Je voudrais bien pouvoir

féliciter également la Grèce sous le rapport politique; mais l'insurrection Crétoise,⁴ qui semblait lui promettre des avantages précieux, n'a servi que de leurre, et a seulement laissé les Grecs encore plus dénués qu'auparavant des ressources nécessaires pour le bon gouvernement de leur pays. Je n'ai pas besoin de dire que toutes mes sympathies sont avec eux; mais dans l'état présent de l'Europe, la Grèce n'a pas d'autres chances d'agrandissement qu'en travaillant à la prospérité intérieure. Contrairement à une opinion malheureusement très répandue, je crois les Grecs très dignes et très capables d'un gouvernement libre. Mais ils souffrent du fléau de toutes les nations dont les citoyens n'ont pas l'habitude ou le loisir de s'occuper de la chose publique, sans remission. Ils laissent les affaires nationales à des hommes qui pratiquent la politique comme un métier pour vivre, et qui partout, même aux Etats-Unis, s'ils ne sont pas contenus par une opinion publique forte et prononcée, conduisent les affaires dans le sens de leur propre intérêt pécuniaire. Je ne vois à cela de remède permanent que dans une grande prospérité matérielle, qui permettrait à un nombre considérable d'hommes intelligents de mener une certaine attention aux intérêts publics de front avec leurs propres affaires. Ajoutez à cela les bonnes voies de communications qui permettraient une combinaison plus facile entre des efforts aujourd'hui isolés, et la Grèce ne serait plus exploitée comme elle l'est aujourd'hui par des *place-hunters*.

Votre Toujours Affectionné

J. S. Mill

1423.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

April 19. 1869

Dear Mr Cairnes

On the day of our arrival here, I received your kind note. I will have your copy of the book² sent, as soon as it is published, to the address you mention.

I cannot feel very positive in my opinion as to the questions of policy connected with the proposed disposal of the Church property, especially as you do not agree with me.³ But my impression has been, all along, that it would have been extremely difficult to pass a bill for disendowment through even the House of Commons, without deciding, in the Bill itself, what should be the application of the funds. People are very suspicious in Church matters, and a large proportion of the warmest supporters of disendowment would have suspected the Government of meditating some employment of the money which they did not yet dare disclose; probably, to give it, in some form, to the Catholic clergy.

If, in your journey to Aix, your way lies through Avignon, I hope you will give us an opportunity of snatching a sight of you as you pass. If so, perhaps you will kindly write me a line a few days before the time when we may expect you, so that we may not be absent on an excursion exactly at the time. We do not intend to make any long journey this year; nevertheless we shall not be quite stationary here through the spring, but shall make many excursions of a few days or a fortnight's length in the neighbourhood, and probably some as far as the Pyrenees. But we shall always be returning here for our letters, &c and resting in the intervals; and as our movements in this respect will be decided chiefly by our inclinations and the exigencies of weather, if we had any reason to expect either you or Mrs Cairnes at any particular time we would arrange to be at home for that time.

My daughter and myself desire our best regards to M^{rs} Cairnes, and I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1424.

TO ELIZABETH CADY STANTON¹

Avignon, April 25, 1869

Dear Madam—

You have done me the honor to inform me of the Convention about to be held in New York on the subject of Woman's Suffrage,² and you ask me for a letter on the occasion. I would gladly comply with the request, but the cause, in America, has advanced beyond the stage at which it could need a recommendation from me, or from any man. It is not to be believed that the nation which is now engaged in admitting the newly-liberated negro to the plenitude of all political franchises, will much longer retain women in a state of helotage which (as is truly remarked in the letter of invitation issued by your Association) is now more degrading than ever, because, being no longer shared by any of the male sex, it constitutes every woman the inferior of every man. The late glorious struggle has shaken old prejudices, and has brought men to a feeling that the principles of your democratic institutions are not mere phrases, but are meant to be believed and acted upon towards all persons; and I am persuaded that the political equality which is now refused to no one else, will be conceded to women as soon as a sufficiently large number of them unite in demanding it. I therefore heartily wish success to the approaching demonstration.

I Am, Dear Madam, Very Sincerely Yours,

J. S. Mill

1425.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Avignon

May 2. 1869

Dear Chadwick

Lord Russell's bill,² and its favourable reception by the Lords, are no further of importance than as shewing the need which the Lords feel of strengthening their position. So small a number of life members would do little good even if they were always honestly selected, which they will not be. A few good names may be put in at first, but, as a rule, the life peerage will be a refuge for the mediocrities of past administrations. If now and then a thoughtful and vigorous man gets in, he will, no doubt, have the means of publicly speaking his thoughts, but to an inattentive audience; for the Peers are too stupid and too conservative to be moved, except by a party leader who they think will carry distinctions to the utmost limits of practicability; and the public pay little attention to speeches in the House of Lords. I doubt if a Second Chamber can ever again carry weight in English politics, unless popularly elected. I feel sure, at all events that nothing less than what I proposed in my book on Representative Government,³ will enable it to do so. These are my opinions; but I do not wish to throw cold water on anything which acknowledges an evil, and points in the direction of improvement.

I should not at all wonder if Gladstone in what he said to you, did hint at a life peerage: though perhaps what he meant was, to hold out hopes that you might be supported by the Government in a future candidature for the House of Commons. I should be more glad if it were the last; but I do not mean that I should advise you to refuse the former, for as it would be obviously a tribute to your legislative capacity, it would doubtless increase your weight. Ever yrs truly

J. S. Mill

1426.

TO ARMAND LALANDE¹

A[vignon]

May 2. 1869

Dear Sir—

Your letter has followed me here, & I have read it with great interest. As a piece of English composition it is quite remarkable as the production of a foreigner; & I agree in a great part of its substance. Mr Lowe has certainly much exaggerated the strength of the case against the shilling duty on corn.² I however differ from you on one of the leading points of your argument, viz. where you aim at proving that the price of corn would not fall by the whole amount of the duty taken off, but by a smaller amount, dependent on the degree in which the importation of corn may be increased by the abolition of the duty. This argument was urged formerly during the discussions which preceded the repeal of our corn laws³ & I had occasion to contest it at that time. It seems to me that your argument errs by stopping short at demand & supply as the final regulators of price, without going on to that which in the last resort, adjusts the demand & supply to one another, viz. Costs of production (including all cost necessary for bringing the article to the place of sale). If from any permanent natural calamity smiting the soil with sterility the cost of production of wheat were increased by a shilling a quarter, I apprehend that the price of wheat would rise by that amount, *plus* the ordinary profit upon it, even if there were no diminution of supply. Whether the supply would be finally diminished or not would depend on whether the rise of price caused a falling off in the consumption. But the conditions of production having been altered, the average price (that which the producer looks forward to & calculates upon) must accommodate itself to the new conditions. And the same thing happens if instead of a natural calamity, we suppose the artificial burthen of a tax, which though levied only on a part of the corn consumed, enables all the remainder to command on the average the higher price necessary for bringing in that part: Supply & demand determine the perturbations of price; but (when the article admits of unlimited increase) not the permanent, or average, price.

I think, therefore, your argument fails in one important point; & though some of your other arguments remain valid notwithstanding, I do not think them sufficient to outweigh the advantage of getting rid of the last remaining shred of Protectionism.

But I do not therefore dissuade you from publishing your paper.⁴ It is written in a way to command attention, & so many intelligent persons will think your opinion correct & mine erroneous, that it is right that the opinion sh^d have a fair hearing. The only newspapers however which would be very likely to insert such a paper would be the Conservative journals, Standard, Herald, &c. & with them I have no relations. Probably it would have a better chance either with them or with the Times if sent by yourself.

1427.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

le 8 mai 1869

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je serai heureux d'être de quelque utilité à votre fils.² Je puis lui donner des recommandations à quelques familles de Manchester, entr'autres à M. Bazley,³ député de Manchester, à M. Potter,⁴ qui a succédé à Cobden comme député de Rochdale, et une ou deux autres. Les enverrai-je directement à son adresse (chez Bryan Peacock et C^{ie}?) ou à vous-même à Paris?

En effet, je suis avec le plus grand intérêt le mouvement électoral du moment.⁵ Ce serait trop de bonheur s'il pouvait aboutir comme celui auquel vous le comparez, à un changement de majorité. Mais on ne peut pas espérer autant. Ce serait déjà beaucoup qu'un notable accroissement dans le nombre de l'Opposition.

Qu'une révolution soit désormais possible ou non, la plupart de la classe aisée paraît encore la craindre beaucoup, et je crois qu'une partie de la classe ouvrière, même dans le midi, l'espère toujours. Des hommes intelligents d'ici pensent que la tendance plus libérale qui se montre parmi la classe moyenne a surtout pour cause la crainte que le système du gouvernement actuel ne pousse à une catastrophe, et qu'au lendemain d'un triomphe libéral les mêmes hommes redeviendraient conservateurs. On se plaint aussi que les hommes d'opposition qui reparaissent sur la scène politique sont pour la plupart des démocrates autoritaires de l'école de la Convention, et non des hommes de la nouvelle école libérale. J'aimerais beaucoup à connaître votre opinion sur ces choses.

Je lirai avec grand intérêt votre écrit sur la prononciation grecque.⁶ C'est un sujet qui m'intéresse beaucoup, et le peu que j'en sais s'accorde essentiellement avec ce que je crois être votre opinion.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

1428.

TO A. M. FRANCIS¹

Avignon

May 8. 1869

Dear Sir—

I have received your letter & I will answer its different points seriatim.

1. My letter to Mr. Holden² has been much misunderstood if it is supposed to indicate any change in my opinions on the sphere & functions of Government in the

economical affairs of societies. The only opinion I intended to withdraw was that which recommended, in certain cases, temporary protective duties in new countries to aid the experimental introduction of new industries. And even on this point I continue to think that my opinion was well grounded but experience has shewn that protectionism, once introduced, is in danger of perpetuating itself through the private interests it enlists in its favour, & I therefore now prefer some other mode of public aid to new industries, though in itself less appropriate.

I quite agree with you that in Australia there are many important requisites of prosperity which the Gov^t ought not to consider it beyond its province to provide. One of these is the one you mention—works of irrigation. I have long looked forward to the time when Australia would feel the need of tanks like those of Southern India,³ to retain through the dry season the surplus rains of the few rainy months. This however is a work on a great scale requiring combined labour & therefore difficult to accomplish with your present population.

I took no part in the discussion about the purchase of the Telegraphs⁴ because it was a mere experiment of which I do not foresee the result. I sh^d object to the purchase of the railways until the smaller measure shall have approved its policy by its success. And in no case does it seem to me admissible that the Gov^t should *work* the railways. If it became proprietor of them it ought to lease them to private companies.

2. With regard to lands I am still, like yourself, in favour of the Wakefield system.⁵ I should however highly approve of selling the lands subject to a land tax, if the Gov^t is in a condition to enforce its payment without a cost exceeding the worth; a difficulty which seemed fatal to this plan at the time when Wakefield wrote.

3. On the importation of Polynesian labourers⁶ I am afraid we differ more widely. If the South Sea islanders came to Queensland spontaneously, the province would have every reason to welcome their coming. But I have the most deep rooted distrust of plans for sending emissaries to induce them to come, even by no worse means than brilliant representations. And I do not believe that any laws, which it is possible to enforce among an English population, will protect ignorant & uncivilised strangers living with them as servants, against outrageous abuses of power. If the experiment ever answers it is probably with Chinese, who are a more fearless & vigorous race & are able to make themselves very unpleasant to those who ill treat them. But the common English abroad—I do not know if in this they are worse than other people—are intensely contemptuous of what they consider inferior races, & seldom willingly practise any other mode of attaining their ends with them than bullying & blows. I therefore most positively object to putting such victims in their power. If there are no other means of preventing labour from being over scanty, then I am afraid the inconveniences of the climate must be taken with its advantages. But I sh^d think that the agricultural population of England & Ireland would furnish (agreeably to one of Wakefield's principles) a sufficient number of young married couples to supply in a moderate number of years the labour required.

If in the expression of these opinions I have been rather brief & abrupt, I beg that you will attribute it to my occupations & to the haste with which they oblige me to write.

1429.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

A[vignon]

May 8, 1869

Dear Mr Leslie—

You should not take the editors & their ways so much *au sérieux*.² You must remember that your writings are intended for the public good, & that the editors are not half such good judges of that as you are. Consequently it is for you to make them take your articles just as you would make them take medicine, without any amour propre at having made it up for them yourself, & so put in a little sugar now & then if need be. Now, having made a real success with your amusing as well as useful articles of travels,³ the editors ask you for more of the same, & you should give it them, wrapping up good doctrine in this form. You should be no more on your dignity with them than with children. To a man like yourself most of them are children, as regards their motives & the objects they have in view. Morley indeed is better, but I dare say he is a good deal bothered & he probably thinks that Chauffard's Mittermaier is a subject that can wait better than most.⁴ I should be vexed if the paper that you wrote to oblige me should have any unpleasant effect on your relations with him.

I agree with you in exceedingly disliking the insolent & domineering affectations of Fitzjames Stephen. In pol. economy he is exceedingly ignorant, but not the less presumptuous. On other matters, however, he is able to do some useful work, & he is undoubtedly a clever man. My daughter begins to have some doubts whether he is thoroughly an honest man, either in word or deed. It is certain that he says & does oddly inconsistent things. He is always brutal, even at his best; that however is apparently in him a radical defect of temperament, which if he is otherwise an honest worker for good, might have to be overlooked. It is certain that he is very vain, & that may be the cause of many of his defects in which vanity is not apparent, as of the boyish boast that he always goes to sleep at the P.E. Club.⁵ Has he then so much time to spare; or does he mean that he comes because he cannot get sleep elsewhere? But he is full of this sort of fanfaronnade, which is offensive enough, but which we may excuse if he is in earnest about anything. One cannot help hoping he is because he is clever enough to do a good deal of good or of mischief.

I shall read with great interest your paper on profits.⁶ If it is not in print before I return to England, perhaps you would not mind letting me see it in MS. I am open to conviction, but at present I cannot see that you are likely to be successful in anything more than in shewing that the doctrine respecting value & cost of production is true within wider limits of error—is true much more roughly & only in the gross, than is often supposed by political economists. This I am quite prepared to admit.

I am very happy on all accounts that you have been appointed to the Examinership⁷—& on my own account that you are likely to bring on your question at the Club in July⁸ for I count upon being present at that meeting. I read & was glad of M. de Laveleye's letter in the Economist.⁹ The prospect of an account of Servia & Bosnia from so good an observer & thinker is very agreeable.¹⁰

Sumner's speech¹¹ if serious is almost frantic. Probably however (& that is unpleasant enough) what it means is a wish not to settle the Alabama question at all but to keep the wound unhealed. One does not know what to say or do until it appears whether this is a passing gust or a permanent mood of the American mind. Perhaps it is but a reaction from Reverdy Johnson's ill-advised & ill-timed soft sawder.¹²

We saw Cairnes on his way through Avignon to Aix les Bains, & you will be glad to hear how wonderfully he has improved in health. He can now walk for a short time, without even a stick, on level ground, & for the first time speaks as if he had some hopes of being restored to active life.

I do not understand Lord Dufferin.¹³ Why sh^d he wish to receive from me a production of which he thinks so unfavourably that my sending it to him of my own accord would have been almost a piece of bravado? A compliment of the sort he seems to desire from me is only suitable towards a fellow worker in the same cause, or a private friend, & Lord D. is neither: but as I sh^d be sorry to refuse any request of the sort from you, I will do what you asked if you wish it, on the ground that Lord D. is a friend of yours.

1430.

TO GEORGE JOHN GRAHAM¹

Avignon

May 11, 1869

Dear Graham

I will with great pleasure be your surety for the additional £1000.

It does seem as if this time a Bankruptcy Bill will really pass,² and those personally interested will be no longer kept in uncertainty concerning their future. I greatly doubt the expediency of the change, as far as relates to the abolition of your office:³ but apparently the mercantile men will have it so. In other respects this bill seems a little better than the very bad ones we have had lately, but still very different from what it ought to be.

If the bill passes, you will have more time for the subjects in which you were so deeply interested in our younger days,⁴ and in which I have always thought that the engrossing and anxious nature of your daily occupations has cost to the world very

valuable contributions. I have myself been greatly indebted to those searching discussions, at Mr Grote's house in Sun Court,⁵ of some of which the "Analysis" itself was the text, and to the value of which no one contributed more, if anybody so much, as yourself.

I had long had the project of publishing an annotated edition of the Analysis; and now when Bain's treatises and the progress of physiology have raised up a certain public, disposed to listen to the Association view of Psychology, the republication will probably place the book in its deserved position as a text book of that view of the science.

Ever, Dear Graham,
Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

G. J. Graham Esq.

1431.

TO T. S. CREE¹

Avignon

May 17, 1869

Dear Sir

I thank you for your letter, as I am always glad to have my opinions and arguments subjected to the criticisms of any one who has studied the subject. It appears to me, however, that your remarks do not touch the scientific exactness of the propositions laid down in my article in the *Fortnightly Review*, but only the practical importance of the cases to which they are applicable. Now, though I am far from agreeing with you as to this, I have not discussed it in the article. My object, on this occasion, was to show that the door is not shut on the subject by the insuperable law of nature.

It is one thing to say that labourers, by combination, *cannot* raise wages (which is the doctrine of many political economists), and another to say that it is not for their *interest* to force up wages so high as to reduce profits below what is a sufficient inducement to saving and to the increase of capital.

I have written a second article on the subject, which will be printed in the next number of the *Fortnightly*, and which, though it will not satisfy you on all points, will, I think, show you that I do not disregard either the moral or the prudential obligations of trades' unions.

I Am, Dear Sir,
Yours Very Faithfully,

J. S. Mill

R. [*sic*] S. Cree Esq.

1432.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

le 18 mai 1869

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

J'ai lu avec le plus grand intérêt votre article sur la prononciation de la langue grecque.² Vous m'avez fait comprendre la question mieux que je ne l'avais jamais fait. Il faudra bien qu'on finisse par adopter la prononciation de la Grèce moderne, sauf à provoquer quelques modifications dans cette prononciation même, ce qui n'est pas tout-à-fait chimérique après ce que les Grecs d'aujourd'hui ont déjà fait pour la langue écrite. J'étais sûr que l'iotacisme exagéré de la prononciation actuelle devait être une corruption, ancienne peut-être, mais non antique. C'est un défaut réel, et non sans importance.

Vous pouvez bien juger avec quel vif intérêt j'ai lu vos observations sur l'état des esprits, et sur les probabilités des élections.³ Vous êtes certainement mieux placé que moi pour en juger, surtout en ce qui regarde Paris, et le nord de la France. Moi-Même je vois bien, jusqu'à un certain degré, les tendances que vous signalez, et je ne demande pas mieux que de partager toutes vos espérances. Si vraiment la question de l'affranchissement des femmes va monter au premier rang, ce sera un signe de progrès dépassant tout ce que nous avons vu jusqu'ici.

Je vous envoie des lettres de recommandation aux deux députés libéraux de Manchester, au député de Rochdale, et à M. Steinthal, ministre unitairien intelligent et éclairé, qui comme la plupart des unitairiens en Angleterre et aux États-Unis, est au premier rang du libéralisme en religion et en politique.

Votre Affectionné,

J. S. Mill

Dans la liste des membres de l'Association on me donne pour recteur de l'Université de St Andrew à Londres, l'Université dont j'étais recteur est celle de St Andrews en Ecosse. Je ne le suis plus aujourd'hui, la nomination n'étant que pour trois ans.

Mon adresse en Angleterre est Blackheath Park, Kent.[4](#)

Lettres pour

Jacob Bright }
Thomas Bayley Potter } M.P.
T. Bazley Esq. }
S. Alfred Steinthal }

1433.

TO PETER ALFRED TAYLOR[1](#)

A[vignon]

May 21. 1869

Dear Mr Taylor

Of the three modes of presenting the £200 to Mr Chesson,[2](#) I agree with you in preferring the third; & as you wish it, I send a draft of a letter to be signed by us, if approved by you. If you will kindly return it with any improvements which occur to you I will copy it & send it to you with my signature.

I am glad that the Phillips case is to be carried to at least the first stage of appeal.[3](#)

O'Sullivan's resignation has saved the country from a most mischievous infringement of the commonest principles of good government—an act of Parl^t against an individual.[4](#) Arbitrary power is arbitrary power whether exercised in legislative forms by a Parl^t or in administrative forms by a king & it is precisely in the case of persons with whom hardly any body sympathises (or dares to admit that he sympathises) that fatal precedents creep in. It is a permanent blot on the conduct of the present Government that it brought in such a bill & the mischief is not altogether cancelled by its not being proceeded with.

1434.

TO CHARLES BRADLAUGH[1](#)

Avignon

May 24, 1869

Dear Sir

You have gained a very honourable success in obtaining a repeal of the mischievous Act by your persevering resistance.² There would be a certain satisfaction in getting the subject of your costs brought before Parliament by any one who would take the occasion of speaking disagreeable truths on the conduct of the Government in going on so long with the prosecution. But no practical result would follow, for there would be the ready answer that after all you were violating the law (though this you deny) and that it would be a mischievous precedent to indemnify any one for the expense of defending what was technically illegal. As, therefore, there would be no probability of getting any of your expenses refunded to you, I think that I would rest satisfied with the really important victory you have already obtained.

Many thanks for what you are doing about the petitions.³ Now that you are in communication with Miss Taylor,⁴ I have no doubt that together you will judge rightly of what can be advantageously done.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1435.

TO ARMAND LALANDE¹

A[vignon]

May 24. 1869

Dear Sir—

I have read your letter of the 18th with attention & interest & I am much inclined to think with you that the effect of so small a duty as one shilling a quarter on wheat is not sufficient to make it certain that any perceptible relief will be obtained by taking it off. Still, we must reason about small effects on the same principle as one does on large ones. The duty gives a premium of a shilling in cost of production to home grown corn over imported. This must naturally cause a certain quantity more to be grown at home & a certain quantity less to be imported & every additional quantity grown at home in a given state of agriculture is grown at a proportionally greater cost. The average price therefore must rise sufficiently to remunerate this greater cost; but it will not rise by the full amount of the duty; otherwise it would not have the effect of reducing the quantity imported. Thus the average price of corn will, I conceive, be raised by an uncertain amount short of one shilling a quarter. But this increased price

the consumer has to pay on *all* corn, home grown as well as imported, and from this he will be relieved by taking off the duty.

1436.

TO FREDERICK W. CHESSON¹

[Before May 28, 1869]

Dear Mr Chesson

The executive body of the Jamaica Committee are anxious, in closing for the present all active operations, to give a marked expression of their sense of the important part which you have taken in their proceedings from the commencement, and of the great value of your laborious, unremitting and disinterested services to the cause.

In all the anxieties and responsibilities of the Executive Committee you have fully participated; none of its members have contributed more usefully to its deliberations; while the onerous labours of detail have fallen mainly upon yourself.

The sacrifice even of mere time, by one who is otherwise so fully occupied as you are, entitles you at the hands of the Committee to more than a simple expression of their cordial thanks; and the funds in their possession fortunately enable them to fulfil the duty of making some compensation to you for labours so valuable, and the burthen of which ought not to fall solely on yourself. The Committee have therefore requested us to present to you, in grateful recognition of your exertions, the sum of £200, and to beg you to accept it along with their thanks for your public spirited services.

We Are
Dear Mr Chesson
Very Sincerely Yours

J. S. Mill, Chairman

P. A. Taylor, Treasurer

1437.

TO PETER ALFRED TAYLOR¹

A[vignon]

May 28. 1869

Dear Mr Taylor—

I have reconsidered the letter to Chesson² with reference to your remarks on it; but I do not see any ready means of freeing it from the character you point out without making it less expressive of the sentiments which the Committee wish to put on record. On the whole I think it is hardly if at all a defect that the official letter should be written as if the recipient had no previous knowledge of what is intended. Anything which is taken for granted is of course not expressed; & its expression is so much abated from the complimentary matter which the recipient would naturally like to retain in a permanent form.

As, therefore, you did not suggest any particular alteration, I have made none but merely return the letter, copied fair with my signature; but if you would like any alteration it is not too late to make it.

I cannot but think that the dropping of the bill against O'Sullivan³ has saved the British democracy from a most perilous snare. It seems to me that the distinction between a government by general laws & one of arbitrary edicts is the broadest in all politics, & absolutely essential to good government under any constitution: for the reason long assigned by Aristotle,⁴ that government by law is guided by general considerations of permanent policy while government by special decree is guided by the passion of the moment. And it is most especially necessary that this distinction should not be tampered with in a popular government, for most other governments are under some check from fear of the majority; but when the majority is itself the government, the check is only in its own breast, & depends on a strong conviction in the popular mind of its necessity which conviction is enfeebled by every instance of violation. I think it would be a fatal notion to get abroad among the people of a democratic country that laws or constitutions may be stepped over instead of being altered; in other words that an object immediately desirable may be grasped directly in a particular case without the salutary previous process of considering whether the principle acted on is one which the nation would bear to adopt as a rule for *general* guidance. I have always admired Lincoln, among other reasons, because even for so great an end as the abolition of slavery he did not set aside the Constitution⁵ but waited till he could bring what he wanted to do (by a little straining perhaps) within the license allowed by the Constitution for military necessities.

1438.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Avignon

le 30 mai 1869

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Il y a bien longtemps que nous ne nous sommes vus. Je n'ai pourtant pas demeuré sans communication, au moins intellectuelle, avec vous, car je ne manque jamais une de vos lettres dans le Temps.² Je les regarde comme un grand service que vous rendez à nos deux pays, et il est très rare que je ne partage pas les opinions qui y sont exprimées. Surtout dans ces derniers temps j'éprouve continuellement le désir de vous en féliciter.

Je me réjouis comme vous et avec vous de la renaissance si remarquable de l'esprit public en France. La nouvelle génération qui n'a pas subi les effrois d'il y a vingt ans, nous promet un meilleur avenir. Je voudrais pourtant plus de concorde dans l'opposition démocratique et libérale, et que les électeurs ne préférassent pas un Rochefort³ à un Jules Favre.

Nous retournerons à Blackheath au commencement de Juillet. Vous serait-il possible de venir dîner avec nous le premier dimanche suivant (4 juillet)?⁴

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

1439.

TO DR. EMILE HONORÉ CAZELLES¹

A[vignon].

May 30, 1869

Cher Monsieur—

Je crois en effet que quelques pages préliminaires à la traduction de l'Assujettissement des Femmes² seraient très utiles et je trouve les vôtres excellentes. Je vous soumettrai cependant deux ou trois observations.

1. D'abord il me semble que vous ne rendez pas pleine justice aux St Simoniens et aux Fourieristes, que vous désignez clairement sans les nommer. Je condamne comme vous beaucoup de leurs doctrines et surtout le gouvernementalisme à outrance des St Simoniens. Cependant je trouve que les uns et les autres ont rendu de grands services: et notamment sur la question des femmes, le St Simonisme surtout ayant jeté dans les hautes régions de la vie intellectuelle et pratique, un grand nombre d'esprits supérieurs, désabusés aujourd'hui de ce qu'il y avait de faux ou d'exagéré dans leurs systèmes mais conservant ce qu'ils avaient de bon y compris l'égalité des femmes. Les St Simoniens d'ailleurs avaient le bon esprit de déclarer toujours qu'on ne peut prononcer sur la fonction des femmes sans elles et que la loi qui les doit régir ne peut

être donnée que par des femmes ou par une femme. Ils n'ont donné leurs propres idées sur ce sujet que comme des hypothèses. Il est vrai que, comme il arrive le plus souvent, on leur a tenu très peu compte de cette réserve.

2. D'un autre côté tout en traitant Proudhon avec une juste sévérité vous me semblez lui avoir fait la part trop belle en disant qu'il a rendu de grands services à la course du progrès. Je puis me tromper, mais il m'a toujours semblé que Proudhon a été très nuisible à la cause du progrès. D'abord personne n'a tant fait pour provoquer la réaction de la peur, qui a eu et qui a encore des effets si funestes. Ensuite je ne vois dans ses écrits rien de foncièrement juste et progressif. Ce qu'il y a chez lui de plus puissant c'est sa dialectique subversive, mais c'est une dialectique d'un mauvais aller; une vraie sophistique, car elle s'attaque au bien comme au mal, et au lieu de se contenter de dire ce qui peut se dire avec vérité contre la meilleure cause, elle entasse contre chaque côté de la question pêle-mêle avec les bonnes raisons, tous les sophismes et même les calomnies qu'on a jamais débités de part et d'autre. Cela brouille les esprits et fausse les idées, tandis que la bonne dialectique les éclairait.

3. Tout ce que vous avez écrit à l'endroit de Lanfrey³ est parfaitement bien pensé et dit. Seulement il me paraît douteux si nous faisons prudemment de rompre en visière avec lui. C'est un homme qu'on peut toujours espérer de ramener aux idées vraies, et si on s'attaque aux gens on risque d'intéresser leur amour-propre à persister dans la voie qu'ils ont une fois prise.

4. Je voudrais qu'il fût vrai qu'en Angleterre les esprits eussent été déjà préparés en 1851 à la discussion de l'émancipation des femmes, et que le temps où l'on pouvait s'en tirer par le ridicule était déjà passé. Cela est vrai aujourd'hui, mais ne l'était pas alors. La discussion n'a été réellement entamée en A[ngleterre] que dans cette année-là, par l'article de ma femme que vous avez lu dans le 2^{me} vol des Dissertations.⁴

Il y a à la page 6 une expression qu'il serait peut-être bien de modifier: c'est là où vous dites "Il ne s'agit plus de changer les relations sociales des sexes." Je sais bien ce que vous avez voulu dire, mais ce qui est proposé dans mon petit livre serait certainement regardé comme un grand changement dans les relations sociales des sexes.

1440.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

le 30 mai 1869

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je ne connais "The Jesus of History"² que par l'annonce. Depuis quelque temps on s'occupe beaucoup en Angleterre comme ailleurs de la critique historique de la Bible,

et les idées rationnelles sur ce sujet y sont en grand progrès. Il est très heureux que votre livre des Evangiles³ y soit connu de ceux qui s'occupent de ces questions, sur lesquelles il a tant répandu de lumière.

Le livre assez mal nommé "Eléments de Science Sociale" est, je crois, d'un certain Docteur Drysdale. Il y a deux Docteurs en Médecine de ce nom, frères (je crois) et partageant les mêmes opinions. Celui-ci, à ce que je pense, doit être le Dr. Charles Drysdale.⁴ Sans avoir lu tout le livre, j'en pris un peu connaissance à l'époque de sa première publication. J'y trouvai d'excellentes choses, avec quelques autres qui ne me plaisaient pas. Je crois l'auteur, au reste, un homme éclairé, et très zélé pour la plupart des bonnes causes.

Les élections ont bien répondu à vos prédictions.⁵ C'est l'indice d'un immense progrès; mais il eût été à désirer que le parti démocratique par excellence se fût mieux entendu avec ceux qui mènent la liberté de front avec la démocratie. Il est fâcheux que Jules Favre risque de n'être élu nulle part, et qu'un homme comme Carnot⁶ soit rejeté.

M. Lavasseur me fit l'honneur de m'envoyer son livre.⁷ Ce que j'en ai eu le temps de lire indique que c'est un très bon ouvrage d'enseignement populaire.

Je sais que ni vous ni votre frère ne prenez le titre de baron, mais je crois que lui au moins, et probablement vous, y avez droit. C'est la première fois que j'en affaibli l'un ou l'autre,⁸ mais vous savez qu'il y a de nos gros industriels anglais qui ont une admiration sincère pour un titre, et que pour ceux-là un homme estimable est rehaussé par la possession d'un titre, comme aux yeux de presque tous les Français une femme d'esprit l'est par la beauté.

Il se pourrait bien que je tombe chez vous en traversant Paris, si vous y êtes encore du temps de mon passage.

Votre Affectionné,

J. S. Mill

1441.

TO FREDERIC HARRISON¹

June, 1869

[I have many letters from him between 1865 and 1873 on public questions, on the Jamaica trials in the case of Governor Eyre, on the Trades-Union Bill of 1869, on the Paris Commune, on the Women's Suffrage question—whereon he wrote June 1869—]

There are few persons whom we all should be more glad to see even partially with us on this subject than yourself.

1442.

TO DR. EMILE HONORÉ CAZELLES¹

A[vignon]

June 4, 1869

Cher Monsieur—

Après quelque considération ma première impression en faveur d'une préface à mettre en tête du nouveau livre ne se conserve pas, et toute réflexion faite, j'aimerais mieux que le livre se présente tout seul au lecteur tel qu'il est, sans introduction ni observations préliminaires.² J'espère que vous me pardonneriez ce changement d'avis, qui ne vient pas d'une manque d'appréciation de ce que vous avez écrit. Au contraire je l'estime hautement, et certainement la partie que j'ai critiquée sous le support de l'intérêt de notre cause, c. à. d. celle qui est dirigée contre M. Lanfrey.

Je vous ai envoyé hier par la poste quelques feuilles de la traduction que j'ai reçues de l'éditeur. J'ai fait quelques corrections en crayon que généralement ne regardaient que l'imprimeur. Je n'ai proposé, si je m'en saurais bien, de changement dans la traduction que celui d'un seul mot.

1443.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

A[vignon]

June 7, 1869

Dear Bain—

Mr Veitch sent me a copy of the Life of Hamilton.² His replies to my strictures are so very weak (Mansel & water, with an infusion of vinegar) that I shall hardly [feel] any need of giving them the distinction of a special notice; except that I am bound to admit that the passage of Aristotle which H. seemed to have misunderstood,³ was not indicated by any reference of his own, but of the editors. That is quite sufficient for my purpose; since Mansel at least has learning, & that passage of Aristotle was I suppose, the nearest he could find to bearing out what Hamilton said. But after all H. must have known what A. meant by *ῥεργεια*.⁴ I agree with you as to the general impression which the book gives of Hamilton.⁵ Only as it shews advantageously a

side of his character which I had no knowledge of, that of his private affections, the general result rather raised him in my eyes.

I [am] glad to be confirmed by you in my impression that nothing in my notes to the Analysis, on the question of Belief,⁶ is incompatible with your theory of it. I shall be very glad to see your last views of the subject more fully developed. Cairnes, who had not previously studied psychology very seriously but who has now been reading both the Analysis & our notes with full appreciation & great edification, seems to feel a need of some further explanations on the doctrine of Belief as connected with the Will,⁷ & what a man of his practised intelligence wants is likely to be wanted by most others. As far as we two are concerned, it is very unlikely that any difference of opinion sh^d develop itself when your doctrine is explicitly worked out.

I hope the new book⁸ reached you early. Longman is wanting to print a second edition.

The Lords have done all the mischief they could to the Scotch Education Bill.⁹ One would have thought the unanimous recommendations of a Commission, partly Tory & fairly representative of all sections in Scotland, might have passed their ordeal. But they will no doubt as you say, revenge themselves for having to eat their leek (if they do eat it) in the Church question¹⁰ by spoiling other Bills. They are becoming a very irritating kind of minor nuisance.

1444.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

June 12, 1869

Dear Sir

I have gone over the paper which you have sent,² and have condensed it a little, with some alteration in the arrangement. If you approve of it as it now stands, I should be happy to sign it along with the others. The signatures should, I think, be in alphabetical order. I see no objection to its being printed, with the words "private & confidential" as you propose.

I beg you to put me down as a subscriber of £100, not on the score of interest foregone, but in virtue of the £100 I lent to you,³ which will now be not a loan but a subscription. I am

Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

1445.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Avignon

June 14. 1869

Dear Mr Spencer

I fully agree with you that in a great many cases women tyrannize over men, and you will find that I have not omitted to notice this in the little book I sent you,² nor to notice the fact that it is generally the best men who get the worst tyrannized over. But in this case as in a great many others, two negatives do not make an affirmative, or at all events two affirmatives do not make a negative and two contradictory tyrannies do not make liberty. In the first place the illegitimate power of women is greater than it would be if they had legitimate freedom. The consciousness of their weakness makes the most generous men shrink from exacting justice from them: while the fact that women have to submit to injustice through the whole of their lives, dulls in them the sense of justice when circumstances put it in their power to be the arbiters of justice towards others. Moreover, the more decidedly we think that women are already a great power in society—and no one is more strongly of that opinion than I am—the more important it becomes that they should be fit to exercise it properly. All the mischievous sources of women's power are exaggerated by our morbid habit of dwelling upon sex as deciding their whole destiny in life: and this same system makes both the motives and the methods of women's influence morbid and demoralizing in their turn. I shall hope to have some opportunities of talking over this and other matters with you, if you are in town in the summer, and can spare us an afternoon now and then. Are any of your Sundays in July or the first half of August disengaged? and if you could come down and dine with us on any of them, will you let me know which? I am

Dear Mr Spencer
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1446.

TO WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE¹

Avignon

June 15. 1869

My Dear Mr Gladstone

It was kind of you to spare time from your anxious labours to acknowledge receipt of the little book.²

I thank you for your kind invitations. As you are aware, I hardly ever go out in the evening; but I am not disposed to let drop the privilege of breakfasting with you, and I shall be glad to avail myself of it after I return to England, which will be early next month. I am

My Dear Mr Gladstone

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1447.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

Avignon June 15, 1869

I hope you have duly received from the publisher a copy of the little book I have just published "The subjection of women". I have received several applications to translate it into German, and as it is very desirable that this should be done immediately, I have accepted the offer of Dr. Heinemann,² Professor at the Civil Service College; reserving your right to include in the collected edition either his translation by agreement with him or a different translation. I expect that Dr. Heinemann will write to you on the subject. I should very much like to hear from you sometimes, respecting your own and your sister's health, the progress of the edition,³ and your own pursuits, projects, and opinions.

1448.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

June 23. 1869

Dear Mr Cairnes

I have had so much to do, and so many other letters to write, that I have delayed till now thanking you for your most acceptable letter of May 23, and especially for the sifting which you have given to my review of Thornton.² You may imagine how gratifying it is to me that you give so complete an adhesion to the view I take of the wages fund. In regard to the general subject of demand and supply, I think there is not, at bottom, any considerable difference between us. My object in the Fortnightly was to shew that the cases supposed by Thornton do not contradict and invalidate, as he thinks they do, the equation of supply and demand. In this you agree with me, and you do not think the doctrine incorrect. The amount of its value, either scientific or practical, is a different question. But, while I admit almost all that you say, I think that the proposition as laid down is something more than an identical proposition. It does not define, nor did it, as I stated it, affect to define the causes of variations in value. But it declares the *condition* of all such variations, and the necessary *modus operandi* of their causes, viz. that they operate by moving the supply to equality with the demand, or the demand to equality with the supply. The numerous considerations which you notice as influencing the minds of sellers, are, all of them, considerations of probable future demand and supply, modifying the effect which would take place if nothing but present facts were considered. Now it appears to me important to point out that these prospective considerations operate by inducing the sellers either to convert a possible present supply into an actual one, or to withdraw an actual present supply into the region of merely possible ones; and that in either case the relation of the price to the actual supply and demand is constant, i.e. the price is that which will make them equal. If this statement does no more than give a distinct scientific expression to what is already implied in the terms used, still it is not unimportant to evolve and make explicit what the facts of purchase and sale and a market price really involve.

I am delighted that you have derived so much pleasure and advantage from the Analysis. That alone is enough to satisfy me of the great good likely to be done by its republication. With regard to the difficulties you have found in some of Bain's notes,³ he is aware that his doctrines respecting Belief and Volition require further explanations and developments. I am myself not always sure that I am able to follow him in every detail, though I do not think that any of my views clash with his. I am, however, inclined to agree in what I think is his opinion, that volition is not a name for a peculiar state of feeling or phenomenon of mind, but only a name for the immediate and irresistible sequence between the specific action of the efferent nerve fibres and the internal cause which produces it, and which is either an idea, a desire, or (as explained for the first time by Bain) the spontaneous activity of the nervous system under the stimulus of nutriment.

Pray thank Mrs Cairnes very warmly for her kind letter. I hope to be able to talk over with her and you any remaining difficulties she may feel.⁴ I wish the opportunity were nearer than it is likely to be, for Penzance and Blackheath are very far apart.⁵ But if Penzance aids your restoration to health, I shall be very grateful to it. We were

happy to hear good accounts of you from those who saw you in your passage through London.

Helen desires her kind regards to you and Mrs Cairnes, and I am

Dear Mr. Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1449.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

June 23. 1869

Dear Sir

I return the printed circular with my signature.² I think the signatures as well as the list of subscribers should be in alphabetical order, as otherwise it is apt to be thought that the person who signs first is the originator, and that the others only give their adhesion. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

1450.

TO CHARLES ELIOT NORTON¹

Avignon, June 23, 1869

Dear Mr Norton

Few things could be more pleasant or more encouraging to me than such a letter as yours. It is a great satisfaction that you not only agree so completely with the little book,² but think so highly as you do of its probable influence. It is quite true that it was written principally with a view to the state of society and opinion in England; and even with respect to that, it bears traces of having been written, as it was, several

years ago. I am aware that the circumstances of the United States are, for the reasons you give, decidedly more favourable than those of the old country. Accordingly, the movement commenced in America, and is much more advanced there than in England though it is advancing very rapidly in England too. It will probably be some time before a Committee of the House of Commons will recommend the admission of women to the parliamentary suffrage; but the repeal of the legal provision which excluded women from the municipal franchise, has just passed the House of Commons unopposed.³ The present session will also see (unless the Lords stop it) the right of married women to their own property and earnings acknowledged,⁴ and placed on the same footing in England as in most of the States of the Union. We live in times when broad principles of justice, perseveringly proclaimed, end by carrying the world with them. Your great anti-slavery contest has done that much for mankind. How little did the cotemporaries of the voyage of the *Mayflower* suspect what was to come of it!

America will probably also be the first to resolve the complicated question of marriage and divorce. It cannot be resolved until women have an equal voice in deciding it.

If we were going to stay here, we should not envy you even your magnificent view of the Lake and the Dent du Midi;⁵ but we are going back to England, though only for a few weeks. With our kind regards to Mrs Norton, I am

Dear Mr Norton
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

C. Eliot Norton Esq.

1451.

TO MRS. HENRY HUTH¹

[Avignon]

[after June 23, 1869]

Dear Mrs Huth—

I can only say in return for your & Mr Huth's generous wish to defray the whole of the expenses of the publication of the C[ommon] P[lace] books² that I am sure your wish to publish them is wise, both with a view to Mr B[uckle's] reputation & with a view to their real literary value. In fact, no memoir however good could give so good an idea of the workings of his mind. The copying is proceeding steadily & I hope there will be no further difficulties in the publication. We expect to be in England next

month & to see Mrs Allatt who is now there as well as Miss Shireff, & will do all we can to help Miss Shireff to obtain materials, of which however I imagine there exist but few. If you sh^d be writing please direct to me B[lackheath] P[ark] Kent.

1452.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Paris

July 2. 1869

Dear Mr. Spencer

I have been stopped here on my way to England by a sudden attack of what the doctor calls cholera. The attack is over, but I am obliged to return by short stages, and we are not sure when we shall be at Blackheath. I am therefore obliged, much to my regret, to postpone the pleasure of seeing you. If you are still in town on the Sunday after next (July 11) we hope you will come down to us on that afternoon instead.

I Am

Dear Mr Spencer

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1453.

TO HARRIET ISABELLA MILL¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 6, 1869

Dear Harriet

I suppose there can be no doubt of your having before this time returned to England, so I inclose a crossed cheque for your share of the payment for the copyrights &c.² I hope that your winter in the South has benefitted your health, and that the improvement will be permanent.

J.S.M.

1454.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

July 6. 1869

Dear Mr. Spencer

My murderous propensities are confined to the vegetable world. I take as great a delight in the pursuit of plants as you do in that of salmon, and find it an excellent incentive to exercise. Indeed I attribute the good health I am fortunate enough to have, very much to my great love for exercise, and for what I think the most healthy form of it, walking.

My late attack at Paris was choleraic,² dangerous for a few hours, and leaving me a little weak, but I am now quite recovered, thanks partly to having wandered about the Dunes at Calais and the Downs at Dover in pursuit of specimens for my herbarium.

We are very sorry to lose the opportunity of seeing you this year, and if you are not otherwise occupied and are inclined to take the trouble of coming down and dining with us at our five o'clock dinner on Thursday we shall be delighted to see you. But we shall be quite alone. If any of your excursions should lead you to the South, we shall always be glad to see you at Avignon, where we shall be for the autumn and winter.

I Am

Dear Mr. Spencer

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1455.

TO MRS. FRANK HARRISON HILL¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 7. 1869

Dear Madam

I have to thank you for the very gratifying letter you sent me some time ago. Will you and Mr Hill do us the pleasure of coming down and dining with us on Saturday, the 17th July? We dine at six o'clock. I am

Dear Madam
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1456.

TO LOUIS BLANC¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

le 9 Juillet 1869

Mon Cher Monsieur Louis Blanc

Nous sommes ici depuis Lundi, et comme nous n'avons pas de réponse à la lettre que ma fille vous a écrite de Paris,² nous comptons sur le plaisir de vous voir dimanche prochain. Il y a un train de Charing Cross à 4.5. Ai-je besoin de vous dire que si Madame Louis Blanc voudrait bien vous accompagner nous serons enchantés de la voir.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

1457.

TO MR. KING¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 9. [1869?]

Mr J.S. Mill requests Mr King to send a complete copy of the Reports and Evidence of the Trades Union Commission² to Mr Trübner 60 Paternoster Row, in Mr Mill's name, and to send the account to Mr Mill.

1458.

TO MARY SOMERVILLE¹

Blackheath Park

July 12. 1869

Dear Madam

Such a letter as yours is a sufficient reward for the trouble of writing the little book.² I could have desired no better proof that it was adapted to its purpose, than such an encouraging opinion from you. I thank you heartily, for taking the trouble to express in such kind terms, your approbation of the book; the approbation of one who has rendered such inestimable service to the cause of women by affording in her own person so high an example of their intellectual capabilities, and finally, by giving to the protest in the great petition of last year, the weight and importance derived from the signature which headed it.³ I am

Dear Madam

Most Sincerely And Respectfully Yours

J. S. Mill

1459.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 14. 1869

Dear Bain—

I am very glad that you are so well pleased with the new book.² With regard to the single point on which you are doubtful,³ my defence is this. The policy of not laying down wider premises than are required to support the practical conclusion immediately aimed at, was a wise policy ten years ago. It was the right policy until the women's suffrage question had acquired such a footing in practical politics as to leave little danger of its being thrown back. But the question has now entered into a new & more advanced stage. The objection with which we are now principally met is that women are not fit for, or not capable of, this, that or the other mental achievement. And though it is a perfectly good answer to say that if this be a fact, things will adjust themselves to it under free competition, & also that without free competition we

cannot know whether it is a fact or not, many will ask, & many more will feel, “Why make a great change & disturb people’s minds only to give women leave to do what there is no probability that they either can or will do? Why make a revolution on the plea that it will do no harm, when you cannot shew that it will do any good?” Even if on no other account than this, it is thoroughly time to bring the question of women’s capacities into the front rank of the discussion.

But there is a still stronger reason. The most important thing we now have to do, is to stir up the zeal of women themselves. We have to stimulate their aspirations—to bid them not despair of anything nor think anything beyond their reach but try their faculties against all difficulties. In no other way can the verdict of experience be fairly collected, & in no other way can we excite the enthusiasm in women which is necessary to break down the old barriers. This is more important now than to conciliate opponents. But I do not believe that opponents will be at all exasperated by taking this line. On the contrary I believe the point has now been reached at which, the higher we pitch our claims, the more disposition there will be to concede part of them. All I have yet heard of the reception of the new book confirms this idea. People tell me that it is lowering the tone of our opponents as well as raising that of our supporters. Everything I hear strengthens me in the belief, which I at first entertained with a slight mixture of misgiving that the book has come out at the right time & that no part of it is premature.

One effect which the suffrage agitation is producing is to make all sorts of people declare in favour of improving the education of women. That point is conceded by almost everybody & we shall find the education movement for women favoured & promoted by many who have no wish at all that things sh^d go any further. The cause of political & civil enfranchisement is also prospering almost beyond hope. You have probably observed that the admission of women to the municipal franchise has passed the Commons & is passing the Lords without opposition.⁴ The bill for giving married women the control of their own property has passed through the Commons, all but the third reading & is thought to have a good chance of becoming law this session.⁵

1460.

TO WILLIAM FRASER RAE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 19. 1869

Dear Mr Rae

I shall be very glad to give you letters to any of my friends in America.² If there are any people in particular to whom you wish for introductions from me, and will let me know their names, I will write to them, if I am acquainted with them. We shall hope to see you some day before you leave.

The meeting³ was a far greater success than the newspapers would lead you to imagine. The uniform level of the speaking was quite unprecedentedly good, and I believe it has struck a really important blow.

Your article on the Patent Laws⁴ was much needed, and exceedingly good. It will be extremely useful. I am

Dear Mr Rae
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1461.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

July 24 [1869]

Dear Mr Fawcett

Can you and Mrs. Fawcett dine with us on Sunday 8th August, at our usual time, five o'clock? I should like to know what you think of the compromise.²

I Am
Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1462.

TO SIR ALEXANDER DUFF-GORDON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 26, 1869

Dear Sir

I saw with much regret the news of Lady Duff Gordon's decease.²

I am glad to hear that my notes of Mr Austin's Lectures have been useful, and shall be obliged if you will kindly address them here as well as the copy of the new edition which I have been favoured with,³ by the Parcels Delivery Company. I am Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Sir Alexander Duff Gordon Bart.

1463.

TO HENRY VILLARD¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 26. 1869

Dear Sir

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of July 3.

I am happy to hear that you anticipate a successful session of the Social Science Association in October.² I am much honoured by your wish that I should read [*sic*] a paper to be read on the occasion. I have hitherto, though often solicited, always abstained from taking part by written papers or otherwise, in the proceedings of any of the various associations for the discussion of social questions; because I think my vocation is chiefly to lay the foundations of future improvement by the discussion of general principles, while the business of associations like yours is the consideration of immediate practical applications, dependent on a knowledge of details which I seldom possess nor have time to acquire. For example on the subject which you suggest to me for a paper—the Act of Congress on the limitation of labour to eight hours:³ the only part of the question which I feel qualified to treat, is, whether legislative limitations of the hours of labour can ever be desirable, or are properly within the competence of governments; to which my answer would be in the affirmative. But whether, in the particular circumstances of the working classes of the United States, such a measure is required, or does more good than harm, I am not in a condition to discuss. If I feel called upon to study and think out any practical question with sufficient thoroughness to be qualified to write upon it, the probable result would be that I should publish a pamphlet or a book respecting it. On the whole, therefore, you must not count upon me for a contribution, though it is just possible that, in the interval before your meeting, some subject may present itself to me on which I may think that I could usefully address a few pages to your Association.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Henry Villard Esq

1464.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 30. 1869

Mon Cher Monsieur Villari

Je sais qu'il se publie en Italie tous les ans un volume pareil au "Livre Jaune"² Français formant un compte rendu général du mouvement des intérêts publics pendant l'année précédente: J'ai un besoin particulier de consulter le dernier numéro de cette publication et je ne sais comment le procurer ici. Vous savez ce que sont les délais des libraires en faisant venir des livres dans l'étranger.

Je vous serais donc très obligé si vous vouliez bien procurer pour moi un exemplaire de ce livre et me l'envoyer par la poste à l'adresse de Blackheath Park, Kent. J'en enverrai le prix de la manière que vous aurez la complaisance de m'indiquer.

Nous venons d'avoir un *meeting* très important de la Société pour le suffrage des femmes.³ Cette réunion a été admirablement présidée par une dame⁴ et il y [a] eu d'excellents discours. Cette question est en grand progrès ici, et les nombreuses lettres que je reçois témoignent qu'elle l'est également dans la plupart des autres pays civilisés.

1465.

TO EMILE DE LAVELEYE¹

Blackheath Park, Kent, le 3 août 1869

Mon Cher Monsieur,

J'ai bien regretté les circonstances qui vous ont empêché de revenir cet été en Angleterre. J'espère que lorsque vous reprendrez ce projet, j'aurai l'avantage, dont j'ai été privé cette fois, de faire votre connaissance personnelle.

J'ai à vous remercier des trois importants volumes² que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser. J'en ai déjà lu une assez grande partie avec très grand intérêt. Il y a peu d'écrivains dont les études sur un pays quelconque valent les vôtres par la précision et l'importance des renseignements et par la justesse des appréciations. J'espère que votre voyage en Espagne procurera à vos lecteurs de nouvelles satisfactions.

C'est une chose remarquable quand on pense au nombre de pays où l'état de la propriété territoriale et les réformes nécessaires pour le rendre supportable, occupent maintenant l'esprit des penseurs et même des hommes d'état. Sans parler de l'Espagne, il y a l'Angleterre, l'Irlande, les Indes anglaises, la Russie. Il n'y a d'exception que pour les pays où la révolution a passé, et dans ces pays même, ces questions sont loin d'avoir reçu leur solution définitive.

A défaut de discussion orale, je serais charmé que nous nous entretenions ensemble par correspondance sur les questions économiques auxquelles vous faites allusion. L'une d'elles, à ce que m'a dit M. Leslie, serait la question de l'utilité des colonies pour un pays comme la Belgique. Là-dessus je partage l'opinion générale des économistes sur l'inutilité des colonies, seuf peut-être quelques circonstances spéciales qui n'existent pas, à ma connaissance, pour la Belgique. Si on prétend qu'il en existe, j'aurais bien envie de les connaître.

Agréez, Monsieur, l'expression de ma considération la plus distinguée.

J. S. Mill

1466.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug. 4. 1869

Dear Mr. Hare

We had a long discussion at the meeting yesterday on the resolution drawn up by the Sub Committee.² In addition to some of those who were at the past meeting, Jacob Bright and Maclaren were present. The minds of most of them proved to be extremely unprepared on the points which have not yet been fully discussed in the newspapers. Even Morrison³ could not be made to see the advantage of keeping land unappropriated for the purpose of experiments. It conflicted with their notion of "free trade in land." At last Beales proposed a new wording of the sixth point making it much more general, and after some parley this was agreed to. It now stands:—

“As one means of the object last proposed; to endeavour to procure⁴ such an administration of landed property owned by public bodies, or held for any public or charitable purposes, as shall best carry out such object.”

The whole is subject to the confirmation of another meeting, to be held next Saturday at two, at which I hope you may be able to attend. The desire to hear your opinion of the new form given to No 6 was one of the motives for appointing the further meeting.

The new wording will enable us hereafter to bring forward your ideas, and we may hope to get them adopted by the Association when it has heard them sufficiently discussed.⁵ But the approximation made to them in the present wording is as much as, I think, any of the members of parliament present except Fawcett would pledge himself to, by joining the Association. And it is desirable to carry them with us, if only in hopes of their future conversion, which I do not by any means despair of. I am
Dear Mr Hare

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1467.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug. 8. 1869

Dear Chadwick

I did read, with much approbation, your remarks on Hobhouse.² I have been very much pleased also with those on financial reform³ (which I return) and interested by the particulars about your model cottage.⁴

There is, as you say, plenty to be done, and I find it so as well as you. I am almost as much overdone as when I was in the House. But I look forward to some relief when we return to Avignon.

I Am Dear Chadwick
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1468.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

Aug. 8. 1869

Dear Sir,

It is a great triumph of freedom of opinion that the Evidence Bill should have passed both houses without being seriously impaired.² You may justly take to yourself a good share of the credit of having brought things up to that point.

With regard to taking an oath,³ I conceive that when a bad law has made that a condition to the performance of a public duty, it may be taken without dishonesty by a person who acknowledges no binding force in the religious part of the formality; unless (as was your own case) he has made it the special and peculiar work of his life to testify against such formalities, and against the beliefs with which they are connected.⁴ I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

G. J. Holyoake Esq.

1469.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug. 8. 1869

Dear Mr Plummer

We were very glad to hear from you again, and to be told in what direction you are working. Would you like to receive the Edinburgh and Westminster Reviews? I will send them to you, if they would be of any use. I am acquainted with Mr John Morley. My daughter desires to be kindly remembered to Mrs Plummer, and I am

Dear Mr Plummer
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1470.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug. 9. 1869

Dear Mr Fawcett

My daughter mentioned to Mrs Fawcett that she thought perhaps Mrs Isabella Hooker might be willing and able to give the account of the progress of the movement for the emancipation of women in America which was wanted by the French lady who wrote to Mrs Fawcett. Mrs Hooker's address is Mrs Isabella Beecher Hooker

Hartford
Connecticut

I Am Dear Mr Fawcett
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1471.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug. 10. 1869

Dear Mr Plummer

I have been so much occupied of late, in spite of my absence from Parliament, that I have had no time for any letters that could possibly be spared. I am very glad to hear that the Reviews will be of use. You are very welcome to mention my name to Mr

Morley, and if I have an opportunity I will mention you to him. With our regards to
Mrs Plummer I am

Dear Mr Plummer
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1472.

TO JOHN NICHOL¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 18. 1869

Dear Sir—

I have been long without acknowledging your letter of July 20 because there were several points in it on which I wished to make some remarks & I have not had time to do this sooner. Even now I am unable to do it at any length. You have, I doubt not, understood what I have endeavoured to impress upon the readers of my book,² that the opinions expressed in it respecting the natural capacities of women are to be regarded as provisional; perfect freedom of development being indispensable to afford the decisive evidence of experiment on the subject: & if as you truly say, conventionalities have smothered nature still more in women than in men, the greater is the necessity for getting rid of the conventionalities before the nature can be manifested. I have however thought it indispensable to weigh such evidence as we have & examine what conclusions it points to, & I certainly think that in all matters in which women do not entirely lean upon men, they have shown a very great amount of practical talent. I do not read the new evidence respecting Queen Elizabeth as you seem to do.³ She was already known to have had weaknesses of vanity & temper, but with the means of realising her position now afforded to us by the mass of contemporary documents transcribed by Froude,⁴ I confess she seems to me to have taken on the whole more just views of general policy than her critics. For example: with the very small pecuniary resources she had (a thing generally forgotten) the economy absolutely indispensable could only be enforced by making those whom she employed (every one of whom was always in great need of money for the purposes of his department) feel constantly extreme difficulty in getting it & the strongest motive to do without it if he could. Again, with half or more than half her subjects Catholics, herself under the ban of the Pope⁵ & with a Catholic competitor for the throne,⁶ was it not wise in her to take advantage as long as she could of the real indisposition of the powerful Philip⁷ (an indisposition never fully known till now) to drive her to extremities? We are bound to remember that after all that is said of the danger to which she exposed England & Protestantism by her parsimony & over-caution, the

event has justified her; England & Protestantism survived the risk & came out with greatly increased power & éclat.

If you have read Mr Motley's last two volumes,⁸ you will have observed a great change in his tone respecting Elizabeth. There are no more of the disparaging comments of his earlier volumes but on the contrary her abilities are always spoken of with great respect.

As you truly say, queens, & kings, too, are now superfluous; but the experience which women have given of themselves as queens is not obsolete. They are not now wanted as queens, but the qualities which made them successful as queens are still the conditions of success in all the practical affairs of mankind.

I thought it best not to discuss the questions about marriage & divorce along with that of the equality of women; not only from the obvious inexpediency of establishing a connexion in people's minds between the equality, & any particular opinions on the divorce question, but also because I do not think that the conditions of the dissolubility of marriage can be properly determined until women have an equal voice in determining them, nor until there has been experience of the marriage relation as it would exist between equals. Until then I should not like to commit myself to more than the general principle of relief from the contract in extreme cases.

1473.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 18. 1869

Dear Mr Robertson—

Want of time has prevented me from sooner thanking you for the very interesting letter you wrote to me on the subject of my little book.² On the few points which you criticise you shew so clear a discernment of both sides of the question that there is little need or scope for answering you. Only on the smallest of them the good government of Indian princesses,³ do your remarks present anything to be corrected. In an Asiatic principality good government (even comparative) is never obtainable by letting alone. It is obtained by an ever watchful eye & a strong hand, depending as it does upon a rigid & vigorous control of the subordinate agents of government, whose power of plunder & tyranny if left to themselves is irresistible. The rulers who do let things alone, are those whose affairs fall into disorder & their countries into anarchy through their supineness & self indulgence; & these are generally male rulers. The measure of good government in the East is the closeness of the ruler's application to business; & it is really remarkable that the instances of this should be so preponderant in the temporary rule of women as regents.

The comparison of women to slaves⁴ was of course not intended to run on all fours. I thought the differences too obvious to need stating, & that the fundamental resemblances were what required to be insisted on. But a different judgment coming from you cannot but be valuable to me.

The most important of your points is the suggestion of a possible turning of what is said about the usefulness of the present feminine type as a corrective to the present masculine, into an argument for maintaining the two types distinct by difference of training.⁵ You have yourself gone into considerations of great importance in answer to this argument, all of which I fully accept. I sh^d add some others to them, as, *first*, it is not certain that the differences spoken of are not partly at least natural ones, which would subsist in spite of identity of training; *secondly* the correction which the one type supplies to the excesses of the other is very imperfectly obtained now owing to the very circumstance that women's sphere & men's are kept so much apart. At present, saving fortunate exceptions, women have rather shown the good influence of this sort which they *might* exercise over men, than actually exercised it.

We have much regretted that your absence prevented us from seeing anything of you during our summer stay here; but what is a loss to us is a gain to you. We shall hope to be indemnified when we are next in England. We leave for Avignon in two or three days.

1474.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Avignon

Aug. 30. 1869

Dear Sir

Your letter is extremely gratifying, and shows how much may be done by real earnestness and public spirit. You have done very wisely to write to the Post Master General about the Petition² because I have seen some causes to suspect that members of Parliament are not altogether to be trusted in this matter. Certain it is, that during the time I was in Parliament, no petitions sent to me by post—and I believe I had more than the average number—ever failed to be delivered by the post; also that among all the petitions got up by or for the London Women's Suffrage Society, I have never heard of one directed *to the Society* that failed to come to hand. It is exceedingly desirable that the petitions should whenever possible be forwarded by the constituents direct to their own member, but it is singular that failures on the part of the Post Office generally take place in these cases. Possibly there is some failure in the delivery at the House of Commons: nevertheless I myself had always every cause to think highly of the attention and exactitude of the officers of the House, and it never happened to me to lose anything from their neglect, any more than through the neglect of the Post Office.

I send you some reports of the meeting of the London Women's Suffrage Society,³ and you can have any number that you would like to distribute among your friends. To be a member of the Society it is only necessary to subscribe one shilling per annum and to give the name and address. You can either send in your own name and address and that of any friends who wish to be members, along with the necessary postage stamps, to Mrs. P. A. Taylor, Aubrey House, Notting Hill, London, W. (Honorary Secretary of the Society) or to me. The former would be the simpler and quicker, and you will receive receipts from Mrs. Taylor in due time and also in future as many copies as you would like to have of all the publications of the Society. I will ask Mrs. Fawcett, wife of Professor Fawcett M.P., whether it would be possible for her to go and speak at Stoke. Either she or Mrs Taylor would speak well, if it were possible for either of them to make arrangements to do so. It is just possible that my friend Professor Fawcett might be able himself to go to Stoke, and the cause of Women's Suffrage has no more active, judicious and useful friends than Mr and Mrs Fawcett.

The Land Tenure Reform Association is only in process of formation. As soon as the terms of membership are settled, I will let you know.

If you could make use of more copies of my little book on the Subject. of Women and would let me know how many you would like I will direct my publisher to send them to you.

1475.

TO EMILE DE LAVELEYE¹

A[vignon]

Sept. 9. 1869

Mon Cher Monsieur—

Les raisons indiquées dans votre lettre, comme celles que mettent en avant les partisans de la fondation de colonies belges, me paraissent, comme à vous, extrêmement faibles. Il me semble d'ailleurs que cette fondation, regardée comme moyen d'assurer un marché aux produits de l'industrie belge, suppose le maintien de privilèges exclusifs en faveur de la mère patrie: ce qui est tout à fait repoussé par les lumières du siècle, et ne serait certainement pas supporté par les colonies, lorsqu'elles se seraient assez développées pour offrir un débouché de quelque valeur.

Une meilleure raison serait que la création d'une nouvelle province, unie avec la mère patrie par un même sentiment de patriotisme, pourrait être un surcroît de force en cas de danger de la part de l'étranger. Mais à cela, on peut répondre que si l'indépendance de la Belgique est exposée à quelque danger d'invasion, ce serait plutôt dans un temps très prochain. On doit espérer qu'en moins de temps qu'il n'en faudrait pour qu'une colonie devint assez importante pour avoir quelque poids dans la balance des

événements, il n'y aura plus de grandes monarchies militaires, prêtes à fondre sur les petits pays, au premier prétexte qui se présente.

Quant à la "Subjection of Women", j'ai à vous remercier de vos renseignements sur l'éducation des demoiselles en Allemagne. Il se peut que je n'aie pas rendu pleine justice à l'instruction qu'elles reçoivent. Cependant, on m'assure que, si elles apprennent plusieurs langues modernes, elles ne s'en servent guère pour la lecture, et que même dans leur propre langue, elles ne lisent, en générale, que la littérature la plus légère. Il est vrai aussi que l'éducation des jeunes Françaises est ordinairement très défectueuse; cependant, il y a un assez grand nombre de Françaises qui prouvent par leurs écrits qu'elles sont douées d'une instruction assez solide, tandis qu'en Allemagne, les femmes quelque peu lettrées, comme Bettina,² comme Rahel³ ou même comme la comtesse Hahn-Hahn,⁴ semblent être en très petit nombre. Après cela, qu'il y ait en Allemagne beaucoup de femmes d'un talent pratique distingué, je le crois sans difficulté; mais je pense qu'il y en a partout.

Je pense que la vie de famille n'a rien à craindre de la parfaite égalité politique et civile des deux sexes. Cette vie est tellement essentielle à l'humanité, qu'elle ne risque pas de s'ébranler et ne peut, ce me semble, que gagner, comme toutes les autres relations sociales, en étant régie par l'accord des volontés, au lieu du pouvoir arbitraire d'un des conjoints. Quant au vote politique des femmes, s'il pouvait s'établir dès aujourd'hui, il y aurait sans doute un danger temporaire du côté de "l'influence cléricale", mais il s'en faut de beaucoup que nous en soyons là. Et n'est-ce pas surtout parce que les femmes n'ont pas de voix dans la politique ni dans la conduite des affaires, que les hommes les abandonnent à l'influence des prêtres, dans l'idée, au moins dans les pays catholiques, que cela ouvre une voie à leur sensibilité naturelle, sans que cela puisse tirer à conséquence, et même en assurant davantage leur fidélité conjugale? C'est un calcul très peu pré voyant et qui ne pourrait pas durer, si les femmes avaient des droits dont l'exercice peu éclairé pourrait compromettre ce qu'on regarde comme de très graves intérêts, même matériels.

Agréez, mon cher Monsieur, l'expression de ma considération la plus distinguée.

J. S. Mill

1476.

TO DAVID McBURNIE WATSON¹

A[vignon]

Sept. 9, 1869

Dear Sir—

My letters are forwarded to me from England once a week & I received your letter of the 1st too late for you to receive my reply on Monday. Any one who would draw out

a careful statement of exactly the points indicated in your letter would be doing a very great service to the public, but it would be difficult to get correct information on all these points. The ballot in the U. S. of America is I believe universal, but also, I believe, quite inoperative as to secrecy. The same thing is true of France, & true to a considerable extent of the Australian colonies. It is said, that in some of the Australian colonies & in Greece, the secret is well kept. I believe that it would be next to impossible to get authentic information on all these points except on the spot or by a long & varied acquaintance with natives of each country, as most people make very loose & careless statements even on the most literal matters of fact, & it is necessary to collate the statements of a great many, to get at the facts even in one individual case. To draw out a really trustworthy comparative table of the mere bare facts concerning the ballot would be a matter of time & labour requiring a good deal of cooperation. It would probably well repay the labour, but there exists no association that I know of for the purpose of combating the Ballot in any way. I do not think that the almost certainty of the Ballot being tried in England before long sh^d be any discouragement, but the contrary, to our efforts to get at the truth about it, & should you & your friends be disposed to undertake any labours of the kind I shall be happy to furnish you with introductions to any of my foreign friends & correspondents. Mr Arthur Arnold² has written an account of the method practised in Greece to secure secrecy & I believe has mentioned in that some of the other systems which are inoperative in this respect, & I believe this is the best & almost the only attempt to give statements of mere facts on the subject in English.

In America it would appear that nobody desires to keep his vote secret & that the ballot is preferred only as a convenient & quiet mode of collecting the votes. I observe also that the eulogiums one often hears from Australia on the working of the Ballot in Victoria turn almost entirely on the tranquillity & good order in which the elections are there conducted through abolition of the open poll. Now it is evident that these benefits do not at all depend on the secrecy of the votes, but on their being given in the silent mode of putting tickets into a box; & would be equally attained if the voter were required to sign his name to his voting ticket.

1477.

TO ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER¹

A[vignon]

Sept. 13, 1869

Dear Madam—

I beg to acknowledge, with many thanks, your letter of Aug. 10.

You have perceived, what I should wish every one who reads my little book to know that whatever there is in it which shews any unusual insight into nature or life was learnt from women—from my wife, and subsequently also from her daughter.

What you so justly say respecting the infinitely closer relationship of a child to its mother than to its father, I have learnt from the same source to regard as full of important consequences with respect to the future legal position of parents & children. This, however, is a portion of the truth for which the human mind will not, for some time, be sufficiently prepared to make its discussion useful.

But I do not perceive that this closer relationship gives any ground for attributing a natural superiority in capacity of moral excellence to women over men. I believe moral excellence to be always the fruit of education & cultivation, & I see no reason to doubt that both sexes are equally capable of that description of cultivation. But the position of irresponsible power in which men have hitherto lived is, I need hardly say, most unfavourable to almost every kind of moral excellence. So far as women have been in possession of irresponsible power they too have by no means escaped its baneful consequences.

With hearty congratulations on the progress of the cause of women in both our countries & in most other parts of the civilized world, I am &c

1478.

TO COL. JOHN WYCLIFFE THOMPSON¹

Avignon

Sept. 13. 1869

Dear Sir

I thank you sincerely for your letter. I had but a slight personal acquaintance, of rather old date, with General Thompson, but I have always regarded him with very high respect, and rejoiced that he was preserved to see so many of the things he had so nobly struggled for brought into successful operation. He was one of the worthiest, as he was one of the latest, survivors of the generation to which he belonged, and which he had served. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

Colonel J. W. Thompson

1479.

TO GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE¹

Avignon

Sept. 13. 1869

Dear Sir

Your letter dated the 7th inst. has been forwarded to me here.

My life contains no incidents which in any way concern the public; and with the exception of my writings, which are open to every one, there are no materials for such a biographical sketch as you contemplate. The only matter which I can furnish is a few dates. Born in London, May 20, 1806. Educated wholly by my father, James Mill, author of History of British India, Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind, and other works. In 1823 received an appointment in the East India House, and rose progressively to be the head of the principal office of correspondence between the home authorities and the local government of India, a post which had been held by my father. Quitted the service in 1858, when the functions of the East India Company were transferred to the Crown. Married in 1851 to Harriet, daughter of Thomas Hardy Esq. of Birksgate, near Huddersfield and widow of John Taylor Esq merchant of London; who died in 1858. Elected to Parliament for Westminster in 1865; was an unsuccessful candidate for that city in 1868.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Ever Faithfully

J. S. Mill

G. M. Towle Esq.

1480.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 5. 1869

Dear Mr Leslie

I am your debtor for two interesting letters, one from Peyrusse, the other from London, the last of which owing to an excursion we were making from home I did not

receive until a week after it was written. You seem to have had a long & varied tour & I look forward with much pleasure to reading your observations on the districts you visited, more especially as I have but little personal acquaintance with most of them. In regard to Britany in most parts of which I have travelled formerly² I thought its backwardness even then much exaggerated, but Rennes & its neighbourhood are a favourable specimen. What the French call “La Bretagne Bretonnante” is, or was fifteen years ago much wilder, though really very like the wilder parts of England. I should like to know your opinion of M. Victor Bonnet.³ Judging from his article on the Gold question in the *Revue des 2 Mondes* of 15th August last⁴ he seems but a poor political economist. Though acquainted with your speculations on the subject he seems quite at sea as to the application of them.

It seems to me that whatever can be justly said against women’s fitness for politics either on the score of narrowness or violence of partisanship arises chiefly if not wholly, from their exclusion from politics. Their social position allows them no scope for any feelings beyond the family except personal likings & dislikes, & it is assumed that they would be governed entirely by these in their judgment & feeling in political matters. But it is precisely by creating in their minds a concern for the interests which are common to all, those of their country & of human improvement, that the tendency to look upon all questions as personal questions would most effectually be corrected.

My daughter thinks the opinions expressed by the ladies you mention⁵ very natural for French men & women & those whose ideas have been most formed by French literature & for two reasons:—

1. The peculiar bringing up of women has on the whole from a multiplicity of causes having to do with the history of the nation & also with race peculiarities tended in England to make women both weaker & gentler than men; in France, to make them more energetic and passionate. This passion & energy is chiefly used up in rivalry with other women, & a habit of fierce, passionate contest between women as individuals is acquired. What helps to this is that energetic Frenchwomen are apt to be less domestic than energetic Englishwomen partly on account of the smaller families, partly of the custom of sending the children out to nurse and to *pension*. Their energies are thus devoted in greater proportion than in England to rivalry with other women in dress, in love affairs, & in social success; so that being at once more energetic & more given to using their energies in specific contests for superiority with other women, they are more disposed to personal enmities.

2. It is probably true that women on the average are more what the French mean by *jealous* than men; it is certainly true that the less civilised people are more jealous in this sense than the more civilised; probably on this account it is that women are more jealous than men as certainly the French are more jealous than the English. There seems however good reason to think that one of the specific benefits of political freedom is that it diminishes this moral vice of *jalousie* to which the French are more subject than any other people I know, in private affairs, although not more so than the Spaniards & Greeks in politics. You have evidently seen the true answer when you say that the habit of combination for common objects which is always induced by

political freedom is the cure for the passionate & self willed disposition of which the French accuse women & other nations accuse the French.

I inclose three French postage stamps of 20 centimes being the equivalent of those inclosed in your letter.

1481.

TO ANDREW REID¹

October 5. 1869

Dear Sir—

Your letter of Sept 29 has just reached me. I am very glad to hear of so many & such good adhesions. It is a proof that many have arrived at the conviction that the time has come for making some improvement in the land laws. But the subject has been so little discussed that there is sure to be great difference of opinion as to what that improvement sh^d be. I myself agree in principle with M^r Odger & his friends;² but if the Assⁿ were to adopt as its purpose the resumption of all the land from its proprietors it could not hope for any support except from a portion of the working classes. The proposal is entirely new & startling to all other classes & a great deal of preparation will be required to induce them even to listen to it patiently. An Association to agitate on a question is seldom timely or useful until the public have first been to a certain degree familiarized with the subject so that hopes may be entertained of making at once a considerable show of strength. We are certainly very far from this point in regard to the question of taking possession of all the land & managing it by the State; I say nothing at present of the reasonable doubt which may be entertained whether we have yet reached such a degree of improvement as would enable so vast a concern to be managed on account of the public without a perfectly intolerable amount of jobbing. I merely say that the general mind of the country is as yet totally unprepared to entertain the question. It is possible that the active spirits in the working classes may think nothing worth trying for short of this, & may consequently withhold their support from the Assⁿ. I think this would be a great mistake; but we must be prepared for the possibility of it.

I agree with Mr Taylor in thinking that the alteration which was proposed in Art 5,³ which seems to let in claims to an interest in the land on the part of the working classes generally as distinguished from those who are actually at work on the land is more than verbal & exceeds the reasonable powers of a Sub Committee.

With regard to my attendance at the first meeting of the Assⁿ I shall be able to speak more precisely when I know at what time it is proposed to hold the meeting, & what is to be done there. I am anxious that you sh^d understand clearly that the only relation which I can hold towards the Assⁿ is that of a member, & occasional speaker. You talk of “leadership” but that is entirely out of the question.⁴ It would be impossible for me to undertake a prominent position in the Assⁿ without giving to it an amount of

time and labour which I do not feel called upon to give; withdrawing me as it would do from literary occupations to which, both on public and private [grounds] I prefer to devote my energies.

I have much pleasure in inclosing a note I have received from Mr W. Rossiter, the manager of the South London Working Men's College.⁵ He will be a most desirable & valuable member of the Assⁿ. I have referred him to you for all points of information.

1482.

TO FRÉDÉRI MISTRAL¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 6. 1869

Cher Monsieur—

Parmi toutes les adhésions qui ont été données à la thèse de mon petit livre² je ne sais s'il y en a aucune qui m'ait fait plus de plaisir que la vôtre; et cela non seulement à cause de l'influence que donne à vos opinions votre position si importante dans le monde des lettres³ mais encore plus par la confirmation de ma conviction que les âmes poétiques, lorsqu'elles sont jointes à une intelligence éclairée ne verront rien qui leur répugne dans la modification que la justice exige dans les relations sociales entre les deux sexes. En effet dans toute société qui n'est pas profondément démoralisée il n'y a pas à craindre que l'homme ne cherche pas à idéaliser la femme. La nature l'y portera toujours: mais ici comme dans tout le reste, il s'agit pour l'idéal de ne pas trop s'écarter des conditions de la réalité. Autrement on aurait d'une part un idéal incompatible avec les conditions de la vie, et d'autre part une vie réelle toute prosaïque dans laquelle on retomberait toujours. Il en est ainsi de l'idéal que beaucoup de poètes ont voulu établir pour les femmes. Ils se sont figuré un être tout de fantaisie, qui aurait besoin pour exister d'un monde aussi imaginaire que lui; ils ont proposé aux femmes cet être-là pour modèle, et quand elles tâchent de s'y conformer en toute sincérité ou en apparence, elles se heurtent contre les dures exigences de la vie réelle qui s'opposent invinciblement à la réalisation. Qu'on s'efforce tant qu'on veut à écarter de la vie des femmes ces exigences, on n'en vient jamais à bout: d'abord, pour la très grande majorité du sexe féminin c'est matériellement impossible; et chez le petit nombre des privilégiées il en reste toujours assez pour les rendre dures, égoïstes et cruelles, à moins d'en être préservées par une culture morale qui serait tout aussi efficace dans un état de choses plus naturel. Il me semble que l'idéal propre à l'existence humaine serait tout autre que cet idéal de fantaisie, sans être pour cela moins poétique: ce serait l'idée d'une personne complète dans toutes ses facultés, propre à toutes les tâches et à toutes les épreuves de la vie, mais qui les remplirait avec une grandeur d'âme, une force de raison et une tendresse de coeur très au-dessus de ce qui a lieu maintenant, sauf peut-être chez les plus admirables caractères dans leurs moments de plus grande exaltation. Si cet idéal a jamais été offert au genre

humain c'est dans le Christ, et je ne sais pas ce qu'on pourrait demander de mieux soit à un homme soit à une femme sous le rapport de perfectionnement moral, que de lui ressembler. Or ce caractère-là est aussi profondément réel que poétiquement élevé et émouvant.

1483.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Avignon

Oct. 6. 1869

Dear Sir

I return your paper of questions, with answers annexed as you request. The most common of the informalities which prevent a petition from being received, is a breach of the rule that at least one of the signatures should be written on the sheet of paper on which the petition itself is written. A single signature on the same sheet authenticates it as at least the petition of somebody: but if *all* the signatures are on sheets pasted on, there is no positive assurance that any of them were really intended for the petition to which they are in that manner annexed.

Your petition,² however, seems never to have reached the stage at which it could be rejected for informality; since this takes place after, not before, the petition has been presented to the House and referred to the Committee of Petitions. If your petition never reached the member to whom it was addressed (which from your former letter I understood to be affirmed by him) the miscarriage (if you are sure that it was posted) must either be imputable to the Post Office or to the officers of the House of Commons.

I will write to ascertain whether it will be possible for Mr and Mrs Fawcett, or any other of the ladies of the Committee, to attend and speak at a meeting in your borough.³ I will also direct the publishers to send you a number of copies of the little book. There seems a great probability that the question will be brought forward in the House next session; but people should be willing to petition whether this is the case or not. A great question is seldom carried without long perseverance in working for it.

I shall always be happy to hear your opinions on any subject on which you like to write to me.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Mr William Wood

1484.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Avignon

Oct. 7. 1869

Dear Mr Fawcett

Mr William Wood, a working man in the Potteries, who has long been a correspondent of mine, and is one of the most thoughtful and sensible working men with whom I have ever been in communication, is of opinion that a public meeting on Women's Suffrage might usefully be held, or at the least a lecture delivered, in the borough of Stoke on Trent, and offers to take upon himself the work of making the necessary arrangements, provided that one of the leaders of the movement is able to be present, and especially if, as he says, "one at least of the ladies who are the glory and no small part of the strength of the movement be present to speak to us in its advocacy." This last he considers of primary importance. He will write further on the details of arrangements if I can tell him that you and Mrs Fawcett would be able and willing to take part. Mr Wood was the first to broach the subject in the local press, and has ascertained by a successful personal canvass for signatures to a petition that "there is really a large body of people in the Borough who are favourable to the movement, and who with a little organisation, would be willing to give an active support to it." He adds "I have assurance of assistance in any future action in the matter from many of the most active and intelligent politicians amongst my own class, and also from some of the few with whom I came in contact of the wealthier classes in the borough." A meeting, therefore, under your and Mrs Fawcett's auspices would not be likely to be a failure, and might tend to promote the movement among the working classes in general; and Mr Wood thinks that the presence of a lady among its advocates might encourage ladies in the locality to join. It seems a pity that such favourable promise should not be taken advantage of. Next to a meeting, a lecture by Mrs Fawcett would be most useful, and the same lecture might afterwards be delivered in other places. If you and Mrs Fawcett look favourably on the proposal, I think you will find Mr Wood capable of fulfilling all he promises. His address is 6 Hawkesmere Street, Hanley, Stoke on Trent.

The cause seems to be prospering everywhere. There are responses to my little book in almost all parts of Europe. It is being translated into Polish; I have had three proposals for translating it into Russian and a greater number than I can remember into German.² The reviews of it, whether favourable or hostile, are in general very encouraging.

The Land Association also has got together a great number of very good adhesions. I only hope it will be possible to keep adherents together who differ so much in the

length they intend to go. This can only be done by leaving many important points as open questions for discussion within the Association itself.

My daughter sends her kindest regards to Mrs Fawcett, and I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

Professor Fawcett M.P.

1485.

TO MRS. PETER ALFRED TAYLOR¹

7th October 1869

Dear Mrs. Taylor,—

One of my working-men correspondents, and the most thoughtful and intelligent of them, Mr. William Wood, of Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, who has lately enrolled himself as a member of the London Woman Suffrage Society, is very desirous of having a public meeting, or, if that should be impossible, a lecture in his borough, and offers to take upon himself the work of making the arrangements; but he considers it a *sine qua non* that “one at least of the ladies who are the glory and no small part of the strength of the movement, be present to speak to us in its advocacy.” . . .

I have written to propose to Mrs. Fawcett to take up the project;² if she does not, would it be impossible for you to do so? It would be unfair to ask you, who have so much on your hands in the central direction of the movement, to work at the outposts when the work can be done by anyone else, but we rely so much on your public spirit that we cannot help looking to you as a reserve when others fail. The cause has now reached a point at which it has become extremely desirable that the ladies who lead the movement should make themselves visible to the public, their very appearance being a refutation of the vulgar nonsense talked about “women’s rights women,” and their manner of looking, moving, and speaking being sure to make a favourable impression from the purely feminine as well as from the human point of view.

1486.

TO WILLIAM HENRY DUIGNAN¹

Avignon

Oct. 20. 1869

Dear Sir

I feel highly honoured by having been thought of as a candidate for the anticipated vacancy in the representation of Dudley, notwithstanding my refusal on principle to incur any expense. But I have for the present determined not to reenter Parliament, being of opinion that I can promote my opinions more effectively at this time in the capacity of a writer, than in that of a member of the House of Commons. Again thanking you for the high compliment of your proposal, I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1487.

TO ANDREW REID¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 22. 1869

Dear Sir

In deference to your wishes I have taken some days to reconsider the subject of your letter but the result is that I adhere to my resolution of not accepting the Presidentship of the Association.²

When I was asked to take the Chair at the first meeting of the Committee, & when Mr Beales & yourself shewed a desire to put my name forward to the public, I distinctly said that it would not suit me to be President, or to take the leading part in the conduct of the Association, and it was on that understanding only that I consented to be Chairman of the Provisional Committee. It is repugnant to me to be ostensibly at the head of any undertaking unless I am prepared to devote my utmost efforts to make it succeed; & the land question notwithstanding its importance is only one of a number of subjects which have a claim on my time & exertions. I therefore do not think it required by or consistent with my duty to devote myself to this one movement even if it were clear, which it is not to me, that I am the fittest person to take the lead in it.

With regard to attending the first public meeting, it would not be impossible for me to do so, at any time not earlier than the latter end of November. But it seems to me quite premature to appoint a public meeting as long as there is the present uncertainty about our pecuniary means. You say that the Education League³ is up & doing & that

therefore the Land Association should be up & doing too. But if the newspapers speak truth, the Education League has already raised many thousands of pounds. I think it imprudent to give publicity to our proceedings in any way until we are privately assured of an amount of support which will prevent the possibility of a total break down in the attempt to form a Society. Our first duty is if possible to guard against this. We cannot hold meetings & carry on agitation like the Education League unless we have as much money. We shall need ample donations from our richer members & an annual subscription from all, and until assured of these I think it better not to come before the public.

With regard to the Programme, the reason which led me to suggest a modification of it, has been taken away by the formation of a separate organisation by some of the leaders of the working classes for their own programme.⁴ If they think the time has come to agitate for their more extreme objects, they will give but a cold support if any support at all, to ours, & it is useless going out of our way to attract them. I myself should differ from them even as to the waste lands. I should be sorry to see the whole of these farmed out & given up to cultivation. I wish a great part of them to remain in their native wildness & natural beauty. There is little enough beauty in our common life, & we cannot afford to sacrifice what we have. It is in the lands owned by public bodies & charitable institutions that I would try the experiment of state or municipal management.

I wish it clearly understood that if I am present at all at any public meeting it must not be as presiding but merely as one of the speakers.

1488.

TO JAMES M. BARNARD¹

Avignon

Oct. 23. 1869

Dear Sir

You are aware of the favour with which the majority of the popular party in Great Britain regard the vote by ballot at parliamentary elections, as a means of restraining bribery and intimidation, and the increased interest which this question has assumed through the recent extension of the suffrage. The writer of the inclosed letter,² and some of his friends, are anxious to obtain information that can be depended on, respecting the practical working of vote by ballot in the countries in which it exists by law. Their own opinion, like mine, is unfavourable to it; but their desire is to find the truth, whatever it may be; and the vague impressions current in Europe give no real knowledge of the ballot in America even as it exists by law, much less of the mode in which it is actually conducted, and the advantages and disadvantages which are found in practice to attend it. You would oblige me very much, and would do some public

service, if you could kindly supply my correspondent with any of the information which he desires, or refer him to any sources from which he could procure it.

I Am
Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

J. M. Barnard Esq.

1489.

TO DR. EMILE HONORÉ CAZELLES¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 23. 1869

Cher Monsieur—

Je vous remercie de m'avoir envoyé le Journal des Débats.² La notice par M. Taine dépasse beaucoup en louanges, et ce qui vaut mieux, en adhésion, tout ce qu'on pouvait espérer. J'ai lu dans la Revue l'article de M. Janet.³ J'ai lieu de lui savoir gré encore plus que vous, des égards qu'il nous montre. Quant à la substance de l'article, mon appréciation diffère peu de la vôtre. La tentative qu'il fait de prouver l'existence objective des corps par un argument semblable à celui dont je me sers pour établir la réalité d'autres êtres sentants et pensants, est ingénieuse mais sans valeur aucune. Son exemple des deux lutteurs ne prouve que ce qu'on ne songe pas à nier, savoir que les possibilités permanentes de sensation qui sont de la catégorie de ce que nous nommons résistance, se trouvent quelquefois liées à une conviction rationnelle d'une autre sensation de résistance hors de nous, à quoi l'on peut ajouter que leur réalisation dépend quelquefois d'une volonté hors de nous. Tout cela n'a aucune difficulté dès qu'on admet la réalité de sensations et de volitions autres que les siennes propres.

Quant au problème général. M. Janet le déplace complètement. On lui dit que la force n'est qu'un phénomène, et il vous répond en prouvant la force, comme si vous aviez dit qu'elle n'existe pas.

Je viens aussi de lire l'opuscule de M. Renouvier.⁴ Sauf la question du libre arbitre, que du reste il a pu poser plus nettement et d'une manière plus rationnelle qu'on ne la pose ordinairement, parcequ'il a renoncé à sauver la prescience divine: sauf cette question, dis-je, il ne me semble pas qu'il y ait beaucoup de différence entre ses opinions et les miennes, sur les grandes questions de la métaphysique. Il nie la substance, il réduit les corps à des groupes de phénomènes. Il croit à la vérité me dépasser lorsqu'il nie l'infini, et il pense qu'en soutenant l'intelligibilité non de

l'infini abstrait mais de l'infini *quoad hoc* j'ai voulu laisser une ouverture pour des spéculations transcendantes. Il n'en est rien: mon but était pratique, et surtout moral; j'ai voulu montrer que s'il existe un être possédant un attribut quelconque porté à l'infini, cet attribut doit être qualitativement identique au même attribut s'arrêtant au fini; que, par exemple un Dieu infiniment bon ne peut être bon que de la bonté humaine. Ma controverse avec Mansel aurait dû prouver à M. Renouvier la grande importance morale, dans un milieu croyant, de cette thèse.

La réponse de M. Huxley à M. Congreve a déjà paru, dans le même recueil périodique que la conférence.⁵ Par un heureux accident j'ai conservé cette réponse et je vous l'envoie par la poste. C'est une critique amère de Comte, parfois juste, plus souvent injuste ou exagérée, et qui me paraît dans son ensemble extrêmement faible. Pour rendre justice à Huxley il faut se rappeler que le volume le plus imparfait et surtout le plus arriéré de la Philosophie Positive est celui qui traite de la chimie et de la biologie,⁶ et que ces deux sciences sont justement celles que Huxley connaît le mieux. Je ne lui crois pas de grandes connaissances dans les sciences qui dépendent de la mathématique: lorsqu'il se hasarde à contester les généralisations de Comte sur la philosophie générale des sciences, tout ce qu'il dit est tellement superficiel que le moindre disciple de Comte n'aurait pas de peine à le réfuter.

1490.

TO HENRY GEORGE¹

Avignon

Oct. 23, 1869

Dear Sir

The subject on which you have asked my opinion, involves two of the most difficult and embarrassing questions of political morality; the extent and limits of the right of those who have first taken possession of an unoccupied portion of the earth's surface, to exclude the remainder of mankind from inhabiting it; and the means which can be legitimately used by the more improved branches of the human species to protect themselves from being hurtfully encroached upon by those of a lower grade in civilisation. The Chinese immigration into America raises both these questions. To furnish a general answer to either of them would be a most arduous undertaking.

Concerning the purely economical view of the subject I entirely agree with you; and it could hardly be better stated and argued than it is in your able article in the New York Tribune.² That the Chinese immigration, if it attains great dimensions, must be economically injurious to the mass of the present population; that it must diminish their wages, and reduce them to a lower stage of physical comfort and well-being, I have no manner of doubt. Nothing can be more fallacious than the attempts to make out that thus to lower wages is the way to raise them; or that there is any compensation in an economical point of view to those whose labour is displaced, or

who are obliged to work for a greatly reduced remuneration. On general principles, this state of things, were it sure to continue, would justify the exclusion of the immigrants, on the ground that with their habits in respect to population, only a temporary good is done to the Chinese people by admitting part of their surplus numbers, while a permanent harm is done to a more civilised and improved portion of mankind.

But there is much also to be said on the other side. Is it justifiable to assume that the character and habits of the Chinese are unsusceptible of improvement? The institutions of the United States are the most potent means that have yet existed of spreading the most important elements of civilisation down to the poorest and most ignorant of the labouring masses. If every Chinese child were compulsorily brought under your school system, or under a still more effective one if possible, and kept under it for a sufficient number of years, would not the Chinese population be in time raised to the level of the American? I believe indeed that hitherto the numbers of Chinese born in America has not been very great: but so long as this is the case—so long (that is) as the Chinese do not come in families & settle, but those who come are mostly men and return to their native country, the evil can hardly reach so great a magnitude as to require that it should be put a stop to by force.

One kind of restrictive measure seems to me not only desirable, but absolutely called for; the most stringent laws against introducing Chinese immigrants as Coolies, i.e. under contracts binding them to the service of particular persons. All such obligations are a form of compulsory labour, that is, of slavery: and though I know that the legal invalidity of such contracts does not prevent them from being made, I cannot but think that if pains were taken to make it known to the immigrants that such engagements are not legally binding, and especially if it were made a penal offence to enter into them, that mode at least of immigration would receive a considerable check. And it does not seem probable that any other mode, among so poor a population as the Chinese, can attain such dimensions as to compete very injuriously with American labour. Short of that point, the opportunity given to numerous Chinese of becoming familiar with better and more civilised habits of life, is one of the best chances that can be opened up for the improvement of the Chinese in their own country, and one which it does not seem to me that it would be right to withhold from them.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

1491.

TO THEODOR GOMPERZ¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 23, 1869

Dear Mr. Gomperz—

It gave us great pleasure to receive, a short time before we left England for Avignon, the notification of your marriage.² Pray accept our warm congratulations on that auspicious event, & every possible wish for the happiness present & future of yourself & of the lady who has joined her destiny to yours.

It is long since I have heard from you: I hope that the favour which I am going to ask will procure me that pleasure. A correspondent of mine in Scotland, Mr. D. Watson (6, Teviot Crescent, Hawick)³ and some friends of his, are desirous to obtain authentic information, which is not generally possessed in England, on the mode of operation of Secret Suffrage in the countries where it exists in the election of members of representative bodies. Their opinion, like mine, is unfavourable to secret voting; but their wish is, not to confirm their existing opinion, but to know the truth; what are the means taken in different countries to secure secrecy; how far those means are effective; and in what respect secrecy, so far as secured, is attended with either good or bad effects. Could you furnish from your own knowledge, or point out the means of obtaining, information on these points in the cases of Austria, Hungary, or any German Government? If you could do so it would be a valuable contribution to a subject of great & increasing importance in English politics, and I should myself be sincerely grateful to you for it.

1492.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 23. 1869

Dear Thornton—

We are most happy to hear that you have had such an interesting holiday² & that both the weather & your health & spirits were so favourable to enjoyment. I am much obliged to you for your observations on the peasant properties. We must try to find out whether the farms which pleased you so much in North Holland are the property of the farmers.³ With regard to the internal discomfort of the houses in other places, it is probably a consequence & sample of the general habits of the country. In most parts of the Continent the taste for what we call comfort is much less developed than in England: & peasant properties by the prudential and calculating habits which they foster, promote frugality as well as industry (the peasants preferring saving to enjoyment) often exhibit a very meagre state of living when the means are, as in the case you mention of the widow near Darmstadt, ample.⁴ Helen says too that to understand this subject one must distinguish between comfort & neatness, although

neatness is no doubt an essential to comfort in our eyes. There would almost seem something of race in the care for neatness, which Helen says does not follow at all, as one might suppose, the variations of climate. Some Oriental peoples are very neat, as are the Spaniards (in the parts of Spain we have visited) & the Greeks. In Greek & Spanish rooms where the furniture is poor, & there is substantial dirtiness if vermin may so be called the neatness is often charming, & most refreshing to the eye & spirits, while in French rooms of the same class the building will be more solid, the bedding comfortable & irreproachably clean, & yet the dust and untidiness will be repugnant & wretched to an English eye. Some of the same curious differences may be noticed in different parts of Germany, & Helen says that for many years she has tried to find any general rule which will explain these variations. She is inclined to think that it may perhaps prove that this pleasant tidiness of the home to the eye depends upon whether the women work out of the house or not, & may have nothing to do with race, climate, civilisation or wealth. This however is still a mere hypothesis in her mind.

We too have made an excursion, of about ten days, in the Alps. We established ourselves at the inn on the top of the pass of Mont Cenis, 6000 feet above the sea, & greatly enjoyed walks among the neighbouring heights. We had at first splendid weather but as it seemed to be changing we went off to some little travelled parts of the lower Alps, south of Grenoble where we had again beautiful weather & much enjoyment. We have since had a still pleasanter though shorter excursion in the mountains of the eastern part of our department, in which last excursion we walked upwards of fifty miles in three days. The improvements in our own little place are now nearly completed, but until they are quite finished they continue to give Helen a great deal of troublesome occupation. I have no report to make as yet of work done, except what can hardly be called by that name—bringing up arrears of general reading—but I hope to have better account to give in a little while. About Carlyle I agree both with you & with Hill.⁵ It is only at a particular stage in one's mental development that one benefits much by him (to me he was of great use at that stage)⁶ but one continues to read his best things with little if any diminution of pleasure after one has ceased to learn anything from him.

1493.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Avignon

Oct. 24. 1869

Dear Mr Fawcett

I had already seen a very brief account in a newspaper,² of your and Mrs Fawcett's proceedings at Warwick, and was extremely pleased with both. We are specially delighted that Mrs Fawcett took the opportunity of speaking for women's suffrage, and that she thinks seriously of preparing a lecture. What she has already written is a

guarantee for its being excellent both in matter and stile, and her person and manner will dispel prejudice and attract adherents wherever she delivers it. I hope that there will be nothing to prevent your going to Stoke in January, which, I imagine, will be as suitable a time for Mr Wood's purpose as November or December.³ If I may judge from his correspondence, you will find him an interesting and useful person to know: he has thought on a great many important subjects, and very soundly on almost all. What you say about the reception of Mrs Fawcett's speech at Warwick, and of the book⁴ at Brighton, is very encouraging. If the working men, in any numbers, take up women's suffrage, it will get on very fast. We highly approved the course you took and the things you said at Birmingham.⁵ I, like you, have a rather strong opinion in favour of making parents pay something for their children's education when they are able, though there are considerable difficulties in authenticating their inability. At all events I would have it left an open question; and because they refused to leave that and other secondary questions open, I did not join the League. But I think you are quite right in overlooking this consideration, and acting with the League, in order to form a strong party in the House for the principle of universal and compulsory unsectarian education.

You will believe how delighted we are that Cairnes is so much recovered, and is able to resume his Lectures. The pamphlet he mentioned, by George Campbell,⁶ was sent to me by the author after it was printed, but before publication, and I did not know that it was yet published. It appeared to me a most valuable contribution to the subject. The Cobden Club have for once done something useful in asking him to write on the Land question.⁷ The Land Tenure Reform Association has received a considerable number of good adhesions, but it has not yet raised any money; and it is indispensable to know what it is able to do in this way before attempting to come before the public; for a break down would be much more ignominious, and much more injurious to the cause, after, than before, a public demonstration. My name has very unjustifiably been put forward as President, which I from the first refused to be. I have told Reid [*page torn*] my name must not be used in this way, as I cannot be President,⁸ although I am willing to do anything I can as a member. I do not know whether to be glad or sorry for the separate organisation which has been started by some leaders of the working classes for a much more radical alteration of the land laws.⁹ The furious and declamatory violence of their Resolutions and some of their speeches, seems to shew that they would have been a very intractable element in the other Association and that it is well rid of them. One thing I see clearly; that there will be more difficulty than ever in preserving the commons. The working class speakers are filled with exaggerated ideas of the value of the waste lands for cultivation, and apparently do not care at all for the preservation of natural beauty; and if they make any way with their agitation, the landlords will throw over the commons to save their estates. Our best chance of avoiding this will be the progress of education in all classes; and unfortunately it is much easier to improve education in quantity than in quality. It is no new thing that all good depends on work, but in the present state of matters the work of the more advanced minds, over and above its inherent difficulties, has the additional one that it is, in a certain degree, working against time. But there would be little to fear if there were a tolerable number who worked with the energy and spirit that you do. Women's suffrage will help us in this as in so many other

things, for women will be much more unwilling than men to submit to the expulsion
of all beauty from common life. I am Dear Mr Fawcett

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1494.

TO CHARLES W. WILKINSON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 24. 1869

Dear Sir—

I have received your letter dated the 18th inst. I need hardly say that I sympathize in your preference of literary to mercantile occupation; but all experience proves that of these two, considered as professions, the latter alone is to be depended on as a means of subsistence & that the former can only be prudently taken up by persons who are already in independent circumstances. It is a rare good fortune if an author can support himself by his pen, unless as an editor or sub editor of a newspaper or other periodical; & I suppose there is not in our day a single instance in which it has been done by poetry of any kind. All my experience of life confirms the wisdom of the advice which Coleridge, in his *Biographia Literaria*,² gives to writers even of the greatest genius: to let, if possible, their regular business, on which they rely for support, be something foreign to their favourite pursuits, reserving these as the consolation of their leisure hours. In that case, success, & the favourable estimation of others, are not a matter of necessity to them; if they produce anything worthy of being remembered, they can wait for it to be appreciated, or can be content with the pleasure of the occupation itself. My own conviction is that to be independent of immediate success is almost an absolute condition of being able to do anything that greatly deserves to succeed. Many meritorious literary men would feel themselves saved from lifelong disappointment if they could exchange their position for one of assured though moderate income in the vocation which you are so desirous of quitting for theirs.

With regard to the publication of your work I hardly know what advice to give. It is easy to obtain a publisher if you are able & willing to take on yourself the risk of pecuniary loss. But it is difficult to find a bookseller who is willing to venture anything on the success of a dramatic poem; there are so many writers of dramatic poems, & so few buyers of them; & whatever may be the merit of yours, there is no certainty of its becoming known to the public. Even if an author has friends who are connected as writers or editors with the literary periodicals, which people consult to know what books to order from Mudie's³ or the circulating libraries, he has but a

precarious chance, for people have learnt to distrust the praises of periodicals. Authors often build hopes on recommendations to a publisher from some person who is considered a good judge but these are so often given from mere good nature that they carry little weight; nor do publishers consider the merit of a work as a sufficient guarantee of its pecuniary success. For myself I have no means of aiding you in any of these ways. Even if authority carried greater weight than it does with publishers, I am not an authority on these subjects.

What I say to you I have said to many others who have made applications to me of the same kind, & I sincerely regret that I have nothing more satisfactory to offer.

In short I see but two alternatives for a young author. He can test the probable popularity of his work by offering it to publishers & editors who whether rightly or not are practically the judges of this, & if their decision is unfavourable he must either resign literary work or content himself with working merely for the love of his work accompanied by any such hopes as he may still venture to entertain of better success in the future.

1495.

TO JAMES M. BARNARD¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 28. 1869

Dear Sir—

I thank you & Mrs Barnard heartily for your kindness to Mr Kyllmann.² I hardly know your equal in eagerness to do kind offices to your friends or to your friends' friends, while from your manner of conferring a favour any one would suppose that you were receiving one.

I have not written anything on the subject of police. What you have heard of is doubtless a private letter to one of my active supporters in Westminster,³ who asked my opinion on the proposal to place "habitual criminals" under police surveillance, a proposal since embodied in an Act of Parliament⁴ some of the provisions of which appear to me very objectionable. The letter though signed by me was written by my daughter, who has thought more & to greater purpose on these questions than I have. It was not intended for publication, but was sent without my permission to the newspapers. The date of the letter was December 14. 1868, but I have not a copy of any newspaper containing it & do not remember the date [of] publication.

The multiplication of casts of the finest works of ancient sculpture is very useful as one among many means of educating the public eye.⁵ Both in art & in nature, a certain degree of familiarity is necessary not merely to the intellectual appreciation but to the enjoyment of the higher kinds of beauty: Every one who takes pleasure in a

simple tune has the capacity of fully enjoying Weber & Beethoven, but very often he derives little or no pleasure from a first hearing of them. It is a great mistake to think that children are not benefitted by living & growing up among models of beauty. They are on the contrary more benefitted than any one else, though not, at the time, conscious of the benefit. I can trace a great influence in my own development to the accident of having passed several years of my boyhood in one of the few old abbeys which are still inhabited,⁶ instead of a mean & graceless modern house, & having at the same time & place been familiar with tapestries from Raphael's cartoons, which peopled my imagination with graceful & dignified forms of human beings. There is a great want of this training of the perceptions & taste in our modern societies; but it is not by any one help or stimulus that the want can be supplied. The great desideratum in America—& though not quite in an equal degree, I may say in England too—is the improvement of the higher education. America surpasses all countries in the amount of mental cultivation which she has been able to make universal; but a high average level is not everything; there are wanted, I do not say a class, but a great number of persons of the highest degree of cultivation which the accumulated acquisitions of the human race make it possible to give them. From such persons, in a community that knows no distinction of ranks, civilisation would rain down its influences upon the remainder of society, & the higher faculties having been highly cultivated in the most advanced part of the public would give forth products & create an atmosphere that would produce a high average of the same faculties in a people so well prepared in point of general intelligence as the people of the United States.

I have given an introduction to you, and to two or three of my other friends in America, to a correspondent of mine in Scotland, Mr. D. Watson,⁷ of Hawick, who is anxious to obtain information that can be depended on (but is under the necessity of asking for it by letter) respecting the practical operation of Vote by Ballot in the United States. The example of America is often cited in favour of secret voting & sometimes against it, but there is a great deficiency of real information as to how it operates in America & even as to whether there is real secrecy at all. My correspondent & some of his friends are like myself unfavourable to secret voting but they are anxious to obtain whatever light American experience can throw on the practical question.

1496.

TO CHARLES W. WILKINSON¹

A[vignon]

Nov. 5. 1869

Dear Sir—

I have received your letter of the 28th which gave me much pleasure & I congratulate you on the wise resolution which you have formed. At your age you have a long time before you & whether or not you are destined to have what is called a “successful

life," the feeling early acquired that you can do without it is one of the greatest blessings which it is possible to carry through life. With your tastes & pursuits you have a source of permanent enjoyment independent of fortune & by the disinterested cultivation of your mental powers you may become capable of rendering services to the world for which it would be imprudent to rely on its making you any adequate pecuniary return.

1497.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Nov. 16. 1869

Dear Mr Cairnes

It gave us great pleasure to receive a letter from you dated from London, and to know that you are able not only to live in England but to lecture this winter. Even if your health has not sensibly improved since you arrived in England, it is very much that it should have recovered sufficiently before that time to restore you to active life, and that it should maintain the improvement under less favourable circumstances of climate. Your class, I believe, is as large if not larger than has ever been obtained by a Professor of Political Economy in University College. The whole career of that Institution is a melancholy proof of the rarity of any desire in the middle classes of London to give the benefit of a good education to their sons. They evidently set no value on any instruction not strictly professional, and I am afraid the manufacturing districts of England, though in some respects more active-minded are, on this point, not at all superior to London. In Scotland alone a higher instruction is valued, probably because the teaching in the elementary schools has been so managed as to lead up to it; which should be a lesson to those who have to construct a national system of primary schools.

It is very kind of you to feel so much interest about my health. There was no cause of uneasiness from the attack I had at Paris,² after the first few hours. Being taken in time, it was soon conquered, and when I left Paris for England a few days afterwards I was in my usual health, and have since remained so. My daughter also, though still liable to a return of her headaches, is much stronger and better than when we arrived here.

Your letter made me rather ashamed of myself from the belief it shewed that I must be very busy. Since I have been here this time, I may almost call myself idle, having done little but to bring up old arrears of general reading. And I am seldom for long together too busy to spare time for anything *you* ask me to do, especially anything so pleasant as to read any of your writings. I beg that you will never allow any scruple to prevent your applying to me when you think I can be in any way useful: and with respect to the very interesting book you think of writing (I well remember how highly

I thought of its precursor)³ I should be only too happy to read in the MS. either any part or the whole. Indeed, if I were to see all of it that relates to the French political economists as well as to Comte,⁴ I should be better able to compare your impression respecting them with my own. I believe we think pretty much alike about them. French philosophic writers seem to me decidedly inferior in closeness and precision of thought to the best English, and more in the habit of paying themselves with phrases and abstractions. The French political economists share largely in this defect. It should be remembered however, that there is a much greater number of them than of English, unless, to make up the equality we descend to English writers so bad as almost to turn the average the other way. There are also more exceptions than you perhaps know to the general vagueness and looseness of thought of French economists. Besides Say,⁵ and Turgot,⁶ of which last Courcelle-Seneuil says with some reason that it is harder to say what of the truths of the science he did not anticipate than what he did, there are some now living who have formed themselves very much upon the stricter and more precise English model: Joseph Garnier⁷ especially, in his treatise on Political Economy. Garnier is an exception to their false conception of the method of the science. Courcelle-Seneuil, whom I just mentioned, and who has written a book of considerable merit (*Traité Théorique et Pratique d'Economie Politique*)⁸ is also, to some extent, an exception. A. E. Cherbuliez of Geneva (who lately died) published in 1862 a "Précis de la Science Economique et de ses Principales Applications" which I thought favourably of. The last two of these treatises I have here, and can send to you if you would like to see them. I think both Reybaud⁹ and Michel Chevalier¹⁰ unfavourable specimens of French economists as to close thinking, and the former is besides of a narrow and prejudiced school. Bastiat¹¹ shines as a dialectician, and his reasonings on free trade are as strictly scientific as those of any one; but his posthumous work (*Harmonies Economiques*)¹² is written with a *parti pris* of explaining away all the evils which are the stronghold of Socialists, against whom the book is directed. The *Journal des Economistes*¹³ you will find in the London Library. A course of that gives a more correct idea than anything else, of the general characteristics of French economists: the more, as they occasionally carry on controversies with one another in its pages, which bring out their several types of thought. They are divided by two broad lines: into Malthusians and anti-Malthusians, and into Utilitarians and anti-Utilitarians. This last distinction extends even to political economy, in consequence of the prevailing French habit of appealing to intuitive principles of *droit* even on economic subjects.

Your news of the Fawcetts is pleasant. I have a high opinion of M^{rs} Fawcett's capabilities, and am always glad to hear of any fresh exercise of them.¹⁴ Respecting the Irish land question, I hardly think it possible that you and I should not agree entirely, when discussion has thrown sufficient light upon the details of the question. I feel, with you, that the reasons for fixity of tenure apply chiefly to *ryots*, or labourer-farmers and not to capitalist farmers, for whom leases suffice; and I feel, also, that by making these last actual proprietors, a fresh agrarian question may be raised up on the part of the labourers whom they employ. The chief difficulty I feel is the practical one of having different laws for large and for small tenants; though I myself, in my speech in 1868,¹⁵ suggested as a possible expedient, to make a distinction between arable and grazing farms. *A propos*, there has been a call from Ireland for a reprint of my two speeches on the land question,¹⁶ together with the chapters on that subject in my

Political Economy;[17](#) and this is now being printed.[18](#) Is it not curious that the plan in my pamphlet[19](#) is almost always spoken of as a simple proposal to buy out the landlords and hold all the land as the property of the State? though it is palpable to every one who looks at the pamphlet that my proposal was simply a permanent tenure at a fixed rent, and that I only offered to any landlord who disliked this, the option of giving up his land to the Government instead. Mr George Campbell sent me his paper[20](#) before it was published, and I quite agree with you as to its great merit. He has since informed me that he has published it in an enlarged form, and has sent me a copy. This is at Blackheath, and will be in the first parcel that comes.

With our kind regards to M^{rs} Cairnes, whose improved health it gave us great pleasure to hear of, I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1498.

TO WILLIAM COX BENNETT[1](#)

[December ? 1869]

The education movement is going forward with a rapidity which justifies the most sanguine hopes, and the two great principles of the National Education League, that elementary education should be compulsory, and the State Education should be undenominational, are striking root deeply into the mind of the nation. Having held the first opinion for many years, and the last always, I need not say how heartily I rejoice at the progress they are making towards general recognition.

1499.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES[1](#)

Avignon

Dec. 4. 1869

Dear Mr Cairnes

I will send the Courcelle Seneuil and Cherbuliez[2](#) almost immediately, to your Hastings address. I by no means answer for their view of the science, or Garnier's either,[3](#) as unexceptionable at all points; but it is certainly better than that of the French writers of the present day with whom you appear to be best acquainted, and I

think it necessary for you to know them in order to form a just judgment of the contemporary French school.

I look forward with great pleasure to reading any portion you like to shew me of your new book, or indeed of any book of yours.

I expect to receive M^r Campbell's book⁴ in a few days. In the meantime, there is a letter of his in the Daily News of last Tuesday, Nov. 30,⁵ containing, as I gather, proposals somewhat more specific than those in his book, and among other things an attempt, though an inadequate one, to lay down principles to guide the public arbitrator in determining what is a fair rent. That difficulty is inherent in all plans, however moderate, which offer any greater security than at present to the tenure of the occupier. But, after all, a question cannot be insoluble which, in point of fact, has to be resolved by every landlord who lets his land on any other principle than the (in Ireland) ruinous one of competition. I should say that the rent which a public arbitrator ought to consider a fair one, is the highest which any respectable tenant, capitalist or peasant, could afford to give, consistently with proper cultivation of the land according to the standard of good farming received in the country, and this, though difficult to define in general terms, could certainly be determined with considerable accuracy in each particular case, by an experienced land agent or manager, such as many in Ireland are. What do you think of Campbell's line of demarcation between contract and status tenures? In case you have not seen the letter, I transcribe the passage. "All agricultural tenures in which the landlord has erected the necessary buildings and fences and made all the considerable improvements, and in respect of which no practice of selling the claims of the tenant or compensating him for loss of occupancy exists, shall be distinguished as contract tenures, and shall not be subject to the interference of the Commission. All other agricultural holdings shall be designated Status tenures."

I should very much regret not to be at the Club when your question is discussed.⁶ I do not expect to be at the February meeting, and am not certain about the March. I may say that the April meeting is the only one this year at which I feel confident of being present.

The "Chapters and Speeches"⁷ will be out shortly. The reports of the speeches are taken from Hansard. The first of the two, that of 1866, was printed verbatim from my MS. That of 1868, not being a written speech could not be given so exactly, but the newspaper report was carefully corrected for Hansard by myself, and is tolerably adequate.

The Tracy you speak of is the metaphysician Destutt-Tracy,⁸ and his Political Economy forms one of the four volumes of his *Idéologie*,⁹ which by an unlucky and rather strange chance I have never read, though I know it to be worth reading. What are the merits of the political economy portion I do not know. It is probably good for its time, but, I suppose, behind hand now.

I Am
Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1500.

TO MRS. MILLICENT J. FAWCETT [1](#)

[After Dec. 4. 1869]

My Dear Mrs Fawcett—

The news contained in your letter is indeed a subject of congratulation. [2](#) What is to be done will certainly prove the first step in the admission of women to the University, & the most certain & speedy step too. We do not see any suggestions to offer you, as the plan seems in all respects all that can be desired. Will you let us know some further particulars about the Scholarships as soon as they are decided, as we sh^d like to contribute a little towards them.

There is no harm, & some good, in any number of persons attending merely for amusement provided that the lectures are not adapted for them but for serious students. This would be very much guaranteed by the lecturers' holding some amount of examination at every lecture, as is the practice, I believe, of the Scotch professors. This would have a very good effect both on teachers & pupils, keeping before the minds of both that serious work is intended. No one need be examined without her own consent.

1501.

TO FRANCIS ELLINGWOOD ABBOT [1](#)

Avignon

Dec. 11, 1869.

Dear Sir,—

You have rightly judged that I should sympathize with an attempt to raise the standard of free and unfettered discussion on religious as on all other subjects; involving necessarily the same unlimited liberty of disbelief as of belief. Whether that attempt is made by professing Christians, or by persons who do not take that name, it is equally welcome to me; so long as, whichever side they take, they are willing and able to do

justice, both logically and historically, to the other side. There is nothing in your letter and Prospectus that tends to give any other than a favorable idea of the spirit in which you have set about your undertaking. But to come before the public as giving what would be sure to be construed, however untruly, and however contrary to your intention, as a kind of voucher or guarantee for the merits of the projected newspaper, would, as it seems to me, be only suitable in those who have much greater means of knowledge than I possess of the manner in which it is likely to be carried on, both in respect of opinion and otherwise. I am, therefore, unable to comply with your wish that I should write you a letter to be inserted in your journal, and must content myself with this private expression of my good wishes.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Very Truly,

J. S. Mill

1502.

TO PAULINA WRIGHT DAVIS¹

Avignon, France

Dec. 11, 1869

Dear Madam:

I should have reason to be ashamed of myself if your name were unknown to me. I am not likely to forget one who stood in the front rank of the women's rights movement in its small beginnings, and helped it forward so vigorously in its early and most difficult stages. You and Mrs Mott² have well deserved to live to see the cause in its present prosperity, and may now fairly hope to see a commencement of victory in some of the States at least. I have received many kind and cordial invitations to visit the United States, and were I able, the great convention to which you invite me would certainly be a strong inducement to do so. My dislike to a sea voyage would not of itself prevent me, if there were not a greater obstacle—want of time. I have many things to do yet, before I die, and some months (it is not worth while going to America for less) is a great deal to give at my time of life, especially as it would not, like ordinary travelling, be a time of mental rest, but something very different. I regret my inability the less, as the friends of the cause in America are quite able to dispense with direct personal co-operation from England. The really important co-operation is the encouragement we give one another by the success of each in our own country. For Great Britain this success is much greater than appears on the surface, for our people, as you know, shrink much more timidly than Americans from attracting public notice to themselves; and the era of great public meetings on this subject has not arrived in our country, though it may be near at hand. I need hardly say how much I am gratified by the mode in which my name was mentioned in the National Convention at Newport, and still more at the tribute to the memory of my dear wife,³

who from early youth was devoted to this cause, and had done invaluable service to it as the inspirer and instructor of others, even before writing the essay⁴ so deservedly eulogized in your resolutions. To her I owe the far greater part of whatever I have myself been able to do for the cause, for though from my boyhood I was a convinced adherent of it, on the ground of justice, it was she who taught me to understand the less obvious bearings of the subject, and its close connection with all the great moral and social interests of the cause. I am, dear Madam, very sincerely yours,

J. S. Mill

To Mrs Paulina W. Davis

1503.

TO THE EMPLOYEES OF MESSRS. BREWSTER OF NEW YORK¹

A[vignon]

Dec. 11, 1869

Dear Sirs—

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of Nov. 12.

The plan of Industrial Partnerships seems to me highly worthy of encouragement as uniting some of the advantages of cooperation with the principal advantages of capitalist management. We should hope, indeed, ultimately to arrive at a state of industry in which the workpeople as a body will either themselves own the capital, or hire it from its owners. Industrial Partnerships, however, are not only a valuable preparation for that state, & transition to it, but might probably for a long time exist by the side of it with great advantage; if only because their competition would prevent cooperative associations of workmen from degenerating, as I grieve to say they often do, into close joint stock companies in which the workmen who founded them keep all the profits to themselves.

The proposal of Mess^{TS} Brewster is in some important respects a considerable improvement on the English Industrial Partnerships of which I have any knowledge; because it takes the employés themselves into council to determine the share of profit to which they shall be admitted, instead of fixing its amount by the sole will of the employers, and because it gives to a council elected by the employés, an important share in the government of the workshops, even to the extent of allowing them, by a two-thirds majority, to overrule the wishes of the employers.

I have no such knowledge of the details of the subject as would enable me to make any suggestions that it would be useful to you to receive. But I will shew your letter & the printed plan of Mess^{TS} Brewster to those of my friends who have more information

on the subject & are more capable of making useful suggestions than I am myself, especially Mr Hughes and Mr Ludlow, both of whom have had an intimate connexion with Cooperation in England almost from its infancy. Only one point in Mess^{rs} Brewster's plan occurs to me as open to criticism: that which provides that those who leave the employment voluntarily shall forfeit their share of profits for the current year. It seems to me that the Boards to whom so many other powers are entrusted, might be the judges to decide whether in the particular circumstances of each case the share of profit sh^d be forfeited or not.

1504.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

Dec. 14, 1869

Dear Sir

One of my correspondents in the United States has sent me a list, which I inclose, of persons in America whom he believes to be sufficiently well disposed to the Westminster Review to make it worth while to send them copies of a paper inviting support. The difficulty, he says, will be that the Review is reissued in America in a cheap form.² But he says "we all hope" that the Review will not go down.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

1505.

TO WILLIAM WOOD¹

Avignon

Dec. 14. 1869

Dear Sir

I had not the smallest idea of implying any negligence in you; but in mentioning the possible causes of loss, it was necessary to include that one, as you had not mentioned to me before that you had posted the petition yourself.

I am glad to hear that Mr Melly has declared in favour of Women's Suffrage. He is a valuable man, and an acquisition to the cause.

Your questions² did not by any means appear to me as absurd or trivial. On the contrary, they shewed that you practise and require accuracy in a matter of business. That three names of one family should be signed in one handwriting is so common and so trifling a circumstance that nobody is likely to notice it nor to draw any unfavourable inference from it if noticed.

I hope you may be able to arrange with Mrs Fawcett to deliver a lecture in your borough.³ She seems quite willing to do so if she can make it accord with her arrangements.

The two copies of my little book⁴ would be extremely well bestowed on the Libraries you mention, and I should have relied on your judgment had you bestowed them without consulting me. If you would like any more copies I shall be very happy to send them to you.

I do not know who is the Secretary of the Labour Representation League,⁵ but a note to Mr George Howell, 9 Buckingham Street, Strand, London W.C. would probably procure for you that and any other information about the League. He is perhaps himself the Secretary, and in any case, is sure to know all about it.

I do not possess a copy of "Essays and Reviews".⁶ My copy was lent many years ago, and has not been returned to me. If I can procure it again from the friend to whom I lent it, I will send it to you.

Your appreciation of the importance of the question of the equality of women is most just. I shall be glad to receive your promised letter relating to National Education. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Mr William Wood

1506.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

December 20, 1869

I cannot too much congratulate you on such a paper as that of Mr. Freeman.² I honour him for having broken ground against field sports, a thing I have been often tempted to do myself, but having so many unpopular causes already on my hands, thought it wiser not to provoke fresh hostility. He seems to have strongly coerced his habitually impetuous feelings and been studiously calm. It is a sign of the powerful effect he produces that the *Daily Telegraph* at once took up the cause with evident earnestness,³ though with timidity and reserve.

J. S. Mill.

1507.

TO LORD LYTTTELTON¹

[Avignon]

Dec. 21. 1869

My Dear Lord

I beg that you will express to the Committee of the Birmingham and Midland Counties Institute² my high sense of the honour they have conferred on me by their invitation to become their President for next year. I have been obliged, however, to decline all proposals of that nature, having really not time to prepare an Inaugural Address. The Rectorship of St Andrews is the only exception I have made. I am

My Dear Lord
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

The Lord Lyttelton

1508.

TO THE PRINCESS ROYAL OF PRUSSIA¹

A[vignon]

Dec. 26. 1869

Madam—

I am most highly honoured by the message which I have received this morning from your Royal Highness but I regret to say that being at present under medical treatment I am not in a condition to avail myself of the honour intended me. Indeed I have scarcely the use of either hand & have difficulty in even writing these few words.

I Am, Madam, With The Greatest Respect
Your Royal Highness'S Faithful Servant

A son Altesse Royale

la Princesse Royale de Prusse

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

1870

1509.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Jan. 11. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

The Pall Mall Gazette containing Mr Maine's criticism of your article² reached me duly. Though some of Mr Maine's strong points come out in it, on the whole it is hardly worthy of him. I need scarcely tell you that what he principally objects to in your article constitutes in my eyes its greatest value. I have never seen the ethical distinction between property in land and in moveables so thoroughly and clearly worked out, and the philosophical limits both of the property doctrine and of the counter-doctrine so well stated. And though Maine goes along with the practical conclusion, I am disappointed that he does not see the value of this exposition, or that the conservative instinct is so strong in him as to make him jealous of bringing the foundations of property under discussion. Surely nothing can be more strange than one of his arguments for abstaining from stirring up the subject, viz. that the present ideas of property are wrong not in one direction only but in both, as witness the disrespect for patent rights, and for copyright! Surely that is only the more reason why the real foundations of the question should, instead of should not, be insisted on.

It is a real and great pleasure to read such writing as yours. Very few writers have a skill comparable to yours in making the exposition of principles at once clear, persuasive, and attractive. With regard to the practical conclusions of the article, Mr Campbell's suggestions,³ with your additions and modifications, are without doubt the utmost of what there is any chance of obtaining at present from Parliament. The danger is, as you observe, that we shall be put off with something far short of this. If the plan is adopted, and gets into operation, no one will be better pleased than I shall be. But I retain all my doubts whether, at the point which Irish demands and expectations have now reached, any measure which makes the amount of rent and the grounds of eviction in each individual case depend on the decision of a public authority, can settle the question, or can possibly be final. Every possible suspicion will be thrown on the intentions of the Commission,⁴ and every possible hostile criticism will be made on its decisions; and all whom it suffers to be evicted, or whom it requires to pay an increase of rent, will think that they ought to have had fixity of tenure at a valuation made once for all. But it is of no use grumbling at the inevitable. Fixity of tenure cannot be carried at a high step; and it is important that the intermediate measure should be the best possible, as I think yours is.

I hope Courcelle Seneuil and Cherbuliez,⁵ which I had been too long in sending, have long since reached you. I hope still more that your health improves. It is already a great thing that so much of your working power is restored. One can hardly exaggerate the value of minds which keep up their thinking as time and events advance, instead of doing it all in the first few years after entering into active life. There are too few of them.

With our kind regards to M^{rs} Cairnes

I Am Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1510.

TO SIR ROBERT COLLIER¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 11. 1870

My Dear Sir,

I take the liberty of inclosing to you the newspaper report² of a matter in which I feel a painful interest & in which I am anxious to obtain the aid of your influence towards mitigating the hardship of what seems to me an extremely hard case. On the 24th of Dec^r a policeman named W^m Smith was charged before Mr Benson³ the magistrate with an assault upon a labouring man. The evidence proved that the policeman saw the man knock down a woman (his wife as it turned out) in the street at one o'clock in the morning & interfered for her protection, & in doing so, struck the man with his staff—which assault on the man, Mr Benson said was “unprovoked, brutal & unjustifiable” & sentenced the policeman to a month’s imprisonment & hard labour. I learn from enquiries which I have since caused to be made, that the man, though of unblemished character & 3½ years service has been dismissed from the force & deprived of his livelihood.

Now the only thing in which this poor man had exceeded his duty—the only point in which his conduct was not meritorious—was the blow with his truncheon & in that he did what any man, not a police officer, might justly have been proud of doing but which a policeman sh^d not have done if he was able to take the man into custody by a less employment of force; which however is uncertain, as the man was evidently in an excited & violent state.

I am not a partisan of the police, on the contrary I greatly distrust them & think that magistrates rely too much on their evidence & often treat instances of bribery, perjury

& other highly criminal conduct on their part with most undue lenity. But on this very account, can there be a worse lesson to the police or to the public, than that when so many are retained in the force after flagrant misconduct one poor man against whom there is no other charge is dismissed for a little excess of zeal in protecting a woman against gross ill treatment? Policemen will think twice before they will interfere again to protect men's wives, or any other women against brutality when they find that any hurt they inflict on a brute of this description is declared from the seat of justice to be not only "brutal & unjustifiable" but "unprovoked," knocking down a woman in the street being no provocation to a bystander, even to an appointed & paid preserver of the peace—that in short a woman is a creature whom it is safe to knock down but most dangerous to defend from being knocked down by another man.

The policeman's sentence will shortly expire & he will be released from prison. Would it be impossible to prevail upon the Home Office to restore him to the force? He has surely been punished enough for the worst that he can be charged with—overzeal in the performance of an important duty. I think it would be possible to get a well signed Memorial presented to the Home Office, praying for his reinstatement; but it would be better that it sh^d be done by the spontaneous act of the Home Secretary,[4](#) as it might perhaps be, if you would interest yourself in the matter. I write by this post to Sir John Coleridge[5](#) & Mr Russell Gurney[6](#) & would write to Mr Bruce if my acquaintance with him was sufficient to warrant it.

1511.

TO FRANK HARRISON HILL[1](#)

Avignon

Jan. 11. 1870

Dear Mr Hill

There is a subject in which I very much wish to interest you. It is a police case, reported under the head of "Thames" in the Daily News of Dec. 25. The policeman William Smith, who was sentenced by Mr Benson to a month's imprisonment with hard labour for, at the worst, using an unnecessary degree of violence against a man whom he saw knock down a woman in the street at one o'clock in the morning, has, as I have learnt by private inquiry, been dismissed from the force and deprived of his livelihood. The contrast between the manner in which perjury and other gross criminality on the part of policemen are continually passed over by magistrates, and this extreme severity for an act which would be honourable to anybody but a policeman, and in him was nothing worse than a slight excess of laudable zeal in the performance of a duty in which the police are much oftener culpably remiss than overzealous, must make a very great impression on the minds of policemen, who will learn from it to be still more careful for the future how they interfere to protect a woman from ill usage by a man. The magistrate had not a word of blame for the brutal husband, but declared the blow struck by the constable to be "unprovoked, brutal, and

unjustifiable.” Be it observed that at the time the policeman struck the blow, he probably did not even so much as know that the woman was the wife of the man who was assaulting her but simply interfered against a man who was in the act of knocking down a woman in the public streets. As the poor man’s punishment is now drawing to a close, if the Daily News would say something in favour of restoring him to the force,² it might greatly aid the attempt I am making to bring influence to bear upon the Home Secretary for that purpose.

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Hill, I am

Dear Mr Hill
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1512.

TO J. O’CONNELL¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 11. 1870

Dear Sir—

I think you have done wisely in writing to Washington & in accepting the correspondence of the New York Tribune. Will you pardon me for saying that I think you are likely to be much sooner recognized as a man of ability through what you may do in this last capacity, (if it suits you to make yourself known as the writer) than by the profoundest philosophical treatise that it is possible to write? because there are so many more people competent to judge of the activity shewn. In some respects even your larger works would have more chance of giving you a reputation than the one you are now thinking of, since jurisprudence being a *special* subject, a systematic work on any branch of it has to some extent the advantage of being judged by experts, while Logic & Method are at once everybody’s business & nobody’s.

I have no fault to find with the title of your proposed book.² I think it quite allowable either to treat Logic as coextensive with Method, or Method as a whole of which Logic is a part: the latter is more conformable to my own use of the words. But I am not nearly so confident as you seem to be that I shall like your book. Ability it will not want, nor system & concatenation: but I suspect that your “method” & mine are radically different, & I gather from what you say that in order to agree with your views, I shall have to abandon the greater part of my own. It may be that you have made discoveries which supersede all previous writers on logic from Aristotle downwards & change the whole face of the subject: if so, you will probably be appreciated fifty years after your death. You may have done all this, & I may not be

able to see it: if I do, I think I can depend upon myself for being ready to confess & proclaim it; but even that would be but a very little way towards success. Byron might rise one morning & find himself famous, but Byron was a lord, & besides, what he wrote were trivialities which anybody could understand: and when a lord or a rich man gets praised for his writings it is not because of the means which his title or his wealth gives him of making their merits known; the homage is to the title or riches themselves, & he is praised as a writer because that is the form of praise he is supposed to like. Publishers look only to the saleable: there is little or no public for philosophical treatises (unless indeed they can get into the Universities) & books of any profundity are now generally written by men who have other occupations & means of subsistence & who, contented to get their books into print, can wait any length of time for recognition. As regards myself, unless I am completely converted to your views & become a disciple, there is little that I can do to help you. Old & intimate friends of my own whom both on personal & on public grounds I am most desirous to assist, are unable to get their writings published. No opinion from me will make a publisher think that a book on a dry subject is saleable: but if you can make yourself, by other means, independent & known, or even only independent, you may be able to risk it yourself & try the chance.

I expect to be in England about the first week in March.

1513.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Avignon, January 11 1870

The subject of your letter of the 3rd is one which I have much considered, and in which I feel great interest, and the result of the consideration is that I greatly deprecate any extension of the Contagious Diseases Act,² and should highly approve of its repeal. I do not think the abuses of power by the police mere accidents which could be prevented. I think them the necessary consequences of any attempt to carry out such a plan thoroughly. If once examination is made other than voluntary the police must try to prevent evasion of it, and this at once opens the door to innocent mistakes on the part of the police, and makes it necessary to entrust them with power over women which no men are fit to have. I am opposed to the principle of the Act. I believe the medical efficacy of it to be doubtful, and I believe it to be impossible to carry it out without a degree of oppression which would more than overbalance any advantages that could be gained. Of course, in saying this, I look to the female population as well as the male, and strike the balance of advantages to the whole. I may as well say that I think this oppression does exist in France, and is responsible for a state of things among all classes far worse than exists in England. Nor do I think the indirect evils of this kind of registration to be despised. The interpretation certain to be put upon regulations of this description, even if entirely false, is so mischievous that a very great balance of well-ascertained practical good effects would not, perhaps, be sufficient to compensate for it. To fancy that calling this objection a sentimental one at all invalidates it is merely childish, for, assuredly, men's

sentiments have a great deal to do in regulating their conduct; and no law can be a good one which gives a bad direction to men's sentiments.

1514.

TO ROBERT DALGLISH¹

Avignon

Jan. 12. 1870

My Dear Sir

Allow me to introduce to you Monsieur Georges d'Eichthal.² His father, Monsieur Gustave d'Eichthal, of Paris, is well known as a thinker and writer on many important questions of politics and social science, and is one of the men for whose purposes as well as for his abilities and knowledge I have the greatest respect. He and his brother M. Adolphe d'Eichthal, who is the head of one of the principal banking houses of Paris, are the oldest friends I have in France. M. Georges d'Eichthal, who has passed some time in learning business at Manchester, is now going to enter into the employment of Mess^{rs} Elder and Co. of Glasgow. Any kindness you could shew him would be a great advantage to him and obligation to me, and from what I know of him I feel sure that he would do credit to your good offices. I am my dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

R. Dalgleish Esq. M.P.

1515.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

12 janvier
1870

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Les seules personnes que je connais à Glasgow sont les deux députés libéraux, MM. Dalgleish² et Graham,³ et un jeune professeur à l'Université, M. Nichol,⁴ homme d'un esprit cultivé et très libéral. Je vous envoie des lettres pour eux. MM. Jacob Bright et Steinthal m'ont tous deux écrit des éloges de M. votre fils,⁵ et m'ont

remercié de le leur avoir recommandé. Je ne doute pas qu'il fasse à Glasgow une impression également favorable.

La situation politique de la France en ce moment est vraiment merveilleuse, et donne lieu aux plus grandes espérances. La France est habituée à étonner le monde par une renaissance subite à la lumière au moment où les ténèbres semblaient le plus épaisses. Je crois avec vous que pendant les années de son silence politique elle a appris des choses très importantes, et que l'avortement de sa dernière révolution lui a donné des pensées qui étaient nouvelles pour elle, et qui la rendront, j'espère, plus heureuse cette fois.

Votre Très Affectionné,

J. S. Mill

1516.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

A[vignon] Jan. 12. 1870

Mon Cher M. Villari—

J'ai bien tardé à vous remercier de votre bonne lettre et des envois si intéressants qui l'ont accompagnée. C'est que j'attendais pour avoir le loisir de lire l'ouvrage de M. Gabelli,² qui méritait évidemment une lecture très sérieuse. J'ai fait enfin cette lecture et j'en suis bien récompensé. Ce traité a tout le mérite qu'on devait attendre de la haute opinion que vous avez de son auteur. Je suis charmé de voir arborer en Italie le drapeau de la psychologie inductive et de la morale utilitaire, dans un livre si fortement pensé et qui prête si peu à la critique.

C'est en même temps un indice et une cause de progrès intellectuel, en donnant aux principes du droit et de la morale une définition claire et une base démontrable et en épargnant la déplorable déperdition de force intellectuelle qui a lieu aujourd'hui pour une métaphysique nuageuse qui ne mène à rien, parcequ'elle suppose toujours ce qui est en question, en faisant du sentiment subjectif de l'homme sa propre justification. Votre ami me paraît de force à lutter très vigoureusement contre cette métaphysique et cela de la meilleure façon, en le remplissant par quelque chose mieux. J'ajouterai qu'il raisonne et discute très bien: les mots ont toujours pour lui un sens notamment déterminé et il sait toujours ce qu'il veut dire.

Je suis très content de vos circulaires sur l'instruction des femmes. Ces circulaires sont très propres à stimuler le zèle des autorités locales en leur faisant sentir l'importance que met le gouvernement à l'instruction réelle et sérieuse des femmes. Ce que vous me dites par leur retentissement et par l'effet que déjà elles produisent est très encouragement. J'espère que le changement du ministère n'a rien changé dans

les dispositions du gouvernement à cet égard et n'a pas ébranlé votre position officielle³ si précieuse au bien public.

Vous me demandez mes idées sur l'instruction des femmes, mais puisque vous approuvez mon livre⁴ je crois que vous les connaissez déjà et que ce sont les vôtres. Vous savez que je ne voudrais nulle distinction dans l'instruction donnée aux deux sexes. Dans mon opinion l'instruction générale doit être la même: quant à la professionnelle, elle dépendra de la destination sociale de chaque élève, mais celle-là aussi doit être ouverte aux jeunes filles comme aux jeunes gens. Je crois que l'on finira par n'avoir que des écoles communes aux deux sexes. Après cela il va sans dire que la connaissance du milieu social de l'Italie doit décider de l'approche qu'il est aujourd'hui possible de faire à cet idéal. Le plus grand danger à craindre c'est que tout en faisant faire les mêmes études, on ne s'efforce pas à les faire faire aussi solides par les jeunes filles; et qu'on se contente de quelque chose de plus superficiel, ne visant guère qu'à l'amusement ou à l'agrément. Ce danger cessera du moment où il sera compris que l'instruction des femmes est tout aussi importante aux intérêts sociaux que celle des hommes. Dès que cette idée-là se sera emparé des esprits, la cause sera gagnée. Et le gouvernement fera déjà beaucoup de bien en faisant voir que c'est là son intime conviction.

Vous me connaissez assez pour juger que je ne suis pas ému par ce qu'il y a de peu satisfaisant dans la vie politique du moment en Italie. Ces luttes d'ambition et d'amour propre sont réellement des phénomènes très superficiels: et tout indique que les mouvements intellectuels et économiques se poursuivent très heureusement sous cette surface. C'est sur ces deux mouvements que tout renseignement venant de vous me serait précieux. A propos, les documents sur Rome que vous avez eu la complaisance d'envoyer n'étaient pas ce dont j'avais besoin: Je croyais que comme en France un exposé général de l'état, surtout économique du pays, se publiait tous les ans, et je voulais y chercher principalement des renseignements sur l'émigration. Au reste le besoin momentané que j'avais de ces renseignements est passé.⁵

1517.

TO HENRY SAMUEL CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

Jan. 14. 1870

Dear Chapman

I am much obliged to you for your interesting letter on the Colonial question, and all the more, as your early departure² will prevent me from having any opportunity of talking over with you the new aspects of the subject.

The causes you mention are, no doubt, those which have chiefly contributed to the indifference of official people in England about retaining the colonies. I suspect that

separation would still be a great shock to the general English public, though they justly dislike being taxed for the maintenance of the connexion. For my own part, I think a severance of it would be no advantage, but the contrary, to the world in general, and to England in particular; and though I would have the colonies understand that England would not oppose a deliberate wish on their part to separate, I would do nothing to encourage that wish, except telling them that they must be at the charge of any wars of their own provoking, and that though we should defend them against all enemies brought on them by us, in any other case we should only protect them in a case of extremity such as is not at all likely to arise. I have always thought, however, that we ought to have softened the transition in the case of New Zealand by guaranteeing a loan to enable the colony to maintain for a few years a sufficient force of its own raising, without taking away the industrious population from the labours on which the very existence of the colony depends.

I do not see my way to any practicable mode of federal government for communities so widely scattered over the world. And I have attended sufficiently to colonial affairs to be aware that the colonies will not allow us to cast out our paupers into them. But emigration of able bodied agricultural labourers who are not paupers, I suppose they would welcome, and this would be very useful to us. Our having given up the unoccupied lands to the colonial government creates many difficulties. I thought, at the time, that it was an error; that the lands ought to have been regarded as the common inheritance of the whole people, the United Kingdom and the colonies taken together; the first comers having no just claim to the exclusive disposal of more than they could themselves occupy. But in this matter, *jacta est alea*, and we have only to make the best arrangement we can with the colonists for the reception of such emigrants as they are willing to take.

I had the pleasure of being introduced to Sir George Grey³ a short time ago, at a meeting on the subject of Landed Tenure, and I shall always be glad to know his opinions on a subject of which he has such extensive knowledge as Colonial Government and to compare notes with him on anything that occurs to myself.

The Canadian land transaction mentioned in your letter received today, is entirely a case of coproprietorship similar to tenant right.

With every good wish for the prosperity and happiness of yourself and your family, I am

Dear Chapman
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1518.

TO MRS. CHARLOTTE SPEIR MANNING¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 14. 1870

Dear Madam—

I have delayed very long to thank you for kindly sending me your book² the reason being that I have only just now found time to read it. Nothing can be more laudable than your purpose in writing the book—that of inspiring greater respect for the people of India in the minds of those who are appointed to govern them. That respect for the most part exists in the experienced men who know the natives from a long course of service in India; but nothing can be more disgusting than the feelings & demeanour towards them of numbers of the raw young Englishmen who go out & I am afraid this is an increasing evil since the substitution of the Queen's army³ who detest the country and only remain a few years in it, for a force of which the officers passed their whole career in India, & since the great increase of private adventurers, who are not even under that imperfect control from superiors to which the military, & the civil officers of government are subject.

I think you have done good service by putting within reach of the English public, in the compass of a single work, so much knowledge, both in the shape of information & of specimens, of the thoughts & intellectual productions of the Hindoos. Opinions will differ as to the merits of these productions, & of the state of civilization which they indicate; but they are an authentic & interesting product of the human mind; they deserve to be known, & any one may now know where to find such a selection from them as is sufficient to give a correct general notion of their kind & quality. This could not, as far as I know, have been obtained before, without at least dipping into many books.

You ask me for information respecting the administrative capacity shown by so many ladies of ruling families in India & especially whether these ladies are Hindoos or Mahomedans. They are almost all Hindoos. The case can seldom arise in a Mussulman principality, as by Mahomedan law the mother is not regent for her minor son, whereas among Hindoos the mother by birth or adoption is regent of right. One of the most remarkable however of these ladies, the late Sekunder Begum of Bhopal,⁴ was a Mahomedan. She was the only child of the ruler of the country, & at his death, according to the custom of the people she could transmit the chiefship to her husband but could not exercise it herself: she was however so much the stronger mind & the most popular too that the people obeyed her in preference to her husband & after his death which was an early one she was allowed to govern the country at first nominally for her daughter, but latterly in her own right. She was a most energetic, prudent, & just ruler, & her daughter who has now succeeded her, & who has been carefully trained by her to public business, is expected to tread in her footsteps. Her own

mother too was a remarkable woman. As the Native States were in my department at the India House I had opportunities of knowing all that was known about the manner in which they were governed & during many years by far the greater number of instances of vigorous frugal & skilful administration which came to my knowledge were by Ranees and Raees as regents for minor chiefs.

My daughter has not yet had time to read your book, but she looks forward to doing so with pleasure & begs to be kindly remembered to you.

1519.

TO WILLIAM T. MALLESON¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 18. 1870

Dear Sir—

I do not feel entitled to proffer my opinion unasked to Mr Odger on a point on which you say he has not made up his mind, & I do not like to urge upon him any particular course of action during his canvass,² supposing that I knew he agreed with me in opinion. No one has taken a warmer interest than I have in the candidatures of working men in general & M^r Odger in particular, & I believe Mr O. is well aware of this.

Not only do I object altogether to the extension of the C[ontagious] D[iseases] Acts,³ but I have seen the passing of them as they at present exist with great regret & sh^d be extremely rejoiced if they could be repealed: since not only do I object to them altogether on principle but I think that in the long run those measures are likely rather to increase than diminish the evil they are intended to attack. Moreover I fully agree with you in thinking that opposition to those Acts is more particularly incumbent on the defenders of the interests of working men, because working women are likely to be the greatest sufferers by this system of legislation & if it is to be carried out with anything like efficiency it could only be by an enormous expenditure which of course would fall in the long run upon the great mass of the taxpayers. Of course one need scarcely say that to any man who looks upon political institutions & legislation from the point of view of principle the idea of keeping a large army in idleness & vice & then keeping a large army of prostitutes to pander to their vices is too monstrous to admit of a moment's consideration, while the safety of the country could be provided for by the military education of all classes, or until after every possible experiment with married soldiers had been tried & failed. I therefore do not think that this system of legislation which I think utterly depraving to the mass of the population (not to speak of its gross inequality between men & women) is in any way specially necessary for the army & navy. It is a monstrous artificial cure for a monstrous artificial evil which had far better be swept away at its root in accordance with democratic principles of government.

I do not wish to write anything at length or to print anything on the subject, as I have great hopes that any further extension of these Acts will be checked by the public spirited action of the Ladies Committees, & I believe that full discussion of the subject will lead to bringing public opinion to our side in regard even to the repeal of the Acts. But if you would like to shew this letter to Mr Odger, or to any friend, I sh^d have no objection at all to your doing so.

1520.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Avignon, Thursday, Jan. 20, 1870.

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Nov. 21.

I think you must have been misinformed as to the purport of the letter which I addressed, on the 23d of October, to a California citizen who had asked my opinion on the subject of the Chinese immigration.² I certainly said that the settlement, in large numbers, of a population in a lower state of civilization, and willing to work for a lower rate of remuneration, would have a tendency to deteriorate the condition of the native laborer for wages, and would, so far, on general principles, justify restraints on immigration; but I urged, as a greatly preferable course, to endeavor, by education, to raise the Chinese population to the level of the American; and it is with great pleasure I learn from your letter that this is already being attempted with some success. The only measure of distinction which I did advocate was the enforcement of stringent laws against introducing Chinese under contract to work for particular persons; which is a form of compulsory labor—that is, of slavery. I should greatly deprecate the institution of a Chinese for an American population in all the departments of manual labour, the Chinese remaining what they are; but I distinctly stated in my letter that so long, at least, as the bulk of the immigrants return eventually to their own country, the opportunity given to numerous Chinese of becoming familiar with better and more civilized habits of life is one of the best chances that can be opened up for the improvement of the Chinese in their own country, and one which it does not seem to me that it would be right to withhold from them.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours, Very Faithfully,

J. S. Mill

1521.

TO WILLIAM T. MALLESON¹

A[vignon]

Jan. 24. 1870

Dear Sir—

I would rather that no part of my letter² were sent to the press. My former letter³ was published without my permission & though I do not greatly regret that it has been done I sh^d much dislike anything further of the same sort. It is neither good for the public nor for myself that mere *obiter dicta*, things written with no view to publication & written to persons who already agree with me, sh^d be sent forth through the newspapers as if they were the best I could do, & as if that were my chosen way of communicating with the public. I owe to the cause my name & the declaration of my opinion; but any slight & cursory attempt to argue it before the public would be a great mistake. So would it be on my part to join the Executive of your Association,⁴ which will be managed by men much fitter for such business than I am. But I feel it my duty to join the Association & shall be obliged by your putting down my name.

1522.

TO JAMES M. BARNARD¹

Avignon

January 26, 1870

The American Social Science Association will do immense service if it makes itself an organ for stimulating the desire and obtaining the means of the highest possible education. Stimulating the desire is all that is needed for obtaining the means, for there are never wanting, in your country, generous men who give large sums to enrich their country with permanent institutions which they think useful to it. When opinion shall have been duly prepared, persons will probably be found who will be disposed to endow Professorships of Jurisprudence and Roman Law at Harvard College and the other Universities.

What you say about the new start which the mind of America has been led to make by her long and arduous struggle, is exactly what I foresaw from almost the very beginning. I wrote in January, 1862, and often said in the years following, that, if the war lasted long enough, it would very likely regenerate the American people,² and I have been seeing more and more clearly since it closed, that to a considerable extent it has really done so, and in particular, that reason and right feeling on any public subject has a better chance of being favorably listened to, and of finding the national

mind open to comprehend it, than at any previous time in American history. This great benefit will probably last out the generation which fought in the war; and all depends on making the utmost use of it, for good purposes, before the national mind has time to get crusted over with any fresh set of prejudices as nations so quickly do.

1523.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Jan. 28. 1870

Dear Sir

It is wholly untrue that I have given any approbation whatsoever to the projectors of the meeting mentioned in your letter, or that I agree with them in any respect but in wishing to retain some connexion with the Colonies, and to promote emigration: and even on these points they had no authority from me to state any opinion. On the contrary, having received a copy of an intended Memorial to the Queen,² emanating from the same people, with a request that I would sign it, I wrote a reply on the 23rd of this month, decidedly objecting to almost every point in the Memorial, I am very glad that you wrote to me and I beg that you will not give credit to any statement you may see about my supposed opinions unless confirmed by myself. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Sir C. W. Dilke Bart. M.P.

1524.

TO LORD AMBERLEY¹

Avignon

Feb. 2. 1870

Dear Lord Amberley

Mr Lecky's² state of mind on the subject of prostitution is characteristically conservative. He thinks that since it has not been reformed up to this day it never can

be. This is the true conservative stand point. Whatever reforms have been already effected are well enough; if they were effected long enough ago, they are even excellent. As to any reforms in the future, though they might be desirable in themselves, they are sure to bring with them greater evils than they can remove; and then come those jeremiads more or less eloquent and touching, which we are so accustomed to in politics and morals, about the fearful consequences to society of attempting to do anything that has not been done already. It would be hardly possible to support any opinion by flimsier reasons than these particular ones of Mr Lecky. Are we to consider what the Church accomplished in the middle ages as the extreme limit of the moral improvement possible to mankind? Are the violent appetites and passions of half-tamed, or not even half-tamed, barbarians, a measure of the obstacles to be encountered in educating the young of a cultivated and law-observing community? The Church strove with sincerity and earnestness in the middle ages to suppress private war and the abuses of military violence, with very little success; but what could not be done then, has been found quite practicable since, and has been actually accomplished.

It is of more importance, however, to consider Mr Lecky's doctrine than his reasons. He considers prostitution as a safety valve to prevent the propensity to which it ministers from producing worse evils.³ Now, in the first place, I believe that the propensity has hitherto been fostered, instead of being weakened, by the tendencies of civilisation (which has been a civilisation left mainly to the influence of men) and by the teaching of the Catholic Church, which in order to add to the glory of the 'grace of God,' always has exaggerated and still does exaggerate the force of the natural passions. I think it most probable that this particular passion will become with men, as it is already with a large number of women, completely under the control of the reason. It has become so with women because its becoming so has been the condition upon which women hoped to obtain the strongest love and admiration of men. The gratification of this passion in its highest form, therefore, has been, with women, conditional upon their restraining it in its lowest. It has not yet been tried what the same conditions will do for men. I believe they will do all that we wish, nor am I alone in thinking that men are by nature capable of as thorough a control over these passions as women are. I have known eminent medical men, and lawyers of logical mind, of the same opinion.

But, in the second place, supposing that Mr Lecky is right in thinking, as he apparently does, that men are not capable of efficient control over this propensity, I should still differ from him when he thinks that prostitution is the best safety valve. I, on the contrary, think that with the exception of sheer brutal violence, there is no greater evil that this propensity can produce than prostitution. Of all modes of sexual indulgence, consistent with the personal freedom and safety of women, I regard prostitution as the very worst; not only on account of the wretched women whose whole existence it sacrifices, but because no other is anything like so corrupting to the men. In no other is there the same total absence of even a temporary gleam of affection and tenderness; in no other is the woman to the man so completely a mere thing used simply as a means, for a purpose which to herself must be disgusting. Moreover so far from thinking with Mr Lecky that prostitution is a safeguard even to the virtuous women, I think it cuts at the core of happiness in marriage, since it gives

women a feeling of difference and distance between themselves and their husbands, and prevents married people from having frank confidence in one another. The fact I believe to be, that prostitution seems the only resource to those and to those only, who look upon the problem to be solved to be, how to allow the greatest license to men consistently with retaining a sufficient reserve or nursery of chaste women for wives. Their problem is not, as yours and mine is, how to obtain the greatest amount of chastity and happiness for men, women, and children. Marriage has not had a fair trial. It has yet to be seen what marriage will do, with equality of rights on both sides; with that full freedom of choice which as yet is very incomplete anywhere, and in most countries does not exist at all on the woman's side; and with a conscientious scruple, enforced by opinion, against giving existence to more children than can be done justice to by the parents. When marriage under these conditions (and with such means of legal relief in extreme cases as may be adopted when men and women have an equal voice) shall have been tried and failed, it will be time to look out for something else: but that this something else, whatever it may be, will be better than prostitution, is my confirmed conviction.

We are sorry that you have had such deplorable weather during your whole stay in Italy. The winter seems to have been a bad one over the whole South. There has been snow all round us; Perpignan, Narbonne, Beziers, have been snowed up. We have had none here; but instead of our glorious winter days (of which, until quite lately, there have been only a few) cold northwest winds, with clouds and haze almost like England. This ungenial weather has disagreed both with my daughter and me: she has been not nearly so well as when you saw her, and I have had a series of small ailments, and have still an obstinate cold.

Shall you be in England in April? The Women's Suffrage Committee would, I believe, prefer to hold their meeting in April, but if you could not be present then, would postpone it till June. Would you mind writing to ask Mr Winterbotham⁴ to speak at the meeting? either in April or in June, according as you are yourself able to be present.

I inclose introductions to M. Jules Simon and M. Louis Blanc: the latter of whom, however, lives in England, and we hope you will meet him at our house. M. About I do not know.⁵

I Am
Dear Lord Amberley
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1525.

TO LORD AMBERLEY¹

Avignon

Feb. 12. 1870

Dear Lord Amberley

I should have plenty to say both on M^r Lecky's further remarks² and on your difficulties; but having just found your letter on returning from a five days excursion I write hastily for the chance of finding you still at Florence. I will therefore merely throw out a few hints. I see no proof of the difference of physical constitution you suppose to exist between men and women as to the point in question. From all I have read or heard I believe that there are no signs of it among savages: and the Hindoo books talk perpetually of the unrestrainable voluptuousness of women. I rather think the difference is merely that the masters, being more accustomed to indulge all their propensities than the subjected, find them more imperative and uncontrollable. So much for Mr Lecky's "heroic standard of virtue." With Mr Lecky I am entirely at issue as to prostitution being the least bad form of illicit sexuality. I think it by far the most degrading and the most mischievous. On the whole I would rather you did not shew my letter to Mr Lecky.

We are very sorry to hear that you are going to lose a place which you like, and to have the great trouble of looking out for another.³ We will inform the Women's Suffrage Committee of the limits within which your ability to attend the meeting will be confined. Many thanks for writing to Mr Winterbotham.⁴ I do not know how he reconciles his not having yet made up his mind to the suffrage, with "hearty adhesion to the principles" of the book on the Subjection of Women. "The question of careers and of political rights" will settle that of education much sooner than the latter the former; and this he will probably find out. Meanwhile, and independently of losing him as a speaker at the meeting it is a disappointment to find him less advanced than we hoped. I am

Dear Lord Amberley

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

P.S. It will give me much pleasure if you should like to accept the offer Helen makes in her letter to Lady Amberley.⁵

1526.

TO HORACE WHITE¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 13. 1870

Dear Sir—

I presume I am indebted to you for sending me the number of the Chicago Tribune which commented on my supposed opinions respecting Chinese immigration.² Nothing could be clearer or fairer than the editorial statement of the reasons which in my opinion *might* justify the exclusion of immigrant labourers of a lower grade of civilisation than the existing inhabitants. But I never said that in America & in the present circumstances of the case it ought to be done. My letter on the subject to a Californian citizen³ who had asked my opinion, has been so much misunderstood that I cannot but think the copy of my letter which I understand appeared in the newspaper must have been a mutilated one. I distinctly declared that in my opinion the right course to be adopted is to endeavour by education to bring the rising generation of Chinese up to the level of Americans. If there is little or no rising generation (the Chinese not being permanent settlers) I said that in that case their coming could be no such evil to the labouring classes as to justify its prohibition, while the opportunity it gives of carrying the ideas of a more civilised country into the heart of China, is an advantage to the people of China of which (I said) I do not think it would be right to deprive them. The only mode of immigration which I said that I thought sh^d be prohibited is the bringing over Chinese as Coolies under engagements to work for particular persons; which is a form of compulsory labour, or in other words of slavery.

Many thanks for the trouble you have taken to give information to Mr Watson.⁴ I have since heard that the American Soc Sc. Assⁿ has taken up the subject,⁵ so that I hope a considerable amount of valuable information is likely to result from Mr Watson's inquiries.

1527.

TO FRANK LYNN¹

Avignon

Feb. 15. 1870

Dear Sir

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Feb. 7 requesting me to give my name as Patron and Treasurer to the Working Men's National Emigration Association.

I wish success to any plan by which the working people may be enabled to effect the purpose which the Association has in view; but as it is impossible for me to give any portion of my time and attention to the Society, I do not think myself justified in becoming responsible for its proceedings by connecting my name with it. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

Mr Frank Lynn Esq.

1528.

TO GEORGE ODGER¹

Avignon, February 19, 1870

Dear Mr Odger

Although you have not been successful, I congratulate you on the result of the polling in Southwark, as it proves that you have the majority of the Liberal party with you,² and that you have called out an increased amount of political feeling in the borough. It is plain that the Whigs intend to monopolise political power as long as they can without coalescing in any degree with the Radicals. The working men are quite right in allowing Tories to get into the House to defeat this exclusive feeling of the Whigs, and may do it without sacrificing any principle. The working men's policy is to insist upon their own representation, and in default of success to permit Tories to be sent into the House until the Whig majority is seriously threatened, when, of course, the Whigs will be happy to compromise, and allow a few working men representatives in the House.

John Stuart Mill.

1529.

TO MRS. PETER ALFRED TAYLOR¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 21, 1870

Dear Mrs Taylor—

I cannot help thinking St. James's Hall too large for the meeting,² unless you mean the smaller room there. I look with great misgiving upon a meeting at all this year, as the promises are as yet so few. You have not told us whom you think of asking to speak. I think the second meeting³ in some respects more critical than the first, because many who have heard of the success of the first will come, & it will be mischievous if they go away disappointed. I cannot pledge myself to speak & I do not see a prospect of a successful meeting, whether I speak or not, unless Mr Maurice & Mr Cairnes consent. I do not see, without them, enough speakers of the first class. Will you kindly let us know for what day the 2^d reading of the bill is fixed;⁴ & Helen asks me to say that she cannot write to Miss Hare⁵ until you answer her question whether you would like Miss Hare to read the report of the year's proceedings in the place of Miss Biggs,⁶ as you suggested that some one sh^d do when we last saw you. You do not tell us what lady speakers you think of asking. Helen says that if there were no other lady speakers than yourself & Mrs Fawcett, she would do her utmost to try to speak herself, & thinks that probably her doing so might help to induce Miss Hare: but unfortunately she cannot promise, as she cannot depend with certainty on her health. Still we think that few lady speakers are better than having any who are not all that could be desired. I must reiterate my objection to St. James's Hall because I think that even if it could be filled (which is doubtful) it would have too much the appearance of a public meeting. I sh^d have thought Willis' Room quite large enough.

We have not yet fixed when we shall leave here, but will be in England for the meeting whenever it may be. In a letter⁷ received yesterday from Lady Amberley dated Feb. 17th she tells Helen that between March 20th & 25th would suit Lord A. best.

1530.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Feb. 23. 1870

My Dear Sir

My daughter desires me to express her thanks to the Club² for the honour which it has done her.

The earliest day on which the Club meets and on which I think I can be sure of being in England, is the 27th of March, and on that day we shall be most happy to attend. Will you kindly send the circular to Blackheath.

I hope that if there is a meeting of the Women's Suffrage Society you will do it the great service of speaking.³

The Education Bill of the Government seems to me the nearest approach now possible to a surrender of English education into the hands of Denominationalism.⁴ I do not wonder that the Tories speak so well of it. If it passes unaltered, the effect will be doubly mischievous in Ireland. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Sir C. W. Dilke

Bart. M.P.

1531.

TO GEORG BRANDES¹

Avignon

le 24 février 1870

Monsieur

C'est avec grand plaisir que j'ai appris par votre lettre que mon livre sur l'Assujétissement des Femmes a été traduit en Danois. Vous ne vous trompez pas en pensant que je ne connais pas cette langue, bien que je connaisse par des traductions quelques-uns des auteurs qui l'ont illustrée par leurs écrits. Je suis heureux de voir que la question des femmes, la plus importante à mes yeux de toutes les questions politiques du temps présent, excite dans le monde civilisé un intérêt si général, qu'on a fait à mon livre l'honneur de le traduire dans la plupart des langues, y comprises celles de plusieurs pays bien moins éclairés et avancés que le Danemarck.

Vous me demandez, Monsieur, quels sont les ouvrages de la littérature anglaise, française, ou allemande les plus considérables qui ont pour objet la situation sociale des femmes. Jusqu'ici ceux qui ont quelque valeur sont loin d'être nombreux. La question ne fait que commencer d'être sérieusement étudiée. Je puis vous signaler, en langue française, les livres suivants:

“La Femme Pauvre au 19^{me} Siècle”, par M^{lle} Daubié: éditeur, Ernest Thorin, Rue de Médicis, 7, à Paris. [1866]

“Le Droit des Femmes”, par Alfred Assollant: éditeur, Anger, Rue Laffitte, 8, à Paris. [1868]

“L’Ouvrière”, par Jules Simon: éditeur, Hachette, Boulevard St. Germain, 77, à Paris [1861]

“La Femme Affranchie”, par Madame Jenny d’Héricourt: éditeur, Lacroix, Rue de la Putterie, 33, à Bruxelles: à Paris chez tous les libraires. [2 vols., 1860]

En Anglais:

“Social and Political Dependence of Women” by Captain [Charles] Anthony: éditeurs, Longman et C^{ie} à Londres. [1867]

Un volume d’Essais par plusieurs auteurs sous le titre de “Women’s Work and Women’s Culture”: éditeur, Macmillan, à Londres.[2](#)

Je ne sais pas ce qui a pu être publié en Allemagne, sauf l’ouvrage de M^{me} Lewald-Stahr que vous connaissez.[3](#)

Il y a au moins trois journaux, l’un à Paris (“Le Droit des Femmes”), les deux autres aux Etats-Unis (“The Revolution” et “The Woman’s Journal”) qui sont consacrés à cette cause. Les bureaux sont:

Le Droit des Femmes: Rue du Paradis Poissonnière 1 bis, à Paris.

The Revolution: 49 East Twenty-third Street, New York.

The Woman’s Journal: 3 Tremont Place, Boston, et 82 Washington Street, Chicago.

Il y a une Association Anglaise pour le suffrage des femmes, dont le siège principal est à Londres: Secrétaire, Madame P. A. Taylor, Aubrey House, Notting Hill, London.

Je me suis donné le plaisir de vous envoyer par la poste un exemplaire du seul pamphlet ou article que j’ai ici, sur la question des femmes, c. à. d. le compte rendu du premier meeting tenu à Londres par la Société pour le suffrage des femmes.[4](#) A mon retour en Angleterre je vous enverrai les autres articles et pamphlets qui ont été mis en circulation par la Société.

Il existe aussi des Sociétés pour obtenir le suffrage pour les femmes, aux Etats Unis d’Amérique, en France, en Italie, et en Suisse.

Agréez, Monsieur, l’expression de ma considération très distinguée.

J. S. Mill

1532.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES[1](#)

Avignon

Feb. 25. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

It would be of the utmost value to the meeting of the Women's Suffrage Society, and a great service to the cause, if you could find it possible to say a few words at the meeting.² I know that it is asking very much from you, but in a case like this the second meeting is the most critical of all, especially after the first has been successful. Even if it is as good a meeting as the first, there will seem to be a falling off, because more will be expected: but to have the same speakers over again, with hardly any new ones, or with such only as add little to our strength, would be more than a falling off—it would be a failure. And so many of our best supporters came to the front last year, that there is considerable danger of failure from this cause. You, however, are part of our reserved strength: your name, and even a very brief expression of your sentiments, would add weight to the meeting. It is this extreme need which makes me hope that if it be possible, you will consent to speak a few sentences. However few they are, they will be of the greatest service, and I do not venture to ask for more.

My daughter says she shall be more an enemy of hunting than ever now that she knows your loss of health is partly due to it.³ She is very much gratified at your good opinion of her article,⁴ as there is no one whose favourable judgment she would regard more highly. She is very anxious to see your additions to your Logic of Political Economy,⁵ as she had felt tempted to controvert part of it in something she was writing, but which she has laid aside until she knows your present views on the subject.

With our best regards to Mrs Cairnes, I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1533.

TO ALEX D. CAMPBELL¹

Avignon, 28th February 1870

I agree with you that the land ought to belong to the nation at large, but I think it will be a generation or two before the progress of public intelligence and morality will permit so great a concern to be entrusted to public authorities without greater abuses than *necessarily* attach to private property in land. Meanwhile we should try to go on limiting the power of individuals over land by imposing more and more conditions on behalf of the people at large.

1534.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Feb. 28. 1870

Dear Sir,—

I most heartily agree with the Resolution of the London Branch,² which I had already seen in the newspapers, and I am delighted that the Education League is preparing for a struggle. For myself I would rather, and I should think that the intelligent part of the working class would rather have no National Education Act for the next five years, than one which should empower the State to establish schools on the denominational principle. All other objections, strong as some of them are, might be waived in order to get a beginning made of a national system; but that all schools *founded* by the Government, either general or local, should be purely secular is a point on which if I were in Parliament I would make no compromise, but if it was not conceded, would do what I could to defeat the Bill. Ever since I saw that the League was going to make a stand on this point I have been desirous of helping it by some expression of opinion, but I have not yet made up my mind how I can best do so.³ I rather dislike writing private letters to be published in the newspapers, of which there has been a great deal in my case already without my consent.

With regard to an International Free Trade Congress,⁴ I do not clearly understand whom in particular it is hoped to influence by it—the English working people, or foreign countries. If the latter, it would probably do good, provided it proceeded mainly from the foreign free traders. I am Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Sir C. W. Dilke

Bart. M.P.

1535.

TO FANNY LEWALD-STAHN¹

A[vignon]

March 1. 1870

Dear Madam—

I beg to return you my sincere thanks for your kindly sending me your excellent series of letters on the Women question.² It is a real honour to have my name inscribed at the beginning of such a volume. Your book is both convincing & persuasive & is singularly free from the two contrary defects one or other of which writings for the cause of woman so often exhibit, of indiscreet violence & timid concession.

So competent a testimony as yours is well fitted to make me think that I have been at least apparently unjust to German women in the remark I made in my little book on the insufficiency of their education.³ When I referred to this as being inferior to what it is in France I did not so much refer to the ordinary character of the schools for young women which I believe is much worse in France than in Germany, but to the much smaller number of women who, like yourself & a few others, have qualified themselves by their studies & acquirements for distinction & usefulness as writers. The average education of German ladies may be much superior (at least as to languages) to that of French ladies but there appears to be as yet a much smaller number who stand out from the general level & take a more or less high rank either in the literature or in the serious discussions of their country.

1536.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

March 2. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

I hardly know how to express to you how much I feel the kindness of your consenting to speak in compliance with my wishes,² though so much in opposition to your own. Had your unwillingness been grounded solely on your health, I would on no account have urged you against your own preference: but since it has its source in that too modest estimate of yourself, of which your friends have ample experience, I think they may fairly do what I should not advise them to do on most subjects—set their judgment above your own. I have not the slightest misgiving about your speaking, if but you do speak. It is only your health I am anxious about, and on that point your letter is encouraging. I beg that you will say only as much as can be said without overtasking your physical powers. However short your speech may be, I will answer for its being both a help and a credit to the meeting.

My daughter found, as I did myself, much to admire, as well as to learn from, in your Logic of Political Economy. As for your last article in the Fortnightly,³ she is even more enthusiastic in her admiration of it than I am, and thinks it one of the finest bits

of writing in the English language; an absolute model of philosophical exposition in the balance and proportion of the parts.

I am happy that the favourable impression I retained of Courcelle Seneuil's and Cherbuliez's books⁴ is shewn by your agreement with it to be well grounded.

We expect to be at Blackheath in about a fortnight.

With our kind regards to M^{rs} Cairnes, I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1537.

TO SIR ROBERT COLLIER¹

A[vignon]

March 3. 1870

My Dear Sir Robert Collier—

Allow me to thank you for your kind attention to my letter, & for the interest you have taken in the case of the dismissed policeman.²

I sh^d think more of the reason assigned by Mr Bruce for not reinstating the man if it were one that is consistently acted on by the police authorities. But there have been not a few cases in which magistrates have shown by their decision that they entirely disbelieved the testimony of policemen, either given to screen themselves or one another or in wrongful accusation of other people; yet so far as the public are aware, dismissal has not followed. I inclose a case which I have read this very day in the Daily News,³ where an inspector who had been dismissed for a grossly insulting abuse of authority towards two respectable women got himself restored by making statements privately against their character which statements having inadvertently become public he has been obliged publicly to retract. This is surely a much worse case of disregard of truth than that which W^m Smith is charged with. If this inspector remains in the force, it will be thought, & said that falsehood may be overlooked in a policeman who insults women but is unpardonable in *one who defends them*.

Undoubtedly if the man has really been guilty of falsehood he ought not to be reinstated: but that he persists in his story is all he can do if he is innocent. Of course in a case like this in which the magistrate has shewn such gross incapacity there ought to be some independent examination of the worth of the evidence of the witness

whose story was at variance with that of the man Smith. I sh^d have supposed that it would have been within the province of the head of the police to have made such an examination: for however much respect is due to a magistrate's decision magistrates are after all fallible (unhappily in the case of Mr Benson apparently very fallible) & then it seems to lie with the Home Sec^y & the immediate superiors of any one who has been aggrieved to redress the injury as well as they can in the absence of any Court of Appeal.

I hope you have by this time quite recovered from your unfortunate & troublesome accident which I much regretted to hear of.

1538.

TO JOHN CHAPMAN¹

Avignon

March 6. 1870

Dear Sir

I have just received your letter, and I hasten to say that I am glad you agree with me in preferring joint action, and I highly approve of the formation of such an Association as you propose, consisting of the Ladies' Committee with a reinforcement of men.² I should be happy to be a member of an Association so constituted but should not be willing to be its President, as, being unable to give my time and labour to the business of the Committee, I do not think it would be right for me to hold myself out to the public as the head of the organisation, and the apparent guide and director of its proceedings.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

Dr Chapman

1539.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

A[vignon]

March 8, 1870

Dear Mr Leslie—

I am truly sorry to hear that your indisposition has been so painful & so serious. It is well that the worst is past, and that you are rapidly recovering.

I am much obliged to you for writing out so clearly & well the best things which can be said against the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts.² Much of what you say is in itself just: but considered as an argument in support of the Acts, I think I could answer every part of it; & some time or other I hope to do so.

The Ladies' Manifesto³ supports its case in a manner which though well calculated for effect on a great number of minds, does not bear being brought to a strict logical test. Nevertheless it appears to me that the fault is not so much in the arguments as in the mode of putting them & that they might be so stated as not to be open to the criticisms which they have, naturally enough, suggested to you.

What will probably go farther in influencing the public mind than any argument is that the facts relied on by the supporters of the Acts are breaking down under them in all directions, & that their claim to have nearly all medical opinion on their side is showing itself to be utterly futile.

I have just seen the advertisement of your book⁴ in Longmans' list. It is not worth while sending any proofs here as we leave for England at the beginning of next week.

1540.

TO JOHN SHORTT¹

Avignon

March 8, 1870.

Dear Sir

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 2nd instant and to express my regret that the preparation of a Lecture for delivery as part of the Society's series, still continues to be incompatible with my occupations and engagements.

I Am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

John Shortt Esq.

1541.

TO WILLIAM FRASER RAE [1](#)

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 21. 1870

Dear Mr Rae

Many thanks for your offer of help at the meeting of the 26th. [2](#) The list of speakers is arranged by the Ladies' Committee, of which Mrs P.A. Taylor, Aubrey House, Notting Hill is Secretary. The list is full for the present occasion; but it is just possible that Mr Odger, who is one of the speakers, may be detained at Bristol, and in that case perhaps the Committee may apply for your help at a short notice. [3](#) In any case I will make your kind offer known to them, and, if not for this year, it may very likely be acceptable for next.

I was much interested by your letters, [4](#) and am glad to hear that they are so much sought after. You are quite right, in these circumstances, to republish them, and I inclose an introduction to Mr W. Longman. I am

Dear Mr Rae

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

W. F. Rae Esq

1542.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES [1](#)

March 28. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

I regret that my name is promised to Chadwick for the meeting on Friday. [2](#)

It would be very desirable to give to the question the wider and more practical character you propose; and I think you may fairly try the experiment in the manner which your letter suggests. Any one who is interested in the narrower question is likely to be interested in the wider and to be even better prepared for it, since it is *à*

l'ordre du jour. It is very likely therefore that nobody will be otherwise than pleased at coming in for a more interesting discussion than he expected.

You were quite right, I think, as to the expediency of not mixing Longfield's plan³ and the question of valuation in the same amendments.

I hope your cold is better. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1543.

TO ARTHUR HELPS¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 28. 1870

Dear Mr Helps—

Your letter was forwarded to me at Avignon but I delayed acknowledging it until I sh^d have an opportunity of reading your book² which was waiting for me here.

If, as you intimate, my review of your first publication³ had any share in procuring for the world the series of works which I & so many others have since read with so much pleasure & instruction; far from regarding this exploit of mine as a sin to be repented of, I should look upon it as a fair set off against a good many sins. This most recent of your works is as full of valuable & happily expressed thoughts as any of its predecessors, while as a story it is more successful than *Realmah*⁴ though perhaps not more interesting to a psychologist. With regard to its practical object, emigration, I sh^d like very much to see the experiment tried in the manner you propose, of founding beyond the seas a new community complete in all its parts. But the conditions of a new country produce of necessity a state of society so much more democratic than our own, that it is only very exceptional persons in our higher and middle classes that could either reconcile themselves to it or have the foresight & mental adaptability required for guiding & organising the formation of such a community. And considering the great addition made annually to the poorer part of our population, the scheme would have to be executed on a vast scale indeed if it is to clear out the bad quarters of our towns & leave them a tabula rasa for reconstruction on better principles; not to say that the inhabitants of those quarters are far from being, in general, good material to colonise with.

I am very happy that you go so far as you do with those who are seeking to remove the civil & political disabilities of women. Since you think women sh^d have the suffrage, surely you sh^d join the Suffrage Society which claims nothing whatever but that independent women with a due property qualification sh^d be allowed to vote.

1544.

TO MRS. WILLIAM E. HICKSON¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 28, 1870

Dear Madam—

Before receiving your sister-in-law's letter,² we had learned of your irreparable loss from one of those who most loved you & Mr Hickson, our friend Miss Lindley.³ My first thought on hearing the sad news was of you. I know too well that there is no consolation for a calamity like yours. But nothing can deprive you of what comfort there is in a knowledge of the deep respect which was felt for your husband & will continue to be felt by his memory, by those who have known him as long & as well as I have. Mr Hickson was one of the small number of those who, with no personal ambition to gratify have laboured from an early age first to acquire the powers necessary for enabling them to render services to mankind, & then to use those powers to the utmost extent of their opportunities, & he was in no ordinary degree, successful in both objects. I have from an early period been accustomed to look upon him as in many important respects an example of what men should be. The loss of every such man makes the world poorer, & is to be lamented even by those who had not the privilege of his personal friendship—how much more by all who had.

1545.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 30. 1870

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Neither my daughter nor myself will be able to attend the Radical Club² next Sunday. I shall have much pleasure in accepting your kind invitation to dine with you on Saturday April 9, but my daughter regrets that she has an engagement which will prevent her from accompanying me. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1546.

TO HIPPOLYTE TAINÉ¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 10. 1870

Monsieur—

Je vous remercie très sincèrement d'avoir bien voulu m'envoyer votre livre,² que je lirai avec grand intérêt, et j'espère avec profit. Depuis la critique, d'ailleurs si flatteuse, que vous fîtes il y a longtemps de mon *Systeme de Logique*,³ j'ai toujours désiré savoir plus au long votre manière de penser sur les questions philosophiques si semblable et pourtant à certains égards si différente de la mienne. Je me permets maintenant cette satisfaction jointe à beaucoup d'autres, de la lecture de votre livre.

Je vous dois, monsieur, un long arriéré de remerciements des choses aimables que vous avez écrites sur mes livres de philosophie et notamment sur mon examen d'Hamilton.⁴ Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire combien je suis heureux que ce livre vous ait paru mériter un jugement si favorable.

Veillez me dire si vous avez reçu de ma part la nouvelle édition de l'ouvrage de mon père intitulé "*Analysis*" &c.⁵ J'avais l'intention très arrêtée de vous en offrir un exemplaire et cependant je ne puis pas me rappeler si cette intention a été exécutée ou non. Si par inadvertance j'ai omis de vous envoyer ce livre je tiens à réparer sans retard cette négligence regrettable.

1547.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 11. 1870

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I inclose the list of the pairs, which with the two tellers makes up 82 on our side in the division.²

I omitted to mention to you yesterday how exceedingly mischievous I think it would be if any deputation of ladies were to attempt to go up to Gladstone. From what I know of him, as well as from many other considerations, I think there are few things that would do more to throw back the movement, renew the old prejudices against women's franchise and neutralise what has been done to further it. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1548.

TO HIPPOLYTE TAINÉ¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 21, 1870

Monsieur—

Je suis bien aise d'apprendre que je n'avais pas négligé de vous envoyer le livre de mon père.² Ce livre parut dans le moment le plus extrême de la réaction soi-disant spiritualiste, et il y a manqué par là un éclatant succès tout en contribuant beaucoup à former un certain nombre de bons esprits. Réimprimé dans un temps plus propice à la philosophie inductive de la nature humaine, il tendra à fortifier cette bonne tendance, sans jeter ses lecteurs dans les défauts que vous reprochez avec quelque raison à l'école matérialiste.

Quant à la question des femmes;³ vous n'êtes pas le premier qui m'a fait à peu près les mêmes observations sur le caractère des françaises. J'ai été souvent frappé de l'espèce de mépris avec lequel les français parlent souvent des françaises, et (puis-je le dire?) il me semble que les françaises ne manquent pas de rendre ce mépris même avec intérêt. Il est sûr que les hommes et les femmes en France ne s'estiment pas réciproquement; ce qui est, par parenthèse, assez souvent la conséquence de trop de galanterie dans les moeurs. Cependant j'ose dire que comme beaucoup de français et surtout de Parisiens et surtout encore des hommes de la classe aisée, vous ne connaissez pas toutes les belles qualités des françaises. Il n'y a pas au monde de femme qui sache mieux "s'ennuyer, sans s'amortir ou s'éteindre" que la française provinciale rangée et vertueuse de quelque rang que ce soit, et il n'y a pas de

meilleure femme d'affaire ni de personne plus réfléchie, plus sobre (d'esprit) que les paysannes françaises, et encore beaucoup de femmes de la classe artisanne quand elles ne sont pas trop écrasées par les souffrances dont leur maris les abreuvent. Et même pour les jolies femmes et les Parisiennes, c'est un peu la légèreté des hommes français qui est cause que les femmes françaises ne leur présentent que les côtés fourbes de leur caractère. Quand ces mêmes femmes d'apparence frivole ont à faire avec des femmes anglaises, il arrive quelquefois qu'elles font voir un fonds de sérieux et d'amertume que se trouverait rarement peut-être même parmi ces Anglaises que vous croyez si sérieuses. Ce caractère sympathique qui est si gracieux, si aimable et dans les français et dans les françaises, fait que les femmes se montrent banales et frivoles quand elles croient voir que les hommes attendent d'elles la banalité et la frivolité. C'est à vous hommes intelligents de la France, à montrer que vous croyez les femmes capables des idées sérieuses et des goûts élevés, et je me trompe beaucoup si vous ne verrez pas bientôt se dévoiler une intelligence et une élévation dont vous ne soupçonnez pas encore l'existence.

1549.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 22. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

You are most welcome to retain Cherbuliez and Courcelle Seneuil² for any length of time, or permanently. As for Carey's book,³ which I think is the very worst book on political economy that I ever toiled through, the only thing I wish to do with it is to find somebody who will take the trouble to write a detailed exposure of it, for the American public, on whom I believe it has really some influence. If you know of any person competent and willing to perform this irksome but useful service, it would be a great satisfaction to me to make him a present of my copy.

The Land Tenure Committee, at its meeting on Monday, approved a programme compounded of the old and the new articles, subject to confirmation by a general meeting of all the members of the Association, which is to be held in July.⁴ Meanwhile the programme is to be printed and a copy sent to every member. The organization of the Association is adjourned till after that meeting has been held.

We leave tomorrow morning for Avignon. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1550.

TO JULIE VICTOIRE DAUBIÉ¹

[Spring? 1870]

Mademoiselle:

You have a right to be surprised at the delay in my answer to your letter. But your book² is not one of those which one is content to read in haste, and some time passed before the pressure of my occupations permitted me to devote to it the time and attention which it deserved.

You have written a work, Mademoiselle, of great value, and all the more meritorious that it must have been very painful to write it. I have rarely read a more sad book. One has never, I believe, revealed in fuller detail the miseries of life for the great majority of women, and the revolting injustices of masculine society with respect to them. I should like it if this book were to be read from beginning to end by all men and women of the so-called enlightened class. I believe that it would make many of them ashamed of their culpable inaction in face of evils so frightful and injustices so monstrous.

Unfortunately, France is far from having on this question the bad preeminence which you attribute to it. Social reformers are always inclined to believe that other countries are better than their own. Unhappily, the difference is very often more apparent than real. In many passages you give an amount of praise to England on the subject in question which it is far from deserving; and those who in England uphold the cause of women often pretend in their turn that their condition is much better in France. Unhappily, both deceive themselves.

As to the commencement which has been made here in the regulation of prostitution, and which some are endeavoring to extend, your book would suffice to condemn it without appeal. An association of women, some of whom are very distinguished, has been formed to excite opinion against this deplorable system.³ They are heartily seconded by men, and there is reason to hope not only that the upholders of the system will not venture to go further, but that they will be obliged to undo what they have done.

Accept, Mademoiselle, the expression of my high and respectful consideration.

J. S. Mill

1551.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Avignon, 1st May 1870

Dear Madam,—

You greatly overrate the qualities required for writing such books as mine, if you deem them to include that of being a competent adviser and director of consciences in the most difficult affairs of private life. And even a person qualified for this office would be incapable of fulfilling it unless he possessed an intimate knowledge of the circumstances of the case, and the character of the persons concerned. It would be a long and a difficult business to define, even in an abstract point of view, the cases which would justify one of two married persons in dissolving the contract without the consent of the other. But as far as I am able to judge from your own statement, yours does not appear to be a strong case, since your husband has still an affection for you, and since you not only do not complain of any ill treatment at his hands, but have so much confidence in his goodness and high feeling, as to feel sure that even in case of your leaving him without his consent, he would not seek to withhold any of your children from you.

If I could venture to give any opinion, it would be that if the only bar between you and such a man is a difference in your “ways of thinking and feeling,” unfortunate as such a difference is in married life, the mutual toleration which we all owe to those who sincerely differ from us forms a basis on which the continuance of your union may be made endurable, and the differences themselves, when nothing is done to exasperate them, may, as is usually the case between persons who live intimately together, tend gradually to an approximation.

1552.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

May 10. 1870

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I suppose Fawcett will attend the General Meeting of the Committee of the Land Reform Association in July, when his difficulties can be considered, and probably met. Nobody who had any hand in the programme had the smallest wish that cooperative cultivation should be under any control of Government, either in the large sense of State, or in the narrower sense. The words last added to the article relating to

Cooperation (which I think were inserted after Fawcett had left the meeting) were intended expressly to meet the objection felt by him & others that the Cooperative Associations might not be sufficiently spontaneous.² The State was never intended to have any part in the matter except to grant land, on their application, to such spontaneous cooperative associations as could give due guarantee of solidity, the nature of which guarantees should be fixed by law.

There is surely something better for us to do than to drop all that part of the programme which relates to the land & confine ourselves to claiming for the public the accidental increase of rent. It would hardly be worthwhile forming an association for a single point of land reform, or for anything less than a comprehensive scheme. And the point in question is precisely that which would meet with least support from the higher and middle class reformers, while the working classes would not be satisfied with it.

With regard to Snell's Committee,³ you & Fawcett probably know more about him, and what he is likely to do, than I have any means of knowing.⁴ But I should have thought that if the leaders of the working classes are willing to join the Committee we might do so. I do not know in what sense you mean that Snell may "deliver us into the hands of Glyn." If merely that you think he will compound for too few seats, I see no harm. Such members of the Committee as are willing to yield for a little, will have done all the work they are capable of doing in getting that little, & probably never would be able to get it if we who stand out for more did not unite with them. But we should still be free to refuse to compound for so little, & the fact that some of us had been bought off would be an encouragement, not a discouragement to newcomers to join us and fill up our ranks again. Of course what I say will not apply if you think we are likely to be quite outvoted as the Committee in any corporate action; if the leaders of the working men, content with their own Association⁵ for the same purpose, have declined to join the Committee.

I Am Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1553.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Avignon

le 10 mai 1870

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Je suis ici pour quelques semaines, et je serai charmé d'y recevoir l'annuaire de l'Association.² Je vous envoie par mandat de poste ma souscription annuelle.

Vous avez été heureux, c'est à dire clairvoyant, dans vos prévisions politiques au commencement de la crise actuelle, et c'est là une forte raison pour ajouter foi à vos prédictions d'aujourd'hui. Cependant j'ai grande envie de savoir sur quoi repose la supposition que l'issue de la situation actuelle sera la république.³ Viendra-t-elle par un coup de main de la classe ouvrière de Paris et des grandes villes? Alors tout dépend de la fidélité des soldats, qui sont beaucoup plus nombreux et mieux armés et qui seront probablement mieux commandés que dans les révolutions précédentes. Ou bien croyez-vous que les électeurs apprendront à nommer des députés républicains? Cela me semble fort douteux, en ce qui regarde les campagnes; car quoique les paysans désirent, selon toute apparence, un gouvernement libéral, l'élection des maires, etc., je crois que toutes les fois qu'on leur fera croire qu'ils ont à choisir entre Napoléon et la république socialiste, ils voteront pour Napoléon; et il faut avouer que les républicains socialistes ne font rien pour les rassurer.

Votre Tout Dévoué

J. S. Mill

1854.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN¹

Avignon, May 17, 1870.

Dear Bain—

I have now finished a careful reading of your book.² When I compare it with my own mode of treating the subject I am much struck with the combination of nearly perfect agreement in the *fond* of our opinions on every part of it with so much originality in the manner in which you have presented many of them. This, if it stood alone, would make the book very valuable for there is no more important service to any set of thoughts than to vary their expression, & to deduce them from one another in different ways. But in addition to this, by varying the modes of statement you have illuminated points & aspects of our common doctrine which the previous exposition had left more or less in the shade. And you have followed out some of the principles into consequences not previously drawn.

I find little or nothing, relating properly to Logic, from which I dissent; but a good many apparent conflicts between your mode of expressing & presenting technical details, & mine; in most of which cases I still prefer my own. This applies chiefly to the first volume,³ & even that exclusive of its concluding chapters. When I next

revise my Logic⁴ I shall carefully collate each chapter with the corresponding chapter of yours: but in general, instead of trying to incorporate your new matter, I think it will be both better in itself, & fairer to you to refer to what you have done, give a brief account of it, & direct the student to your fuller exposition. Of course I cannot dispense with adapting the statement of the theory of Causation to the Correlation of Force: but your book has confirmed me in the opinion I had formed, that but little adaptation is required. In making that little I shall be greatly helped by the clear light in which you have placed the distinction between the two sorts of antecedent conditions, the conditions of Force & those of Collocation.

Respecting the Conservation theory itself, you have given by many degrees the clearest explanation of it that I have ever met with, & I now seem to myself to understand the *facts* of the case pretty completely. But about the mode of expression of the facts I still boggle, & have a stronger impression after reading your exposition than I had before that the men of science have not yet hit upon the correct generalization though they may be at no great distance from it. I am so anxious to understand this matter thoroughly that I write down my difficulties in hopes that you will help me to resolve them.

In the first place, you exclude from the theory two of the principal forces, Gravitation & Molecular Adhesion, expressly distinguishing these from the “correlated forces.” Of course you do so because there is at present no proof of the convertibility of the other forces into these; & you do not take any notice of the hypothetical explanation of gravitation by molecular motions, given by Tait⁵ (I believe) & others, which so strikingly resemble the argument of Descartes to shew that his vortices might generate a tendency to a centre. But though gravity does not take its place in the theorem of conservation, motion generated by gravity does. Suppose, then, a weight suspended by a string over the shaft of a mine—suppose that the string breaks, & the weight falls, with rapidly increasing velocity, to the bottom. Here is a positive addition to the active force at work in the universe, which, when it ceases its mechanical motion, remains in the form of heat or in some other of the correlated forms. Now, at the expense of what pre-existing energy has this force been generated? The conservationists are obliged to say, out of potential energy. A given quantity of potential energy has become actual; & if the weight is hoisted up again the power expended in raising it is so much taken back from the sum of actual energy & restored to the sum of potential.

Now I want to analyse the meaning of this phrase, “potential energy.” It seems to signify some force actually residing in the suspended weight. But it is nothing of the kind. There *is* a force actually residing in the weight; a force exactly measurable: viz. the downward pressure with which it pulls at the string, & by which it is able to neutralise an equal weight at the other end of a lever. But this force is limited to that with which the body would commence falling if the string broke, & is far short of the vastly accelerated force with which it would reach the bottom of the mine. When we are bid to say that this augmented force existed previously as potential energy in the weight, this potential energy is not to common sense & logic anything which really existed, but is a mere name for our knowledge that a force *would* be created if the body began to fall.

I am discussing the expressions, not denying any of the facts. I admit that when force is expended in placing a weight in a “more advantageous position,” as you express it (i.e. in a place from which it has further to fall in order to reach its centre of attraction) when it does fall to the depth from which it has been raised it will reproduce the exact amount of force expended in raising it (making allowance for any part which may have been transformed into heat). The expression “potential energy” is no doubt adopted to enable us to say that the total amount of force in all Nature can neither be increased nor diminished, the sum of the actual force plus the sum of the potential being a constant quantity. But this only means that there is a vast reserve of force not existing in any shape now, but which gravity could call into existence, & that this not actual but possible quantity of force has an extreme limit, viz. the whole of the motion that would be generated by the rushing together of all the gravitating bodies in the universe until they could not possibly get any closer together. From time to time a little of this possible force gets itself created & in that case it requires that an equal force sh^d be expended if the effects produced are to be counterbalanced or undone.

It seems to me a bad & misleading form of expression to ascribe the motion which would be gradually acquired by gravitating bodies if the obstacles which keep them apart were removed, to an energy of equivalent amount residing in the body before it begins to move.

But if this objection could be overruled a greater remains behind. You say (& this is a point quite new to me) that force may be, & is, expended in merely altering the collocation of bodies, without generating even potential energy. This I suppose is the case when force is expended in destroying molecular adhesion. But if this be so, how can the indestructibility of force be maintained? The sum of actual force plus the sum of potential is, in that case diminished.

When you have time, perhaps you will kindly explain to me how the theory of Conservation as at present expressed, can stand with this fact.

There are some questions in physical science which I sh^d like to ask of you, but this can be done *viva voce* at some future time. In particular I was not aware that chemical combination *always* produces heat. I will ask you some time or other to tell me the explanation of the apparent exceptions—freezing mixtures & the like.

Among the differences of mere language between your book & mine there is only one which I much care about; your use of the word “elimination.” In mathematics we eliminate what we want to get rid of: we eliminate *y* to obtain an equation containing only *x*. Of late careless writers in newspapers &c. having picked up the term have taken to using it in a sense the reverse of this: they eliminate not what they turn out but what they keep in: they *eliminate* the truth out of conflicting stories &c. In your book you employ the term in both ways: whenever a separation is effected between essentials & nonessentials, you speak indiscriminately of “eliminating” either the one or the other.⁶ Is this mode of using the term adopted from a deliberate choice? & what are the advantages that recommend it to you?

1555.

TO ROWLAND G. HAZARD¹

Avignon

May 18. 1870

Dear Sir

You have some reason to be surprised that so long a time has elapsed since I received your Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing² without my having given you any intimation of the impression they have made on my mind. The reason is, that ever since I received them, my thoughts have been so much occupied with subjects not metaphysical, that I really have not, until quite lately, been able to give the proper attention to such a book as yours, or even to make myself acquainted with more of its contents than was apparent on a cursory inspection. I once began reading it through, but was obliged to leave off. At last, however, I have had time to read it with the attention it deserves and am able to tell you the result.

Your present book confirms and increases the impression I already had of your acuteness, argumentative power, and perfect fairness both in considering the subject and in discussing it. I do not think that your side of the question has ever been better represented. The book, like your previous ones,³ does honour to American thought. It seems to me, however, to mark that the discussion between us has reached the point at which there is no advantage in our carrying it any further; since the region of difference between us, instead of narrowing, as is the case in controversies likely to have a successful issue, is, on the contrary, very much enlarged. The exhaustive manner in which you endeavour to meet everything which is said in opposition to your conclusion, stirs up continual new ground, and raises a great number of fresh differences of opinion. Were I to attempt to answer you, I could hardly do so but by getting an interleaved copy, and writing something on every blank leaf; for there are few pages of your book in which there is not some proposition or argument which I contest. And were you thereupon to follow my example, you would have to write another book as large as this. Both of us would thus spend a great deal of time for no sufficient result, since no important practical consequences depend on our convincing one another. Our opinions agree as to the point of real importance in practice, viz. that the moral government of human beings, either by themselves or by their fellow creatures, must take place by acting either upon their knowledge or their wants; i.e. either upon their expectation of consequences from their acts, or upon their feelings of desire and aversion towards those consequences.

I will merely touch briefly on one or two points on which something seems necessary to be said in order to bring out the question between us with greater definiteness and intelligibility.

1. You argue (with Professor Bowen)⁴ that our knowledge that we can produce effects by volition must be antecedent to experience, because, in order to have experience of this fact, we must already have willed. The answer to this you will find in the exposition of the Volitional part of human nature given in Professor Bain's book "The Emotions and the Will",⁵ and more briefly in his and my own notes to the "Analysis of the Human Mind."⁶ The substance of it (which was anticipated by Hartley) is, that all our voluntary motions were originally automatic; the product of the mere physical activity of the system under the stimulus of food and air, as when an infant free from restraint kicks about in all directions. By these means, without any antecedent volition, experience is acquired and an association formed between particular movements and the wants which these movements are found to satisfy; and the result is that the movements themselves come to be directed and controlled by the ideas associated with them: from which elementary fact all the complications of what we call the Will are gradually built up. I cannot here go any further into the point, but this is the doctrine you have to combat.

2. I perceive that you attach great importance to maintaining the simultaneity, in preference to the succession, of the immediate cause of an effect and the effect itself. I confess that this question appears to me equally unimportant and insoluble, inasmuch as the only point at issue is, whether the commencement of the effect dates from the very first instant at which the whole of the necessary previous conditions come together, or from the very next instant after that instant. I do not see how it can ever be ascertained which of these is the fact. And whichever is so, Causation remains the law according to which the facts of the universe succeed one another.

3. But you seem to use this supposed simultaneity as the formation of an argument, when you say that the Past has no power of deciding human voluntary determinations—that these conform solely to present facts, viz: the agent's *expectations* of the consequences that will follow his actions and his *wants*. But no one pretends that they conform to anything else. The mode in which past facts are supposed to determine our actions is by determining these present facts, viz. our expectations (well or ill grounded) of consequences, and our wants i.e. our desires and aversions.

4. You take great pains to shew that the possibility of foreseeing how a person will act, is consistent with his freedom. Many necessitarians, I admit, have maintained the contrary; but I never did. I have never taken any part in that controversy. My use of the possibility of prevision was quite different. I used it to shew, that since we can foresee human actions with as near an approach to correctness as we can foresee any of the phenomena of dead matter which are equally complicated, and the antecedents of which are equally obscure; it thence appears that there is the same uniformity in the course of human actions as there is in the remainder of the course of nature; or at least, that we have as much ground for affirming such uniformity in the one case as in the other; and the distinction contended for between voluntary acts and other phenomena of nature, that the latter are in their own nature certain and the former contingent, does not exist. This argument perhaps does not apply to you, as you, apparently, do not assert that supposed distinction, but consider the phenomena of inanimate nature as also the direct effects of (divine) volition.

To turn to another subject: I am much obliged to you and to your son⁷ for the information you kindly sent respecting the operation of the Ballot in the United States.⁸ From these and other communications I infer that the popularity of that method of voting in America depends upon its convenience as a mode of collecting large numbers of votes, and not upon its secrecy, which, as a general rule, does not exist in America. It is now, to my great regret, going to be tried in the United Kingdom; for, having been proposed by Mr Gladstone's Government, it is sure to be carried before long.⁹ Voting by putting tickets into a box is a very good method, provided that each voter signs his ticket with his name. But in England the object in view is to conceal the name; and though the voters can scarcely, by any change, be made to feel less moral responsibility for their votes than a great proportion of them do now, I believe that the secrecy of the vote will tend very much to prevent the growth of a feeling of moral responsibility in time to come, while it will shield from all discredit the man who votes contrary to his known or professed opinions. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Hon. Rowland G. Hazard

1556.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Avignon

May 24. 1870

Dear Chadwick

I do not think there is much that I could do with the leaders of the working classes by means of your Resolutions.² The Resolutions go into details on which they might conflict with the line already taken up by the working classes at their public meetings, especially in the limitation applied to the compulsory principle, and possibly in the constitution you propose for the school committees. The point which it is really of importance to impress on the working classes is the necessity of a skilled central initiative instead of leaving the initiation of measures to local boards: and on this I do not think the working classes likely to be unwilling listeners. It does not seem to me that they have anti-centralisation prejudices: it is the lower middle class, who are accustomed to get local management into their hands, that are unwilling to share power with a central authority. I think you should put yourself directly in communication with the leaders of the working men. It is your working so much through others that prevents you from having the personal weight and importance you ought to have. People really do not know how many of the most important practical

ideas afloat originated with you. The only leaders of the working classes whom I know personally (except very slightly) are Odger, Cremer, and Howell. The last two I know best, and I think you would find them capable of understanding and appreciating you. If you could make an impression on them, or on Odger or Applegarth,³ they would be good advisers as to the best mode of bringing your ideas before the working classes of London and the provinces—I am

Dear Chadwick
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1557.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

A[vignon]

May 24. 1870

Mon Cher D'Eichthal—

Le discours de M. Basiadis² est vraiment très remarquable dans le rapport de la langue. C'est l'ancien grec dans la pureté de ses formes grammaticales, et ce qu'on y remarque de modification dans le vocabulaire et dans la tournure d'expression n'est que celle qu'éprouve toute langue vivante dans le cours des siècles. On voit cette modification avec plaisir, car l'affectation d'écrire en tout comme écrivaient les anciens entrainerait à ne se permettre d'autres pensées que les leurs. Pour moi je suis d'avis que le Latin de Bacon et de Descartes est à beaucoup d'égards un grand progrès sur celui de Cicéron. Des penseurs comme eux, s'ils eussent existé du temps des Césars auraient certainement agrandi et enrichi le Latin classique; et quand il se trouvera en Grèce un homme du génie de Platon ou d'Aristotle il fera faire à la langue Grecque des progrès pareils à ceux que ces philosophes lui feront faire.

Ceci entre parfaitement dans les idées de vos "Observations"³ où j'ai reconnu une grande justesse de pensée, jointe à des détails historiques très intéressants. Je vous trouve parfaitement dans le vrai quant au genre de réforme à faire dans la langue vulgaire. J'ai remarqué par parenthèse deux *errata*, à la page 118, ligne 12 l'imprimeur a mis "matérielle" au lieu d' "intellectuelle," et à la page 140 ligne 2 on lit "le siècle de Péricles" là où vous avez dû écrire "le siècle de Philippe."

Je vous remercie bien des explications que vous m'avez données sur votre prédiction politique.⁴ Maintenant que je la comprends mieux, j'en reconnais aisément la justesse. J'avais d'abord crû que vous vous attendiez à un dénouement républicain beaucoup plus prompt. Je crois avec vous que le progrès de l'opinion est dans le sens des convictions républicaines, et cela dans une forme plus élevée et plus profonde que

tout ce qu'on entendait par ce mot du temps de notre jeunesse. Vous avez assisté au berceau de ces nouveaux éléments par votre participation au mouvement Saint Simonien et ma lettre de 1831⁵ montre que dès lors j'ai pleinement reconnu l'importance européenne de ce mouvement. Mais l'opinion ne peut être assez forte pour prévaloir sur les obstacles que lorsqu'elle sera devenue assez générale pour gagner l'armée. Tant qu'il y aura 7 millions d'ignorants pour voter des plébiscites de confiance et 1 million d'hommes armés prêts à obéir aux ordres de leur chefs, il me semble que nous sommes encore très éloignés du but que sans doute on finira par atteindre.

Je ne connais pas personnellement M. Mundella⁶ mais je vous envoie une lettre adressée à M. Hughes,⁷ membre de la Chambre des Communes, qui a pris une part très active dans le mouvement coopératif depuis son commencement, ainsi que dans la question des Trade Unions et qui pourra faire connaître à M. votre fils non seulement M. Mundella mais la plupart de ceux qui ont joué un rôle utile dans ces questions, y compris les chefs les plus intelligents des associations ouvrières. M. Hughes a été membre de la Commission nommée pour étudier la question des Trade Unions et il y a voté avec la minorité dont le support à mon avis était le seul bon.

1558.

TO CHARLES LE HARDY DE BEAULIEU¹

A[vignon]

May 24, 1870

Monsieur—

C'est avec un plaisir extrême que j'ai reçu d'un homme de votre mérite, et d'une position si éminente parmi les intelligences les plus éclairées d'un pays qui a mes vives sympathies une adhésion si complète aux doctrines de mon petit livre "L'Assujétissement des Femmes." Savoir qu'un esprit comme le votre était gagné d'avance à cette juste cause, est assurément l'un des plus précieux parmi les nombreux encouragements qui me sont venus de la plupart des pays civilisés. Le progrès immense des principes de la véritable justice politique et sociale en assure l'application à la plus importante et la plus intime des relations humaines, à une époque qui, comparée à ce qu'on pouvait espérer il y a seulement dix ans peut passer pour prochaine.

Je suis très sensible, Monsieur, aux expressions sympathiques de votre lettre et à l'offre que vous voulez bien faire de me proposer comme membre correspondant de la Société des Sciences, des arts, et des lettres du Hainaut.² J'accepte cette offre avec reconnaissance et je me sentirai très honoré d'entrer dans la Société sous vos auspices comme l'un de ses membres correspondants.

1559.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

May 28. 1870

Dear Sir Charles

It seems to me that the position of the Women's Suffrage question is immensely improved by what has taken place in Parliament.² You yourself a few weeks ago could not count as many as 100 members of parliament who were known to be in our favour, & there are now, including pairs and absentees, 184, considerably above a fourth part of the House; of whom 29 voted in the second who had not voted in the first division. The amount even of Tory support was most promising, including some of the most prominent members of the party below Cabinet rank, and among others both the whips. We knew that we had not a majority in the House, and that when the thing looked serious, our enemies were sure to rally and outvote us unless the Government took up the cause, which the time had certainly not come for expecting. The rally is the first proof we have had that the thing is felt to be serious. I am in great spirits about our prospects, and think we are almost within as many years of victory as I formerly thought decades.³

But I think it would be a great mistake to merge the women's question in that of universal suffrage. Women's suffrage has quite enemies enough, without adding to the number all the enemies of universal suffrage. To combine the two questions would practically suspend the fight for women's equality, since universal suffrage is sure to be discussed almost solely as a working men's question: and when at last victory comes, there is sure to be a compromise, by which the working men would be enfranchised without the women, and the contest for women's rights would have to be begun again from the beginning, with the working men inside the barrier instead of outside, and therefore with their selfish interests against our cause instead of with it. Thus women's enfranchisement would be thrown back for a whole generation, for universal suffrage is not likely to be obtained in less time than that; and at the end of the generation we should start again in a more disadvantageous position than we are in at present.

Want of time, and other causes, make it impossible for me to undertake the essay requested for the new Cobden Club volume.⁴

I hear from Mr Pratt of Bombay,⁵ that you have been looking into his case. I know nothing of it or of him but what I have heard from himself, but there is great appearance of his being an injured man; for, the government having acknowledged him to be substantially in the right, by abolishing the abuse he pointed out, the only ground on which they can have furnished him with any pretence of reason is that there was something in the manner of doing what he did, which was inconsistent with

official subordination, and on that, if, as he affirms, the late Governor Sir Bartle Frere⁶ thinks him perfectly in the right, I would back Frere's opinion at any odds against that of the Tory underling, Fitzgerald.⁷ He seems also to have a prima facie case of at least favoritism against Fitzgerald with reference to the Bombay firm whom he attacked. Do you not think that it is altogether a case which requires that a question or questions should be asked in Parliament? any further steps to be dependent on the kind of answer received? I am

Dear Sir Charles
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1560.

TO THOMAS HARE¹

Avignon

May 29. 1870

Dear Mr Hare

My friendly correspondent Mr Barnard of Boston has sent me the enclosed cutting, which, if Mr Ware² has not already sent it to you, you will be glad to see.

Have you seen the article by Mr Eugène Aubry-Vitet, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of May 15, entitled "Le Suffrage Universel dans l'Avenir et le Droit de Représentation des Minorités"?³ It is a most intelligent and thorough advocacy of your system, of which it will spread the knowledge and appreciation through France and Europe in a very effective manner. There is only one point on which he stops short of you. Thinking it vain to hope that electors will fill up intelligently, or fill up at all, a list equal to the entire number of the House, he would divide the country into large districts, and hold a separate election for each, the voter only putting down as many names as the district returns members. But he has a supplementary proposal which would give to this plan a great part of the advantages of yours. Whenever a district cannot make up the quota for its full number of deputies, then, instead of supplying the remainder by a simple majority of votes, all the voting papers which have not served for a return are to be sent to a central office, to have the quota made up whenever possible from the similar voting papers of the whole country. Now these voting papers would be chiefly those of the electors who had voted for national in preference to local names; so that persons of known merit, but without local influence, would have facilities for being elected, approaching to those which your system would give them.

I should much like to know what you think of this plan, both in itself and as an intermediate step.

A time seems to be coming in France, when improvements tending to correct the defects in the machinery of universal suffrage, without impairing, but on the contrary giving for the first time real effect to its principle, will have more chance than heretofore of a favourable hearing from the friends of universal suffrage; in order to take away weapons from the Orleanist and bourgeois party, who are thought to be making plans for indirectly reducing universal suffrage to a nullity.

What immense progress the cause of Women's Suffrage has made since 1867:⁴ the number of votes rendered for it at one or other of the divisions 162, double the number of three years ago; making up with the known adherents who were absent, more than a fourth of the house: and including both Liberal and Tory names which were little expected. And the bill was only thrown out by a rally of its enemies in force, shewing that, for the first time, they felt it to be a serious matter; which it must be our business that they shall never hereafter cease to feel it. We may count among our gains, the tone of exasperation which has succeeded to that of mockery in the Saturday Review, Pall Mall Gazette, &c. which is at once a sign that they feel us to be getting on, and a help, by the resentment which their insolence rouses in women. As soon as a sufficient number of women can be sufficiently roused, success is certain. I am

Dear Mr Hare
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1561.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

June 3. 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I think it ought to be the aim of our endeavours, to accelerate the period when male voters *will* vote against a member for refusing the franchise to women. In proportion as we succeed in inducing women to desire the suffrage, we shall gain the electoral votes of an increasing number of their husbands & fathers; and a small fraction of the constituency making any particular point a condition of their support, often compels the candidate to subscribe to it. Between now and the next general election a great deal may be achieved in this way. But there is still more to be hoped from the progress of conviction in the minds of members of parliament. It is not the pressure of

constituencies which has doubled the number of our parliamentary supporters since 1867. Is there not something marvellous in so great a progress? It is an important fact to know that Noel² & Col. Taylor³ voted for the Bill avowedly on party grounds. With the opinion of the whips and (we may be sure) of the leader of the party, that it is a good party move, we may count positively upon very soon gaining quite as many votes by "party hope" on that side as we lose by party fear on the other. And it is very encouraging to hear that in addition to the liberals who have voted or paired for us in spite of party fear, there are many more who would do the same if that disturbing consideration were absent. It shews what strong ground there is for hope from our continuing to act, with all the force we can command, upon the general mind of the country. Moreover, we have often found that the very Liberals who express the strongest fears for the Liberal party if women had votes, and ground their refusal to join in our agitation upon this fear, seem suddenly to lose it altogether when from some cause or other they begin really to wish that women had votes. In fact, this fear for the Liberal party is accordingly apt to be the last subterfuge in which men entrench themselves who have too much liberal principle and too much perception of logic to be able to take up any other, but who at the bottom of their hearts do not like the equality between men and women. Every year diminishes the dread and dislike of this equality among just such men; and in the same proportion diminishes their fears for the interest of the Liberal party. I am

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1562.

TO HERBERT SPENCER¹

Avignon

June 3, 1870

Dear Sir:

In a Commission of Inquiry, the having already formed an opinion on the subject ought not to be a disqualification since the object is to appoint, not judges, but persons who are capable of extracting the evidence, for others to judge of. I don't, however, feel that I should be warranted in tendering to Mr. Gladstone, unasked, a recommendation as to the persons of whom he should compose his Commission.² I am,

Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1563.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

June 8, 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I do not conceive that those who think as we do can support any proposal which would tax Catholics, Jews, and Secularists for religious teaching which (though it might be undenominational as regards the different divisions of Protestant Christians) would be such as they would not consent to have given to their own children. I see no mode in which the plan of the Dissenters, taken up by Vernon Harcourt,² could be supported by us, unless provision were made that Catholics, Jews and Secularists on declaring themselves such, should be excused a part of the school rate. If this is not done, probably the best course for those who think as we do would be not to vote at all on Vernon Harcourt's Resolution. It would not do to vote against it, because that would be giving the preference to the Government plan, which is worse.

When the time comes for succeeding in a proposal to leave religious teaching altogether to the voluntary principle, I think the different religious denominations should be left to organize the teaching as they please. It is not likely they would leave the expense to be defrayed exclusively by the parents of the children. It would be a point both of honour and of interest with every denomination, to raise a fund for the payment of religious instructors for as many of the children as would accept such instruction at their hands. The churches and sects, being relieved from voluntary subscriptions for secular instruction will have the whole amount available for religious, for the sake of which chiefly it is that many of their number subscribe for education at all. I am

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1564.

TO COL. THOMAS ALEXANDER COWPER¹

A[vignon]

June 16. 1870

My Dear Cowper—

I have received your three letters but (owing to my absence from England) not your pamphlet,² & I shall not now see it until my return, which will be in the beginning of next month. From what I already know of the case,³ I am convinced that justice requires the Government to take upon itself the responsibility of culpable not to say criminal mismanagement which could not have taken place except through the connivance or guilty negligence of the Government directors & which by placing those directors on the Board the government pledges its integrity to prevent. I am therefore most desirous to give you all the help I can. When I have read your statement I shall be better able than I am to judge in what manner this can best be done.

I think it will be quite right that you should send copies of the pamphlet to Mr Gladstone & the D. of Argyll accompanied by a short letter & the draft you sent me is very good, but I think you might advantageously throw down into the letter something of what of course predominates in the pamphlet, a direct appeal to their sense of justice.

I am truly sorry to hear that in addition to your heavy losses by the Bombay Bank you are a sufferer by another insolvent company. Our commercial law even after its recent amendments is still deplorably lenient to the grave offence of dishonest bankruptcy.

1565.

TO SISSON C. NORRIS¹

[Before June 20, 1870]

. . . The oversight which you point out has been brought to my notice by other correspondents, though it seems, curiously enough, to have escaped the notice both of friends and of opponents until after the publication of the last edition.² . . . The necessary correction will be made in revising the book for a future edition. . . .

1566.

TO GEORGE ADCROFT¹

A[vignon]

June 21, 1870

Dear Sir—

I have read your little tract with interest but I perceive that you have either published or intend to publish another pamphlet containing the remedies you propose for the evils you so justly denounce. In the meantime I will only say that I think you underrate the power of Trade Unions to raise wages; & that I differ from you when you say that a general rise of wages would be of no use to the working classes because it would produce a general rise of prices. A general rise of prices, of anything like a permanent character, can only take place through a general increase of the money incomes of the purchasing community. Now a general rise of wages would not increase the aggregate money incomes, nor consequently the aggregate purchasing power of the community; it would only transfer part of that purchasing power from the employers to the labourers. Consequently a general rise of wages would not raise prices but would be taken out of the profits of the employers; always supposing that those profits were sufficient to bear the reduction.

The case is different with a rise of wages confined to a single, or a small number of employments. That rise if taken out of profits, would place a particular class of employers at a disadvantage compared with other employers: & as soon as they ceased to hope that the loss would be only temporary, they would withdraw part of their capital, or at all events, all new capital would avoid those trades & go into others. Consequently the supply of these particular articles would fall short, & their prices would rise so as to indemnify the employers for the rise of wages. But this would not happen in case of a rise of all wages, for as all capitalists would be affected nearly alike they could not as a body relieve themselves by turning their capital into another employment.

1567.

TO CHARLES LE HARDY DE BEAULIEU¹

A[vignon]

Jun 21. 1870

Monsieur—

Le mot respect n'a pas en Anglais la signification que d'après votre lettre il paraît avoir en français. C'est un mot qui exprime particulièrement la considération pour les qualités morales, et qui s'emploie entre égaux autant qu'entre supérieur et inférieur. Par une des bizarreries que l'accident engendre souvent dans les langues, cette différence d'usage est l'inverse de celle qui a lieu à l'égard du mot "respectable", mot qui a en français un sens moral, tandis qu'en anglais vulgaire il n'exprime guère qu'une certaine position sociale. Vous m'avez rendu un service en m'avertissant de la nuance en question qui, si je l'avais connue plutôt m'eût souvent permis d'éviter un manque d'usage.

Quant à la question du travail des enfants, l'opinion générale comme celle des hommes éclairés en Angleterre se prononce de plus en plus pour la limitation légale, accompagnée du système *half-time*.² On étend cette législation de plus en plus, en sorte qu'elle s'applique maintenant à presque toutes les industries qui ne sont pas purement domestiques, sauf l'agriculture qui jusqu'ici fait exception. L'expérience a prouvé que la loi peut seule faire face à l'intérêt combiné des fabricants et des pères des enfants à exploiter le travail de ces infortunés aux dépens de leur éducation et même de leur développement physique, et cette expérience a graduellement prévalu sur les idées de liberté individuelle. En effet, la liberté individuelle n'est sacrée que dans ce qui ne regarde, au moins directement, que l'individu, et ne peut être invoqué pour l'exercice illimité d'un pouvoir quelconque sur les autres, dont les abus sont toujours dans le domaine légitime des lois. Cependant je suis tout à fait d'accord avec vous en ce qui regarde le travail des femmes, qu'en Angleterre on a soumis à quelques-unes des mêmes restrictions légales que celui des enfants. Vous savez combien je condamne les iniquités de la position actuelle des femmes dans la famille et dans la société, mais cette habitude de les traiter comme des enfants me semble contraire à leur dignité et à leur véritable intérêt. Je voudrais qu'en les protégeant beaucoup mieux qu'à présent contre les abus de la force physique, on les reconnût comme moralement capables de se conduire et de s'engager par elles-mêmes, et qu'on ne fit aucune différence quant à la liberté des contrats, entre elles et les hommes.

S'il vous serait agréable de posséder les dernières enquêtes parlementaires sur le travail des enfants j'aurai grand plaisir à les procurer et à vous les envoyer après mon retour en Angleterre qui aura lieu dans le commencement de juillet. Je vous serais de mon côté très reconnaissant de tout renseignement sur le succès du système *half time* en Belgique, système qui en Angleterre rencontre encore quelque opposition.

Je regrette que vous soyez du nombre considérable des hommes distingués dans les lettres ou dans les sciences qui dans notre siècle comme en d'autres ont été privés de la vue.³ Cette privation vous est commune avec mon ami M. Fawcett qui de tous nos hommes publics d'aujourd'hui, s'est le plus occupé de cette question du travail des enfants. Comme vous il se soutient noblement contre ce découragement; il ne se relâche en rien dans les travaux qu'il s'était proposés comme l'occupation de sa vie et dans lesquels il promet à sa patrie une carrière aussi utile que distinguée.

1568.

TO COL. THOMAS ALEXANDER COWPER¹

A[vignon]

June 26, 1870

My Dear Cowper—

I knew before reading your pamphlet² that the Bombay Government, having by the Constitution of the Bank the appointment [of] three of the nine directors, was morally responsible, not necessarily for the strict prudence of all the Bank's transactions, but at all events for their not being in violation of the admitted & generally practised rules of safe & legitimate banking. I knew also that those rules had, by the directors of the Bank, been flagrantly & systematically violated. But even after all I had read, my idea of their misconduct fell short of what it is shown to have been by your detailed history of their proceedings, & the many years during which I knew, studied, & profited by the work you did for the Bombay Govt. have taught me to repose great confidence in any statements of yours, which moreover in the present case rest upon, & can be easily collated with, the report of a Government Commission.³

It is hardly possible for abuse of trust to be carried to a greater pitch in the forms of banking than it was by the managers of the Bombay Bank, when, to omit many other disgraceful facts, nearly half the capital of the Bank passed, on nominal security, into the hands of a speculator⁴ who was himself one of the directors, or into those of friends recommended by him, generally for the purpose of puffing up his own special actions; when the Secretary, Mr. Blair,⁵ who was allowed to lavish the funds of the Bank without check or control, received large pecuniary favours from this person; and when two even of the Govt. directors, one of whom was long President of the Bank,⁶ realised large sums by the sale of allotments which they received from speculative companies to whom loans were made by the Bank: the case was certainly one which, in a good system of commercial law, would come within the definition of criminal bankruptcy, and if justice were done, the chief culprits would be expiating their guilt by fine & imprisonment. Now I find that the Government, through the whole course of the Bank's misconduct, were as utterly regardless of their obligation to watch & control its management as if no such obligation had existed. They gave no instructions to the Govt Directors. They allowed the Bank to be carried on under the new charter without even any by-laws to govern & direct its management. And they neither obtained nor sought from their representatives on the Board any information respecting its proceedings. The great pressure of public business on an Indian Govt might be some, though a very insufficient excuse for this quiescence as long as there was nothing to excite suspicion. But the quiescence continued after the mismanagement & embarrassments of the Bank were so notorious even in England as to alarm the Secretary of State, who felt it his duty to warn the Bombay Govt. After this the conduct of the Govt. was if anything more discreditable than before. Their unwillingness to admit that anything was seriously amiss almost amounted to

complicity. To the warnings & questionings which they now frequently received from their superiors in England & at Calcutta, they answered smooth things, extenuating to the utmost the amount of mischief, abetting the directors in withholding information demanded of them, & acting as if it were their deliberate purpose to screen the misconduct of the Bank, though probably only desirous of screening their own neglect of the duty of supervision. It is shown that had the Bombay Govt., even after they had become aware of the evil, done their duty in preventing further malversation, the Bank notwithstanding the great losses already sustained might have been saved from insolvency, & the property of the shareholders might have been in great part preserved to them. By not having done this, even if by nothing else, the Bombay Govt. made itself morally a party to the misconduct of the Directors & responsible for it to the sufferers.

It may be said that the majority of the Directors, including those most certainly guilty, were elected by the shareholders. But considering the extreme difficulty under which the shareholders labour, as well in England as in India, in choosing trustworthy directors or in controlling them, it is certain that the shareholders placed (as they had every reason to think themselves warranted in placing) their principal reliance on the Govt; whose representatives on the Board, themselves high in the public service, must if they did their duty to Gov^t even as the largest shareholder in the Bank, take care that its interests in common with those of the other shareholders, sh^d receive ordinary & decent regard from those to whose charge they were entrusted. The shareholders would have had no claim to indemnity from the Gov^t for ordinary losses, or for such as were occasioned by irresistible circumstances, or even by ordinary & venial mismanagement. But they have a just claim in *foro conscientiae* to reparation from the Govt for loss sustained by gross and criminal violation of duty on the part of its agents. An able speaker in the H. of C. who was master of the facts could make a speech on them which would resound through the whole country & which would be damaging to any Govt that resisted the claim.

You are at liberty to make use of this opinion of mine in any quarter in which you think it would be of service. If it goes to Mr Gladstone or the D. of Argyll, I would rather it sh^d be as an enclosure in your letter than directly from myself. But though I think well of the intentions of both those ministers, I think them sufficiently like ministers in general to be much more certainly influenced through the press than by any representation addressed to themselves. I could put your pamphlet into the hands of the editors of several newspapers & could probably induce them to pay some attention to the subject. How far they might be willing to proceed in what might be opposition to the Gov^t I cannot tell.

There are several courses to choose from, & it is for you to consider which of them you prefer. One is to defer any appeal to Parl^t or the public until it is certain that your application to the authorities is unsuccessful. Another is to endeavour to get a motion made in the H. of C. And if this be determined on, the question occurs whether it sh^d be done in the present session, or early in the next, the public mind being in the meantime acted on as much as possible through the press. If you decide for this session, I will when I return to E. which will be in about a fortnight, consult with my parliamentary friends & try to find some one in the House willing to take up the

subject & capable of doing it with effect. There sh^d if possible be simultaneously an organisation through the press & any influence I have with editors I will most gladly make use of but as I have said I do not know how far it is likely to be effectual.

As I leave Avignon very shortly, please direct your answer to Blackheath Park, Kent.

1569.

TO CHARLES ELIOT NORTON¹

Avignon

June 26, 1870

Dear Sir

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of June 17. I agree in the main, with all that you say respecting the limitation of the right of property even in moveable wealth.² I never meant to say that this right should be altogether unlimited, nor to ascribe to it sacredness in any other sense than that all the necessary conditions of human happiness are sacred. I do not, indeed, quite agree with your friend Mr Wright,³ when, in the passage quoted and concurred in by you, he seems to say that, from the utilitarian point of view, the right of private ownership is founded *solely* on the motives it affords to the increase of public wealth; because independently of those motives, the feeling of security of possession and enjoyment, which could not (in the state of advancement mankind have yet reached) be had without private ownership, is of the very greatest importance as an element of human happiness. But this is probably a difference rather in expression than in opinion between us.

There is, however, this great practical difference between the case of moveable wealth and that of land, that, so long as land is allowed to be private property (and I cannot regard its private appropriation as a permanent institution) society seems to me bound to provide that the proprietor shall only make such uses of it as shall not essentially interfere with its utility to the public: while, in the case of capital, and moveable property generally, though society has the same right, yet the interests of society would in general be better consulted by laws restrictive of the acquisition of too great masses of property, than by attempting to regulate its use. I have, in my Political Economy, proposed limitations of the right of ownership, so far as the power of bequest is part of it, on the express ground of its being injurious to society that enormous fortunes should be possessed by gift or inheritance.⁴

My daughter and I are greatly obliged to you and Mrs Norton for your kind invitation.⁵ It would be a real pleasure to us both to avail ourselves of it. But we have been calculating lately whether we can afford to allow ourselves, this summer and autumn, a holiday of ten days or only of four, and such are the calls on our time and the quantity of work we have to do that we have been compelled to decide for the shorter of the two.

The announcement that I was to be at a meeting in London on the 15th of this month was quite unauthorized.⁶ The request did not even reach me till after the meeting had taken place. We leave here in a few days, and shall be at Blackheath (where please direct) in the second week of July for the remainder of the summer.

The death of Dickens⁷ is indeed like a personal loss, even to those who knew him only by his writings. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

C. Eliot Norton Esq.

1570.

TO ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE¹

[Early July, 1870]

I hope that you will be able to attend,² and that you will propose, as an addition to the programme, the important point which you suggested in your letter to me, viz., the right of the State to take possession (with a view to their preservation) of all natural objects or artificial constructions which are of historical or artistic interest. If you will propose this I will support it, and I think there will be no difficulty in getting it put into the programme, where undoubtedly I think it ought to be.³

1571.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 8, 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

We hope to be able to be at the Club² meeting on the 24th, and any place of meeting is equally convenient to us.

I am sorry that an engagement will prevent us from being at the Club next Sunday.

The programme was adopted at the meeting today³ in all its parts, with an additional article moved by Mr Wallace (of the “Malay Archipelago”) for taking possession by the State of all natural objects or artificial constructions of historical or artistic interest.⁴

At the request of several members, the provision for allowing landowners to give up their land to the State at the market price was incorporated with article 4. One of the most recalcitrant opponents of the article, Mr Neville,⁵ hereupon gave in, and remains with us; and I think he will be valuable. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1572.

TO CHARLES KINGSLEY¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 9. 1870

My Dear Sir

I am greatly obliged to you for your letter, with the greater part of which I fully sympathize. Most especially do I concur in what you say about confining the movement as far as possible to women domestic in their tastes and habits, who have fulfilled their own duties in an exemplary manner; and also to women of good education and breeding, not lovers of fuss or notoriety. Unhappily the success we have attained attracts, like all other success, the sort of people who are always seeking to turn a penny or push themselves into notoriety. The very success which has brought home the knowledge that there are such opinions as ours to a sufficient number of households to influence the country, brings with it unhappily in its train the crowd of vulgar selfseekers. But however quiet the means we take for bringing opinion round to us, we cannot escape this hateful train of pushing and vulgar, except by escaping success. The very day and hour that it begins to be felt there are many who agree with us, the selfseekers will thrust themselves in, whether it be sooner or whether it be later. They are the signs of prosperity, and its curses, which we cannot escape. The question therefore, appears to me to be—Cannot we associate the cause with quiet, upright, and ladylike women, *as well* as with vulgar, questionable, and pushing ones? I am aware that nothing but a strong sense of duty will induce such women to expose themselves to be, even by mistake, associated with the others. But should we do well to leave the others as the sole public representatives of our cause? which will be the consequence if all the quiet and self-respecting women remain hidden in their own

homes. This was a cause of great anxiety with us last winter. We knew that M^{rs} Taylor would have lady speakers, if possible, at the London meeting,² and we knew that if we could not find ladies who would do what we thought credit to the cause M^{rs} Taylor would be thrown back upon those friends of the cause, of whom there are plenty, who have more energy than discretion. Now it has been our constant effort to keep the London Committee free from association with pushing people; and we feel that your influence will be of great use in helping this, weighing heavily on the side of discretion and reserve. Unfortunately, too many of those whose influence will be of use on this side, instead of joining in the work, and throwing their influence on the right side, are apt pusillanimously to withhold themselves altogether. Yet this is, in a manner, a monastic view of public affairs. If all the highminded shrink into the congenial privacy of their own homes (as in the middle ages into a convent) they leave none but the vulgar minded to occupy the public eye, and produce an effect upon the world at large. We must remember that there are vast numbers in the country, to whom the papers and public agitation are the only openings for obtaining knowledge of what other people are thinking. People of small means, who have little or no social intercourse, and who cannot afford to buy or borrow many books, yet see a penny paper, and hear of public meetings in their own neighbourhood. It would take many generations to touch these, solely through private intercourse. Yet this class of people are worthy and excellent, deserve as much attention as the higher classes, and by their numbers are fully as influential on the course of politics. Indeed, for a long time past, it has been they who have forced new ideas upon the upper classes, not the upper classes upon them. And yet, to work upon them, it is necessary to condescend to the vulgar instruments of the press and public agitation. M^{rs} Taylor, in all her action, mainly regards these: and we cannot say that we think her altogether wrong: but we should like to see a course of conduct struck out which might be suitable to all classes of society, and we think that with sufficient care and thought it might be done. If we regarded only the upper classes, it would be well to work only by social means: if we regarded only the lower and lower middle, almost any means of publicity would be useful. Is it quite impossible to strike a reasonable balance between the two? This is a question which we should like much to discuss with you.

I cannot agree in considering the result of the division in the House of Commons this session as a check.³ Of course it was called so by opponents; if only to conceal the enormous progress it really shewed us to have made. I cannot conceive that the measure ever could have passed this year (or that it can pass for many years to come): but I had not imagined that 150 members of the House of Commons were prepared to vote for it, as they did. This year's division has shewn that the measure has nearly doubled its supporters in the House of Commons in the last three years. I am not sanguine enough to hope that we can receive many more such "checks"; if we could, within nine years, by a very simple process of arithmetic, we should have the measure passed by unanimity through the House of Commons, and then we might defy the Lords! Surely, on due reflection, this cannot be fairly called a check.

As regards the other movement⁴ which has lately sprung up, to which you allude, there is no doubt that it has greatly intensified the bitterness of one or two writers in the press (who might be easily named) who however, at the best, were always vehement opponents of any emancipation of women. Those gentlemen are now really

angry, because in this particular movement they see women's point of view producing practical results upon the elections.⁵ Hence they are really frightened; but we should have had them just as bitter against the suffrage whenever that also was a sufficiently popular cry to influence the elections: and of course you and I hope it may be that, some day. I do not think that the majority of women who have interested themselves in this unpleasant matter are influenced by any of the base motive you seem to attribute to some of them. I believe that there has seldom been a movement of purer chivalry than this among respectable women who are exposing themselves to almost intolerable insult, wholly from the goadings of their conscience, and their belief that they are responsible if they do nothing for the horrible degradation of fellow-women. So far as I have seen, it has been this feeling, that the connivance of virtuous women alone makes it possible for so-called decent men to call into existence the "profession" which is in question—it is this feeling which has made the strength of this particular movement among women. Of course, there may be exceptions; but it so happens that all women whom I know of, concerned in the matter, are middle aged, and most of them mothers of families: and this movement also has convinced large numbers of people (including Mr Maurice, and Miss Carpenter) that women ought to have the suffrage.

I should be very glad to have an occasion for talking over these matters with you, and my daughter wrote in April last to M^{rs} Kingsley, asking her whether there was any chance of our seeing you and her at Blackheath this year, either in the month of July or August. My daughter's letter was addressed to Eversley, and we suppose M^{rs} Kingsley has not received it.⁶

With our best regards to Mrs Kingsley I am, my dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Rev. Canon Kingsley.

1873.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 11. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

I find that the only days we shall be engaged this week are Friday and Saturday.

I shall be very glad to see you if you like to come in any day, either morning or evening. From 2 to 5 P.M. I am usually out.

I Am
Dear Mr Cairnes
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1574.

TO JOHN MORLEY [1](#)

July 11, 1870

Dear Mr Morley

Friday will suit us very well, and we shall be glad to see you then. We usually dine at five on week days as well as Sundays, but can defer it to a later time if you cannot be conveniently down here so soon.

My daughter sends her article [2](#) by this post. She would be glad to have a proof. I am

Dear Mr Morley
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1575.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE [1](#)

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 12. 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I shall be very happy to bring the subject of English land reform before the Club [2](#) on the 31st, if you think it would make a good discussion. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1576.

TO ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 12 [1870]

Dear Sir

Did you leave a copy of Mr Herbert Spencer's book on Education² here? If so, I will return it to you. But if the copy we have found is not yours, do not trouble yourself to write as I shall take not hearing from you as a sign that the ownership is to be looked for elsewhere. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

A.R. Wallace Esq

1577.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 19. 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Miss Taylor and myself propose to be present at the meeting of the Club² on the 31st, but have not decided at what time we go, or in what way. Most probably however we shall drive over from Ramsgate on the Sunday. I suppose in that case there will be no difficulty in getting rooms in the Hotel for Sunday night. I am

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1578.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 20. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

I think you should by all means publish the note.² There is a slight obscurity in one part of it, which, on examination, I think depends on a single pronoun. You say "According to Comte (as will be seen by reference to the passage just quoted) the reason for *this* is" &c. It is not clear what is the antecedent to "this". I presume "the reason for this" means the reason why the organic world must be studied in the ensemble. But it reads as if it meant the reason why every organism is an ensemble.

In consequence of letters which came last night, I shall be engaged on Friday from 12 to 1 and on Saturday the greater part of the forenoon. But I am disengaged on Friday either at 1 or at 2. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes

[Signature has been cut off.]

1579.

TO PAULINA WRIGHT DAVIS¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

July 22d, 1870

Dear Madam:

It gives me the greatest pleasure to know that the service rendered by my dear wife to the cause which was nearer her heart than any other, by her essay in the *Westminster Review*,² has had so much effect, and is so justly appreciated in the United States.

Were it possible in a memoir to have the formation and growth of a mind like hers portrayed, to do so would be as valuable a benefit to mankind as was ever conferred by a biography.

But such a psychological history is seldom possible, and in her case the materials for it do not exist. All that could be furnished is her birth-place, parentage, and a few dates! and it seems to me that her memory is more honored by the absence of any attempt at a biographical notice, than by the presence of a most meagre one.

What she was I have attempted, though most inadequately, to delineate in the remarks prefaced to her Essay, as reprinted with my "Dissertations and Discussions."

I am very glad to hear of the step in advance made by the Rhode Island Legislature in constituting a board of women for some very important administrative purposes. Your intended proposal that women should be impaneled on every jury where women are to be tried seems to me very good, and calculated to place the injustice to which women are subjected at present, by the entire legal system, in a very striking light.

I am, dear madam, yours very sincerely,

J. S. Mill

Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis

1580.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 22. 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Any plan that suits the other members² will suit me perfectly. And as I and my daughter are accustomed to travelling, we should not mind if rooms cannot be found for us: only, in that case, I should wish to know beforehand, so that I may get some kind of conveyance to take us to and from the nearest convenient sleeping place, or home. As far as we are concerned, if the meeting were at Broadstairs, Ramsgate would have suited us quite as well as the Albion. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1581.

TO JOHN BOYD KINNEAR¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 22, 1870

My Dear Mr Kinnear—

Though I regret very much that you do not sufficiently agree with the articles of the new Programme,² to feel justified in remaining a member of the Association, it is not without deliberate consideration that I have concurred in a course of policy for the Assⁿ which we knew would prevent many persons whose support would have been valuable from joining it. We had to choose, however, between losing their adhesion, & depriving ourselves of all support whatever from the working classes: & we might still hope that those who had accepted our first programme would cooperate with us from without on the important points on which they agree with us, while as an Association we sh^d have no power of usefulness whatever unless we could enlist in our support the most intelligent part of the working classes; who are very generally adopting as their creed the entire resumption of the land from private hands into those of the State.³ We thought it the wisest course, therefore, instead of limiting our demands so as to obtain the greatest attainable amount of adhesion among the higher & middle classes to go as far to meet the demands of the working classes as we conscientiously could, provided that by this means we could induce them to support us & act with us; and the Conference with some of their leaders at which you were present, showed that they were willing to do so.

The provision for the purchase by the State of land in the market, would be chiefly applicable to neighbourhoods in which there are neither common lands, nor lands belonging to public bodies, sufficient to give a fair trial to small holdings & to cooperative agriculture. I quite agree with you that public bodies ought not to hold lands; but I think it quite worth trial how the State could manage landed property (which is a great part of its business in India). And of one thing I feel certain that nothing but a trial on a large scale, & for a considerable period, would convince the working classes that such a system would be unsuccessful or injurious.

The article asserting the right of the State to the “unearned increase”⁴ &c is not so worded as to imply that landowners are to be dealt hardly with in this respect. Its purpose is simply to assert the legitimacy of special taxation on land, in consideration of the special property it possesses, in a prosperous country, of continually rising in value. No doubt, as you say, this rise could not have been so great as it has been & is, had there been no improvements in agriculture, because, without those improvements, the growth of wealth & population could not have reached anything like the same extent. The improvements however arise in great part, from the improved skill, & knowledge, & exertion of the tenants, not the landlords. And, for what the landlords have done, they would be indemnified by the option allowed them (& now inserted in

the programme) of resigning their land to the State at the market price. It is probable, as you say, that the price of wheat is not now higher, proportionally to other things, than it was many years ago. But I apprehend that this is owing to foreign importation; & that nearly all other agricultural produce, especially cattle, meat, & dairy produce, have risen in an extraordinary degree.

Other property than land may, no doubt, rise in value without any exertion on the part of the owners. But I do not know of any other kind of property of any importance, which rises in value from generation to generation in every improving county by a sort of natural law, the exceptions to which are rare & only temporary. Not to mention that land being the gift of nature, & of limited quantity, a system of landed property which was just & reasonable so long as land was obtainable by all, is fairly liable to reconsideration as soon as the land has become insufficient in quantity, & has been engrossed by a small number of proprietors.

I hope your visit to the Channel islands will accelerate the restoration of your health which I was very sorry to hear stood so much in need of recruiting.

1582.

TO HENRY KEYLOCK RUSDEN¹

Blackheath Park, 22nd July 1870.

Dear Sir—

I have received and read the essays² which you did me the honour to send. I am quite of your opinion as to the usefulness, in the present stage of human improvement, of speaking out, without reserve, whatever opinions one has deliberately formed on topics important to mankind, subject, of course, to the duty of satisfying oneself by calm consideration that one knows, and has taken into account, such qualifications and counter considerations as may be necessary to make one's opinion a fair expression of the truth. I do not, however, blame a person who stops short of the complete public expression of unpopular opinions, when it would involve serious danger of the loss of his means of subsistence; for though it is often a merit, it is only in peculiar cases a duty, in any one to be a martyr for his opinions.

You are mistaken in thinking that I have purposely withheld, in my book on "The Subjection of Women", any opinions which I thought relevant to the subject.³ The purpose of that book was to maintain the claim of women, whether in marriage or out of it, to perfect equality in all rights with the male sex. The relaxation or alteration of the marriage laws, in any other respect than by taking away all vestiges of the subordination of one sex to the other, is a question quite distinct from the object to which the book is devoted, and one which, in my own opinion, cannot be properly decided until that object has been attained. It is impossible, in my opinion, that a right marriage law can be made by men alone, or until women have an equal voice in making it. You say in one of your essays that my book recommends that marriage

should be dissoluble at the will of either of the parties. Now I carefully avoided giving any opinion as to the conditions under which marriage should be dissoluble, for the very good reason that I have not formed, and do not consider either myself or any one else capable at present of forming, a well-grounded opinion on the subject. I, of course, accept your proposition that human freedom should not be interfered with, except by such precautions as are necessary to prevent injury to society; but what those precautions are, in this particular case, is precisely the question to be discussed, and it can only be determined justly or expediently by the joint experience, and with the full force and well-considered concurrence, of both sexes.

1583.

TO HIPPOLYTE TAINÉ¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 22. 1870

Monsieur—

Je me félicite de ce que vous avez bien voulu exprimer une opinion favorable de la notice que j'ai publiée de votre très remarquable ouvrage.² Je sais combien cette notice est insuffisante mais j'ai voulu, au premier moment possible, attirer l'attention des hommes éclairés sur un livre dont la publication en France me paraît destinée à faire époque. Votre livre n'a pas besoin d'être interprété. Il suffit qu'on le lise, car vous possédez parmi tant d'autres qualités, le génie de la clarté.

Quant à notre différence d'opinion, pour approfondir il faudrait entrer très à fond dans la théorie de ce qu'on peut nommer l'idéalisation d'une conception d'expérience; comme une ligne droite géométrique est l'idéalisation des lignes droites de nos sens. Cette conception idéalisée n'en est pas moins, comme vous l'admettez, un produit de l'expérience; mais vous dites qu'elle ressemble aux produits chimiques et que ses propriétés ne peuvent être connues que par l'observation directe. Je pourrais, peut-être, contester cela, et soutenir que c'est là l'une des différences entre une conception idéalisée et une conception comparée: mais même en admettant votre opinion, on peut dire que cette observation directe ne pourrait nous révéler que les propriétés du produit regardé comme conception mentale, c. à. d. des faits psychologiques, et qu'elle ne nous dit rien sur les lois générales de l'univers.

Ceci soit dit seulement pour vous mettre sur la voie que je pourrais suivre en combattant le système de [?] vous [?] deux derniers chapitres. Il ne me paraît pas essentiel, quant à présent, que cette différence d'opinion soit vidée entre nous. Les experts la jugeront et je voulus n'en dire dans ma notice que ce qu'il fallait pour attirer là-dessus leur attention.

1584.

TO E. L. BURNETT¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

July 25. 1870

Sir—

I shall feel obliged by you laying before the Assessment Committee this my appeal against the increase of the valuation of my house in Blackheath Park to £180 Gross & £150 rateable value.

The rent I pay for the house is £150 with an additional £3.17.0 for insurance. But the continual cracking of the walls owing to the settling of the house from defect in the foundations causes incessant expenses falling little if at all short of half the rent. I have been under the necessity of twice underpinning the house, & during the ten years ending with 1869 it has cost me in absolutely indispensable repairs £422.19.4 in bricklayer's bills alone, besides heavy bills of carpenters, plasterers, painters, paperhangers, plumbers & even glaziers, consequent on the unequal sinking of the house. This expenditure I can substantiate by vouchers, and the most cursory inspection of the house will shew it to be in need of much further expense of a similar nature at the present time.

A few years ago the Assessment Committee of the Lewisham Union gave me notice of their having raised the valuation of my house, but on representation from me of the continual & heavy expense of necessary repairs they reduced the rateable valuation to £100 per annum at which it has since stood & at which I hope it may be allowed to remain.

1585.

TO THE CLERK OF THE WOOLWICH ASSESSMENT
COMMITTEE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark] July 26. 1870

Sir—

Being informed by Mr Burnett² that I ought to send you notice of the appeal against the new valuation of my house in B.P. which I have sent through him to the Ass C^{tee} I beg leave to inclose a copy of the appeal.

1586.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

July 26. 1870

Dear Mr. Fawcett—

Sir Charles Dilke ended the note in which he told me of your wish to make a public demonstration on the war,² by asking me, if I disapproved of it, to write to you; and therefore I have not written to you.

I highly approve of having a demonstration, and I hope there will be many of them. For myself, I do not wish for the present to appear in any way in the matter. A time may come when it will be the duty of every one to speak out. But, while I do all I can in private, I think it best for the present, both for public and for private reasons, that my name should not appear.³ This letter therefore is confidential. In the meantime I think the points of most importance are, that the English public should know, and shew that it knows, that this war has been brought on wholly by Napoleon: that the Prussians are fighting for their own liberty and for that of Europe: that England is bound to protect Belgium, and that our utmost efforts can only, if Napoleon lives, defer war, not prevent it. Our turn must come. Therefore, that our people ought to arm at once, taking the responsibility off the Government, which is right to be prudent and silent. The Volunteers ought to be armed with the newest and best rifle by public subscription. It is not a time for talking about peace and the horrors of war when our national existence may be soon at stake. At the same time it is wrong to attribute this war to France. Neither in justice nor in prudence ought we to do so. The Germans are right in saying that it is Napoleon, and not France, they are fighting, and Napoleon, if he lives, and is successful in humbling Prussia, will attack England, the fourth of the great powers that fought at Waterloo. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Yours Very Truly

J.S.M.

1587.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath Park

July 26. 1870

Dear Mr Plummer

We are very glad to hear from you, and to know that you are going on prosperously. I do not recognize your hand in the two numbers of the Figaro,[2](#) but I am glad that it may be seen in the Nonconformist.[3](#)

With our kind remembrances to Mrs Plummer, I am

Dear Mr Plummer

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1588.

TO ALEXANDER BAIN[1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 4, 1870

Dear Bain—

I am much obliged to you for your letter which though it does not remove my difficulties affords material which may perhaps help me towards resolving them.[2](#)

How do we know that any energy has ever been expended in “separating the masses to the distance at which they begin to gravitate towards each other”? The new theory of the universe in relation to Force shews the same tendency from all past time to draw the masses nearer to one another instead of separating them, to which it is supposed that the present order of the universe will finally succumb. If by the masses are meant the molecules, & if what you say refers to the separation into different stellar bodies by cooling, of what was originally a nebula; I would say that the molecules of the nebula must have already gravitated towards one another. If they were ever too close together to do so, how have they ever emerged from that state? I cannot see what preexisting force can have been hoarded by gravitation.

“Elimination” in the chemical application which you mention, still seems to mean only *getting rid of*, and not picking out & retaining.[3](#)

If the old corporations retain and exercise the power of granting to women a complete medical education & if they can be induced to confer on those who avail themselves of it medical degrees, it is probable that the examining body to be created by the new

medical bill would not be permitted by opinion to refuse them the license to practice.[4](#)
The bill I see is withdrawn so that there will be time to look into the subject.

The Woman's Suffrage Committee is desirous of finding competent persons who would be willing to go to different places to speak at public meetings, help to form local committees &c. The Committee would remunerate them for their time & trouble. Are there any of your former pupils or other intelligent persons known to you who you think would be willing to cooperate with the Committee in this manner?

You have no doubt received the new programme agreed to at the General Meeting of the Land Tenure Association. There are still great difficulties made about the 4th article,[5](#) that which relates to the unearned increase of rent, but these generally gave way after explanation & discussion as far as regards individual conviction; the objectors still thinking it premature & injudicious to include that point in the programme. There is however no hope of obtaining any support to the Assⁿ from the leaders of the working classes without going at least as far as the fourth article goes in the way of a compromise with their larger projects. All that seems feasible is to get this part of the programme well explained, so as to meet such of the objections as are founded only on misapprehension.

1589.

TO WILLIAM TRANT[1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 4. 1870

Dear Sir—

The statement in the papers that I am about to publish a new ed. of my Logic is incorrect.

It has been suggested to me several times to publish a cheap edition but these applications have not, in general, been from working men. I sh^d be very happy to think that there is any considerable number of working men who desire to read a treatise of such length & on such a subject.

1590.

TO HENRY GEORGE[1](#)

Blackheath Park
Kent

Aug 13, 1870

Dear Sir

The first intimation I received that my communication to you² had appeared in print, was in a letter from California complaining of it as unjust to the Chinese,³ in such terms as to give me the idea that the writer had never seen the concluding part of the communication. He did not, I believe, inform me in what publication he had read it, nor did I suppose that even if garbled it must necessarily have been for a dishonest purpose, nor that you must have been the garbler. I am perfectly satisfied with your assurance that my letter was originally published as it has since been republished entire.

I Am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Faithfully,

J. S. Mill

1591.

TO JOHN BOYD KINNEAR¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 13, 1870

Dear Sir—

I am sorry to hear that your progress towards recovery is so slow. There can be little doubt that rest from the exertion of the brain is the real cure, & this is seldom to be had except by the substitution of gentle & unexhausting excitement for that which is more severe. The mind flies back to its old occupations unless it obtains new.

What the working men of London aim at under the name of nationalization of the land, is nothing less than the entire abolition of private property in land, the State taking possession of all the land (at a valuation) & managing it as the public estate. As a step to this it is proposed by some of them to prevent all future purchase of land by private individuals, those who wish to sell being required to sell to the State.

With regard to the reasons that you give for thinking that the increased value of land is no more than a fair equivalent for landlords' improvements, I expect that when the question becomes a serious one, a Commission will have to be appointed to collect all facts which have any important bearing on the subject.

1592.

TO M. E. GRANT DUFF¹

Aug. 14, 1870

Dear Mr Grant Duff—

If you are in town & can spare the time I sh^d like much to call on you & have some conversation on the affair of the Bombay Bank.² Although both my opinions & my official experience make me anything but favourably inclined to the interference of Gov^t to shield individuals from the consequences of their own unfortunate speculations, it does appear to me that the Bombay Gov^t not only by the gross misconduct of the official directors & its own neglect to look after them but also by its course of conduct after the evil had become a matter of notoriety, has incurred a very grave moral responsibility to the shareholders; & that it cannot relieve itself from this except by taking on itself some pecuniary responsibility.

1593.

TO HENRY KILGOUR¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Aug. 15, 1870

Dear Sir—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Aug. 10 & the pamphlet² to which it refers.

I am entirely in favour of retaining our connexion with the colonies so long as they do not desire separation. And I think the nation is of the same opinion, & would not tolerate, in the Government, any conduct which it believed to proceed from a desire to break the connexion. But I confess I do not think it likely that a periodical meeting of delegates from all the colonies & dependencies with no substantive powers, merely for the purpose of discussion, would excite sufficient interest in those countries to become a useful institution. What a colony desires from the mother country is generally something having reference to its own special wants, & which it would probably, in general, prefer to discuss singly with the Gov^t which has the power of decision. The participation of numerous delegates from other communities with no interest in the particular question, communities whose wants are different & who have little fellow feeling, would, I should think, be more likely to be felt as an incumbrance than desired as a help.

Allow me to express my surprise that one who attaches so much importance as you do to the mere public discussion of subjects by those who are specially interested in them, should see no use in the admission into the H. of C. of representative working men. Their presence there seems to me indispensable to a sufficient discussion of public interests from the particular point of view of the working classes; which assuredly is not less worthy of being considered, nor has fewer truths mingled with its errors, than the points of view of the other classes now so superabundantly represented in Parliament. The “Parliamentary tone” does not seem to me to be at present so elevated as to be in any danger of being lowered by the admission of such men as Mr Odger³ into a House a majority of whom seem to me to be abundantly endowed with all the characteristics you ascribe to him, except the “considerable mental vigour” for which you give him credit. The result I sh^d expect from bringing contrary prejudices face to face & compelling them to listen to one another would be a great improvement on both sides: & in my own experience the working classes are not those who have shown least willingness to be improved by such collisions.

1594.

TO PETER ALFRED TAYLOR¹

Aug. 22. 1870

Dear Mr Taylor—

I have the highest admiration for Mazzini,² & although I do not sympathize with his mode of working I do not take upon myself to criticize it, because I do not doubt that to him is mainly owing the unity & freedom of Italy. Nor do I in the least doubt the reality of the danger your letter speaks of. But the real safeguard against that danger lies in the fact that the whole Italian people, friends & enemies, are assuredly fully aware of it, & that the Italian Gov^t must be fully aware that if any mischief happens to M. while under their custody no one in Italy will attribute it to natural causes. On the other hand, nothing whatever would persuade any but a few rare scattered English people that any such danger exists at all. To say so would simply be to expose oneself in England to the imputation fully believed by those who make it, of being a rabid & fanatical partisan: whereas in Italy the mildest & most moderate people will believe it even if it is not true. Hence I am sure that it would be impossible to bring the influence of English public opinion to bear in this matter. To attempt to do so would simply be to call forth such honest & genuine expressions of incredulity as might even convince the Italian Gov^t of what they would otherwise never suspect—that if M. dies in prison the English public may really not be sure that he was poisoned.

The safety of M. depends on the fear that his death might arouse feeling in Italy dangerous to those in whose hands he is. As I believe this to be the case, I think in all human probability the Gov^t will be very desirous of avoiding anything of the sort & of setting him free as soon as they conveniently can. Some action on the part of English liberals to request his liberation on grounds of humanity, his age, his health,

&c., might, a little time hence, give an excuse to the Gov^t they might be glad to take to set him free. At present I fear they would not think it prudent to do it.

Were I an English personal friend of Mazzini I sh^d certainly endeavour to obtain access to him,³ for I think the greatest danger at present is of his fretting himself into an illness, which in the hands of Italian doctors might naturally terminate fatally. The presence of a real friend might be of great use to him, & as English people's word is generally believed, the Italian Gov^t might more easily permit English than Italian friends to see him, since they might trust them better to do nothing that they undertook not to do.

1595.

TO PATRICK HENNESSEY¹

[After Aug. 25, 1870]

Dear Sir—

I so far agree with the promoters of the meeting to which you do me the honour of inviting me, as to be very desirous to see a movement commenced for the thorough military training of the general population. I wish the mass of soldiers to be identical with the mass of citizens, & standing armies to be eventually dispensed with, except the scientific corps, & probably a permanent staff of carefully trained officers, not taken as at present from one class of the community, but from all.

But I do not agree with what seems to be implied in a "Protest against this country being brought into the war."

To declare beforehand that no amount of iniquity perpetrated before our eyes, shall induce us to go to war, would be the surest way of encouraging wars abroad, and would infallibly, like all other selfishness & cowardice, finally redound to our own cost. If war between nations is ever to be put an end to, it can only be as war between individuals has been checked in civilised societies—by the creation of a police & an impartial umpire to settle quarrels. To create such a system it is necessary that all courageous & right feeling men sh^d be ready to suffer in protecting the weak in politics as they ought to be in civil life. And to stand by & see a free & civilised [right loving?] nation, such as Belgium, which appeals to us for help, deprived of its liberties by overpowering force, would be to set an example as injurious to the best hopes of civilization as it would be base & pusillanimous. What is necessary to prevent the generous spirit of the nation from being abused to bad purposes & leading either to iniquities or to unnecessary wars is that the nation itself sh^d closely watch its governors, sh^d refuse to enter into any war which does not approve itself to its conscience as just, & sh^d steadily in time of peace as in time of war examine into & control all the military expenditure & organisation.

I have put down these few remarks for yourself & the Committee, but I sh^d be obliged by your not giving any further publicity to them.

1596.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 27 août 1870

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Merci d'avoir pensé à moi dans un temps si douloureux. Depuis longtemps je suis arrivé à la triste conviction que malgré l'incontestable réalité des progrès modernes, nous ne sommes pas encore à l'abri des grands malheurs et des grands crimes que notre siècle se flattait d'être parvenu à bannir de la terre. Je plains profondément le peuple français, qui n'est pas responsable de tout ceci, qui n'aime pas et n'a pas voulu la guerre, et qui est condamné à la payer du meilleur de son sang, et peut-être d'une humiliation nationale la plus difficile à supporter. Pourvu que l'Europe, et surtout la France, apprenne de ces tristes événements, que lorsqu'un peuple abdique la direction de ses propres destinées, et se résigne à ce qu'un gouvernement fasse de lui un simple instrument de sa volonté, il est condamné à supporter toutes les conséquences de ce qu'il a laissé faire en son nom; et qu'un gouvernement qui par les conditions de son existence a besoin de tout ce qu'il y a de plus malhonnête et de plus corrompu dans le pays, finit par être trompé par eux, au point que même son appui de prédilection, l'administration militaire, se trouve pourrie et en décomposition au moment du besoin.

Quelles que puissent être pour la France les suites immédiates de ces événements, il ne lui faudra pas beaucoup d'années pour redevenir tout aussi grande qu'auparavant. Mais elle devra se contenter d'être l'une des grandes puissances de l'Europe, sans prétendre à être la seule, ou même la première: il lui faudra reconnaître pour les relations internationales comme pour celles de la vie civile, le règle de l'égalité. La prétention d'un pays quelconque à être tellement au dessus des autres pour que rien d'important ne se fasse sans le consulter, ne peut plus se soutenir aujourd'hui, et la France devrait voir dans la répudiation universelle d'une telle prétention, le triomphe du principe qui fait sa propre gloire.

J'espère qu'au moins vous n'aurez pas d'autres malheurs que le désastre public à déplorer, et que la guerre épargnera toute votre famille.

Je suis arrivé ici huit ou dix jours avant la déclaration de guerre,² alors qu'un pareil coup semblait presque aussi peu probable que la destruction de Paris par un tremblement de terre. La rapidité foudroyante des grands événements d'aujourd'hui n'est pas ce qu'ils ont de moins étonnant.

Votre Toujours Affectionné

J. S. Mill

1597.

TO JOHN WESTLAKE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Sept. 7. 1870

Dear Sir—

The question respecting the expediency of making the sale of instruments of war by neutrals to belligerents an offence against the law of nations, is a difficult one, & though I have given it some consideration I cannot say that I have arrived at a positive opinion. Your paper² will probably assist me in forming one.

About one thing I feel quite clear; that the matter ought not to depend, as it does by our present laws, on the discretion of the executive. For the sake both of principle & of policy the question sh^d be determined by law. And it cannot well be determined by law without a previous agreement among the principal nations; since otherwise we should either be adjudging to ourselves rights which might not improbably be disputed, or acknowledging obligations which might not be reciprocated.

On the rule itself, there is a conflict of considerations. On the one hand real neutrality seems to me to consist in not aiding either side with means of carrying on the contest: including under “means,” any articles of which the sole, or at all events the principal, use, is for warlike purposes. On the other hand, it is generally, though not universally, true that the party most benefitted by, because most needing, supplies from neutral countries, is the weaker of the belligerents, who is the more likely to be the oppressed or injured party; including among the rest all who are in arms, on however just provocation, against their own government. It is significant that the only case in which the power given to our own executive in this matter has been acted on (the case of the Greeks & Turks) is of this last description.

A further consideration is the difficulty of preventing exportation to the belligerent countries without stopping exportation altogether. It would be of little use to prevent guns being sent to Dunkirk if they can be sent to Ostend & from thence find their way into France. But this only amounts to saying that it is of no use for one country to act on the rule unless it is adopted generally. If it were so adopted, the Belgian Gov^t would be responsible for preventing the guns exported to Ostend from entering France.

On the whole, I incline most to leaving the exportation free, but not without misgiving; for when the access to foreign supplies operates as it generally does, unequally upon the two belligerents, it seems to me hardly possible that the public opinion of the party suffering sh^d not regard the professing neutral as substantially an ally of the enemy; & perhaps with still greater resentment as one who without any ground of quarrel seeks to make profit by a neighbour's misfortunes.

There is but too much ground for your apprehensions as to the feelings likely to be left by this war;³ but if it had been unattended with a great & decisive success on either side, it would probably have been much more prolonged, & the case is preeminently one in which the shortest evil is the best. Then too it was important that a striking retribution sh^d fall on the aggressor [in] an unprovoked war. It is the justice of their cause which has roused the whole German people & given them this irresistible might. But it is deplorable to think that the French nation may from a false point of honour, persist in an unjust war which they neither originated nor desired.

1598.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Sept. 15. 1870

Dear Mr Cairnes

I think your article² very good, and likely to be useful. It is very complete in the logical, and also in the purely economical, point of view. Some other time perhaps you might find it useful to carry on the examination of Bastiat's doctrines to the social, or practical, point of view, and shew how far from the truth it is that the economic phenomena of society as at present constituted always arrange themselves spontaneously in the way which is most for the common good or that the interests of all classes are fundamentally the same. There is not, however, room to do this in addition to what you have already so conclusively done, and I should not recommend attempting it. I have therefore sent on the proof to Virtue,³ after correcting two or three typographical errors which had escaped your notice.

The events in Europe are indeed overwhelming. What will be the end of them no one can foresee. But it is melancholy to see that the French, even those who opposed the war, have not the magnanimity or the common justice to feel and admit that they are responsible to their neighbours for injuries done by any one whom they allow to govern them; and instead of making reparation to Germany for perhaps the most unprovoked attack in modern European history, and for the myriads of lives which have had to be sacrificed in repelling that attack, they think it fine to persist in the injury, and to slaughter more and more of those against whom they are already such deep offenders.

Thornton's article⁴ is, as you say, very weak; but metaphysical subjects are not among his strong points. You have laid your finger very precisely upon one of the principal of his many fallacies.⁵ All he says is answered by anticipation in Bentham's Introduction to Morals and Legislation,⁶ and in my father's Fragment on Mackintosh.⁷

With our kind regards to Mrs Cairnes

I Am Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1599.

TO WILLIAM TRANT¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Sept. 15, 1870

Dear Sir—

I should be happy to give copies of my "System of Logic" to some of the Institutions you refer to if you would let me know what are those where you think it would be valued.² The degree in which these copies are read by working men would be some indicator of the degree of utility of a cheap edition.

What sort of price would in your opinion meet the requisites of a cheap edition of such a book as the System of Logic?³ I must however add that in permitting a cheap edition I am simply sacrificing nearly the whole of any profits made by my work, even if the sale is very considerable. No cheap edition of a serious work appears ever to pay the author anything more than a trifle. If the sale is likely to be large among really working class people, that is to say if many persons are really benefitted by my sacrifice I am willing to make the sacrifice of my own profit for their benefit. But unless the sale is largely increased I am not sure that it is the best use I can make of the money. I am not sure even whether the same amount of money might not be better spent in making presents of gratuitous copies of the library edition.

1600.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Sept. 30. 1870

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

On the first of the points mentioned in your note, I think that the Government of National Defence,² being to all appearances obeyed as the Government of the country by all parts of France which are not in the power of a foreign army, ought to be recognised officially (it is already recognised semiofficially) as the *de facto* Government by Great Britain:³ which recognition I understand to consist in giving to our ambassador new credentials, addressed to the new authorities. I think that what was done in the case of the Provisional Government of 1848 should be done in the present case.⁴ But, after Gladstone's answer to the deputation,⁵ I do not think that there is any chance of inducing him to do this.

The second point⁶ I cannot see in the same light. The Germans have a very strong case. One of the wickedest acts of aggression in history, has been by them successfully repelled, but at the expense of the bitter suffering of many thousand (one might almost say million) households. They have a just claim to as complete a security as any practicable arrangement can give, against the repetition of a similar crime. Unhappily, the character and feelings of the French nation, or at least of the influential and active portion of all political parties, afford no such security. I feel, with you, a strong repugnance to the transfer of a population from one government to another unless by its own expressed desire. If I could settle the terms of peace, the disputed territory should be made into an independent self governing state, with power to annex itself, after a long period (say fifty years), either to France or to Germany; a guarantee for that term of years by the neutral powers (which removes in some measure the objection to indefinite guarantees), or if that could not be obtained, the fortresses being meanwhile garrisoned by German troops. But there may be many objections to this which I do not see; and at all events, our Government would probably suggest it in vain. Our Government is not likely to have the smallest influence at present with Germany. English public opinion might have some little influence. But all demonstrations of the kind seem only likely to encourage France in a hopeless struggle.

If Gladstone had been a great man, this war would never have broken out, for he would have nobly taken upon himself the responsibility of declaring that the English navy should actively aid whichever of the two powers was attacked by the other. This would have been a beginning of the international police we are calling for. I do not much blame Gladstone for not daring to do it, for it requires a morally braver man than any of our statesmen to run this kind of risk.

I have willingly given you my opinion on the points on which you ask it, but I do not wish any public use made of it with my name, as I have no desire to put myself or be put forward in the matter; for public opinion in England appears to me on the whole so reasonable and well intentioned on the subject, as to be likely ultimately to arrive at a right conclusion; and I am not sure whether we have really yet sufficient data as to the mere facts, to entitle us to form a very definite opinion. I am

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1601.

TO THE SECRETARY, SOUTHWARK RADICAL
ASSOCIATION¹

Blackheath Park

September 30, 1870.

Dear Sir,

I am highly honoured by the wish of the Southwark Radical Association to nominate me as a candidate for the School Board,² and I regret that the pressure of other occupations puts it out of my power to perform the duties of that most important trust.

Yours Very Sincerely,

J. S. Mill.

1602.

TO THE REV. DAVID KING¹

[Oct. ? 1870]

Dear Sir

I have most certainly never on any occasion whatever, in public or private, expressed any approbation of the book entitled *Elements of Social Science*. Nor am I likely ever to have done so, inasmuch as I very strongly object to some of the opinions expressed in it. You are therefore quite at liberty to say that I am not correctly represented by anyone who asserts that I have commended the book.

Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

1603.

TO FRANÇOIS BARTHÉLEMY ARLÈS-DUFOUR¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Oct. 29, 1870

Cher Monsieur—

Je n'ai pas eu le coeur de répondre à votre lettre du 26 Sept. parceque je ne pouvais vous rien dire de consolation dans l'immense malheur qui pèse sur la France.

Aujourd'hui votre voeu pour une médiation anglaise semble être exaucé,² dans la mesure de ce qui est possible.

Ici la sympathie pour les malheurs de la France est grande, et le désir est général qu'elle sorte de cette crise aux conditions les plus favorables que comportent les circonstances. Mais on ne pense pas moins qu'elle doit une grande réparation à l'Allemagne pour les vastes sacrifices de son sang le plus précieux qu'une agression injuste lui a imposés. Et l'on craint que cette facilité à croire ce qui est agréable, et à résister à l'évidence des faits, qui est propre aux habitudes du français ne leur fasse refuser des propositions supportables, pour être réduits à subir plus tard des conditions encore plus rigoureuses. Si le patriotisme éclairé de tout ce qu'il y a de meilleur en France pouvait décider les classes lettrés de la nation à voir dans les sacrifices qui sont devenus inévitables, une leçon pour ne plus jamais se laisser aller à préférer des rêves d'agrandissement au dehors, à la recherche de la liberté et du progrès moral et social au dedans et pouvait décider l'immense majorité de la nation à ne se laisser gouverner que par eux-mêmes alors on pourrait espérer que les tristes événements de cette année, quelque puisse être leur dénouement, deviennent la date d'une véritable régénération pour la France.

Je n'ai guère besoin de vous dire cher monsieur à quel point moi-même je partage votre douleur, et combien ma sympathie est profonde pour tous les français qui n'ont à se reprocher ni le commencement de cette déplorable guerre ni sa prolongation.

1604.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Oct. 29. 1870

Dear Chadwick

I have no improvements to suggest in your paper on elections to the school board.² I see objections to house to house voting, but those objections are much less strong than in the case of elections to Parliament and are perhaps outweighed by the advantages in this and other elections for local purposes.

By whom, and how, is the Committee of Selection in the City appointed? I am glad that Ellis³ is a member of it; but he ought to be in the School Board himself, as well as you.

What you say of the general indifference to considerations of special qualification, is painfully confirmed by other testimony. The leaders, however, of the working classes do not seem to share this indifference: it was much complained of at a meeting of the Representative Reform Association last Saturday⁴ in which Odger, Mottershead,⁵ and Lloyd Jones⁶ took an active part; and the response was general to what I and others said of the bad *quality* of the instruction.

You, of all men, ought to be on the Board, and I will certainly urge your claims wherever I have an opportunity.

I have myself received two offers, but the matter does not lie in my speciality, and I have refused.

The Journal des Economistes is not sent here, but to Avignon and I have not seen the September number. I am

Dear Chadwick
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1605.

TO WILLIAM RIDDLE¹

Blackheath Park, Kent.

Oct. 29, 1870.

Dear Sir:

No question can be greater or more urgent than that of the relations of the poor to the rich, and though for the rectification of those relations political and social reforms are the principal requisite, I am quite prepared to admit that "practical engineering measures" may be highly useful auxiliaries. But of this part of the subject I cannot

deem myself a competent judge; though I should be very willing, when I know your proposals, to tell you whether, in my opinion, there are any objections to them on the score of political economy.

I Am, Dear Sir,
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

W. Riddle Esq.

1606.

TO FREDERIC BOOKER¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Oct. 31. 1870

Dear Sir—

I have not a copy of the Act² by me, but I have always understood that the prohibition of payment had reference only to payment out of taxes, rates, or any public fund. I do not believe that there exists any legal obstacle to payment of the representatives by their constituents, as the Trades Unions pay their officers & delegates. It would not cost the Trade Societies of Manchester much to pay, if necessary, to those working men whom you may succeed in electing, the weekly wages which they would earn if they worked at their ordinary employment. There appears to me, however, a more serious difficulty. If really, as you say, the working men will not have confidence in any man as a real working man, who has saved enough to be independent or who can spare even a portion of his time from earning his daily bread, it would appear that the moment they have elected a man they must lose confidence in him if he is to be supported by subscription, since from the moment when he is so supported he ceases to be a working man. I sh^d have thought it had been the first object of all who have the interest of the working classes at heart, that some among the working men whose talents or good fortune enable them to be pecuniarily better off than the majority of their companions, sh^d continue to be, & to be considered, still members of the working classes. But if they are to be looked on with suspicion & dislike, this cannot be the case. It has always been my hope that the working classes might come to have a moderate portion of leisure, & I sh^d regard it as a great misfortune if the moment a working man is able to attain this he sh^d lose the confidence of his fellow workmen unless he is dependent on their bounty. It cannot be impossible that a working man sh^d retain the principles which are honestly entertained by so many individuals among the richest classes of the country, merely because he has been able to become a master workman, or a writer, &c. &c, & as he will if he has been born & has generally lived among the working classes, understand & sympathize with them better than most

persons of other classes can do, I think such a man sh^d be trusted till he has proved himself unworthy of trust. Doubtless many men will do so, as many men in every rank shew when put to the test that their real motives for entering into public life were vanity or self interest, but I cannot believe that a larger proportion of men mainly inspired by such unworthy motives will be found among the self-raised men of the working classes than among the self-raised men of the leading mercantile, manufacturing, literary, and others.

1607.

TO WILLIAM TRANT¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 2. 1870

Dear Sir—

I thank you for your kind letter and will order the publisher to send six copies of the “System of Logic” to yourself which I beg that you will dispose of in the manner suggested by you, or in any manner you think best, retaining one copy for the library you mention of your own.²

Will you kindly tell me also whether there are any of my other writings which might be usefully presented to any of the Institutions you mention or to your own Library.

1608.

TO WILLIAM DOUGAL CHRISTIE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Nov. 3. 1870

Dear Mr Christie

I am glad to hear that you are exerting yourself in favour of Miss Garrett’s election,² and although I am not disposed to subscribe towards it,³ yet I hope she may succeed.

I hope there may be a chance of your coming into the House of Commons for some early vacancy. There are many signs that the influence of the Ministry for or against a candidate will not go quite so far now as it did at the General Election. I am

Dear Mr Christie
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1609.

TO WILLIAM TRANT¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 15, 1870

Dear Sir—

I have directed Messrs. Longman to send to your address 6 copies of “System of Logic” 2 of “Examination of Hamilton” 1 of “Dissertations & Discussions” 1 of “Analysis of the Human Mind” written by my father and edited by me, three of “Utilitarianism” and 3 of “Subjection of Women”. I have also directed Mr. Trübner, who is the publisher of “Auguste Comte & Positivism” to send you a copy of that. Please inform me if they all reach you that, if not, I may correct the mistake. One copy of each is for yourself, the remainder to be employed by you in the manner proposed in your letters, or otherwise in any better mode which occurs to you.

I am sorry that the rules of the Cobden Working Men’s Club, Bermondsey Square, limit its advantages to “males.” I sh^d like to see women admitted on equal terms to all such societies. At least the benefit of the Library ought surely, on every consideration, be extended to them. From the just & enlightened opinion you express respecting Mixed Schools I hope that we are of the same opinion also about Mixed Libraries.²

1610.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

November [16?], 1870

Dear Mr Morley—

I have been much disappointed at not seeing Lady Amberley’s lecture² in the Fortnightly yet.³ I hope it is to be in the December number.

When I last heard from you you mentioned that you might have some points on which you would wish to speak to me. I do not know whether that time is yet come; if so I sh^d be glad to see you at any time if you will let me know when. As I understand you

have not a home in London now, we have a bed at your disposal when you come down here.

I am glad to see you have not yielded to the utterly false & mistaken sympathy with France⁴ & indeed I go farther than you do on the other side. Stern justice is on the side of the Germans, & it is in the best interests of France itself that a bitter lesson sh^d now be inflicted upon it, such as it can neither deny nor forget in the future. The whole writing, thinking, & talking portion of the people undoubtedly share the guilt of L. Napoleon, the moral guilt of the war, & feel neither shame nor contrition at anything but the unlucky results to themselves. Undoubtedly the real nation, the whole mass of the people, are perfectly guiltless of it; but then they are so ignorant that they will allow the talkers & writers to lead them into just such corners again if they do not learn by bitter experience what will be the practical consequences of their political indifference. The peasantry of France like the women of England have still to learn that politics concern themselves. The loss of Alsace & Lorraine will perhaps be about as painless a way of learning this lesson as could possibly be devised.⁵

1611.

TO LEONARD H. COURTNEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 18, 1870

Dear Mr Courtney—

As I intend to publish the inclosed² or something like it in one of the papers I send it to you first to know whether you think it best that I sh^d send it first to the Times through yourself. I almost take it for granted that you are of my way of thinking in the matter & that the articles in the Times³ I so strongly object to cannot be yours. If you think it best that it sh^d find its way to the Times merely through the post might I ask you to be kind enough to close it & drop it into a letter box to save the time that would be lost in returning it to me as I intend to send it to the Times before sending it elsewhere, in case they think fit to insert it.

1612.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Nov. 18. 1870

Dear Mr Fawcett

You will be glad to hear, if you have not already heard, that the Commons Committee yesterday acted in the spirit of your telegram, by determining to bring in their own Epping Forest Bill in the approaching session, whether the Government bring in theirs or not.² It was also determined to take up the subject of the New Forest, and that of the preservation of footpaths, with a view, on the latter subject, of getting the power of stopping paths put into better hands.

The newspapers are raging and blustering on the subject of Russia,³ in a manner which will be very dangerous, if the Government and the House of Commons once think that their ravings express the opinion of the country. Writers who for many months have never ceased sounding an alarm about our total want of preparation for a war even of self defence—telling us that we have neither troops, nor horses, nor guns, nor officers, nor organisation, nor men capable of giving us these things—all, I believe, too true—now demand that we should instantly say to Russia, Retract that declaration, or War: and when Russia refuses (as what power, in such a case, would not refuse?) we are to go to war with Russia at once, and as they themselves think not improbable, with Prussia too. And all this, for what? Because Russia shakes off an obligation which, though it may sometimes perhaps be rightly imposed as a temporary penalty for unprovoked aggression, no nation can ever be expected permanently to submit to. One would think such a thing had never happened before, as that a nation on whom hard terms had been imposed by victorious enemies, has ever treated them as no longer binding after she had recovered her strength. The truth is, such things are often happening, and must often be submitted to, when the object itself is not worth a war; and so it will be, until treaties are concluded, as they ought to be, for terms of years only, instead of affecting to be perpetual. Will any one pretend that a nation can bind its posterity for all time by the conditions to which it has been forced to submit at a moment of difficulty? If not, such stipulations, unless they still remain in themselves desirable, must be allowed to become obsolete; and the only questions are, after what lapse of time, and under what conditions; questions which no one, I believe, is yet prepared to answer. Strength and opportunity have always decided them hitherto.

When we consider that England might have done the inestimable service to mankind of preventing the present terrible war,⁴ if we had chosen to run a very slight risk of being involved in it ourselves; the proposal that after shrinking from this, we should rush precipitately into war to limit the number of Russian ships of war in the Euxine, shews a degree of criminal fatuity almost greater than that of Louis Napoleon and his advisers, four months ago. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1613.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 18. 1870

Dear Mr Morley—

We congratulate you very heartily upon your marriage,² of which it gives us great pleasure to hear. Home life is the best possible “milieu” for work, & I hope you will be able to subordinate your work to the claims of your health, a task however which is found very difficult by everybody who can & will work well.

I am very anxious just now that there sh^d be some proper protest against the infatuation of our press on the Russian question.³ I can compare it to nothing but the infatuation of the French press which we have all been wondering at. Almost in the same breath in which our journals tell us only too truly that we are utterly unprepared for war, nay unprepared for the most essential defence, they call upon us to declare war with one of the most powerful military empires of the world—a naval power too, & that at the very same time that our quarrel with America is still pending.⁴ So much for their common sense. As for the rights of the question, it is doubtful whether they are not substantially on the side of Russia. At all events we are not bound in honour to attempt to carry out the Treaty when our most important co-signatory can give no help.⁵ Least of all are we bound in honour to insist upon the perpetual adhesion to a treaty which in all probability we ought to be ready to abrogate. As for the argument that Russia is simply casting off all treaty obligations, that simply points to the fact that all such obligations always have been disowned directly the party unwillingly bound by them perceives a relaxation of force in the powers which attempted to bind it. This will always happen so long as treaties are made in perpetuity. Were they terminable, as they ought to be, those who object to them would have a rational hope of escape in some more moral way than an appeal to the same brute force which imposed them. It points also to the inherent weakness of the scheme of joint treaties & guarantees which must of their own nature fall to pieces directly there is any great change in the conditions or the relations of the joint powers. This treaty of 1856 sh^d have been allowed to fall into disuse. That it has not been so allowed is a legacy of the evil Palmerstonian days. Now, I conceive that the only dignified thing for us to do is to let the treaty be abrogated by Russia with a protest reserving our own liberty of action. The way in which Guizot dealt with the annexation of Cracow⁶ is a case in point & would form a very good precedent for us in this matter.

We shall hope to see you on Tuesday next as you say in the forenoon. There is a train at 35 min. past 12 from Ch. X,⁷ by which perhaps you can come & take luncheon with us.

H. T.

1614.

TO LEONARD H. COURTNEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 19. 1870

Dear Mr Courtney—

I thank you very much for your kindness about my letter.²

I perfectly understand that what you & other thoughtful men, regard as the important point in this matter is the declaration of the Russian Gov^t that it intends to throw off one of the obligations of the Treaty,³ without asking the consent of the other contracting parties. My position, however, is that it is not every breach of treaty that requires to be, or that ought to be, resented by war. The *fons et origo mali* is the great error of concluding treaties in perpetuity, instead of only for a term of years; which, by making it inevitable and sometimes even a duty to break treaties, creates that conflict of possible obligations which both fosters & shields unconscientiousness. No treaty is fit to be perpetual. When, however, a treaty is an amicable contract between nations for their joint advantage, it is in most cases possible to get necessary modifications effected by joint consent. But it is not, & never has been thought to be so in the case of treaties which are real capitulations—terms of peace imposed by victors on the vanquished expressly because known to be disadvantageous to them. Even such treaties if they were temporary might be kept. But when no term is fixed for their expiration these treaties—those conditions of them especially which directly restrain the freedom of action of the country—always have been & always are violated as soon as the nation on whom they are imposed is able & willing to risk another war. And such violation is habitually condoned, unless the other parties to the violated treaty think the particular object worth a war. Was there ever a more direct violation of a treaty to which all the powers of Europe were parties,⁴ than was committed by France when she placed another Bonaparte on the throne? But what country dreamed of going to war with France to prevent or chastise that breach of engagement? Instances more or less similar are too frequent in recent history for it to be necessary to enumerate them; but there is one worth mentioning because it affords a precedent applicable to the present case. When Russia, Austria, & Prussia combined in violation of treaties, to destroy the Republic of Cracow & annex it to Austria,⁵ Guizot was foreign minister of France. He made a public declaration, I do not remember if it was by a circular to his diplomatic agents or by a speech in the Chamber, or by both, that France took notice of this breach of treaties; that she did not intend to take any active measures in opposition to it; but that she reserved to herself the exercise of all such rights as the violation without her consent of a treaty to which she was a party, in her judgment restored to her. It seems to me that something similar to this is the only wise & dignified course for the English Gov^t to take: unless indeed the repudiated engagement be such as it would enforce *de novo* if the thing were *res integra*, & that too at the cost of a war under the most disadvantageous & perilous

circumstances: but as you, in common I sh^d think with all rational persons who know anything of the subject, totally reject this supposition, I need not discuss it.

As for Mr Forster, with the fullest respect for his many excellent qualities, he is so hot headed a man—so thorough a Quaker unfranchised⁶—that he needs little inducement to come to blows. However I venture to think that he knows nothing whatever about foreign politics. Excuse me for saying that you have not chosen your instance well if you thought I sh^d think *his* opinion could add any weight to *yours*.

1615.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Nov. 19. 1870

Dear Sir

Thanks for your kind invitation, but I am too busy just now to avail myself of it.

The newspapers are madder than ever, and it is alarming to hear of the kind of persons, some of whom participate in the madness. You have, no doubt, seen my protest in the Times.² We have much need of calm good sense in our public men in this matter at present.

I Am

Dear Sir

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Sir C. W. Dilke Bart. M.P.

1616.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 21. 1870

Dear Thornton—

I am very happy that you so entirely agree with me about this insane clamour for war.² I think there is a great deal in your argument. Even were there no other reason the total inability of the most powerful of the parties to the treaty to do anything towards enforcing it goes a very great way indeed to release the others from any obligation they might have contracted to do so. Will you not write a letter on the subject to one of the newspapers?³ Every additional protest at this particular time is of great value by shewing that Englishmen are not all mad together, & that those who determine future opinion will pass a severe judgment on a government which should sacrifice the safety of England to mere bluster & brag. To do the present Govt justice however it is my belief that they only want support from the public to shew themselves yielding & conciliatory; & therefore we ought all the more to give public expression to this point of view.⁴ Those who pretend that we are bound by our engagements to go to war rely chiefly on the tripartite treaty of England, France, & Austria. I send a page of the Economist which contains it.⁵ By the first article those powers guarantee, jointly & severally, not the Treaty with Russia, but the integrity of the Ottoman Dominions. It cannot be pretended by any one that this guarantee comes into force until Turkey is attacked. By the second article, they engage to consider any infraction of the treaty a casus belli: & if there are causes, to determine with Turkey & with one another what it has become necessary to do. This merely promises that when a case has arisen which gives them a right to go to war, they will take counsel together whether to do so or not. But a still plainer point is that by this Treaty the three powers did not bind themselves to Turkey at all. Turkey was not a party to the Treaty. They bound themselves only to one another, & can therefore release one another from the engagement. More, since one of the three, France, cannot possibly fulfil that engagement it cannot require the others to do so, nor is there the least probability that Austria will make any such requirement from us while even if she did the practical impossibility of attaining the end without the aid of France would be a full justification for non-compliance, even in the case of the 1st article, much more in that of the second. It is perhaps also worth mentioning, for the sake of the completeness of the argument, that this very condition of the neutralization of the Black Sea has been already broken through by the U. S. & that on that occasion none of the contracting parties to the Treaty thought fit even to protest.

With regard to Utilitarianism,⁶ you have not said anything yet which would give to the most irrational or most irritable person living anything to “forgive.” But were you to attack my book or my arguments with any amount of severity I sh^d only see in the attack, coming from one of whose friendship I am so certain, an additional proof of friendship. Of course one is more glad when a friend agrees with one in opinion than when he differs, unless he brings one over to his opinion. This you have not done, as yet. I think you will find all your arguments answered in Bentham’s Introduction to the Principles of Morals & Legislation⁷ or in my father’s Fragment on Mackintosh,⁸ long before I wrote anything on the subject.

We have had two very pleasant excursions, one on the Wye, & one through Belgium & Germany to Geneva.⁹ From there Helen went on to Avignon to fetch some of

Buckle's MSS, as we made up our minds that the posts through France would be too irregular to enable her to carry on the printing from there this winter.

During our journey along the Rhine & through Switzerland & my stay at Geneva we had most exceptionally beautiful weather, seeing the scenery more finely in some respects than we had ever done before: Indeed we had never seen such magnificent autumn colouring; it reminded one of the descriptions one reads of America. I return your letter in case you want to use it in writing to any of the papers.

1617.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Nov. 23. 1870

Dear Mr Fawcett

At the meeting of the Commons Preservation Committee yesterday, the resolution to proceed with our Epping Forest Bill this year was, with my full concurrence, rescinded.² I am very sorry you were not there, but I think, if you had been, you would have agreed with us. The principal reason which decided my own opinion, was that the danger of being thwarted by the Government would now be incurred by going on, not by stopping short: for, the time for giving the first notices having expired, the Government cannot now bring in a bad bill of their own this session; but if we brought in ours, they would be enabled, and probably induced, to turn our good bill into a bad one. Another reason is, that our Solicitor says the fight would cost us some £5000, a sum we have not got and do not expect to get. There were some minor reasons: particularly this, that bills have been prepared to carry into effect the voluntary transfer of all Lord Spencer's³ rights in Wandsworth and Wimbledon Commons to the public, for an annual payment equal to what he now gets from them; and it is hoped that these bills when actually passed will establish a precedent, and also make other lords of manors more compliant when they see that Lord Spencer has had to give up the attempt to enforce ulterior claims by law. I think myself, that the public mind grows more favourable to us every year, and that our agitation would be more effectual next year than this, especially considering with what subjects the public mind is now engrossed; and the New Forest bill of the Government will give a good opportunity for putting forth right doctrines on the whole subject.

I am truly glad that you report so favourably of the opinion of the Cambridge Liberals on the war frenzy. I think every day will now raise up more resistance. Did you see the excellent letters of Cairnes and Freeman in yesterday's Daily News?⁴ I am myself writing something for Morley on the subject.⁵ I shall be glad to hear what your correspondents think about public meetings. One has been already appointed for

Birmingham⁶ on Friday the 2nd and I have been consulted about one in Westminster.
I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1618.

TO JOSEPH STURGE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Nov. 23, 1870

Dear Sir

I am most happy to hear that public feeling in Birmingham is believed to be against the frantic clamour for war, and that it is in contemplation to hold a public meeting next week,² to which you have done me the honour of inviting me. But the uncertainty of public events, on which indeed the holding of the meeting is itself contingent, makes it difficult for me to determine beforehand whether to take part in it. I have good hopes that the course taken by the Government will be the right one, and that if a meeting is needed, it will be to give them support. We shall probably know more about this, some days before the day named. In my case I should be glad to hear when you have come to a final decision about the meeting.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

Joseph Sturge Esq.

1619.

TO EMILE DE LAVELEYE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 26. 1870

Cher Monsieur—

Votre lettre du 21 Nov. me paraît si importante que je prends la liberté de vous demander la permission de la publier avec votre nom dans quelqu'un de nos journaux.² Elle est pleine de choses qui me semblent de nature à causer une heureuse influence sur l'esprit public dans ce moment critique. Rien ne contribue autant à jeter la nation anglaise dans la folie fatale d'une guerre avec la Russie que la crainte de paraître poltronne aux yeux de l'Europe. Il lui sera utile de savoir de quel œil cette folle entreprise est vue par l'un des hommes les plus éclairés du Continent, dans la position impartiale d'un citoyen Belge.

1620.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Nov. 28, 1870

Dear Mr Morley,

I have been thinking much over our conversation when I last saw you, & I feel so very strongly how wrong it is that your health sh^d be seriously risked as I fear it is being, by the impossibility of putting the F[or]nightly Review aside for a time that if you cannot find any other friend to whom you would like to confide it, & if you think it would be possible for me to do it for you in a satisfactory manner temporarily, I sh^d be very happy to do what I can. We do not intend in any case to leave England until my daughter has finished, or very nearly finished, her task with Mr B's MSS.,² & as her health only permits her to work very slowly she has no expectation that this will be for many months. The books & MSS she is obliged to refer to are so voluminous that they cannot well be carried about. They must be worked at at home, & as the stoppage or uncertainty of the French posts³ debars her from doing it at Avignon, we intend to remain here till it is done. It would be some satisfaction if this circumstance sh^d enable me to be of use to yourself; at all events sh^d other motives induce you to accept my proposal, you need have no scruples on the score of keeping us in England. I presume that the business part of the Review—money matters, advertisements, printing &c.—are or could be deputed either to the publisher or to some one who could act as man of business; & I sh^d think that whoever this may be might in the event of my undertaking the temporary editorship, write, under my directions, any letters that might be absolutely essential to contributors, & might receive & send on to me letters & articles. I could in that case undertake to read & judge of the articles & take upon myself the literary editorship, & either forward the letters to you or read them & forward only such as I might think you ought to see. What I myself sh^d most shrink from in undertaking such a thing, would be not the work of editing itself, but the enormous increase of unnecessary correspondence which I fear I should incur if it were generally known that I had undertaken it & on this account I think it would be

best for letters to be sent to the publisher or some man of business, & for some one, other than myself, to be the ostensible name in such correspondence as could not be carried on by yourself. If you still continue to feel that an interval of at least comparative leisure would be of benefit to you, & can make no more satisfactory arrangement for the Review, I beg that you will not scruple to avail yourself of any help it is in my power to give.

I returned the proof of my little article⁴ yesterday to the printers.

1621.

TO MRS. MILLICENT J. FAWCETT¹

Dec. 9. 1870

Dear Mrs Fawcett

The inclosed letter is one which I have been requested by Miss Robertson² to forward to you. The newspaper cutting came to me from Mrs Howe,³ of Boston, with a request that I would send it to you. Both ladies say they have written to you, and no doubt they have given whatever explanation they thought necessary.

I confess I do not hope for any good from Mrs Howe's projected congress.

My daughter sends her kind remembrances, and I am, Dear Mrs Fawcett,

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1622.

TO ALEXIS MUSTON¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Dec. 9. 1870

Monsieur—

Pardon du retard que j'ai mis à répondre à votre lettre, et qui ne fut causé que par le manque de temps. Ce fut un véritable rafraîchissement pour moi de recevoir de vous une pareille lettre au milieu d'événements si malheureux, comme ce doit être pour vous même une grande consolation que de pouvoir dans le malheur public vous

rejeter sur la paisible étude des grandes questions qui importent tant aux intérêts permanents du genre humain.

J'ai très bonne opinion de l'ouvrage de M. Taine sur l'Intelligence,² sauf les derniers chapitres où il me semble renier ses principes en croyant pouvoir étendre les généralisations de l'expérience humaine à des régions étrangères à cette expérience. Quant à la doctrine communément dite matérialiste, c. à d. que toutes nos impressions mentales résultent du jeu de nos organes physiques, je trouve comme vous que jusqu'ici ce n'est qu'une hypothèse,³ puisqu'on n'a pas pu remplir la condition qu'exige une bonne logique inductive dans la recherche des causes, en établissant que, la cause donnée, l'effet a lieu. Pour cela il faudrait pouvoir fabriquer un organisme, et essayer si cet organisme pense et sent. Dans ce cas-là on saurait si les conditions organiques que nous savons être nécessaires à la pensée, sont suffisantes pour la produire, si enfin ce sont de véritables causes, ou seulement des accompagnements obligés.

Quant à la question du moi, je ne puis rien ajouter à ce que j'ai dit là-dessus dans le livre sur Hamilton. Je doute si cette question comporte dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances une solution complète. Je suis allé jusqu'où je pouvais aller et j'ai indiqué le point où s'arrête mon analyse. Pour la question du sentiment moral il en est autrement, et je crois que l'association en rend compte. Ce sentiment me paraît un résultat très compliqué d'un grand nombre de sentiments plus élémentaires. Mais la discussion de cette question serait impossible dans les limites d'une lettre. Je pourrais vous nommer des livres anglais où elle est bien traitée, mais ils ne sont pas encore traduits. J'en ai touché un côté dans un petit livre qu'on a traduit en français "L'Utilitarisme":⁴ je ne me souviens pas si je vous l'ai envoyé. Sinon, veuillez me le dire et je vous ferai parvenir cette traduction lorsque les communications avec Paris seront rouvertes.

1623.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

le 17 décembre
1870

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Vous trouverez des maisons plus facilement dans les environs qu'à Londres même, surtout puisque vous êtes beaucoup de monde. Si donc vous n'avez pas encore réussi à Londres, venez ici, je vous prie. Nous avons une chambre à votre disposition jusqu'à ce que vous ayez trouvé ce qu'il vous faut pour votre famille. Je viendrais vous voir si ce n'est que d'après ce que vous dites, je vous trouverais probablement

dehors. Écrivez-moi donc quelques mots pour me dire quand nous devons vous attendre ici, ou quand je pourrais vous voir sans vous déranger.

Acceptez, je vous prie, mon offre sans façon. Nous menons une vie très tranquille ici à cause également de mon goût pour l'étude et de la petite santé de ma fille; mais vous ne craignez pas l'ennui sans doute pendant que vous aurez tant d'occupation à vous trouver une maison.

On vient ici par la gare de Charing Cross. Vous demanderez un billet pour Blackheath, et il y a des convois toutes les heures, et le soir toutes les demiheures même.

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

1624.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Dec. 21. 1870

Dear Chadwick

I noticed the article in the Echo,² and remarked how good it was, and although I did not know it was your writing, I saw clearly that the matter must have been obtained from you. The Times had a long extract from the article yesterday.³ I hope you will go on in the same work. I wanted whatever you could furnish me on the subject, because I often lend and give away the papers you send me to people who are likely to work usefully in the matter. They have arrived safely, and I hope to get good use made of them.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1625.

TO JOHN NICHOL¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Dec. 29.1870

Dear Sir

The chairman of the late meeting on Women's Suffrage had already conveyed to me the invitation which I have been honoured with, to attend and address a meeting; but though it would give me much pleasure to do so, I have been obliged to answer that my engagements do not admit of my visiting Glasgow this winter.

I do not care much to discuss the C[ontagious] D[iseases] A[cts]² with yourself, because, being willing as you are to allow women their fair share in electoral representation, you hold a perfectly defensible position when you differ from them on a point of legislation which concerns them. The position of those men, however, who, while they refuse women any share in legislation, enact laws which apply to women only, admittedly unpopular among women, is totally different from yours, and appears to me as base as it is illogical, unless indeed they are prepared to maintain that women have no other rights than the cattle respecting whom a kindred Act has been passed.³ I fully agree with you that the true fundamental point to be set right is the franchise. I will, however, without referring to all the points in your argument which I disagree with, note down one or two of my reasons for differing with you on the main question.

1. There is very strong evidence that in the country (France) where legislation similar to the C. D. A. has been long in force, and its full effects have been produced, it increases the number of the class of women to whom it applies. The comparative safety supposed to be given, increases the demand, and the number of women temporarily removed from the market makes vacancies in the supply which have to be, and are, made up. This is not necessarily shown by statistical returns; inasmuch as these can take no account of the great mass of clandestine prostitution, practised in evasion of the law, and which, if prevented, could only be so by a still more tyrannical use of the powers given to the police, and by exposing respectable women to a still greater amount of injury and indignity than at present.

2. No reason can be given for subjecting women to medical inspection which does not apply in a greater degree to the men who consort with them. The process is painful, even physically, and sometimes dangerous, to women—not at all so to men: and it is idle to say that its application to men is impracticable: the same kind and degree of espionage which detects a prostitute, could equally detect the men who go with her. The law, being one-sided, inflicted on women by men, and delivering over a large body of women intentionally, and many other women unintentionally, to insulting indignity at the pleasure of the police, has the genuine characteristics of tyranny.

You say that you think there is no weight in the objection that the law applies to one sex only, inasmuch as enlistment does the same. I think you will see that my replies are unanswerable. In the first place, the laws that regulate enlistment are not made by women only, themselves not liable to it, and then applied to men only, who have no voice in making them; as is the case in those penalties, or discipline, proposed to be applied to prostitutes by a legislature which neither consists of, nor is elected by, any

proportion of women. Moreover, so long as women who offer themselves as soldiers are not accepted, the being a soldier must be taken as a privilege, and not a penalty, of sex. If women were only not soldiers because they are incapable of the fatigue and labour, then those women who in men's clothes have proved themselves capable would not be ejected on their sex being discovered. So long as this is the case, military service is as much a privilege of our aristocracy as it is in Mahomedan countries where Christians are not allowed to serve. And the discipline to which this aristocracy voluntarily submits itself through the voice of a legislature which itself elects, cannot be compared to the discipline inflicted by those who do not share it, without the consent of those who are alone exposed to it.—Secondly, if it was impossible for any man to expose himself to military discipline without a woman as his companion, and if he, only, was liable to the discipline and punishment, the case would be more nearly parallel. You must remember that no woman can render herself liable as a prostitute without a man for her accomplice: yet when it comes to the punishment, or, if you prefer so to consider it, the discipline, we hear no more of him. Thus the man only is a soldier, and he subjects himself voluntarily to the discipline: a man and a woman must be associated in prostitution, the woman only is subjected to discipline, and that without her own consent.

3. There are important medical opinions against, as well as in favour of, the Acts. If the preponderance is in favour, this carries no weight with me; for professional men look at questions from a professional point of view, and it being a medical man's professional duty to ascertain disease as early as possible and put it under treatment at once, this professional association is quite sufficient to account for a medical bias. I suppose medical men would desire to place men also under the discipline, which would then be decidedly less odious, and more effectual. We cannot take their authority for the half, and then refuse it for the whole. Some of the warmest medical advocates for the Acts admit that their operation can never be satisfactory until men also are submitted to them, which, they say, they know men will never consent to.

4. With regard to those who object to the C. D. A. as encouraging vice, I do not undertake to defend all they say; but I think them so far in the right, that even if there were the strongest reasons of other kinds for the Act, it would always have this for one of its drawbacks. To soldiers and ignorant persons it cannot but seem that legal precautions taken expressly to make that kind of indulgence safe, are a license to it. There is no parallel case of an indulgence or pursuit avowedly disgraceful and immoral for which the government provides safeguards. A parallel case would be the supplying of stomach pumps for drunkards, or arrangements for lending money to gamblers who may otherwise be tempted into theft in moments of desperation, and thus injure their wives and families. We have no such parallels by which to prove to men of lax habits in this particular that we disapprove of, while taking care of them. It is tolerably plain, therefore, that as a matter of fact the legislature does regard this with less disfavour than any other practice generally considered immoral and injurious to society: and the public evidence of its doing so must of necessity tend to remove feelings of shame or disapprobation connected with it. I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J.S.M.

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

1871

1626.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Jan. 2. 1871

Dear Chadwick

I like most of the Resolutions² very much (I have made a few verbal corrections in some of them). The only ones I do not agree with are Resolutions 8 and 18. I do not think it safe to trust entirely to voluntary enlistment for the large defensive force which this and every other country now requires. The perfection of a military system seems to me to be, to have no standing army whatever (except the amount required for foreign possessions) but to train the whole of the able bodied male population to military service. I believe that with previous school drill, six months training at first, and a few days every succeeding year, would be amply sufficient for the infantry. This would not take away the young men from civil occupations to any material extent: the six months would be taken at the very beginning of active life; and there would be at once the greatest amount of force possible, and the strongest security against its being called out unnecessarily: for a service from which no one would be exempt would inevitably be unpopular, unless the cause were one for which the nation at large felt a real enthusiasm. Any military force composed by voluntary enlistment even under the improved circumstances contemplated by you, would have, in a greater or less degree, the inconveniences of a standing army: it would consist principally of the more idle and irregular part of the population, it would acquire a professional military spirit, and it would have time to learn habits of passive and active obedience to its commanders which would make it, if of any considerable magnitude, an apt instrument of despotism.

I Am

Dear Chadwick

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1627.

TO WILLIAM DOUGAL CHRISTIE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Jan. 2. 1871

Dear Mr Christie

Excuse the delay in answering your note.

The only thing I know of which would effect newspaper reform would be to start a first rate newspaper. The obstacle to this is the difficulty of obtaining money to set up such a newspaper and carry it on for a considerable time at a pecuniary loss: and this obstacle seems likely to be of long continuance.

Short of this I do not see what there is to be done, except for each of us to do what he can towards improving any of the existing newspapers, either by writing in it or by such personal influence as he may be able to exercise.

You are not mistaken in thinking that I shall sympathize with anything you may do that tends to so desirable an object: but I cannot find time at present for discussing the subject with you, either by accepting your kind invitation to dinner or otherwise. I am

Dear Mr Christie
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1628.

TO MRS. FANNY HERTZ¹

Jan. 5, 1871

It gives me great pleasure to hear that a meeting is to be held at Bradford for the repeal of the C.D. Acts,² and I wish it all success. . . .

1629.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Jan. 5, 1871

Dear Madam

Your letter of Dec. 31 only reached me on Monday evening after post hour, so that it was impossible for me to answer it in time for your meeting on Tuesday.

I am much honoured by the wish of the Committee of the Ladies' Sanitary Association that I should take the Chair at their intended public meeting; but it will not be in my power to visit Birmingham either for that purpose, or for the meeting which I am happy to hear it is intended to hold in support of Women's Suffrage.

I Am

Dear Madam

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

1630.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 6. 1871

Dear Mary—

When several years ago I offered you the £80 it was on the supposition that £50 added to what you have & what you then earned would meet your wants: and as you had mentioned the Policies to me I made it £80 to enable you to be free from anxiety about that. I will now make it £100 and enclose a cheque for £5 for the December quarter. As to the Policies can you tell me whether if you sell them & invest the proceeds, the interest will be all paid to you? or whether Mr C[olman] will have any claim?

The accounts of June are very satisfactory.

1631.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 6. 1871

Dear Mr Morley—

I rejoice to hear that your short visit to the seaside has somewhat improved your health, but I am afraid that its permanent reestablishment will be much retarded if you work up to the utmost limits of your strength. I hope that you will consider my proposal² as still holding good & that you will have recourse to it at once if you find that your health does not continue to improve.

If I were to write on the attitude which England ought to take in regard to the war,³ without entering into the subject of the war itself, what I should have to say would be soon said, for my answer would be, no attitude at all. It does not seem that there is any urgent necessity for saying this, as there is at present no danger that England might interfere in any way. There is not likely to be any party in Parliament for going to war with Germany in support of France. I greatly regret to see the political leaders of the working classes led away by the Comtists⁴ & by the mere name of a republic into wishing to drag England into fighting for a government which dreads to face any popular representation & is forcing the French peasantry by the fear of being shot, into going up against their will to place themselves under the fire of the German armies; but there is not the slightest shadow of a probability that such counsels will be listened to by the government or by any party in Parliament. The really vital subject of debate will be the necessity of strengthening ourselves for military purposes & the subject on which Cairnes is writing⁵ seems to me to be that which, at the present moment, it is of real importance to take up energetically.

If, on the other hand, the question to be written about is the war itself, & its probable or desirable issues, I would rather that this task sh^d devolve on any one than on myself. It is only an evident call of duty that would make me willing to write & publish all I think about the conduct of the French from first to last & about their claim, aggressors as they were, & defeated as they are, to dictate the terms of peace.

Any one who writes on the subject might make good use of a remarkable pamphlet by Count Agénor de Gasparin⁶ in which he proposes as the only right condition of peace the erection of Alsace & German Lorraine into an independent & neutralized republic. I do not know if the most useful thing that you could publish at this moment on the subject would not be a short analysis of this pamphlet with copious translated extracts. I am afraid the French authorities by their obstinacy have let the time go by when the German people might have been induced to content themselves with this amount of concession. But it is really though not unattended with difficulties the only settlement that would be just to all parties; & by bringing it forward the minds of some readers

might perhaps be put upon a right train of thought; & even the newspaper writers would have an idea suggested to them their advocacy of which would make the nation less contemptible than they are making it at present.

If you would like to use M. de Gasparin's pamphlet for this or any other purpose, my copy is at your service.

1632.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 9 janvier 1871

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Deux mots seulement pour vous dire que ce sont uniquement mes occupations qui m'ont empêché jusqu'ici d'aller vous voir ou de vous écrire. Je pars pour l'Ecosse demain matin,² et je compte passer chez vous bientôt après mon retour.

Votre Affectionné

J. S. Mill

1633.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 15. 1871

Dear Chadwick—

Having only returned home yesterday I did not get the Draft Resolutions² until after the meeting. I think that the alterations have considerably improved them, & that their publication will do much good, though I myself go the whole length with Cairnes.³

1634.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park

Jan. 17. 1871

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Of course M^{rs} Fawcett has far better claims to be a member of the Political Economy Club than many of its present members, and I need hardly say that I should support her warmly if proposed. I think, however, that considering how perfectly well every one knows my opinions on the subject, the proposal would scarcely come with a good grace from me. It would have in some degree the appearance of wishing to impose my own opinions upon others. With regard to any one else proposing M^{rs} Fawcett, I should say yes, at once, but with one proviso, that there is a probable chance of her being elected; for as I do not doubt we could succeed in a few years,² it would be foolish to court failure now by undue haste. I think, therefore, that the best course would be for you to take counsel with M^r Newmarch,³ a hearty friend to women's suffrage, and the best judge of the probable leanings of the Club as a whole. If he thinks it judicious to put M^{rs} Fawcett's name among the candidates, there will not be the smallest difficulty in finding friends to propose and second her among influential members of the Club less specially associated with the women's movement than myself, and therefore in the particular case more suited for the purpose. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1635.

TO CHARLES LORING BRACE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 19, 1871

My Dear Sir

It is always a pleasure & an advantage to hear from you, for your letters always contain, however briefly, valuable information which the ordinary sources do not give, respecting the various important movements going on in the U.S. It is most interesting to have news of the struggle which you & others are making against the characteristic evils of the city of New York & when I hear that your efforts to extend education among the dangerous classes have already had a perceptible influence in the amount of juvenile delinquency as shown by the prison records, I congratulate you most heartily, for success of that kind goes nearer than any other to the root of the mischief, & every step made renders further progress easier. It is also most gratifying to hear that there is an increased feeling for the reform & purification of the Civil

Service. That the cause of free trade was greatly advancing we already knew; but that is a small thing compared with the other: besides, a people like the Americans who really attend to their own public business *must* find out that what is called protection is an organised system of pillage of the many by the few, & the different classes of the pillaged must soon see that the remedy is to put an end to the pillaging & not to ask to be compensated by permission to pillage somebody else, with an ultimate result like placing all Americans in a circle each with his hand in the pocket of his righthand neighbour. The economic loss & waste of all this is tremendous, but the resources of your country & the facilities of living in it are so great that you can bear this waste for a time as no other country could do. But the corruption of your politicians is a far more serious matter; it saps the very roots of free government; & the triumphant success of villainy by corrupting your legislatures & even the bench of justices, cannot go on without demoralizing the whole nation. As you truly say, the only remedy is in awakening the public conscience. The still uncorrupted rural population,—M^r Disraeli's "territorial democracy"—who have so often come forward & saved the country when it seemed on the brink of being led by the professional politicians into some great folly or iniquity—have to be awakened to the disgrace & danger of leaving the affairs of the country in the hands of men who care for them only as a source of corrupt profit. They have only to refuse their votes to these men & the rule is at an end.

You wish that our writers would discuss the idea of an International Court of Arbitration. They do discuss it: more has been said & written on the subject in the last year than ever before. But how little prepared the European world is for the realization of the idea may be seen in the fact, that the leaders of our working classes, who have been more zealous for peace than any other class, & who at the beginning of this war made a strong demonstration against allowing ourselves to be drawn into it, are now or at least many of them are loudly demanding that we sh^d go to war with Germany in behalf of France. I believe that the conditions of a settlement of differences by arbitration do exist between G.B. & the U.S.: because in the first place as I believe, there really exists in both countries a sincere repugnance to going to war with one another; & besides, the ostensible causes of our disagreements are always the real ones. But how could the quarrel between France & Germany have been referred to arbitration? The pretended grievance was a mere sham; the cause of war was that France could not bear to see Germany made powerful by union. If such a war could have been prevented it would not have been by a judicial process but by the forcible interference of neutrals to aid the party attacked. So with the Crimean war: the real question was not about any special ground of quarrel: it was, whether Russia sh^d be allowed to conquer Turkey or not, which question did not admit of being referred to arbitration. When the nations of Europe shall have given up national hatreds & schemes of national aggrandizement, & when their institutions shall be sufficiently assimilated to prevent any of the governments from seeing in the greatness & prosperity of another state a danger to its power over its own people, they will probably be all so sincerely desirous of peace that they will never dream of any other than an amicable settlement of any accidental differences that may still arise. And every step taken in the improvement of the intelligence & morality of mankind brings this happy result a little nearer.

There is a sort of stagnation just now in our internal politics as the public can hardly feel interested in anything but the war. The bringing of the new Education Act into force is however one exception; the elections of the School Boards for London & other places have excited great interest: & there will probably be a great extension of instruction in reading & writing among the children of the poor. How much more will be taught or how well time must shew; but no real friend of popular education regards this Education Act as a final measure. The right of women to a voice in the management of education has been asserted by the triumphant return of two ladies as members of the London School Board² & of several others in different parts of the country.

You ask if we were prepared for the tremendous collapse of the French military system. Nobody I suppose expected it to be so sudden & complete, but to those who knew France there was nothing surprising in it when it came. I hope it will tend to dispel the still common delusion that despotism is a vigorous government. There never was a greater mistake. When a government is continually requiring its functionaries to commit rascalities for its sake, they will go on committing rascalities for their own: & as there can be no publicity & no effectual system for the detection of abuse when the government itself has an interest in concealment, the funds intended for the service of the State find their way into private pockets & all who want to get rid of onerous public obligations are able to buy them off. No doubt even Frederick II & the first Napoleon were often cheated by their officers; but an indolent man like the present Napoleon, who moreover by the circumstances of his usurpation could get few honest men to serve him, was peculiarly exposed to have the whole of his administration one mass of profligate malversation. His folly was that he does not seem to have had any suspicion of this, but rushed into war in reliance on ground which was completely rotten under his feet.

1636.

TO MRS. M. C. HALSTED¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 19. 1871

Dear Madam—

I have had the honour of receiving your letter of 29th December.

Your idea of a general Federation, or United States of Europe, has occurred to many people, & has been a good deal talked and written about of late years among advanced philanthropists, especially on the Continent; indeed, there can be no advanced philanthropist who does not look forward to something of the kind as the ultimate result of human improvement. But a great many things have to be got rid of, & a great many others to be created, before it will begin to be useful to pursue this federation as a practical object. Such a federal system supposes a very great degree of mutual trust

on the part of the communities which comprise it, in at least the good intentions of one another. This trust substantially exists between the States of the American Union (with the temporary exception of the relations between North and South) but the States of Europe do not trust one another, & none of them really trusts its own government much less the governments of the other states. There is moreover such a want of homogeneity among them, such differences in their opinions, their institutions, their education, & among some of them there is still so much mutual antipathy that none of them would choose to give up so much of its power over its own affairs into the hands of the others, as your scheme would require. Every improvement however which takes place either in the internal government or in the education of any of them, tends to diminish these obstacles & to bring universal peace, grounded on federal institutions, so much the nearer & it is to such improvements we must trust for bringing about that & all the other salutary changes in human affairs which philanthropists look forward to.

1637.

TO J. K. HAMILTON WILLCOX¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Jan. 20. 1871

Dear Mr Willcox,

I send you my acknowledgment of the honour done me by the New York Liberal Club² & I have in accordance with your request taken the opportunity of adding a few arguments against Protectionism considered with reference to America.

I duly received your writings on the Women question.³ I had already, with much pleasure remarked some of them in the journals devoted to that cause. I have long been of the opinion expressed by you “that the cause of over-population” or at all events a necessary condition of it “is woman’s subjugation, & that the cure is her enfranchisement.” It is one of the endless benefits that will flow from that greatest & most fundamental of all improvements in human society.

1638.

TO THE NEW YORK LIBERAL CLUB¹

Jan. 20. 1871

Dear Sir—

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of Nov. 11, transmitting the Diploma by which the New York Liberal Club do me the honour of signifying my election as an Honorary Member of their body.² What you tell me respecting the origin & purposes of the Liberal Club, reflects great credit on its founders. There cannot be a higher or more important aim than that of asserting & maintaining individuality of thought & character, together with its necessary complement, the fullest latitude of mutual criticism. Such Associations are a means of making head against the greatest danger of a settled state of society, the danger of intellectual stagnation; & help towards raising up men qualified to speak to the public with decisive effect on those political & social questions which are continually presenting fresh demands on the collective thought & intellectual discernment of the nation.

You intimate that it might be acceptable if in acknowledging your communication, I were to take the opportunity of expressing my opinion on the desirableness of a Free Trade policy for America. I cannot suppose that those who have thought me deserving of the distinguished honour conferred on me, can have anything to learn respecting my opinion on a question of this nature. But I sh^d not be doing justice to my sense of that honour or to the interest I feel in the objects & in the prosperity of the Club, were I not to comply with the wish expressed by you in its behalf.

I hold every form of what is called Protection to be an employment of the powers of Government to tax the Many with the intention of promoting the pecuniary gains of a Few: I say the intention, because even that desired object is very often not attained, & never to the extent that is expected. But whatever gain there is, is made by the Few, & them alone; for the labouring people employed in the protected branches of industry are not benefitted. Wages do not range higher in the protected than in other employments; they depend on the general rate of the remuneration of labour in the country, & if the demand for particular kinds of labour is artificially increased, the consequence is merely that labour is attracted from other occupations, so that employment is given in the protected trades to a greater number, but not at a higher remuneration. The gain by Protection when there is gain, is for the employers alone. Such legislation was worthy of Great Britain under her unreformed constitution, when the powers of legislation were in the hands of a limited class of great landowners & wealthy manufacturers. But in a democratic nation like the U.S. it is a signal instance of dupery, & I have a higher opinion of the intelligence of the American Many than to believe that a handful of manufacturers will be able to retain by fallacy & sophistry that power of levying a toll on every other person's earnings, which the powerful aristocracy of England with all their political ascendancy & social prestige have not been able to keep possession of.

The misapprehension, & confusion of thought which exist on this subject—misapprehension & confusion quite genuine, I allow, in the Protectionist mind—arise from a very small number of oversights, natural enough perhaps in those who have never thought on the subject.

1. When people see manufactories built & hands set to work to produce at home what had previously been imported from abroad, they imagine that all this is fresh industry & fresh employment, over & above that which existed before, & that whatever increased production takes place in these particular trades is so much additional wealth created in the country. The oversight is in not considering that this additional labour & capital to which this production is due, are not created, but withdrawn from other employments in which they would have added as much to the wealth of the country, & not only as much, but more, since they would not have needed a subsidy out of every consumer's pocket to make their employment remunerative. That the apparent increase of employment produced by Protection is a mere transfer from one business to another, is true everywhere but is particularly obvious in America since no one will pretend that labour & capital in the U.S. are in any danger of not finding employment, or that the time is at hand when they will even be obliged to submit to any diminution of wages or of profits.

2. There is a widely diffused notion that by means of protecting duties on foreign commodities, a nation taxes not itself, but the foreign producers. Because foreign nations can really be made to suffer, by being deprived of a beneficial trade, it is imagined that what the foreigners lose one's own country must gain. But this is a complete misunderstanding of the nature & operation of Protection. Duties on such foreign commodities as do not come into competition with home productions, sometimes do fall partly on foreigners, unless the effect is frustrated by a similar policy in the foreign country. Such duties do not destroy any wealth, & may alter its distribution. But such is not the case with any duties so far as they have a protective operation. For their protective operation consists in causing something to be made in one place which in a state of freedom would be made in another, & whatever does this diminishes the total produce of the world's labour; for in a state of freedom, everything naturally tends to be produced in the places & in the ways by which the cost incurred in labour & capital obtains the largest return. If this working of the ordinary motives to production is interfered with, & producers are bribed, at other people's expense, to produce an article where they would not otherwise find it for their interest to do so, there is a loss to the world of a portion of its annual produce, which would have been shared in some proportion or other between the importing & the exporting countries. America can in this way damage foreigners but she cannot tax them, for she cannot avoid largely sharing their loss.

3. A notion very powerful in the minds of some Americans, is that if they let in the competition of what they call the pauper labour of Europe they would reduce their own labourers to similar pauperism. Let me observe by the way that the labour which produces the exportable articles of Europe & especially of England, is not pauper labour, but is generally the most highly paid manual labour of the country. But it is of course true that the general wages of labour in America are above the English level, & if these high wages were the effect of Protection, I for one sh^d never wish to see Protection abolished. But it is not because of Protection that wages in America are high, it is because there is abundance of land for every labourer & because every labourer is at liberty to acquire it. As long as this abundance of land relatively to population continues, wages will not decline. These high wages are not a special burthen upon the New England cotton spinner or the Pennsylvanian iron master; but

have equally to be paid in agriculture & in those numerous branches of manufacturing & other industries (the building trades for example) which every country necessarily carries on for itself. If those employments, which form the bulk of the industry of the country, can pay the high American wages & yield besides, the high American profits, & if there are other branches of manufacture which cannot do this unless the people of the U.S. consent to pay them a subsidy in the form of a large extra price, the former class of employments yield a greater return to the labour & capital of America than the latter, & it is for the interest of American production on the whole that the labour & capital of the country sh^d be diverted from the employments which require to be subsidized, to those which can maintain themselves without.

4. An argument in favour of protection which carries weight with many Americans who are not deceived by the economic fallacies of Protectionism, is that it is an evil to have the population of a country too exclusively agricultural & that the interests of civilisation require a considerable admixture of large towns. I acknowledge that there was no little force in this argument, at a much earlier period of American development. But the time has surely gone by when the growth of towns in the U.S. required any artificial encouragement. Even in those parts of the Union in which little or no protected industry is carried on, towns spring into existence & into greatness with a rapidity more marvellous than even the extension of the cultivated area of your territory. The necessity of centres both for internal & foreign trade; the multitude of occupations which from the nature of things are not exposed to the competition of distant places; & the many kinds & qualities of manufacture which are kept at home by the natural protection of cost of carriage, ensure to the U.S. a town population amply sufficient for a country in which to be an agricultural labourer does not mean as it has hitherto meant in England to be an uneducated barbarian. I believe the most enlightened Americans are generally of opinion that at present it is the rural much more than the town population which is both the physical & the moral strength of the country.

To these various considerations I might add that the protection lavished upon some favoured classes of producers is even from the Protectionist point of view a serious injury to other producers who depend on those for the materials or the instruments of their several businesses; & that the attempt to remedy this injustice by distributing protection all round exhibits American producers in the ludicrous light of attempting to get rich by mutually taxing one another. But these points have been placed in so strong a light by Mr Wells' justly celebrated Report³ that it is quite superfluous for me to insist on them. Rather would I endeavour to impress my conviction that the evils of Protection though they may be aggravated by the details of its application, cannot be removed by any readjustment of those details; & that any Protection whatever, just in so far as it *is* Protection—just in so far as it fulfils its purpose—abstracts in a greater or a less degree from the aggregate wealth of mankind, & leaves a less amount of product to be shared among the nations of the earth, to the necessary loss of all nations whose industry is forced out of its spontaneous course, by preventing them either from importing or from exporting any article which they would import or export in a state of freedom.

1639.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 5. 1871

Dear Mr Leslie—

I did not write to you on receiving your letter of the 22nd because from what you said I counted upon seeing you at the P[olitical] Ec[onomy] Club;² I hope your absence was not caused by any retrogression in your health, the account of which in your letter was so favourable.

I am extremely glad that you are going to speak at the Women's Suffrage meeting.³ It is settled that Sir R. Anstruther⁴ is to take the chair.

I will endeavour to refresh my memory of your article in Dec. 1867⁵ & will mention it as opportunities offer. It does you great honour to have taken up the Swiss system⁶ so early as the example to be followed in reforming our own. Many thoughtful people are now coming round to the Swiss system (of which Chadwick's school drill⁷ forms a part) but the majority even of army reformers are still far behind. They are prejudiced against making military service within the country compulsory on the whole male population chiefly because for want of knowledge of facts they have a most exaggerated idea of the time which would have to be sacrificed from the ordinary pursuits of life. It is to be hoped there will at least be some few persons in Parl^t who will resist the attempt likely to be made by the Gov^t to satisfy the demand for an increased military force without making any fundamental change in the old system. It will be an uphill fight to get a really national defensive force, but it may be a question of life & death to this country not only to have it, but to have it soon. I do not know which are most smitten with imbecility, those who are for trusting our safety solely to our navy on the speculation that no foreign army can land in England or those who after crying at the top of their voices that we are utterly without the means of facing an enemy in the field turn around next day & demand that we sh^d instantly go to war with Russia for the Black Sea or with Germany for France.

1640.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Feb. 8. 1871

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I expect to be able to be at the Radical Club on Feb. 12. My daughter is not able to say with certainty if she can be. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1641.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

Feb. 16. 1871

Dear Mr Villari—

It was a real pleasure to hear from you again. It is, as you say a long time since any letters have passed between us, & the momentous and most unexpected events which have succeeded one another so rapidly during the time make it seem even longer than it is. Among all these events there is but one which we can regard with unqualified satisfaction. The acquisition of Rome by Italy² is now an accomplished fact, & I hope it will be an example how great the power of an accomplished fact is. But Italy will have to look to her strength. If either the Legitimist or the Orleanist party gets the upper hand in the struggle for power which will now take place in France, they will certainly ally themselves with the clergy. How hostile both those parties have always been to the cause of Italy we know; & when the French begin to aim at recovering their military reputation & some part of their influence in Europe, they are much more likely to make their first trial of strength with Italy (& indeed with any of the neutrals) than with Germany. This is one of the most serious dangers impending over Europe, though apparently one of the least thought of, at least in England.

With regard to the present war, there now seems to be good hope that the National Assembly will put an end to it.³ The time for the neutral powers to have interfered was before hostilities had begun. I did not see this at the time, but have been converted to it since. I now believe that there would not have been any war, if even England alone had declared that it would send its fleet to act against whichever side began the attack. But there has been no time since at which neutrals could have interfered to any good purpose. Armed interference was out of the question, for not having opposed the French aggression, they could not go to war to shield France from the penalties of failure: & for mediation there was no room so long as the French Government insisted that France alone of all nations may gain territory by successful

war but must not lose territory by the most thorough & most just defeat. Even now, when that pretension will probably be abandoned, things have gone too far & the public opinion of Germany as to the only safe terms of peace has become too decided, to make it conceivable that the counsels or opinion of neutrals will be at all listened to by the German Government.

I regret for the sake of Italy that you no longer occupy your position in the Ministry of Public Instruction,⁴ though I hope for a large compensation in the use you are making of your leisure to write a book on Machiavelli.⁵ You were of course quite right to resign rather than be the instrument of a policy you do not approve. Doubtless, a rigid economy in expenditure is at present indispensable to Italy; but education is the last of the public interests which should be the subject of any other economy than that which consists in making every *lira* spent go the farthest possible towards the attainment of the end. Unfortunately the economy of most governments consists in starving useful service & spending the money of the public in political or private jobbing; & I suppose Italy has its share of those costs like other countries.

Do not trouble yourself to send the many large folio volumes you mention. The occasion which made me write to have those on emigration has now passed by.⁶

1642.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 2 [1871]

Mr J. S. Mill will dine with the Radical Club on Sunday March 5.

1642A.

TO AUBERON HERBERT¹

March 15, 1871.

I was much pleased with the manner in which you stood up for the Swiss system in your speech on the Army Regulation Bill,² and I am happy to hear that you propose to follow up that effort by others. I believe that as much of the opposition to training the whole people as is *bona fide* would mostly disappear if it were understood how little interruption need be caused in the ordinary pursuits of life.

1643.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN [1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 15. 1871

Dear Sir—

I send you by this post a proof copy of a paper of mine which has been adopted by an Association formed for the reform of the Land Laws as an exposition of its principles. [2](#) I am requested by the Committee of the Association to ask whether you would be willing to publish it, on the half profit principle. It has been set up in type for the convenience of the members of the Committee but no copies have yet been put into circulation. The Committee would like the price to be sixpence. The name of the publishers would of course be added to the title page.

1644.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN [1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 17, 1871.

Dear Sir—

I have directed the printers to put themselves in communication with you. I should like everything to be put in readiness for publication, but the pamphlet is not to be published nor any copies sent to the press or elsewhere until I communicate with you again.

I understand you to assent to the proposed price (6d). The Committee wish to retain the copyright. The number of copies to be printed remains to be settled. What are your ideas on that point? The feeling of the Committee is for a large edition & for distributing it widely.

1645.

TO MARK H. JUDGE [1](#)

Blackheath Park,

21st March 1871

Dear Sir,—

I have understood that the expediency of making the contract between a trades union and its members legally binding and enforceable by the tribunals, has been much discussed among trade unionists, and that the prevailing opinion among them is adverse to giving force of law to the engagement. I believe that one objection felt by the trade unionists to the establishment of a legal obligation, is that it would necessarily lead to the decision of the ordinary courts of law of the expediency of particular strikes, whenever funds have been prevented by such strikes from being forthcoming to meet the other liabilities of the unions. This appears to open up the question of how far it is well that the same organisation should provide for the trade interests as well as for the private interests of its members: and this is a question on which I am not at present prepared to give a decided opinion; for while, at first sight, the reasons against this combination appear extremely powerful, I am aware that there are others of very great weight in its favour. One of these reasons is that the fact that a trade union has other and pressing demands for its funds is likely to induce great caution, if not reluctance, to entering upon a strike; and the combination therefore is thought by many to have a tendency to diminish the number of strikes that will be undertaken by the unions.

1646.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 22, 1871

Dear Sir—

The Committee of the L[and] T[enure] R[eform] Assⁿ are desirous to take 1000 copies of the pamphlet² for distribution, chiefly to the Provincial Press & to associations of working men. These will be required at once in addition to the 1000 copies you propose printing. The Committee would be obliged by your informing them at what cost you can let them have the 1000 copies & by your giving them a list of the newspapers & periodicals to which you would yourself send copies in order that they may not send any of theirs to the same. They would like your copies & theirs to go out on the same day, in order not to give any priority to some newspapers over others.

1647.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

Blackheath Park

Kent

March 23. 1871

Dear Sir

I know of no one more likely to undertake what you propose in your note to me, than Professor Cliffe Leslie, and no political economist of whom I have a higher opinion. I wrote to him on receiving your note, and I inclose his reply.²

I find the question you put to me respecting books rather difficult to decide, but I will consider of it, and write to you in a few days.³ I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1648.

TO MRS. MILLICENT J. FAWCETT¹

Blackheath Park, Kent

March 26, 1871

Dear Mrs Fawcett

There is not at present any question of having a paid Secretary to the Land Tenure Reform Association, because the attempt to do so must land the Association in bankruptcy, inasmuch as our whole assets would not pay a Secretary with the needful printing and stationery for one year, and on this account it is that a new Secretary has to be found. Some of our members are anxious that the Secretary should be paid, thinking that the work may be better attended to in that case, but I do not find that anyone is forthcoming to state how the money is to be got with which to pay one; and I need not say that I shall never consent to launch into expenses in the hope that they may bring in future subscriptions. I shall decline to be President or Chairman if any expenses are undertaken for which we have not a clear prospect of funds.

If, however, subscriptions should come in, I should be glad to know whether Miss Rhoda Garrett² would think as little as £50 a year sufficient for her services. The late Secretary asks £100, and of course it may be possible that we may have sufficient subscriptions for the half, though not for the whole; and it might form an element in our decision, if we know what would be Miss R. Garrett's terms.

I Am, Dear Mrs Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1649.

TO LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.[1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

March 27. 1871

Dear Sirs—

The pamphlet is now ready for press & the sooner it is out the better.[2](#)

As soon as the 1000 copies subscribed for by the L. T. Assⁿ are delivered at the office, 9 Buckingham St Strand, those intended for the press will be folded & directed, & as this will take a longer time than will probably be required to get the copies you propose sending to editors, ready for posting, the Committee propose that when their copies are ready, the Secretary or some member of the Committee sh^d call with them at your office, receive yours, & post them altogether. This will accordingly be done unless I hear from you to the contrary.

1650.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL[1](#)

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 30. 1871

Dear Sir

It is very difficult to recommend books on politics for such students as those who are the subject of your letter. Not only, as you truly say, there are no manuals of statesmanship, but, though there are many books which treat particular topics instructively or which for one reason or another are worth reading, I can mention very few which, judged by the best lights of the present time, do not contain at least as many errors as truths; in addition to which, they are written with reference to European questions and difficulties, and presuppose a knowledge of ordinary European facts and opinions such as it is not likely that your Japanese friends have yet acquired. There are few writers better worth studying to an European thinker than

Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Tocqueville; but I doubt their being of much use for this particular purpose. On the whole I can think of no books so likely to be useful, both from their intrinsic merit and from their cosmopolitan character as some of Bentham's writings, especially those edited in French by Dumont, translations of which, or the original papers on which they were founded, are in the collected edition of Bentham's Works.² To these I may add some of my father's articles in the Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica, especially "Jurisprudence," "Education," and "Law of Nations."

To enable an active minded Asiatic to understand and profit by European political thought, nothing seems to me more important than that he should acquaint himself with European history; beginning with the standard books, notwithstanding their imperfections, and enriching them by the best critical or philosophical writings on historical subjects. Here, also, the choice of books presents great difficulties; but the general outline of the facts of history has to be first acquired, with as little admixture of false notions as possible.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

F. J. Furnivall Esq.

1651.

TO HENRY MAINE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

March 30, 1871

Dear Mr Maine

I am much obliged to you for your book,² which I had already read in the sheets you sent to Mr. Morley, and with all the pleasure and admiration I expected. I am writing something on it for the Fortnightly,³ but with little confidence of success, for it is hardly possible to do justice to any of your writings by a summary. I share your fears as to the tendency of things in India. It is remarkable that a reaction in favour of the English ideas of landed property should have taken place in India at the very time when in England itself a movement has been beginning towards the wider and more liberal conception which has prevailed for two generations in India. Nothing, however, is so likely to check this reaction as your book, which may be expected to be read not only by the young civil officers of the Indian Government, but, we may hope, by those who are preparing for the competitive examination.

Unhappily, it is difficult to interest English readers of periodicals in an Indian subject, but that part of your book which relates to Europe and England will have great and increasing interest; and by the aid of that, the more intelligent readers may be led to pay attention to the Indian part.

Could you give me the pleasure of dining with me some day that you are in town? It would give me much pleasure if you could come down on Sunday April 16. We dine at 5 o'clock, and there are plenty of trains both for coming and returning between Blackheath and Charing Cross.

I Am
Dear Mr. Maine
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1652.

TO ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE¹

[April, 1871]

It would be very useful to the association, and a great pleasure to myself, if you would consent to be one of the speakers at the meeting.² There is the more reason why you should do so, as you are the author of one very valuable article of the programme.³ Were you to explain and defend that article, it would be a service which no one is so well qualified to render as yourself.

1653.

TO FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

April 4, 1871

Dear Sir

I have just ascertained that my friend Mr Cairnes, Professor of Political Economy at University College, might be willing to give lessons in Political Economy to your Japanese friends.² There is no person whom I know of, more highly qualified to give instruction in Political Economy than Professor Cairnes; and as I believe you and Mr Leslie have not been able to make an arrangement, it would be much to the advantage of your friends if one could be made with Mr Cairnes. His address is

J. E. Cairnes Esq

Chesterfield Lodge
High Road
Lee
S. E.

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1654.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 6. 1871

Dear Sir—

Excuse the delay in answering your note. I do not like to put any sort of pressure on my publisher, which even a letter of introduction, for the purpose you have in view, would be to a certain extent; but if you like to mention me to Mr. Longman as knowing you, I sh^d be happy, if he asks me, to tell him all I know of you; & all I know is in your favour.

1655.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 20, 1871

Dear Sir—

The oversight about the 1000 copies of “Liberty” is of no consequence.² I sh^d like to continue publishing the three People’s editions with you receiving for each a fixed sum for every thousand copies printed; & I sh^d be glad to hear from you what you would propose to give for each on that principle.

Will you be so good as to send me 10 copies of the Land Tenure pamphlet on my private account.

1656.

TO THOMAS F. KELSALL [1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

April 30. 1871

Dear Sir

I thank you (though very tardily) for your very interesting letter & I think your idea of making public access to parks (when beyond a small size) no longer optional with the proprietor, an excellent one: wholly right in principle & more likely than anything else to reconcile the people to keeping up the parks instead of ploughing them up to grow corn, which I sh^d much regret.

With regard to game, I am aware that by English law it is not strictly speaking property until it is killed; but the lord of the manor has, if I rightly understand the matter, the exclusive right of shooting or giving permission to shoot on what is by law his waste.

I agree with you that the State sh^d prevent common land from being made the absolute property of individuals even with the consent of those who have common rights, & the programme of the Assⁿ goes this length.

1657.

TO FREDERIC HARRISON [1](#)

[May ? 1871]

[He shared the indignation which I expressed in 1871 for the savage conduct of the Thiers Ministry in suppressing the Paris Insurrection.] The crimes of the *parti de l'ordre* are atrocious, even supposing that they are in revenge for those generally attributed to the Commune.

1658.

TO GEORGE ODGER [1](#)

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 1. 1871

Dear Sir—

Allow me to introduce to you a very old friend of mine, M. Gustave d'Eichthal, formerly one of the chiefs of the St Simonian body, (the original source of many of the Socialist ideas which have diffused themselves in France) & who has retained through life the same strong interest in whatever tends to the reorganisation of society on a more just foundation. M. d'Eichthal wishes to learn all he can of the movement which is proceeding among the working classes of our own country & would be much obliged by being allowed an opportunity of conversing with you as one of the foremost representatives of that movement.

1659.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

May 2. 1871

Dear Mr Plummer

I fear I have been very long a debtor to you in the matter of your last letter. We heard with much regret and sympathy of the loss you sustained during the winter.

My daughter has been so much indisposed during this winter, that we have been seeing very few of our friends. We shall hope that as the warm season advances, her health will improve, and that we may have the pleasure of being able to ask you and Mrs Plummer to come over here and spend an afternoon with us.

My daughter desires her kind regards to Mrs Plummer, and I am

Dear Mr Plummer

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1660.

TO DUNCAN McLAREN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 6. 1871

Dear Sir—

I think so favourably of the capacity shown in your son's volume of Essays² that I have no difficulty in placing the inclosed expression of opinion at his disposal for any use he may think it can be to him.

Having read Mr Charles McLaren's volume of philosophical essays shortly after it was printed, I have formed a very high estimate both of his attainments in mental philosophy, & of his metaphysical acuteness. So far as his opinions agree with my own, I think the Essays show a very considerable mastery of the subject: but I was perhaps still more impressed by one of them which maintains opinions opposed to my own, & which shows an originality & vigour of thought entitling it to a high place among the writings on its own side of the question.

1661.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park Kent

May 13. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I have seen Mr Hare, who would like to see you on Tuesday at 12, if you can make it convenient to call on him at No 8 York Street St James's Square.

It appears to me that if you are outvoted on the motion that the Committee refuses to send delegates, it would be advisable to take a fresh ground, viz. that a measure which would swamp the London Committee in a Central Committee of provincials² in which it would have but three representatives cannot be adopted except by a vote of the London Society, which the London Committee represents. This seems to me both rational in itself, and technically correct, and if your motion is negatived, we think another should be made, referring the question to a general meeting of the London Society, to be called for the purpose. This would embarrass the enemy very much as their object is, quietly to supersede the London Committee, and not to raise a public discussion. The best person to bring forward this motion would be Mr Hare, or in his default, Mr Hunter.³ This practically also would gain time (and the object of the enemy is to decide all as swiftly as possible, in order that they may get into action this session in London): and we think it would probably detach Mrs Taylor's⁴ vote at least from the enemy, as she would be likely to be moved by the argument that the London Executive Committee has no right to decide a point practically swamping the London Society, without referring to the members of that Society itself. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1662.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 15. 1871

Dear Sir—

On the whole I prefer that an abridgment sh^d not be made of my Princ. of Pol. Econ.
& I have written to that effect to Mr. [Howitt?].²

I accept your proposals for the People's Ed. of Pol. Economy & Repr. Gov^t but there
seems to be some mistake in the terms you offer for the People's Edition of Liberty. I
should expect £12 not £10 for that.

Please oblige me by sending a copy of my "System of Logic" to the Rev. A. J.
Ashworth,³ Bramley, Leeds.

1663.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

May 16 [1871]

Dear Mr Robertson

We think that it would be a very good plan to send round as you propose, to the other
Committees a statement of reasons, and that there is no harm, but rather good, in any
steps that make widely known a distinct difference of opinion between the London
Committee and the Manchester;² short always of its being so done as to be likely to
get into the newspapers. Perhaps to avoid this, the word "*Private*" should be written
or printed at the head of whatever paper is sent round.

We think also that it would be better for all to vote simply against any new member of
the London Committee of whom you cannot feel quite sure in future divisions: and no

reasons need be given, but if any is wanted I think it amply sufficient to plead the superior efficiency of a small Committee over a large one. I am Dear Mr Robertson

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1664.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN^{[1](#)}

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 18. 1871

The calculation or data which you ask me respecting my book on Liberty,^{[2](#)} are extremely simple. It is merely that the offer you make me is less than what I have received on the half profit system.

1665.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN^{[1](#)}

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 20. 1871

Dear Sir—

Thanks for the cheque for which I return the receipt. Will you oblige me by sending copies of all my writings (Library Editions) to the Committee formed in London to collect books for the new Library in course of formation at Strasburg.^{[2](#)}

1666.

TO GUSTAVE D'EICHTHAL^{[1](#)}

Blackheath Park, Kent

le 21 mai 1871

Mon Cher D'Eichthal

Vous ne m'avez pas donné le numéro de votre nouvelle adresse, cependant j'espère que ceci vous parviendra, comme aussi un exemplaire du Programme de l'Association² que j'ai mis à la poste pour vous. Je suis charmé que vous ayez assisté au meeting et qu'il vous ait intéressé.

Il est très vrai que le défaut d'instruction générale, et surtout de connaissances historiques, condamne la plupart des ouvriers qui sont des hommes politiques à une certaine étroitesse de vues, même lorsque leurs idées sont foncièrement bonnes. Il n'y aura de remède à cela que graduellement, par le progrès de l'enseignement populaire. J'ai reçu de M. Odger une lettre où il me remercie de lui avoir fait faire votre connaissance,³ et de lui avoir procuré une conversation très intéressante avec vous.

Je partage tout à fait votre avis sur les baux à long terme que l'état devrait donner lorsque des terres à sa disposition sont demandées pour quelque entreprise utile; et je crois que ce système suffirait pour donner une juste récompense à la prévoyance dans cette sorte d'affaires.

Mais outre les accroissements de valeur locaux et incertains qui dépendent du succès d'une spéculation, il y a un accroissement général qui ne dépend que de la prospérité croissante du pays; et c'est celui-là que l'Association revendique le droit d'intercepter au profit de la nation.

J'ai vu M. Wolowski.⁴ Comme il est acharné contre tous ceux qui prennent part au mouvement de Paris. C'est la mesure de l'exaspération, naturelle peut-être, mais très regrettable, que cette malheureuse guerre civile a déjà engendré.⁵

Tout À Vous

J. S. Mill

1667.

TO JOHN HALES¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

May 28. 1871

Dear Sir—

I received your note yesterday evening, too late either to attend the Committee² or to send an answer. Were there the smallest chance that any demonstration of opinion here could arrest or mitigate the horrors now being perpetrated at Paris³ I hardly know anything I would not do to support such a demonstration. But I have no hope of

any such blessed result. It is some comfort that these atrocities are generally regarded in England with some of the abhorrence they deserve.

1667A.

TO AUBERON HERBERT¹

May 28, 1871.

What you say of the lady's feelings on a point on which I myself feel so strongly, that of perfect equality in marriage, increases the pleasure your letter gives me.

1668.

TO THOMAS HUMPHRY WARD?¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

May 29, 1871

Dear Sir

Having been out of town when the letter in the Times,² to which you have drawn my attention, appeared, I did not see it until too late for me to answer it: but in the meantime an excellent answer was written and sent by an eminent member of our Association, Professor Cairnes.³ The Times, *more suo*, did not think fit to insert it, but it has appeared in this morning's Daily News.

Attacks of this sort, fully as effective as this of Blakesley's,⁴ are continually made upon us, and I think the best way for me to treat them is to take an opportunity, by speech or writing, of answering all of them at once.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1669.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

June 1. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

1. I think it a very fortunate circumstance that Miss Biggs² is willing to resign the Secretaryship, and her resignation should be at once gladly accepted, lest she should change her mind. It appears to me out of the question for Miss Biggs to remain, unless as entirely subordinate to another, and far better that she should not remain at all. Nor need there be, in my opinion, any apprehension of difficulty in replacing her. The experience required is very much less than is supposed, and it would be far better that the London Society should consist wholly of persons on whom you can thoroughly rely, even though the work had to be relaxed or set aside for a time. The mere existence of a responsible and discreet body under the name of the London Society, is of far greater importance than any work it can do.

2. It would be well also that Mr Biggs³ should resign the Treasurership, which I understand you to think is likely if his daughter should resign the Secretaryship.

3. I understand from Mr Bain that the Committee might probably meet at Miss Orme's home, and I think this would be most desirable, as I think Miss Orme⁴ should be the new Secretary. I think the Treasurer should be either yourself, or M^{TS} Westlake,⁵ or Mr Hare, or M^{TS} Burbury.⁶ In all probability M^{TS} Westlake, if asked to accept the Treasurership, would do so on knowing that M^{TS} Taylor retires, and very likely Mrs Westlake would lend her house for meetings. She lives at 16 Oxford Square. I think, however, that you yourself would be the best Treasurer, as you would be able to assist Miss Orme with your advice. I repeat that you need have no fear of Miss Orme's not being able to do the work. She would very quickly learn all that is really necessary, and we may hope would be free from that feverish bustle which has made what work has been done seem twice as laborious as it really need be. I know that Miss Biggs has been very far from judicious, and has either lent herself to, or has herself been the cause of, most unwise mingling, this year, of the franchise with the C.D.A. agitation: besides that, in her unnecessary eagerness to get up particular meetings a week or two earlier rather than later, she declares "money to be no object." This sort of feverish haste on the part of the Secretary and Treasurer creates obstacles of every kind.

4. If there should be difficulty in obtaining either Miss Orme's or M^{TS} Westlake's assistance in regard to a place of meeting, or if their homes are not thought convenient, I think the room you mention, of the Century Club, might be made use of, and that there would be no objection on the part of ladies to go to it.

5. It appears to me that any offers, in the way of resignation, on the part of *any* of the members on whose votes you cannot habitually count, should be accepted at once without any hesitation. The success of your efforts in guiding the Committee so as to be of public utility depends upon having a working majority, next to your having the Secretary and Treasurer thoroughly to be relied upon.

6. I need scarcely say, the insidious proposal to send delegates to the London Committee, should in my opinion be opposed as strongly as the other, that the London Committee should send delegates to them. It is only another form of the same thing—an effort to make use for rash folly, of the authority acquired by the prudence and good taste of the London Committee. To all such proposals it should be steadily answered, that the Manchester or any other Committee can do whatever it pleases by itself, and that the London Committee is not disposed to lend its name or its influence to any measures whatever that it does not decide upon entirely by itself. The London Committee does not desire to interfere with any of the others, and cannot consent to be interfered with by them.

7. I am so very strongly of opinion that the Committee should not seem to be merely my mouthpiece, that I feel that for the sake of the cause it is best I should not accept the office of President. If you can get rid of dangerous members of the Committee, or outnumber them by steady attendants, it will be easy by degrees to add new members who will be useful and creditable. Just now the task to be done is to secure the guidance of the Committee by good hands in the present crisis. If that is successfully achieved, confidence will grow up again, and a strong Committee may be formed in time. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1670.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

June 3. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

Your letter does not succeed in removing my objection to Miss Biggs.² My daughter had already written to beg Mr and Miss Hare³ to be present, and we do not doubt that they will be, if possible. You must not count on Mr Thornton⁴ unless on some great crisis. It is impossible that he can find time to attend the Committee except very rarely; but on any very important division being expected your best plan would be to let me know, and Mr Thornton is more likely to attend at my or my daughter's request than at any one else's. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1671.

TO WILLIAM DOUGAL CHRISTIE¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

June 4. 1871

Dear Mr Christie

The Life of Shaftesbury² arrived duly, and has only not been sooner acknowledged because I have been waiting for an opportunity of reading it, which, in consequence of other occupations, has not yet arrived. I expect to be much interested by your book, and I thank you very much for sending it.

I Am
Dear Mr Christie
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1672.

TO WILLIAM LONGMAN¹

B[lackheath] P[ark]

June 16. 1871

Dear Sir—

At the request of my friend Mr Bissett I send you some MS Essays,² on points of history & of the philosophy of history, which he is desirous of having published. Mr B. is a careful & conscientious historical student & may be known to you as the author of a History of the Commonwealth of England,³ this three years ago by Murray, & which by the original researches it is founded on, and the light it throws on an interesting period well merits the attention of the historians & of the public. I differ

from many of the opinions expressed in these Essays, but the author is well entitled to speak on the historical questions to which they principally refer, for he has given very serious study to the evidence.

Mr. Bissett's address is

Andrew Bissett Esq

11 Southwood Terrace
Highgate

1673.

TO HELEN TAYLOR¹

Castletown in Braemar

July 13 [1871]

I have just received your letter and the Spectator, dear, for which many thanks—especially for the letter, which like all your letters does me good. We came here yesterday from Dunkeld; the coach does not yet run, but the coach proprietors sent us by posting at a low rate. The day was fine, and I thought we were to have at least one day without rain; but the rain came in the twilight, and there has been rain today, though not enough to impede our walking and botanising. The plants have been a little disappointing: even on Ben Lawers² Irvine did not find so many as I expected. I am in better spirits, dear, partly from your kind letter, partly from the cheering influence of our first fine day, but most because the sleepiness has not been so excessive; yesterday and today it has been perhaps not more than with me it usually is in travelling. I have nothing to trouble me now but the great and rapid increase of my other symptoms. I have no sign now of indigestion, except (and that is a great exception) a frequent bitter taste in my mouth and a dry tongue in the night. I saw a mention of the pussical show in a newspaper: I think if we were to send Phidia she ought to gain one of the prizes. By the passage from the Times about the Stelvio, Engadine &c.³ I suppose that the bad weather is general in Northern and Central Europe. Here, by which I mean in Scotland, people are telling one another what fine weather their letters say there is in the South. One wonders that such silly things should be written by people who must know better. We do not care to post back by the way we came, and think it best to go to Ballater tomorrow (Friday) and thence by the train to Aberdeen the only way of getting from here by railway. In this way we should probably (unless we stay to botanize somewhere on the way) arrive at Edinburgh on Saturday night; so that anything directed to Edinburgh by even Saturday's post will reach us there. I think my nervous system must be much out of order, for I cannot even use my pen properly; the handwriting of all my letters to you seems to me that of a sick person.

Your Ever Affectionate

J. S. Mill

1674.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Aug. 21. 1871

Dear Mr Cairnes

We arrived here on the 17th, after a most successful journey: the weather was generally excellent, and our enjoyment greater than on any of our former visits to Switzerland, owing to Helen's excellent idea of stopping at the unfrequented places, and avoiding those which are crowded with tourists. We stopped neither at Geneva, Lausanne, nor Bern, and used Lucerne chiefly as a place to go out from. We went there by short railway journies putting up at some of the most charming little towns we ever saw—Nyon, Romont, and especially Burgdorf. At Lucerne we took a rowing boat and made a six days tour of the Lake, part of which we spent on Mount Pilatus, where we staid two nights at one of the hotels on the top, and saw the mountain, and whatever is to be seen from it, to perfection. You would have been surprised to see how, after walking the whole way up the mountain, we had no sooner dined than Helen was ready and eager for two hours more walking among the summits. You may judge from this how rapidly the change told upon her strength, and it was equally beneficial to mine. We returned from Lucerne by the new post road up the valley of Sarnen and over the Brünig to Brienz, then through Interlaken to Thun, and thence by the Simmenthal the valley of the Chateau d'Oex, and a still newer road down the magnificent Val d'Ormont, one of the finest gorges in the Alps, to Aigle in the valley of the Rhone. From Aigle we came here by railway, stopping only at Nyon and Lyons. To our surprise and pleasure we found the weather here by no means overhot; the thermometer did not exceed 76° on Saturday, and 78° yesterday. We are both of us much better for the journey, though Helen has had two bad returns of her headache, first at Lucerne and then here. But we have got back into the full home feeling here, and have thorough enjoyment of the beauty, which is in its greatest perfection, and gains rather than loses from our recent experience of the Alps. In fact, our irrigated meadows give the full freshness and greenness of Switzerland, the Ventoux gives the perceptions and feelings of mountain scenery, and all the effects of our glorious skies and lights come in addition; which we always find more splendid in presence than we are able to realize in absence. I hope both for Helen and myself much improvement in health, and for myself some good work this autumn and winter. The first thing I have to write is an article for Morley on the new edition of Berkeley.² It is a happiness in these days to get back to metaphysics from politics. The whole state of Europe inspires sadness enough, but that of England contempt. We are now, it seems,

avowedly incapable of moving even a small army; our ships are lost,³ one after another; and our ministers, instead of being turned out with disgrace, will apparently live out the duration of a seven years Parliament, even now, when they have put the finishing stroke to their meanness by proposing a pecuniary compensation to Governor Eyre;⁴ a thing which in my worst apprehensions of what a Gladstone Ministry could come to, I had never expected. After this I shall henceforth wish for a Tory Government.

With our kindest regards to M^{rs} Cairnes and yourself, and earnest wishes for the health of you both and of all your children, I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1675.

TO JOSEPH GILES¹

A[vignon]

August 24. 1871

Dear Sir—

From accidental circumstances your very interesting letter of 18th May 1870 has only just reached me.

Your answer to Judge Richmond² is excellent & takes up what I consider the right attitude towards the class of questions to which it relates. I am much obliged to you for sending it. In regard to your question, whether an unverified hypothesis can rationally serve as a basis for expectation & action,³ I quite agree with you that it may do so to a certain extent. On subjects on which we cannot hope for knowledge, we may fairly choose among the various hypotheses which are neither self-contradictory nor contradicted by experience, the one which is most beneficial to our moral nature; provided we always remember that its truth is a matter of possibility & of hope, not of belief. Now the cultivation of the idea of a perfectly good & wise being & of the desire to help the purposes of such a being is morally beneficial in the highest degree though the belief that this being is omnipotent & therefore the creator of physical & moral evil is as demoralizing a belief as can be entertained. Both the copies of your lecture I fear have miscarried but I am very happy to hear of its delivery & to know that you take a view similar to my own of the most vitally important political & social question of the future, that of the equality between men & women.

I shall always be glad to hear from you & to tell you my opinion on any subject interesting to you on which I have formed one.

1676.

TO WILLIAM MARTIN WOOD¹

A[vignon]

Aug. 24, 1871

Dear Sir—

I have just received your letter of July 11. I cannot imagine how the passage quoted from my Princ. of Pol. Econ. can be supposed to give any support to the imposition of Town Duties.² It is true I object to “calling upon one tax to defray the whole or the chief part of the public expenditure”: but the local expenses of the town of Bombay are a very small part of the share of public expenditure falling upon its inhabitants. A house tax appears to me one of the most equitable of all taxes not only in so far as it falls on the occupier but also (in a thriving town) as far as it falls on the ground landlord, from whom it merely intercepts part of the unearned increase of income which he derives from the general prosperity of the place. An octroi, on the contrary, to be productive, must be levied on the necessaries of life or at least on articles generally used by the mass of the people & is therefore one of the most unequal & most burthensome of all ways of raising a revenue. I do not say that in a country like India where it is difficult to levy any tax to which the people are not used, financial necessity may not sometimes justify having recourse to such a tax, but I am sure it sh^d only be adopted in extremity.

1677.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Sept. 12. 1871

Dear Mr Cairnes

I take the liberty of introducing to you M. Arnould Frémy,² who is visiting England, and has brought an introduction from M. Esquiros, which, in my absence, has been sent to me here. M. Frémy is one whom I think it will be a pleasure to you to know, and I cannot do him a greater service than by giving him the opportunity of conversing with you.

Ever, Dear Mr Cairnes
Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1678.

TO EMILE ACOLLAS¹

A[vignon] Sept.20.1871

Monsieur—

Je vous remercie sincèrement du don de la nouvelle livraison de votre Manuel du Droit Civil.² Je m'en promets beaucoup de plaisir lorsque j'aurai le temps de l'examiner particulièrement. En attendant je suis très content de posséder, dans un volume peu étendu, ce qu'il faut pour connaître et pour comprendre le droit français actuel en matière de mariage, présenté par un penseur qui ne cherche pas à en déguiser les injustices.

Votre lettre, publié dans le "Levant Times"³ n'a rien d'opposé à mes opinions, sauf peut-être quelques minuties de phraséologie. Du reste, les limites nécessairement étroites de la lettre ont dû restreindre le développement de votre pensée, qui se trouve plus pleinement exposée dans votre brochure "La République et la Contre Révolution."⁴ Dans cette brochure il y a beaucoup de choses qui s'accordent avec mes plus fermes convictions, et quelques-unes qui indiquent des différences dans notre manière de voir. D'abord quant à la partie historique je suis entièrement de votre avis. Depuis ma jeunesse je n'ai qu'une même opinion là dessus: en 1827 (alors même j'avais beaucoup étudié la Révolution française) j'ai publié un article dans la revue de Westminster⁵ où j'ai soutenu par des preuves irrécusables précisément votre thèse, savoir que l'attaque a toujours été du côté de la Contre Révolution et que la Révolution n'a fait que se défendre. Quant à la partie philosophique, vous savez probablement par mon Essai sur la Liberté, dans quel sens et avec quelles limites j'entends notre principe commun, celui de l'autonomie de l'individu. Je reconnais cette autonomie comme une règle rigoureuse dans les choses qui ne regardent que l'individu lui même ou, si elles intéressent les autres, ne les intéressent que par l'influence de l'exemple ou par l'intérêt indirect que d'autres peuvent avoir au bonheur et à la prospérité de chacun. Par cette doctrine j'affranchis de tout contrôle hors celui de la critique le cercle de la vie individuelle proprement dite. Mais dans ceux de nos actes qui touchent directement aux intérêts d'autrui, il faut à mon sens une autre règle, celle de l'intérêt général. Par exemple je ne trouve pas comme vous que l'autonomie de la personne humaine exige que toutes les fonctions publiques soient électives. S'il y a (comme il y a assurément) des fonctions importantes (celle de juge par exemple) qui exigent des qualités ou des connaissances de qui ne peuvent être bien jugées que par des experts, je trouve que les citoyens peuvent sans compromettre leur autonomie individuelle confier à un ministre responsable la tâche

de chercher et de trouver les hommes les plus compétents pour cette fonction. Pour parler plus généralement, je n'admets pas qu'une organisation politique quelconque soit de droit absolu. Je crois au contraire que des états de civilisation différents exigent souvent des institutions politiques différentes. Et même en admettant que lorsque l'heure de la république est venue la majorité n'a pas le droit d'imposer à toute la nation le gouvernement monarchique, j'y ajouterais qu'une minorité républicaine aurait encore moins le droit d'imposer la république à la majorité contre son gré; et que cette tentative ne peut aboutir qu'à une tyrannie, parcequ'elle ne peut réussir qu'en refusant à la plus grande partie du peuple les mêmes droits politiques qu'à la partie qui se tient pour plus éclairée, et en réprimant par la violence tout effort qu'elle peut faire pour revendiquer l'égalité de droits.

Malgré ces différences d'opinion je me réjouis grandement de votre puissante protestation au nom des droits de l'individu contre la prétendue souveraineté des majorités, idole auquel les démocrates français ont si souvent immolé au moins en théorie, les principes les plus essentiels de la politique.

1679.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Sept. 20. 1871

Dear Mr Cairnes

Many thanks for your letter, and for the kind and friendly interest you feel in all that concerns us. We have now been here for more than a month, to our great advantage, for no place agrees so thoroughly with both of us as this does. We have had no oppressive heat, and enjoy the place very much. Helen, I am sorry to say, is still very weak. As for my own health, it is quite satisfactory.

It is always pleasant to discuss questions of logic and method with you, as your difficulties, no less than your convictions, always lie in the deeper regions of the subject. The kind of laws of coexistence which you speak of,² are recognised and discussed in my Logic,³ but are treated as empirical laws, which, if thoroughly understood, would be found to depend on laws of succession; for, as the coexistent phenomena all depend on causes, no doubt the ground of their coexistence would be found in the causes if we knew them. Of such uniformities of coexistence there is a great multitude in Nature; and the general remark in my Logic to which you refer goes only to this, that there is no universal axiom of coexistence, to the effect that every phenomenon must have an invariable coexistent, as there is that every phenomenon must have an invariable antecedent. I will look again at what I have written on the subject but cannot do so at present, not having a copy of my Logic here.

I have been writing for Morley since I have been here, an article on the new edition of Berkeley's works;⁴ a subject very interesting to me, as I look upon Berkeley, notwithstanding some mistakes, as one of our greatest names in philosophy. It was a great relief to get back to such a subject out of present politics; but the relief is only temporary for the minds of all classes are so ill prepared for the social questions which are coming to the front, that none of us who can contribute anything however little, towards the better treatment of them, can without a breach of duty stand aloof.

We are most glad to hear that M^{rs} Cairnes's health is improving. Pray give her our kindest regards. We hope to continue to receive good news of your little girl. Helen thanks M^{rs} Cairnes for her letter, which she hopes to answer soon.

M^r Brace, in a letter⁵ I had from him lately asks me to remind you that the "little difference of opinion" between you and him "in regard to the importance of M^r Sumner's speech,⁶ is now settled", as, in the recent arrangement, "none of his positions are confirmed, and the nation does not follow them."

I Am
Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1680.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Sept. 20. 1871.

Dear Mr Robertson

1. I think the suggestion "that the London Committee will consent to discuss the basis of a central organization of which it shall be a constituent, after the repeal of the C[ontagious] D[iseases] Acts,"² is a very good one; and that if the London Committee and those of us who approve of it are forced to an open breach with the other school of agitators,³ the question of the association of the agitation for the repeal of the C.D.A. with that for the suffrage would be a good ground upon which to allow the breach to take place.

2. It is important that no further concession than that contained in this suggestion should be made: and I am of opinion that too much stress ought not to be laid on the fear of coming to a public breach. I may as well say that for my own part, I am by no means determined to avoid at all costs the public expression of my disapprobation of the course pursued by some of the advocates of Women's Suffrage: and that I look

forward to the possibility of being obliged by their injudicious conduct to make some such declaration. A breach of this sort has become absolutely necessary in America, and may become necessary here: and it is important that the advocates of moderation should not be terrified into being used as mere instruments in the hands of the violent party, by the threat of open quarrel, inasmuch as when all has been got out of them that is wanted of them, the violent party by its very nature will have no scruple in being the first to make the very quarrel, for the avoidance of which the others have made great sacrifices. It will be more farsighted and judicious for the moderate party to choose its own ground for a stand, and to make that stand before it has sacrificed anything of real importance; especially as in this way it is more likely to act as a real check to the violent. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1681.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Sept. 20. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I approve much of Mr Hunter's² suggestion as regards the C.D.A. agitation, but you will observe I have qualified the words in some respects. I have altered "will consent to discuss and settle" into "will consent to discuss"; and "after the agitation about the C.D. Acts is closed" into "after the repeal of the C.D. Acts:"³ and I think the wording should be carefully attended to, and that Mr Hunter should be on his guard against assenting to anything more. The C.D. Acts are an important part of our objection, and a capital battle ground; but we must not lose sight, in our own minds, of the fact, that the C.D.A. agitation itself would never have become the objectionable thing many people feel it, had it been carried on by people who had more knowledge of the world, and more consideration for the feelings of others. These same people would soon contrive to make the agitation for the suffrage vulgar and ridiculous: and if you consent to any negotiations with them, it can, I think, only be that by the selection of only the best among them, and retaining a substantial majority in your own hands, you may hope to act as a check upon their indiscretions; not because you really hope that when the C.D.A.—the subject upon which just at present they exhibit most of their foolishness—are removed, there will be any substantial agreement between you and them.

As I am not sure whether you may not wish to make use of my opinion, I have written it in a separate form: but there are two other points on which you have not asked my advice, but on which, perhaps, you and Mr Hunter will not object to my warning you:

1. The present difficulty arises from the presence of Miss Biggs⁴ as Secretary. She is not vacillating at all. Her heart is wholly with the other party: she prepares her measures quietly beforehand, is accustomed to working by scratch committees, and any appearance of vacillation is given solely by her having the good sense and self control to withdraw from such steps as she sees cannot succeed. This only makes her the more dangerous, and she will infallibly spring a mine on you some day which will be successful, when she knows better the composition of the Committee, and who are the active persons against whom she must be on her guard. Her conduct in opening the subject after the Committee had been adjourned for the autumn might form a sufficient ground for removing her from the Secretaryship, and prudence would dictate the using it as such. It is not true that the Society owes her any obligation. She was thrust in by M^{rs} Taylor,⁵ to the general disapprobation of the Committee, who reluctantly assented to her employment because M^{rs} Taylor made it a personal matter to herself. Civility and thanks are therefore all to which Miss Biggs has any just claim in return for her services. I mention this lest the younger members of the Committee should not be aware how matters really stood when first M^{rs} Taylor insisted on taking in Miss Biggs as her coadjutor; M^{rs} Taylor giving it as her reason to some of those who objected to it, that she wished to find an interesting occupation for Miss Biggs, to whom she was personally attached, and that the experience thus acquired would be a great advantage to Miss Biggs. If, therefore, now, Miss Biggs is treated with kindness and consideration of manner, it is all to which she has any claim, and it would be culpable weakness to allow her to remain in the Committee to the detriment of its efficient action, on the plea of past services. So long as she remains in the Committee, you have a quiet, steady opponent, who will betray you to the enemy, and take advantage from within of all your weak points: one infinitely more dangerous than M^{rs} Taylor ever could have been, because she knows her own mind and can keep her own counsel, and will make any amount of apparent concession for the purpose of remaining in her present place.

2. No opportunity should be lost of getting rid of the different members whose votes are objectionable: and I cannot help thinking that if, in spite of all that can be done, the opposite party insist upon forming an independent Central Committee, *and any of the members of the London Committee consent to join it* in their private capacity, they should be requested to retire from the London Committee. I mention this merely because I think it is well to be prepared beforehand in case of the worst.

Please remember us very kindly to M^{rs} Grote. I consider my own health quite reestablished. My daughter is still suffering from general weakness and headaches, which have prevented her from writing to M^{rs} Grote since we have been abroad. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1682.

TO CHARLES LORING BRACE¹

A[vignon]

Sept. 23. 1871

Dear Sir—

I thank you for your letter of July 4. It gave me much pleasure to observe the more cheerful view you now seem to take of the moral & political prospects of the U. States. This, in one so thoroughly alive to the evils & dangers which exist, can only arise from the increased energy of the struggle against them by the honest & intelligent majority of the nation; & to this your letter bears direct testimony. As long as there is “a deep well of conscience in the hearts of the people,”² no moral mischief will be able to get beyond a certain length without exciting a wide spread determination to put it down; & when that is the case, the future of mankind is safe even from any aggravated temporary evils.

It is very gratifying also to hear from you that the condition of the labouring classes of the United States is highly prosperous.³ Statements have appeared in England which went to shew that from the great increase of the cost of living in the U.S., principally arising from the tariff, the wages of labour are no longer sufficient to give the labouring classes the comfort & well being they have been accustomed to. This is not very alarming, as the tariff would in that case be swept away all the sooner; still one is glad to have it contradicted by such good authority.

In the old country there is all that uncertainty in the prospects of society for a generation or two to come which there must be when new questions involving the whole structure of society have come to the front while even the advanced minds & a fortiori the minds of *all* classes are not yet prepared to take a rational & practical view of them. The leaders of the working classes have as yet very crude ideas on these questions, & our higher & middle classes have not yet got the length of seeing that the land question & the relation between labour & capital are the points on which the whole of politics will shortly turn; & that very soon no political question will cause any other strong interest than may be due to its bearing on these: with two exceptions however—minority (or rather proportional) representation, & the condition of women, the last a still more fundamental question than even those others & which may advance independently of them to the only admissible issue, complete social & political equality. It is much to be hoped that it will do so, for when women are free

agents their weight is sure to be on the side of an adjustment of social difficulties not by a fierce conflict but by a succession of peaceful compromises.

The arrangement made for the settlement of the Alabama dispute⁴ is as you say, most happy for both nations & the new rules of international law when generally adopted will be very favourable to the general peace. The further advance you look for, the prohibition of all supply of munitions of war to belligerents by neutrals, has much to be said for it, but there are some things also to be said against it which have to be considered. Of these, that which weighs most with me is that the power of obtaining such supplies is favourable to the weaker belligerent, who is, in the great majority of cases, the one most in the right. It was not so in your slavery war, & it did not turn out to be so in the late war between France & Germany. But weak nations attacked by powerful despots & above all, insurgent nations attempting to throw off a foreign yoke would be placed at a sad disadvantage, if thrown wholly on their own resources for the material instruments of warfare.

I hardly know what ways to turn for the information you require concerning the European experience of Foundling Hospitals.⁵ I know, in a general way, that it is, or not long ago was, very unfavourable, & that the establishments of this kind in England & France at least, have been much more divesting themselves of their original character & assuming that of charities for children of known parentage. It is however their experience in this last character that would probably be of most use to you, & if I can find the means of learning what documents there are on the subject, I will endeavour to procure them. If you have not done so, you will find some account of these institutions at Paris, in an article of M. Maxime Du Camp in the *Revue des 2 M. [Deux Mondes]* of 1st Sept. 1870⁶ entitled “Les Hospices à Paris. 1. Les Enfants Assistés.” The writer’s opinions are not of much value but he supplies some materials for judgment.

1683.

TO WILLIAM L. ROBINSON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 9. 1871

Dear Sir—

I have received your letter of Sept. 28 in which you do me the honour to ask my opinion as to whether it is right that the inmates of prisons sh^d be employed in productive labour, so as to defray wholly or in part the expense of their maintenance, or whether the objection frequently made to such employment, that it competes with free labour, is a valid objection.

In reply I beg to say that I hold it to be a sound principle, both economically & morally, that no person capable of work sh^d be maintained in idleness at the expense

of others, but that his labour sh^d always be made available for or towards his own support. I also think that such labour judiciously employed is a most valuable instrument of prison discipline & of the reformation of offenders. It is moreover, in my opinion an error to suppose that the employment of convicts in useful work, diminishes the total amount of employment for free labour; since the funds which are employed in setting the convicts to work are not drawn from what would otherwise be paid in wages to free labourers, but from what would be levied in taxation to support the convicts in idleness or useless work. The only precautions to be observed are first not to derange the labour market by a sudden irruption of a mass of convict labour into some one particular branch of industry; next & chiefly, that articles produced by convict labour sh^d be offered for sale at the market price for goods of the same quality, & not at a price reduced in order to force a sale.

1684.

TO JOHN STAPLETON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 9. 1871

Dear Sir

In consequence of my absence from England I have only quite recently received & read your MS.² It is both well thought & well expressed, & I agree in its main principles. It bears marks, however, of having been written, as you say it was, several years ago, when the land question was in its infancy, & had not yet begun to be a subject of public discussion & popular agitation. The question has now reached a stage at which the statement of principles sh^d be accompanied by a serious consideration of the means of carrying them into practical effect: & this involves points on which you do not seem to have meditated when you wrote the paper though possibly you have done so since. For example, your paper seems to imply that if the land were nationalized all taxation might be abolished: but this abolition, if possible at all, could only be so by refusing any compensation whatever to the landholders. The Land Tenure Reform Association being of opinion that such refusal would be unjust, proposes to leave to the landholders the present value of their land but to interrupt, for the benefit of the nation, the future increase. Any one of your intelligence, writing on the subject at present, would probably think it necessary to discuss this proposal whatever view he might happen to take of it.

I shall be here for several months longer but I will return your MS. by book post on hearing from you to that effect.

1685.

TO [J. K. HAMILTON WILLCOX?][1](#)

Avignon

October 10, 1871

Dear Mr [Willcox?][—](#)

From my delay in acknowledging your two letters of April last, you will probably have inferred quite correctly that the various criticisms on my Free-Trade letter,[2](#) which you kindly sent to me, did not seem to me of sufficient importance to require that I should expend valuable time in replying to them. I have generally observed that when a writing has made as much impression as could reasonably be expected from it, (which from what you tell me my letter appears to have done), the effect is only weakened by returning to the charge, unless it be to add something really important to the discussion. Mr. Greeley's objection[3](#) that the high wages in the United States cannot be caused by cheap land and sparse population, since land is cheaper and population sparser in Canada where wages are lower, deserves notice, both on account of the man and the subject. But as it is not pretended that the effect of these causes in producing high wages cannot possibly be modified or frustrated by anything else, the Free-Trader can afford to admit the fact as stated by Mr. Greeley.

It will not be contested that wages are at all events much higher in Canada than in Great Britain. For the rest, my knowledge of Canada and its circumstances is not sufficient to enable me to explain every part of its economic condition. I should require to know, first, between what parts of Canada and what parts of the United States the comparison as to land and population and wages is made; secondly, whether the wages said to be lower in Canada are wages in gold, and, assuming that they are so, whether, when compared with the prices of articles of consumption, augmented as these prices are by your tariff, they do not enable the Canadian laborer to be fully as well off as his neighbor on your side of the frontier. Finally, if those questions were all resolved in favor of Mr. Greeley, the only inference that I should draw is, that the arts of production are less advanced and the labor of the community less efficient in Canada than in the United States; the natural effect of which would be to keep wages lower than the circumstances of the country with respect to land and population would otherwise make them. It should be remembered also that (as you observe) Mr. Greeley's sovereign remedy, Protection, exists in Canada, though not to the same extravagant pitch as in the United States.

I observe, by the way, that some of the Protectionist newspapers seem to imagine, from the terms in which I expressed the opinion that Protection in America was a mere deception, that I meant to charge its advocates with being willful deceivers. Nothing could be more unjust, more illiberal, or further from my thoughts than such an imputation.

Please make my acknowledgement to the Liberal Club for the great honor they have done to my letter by giving it so wide a circulation.

J. S. Mill

1686.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Oct. 20. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I certainly feel as much astonishment as regret that a vote of censure, and of request to Miss Biggs to resign,² was not passed at the last Committee meeting; and it is very difficult to understand what motive could have prevented it from being done, seeing that her own conduct has forfeited all claim to forbearance. I cannot help thinking she must have been as much astonished herself, and that her father was present in order to present the accounts if needful, because she anticipated some such vote. I can now only say that I recommend the passing such a vote at the very first meeting, and that no pretext or reason whatsoever should be allowed to stand in the way of doing so: with this difference however, that whereas at the last meeting I think she should have been requested to resign, at the next meeting I think a resolution should be passed that Miss Orme be henceforward the sole Secretary. As for any assertion that Miss Biggs has been chosen for one year, that can be of no consequence now. It might have stood in your way in proposing to replace her by Miss Orme merely on the ground of preference, but it can have no force when it is proposed to replace Miss Biggs on the ground of disapprobation of her conduct in the Leeds matter; upon which ground, of course, the change or dismissal must rest: The Committee cannot have chosen her for Secretary for a year and given her full license for a year to act contrary to their wishes without their permission. Any such pretension would only have to be stated in other words, for its absurdity to be evident. Nor, while I recommend the use of the mildest terms, such as "change" &c. in speaking of the dismissal, should I hesitate to use the word dismissal should it prove necessary: and it sometimes happens, more particularly with the Manchester school,³ that blunt language is necessary for they can understand no other, and take the reticence of good breeding or kind feeling for signs of weakness of purpose. Moreover, it appears to me that if you have scruples in carrying your measures either in the absence of the others, or by simply overpowering them with votes by a majority *however small*, you may as well give up the struggle. I speak from observation and experience of the particular people concerned. I should be sorry that you should think I recommend taking even an apparent advantage over absent opponents, or denying them a fair hearing. I believe I should always wish to give my opponents an ample hearing: but then they have had it; and having had it, have manœuvred not to give it to the party at the Leeds meeting. After this, the matter is a battle and must be treated as such; and as one in which, as (if we know them well,

we may be tolerably sure) the opponents will not scruple to take unfair advantage, common sense on our part dictates our taking every fair advantage, and giving them nothing but the strictest justice, without one inch of generosity. You have already been a very great deal too generous: it will have been a useful fault if it has thoroughly convinced you that unfair advantage will be taken of anything of the sort.

The fact is, that for some time past the common vulgar motives and tactics that govern the vast majority of Committees and agitations of all kinds, political and charitable, have been imported into the Women's Suffrage movement. At first, the movement was comparatively free from anything of the kind, and our object I take to be, to keep a London Committee in existence, still pure from all that sort of thing. Until M^{rs} Taylor came under the influence of Miss Biggs and the Jacob Brights, she was quite irreproachable in all such matters, and her own tastes and instincts were always open and upright. I do not mean to blame the various women who from motives of self-interest, of vanity or love of notoriety, employ such tactics, any more than one blames the vast majority of clergymen and other "respectable persons" connected with the getting up of charitable and political organisations. But, in struggling against them, one must look at them as they really are.

It is necessary for those who will condescend to no petty manoeuvres in such a struggle, to replace them by extreme sternness and firmness; and especially to be on their guard against ever allowing a preconceived resolution to be overruled by unexpected movements or apparent yielding on the part of the opponents. One must always bear in mind that it takes frank people a long time to see through the devices of those who are not frank; and that a decision that has been come to on mature reflection should therefore be adhered to even at the risk of apparent obstinacy: else you will be continually outwitted by one device after another, for the quickest witted honest people can never be as quick in seeing through a new trick, as some other people can be in inventing one. One learns therefore by experience that on the whole it is always safest, in such cases, to adhere to a resolution formed at leisure, in spite of any objections suddenly presented to one. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

P.S. I am not sure from the terms of your letter, whether you wish to have another letter from me for general use. If you do, and will let me know the point or points to which you wish it to be addressed, I will write you one for the purpose. It would be necessary in this case for you to post your letter to me not later than five on Monday evening. You could then have my reply on Friday morning.

1687.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Oct. 25. 1871

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I am very happy to hear that you have received several requests to speak on the land question, and that you intend to do so. I regret that not knowing that Mr Newmarch's paper² contained anything about our programme,³ I did not read any report of it, and I only know as much of what it contained as I have learned from subsequent articles in the newspapers. As far as that knowledge goes, the point which seems to me most to require notice is what he said about the Building Societies.⁴ That point was raised in the Committees of the Land Tenure Reform Association, and my answer was, that I should except from the tax, the increase of value of a house actually inhabited by the owner; as this belongs less to his income than to his expenditure. But I would not give this exemption on more than one house to the same person.

As to the questions you ask; my remembrance of Bleak House is so faint that I do not understand Newmarch's allusion to it.⁵ The bad management of corporation property I think a valid argument as far as it goes, and it is a strong reason with me and others for opposing the general nationalization of the land. But what our programme proposes to nationalize is the *waste* land, and to that the objection does not apply, or applies in a very small degree; for a great part of the waste land we desire to keep waste, and the remaining part, as it yields nothing at present but spontaneous products, cannot well, under the worst management, yield less. It is true, we propose that *some* land which is not waste should be bought on account of the State; but this is avowedly for the purpose of trying cooperative and other social experiments, which would only be followed up if successful. The advantages of such experiments is felt by some who do not think they would succeed.

One of the objections to us, which requires to be noticed, though it could only mislead those who are really unacquainted with the programme, is that if we take the increase of value of land, we ought to make compensation when it falls in value. It should be pointed out that we really do so, since any one, whose land falls in value, will be free to give it up at the price put upon it before it fell. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1688.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Oct. 25. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I inclose a letter which I have written in haste for your use.

I do not know what part Mr Christie² has taken in the C.D.A.³ Henceforward I would admit no members into the Committee who are for their repeal, unless well known personally, and I hardly know Mr Christie enough to answer for him. I shall hope to hear from you the result of the meeting, and I will try to think of possible new members before I next write. I am

Dear Mr Robertson

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1689.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Oct. 25. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

The Resolutions forwarded to your Committee from the meeting at Leeds are simply proposals to keep all other Committees independent of that of London, and to make the London Committee dependent on all the others. Now, there can be no doubt that, up to this time, the London Committee is that which, by its calm and judicious conduct, has given dignity and influence to the movement for Women's Suffrage in this country. Those who are now endeavouring to replace it, vainly imagine that it is the name of London that has done this. No impartial observer can doubt that it will be for the advantage of the agitation for Women's Suffrage and indeed for the public estimation of the friends of women's rights altogether that there should still continue to exist one body of such a character.

There is another point of importance, and that is, that the agitation for the repeal of the C.D. Acts should be in nowise mixed up with that for the Suffrage. To confound the two together, is to break faith with the members of the Suffrage Society, many of whom totally disapprove of the other agitation. I cannot help thinking that a proper feeling on this point would bind every person who is conspicuous in the one agitation to resign any part in the other. To make use of the one organisation as a tool to bring in money and influence for the other, is a breach of faith which I have the less hesitation in stigmatizing as it deserves, because I am myself in favour of both, supposing them to be carried on in a loyal and honourable manner.

Since, therefore, you ask my advice, it is my opinion that the judicious course for the London Committee now to pursue, would be to refuse to sink itself in any new body. It already forms an independent and equal part of the National Society consisting of many independent and equal Committees; and from that dignified and independent position I think it should absolutely decline to move.² Secondly, it appears to me that those members of the Committee (and of course I need not say, any of its officers) who have, without authority from the Committee, and without its knowledge, given their names to the proposal to sink its separate existence altogether, should at once be requested to resign, and, if necessary, removed. They cannot be trusted by the Committee to carry out its intentions; and have already given proof that they prefer to act upon their own private opinions, even to an extent the perfect frankness and honour of which is open to criticism, rather than to subordinate themselves to the Committee as a whole.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1690.

TO JOHN STAPLETON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 25. 1871

Dear Sir—

I am glad that you have written out your opinion so fully on the various points connected with the land question. I cannot undertake to enter with equal fulness into all the considerations which your letter raises, but I will endeavour in few words to show to you that the programme of the L[and] T[enure] R[eform] Assⁿ. would if realized accomplish much more good than you attribute to it.

You say it would not enable the working classes of the towns to obtain more space for their dwellings. But what prevents them from obtaining more space? Not the impossibility of getting land, for abundance of land in & near towns can be bought & is bought every year; but that the price of it is too high. And why is it too high? Because of the perpetual increase of its value through the growth of the town's population. If this were taken by the State, there would be no motive to hold out for an extravagant price & land could be obtained on much more favourable terms for the extension of building.

Besides, if suburban land for building were ever deficient nothing hinders the State from compelling the sale of land for the extension & improvement of towns just as it now does for making new streets & railroads.

With regard to rural land you say that to take for the public only the "unearned increase" would not stop the population of the country districts from being drawn into the towns. If in this you refer to the conversion of agricultural land into deer forests as in the Scotch Highlands, this would be stopped by enacting that all tracts of land (above a certain small extent) which are left waste for more than a certain number of years shall revert to the State, for a compensation calculated on what the land brings in to the holder in its waste condition. There is nothing in the programme of the L.T.R. Assⁿ which precludes this, & most of the members would probably be in favour of it.

But if you mean that private property in land causes a system of culture to be practised which diminishes the agricultural population, it is for you to show that the nationalization of the land would not do the very same. If the land were managed as a branch of the public revenue the tendency would be to manage it in the way which would bring in most rent, & nothing worse than this is done by a private proprietor. In fact what you object to in this case, is the saving of labour in agriculture.

Those who support the nationalization of the land are, I think, bound to state the plan on which they would have it managed for the public account. In the present low state both of our political morality & of our administrative habits, I sh^d expect that the land department would become a mass of corrupt jobbing, against which we see by the examples of New York &c.,² that democratic institutions are not an effectual security; & that as a financial measure it would be a complete failure the proceeds realised being probably not sufficient to pay the amount of compensation which even you would allow.

A few words on the subject of compensation. It appears to me that when a great alteration is made in institutions which have existed from a very early period of history with general approval, any expense, loss, or other inconvenience which has to be temporarily incurred cannot justly be laid on any one class, but ought to be fairly shared by the whole community who are to benefit by the reform. I have very radical notions as to what *is* the fair mode of sharing any burthen among the whole community. I would throw a very large proportion of it upon property—not all property, not property which has been earned by the industry of its present possessors, but property which has been inherited, & forms the patrimony of an idle class. But I

see no justice in making those who happen to have inherited land bear more of the burthen than those who happen to have inherited money. I would lay a heavy graduated succession duty on all inheritances exceeding that moderate amount, which is sufficient to aid but not to supersede personal exertion. If the land were nationalized and [the fund]³ for compensating the holders were raised in this manner, the landholders themselves would bear I think quite fairly, a large share of the burthen.

You say, if it is not just to resume the land it cannot be just to take away the unearned increase of its value. I say so too, if it be taken without compensation; but the L.T.R. Assⁿ proposes that the alternative sh^d be allowed to the holders, of surrendering their land at its selling value; on which condition the legitimacy of the operation must be acknowledged by every one who ever voted for a railway Act.

1691.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Oct. 31. 1871.

Dear Mr Robertson

We can most heartily sympathize with your weariness and disgust at the contest which has been forced on you. To fail in tactics in such a case, though vexatious, is almost an honour: certainly quite one, if it is the first time in one's life that one has been so engaged. Nothing but experience can prepare a frank and honourable person for such a contest. One is reduced to hope that the experience thus acquired may be of use in the future. One certainly requires some consolation for having been obliged to acquire it.

It would be quite useless (although I have no objection to your doing it) to use my name to M^r and M^{rs} Taylor² as to Miss Biggs. They already know that we object to her. And moreover, nothing whatever that M^r or M^{rs} Taylor could say, would have the smallest effect upon Miss Biggs. It is she who influences them, not they her. As to M^{rs} Stansfeld,³ to her the argument should be used, against the C.D.A. agitation being mixed up with the franchise. I dare say my name might have some influence with her.

I can only advise continuing to use your utmost efforts to weed the Committee of the obnoxious set, and urging all our friends to give their utmost help. If anything should depend upon it, Mr Biggs' vote ought certainly to be rejected, and Miss Biggs ought to be called upon to shew the minutes of the meeting at which he was ever elected a member of the Committee. If she has not kept *any* minutes, there cannot be a stronger evidence of her unfitness for the office. If she has, she will not be able to produce any evidence of his having been elected a member. Loose unbusiness-like ways are among the methods of the slippery party, and a firm stand should be made against them.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1692.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Nov. 6. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I congratulate you very heartily on your success.² It must indeed feel a delightful deliverance after your most troublesome contest.

I would very willingly accede to the request you and the Committee put in such flattering terms, were it not that I feel convinced that it would still be best for the cause for me to keep distinct from the Committee if possible. If it should prove absolutely necessary as a means of giving your Committee strength in the fight, I would at a future time consent; and in the meantime I have no objection at all to your making it known among all those who are likely to be concerned in another Committee, that I shall give my name to yours if there does come to be a public contest.³

In the matter of new members for the Committee: If I understand rightly, you have six members on whom you can certainly rely: that is, when they are all in town; but of whom one at least, Mr Hare, is often away on business which makes it impossible for him to come up to town when he pleases. I reckon, therefore only five votes *certain*.

The following is the table we make out:

Certain	Uncertain	Perhaps hostile
Prof. Robertson	Mrs. Burbury ⁴	Mrs Fawcett
Prof. Hunter	Mr Macdonell ⁵	Miss Courtenay ⁷
Miss Hare	Mr Wilson ⁶	
Miss Orme		
Mr Thornton		
Mr Hare		

⁴Included with this letter at UCL is a note dated Sept. 9, 1893, and signed Charlotte A. M. Burbury: "The three marked *uncertain* were among the most certain. I was only reluctant to support the vote of censure on Miss Biggs."

⁵Probably John Macdonell.

⁷Louisa Courtenay, a neighbour and friend of Charles Dilke. She was also a member of the General Committee of the National Union for Improving the Education of Women of all classes.

⁶Probably Henry Joseph Wilson (1833-1914), business man and liberal politician; supporter of Josephine Butler's campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts; MP for Holmfirth Div., Yorkshire, 1885-1912.

But then I should like to hear from you whether you think you can reckon on M^{rs} Burbury for certain. We do not know her at all; but, as you think so highly of her, shall be glad to have any opportunity of making her acquaintance when in town. M^{rs} Fawcett also may perhaps be removed to the column of merely uncertain: but I do not think she could ever be more than uncertain. But we should much rejoice if she can be brought right. She is quite public spirited, and is a recent convert to the C.D.A. movement, which I do not think her husband sympathises in. All this is favourable; but on the other hand, she has a prosaic literal way of looking at things, and is apt to be, as I dare say you have noticed Mr Fawcett also is, a little doctrinaire—to see a principle in its full force, and not to see the opposing principles by which it must be qualified. Hence she may at any time fancy that consistency demands what I might think foolish conduct. But she would be valuable on the right side, and doubly so because, if she is not right, she is likely to be wrong.

If my table is correct (which I hope it is not) you can never reckon with certainty on more than five good votes; and therefore it would be very dangerous to elect any new members of whom you could not be certain. If, on the other hand, Miss Courtenay goes out, and M^{rs} Burbury can be reckoned on with certainty, you will have six certain votes against three uncertain. Still, this would only leave margin for two new members, unless you can be certain of them, in order to keep a certain majority of one voice, the very least with which you can manage the Committee.

Now there is one thing the force of which I am not sure that you will see at first, but of which, the more I consider it, the more I am convinced: and that is, that your Committee, if judicious, will pass, at the very first meeting, a vote as nearly unanimous as possible, requesting M^{rs} Taylor⁸ to resume her place as Honorary Secretary.

Her name is more associated with the original Committee to the general public, than that of any one else whatever. The Committee, with her name still as Honorary Secretary, is still *the* London Committee; any other must be a usurper. But with her name gone, it becomes a question, which is *the* Committee: and even if I am on it, still it would appear like something new in which I am concerned. Keep M^{TS} Taylor's name, and the others are the innovators, the introducers of discord. Lose her name, and there is nothing to distinguish you from them. She would be the link keeping up the continuity of existence between the old Committee and the present. Then, again, you do not know when she may be persuaded to join the others. You should have her with you, if only to prevent that; merely because, if her name is in the other, the other will seem to carry with it the weight of the old Committee. Now there cannot be a doubt that it is Miss Biggs who has led her wrong: without Miss Biggs you will find her tractable, and if she is not, you will always, I hope, retain the power in your own hands of outvoting her. But I do not think you will have trouble with her. She would never be an obstinate opponent, at the very worst. Her fault is vacillation, and she is more likely not to vote at all at a crisis, than to vote wrong. Then, again, if you come to public meetings, how great an advantage on our side it would be to have her as formerly for figure head. It would be carrying on the old tradition: and her age, her appearance, that very feminine weakness which is so evident about her, is invaluable for the purpose. Her bitterest enemy cannot accuse her of being a strong-minded woman. With her for Honorary Secretary, Miss Orme for the Secretary, and M^{TS} Burbury for Treasurer, I should think you would do excellently. To the public eye there will have been no change at all, and you will still carry all the weight that the old Committee has acquired. Also M^{TS} Taylor would then permit the old address, Aubrey House, to be used, and perhaps that is worth while. Where have your meetings been held lately? To M^{TS} Taylor herself the Committee should put the matter, that they accepted her resignation because they understood her reluctance to be concerned in anything like a personal contest with the other party: that now the Committee has fought out the contest for itself, without implicating her, and would be glad to have her in her old place among them, now that she cannot be implicated in any unpleasant feeling in the matter.

I cannot suggest any new members on whom we can thoroughly rely, whose names would add apparent weight: but I think that M^{TS} Taylor's name would be of more weight than any dozen others. The only other person whom I can at present suggest is Sir Charles Dilke. I believe that if I myself asked him, he would probably consent to join the Committee: and you would have the advantage, that if he joins you, you secure his not adding such weight as his name has to the other party. I could not feel at all sure of how he would vote, but I fancy he does not like the C.D.A. agitation: at all events he has not committed himself to it.

If you had the present Committee (without Miss Courtenay) with the addition of M^{TS} Taylor and Sir Charles Dilke, I reckon that you would have six votes certain right (supposing M^{TS} Burbury to be so), five uncertain, and one (Mr Hare) occasional. It would be madness to add any more members to the Committee of whom you are not *absolutely* certain: and can you be absolutely certain of any one until after you have tried them a little. I think not.

I think also that twelve is really quite enough for a good Committee. When it is numerous, it gets unmanageable, and little parties form within itself.

Pray weigh well what I have said about M^{TS} Taylor. In the peculiar circumstances of the case, her name will weigh more than my own: besides that I have the greatest objection to giving my own. We could at any time have insured M^{TS} Taylor's fidelity would either my daughter or I have consented to give our names to the Committee. We did not decline to do so because we could not have carried the Committee with us would either of us have made that sacrifice, but because we both thought, as we still think, that the true interest of the movement demands that a good and competent Committee should exist independently of us, excepting in so far as our friends may be disposed privately to seek our advice.

There is one more thing I could advise: that is, that you and Professor Hunter should continue to be the practical managers of the Committee yourselves. All well managed Committees are really managed by one or two persons; and in practically managing the whole matter yourselves, you are not taking any advantage of others, but are really conferring a favour upon them. I am certain that this is the point of view in which it would be looked at by M^F and Miss Hare and Mr Thornton. They will be obliged to you for indicating to them the policy to be pursued, and would be glad to feel that they can rely upon your judgment and activity.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1693.

TO WILLIAM FRASER RAE¹

Avignon

Nov. 11, 1871

Dear Mr Rae

We think the proposed scheme for an international copyright with the United States a very good one;² and shall willingly sign a memorial in favour of it.³

Thanks for your kind enquiries about my health. My indisposition in the spring has been much exaggerated, and I am now very well. I am

Dear Mr Rae
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1694.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Nov. 15. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

As I know by experience that it is uncertain whether my letter posted today will be delivered in London on Thursday evening or Friday morning. I write this to you at Univ. College.

I write in hopes that my letter may reach you in time to prevent any repudiation on the part of your Committee of the statements put forth by the seceders. The thing of all others that we have to desire is that they would put the secession, and the disagreements in the Committee, precisely upon the ground on which it appears that they have, with a most happy shortsightedness, decided to put it. What I had feared was, that they might attempt to give some other colour to the disagreements: this, as to a difference of opinion as to associating the suffrage agitation with the Anti C.D.A. being the one point on which we ought to take our stand firmly and immovably, proclaiming it on all occasions, publicly and privately, as the ground taken up by your Committee. Any other conduct on the part of the Committee I look upon as simply suicidal. Whatever apparent influence our opponents may seem to carry with them among some of the friends of women's rights will be more than balanced by the enormous loss with the public in general: and it is this shortsightedness with regard to the general public which betrays their want of public spirit, or else of judgment, to combat which is the sole object of the existence of your Committee. If the only object were to lead into noisy activity those and those only who go all lengths in favour of women's rights, their policy would be excellent: their fault consists in the fact that they absolutely forget, or do not know, that the majority of the people of England have yet to be led to see the propriety of giving women any rights at all. To the mass of the English people, as well as to large numbers already well disposed towards some little improvement in women's condition, the union of the C.D.A. agitation with that for the suffrage, condemns the latter utterly, because they look upon it as indelicate and unfeminine. The question then is, whether it is not desirable that one Committee should still be in existence which is not utterly excluded from the sympathies of all this vast mass, as well as of influential people who shrink from vulgarity. The more distinctly your Committee places itself in this position, the surer is its footing, the

clearer its reason for existence, and the stronger the sympathy likely to be felt for it by the world in general.

As to the minor detail, that the seceders assert that your Committee and I wanted to drive out those who were *even members* of the other Association, it is doubtless a misrepresentation: but I strongly recommend not correcting it, and passing it over in absolute silence for the present. It may be contradicted in due time and place, if it should seem desirable to take up that point of detail. In the meantime your Committee should accept to the full the colour put upon the matter by the opponents. Neither is there any harm, but rather good, in their asserting that I am mixed up in the matter: let them do so uncontradicted: I dare say I stand as high as they in the estimation of the general public, and they will not damage me more than themselves.

The other point I have now to suggest is that the next move for your Committee will be some appeal to the "London Society for Women's Suffrage." Whether this appeal had better take the form of convening a meeting, or only of sending round a statement of the dissensions, with voting papers, to every single subscriber to the Society, I have not yet had time to consider, and should like much to know what is the opinion of yourself and Mr Hunter, as well as of the Committee. It might perhaps be well to lay this before the Committee at this very next meeting; but I do not think that there is any need for immediate decision, and it is better to weigh well every movement, than to gain any advantages by immediate action. One thing is certain: the other party will go on do what you will: the only question is, how can we all of us do most to neutralize their mischievous effect upon the general public. A single mistake on our part would do more harm for this object than any number of apparent triumphs over us on their part. The fact is, they cannot triumph over us except by doing mischief.

Could you ask M^{rs} Taylor to allow your meetings to be held at her house, as a favour to the Committee, on account of the difficulty they have in finding a room for the present. I would not scruple to put this as a personal favour to the members of the Committee, and to ask it of her as a kindness to the Committee, which after all is still that of which she was the head for so long.

I Am
Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1695.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Nov. 27. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I am glad to find that you and Mr Hunter had arrived independently at the same opinion as we had. It would appear from your last letter, as well as from letters I have received from Mr Arthur Arnold and from Mr Pennington,² that the seceders profess the intention of doing nothing to give publicity to the quarrel, and that the Committee they intend to form will call itself a Central Committee, and not another London Committee.³ Mr Pennington writes with great moderation, and I believe, as far as he is concerned, with perfect truth. Mr Arthur Arnold writes very angrily, and asserts as a positive matter of fact that there is now no lady on your Committee except Miss Hare!

Mr Hunter's paper appears to me very suitable. In regard to an appeal to the London Society, I am not sure that it should be made at present, if it turns out to be true that the seceders do not intend to profess themselves a London Committee. As they assert that their object is to anticipate the possible action of the Manchester people,⁴ they may do as much good as harm, (supposing that they lay no claims to represent the London Society) in as much as I think them a less detrimental set than the Manchester people, with whom they are perhaps better qualified to cope than people who are less like them. If at any time an appeal to the Society should become necessary, I think on further reflection, that it would be better not to make it by means of a meeting, which at best can only represent those present at it, and at which there might be disturbances. I think a better method would be a circular letter addressed to each separate individual whose name is down as a subscriber, and inclosing a halfpenny post card with an alternative vote printed on it. In this way, the opinion of a real majority might be got, if it should be thought desirable to get it.

I have not forgotten my promise to give my adhesion to you by name if a conflict should arise. But this could be done in some other way than by becoming an actual member of the Committee. If you would like to put me down as Honorary President of your Committee, I should have no objection to accept the post; but as neither my daughter nor myself are likely to be able, for some time to come, to attend the Committee, we should both of us prefer not to be actual members of it, and we think my name as Honorary President would be as useful to you.

We are sorry to hear that Miss Hare, on her approaching marriage (we do not know whether it is yet public, but we understand that it is to take place in January next)⁵ will live out of London, and does not, therefore, think she can remain in the Committee. Might it not be worth your while to ask her to remain nevertheless? It will be very difficult, I fear, to find good lady members. I do not know what you would think of asking M^{rs} Westlake to return; if she did, she would probably lend her house for meetings. There is also M^{rs} Grey,⁶ of 17 Cadogan Place, who stood for Chelsea for the School Board, and who, to our knowledge, was very lately much opposed to the Anti-C.D.A. agitation. She is a lady, and her age gives weight, but we do not know much of her. I am afraid we cannot suggest any one else; the ladies we could most rely on are unhappily more or less of invalids. But I do not see why you should not choose for yourselves persons in whom you have full confidence, and whom you could work comfortably with; supposing that you think it necessary to increase the

numbers of the Committee. I myself think a small Committee best for work. However, these are things for you to judge of; and now that you are freed from associates against whose faults we thought ourselves qualified to warn you, by a larger experience of them than you had had, I have no doubt you will find much fewer difficulties and much less need of advice. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

P.S. I need scarcely say that although, if the opponents give any publicity to the differences of opinion, I should not hesitate to take up the challenge, I still recommend avoiding anything of the sort as much as possible, as long as they do.

1696.

TO T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE¹

A[vignon]

Dec. 1. 1871

Dear Mr Leslie—

It gave me great pleasure to hear such a good account of your improvement in health, & also to learn that you have been reappointed to the India Civil Service Examinership, & that the work is increasingly interesting to you.

I am much obliged to you for sending me your paper on Financial Reform.² I need hardly say that I have read it with the greatest interest. You have made out a stronger case than I was aware could be made, of inconvenience & economic loss from the various restrictions on business necessitated by the existence of any excise or customs. Still, this does not decide the question, for every tax produces a great deal of incidental mischief, & the problem is to find which are those that produce the least. We have got to compare the evils of our remaining indirect taxes with those of the best substitutes that it is possible to provide in lieu of them. I cannot but think that to justify the entire abolition of indirect taxes there should be some better substitute suggested than a shilling income tax. You take no notice of the demoralizing effect of a tax of which the assessment depends on people's own returns of their incomes. I look upon this as a very serious matter indeed. One who knew City people very well predicted when the income tax was first laid on by Sir R Peel,³ that the consequence of it would be a great deterioration of commercial morality. Since then we have always been hearing complaints of the growth of mercantile dishonesty; the most flagrant instances of it have been detected where they were least looked for, & though of course it is impossible distinctly to trace the connexion between this & the income

tax, I have never doubted that the tax has greatly contributed to it. A false return of income has probably been in innumerable instances the first dereliction of pecuniary integrity. That this evil must be still further increased by every increase of the tax, could only be doubted, on the supposition that this dishonesty is now so widely spread as not to admit of any further increase. Besides, the evil would be actually added to and increased by one of the most necessary improvements in the income tax viz. that of requiring returns from those who at present have their income tax deducted from their income at the time of receipt. Nothing can be more unjust than to levy income tax from multitudes of people whose income is below the limit at which the tax professedly ceases, or at which the percentage is reduced, & throw upon them, poor, ignorant, & busy as the most of them are, the burthen of bringing evidence to get the money returned.

I wish that you, & all the really enlightened enemies of indirect taxation, would turn your minds to contriving some less objectionable mode of direct taxation than the present. The house tax considering that almost all our local taxes, at least in towns, are of that nature, cannot be much increased without making the overcrowding of dwelling houses still worse than it already is. The succession tax is a resource but not an unlimited one, for that too when the sum payable is large, is too easily evaded. A tax on total expenditure would be the best tax in principle, because it would exempt savings: but I do not see any mode of imposing it which would not depend on the returns made by the payers; not to mention that great objection would be made on the score of its falling most heavily on those who have many mouths to feed.

Your friends of the Financial Reform Association⁴ do not feel any of these difficulties because what they desire—& what most of the advocates of exclusively direct taxation desire—is to throw the whole burthen on what they call realised property that is to say on savings; which is certainly the reverse of expedient, & is not just on any principles but those of Proudhon.

I have not insisted on the special reasons commonly urged for maintaining taxes on stimulants, because it is possible that there may be a satisfactory answer to them. Nor do I lay any stress on the utility of custom houses, &c., for statistical purposes, because it may be practicable by a system of fines to induce importers or producers to make such returns as are required. These objections, though they have some weight are plainly not decisive. But the moral objection remains, & until some mode is pointed out of raising a large revenue by direct taxation to which that objection does not apply I must think that our indirect taxes had better remain, being only lightened from time to time as the prosperity of the country increases their productiveness.

Thanks for your kind inquiries about my health. My indisposition was a good deal exaggerated but has now quite left me. My daughter is still ailing but has been rather better since the cold dry winds set in.

1697.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Dec. 4. 1871

Dear Mr Robertson

I hardly know what advice to give, because I am not sure whether you and the Committee will quite go with my view of the best course to take, and I do not hold with any great tenacity to my own.

I look upon it that the important thing for your Committee is much more to *be* than to *do*, and I therefore can regard with equanimity the progress which the other is sure to make. Methods will be adopted, and I am certain have been adopted, which you cannot possibly emulate, and they will have that amount of success which such methods usually have. The essential thing appears to be precisely that a Committee should exist which keeps clear of them.² I ought however to add that in regard to subscriptions, experience has taught us to be exceedingly sceptical of the assertions made by the getters-up of Committees. For instance—have you ever had any proof in the accounts of the Treasurer, Mr Biggs, of the existence of the £500 Lecture Fund stated in the newspapers to have been subscribed this year to your Committee? If so, what has become of it? *We* have seen only a statement of the expenditure from the Lecture Fund of something between £100 and £200 (to the best of our recollection) and we know we sent in cheques for £100 ourselves. What has become of the other £300 or more? Now it is our opinion that the greater part of this £300 was never subscribed, and that it would be very hard upon poor Mr Biggs to call on him to pay up whatever part of it cannot be shewn to have been spent. M^{TS} Taylor at first was free from all these devices. I cordially hope Miss Biggs was free to the last, and that you have got the £300 in hand.³ But if, as I fear, you have not, you may console yourself by reflecting that a large part of the subscriptions you hear of are in the same predicament. The grateful astonishment with which cheques for the full amount promised are received, combined with a comparison between nominal receipts and actual expenditure, have opened our eyes on this matter: and we have been told it is an established maxim with Committees in general, which we know is fully approved by some of the members of the new Committee, that the statement that thousands have been received, helps to bring in hundreds. I do not see what weapon you have against all this except that of Time, and an established character. What is founded on sham, tends to fall away: but I do not doubt that you will lose subscribers for the present, and be the victim of all sorts of misrepresentations. Still, if you are not able to do much, you can secure that there shall exist in England one Committee, upright, moderate and judicious; to be referred to if scandals should arise in regard to others. This may seem a very modest office, yet it may be an all-important one.

In regard to the Memorial, I see two courses to take. One would be, to answer it formally and shortly, something to the effect that your Committee regrets that some seceders from its body should have thought fit to establish a new Committee, and fully agrees with the Memorialists that the utmost pains should be taken to avoid any further appearance of dissensions; that it understands that the other Committee disclaims any hostile feelings, and that therefore an appeal to the whole body of the Society would probably, when it became known to the general public, be interpreted by it as a sign of graver dissensions than any that exist; and that so long as the new Committee maintains the position you understand it has taken up, of independent but not unfriendly action, you think it would be most prudent not to make any more public than at present the knowledge of such disagreements of opinion as there actually are.

Another course would be, to state the ground you take up, and I inclose a sketch to shew what I mean.⁴ From these two alternatives you will see that we think it best not to appeal to the Society at present. But this opinion goes with our impression that a modest quiet steady position is the only one at present practicable for our Committee, and that we cannot pretend to rival the other in newspaper paragraphs, sham subscriptions &c &c.

If, however, you do not agree in this opinion, and see your way to more energetic action, I am not prepared to disapprove of it: because I am convinced that your energy will be honest, and not sham. But if you have any great expectations of success, I fear there will be disappointment; because, even if you had not this sort of opponents to contend with, success won by honourable means must be of very slow growth, and you will find misrepresentations anticipating you in every direction. I leave it, therefore, to your judgment and that of Mr Hunter what to lay before the Committee, and therefore I do not write you any letter for the purpose. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1698.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Dec. 5. 1871

Dear Mr Cairnes

On referring to your last letter, I am surprised to find that it was written six weeks ago. It gave me news of your health, which, if not so favourable as I had hoped from

the surgical operation, was still good, and I hope to hear that the improvement as well as that which you reported in M^{TS} Cairnes's health, has not only maintained itself, but made further progress.

Your remarks on Laws of Coexistence² came at a very good moment, as my chief occupation for some time past has been the revision of my Logic for a new edition to be published next spring,³ and I have retouched some parts of what I had written on that point; though the alterations and additions I have seen reason to make are not considerable. The question is gone into rather more fully in Prof. Bain's Logic than in mine, and you would find there a good deal to illustrate, and perhaps to confirm, your own views. With regard to those facts of coexistence which as you say "have a manifest adaptation to each other as the teeth, stomach and claws of an animal", these are the ones which seem to me to be *par excellence* referable to causation; they are probably explicable by natural selection, or some other form of the evolution theory. Undoubtedly they may be used as a basis for deductions but so may all empirical laws, within definite limits of time, place, and circumstance. There may be, and Mr Bain thinks there are, uniformities of coexistence that are probably alternate; and I have never denied this, but have maintained that in the logical proof and logical use of such uniformities, they are subject to the same conditions as empirical laws.

I have not seen Mr Jevons' book,⁴ but as far as I can judge from such notices of it as have reached me, I do not expect that I shall think favourably of it. He is a man of some ability, but he seems to me to have a mania for encumbering questions with useless complications, and with a notation implying the existence of greater precision in the data than the questions admit of. His speculations on Logic,⁵ like those of Boole⁶ and De Morgan, and some of those of Hamilton, are infected in an extraordinary degree with this vice. It is one preeminently at variance with the wants of the time, which demand that scientific deductions should be made as simple and as easily intelligible as they can be made without ceasing to be scientific. I look forward with much interest to seeing your notice of the book,⁷ which I am sorry not to see in the December Fortnightly. There is another book lately published, called a Survey of Political Economy, by a Mr M^cDonell,⁸ which the author has written to me about, and which I am expecting to receive from Blackheath. This too, judging from reviews, seems to be of little worth, unless possibly for hanging one of your excellent articles upon. Have you seen it?

Lanfrey's Life of Napoleon,⁹ of which the first volume (which appeared in the *Revue Nationale*) is all I have read, seemed to me, as it does to you, extremely valuable. It is a pity that he has accepted a diplomatic appointment, which may interfere with his work as a writer.

I conjecture that the prediction of Mr Brace which he says has been fulfilled, is that the people of the United States would not adopt Mr Sumner's view of the Alabama difficulty.¹⁰

My daughter unites with me in kind regards to M^{TS} Cairnes, and I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1699.

TO CHARLES DUPONT-WHITE¹

A[vignon]

Dec. 6, 1871

Cher Monsieur—

Merci de votre brochure.² J'y trouve, comme dans votre autres écrits des idées, des pensées, et ce qui est plus rare, surtout en France, l'absence de toute prévention de parti: ce qui fait que tous les partis y trouveraient quelque chose que d'ordinaire ils négligent, en ne regardant pas assez. Quant à vos conclusions j'adhère complètement aux deux principales; d'abord la république, c. à. d. l'élection seulement temporaire du pouvoir exécutif; ensuite que cette élection ne soit pas faite directement par le suffrage universel. J'aurais désiré que vous eussiez exprimé une opinion raisonnée sur le mode de l'élection. Un corps électoral spécial qui aurait le droit d'élire le président me semble à tous égards une mauvaise institution, à moins que ce corps ne soit lui-même nommé par le suffrage universel: encore faudrait-il qu'il ne fût pas nommé uniquement pour cela sous peine d'arriver au même résultat que celui des États-Unis, où les électeurs sont tous nommés avec mandat impératif de voter pour un tel, de sorte que le président est réellement élu par le suffrage populaire direct. Pour empêcher cela il faudrait que les électeurs spéciaux cumulassent avec leur devoir électoral d'autres fonctions, assez importantes pour qu'en les nommant le peuple ne regardât pas exclusivement au choix du président. Je ne vois en France que les conseils départementaux et municipaux qui remplissent cette condition, et attribuer à ces corps l'élection du pouvoir exécutif pourrait être nuisible en faisant de toutes les élections à des fonctions administratives encore plus qu'à présent une pure affaire de parti politique. A tout prendre, le seul système qui me paraisse convenable est celui de l'élection du pouvoir exécutif par l'assemblée législative. C'est là de fait, bien que ce ne soit pas en théorie le système anglais: et c'est le seul qui n'expose pas le pays à des conflits entre les deux pouvoirs—conflits qui pourraient paralyser le gouvernement pendant des années entières à moins d'un coup d'état de l'un ou de l'autre côté.

Je remarque qu'en concluant pour la république, vous vous servez principalement des arguments propres à la recommander aux classes supérieures. Cela est naturel et licite dans un écrit de circonstance.

Vous me demandez si je crois la France en décadence: C'est une question qu'on pourrait se faire aujourd'hui dans beaucoup d'autres pays. A mon sens la décadence

morale est toujours la seule réelle. Qu'il y ait ou non décadence morale en France je n'oserais le dire. Il est certain que le caractère français a de très grands défauts, qui ne sont jamais plus montrés que dans l'année malheureuse qui vient de s'écouler. Mais il n'est rien moins qu'assuré que ces défauts n'ont pas existé au même degré dans ce qu'on appelle les plus beaux jours de la France. D'un autre côté les événements récents ont démontré un immense progrès, la disparition presque entière de la férocité. Il n'y en a là, que je sache, qu'un seul exemple bien caractérisé l'événement déplorable de la Dordogne. Du reste, nous sommes dans une époque où l'on doit s'attendre partout à un relâchement transitoire des liens moraux: attendu que les anciennes croyances qui créaient un idéal, une règle, et un frein, sont très affaiblies et que les nouvelles qui doivent les remplacer n'existent guère pour le grand nombre et ne sont pas assez affermies chez les esprits avancés, n'étant pas encore entrées dans l'éducation. Une condition nécessaire de progrès n'est pas une décadence, quoiqu'elle y ressemble quelquefois à beaucoup d'égards.

Ce qui m'inquiète davantage c'est l'insuffisance intellectuelle de la génération présente pour faire face aux difficiles et redoutables problèmes d'un avenir qui a l'air d'être très prochain.

Je crains aussi que la guerre civile de Paris ne soit fatale à la disposition d'esprit nécessaire pour juger convenablement ces questions épineuses; et que l'exaspération mutuelle des deux partis n'éloigne plus que jamais chacun d'eux d'écouter ce qu'il y a de juste et de raisonnable dans les réclamations de l'autre. Quelque dangereuse que soit l'extrême crudité des idées des socialistes révolutionnaires, ce qui m'alarme beaucoup plus c'est l'effroyable abus de la répression par le parti aujourd'hui victorieux, aux yeux duquel il suffit d'avoir désiré le moindre des changements qui ont figuré dans le programme de la commune pour être un ennemi de la société, et qui semble vouloir massacrer ou déporter en masse s'il est possible, tout le parti opposé. J'avoue que dans les dispositions actuelles du parti de l'ordre, l'unanimité politique des classes supérieures que vous espérez obtenir par la république ne me semblerait promettre qu'un effort violent pour tenir la classe ouvrière en sujétion par tous les moyens usités de la tyrannie monarchique—moyens qui seraient même portés à un plus grand excès par des classes dominantes que n'oserait le faire aujourd'hui un seul homme. Et si par ces moyens on venait à supprimer pour un certain temps toute tentative de résistance légale ou violente, on ne se servirait pas de ce répit pour mettre les questions sociales à l'étude dans le but de donner une satisfaction légitime aux aspirations naturelles de la class ouvrière; non, on s'endormirait comme sous le régime impérial pour se réveiller au milieu d'un bouleversement général. Voilà ce que je crains pour la France, et à un moindre degré pour les autres pays de l'Europe.

Quant à la France j'avoue qu'en vue de l'avenir, et même d'un avenir proche, il me semble que la meilleure ressource serait dans le fédéralisme. Ce serait là le moyen d'adoucir la transition à une autre organisation sociale; en permettant aux novateurs de faire des expériences limités, sans entraîner avec eux des masses de population qui n'en veulent pas et qui s'y opposeraient par la force si on tentait de les mettre en oeuvre chez elles.

Ma fille se recommande aux bons souvenirs de M^{me} D. White à qui je vous prie d'être
l'interprète de mes hommages.

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

1872

1700.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Jan. 18. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

My opinion is most decidedly against making any appeal to the Society for their support against the seceders.² It is not the part of the London Committee to display before the enemies of Women's Suffrage the fact that its active supporters have fallen out among themselves; and with however much moderation and good taste it might be done, it would probably lead to altercations, recriminations, angry correspondence in newspapers, with names and personal details, which in this town would provoke and might even require replies, and no one can foresee how much the unseemly spectacle might be prolonged or how far it might extend. Hardly anything that could happen would tend so much to bring the cause into discredit; and nothing but a public attack by the other side, of which at present there are no signs, could in my opinion justify the London Committee in descending into the arena.

It must, however, be remembered that the next ordinary meeting of the Society, at whatever time it may be held, forms a limit beyond which the reserve which is so desirable on the subject of the dissensions cannot be prolonged; and it will therefore be a point for consideration whether, at some time between now and the next general meeting, the members of the Society should be invited by circular to give their votes upon a specific question or questions, in which no reference should be made to the past, but which should bring into direct issue the continued existence of the London Committee, and the willingness of the members to retain their connexion with it. There is no necessity for coming to an immediate decision either for or against this course. If you wish for an opinion from me on its advisability, I could not undertake to give one without some time for consideration.

I cannot come to the meeting of the Committee, but must continue to decline, as I have always done, taking any action as a member of the Executive. I may add that should a meeting be called, either public or of the Society, it will be impossible for me to be present at it in any capacity. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1701.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Blackheath Park
Kent

Jan. 19. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

I cannot help feeling that unless you have already secured beyond doubt Lord Romilly's name for a Vice President, it would be better not to ask M^{rs} Grote for hers. At least I myself should not like to do so, or to be supposed by her to wish her to give it. She may consent out of kindness or personal feeling; and I myself should feel great scruple in inducing her to do so, unless I was certain of at least one other name besides my own with which she would like to have hers associated. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours.

J. S. Mill

Could you send me one or two copies of your circular?

1702.

TO [FRANCIS E. ABBOT?]¹

Jan. 29, 1872

Dear Sir

I am very much honoured by the request of the Free Religious Association. To see something of America and of its eminent men and women would in itself be very agreeable to me, but I have other engagements for the time you mention, and I moreover find it necessary to economize my time and energies for such useful work in the way of authorship as it may be in my power to do during what remains to me of

life. With sincere acknowledgments to the Association, and thanks for the kind and flattering terms in which their wish is conveyed in your letter, I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1703.

TO WILLIAM B. CARPENTER¹

V[ictoria] S[treet]²

Jan. 29. 1872

Dear D^R Carpenter—

I am much obliged to you for sending me your two Lectures³ & the paper on Common Sense,⁴ all of which I have read with much interest.

I have long recognised as a fact that judgments really grounded on a long succession of small experiences mostly forgotten or perhaps never brought into very distinct consciousness, often grow into the likeness of intuitive perceptions. I believe this to be the explanation of the intuitive insight thought to be characteristic of women, & of that which is often found in experienced practical persons who have not attended much to theory nor been often called on to explain the grounds of their judgments. I explain in the same manner whatever truth there is in presentiments. And I sh^d agree with you that a mind which is fitted by constitution & habits to receive truly & retain well the impressions made by its passing experiences, will often be safer in relying on its intuitive judgments representative of the aggregate of its past experience, than on the inferences that can be drawn from such facts or reasonings as can be distinctly called to mind at the moment. Now you seem to think that judgment by what is called common sense is a faculty of this same kind: & so far as regards the genesis of it, I think you are right; but it seems to me that there is a very great practical difference. The reason why in the cases I have referred to the intuition is often more to be trusted than the reasoned judgment is precisely (I apprehend) because it is not an affair of common sense but of uncommon sense; the perceptions & experiences which have culminated in the intuitive judgment were peculiar to the individual & cannot be recovered. If these evidentiary matters *could* be recalled, the superiority of deliberate over hasty judgment would reassert itself. Now in the case of common sense the very words imply that the evidences which are the real justification of the judgments are familiar to all mankind; & if they are so I apprehend that enough of them can always be recovered & put into a distinct shape to admit of subjecting the point to a real scientific test. Now when this *can* be done, it always ought. For want of it, judgments

by common sense are usually judgments by superficial appearances. Almost all false political economy, for instance, is made up of judgments by common sense.

On the physiological side of psychology your paper raises questions of great & increasing interest. When states of mind in no respect innate or instinctive, have been frequently repeated the mind acquires, as is proved by the power of habit, a greatly increased facility of passing into those states, & this increased facility must be owing to some change of a physical character in the organic action of the brain; whether in the organ itself we do not, I suppose, know. There is also considerable evidence that such acquired facilities of passing into certain modes of cerebral action can in many cases be transmitted more or less completely by inheritance. The limits of this power of transmission & the conditions on which it depends, are a subject now fairly under investigation by the scientific world & we shall doubtless in time know much more about them than we do now. But as far as my imperfect knowledge of the subject qualifies me to have an opinion I take much the same view of it that you do, at least in principle.

Your explanation of the self delusion of so called Spiritualists is no doubt in many cases a true one, but for my part I believe there is much more of absolute lying in their pretended experiences than people generally like to suppose. I am altogether incredulous as to any foundation of truth at all in it.

1704.

TO AUBERON HERBERT¹

V[ictoria] S[treet]

Jan. 29. 1872

Dear Mr Auberon Herbert—

Your impression, as shown in your letter, of the mental state & tendencies of the working men, agrees very much with that which with probably fewer means of knowledge than you possess, has grown up in my own mind. From the little experience which I have had, which chiefly relates to the more advanced portion of them they seem to me to have but a narrow range of thought, but to be much more open than either the higher or middle classes to appeals made to them in the name of large ideas & high principles.² I believe that they, less than any other class, turn away contemptuously from the supposition that life may be inspired by other objects than self interest in the lower sense of the term: that they have a good instinct for discovering who are those that are really single minded in their public professions & acts, & when they perceive this, will trust them not less but all the more for considerable differences of opinion on many matters. I also agree with you in the main as to the kind of cultivation which it is of so much importance, in a social & political point of view, to give to their moral nature. But it is not clear to me that this want can be supplied in the way that has presented itself to you.³ I am not sufficiently

informed as to matters of fact, to know whether there is any considerable number of working people with active & inquiring minds who could be made to adopt as one of the great interests of life the learning & teaching of branches of knowledge unconnected with the political & social advancement of their class. My idea is (but I am open to correction) that for some time to come, politics & social & economical questions will be the absorbing subjects to most of those working men who have the aspirations & the mental activity to which the appeal would have to be made & that the moral lessons you wish them to learn can be most successfully inculcated through politics. You wish to make them feel the importance of the higher virtues: I think this can be most effectually done by pointing out to them how much those virtues are needed to enable a democracy & above all any approach to socialism to work in any satisfactory manner. Again they might perhaps be made ashamed of pursuing their political & economic objects from class selfishness instead of disinterested principle: they might for instance be shamed out of the exclusive regulations of many of the trades unions by inducing them to aim at the benefit of the entire labouring population instead of their own trade only; & it would be a vast moral improvement if this can be taught (for which the best of them I believe are now to a great degree prepared) to claim on principle for women all the rights which they demand for themselves. Then again the lesson of the great importance of other social functions than that of manual labour cannot be successfully impressed on them by any persons but those who enter into their own views of politics sufficiently to sympathize in the desire to get rid of any artificial privilege in favour of those social functions & of any institutions that tend to limiting the access to them to particular classes of mankind. Therefore without doubting that the kind of associations you desire to encourage would be very beneficial in proportion as they could be realized I sh^d have more hope from teaching the same lessons in & through politics & economics, & from the acquisition of political leadership of the working classes by persons who would make working class objects their main business in politics but who would pursue these on the strictest principles of justice & with reference solely to the general requisites of social well being & who would use all the influence they acquire with the working classes by advocating their cause to inculcate this as the only admissible mode of discussing & deciding social questions.

1705.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
S.W.

Feb. 14. 1872

My Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I have quite recovered my health, but I shall not be able to be at the Radical Club next Sunday. My opinions on the essential points of a law against bribery will be found in

the long series of amendments which I moved, and the greater number which I put on the notice paper, in the Committee on the Bill of 1868.² The most essential of them all, in my opinion, is the prohibition of employing paid canvassers, or any paid agents at all except the one required by Act of Parliament.

Pray accept our congratulation on your marriage,³ of which we lately had the pleasure of hearing.

I Am
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1706.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

A[vignon]

Feb. 28. 1872

My Dear M^R Villari—

You needed no apology for not writing oftener; & if you did, I should need it as much. But our feelings towards each other do not require letters to keep them alive, & when independently of other work, one has too many letters to write, one's surest friends are the most likely to be put off.

You judged truly that the loss of Mr Grote² leaves a great blank in my life. He was the oldest & by far the most valued of my few surviving old friends. And though he died at a ripe age, he seemed to bear his years so well that I hoped there might yet be a considerable prolongation of them. But if one lives to be old oneself one is certain of losing those whom nothing can replace, & I have had too sad experience of this to feel the shock of a fresh instance very acutely. It is just so much taken from the value of life to me. It is pleasant to hear from you that he was so much appreciated & is so much regretted in Italy. It is one of the signs which continually come unexpectedly of the hopeful course in which Italy is moving on. I fully appreciate the difficulties which you have so well pointed out. But it seems to me that there is a most encouraging mental activity among the (unfortunately too narrow) educated class in Italy, & there is as there has always been a foundation of practical common sense in the people, which is a safeguard against great & fatal errors such as, for instance, are so often committed by the French.

As you most truly say, the great problem is moral & intellectual more than political;³ & you are probably helping on the improvement of your country still more by devoting yourself to authorship, in addition to the work of a professor, than by any

administrative employment even in the department of public instruction, in which you would be dependent on a superior (& what is worse, on a succession of superiors) for the power of carrying out your ideas. If you write what becomes the standard book on Machiavelli,[4](#) you will do a service not merely to Italian but to European thought, & will help to train the thinkers of the time to come, which has become the chief thing that I also much care to do during such years of working power as remain to me. Mr Grote's example is encouraging as to this hope, for he worked at Aristotle up to his last illness; & his book,[5](#) which is now printing, will, though not complete, be, I have no doubt, a most valuable exposition & appreciation of the more abstruse parts of Aristotle's philosophy. My own work lies rather among anticipations of the future than explanations of the past. I would gladly if I could contribute something in a more direct form than I have yet done towards rendering the great new questions which are rising up respecting life & society a little less difficult to our successors. But it is doubtful whether this can be done at present to much purpose (except in the negative way of dispelling actual error); for the impending transformation of society can only be tentative; the experience necessary for seeing far into it can only be obtained when the change is already in partial progress.

We shall be at Avignon now probably for a considerable time & I shall hope to hear from you there.

1707.

TO THOMAS SQUIRE BARRETT[1](#)

A[vignon]

March 4, 1872

Dear Sir—

Your book on Causation[2](#) was duly received, but not having it with me here I can only refer in a very general manner to its contents. The impression it made on me was that I agreed with a great deal of it, but that where the view it took of the subject differed from my own, it did not make any change in my opinions. I reserved it however for further examination at a future time.

1708.

TO GEORG BRANDES[1](#)

Avignon

le 4 mars 1872

Monsieur

Je vous remercie de votre lettre du 9 janvier. Mon ignorance de la langue Danoise me fermant tout accès direct au développement intellectuel de votre intéressant pays, je vous en ai d'autant plus d'obligation lorsque vous voulez bien me fournir des renseignements. Ceux que vous me donnez sur le progrès des idées libérales sont très encourageants. Je me réjouis du grand succès de vos leçons à l'Université. Je ne m'étonne nullement de l'opposition des professeurs de la faculté philosophique à votre placement officiel. C'est la répugnance bien connue des vieilles idées contre les nouvelles.

Vous me demandez mon opinion sur l'Internationale.² Je crois que cette Association renferme une foule très diverse de représentants de toutes les écoles socialistes, tant modérées que violentes. Les membres anglais dont je connais personnellement plusieurs des chefs, me paraissent en général des hommes raisonnables, visant surtout aux améliorations pratiques dans le sort des travailleurs, capables d'apprécier les obstacles, et peu haineux envers les classes dont ils veulent faire cesser la domination. Mais j'avoue que dans les débats de leur Congrès je n'ai guère trouvé quelque bon sens que chez les délégués anglais. C'est que mes compatriotes ont l'habitude d'attendre des améliorations plutôt de l'initiative individuelle et de l'association privée que de l'intervention directe de l'Etat. L'habitude contraire qui prévaut dans le Continent fait croire aux réformateurs qu'ils n'ont qu'à mettre la main sur les rênes du gouvernement pour arriver promptement à leur but; et non seulement les socialistes français, qui sont même peut-être plus modérés que beaucoup d'autres, mais plus encore ceux de la Belgique, de l'Allemagne, et même de la Suisse, sous la direction apparente de quelques théoriciens Russes, pensent qu'il n'y a qu'à exproprier tout le monde, et abattre tous les gouvernements existants, sans s'inquiéter, quant à présent, de ce qu'il faudrait mettre à leur place. Je ne les calomnie pas, je ne fais que répéter ce que j'ai lu dans leurs journaux. Je crois, par conséquent, que le bon côté de cette Association consiste principalement dans les craintes qu'elle excite. Elle fait penser les classes qui possèdent les biens de ce monde, au sort qui les attend peut-être dans l'avenir si elles n'arrivent à rendre l'état social beaucoup plus avantageux au grand nombre. Encore la peur est-elle une mauvaise conseillère, comme on voit aujourd'hui en France. Pourtant un temps viendra où le danger sera regardé avec sangfroid et où les problèmes sociaux seront mis à l'étude avec une volonté réelle de trouver une meilleure solution que celle d'à présent. Il faut que les hommes éclairés s'occupent en attendant de préparer les esprits et les caractères.

Vous me demandez encore si on a écrit quelque chose de bon sur la question des femmes, ainsi que sur l'utilitarisme. La question des femmes est entrée dans la discussion générale, mais ce qu'on écrit là-dessus depuis quelque temps n'a tout au plus qu'une valeur de circonstance. Quant à l'utilitarisme, on a publié dernièrement plusieurs articles contre mon livre,³ mais je n'y trouve jusqu'ici rien de neuf. Ce sont toujours les mêmes objections, à peine rajeunies par le langage. Je n'a jugé à propos de répondre à aucune de ces attaques: aux vieux arguments il suffit des vieilles réponses. Cette dispute pratique se vuidera avec la dispute théorique, entre la métaphysique de l'intuition et celle de l'expérience: et sur ce champ-là, le progrès scientifique assure la victoire à cette dernière. Cependant, si on publie soit sur

l'utilitarisme, soit sur la cause des femmes, quelque chose digne de fixer votre attention, je vous en avertirai avec plaisir.

Recevez, cher Monsieur, mes salutations amicales.

J. S. Mill

1709.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

March 4. 1872

Dear Sir

I have received your kind and flattering letter, and am much interested by what it tells me of the general accordance of your philosophic views with my own before either of us was acquainted with any writings of the other.²

I expect that your intended visit to England³ coincides with my own absence, as I shall not be in England during this month, nor for a considerable time afterwards. I hope however that some future and more favourable opportunity may present itself for our becoming personally acquainted.

I thank you for the present of your book,⁴ which will be forwarded to me from England.

My English address is now 10 Albert Mansions Victoria Street London S. W.

I Am Dear Sir

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

1710.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

A[vignon]

March 4. 1872

I shall regret if you sustain any pecuniary loss by the winding up of the Reasoner.² I have however done my part in aid of it when such aid was still more needed than now, & as I require all my spare funds for other purposes I am not able to give further help nor do I know any one to whom I could now apply for the purpose.

1711.

TO JOHN BROADWOOD & SONS¹

A[vignon]

March 8. 1872

Mr Mill has received Messrs Broadwood's communication of the 21st & requests that the repairs of the piano may be put in hand & that when finished the piano may be sent to No 10 A[lbert] M[ansions] V[ictoria] Street.

1712.

TO ROBERT S. GREGSON¹

Avignon

March 14. 1872

Dear Sir—

My daughter has received your letter of March 6 & will write to her brother for the information you think necessary respecting his marriage trust. Mrs. A. T.² died in the year 1864 & the Rev. Mr. Gurney³ has left London for a country rectorship, so that the simplest plan appears to us to obtain the information we want from Mr. A[lgeron] T[aylor].

1713.

TO MR. SMITZIO¹

A[vignon]

14 March 1872

Mr. J. Stuart Mill has safely received the weekly packets of letters forwarded to him by Mr. Smitzio but he requests Mr. S. to be good enough to address the letters only

J. S. Mill Esq

Avignon

France

nothing else being necessary & there being no house of Wheatley at Avignon.

It is the quarterly parcels which Mr. Mill requested Mr. S. to forward, not by post but through Messrs Wheatley & Co, Continental Parcels Express Office, 23 Regent St.

Mr. Mill w^d be obliged if Mr. S. will now make up a strong paper parcel containing all such books, newspapers & printed matter as have arrived at V[ictoria] S[treet] by post since Mr. Mill left town. The postage covers sh^d be all taken off before the parcel is made up, & the parcel sh^d be addressed merely

J. S. Mill Esq

Avignon

France

& then taken to no 23 Regent St where directions sh^d be given to forward it to its address & the carriage will be paid on its arrival.

1714.

TO HARRIET GROTE¹

Avignon

March 24. 1872

Dear Mrs Grote

I send to you in three packets (the present being one) 21 letters of Mr Grote, being 18 to myself and three to other people, which I have found by going carefully through my old letters. They are at your full disposal.²

We hope that your health is better, and that you are enjoying the pure air and dry soil of Ridgeway. We have had delightful weather here till the last day or two, which have been both cold and wet.

Helen has been better than usual, and I am very well. I am

Dear Mrs Grote
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1715.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

A[vignon]

April 2. 1872

Dear M. Villari —

I sh^d feel much obliged if you could kindly inform me whether there is a Geological Map of Italy, & if there is, who is the publisher or where it can be bought.

We have left B[lackheath] P[ark] & our English address is now 10 A[lbert] M[ansions] but for the present we are here. I hope for a considerable time.

Few recent things have given me so much pleasure as the demonstrations of honour to the memory of Mazzini,² even by his political opponents & opponents who had sometimes good cause of complaint against him. The honour was simple justice, but there is a magnanimity in feeling & doing unreserved justice in such a case, which it would be well if all nations were capable of. The Italians are said to be calculating & utilitarian, the French pride themselves on being impulsive: on which side is the superiority in generosity & highmindedness!

1716.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

April 6. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

I write to you rather because I have not written for a long time than because I have anything very interesting to communicate. But I know that you take a friendly interest in the facts of our daily life. We have gained nearly two additional months of spring by coming here so early, and though we have still occasional chilly weather, such as England so often has in May and even June, we have escaped the return of real winter that you have had in England and which you seem to be still enduring. We have

varied our stay here by a week's excursion in Southern Provence—Hyères, St Tropez &c. which has a still warmer climate than this and where we found hawthorns in flower and meadows white with narcissuses in the very middle of March. I have no report to make of work done: I have written nothing, but have occupied myself with bringing up arrears of general reading, correcting proofs for new editions of my [Logic](#)² and [Hamilton](#),³ and examining old letters, to make a clearance of those which are no longer worth keeping. In this last operation I have reread with much pleasure many old letters of yours, nearly all of which, both for the marks of friendship they are full of, and for the intrinsic worth of their contents, are much too valuable not to be still treasured up. I hope to receive many more of them before I die, and one very soon, to tell me that you are, if not better, at least not worse than when I last saw you.

My own health is good, and Helen though still in the same weak health, is on the whole better than she has been at some former times.

There is very little pleasant in the state of public affairs either here or in England; perhaps rather more in America, Italy, and Germany. But one mourns to see the persons of the highest worth, and who were individually centres of important influences, passing away one after another. The last few weeks has deprived the world of two such persons, Mazzini and Maurice.⁴ The best consolation is that the essential part of their work was done; and the influence of their lives will still be continued by their memory.

My daughter unites with me in desiring to be kindly remembered to Mrs Cairnes. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1717.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

April 7. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

My daughter has been too unwell to write to you since she received your letter, and asks me to write now to say that you, or the Secretary, were very welcome to use her name in regard to the Vice Presidentship, because it was not for want of quite approving of the [Committee](#)² that she prefers not to have her name on the list. As to the petition you inclosed I do not think it a very good idea to have a petition signed by only two or three names, and I do not quite understand whether you mean that Miss

Nightingale has actually given her signature, and given it on the understanding that it is to be sent in with a petition to which are appended only her name and ours. If she has already given her signature on such an understanding, we will send ours too, but otherwise I should prefer not. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1717A.

TO JOHN VENN¹

Avignon

April 14. 1872

Dear Sir

I willingly inclose an expression of opinion on your qualifications,² such as my knowledge of your writings enables me to give. I am much aided in doing so by the pamphlet which I have had the pleasure of receiving from you,³ and which shews that you have applied the same clear and vigorous intellect to the subject of ethics which was conspicuous in your logical speculations. Whether your opinions and my own on that subject would altogether agree is in such cases a secondary consideration. I should not fear to defend Kant's maxim⁴ against your criticisms: He could not mean, nor could Paley mean,⁵ that we should so act that the whole human race could with general benefit do exactly what we are doing; they meant that our conduct ought to be capable of being brought under a rule to which it would be for the general benefit that all should conform. This rule, in your example of taking orders, would not be that all mankind might with public advantage take orders, but that the choice of a profession should depend (under limitations which could be stated) on the aptitudes and convenience of the individual.

One more remark. I agree with you that the right way of testing actions by their consequences, is to test them by the natural consequences of the particular action, and not by those which would follow if every one did the same. But, for the most part, the consideration of what would happen if every one did the same, is the only means we have of discovering the tendency of the act in the particular case. In your example from Austria, it is only by considering what would happen if everybody evaded his share of taxation, that we perceive the mischievous tendency of anybody's doing so. And that this mischievous tendency overbalances (unless in very extreme cases) the private good obtained by the breach of a moral rule, is obvious if we take into consideration the importance, to the general good, of the feeling of security, or

certainty; which is impaired, not only by every known actual violation of good rules, but by the belief that such violations ever occur.

I Am
Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. Stuart Mill

[Testimonial]

Avignon

April 14, 1872.

From my knowledge of Mr Venn's writings, I have been impressed, in an unusual degree, by the clearness, vigour, and precision of his intellect, as well as by his power of putting his clear ideas clearly and forcibly into words. These qualities are apparent as well in what he has written on ethical as on logical subjects: and on both he has shewn decided power of original thought. I am not sufficiently acquainted with his positive opinions in moral philosophy, to know how far I agree or differ with them; but in the case of a public teacher, his actual doctrines are of less importance than his influence in stimulating the exercise of thought in his pupils, and at the same time guarding them by an exact Method, from the evils of vagueness and looseness in thinking: and in both these respects I think it likely, judging from his writings, that M^r Venn would be a highly successful teacher.

J. S. Mill

1718.

TO M. MALTMAN BARRY [1](#)

[after Apr. 20. 1872]

Sir—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of April 20.

I sympathize strongly with many if not most of those who have been compelled to leave their country by the recent events in Paris. But I am unable to accept the Vice Chairmanship or any other office in your Society, because it is not in my power to give any time or attention to its business, & also because I am not willing to join in giving aid conformable to the Third Article, [2](#) to persons of all political creeds & parties, without distinction. If those who stand in need of aid were Imperialists from

France, Bourbonists from Spain or Naples, participants in the Slaveholders' rebellion in America, I would leave their wants to be supplied by those who think the cause by the failure of which they had been reduced to necessity a worthy one.

1719.

TO LEONARD H. COURTNEY¹

Avignon

April 21. 1872

Dear Mr Courtney

The case of the shareholders in the Bombay Bank,² which was irretrievably ruined, mainly by the fault of the Government, is shortly to be brought before the House of Commons.³ I believe it is very generally felt, by those who are acquainted with the facts, that the conduct of the Bombay Government was inexcusable; but people think it dangerous to admit that a Government which by the breach of solemn duties causes the ruin of individuals ought to make them any reparation. If I could induce you to read a printed statement of the case, drawn up by Colonel Cowper of the Bombay Staff Corps, known to me for many years as one of the most careful and accurate staters of facts with whom I have ever been in official relation, you would be able to judge whether, if that statement cannot be answered, the misconduct of the Government, in reliance on whom the stockholders risked their money, was not such as to create a moral obligation of indemnifying them for a part at least, if not the whole of their loss. I am

Dear Mr Courtney
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1720.

TO COL. THOMAS ALEXANDER COWPER¹

A[vignon]

Apr. 21. 1872

Dear Cowper,

I have no influence with the manager or editor of the Times,² indeed I am inclined to think they would be disposed to thwart rather than promote anything in which I take an interest. Neither could I well ask an editor to publish a private letter of my own. But I am acquainted with one of the best writers in the Times,³ & if I could induce him to read & pay serious attention to your pamphlet,⁴ some good might be done. I therefore inclose a note to him⁵ which, if you think fit you may forward, & I advise you to post at the same time to the same address a copy of your pamphlet. I will see if there is anything I can do to induce any of the other London papers⁶ to attend to the subject. I suppose they have all received copies of the pamphlet; but it may be advisable to refresh their recollection by sending others.

With regard to the Land Tenure Assⁿ my opinion has all along been that it is better not to have a general meeting in London this year and that we sh^d for the present content ourselves with spreading our roots in the provinces through public meetings there & the circulation of pamphlets. I expressed this opinion very decidedly the last time I saw Mr Evans,⁷ & I left England with no intention of returning soon enough to attend a meeting this season. Of course my opinion would be different if speakers were forthcoming sufficient to make the meeting a brilliant success: but a meeting unless better than the former one would seem worse, & we sh^d lose instead of gaining ground. About the Executive Committee, have we lost any of them except Mr Andrew Johnston?⁸ Is there likely to be opposition to the reelection of the present Committee with some other good name instead of his? Auberon Herbert or Lyulph Stanley⁹ or Somerset Beaumont¹⁰ would perhaps be willing to come into the Ex^{ve} if they are not already members of it which I think they are not.

I return Mr Newman's¹¹ letter. The experience of the Bristol meeting if correctly interpreted by him, is against sending *two* persons from the Committee to speak at a provincial meeting. But this I believe has not been done by the work of the Committee, but at the express request of the local promoters of the meetings. M^f Newman thinks it better to send a lecturer than a speaker, & he may be right; though the local opinion sh^d in some degree be consulted on the point. I fear that it is easier to obtain two speakers than one lecturer. It is more necessary, too that a lecturer, than that a speaker, sh^d represent our intermediate standpoint. An authorised lecture which either went beyond that point or stopt short of it would expose us to injurious misconceptions. If Col. Ouvry¹² would prepare & deliver a historical lecture from his own point of view, which has made so great an impression on M^f Newman, it would [tend] both to inform the public mind & to stir it up. Either a speech or a lecture by Mr Newman himself, grounded on the ideas in his letter, would also do good.

Mr Newman is under some misapprehension as to the opinions I have professed. I do not say that "all the land of the country ought to be national." I think this a question of time, place, & circumstance, & I incline to M^f Newman's opinion that people sh^d at any rate be allowed to own the houses they themselves live in, & even some space of ground, ornamental or other, adjoining. But his idea of aiming only at a maximum limit for landed property, though it might have been worth consideration in some former states of opinion would now merely make the working classes hostile instead

of friendly to us. Nor do I see that much would be gained by merely cutting up the great landed properties into estates of 5000 acres each; M^r Newman's plan with respect to suburban land is the same as ours, with the addition that the power of compulsory purchase should vest in the municipalities instead of the State; a question of detail which we have left open.

Mess^{rs} Longman's bill seems right except that it calls the pamphlet "Mill on *Irish* Land Tenure".¹³ They seem to have sold 331 copies to the public & 2100 to the Association. Whether that number of copies would have cost the Assⁿ less if they had been their own publishers the experience they have since had in printing the report of the public meeting will probably have shewn.

1721.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

April 21. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

A short absence from home prevented us from receiving your note at once; but I inclose now the petition with our signatures,² and hope it may not be too late. I am

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1722.

TO ARTHUR ARNOLD¹

A[vignon]

April 22. 1872

Dear Mr Arnold—

I do not remember if the Echo has expressed any opinion on the affair of the Bombay Bank.² It will shortly be brought before the H. of C. & the shareholders have what appears to me a conclusive case against the Bombay Gov^t, giving them the strongest moral claim to a partial if not total indemnification for losses for which several of the principal officers of the Gov^t are responsible as having been officially Directors of the Bank & the Gov^t itself as grossly neglecting the duty of superintendance &

persevering in that neglect after all kinds of warnings. The history of the case has been written in a pamphlet by Col. Cowper, of whom I can say from many years experience that his statements of fact are the most implicitly to be relied on both for fairness & accuracy of any which came before me during my official life. The pamphlet has no doubt been sent or will be sent to you, & if you will read it I am much mistaken if you will not feel a desire to help the shareholders.[3](#)

1723.

TO EDWIN ARNOLD[1](#)

A[vignon]

April 22. 1872

Dear Mr Arnold—

From your knowledge of Indian affairs you have probably paid some attention to the case of the Bombay Bank.[2](#) It has always seemed to me that although the Bombay Gov^t was only a shareholder in the Bank, yet as high officers of the Gov^t were officially members of the Board of Directors which did all the mischief, & as the Gov^t itself not only neglected the duty of supervision but when repeatedly warned, even by the Gov^t at Calcutta, persisted in disregarding the warnings & even withheld from the Calcutta Gov^t the information it demanded at a time when the disaster might still have been prevented from being complete; the Bombay Gov^t is bound in morality & honour to indemnify partially if not wholly the shareholders, who undoubtedly risked their money in reliance on the supervision exercised by the Government through the official Directors. The case will shortly be brought before the H. of C. & a word from the Telegraph[3](#) on the subject would be of great importance. Should you be disposed to say anything in favour of the shareholders you would find abundant material in the history of the case given in a pamphlet by Colonel Cowper, one of the ablest men in the Bombay Service, whose statements of fact I learnt by experience when in the India House that I could always rely on, both for honesty & carefulness.

1724.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES[1](#)

Avignon

April 22. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

We are truly grieved to hear so poor an account of your health, and to learn that you have found it necessary to resign the Professorship.² We both hope very earnestly that your new house³ may bring to you and those of your family who have been suffering, improved health. It seems to be in a much better position than the one you are leaving. It is we who have to apologize to you for the earnestness with which we ventured to press advice on you, which we only did from the feeling that you yourself could not estimate the chance of any improvement in your health as of so much public value, and therefore worth such energetic effort, as we do. We hope that the comfort of a settled home, and the freedom from the fatigue of your Professorship, will have a still better effect on you than any other change could have had. For ourselves, we rejoice that you are still so near London, that we shall hope to be able to see you often whenever we are in England.

Helen hopes that the Buckle,⁴ or at least all her part in it, will be completed some time in the course of May; after which we intend to take a holiday in Styria, so that if we are in England this year, it will not be till after our return from Styria.

I have seen M. Millet's article⁵ which you mention, and was amused by it. One gets accustomed to strange things, but to find myself held up as an apostle of centralization was indeed something unexpected.

Please give our kindest remembrance to Mrs Cairnes, and believe me

Dear Mr Cairnes
Most Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1725.

TO COL. THOMAS ALEXANDER COWPER¹

A[vignon]

April 22. 1872

Dear Cowper,

Since writing to you yesterday, I have written strongly respecting the Bombay Bank to Mr Arthur Arnold, the editor of the Echo, & to Mr Edwin Arnold, one of the editors & chief writers of the Daily Telegraph & have requested them to read your pamphlet which please post to each of them by name.² If you address them at the offices (Echo, 11 Catherine Street Strand—D.T. 135 Fleet Street) write *private* on the outside. Their

private addresses *were*, when I last heard (which was not very lately) Arthur Arnold
18 Stanley Gardens, Kensington Park, Edwin Arnold Kendall Cottage, Victoria Road,
Kensington.

1726.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

April 29. 1872

Dear Sir

It will give me much pleasure to see you either in England or at Avignon. I leave here
next month for a tour in Styria, Carinthia, and the Tyrol, and do not know as yet when
I shall be in England, or whether I shall remain in the Alps all the summer. I shall,
however, in either case, certainly be here in the month of September and October, and
shall be very happy to see you if you should be passing at that time; unless, indeed,
there is any chance of our paths crossing in the Austrian Alps during the summer
months. Meanwhile I shall always be happy to hear from you. And I hope to be able
shortly to write you on the subject of your book,² which I received not long ago from
England, and am now reading attentively. It came at a good time, as Mr. Grote's
posthumous work on Aristotle³ is on the point of publication, and my attention is
therefore in an unusual degree invited to Aristotle.

If you direct to me here, your letter will be forwarded to me wherever I may be.

I Am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Sincerely

J. S. Mill

1727.

TO JOHN MORLEY¹

A[vignon]

May 1. 1872

Dear Mr Morley—

It would always give me pleasure to express in any way my high opinion of you, & my belief in your competency for any office you are at all likely to apply for. But I had no idea that you had any thought of this Professorship, and I have already long before receiving your letter, given a testimonial & my [best ?] support to Leslie, who is a candidate, & who has very strong claims to this particular Professorship.² I regret much that I sh^d be unable to help any enterprise of yours.

1728.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

May 2. 1872

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

I have no knowledge whatever of the extent of the common lands still remaining uninclosed, but I suppose the Inclosure Commissioners have access to the best knowledge that exists on the subject. The “public lands” spoken of at the Club as something additional to the Commons, can only, I suppose, be the Crown property. I am

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1729.

TO THOMAS SQUIRE BARRETT¹

A[vignon]

May 6, 1872

Dear Sir—

I thank you for the copy of the 2^d edit of your book on Causation.² I quite agree in its leading doctrine, & have maintained the same in my System of Logic, viz. that there does not exist in nature any other necessity than the necessity of logical sequence, in other words the certainty that a conclusion is true if the premises are true. But this definition does not explain to people the necessity which they fancy they find in the

relation of cause & effect, which they conceive, above all, not as a conditional but an unconditional, or absolute necessity.

I think this feeling of an imaginary necessity can be no otherwise explained than as I have explained it, namely by the law of inseparable association, but that explanation appears to me sufficient. You are probably, however, right in thinking that the notion of physical necessity is partly indebted for the particular shape it assumes in our minds to an assimilation of it with logical necessity.

I will add two criticisms on detached points:

At p. 118 your objection to my definition of cause seems to me to proceed from your not having sufficiently realized the full meaning of the word “unconditionally,” which, however I do not think I can explain more clearly than I have done in my Treatise.

At p. 174 you say that no definition of matter can be given except that it is that which gravitates. I apprehend the real definition of matter to be that which resists. That whatever resists gravitates is a fact of experience not involved in the concept.

1730.

TO EMILY DAVIES [1](#)

A[vignon]

May 6, 1872

Dear Madam—

I am glad to hear that the College has a class in Pol. Economy. I inclose a set of questions which I hope may suit your purpose, & shall be happy to report on the answers.

My daughter desires to be kindly remembered to you.

[The Enclosed Questions]

1. What is the distinction between Productive & Unproductive Labour, & between Productive & Unproductive Consumption?
2. Does all Productive labour tend to increase the permanent wealth of the country?
3. State any causes, in general operation, which tend to increase the productive power of labour, & any which tend to diminish it.

4. Explain in what sense the value of a commodity depends on supply & demand, & in what sense on cost of production.
5. What cost of production is it which determines the exchange value of the products of agriculture?
6. A state of free trade being supposed, can a country permanently import a commodity from a place where its cost of production is greater than that at which it could be produced at home?
7. What are the effects, first on the national wealth, & secondly, on the wages of labour, of a large government expenditure? & does it make any difference what the expenditure is upon?
8. In what respects are the interest of the labouring classes & that of the employers of labour identical? & in what respects, if in any, opposed?
9. What is the meaning of depreciation of the currency? & what are the principal consequences of such depreciation?
10. By what means can a currency be protected against depreciation?
11. What is meant by the term, a favourable & an unfavourable exchange? & is there any well grounded objection to that phraseology?
12. How far, & in what respects, is the discovery of new & rich deposits of the precious metals a benefit to the national wealth?
13. Mention the principal circumstances that tend to produce either a rise or a fall in the rent of land.
14. State what are the known modes in which the produce of land, or the proceeds of the sale of that produce, are shared among the different classes of persons connected with the land, & state briefly the advantages & disadvantages of each.

1731.

TO JOHN MORLEY [1](#)

A[vignon]

May 11. 1872

Dear Mr Morley—

If you sh^d decide not to stand for the Professorship [2](#) I confess I sh^d be glad of your decision, because on the one hand the Professorship is likely to be of pecuniary

importance to Mr Leslie & on the other I sh^d be afraid lest the undertaking of additional work might possibly affect either your health or the time you can give to the Fortnightly. I am very desirous that the F. sh^d continue, & increase rather than diminish in importance & I think you exercise a wider influence through it than you could do through the Professorship. My daughter & I shall hold ourselves ready to assist either pecuniarily or by writing or in both ways whenever you decide to recommence the fortnightly publication.

With regard to the Irish University question,[3](#) my notion of a really national university for any country, but especially for a country divided between different religions, would be a university in which instead of only one professor of history, of ethics, or of metaphysics, there should be several of each, so that as long as there are subjects on which interested people differ, they might be taught from different points of view; & the pupils might either choose their professor, or attend more professors than one in order to choose their doctrine, examinations & prizes being made equally accessible to all. If Trinity College were reconstructed on this principle, there might be Catholic & Protestant & freethinking professors of all these subjects & in this way it seems to me that Catholics would obtain all that they can justly claim; for their only tenable ground for refusing to receive education along with Protestants is that Protestants & Catholics necessarily take different views of those subjects. Fawcett's bill[4](#) certainly does not provide for this; but this I think would be its ultimate result; & I sh^d be sorry to see any settlement of the question which would prevent this. Considering moreover how very noxious the higher instruction given by the Catholic prelates is sure to be, I think it right to avoid by every means consistent with principle the subsidising it in any shape or to any extent.

1732.

TO EDWIN ARNOLD[1](#)

A[vignon]

May 13. 1872

Dear Mr Arnold—

Your “answer” in the Telegraph[2](#) was so excellent that no other was needed; it was rather I who sh^d have written sooner to thank you for it. If anything could have helped the injured shareholders your article would have done so, & it must have materially contributed to the impression made by their case, an impression which leaves some opening for future efforts.

The article inclosed in your letter[3](#) (which was sure to be as you say it was, attacked and misrepresented) certainly does express a very general & most natural “longing” among those who have outgrown the old forms of religious belief. I myself have more sympathy with the aspiration, than hope to see it gratified, to the extent of any positive belief respecting the unseen world: but I am convinced that the cultivation of

an imaginative hope is quite compatible with a reserve as to positive belief, & that whatever helps to keep before the mind the ideal of a perfect Being is of unspeakable value to human nature. Only it is essential, to prevent a perversion of the moral faculty, that this perfect Being, if regarded as the Creator of the world we live in, sh^d not be thought to be omnipotent.

1733.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

May 15. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

Thank you very much for your two letters. The improvement you report in your health, even though not extending to the rheumatic complaint, is still a change much for the better. Troublesome and disabling as the complaint is, it happily does not touch your mental powers, nor diminish your interest in the matters to which those powers are so usefully devoted.

I should like much to read what you have written on the two points you mention in the theory of value.² You say that on one of them our difference is merely verbal; I suspect it is so on both, relating only to the most convenient or most scientific mode of expressing the same doctrine. The two modes, which you contrast with one another, of expressing cost of production, are, I imagine, both of them admissible, and both of them useful, as presenting different points of view. Of course, when we go down to the fundamentals of the matter, the cost to society, as a whole, of any production, consists in the labour and abstinence required for it. But, as concerns individuals and their mutual transactions, wages and profits are the measure of that labour and abstinence, and constitute the motives by which the exchange of commodities against one another is immediately determined. That, at least, is my present view of the matter.

The check which the Women's Suffrage movement is now sustaining,³ is what we predicted last year,⁴ when it was permitted to be identified in London with the Bright and Becker set.⁵ The mixing up of the suffrage movement with that against the C.D. Acts, which instead of disclaiming, M^r Jacob Bright in his speech did his utmost to confirm,⁶ is but one example of the total want equally of good taste and good sense with which they conduct the proceedings.

Whoever may be elected to the University College Professorship, the loss of you will be severely felt. But it is satisfactory that there is no scarcity of more or less eligible candidates. You know better than I Mr Courtney's special qualifications in Political Economy.⁷ I fear Morley's constitution is delicate, he has already suffered from overwork, and if to this were added the labour either of teaching or of studying so

large a subject, I should fear that his health would entirely give way unless he either gave up or neglected the Fortnightly which would be a great evil. Of all the candidates Leslie seems to me to have much the strongest claims in reference to this special subject; & I should rejoice if he were successful, because I esteem and value him, and because I know no one on whom a little worldly success would have a more beneficial effect.

Have you heard a rumour that the Government intend to extricate themselves from the Irish Education difficulty at the expense of the Queen's Colleges, namely by disendowing them? If there be truth in this, it is very serious, as the device is not at all unlikely to succeed. The mischief to Ireland would be greater than even the endowment of a Catholic College would be.

Brace's article⁸ does him great honour; and American feeling altogether is shewing itself in a manner most creditable to the nation. That, after all, is very much more important than the settlement of the particular dispute, even though this should for the present fail.

I am happy to say that Helen has now really come to an end with Buckle,⁹ and it will be published, probably, in two or three weeks from this time.

We think of starting for our tour in Styria in about a fortnight. Letters addressed here will be forwarded, and we hope to hear from you at least as often as we do now.

Helen joins me in kind regards to Mrs Cairnes, whose health, we hope, continues to improve, and we hope to hear good accounts of the rest of your family. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1734.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

May 19. 1872

Dear Sir

I expect to leave here next week for my German tour, and shall go to Styria from here by way of Milan, Bozen, and Heiligenblut. I expect to be at Bozen very early in June, at Heiligenbluth about the 15th, and at Gloggnitz and Graz early in July: and you can write to me Poste Restante at any of these places.

I believe I shall be nearest to Munich at Bozen and Gloggnitz: unless, indeed, I have time at the end of my tour (at the end of July or beginning of August) to return by way of the Engadine, in which case I shall probably be at Innsbruck towards the end of July, and that will be my nearest point to Würzburg.² If I hear from you at Heiligenblut, Gloggnitz, or Graz, I can write and let you know by that time whether I am likely to return by way of Innsbruck. Even if I do not return by Innsbruck, I am likely to be at Bozen again in August, on my return here.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1735.

TO CHARLES EDMUND MAURICE¹

Avignon, May 19, 1872

You are probably aware of your father's connection with a short-lived periodical of considerable literary merit, founded, I think, about 1828, and called the "Metropolitan Quarterly Magazine."² It was there that he published the article³ on account of which a passage in the second of his Cambridge lectures shows him to have retained an abiding feeling of self-reproach.⁴ That he should have done so is proof of a tenderness of conscience which may even be called excessive, for the article, which was an extremely clever quiz of the style of Bentham's "Book of Fallacies," was in substance an attack, quite legitimate from his point of view, upon what he considered as fallacious in Bentham's own modes of reasoning. I remember another article in the same periodical, which I am almost sure I understood at the time to be his; a powerful denunciation of 'Blackwood's Magazine.'⁵ the most striking article, as I remember, which the publication contained during the short period of its existence.

You are probably aware of the striking articles which he wrote in some of the early numbers of the "Westminster Review."

I particularly remember one on Montgomery's "Pelican Island,"⁶ and one on Theobald Wolfe Tone's "Memoirs,"⁷ and I mention them because, young as he then was, the powers of mind and range of thought and feeling shown in them on subjects not specially connected with theology would make them well worthy of being included in a republication of his minor writings, should such be contemplated.

I was a member of the London Debating Society; during about two years that your father was a member of it, he was not a very frequent speaker, but your uncle Sterling was, and together they formed a third intellectual party or *nuance*, opposed both to the Benthamite and to the Tory sections which used to fight their battles there.⁸ It was to that time that I owed the commencement of the strong and permanent friendship

between Sterling and me, and the greatest part of the personal acquaintance I ever had with your father. He and I were never intimate, but we used to have long discussions together on philosophy, religion, and politics; from which, though I do not think either of us often convinced the other, I always carried away, along with a most lively impression of his mental powers and resources, ideas both new and invaluable to me. Indeed, his conversation and that of Sterling were almost my first introduction to a line of thought different from any I had previously known, and which, by itself and by its effects, contributed much to whatever mental progress I subsequently made.

It was during the same period that your father and Sterling wrote frequently in the "Athenaeum,"⁹ which, under their influence and that of their friends, sent forth many valuable thoughts, and maintained an elevation of character very uncommon, both then and now, in literary or any other periodicals. I had no knowledge of the authorship of the particular articles, on which you are probably much better informed.

After those years, your father's path and my own, both in life and in speculation, were widely apart, and our direct intercourse was small and at considerable intervals; but I remained an assiduous reader of his writings, and was always a sympathising as well as admiring observer of his career.¹⁰

1736.

TO PASQUALE VILLARI¹

A[vignon].

May 19. 1872

Dear M^R Villari—

I am extremely obliged to you for the trouble you so kindly took respecting the Geological Map. Your information fully answered the purpose. I wrote to Audriveau-Goujon² & obtained from him Collegno's map.³

When I received your letter I did not possess, at Avignon, a copy of the tract on Land Tenure⁴ which you expressed a wish to see. I have now obtained one, & send it to you by this post. If it had been anything like what the *Revue des Deux Mondes* represented it to be,⁵ I should not have failed to send it to you. But it is a very slight thing indeed—neither a manifesto of the Radical party nor the programme of a new party. It is simply a few pages in explanation of the objects of an Association founded for a special purpose, viz., to reclaim for the State whatever rights in the land it has not unconditionally parted with to private persons: including among other things the right to impose special taxation on landed property, to the extent of the increase of value which it is continually acquiring in a prosperous country from the mere growth of wealth & population, without any labour or outlay by the proprietors. There is a party among our working classes who go much further,⁶ demanding the resumption of all land by the State, with more or less of compensation to the landholders. A time

may come for something of this sort, but what is proposed by the Society is as much as I think desirable (not to say attainable) for a considerable time to come. I am sorry that that little tract has been reviewed in the *Deux Mondes* by a person so ignorant of my opinions as to call me a partisan of extreme centralisation. It is about the last reproach I sh^d have expected. But a large class of French writers make assertions of facts with a levity almost incredible.

We are going very shortly to make a tour in Styria & other parts of the Austrian Alps, but letters addressed to me here will be forwarded. I hope to have a letter from you soon.

1737.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

May 23. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

Many thanks for your friendly attention to my recommendation on the subject of the Professorship.² M^r Leslie has been very successful as a teacher, and I hear it is very likely that the Irish Professorships will cease to be subsidized by the Government, which would probably lead to his having to resign the one he holds.³

With regard to the suffrage movement, it is not obvious what purpose would at present be answered by calling a meeting of the subscribers, or entering into communication with them by circular. What proposal have you to lay before the subscribers, or for what ostensible object would the appeal be made to them? Not, surely, for the sake of publicly denouncing the mismanagement of the other party,⁴ and exhorting the friends of the movement to adopt you as their leaders instead: It must therefore be to propose some active step: but what step is there to take except to go on propagandising in a quiet way, as you are already doing, by lectures and otherwise? Another public meeting, in competition with that of the other party, would only involve the London Committee in the same or a still greater *fiasco*. The public are tired of the subject, and their interest cannot be revived during the present session. The power of the London Committee to be of use to the movement depends on their keeping themselves absolutely free from the injudicious and undignified fussiness by which the other party have so much injured it: and of all things the most fatal to the cause for a long time to come, would be the spectacle of two sets of people publicly competing for the lead of it, with all the necessary consequences of such a rivalry. All this must be fully apparent to you, but you have not shewn how such a result could be avoided. It is to be feared that the movement will have to sink still lower than at present before it can rise again under new leadership. When the present leaders let the reins drop, disgusted with the failure they have caused, or when they have fallen into such discredit with their followers that they can make no serious resistance to being

superseded, then the time of the London Committee will have come, if it has meanwhile kept itself clear of all similar discredit; but any public demonstration just now would be a humble adoption of the unsuccessful tactics of the other party. Their obtrusive activity requires even an exaggerated quietness and calmness on the part of those who wish to be distinguished from them. The policy of the London Committee is quietly to let the fruit ripen, while it continues itself ostentatiously inactive. Any action on its part now, will only expose it to sharing, in the eyes of the general public, the contempt and dislike which the other party have drawn down, for the present, on the subject. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1738.

TO COSTANTINO BAER¹

A[vignon]

May 30. 1872

Monsieur—

Je vois avec regret et avec quelque surprise que depuis bientôt cinq mois j'ai reçu votre livre (*L'Avere e l'Imposta*)² sans vous avoir encore remercié de ce don et sans avoir obtempéré au désir flatteur que vous avez exprimé de connaître mon opinion sur vos conclusions. C'est que je n'ai trouvé que tout récemment le temps de donner à cet ouvrage la lecture sérieuse qu'il mérite. Aujourd'hui même je suis forcé d'abrégé ce que j'aurais à dire sur votre livre.

D'abord en tant qu'ouvrage d'économie politique pure, je n'ai que des éloges à en faire. La seule critique que je crois pouvoir faire c'est qu'en traitant (p. 83) de la manière dont un impôt sur les profits industriels et commerciaux retomberait sur le consommateur vous ne semblez pas peut-être distinguer suffisamment entre un impôt général sur les profits de tout capital productif et un impôt qui frappe seulement ceux de quelques branches de production. D'après les principes généraux de la politique la possibilité de faire retomber l'impôt sur les consommateurs me paraît manquer dès que l'impôt frappe toutes les industries sans distinction.

Comme ouvrage non pas d'économie politique abstraite mais de haute politique votre livre est plein de choses vraies et utiles; mais j'avoue je n'en trouve pas la conclusion suffisamment établie. Vous soutenez que la règle de la justice en matière d'impôt, savoir que chacun doit payer en raison de son avoir, exige qu'il y ait deux genres d'impôt, l'un sur les dépenses improductives, et l'autre sur le capital; et que le

possesseur d'un capital, après vous payer comme les autres sa part de tous les impôts de consommateur, doit payer en dessus un impôt proportionné à son capital productif. Or je ne suis pas ennemi de l'impôt sur le capital; je trouve assez probable, qu'à cause de l'incertitude et de l'effet si démoralisateur de l'impôt direct sur les revenus on viendra à imposer le capital comme moyen d'en atteindre les profits. Mais je ne trouve pas que dans le système que vous proposez chacun payerait proportionnellement à son avoir réel. Votre opinion me paraît ressembler à celle de quelques Socialistes, qui, parceque les profits du capitaliste et son capital sont tous deux compris dans son avoir légal, oublient qu'il ne peut réellement jouir de tous les deux, mais bien de l'un ou de l'autre à son choix. Il n'obtient ses profits qu'à condition de faire consommer son capital par d'autres: s'il s'en sert pour sa propre jouissance il renonce à en tirer du profit. Or l'égalité dans l'impôt me paraît consister en ce que chacun paie à proportion de ce qu'il peut appliquer à la satisfaction de ses propres besoins. Tant que son capital reste productif il n'en tire pas plus d'avantage personnel que si ce capital lui avait été confié par l'état, sauf le privilège qu'il n'aurait pas alors de le gaspiller sans être responsable à personne.

P.S. Mon adresse à Londres est maintenant 10 A[ibert] M[ansions] &c mais des lettres adressées à Avignon me sont expédiées partout où je suis.

1739.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Spital

June 22. 1872

Dear Sir

Your letter reached me at Heiligenblut. As soon as I am able to fix within a week or so the time when we shall be at Bozen or at Innsbruck, I will write to let you know.

Before leaving Avignon, I finished reading your book,² which I think a work of great merit. I have not yet had an opportunity of comparing it with that of Mr. Grote.³

I am no admirer of the English climate, which I think deserves the worst that I have ever heard said of it; but this year, cold and rain are universal, even in Provence, one of the driest climates in Europe. We have been greatly inconvenienced by the rain all this spring, and I hear the same reports wherever we pass. The weather here is rainy and would be very unfavourable for the ascension of the higher mountains, which, however, fortunately for me, I am not at present planning.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1740.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Udine

Aug. 2. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

Your letter reached me a considerable time after its date, in the heart of the Styrian Alps, which we have found quite as beautiful and enjoyable as we expected; as we have also those of Carinthia, & Carniola. We had, however, a good deal of rainy weather up to the last fortnight, and since that ceased we have found the heat much greater than is pleasant.

I wish your letter had brought a better account of your health. I regret to have in that respect nothing to congratulate you upon, except the strength of mind with which you bear up against so serious a misfortune, retaining all your interest in the public, and seeking consolation in continuing to work for science & the general good. This, indeed, is only what might have been expected of you. I shall be very glad to see what you have written on the theory of value.² Your decided opinion that the question between us is not chiefly verbal, or relating only to the best manner of setting forth the same truths, makes me think it likely that I have still something material to learn from you on the subject; and I think it very improbable that on a question of abstract political economy, after explanation, we should not agree.

What you say in your letter about the University College election in reference to myself is very kind and friendly.³ For reasons which I have already mentioned, I regret that the choice did not fall on Leslie: but your opinion of Mr Courtney's qualifications for the Professorship is entitled to great weight, and has no doubt much helped his election; and if it is not to be Mr Leslie, I prefer it to be Mr Courtney.⁴

Freeman⁵ belongs emphatically to what is called the historical school in politics and jurisprudence; he has the good qualities and the weaknesses of that school. Their error is, as is so often the case, a half truth giving itself out for the whole; for they are quite right in thinking that a good political institution is more likely to take a deep root when it has been called for by a felt want of the people, than when it has been set up by a king or a revolutionary leader on the strength of its general merits. But this truth is continually perverted into an attack on the use of reason in matters of politics and

social arrangements; and Freeman does not sufficiently guard himself against this
perversion.

Helen desires her kind remembrances to M^{rs} Cairnes and I am

Dear M^R Cairnes
Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1741.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Udine

Aug. 3. 1872

Dear Sir

I fear the time is already past which I mentioned as probable for my return to Bozen,²
and I am more uncertain than ever as to when I shall be there. I fear, therefore, that we
must defer our meeting till some more convenient opportunity, for I find the
uncertainty caused by weather, health, and the various unexpected incidents of quite
new country, is such that I cannot fix beforehand any date for my passing through
Bozen. It may be in a fortnight, or it may not be for a month, and I may even possibly
be detained so long as not to pass through it at all. I am

Dear Sir
Your Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1742.

TO COSTANTINO BAER¹

A[vignon]

Sept. 22. 1872

Monsieur—

Votre lettre m'est parvenue au milieu d'un voyage en Autriche et je n'ai pas pu lui donner une réponse immédiate. Je l'ai mise de côté avec le projet de vous écrire à mon premier loisir un examen détaillé de votre réponse à mes objections au sujet de l'impôt sur le capital. Cependant en relisant cette réponse il me semble que tout ce qu'elle contient avait été dit avec une grande clarté dans votre livre même et que ce que vous ajoutez dans votre lettre n'est qu'un résumé des mêmes arguments. En tout cas vous n'avez pas ébranlé mon objection fondamentale, savoir le capital, tant qu'il reste capital productif, n'a d'autre valeur pour le capitaliste que celle du revenu qu'il donne et que par conséquent si on le fait payer sur le capital et aussi sur toutes ses dépenses il est en réalité imposé deux fois. J'accorde qu'on peut justement exiger de celui qui vit sans travailler sur le revenu de son capital ou de sa terre une plus grande contribution que de celui qui gagne un revenu équivalent en travaillant, aussi ai-je toujours demandé une réforme de l'income tax dans ce sens. Mais cela est principalement vrai pour ceux qui doivent leur fortune à l'héritage et non à leur propre travail antérieur; aussi c'est surtout par l'impôt sur les successions que je voudrais rétablir, en cette matière, la justice sociale.

Quant à publier un article sur votre livre² ce serait un plaisir pour moi, mais il est incertain si je pourrai disposer du temps nécessaire. J'espère pourtant que je pourrai écrire une notice raisonnée en deux ou trois pages et la faire insérer dans une revue où j'écris quelquefois. Si cela a lieu je me donnerai le plaisir de vous envoyer le numéro.

1743.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

Avignon

Sept. 22. 1872

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

Excuse the delay in answering your letter, which was caused by my receiving it in the midst of a tour in the Austrian Alps.

I quite agree with you as to the importance of making some movement to prevent the destruction of natural or artificial objects of general interest. France has set us the example, by making a register of all Monuments Historiques,² none of which when so registered can lawfully be destroyed or injured by a proprietor, or by any local or merely departmental authority; though I have known a triumphal arch pulled down by the Ponts et Chaussées³ because it had not been entered in the Register.

The cry of confiscation may be met if the proposal is simply to make a list of all such interesting objects, Roman camps and Druidical circles included, and to provide by

law that none of these may be destroyed or altered by the proprietor without his first giving the public the option of buying it from him for the equivalent of what it is worth to him in its existing state.

I perceive that Sir John Lubbock⁴ has given notice of a motion for next session for the preservation of historical monuments. It will be a great advantage to be able to act in concert with him; and if his contemplated motion does not go the whole length of what is desirable, he might perhaps be induced to enlarge its scope. I am

Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1744.

TO GUILLAUMIN ET CIE.¹

Avignon

le 22 septembre
1872

Messieurs

Je viens seulement de recevoir la première feuille de la troisième édition² de la traduction de mes Principes d'Economie Politique avec prière de compléter la liste de mes écrits traduits en français.

Outre les quatre livres qui sont déjà dans votre liste, il y a des traductions françaises de trois autres de mes écrits: d'abord Utilitarianisme, dont la traduction faite par Mademoiselle de Peyronnet (aujourd'hui Lady Arthur Russell)³ paru d'abord dans la Revue Nationale et a dû être republiée dans un petit volume par Charpentier,⁴ éditeur de cette Revue.

Ensuite, un volume que j'ai publié sur Auguste Comte et le Positivisme, a été traduit par M. Clémenceau⁵ et publié, si je ne me trompe, par la maison Germer Baillière.

Enfin, mon ouvrage sur la Philosophie de Hamilton a été traduit par le traducteur de L'Assujettissement des Femmes, M. E. Cazelles,⁶ et publié par Germer Baillière.

Agréez, Messieurs, l'expression de ma considération toute particulière.

J. S. Mill

1745.

TO ROWLAND G. HAZARD¹

Avignon

Sept. 22, 1872

Dear Sir

I have only just received your note of Aug. 27, and I regret that your visit to London has coincided with our absence. We have just concluded a tour in the Austrian Alps, and are now likely to remain for some time at the little place where we had formerly the pleasure of seeing you, and where you will be heartily welcome should your occasions again lead you to this part of the world.² Meanwhile we shall be most happy to hear from you, and to know whether we can be of more use to you in England.

We have left Blackheath Park, and our present address in England is

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
Westminster

I Am Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

R. G. Hazard Esq.

1746.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

Sept. 24. 1872

Dear Sir

We have now returned here, and shall be very glad to hear from you, and to see you at any time, either here, in England, or in Germany. I intend now to write a review of Mr. Grote's Aristotle, in doing which I expect to be assisted by your work and to find occasion to mention its merits.² I will send you what I have written, when it is

published, and if I do not hear from you before then, will direct it to Aschaffenburg.³
I am

Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1747.

TO LEWIS SERGEANT¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 2. 1872

Dear Sir—

I thank you for the three numbers of the Anti-Game-Law Circular,² which I have read with much interest. No one has a worse opinion than I have of the present Game Laws & their administration & I would rather there were not a head of game left in England than that the existing injustice sh^d continue. But I do not find in the papers you sent, any clear & explicit statement of what, in the opinion of the League, the law on this subject ought to be. The opinions indicated are that there sh^d be no laws whatever respecting game as game, & that wild animals until taken or killed sh^d not be property, but when taken sh^d be the property of whoever takes them. In the former opinion I am inclined to agree but in the latter I am not satisfied. It seems to me just that wild animals sh^d belong to those at whose expense they have been fed; the nearest practical approach to which is that they sh^d belong to the occupier of the land on which they are taken or killed. Neither does it seem to me that the plan shadowed forth in the Circular would of itself terminate the evils arising from game-preserving. It is not, I suppose, intended to permit any one who pleases to kill game on other people's land without their permission. But if not, then until the lavish preservation of game comes to be stamped by public opinion with the disapproval & contempt which it deserves, it is likely still to go on; nor for this purpose should there be need of a new law of trespass: the more rigid enforcement of the existing trespass laws would suffice. There would be still more shutting up of paths & other thoroughfares than there is at present. The fields & woods would be as carefully guarded against trespassers as they now are against poachers, & the highways & such paths as could not be stopped would be shut in between fences, to the great loss of all wayfarers & lovers of rural walks. I presume all these points will be fully discussed in the Circular as it proceeds but until I am satisfied respecting them I cannot, by joining the League, identify myself with the particular means by which they seek to attain our common object.³

1748.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Oct. 4. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

We have now been here about three weeks since the conclusion of our tour, which was prolonged for two or three weeks more than we had expected. We have had an uninterrupted succession of beautiful scenery from the beginning to the end, and yet the result is to make us appreciate not less, but, if possible, more, the characteristic beauty of our own Vaucluse. In point of health the excursion has been beneficial to us both: me it has quite set up; it has not done so much for Helen, but though still very weak, she is materially better than in the spring.

We have had from Thornton very recent intelligence respecting both your health and your literary proceedings; the latter more agreeable than, to our sorrow, the former was. The two volumes of Essays,² I suppose, are a republication of some of your contributions to periodicals, and well worthy they are of being so collected and preserved. I am more and more desirous of the completion of your other book.³ Your discussion of the question whether wages ought in any sense to be considered as cost of production, or whether that term should be exclusively predicated of labour and abstinence, was always likely to be scientifically instructive, but I now perceive that it will have a special value *de circonstance*. You must have been struck as I have been, by the thoroughly confused and erroneous ideas respecting the relation of wages to price, which have shewn themselves to be almost universal in the discussions about the recent strikes. The notion that a general rise of wages must produce a general rise of prices, is preached universally not only by the newspapers but by political economists, as a certain and admitted economical truth; and political economy has to bear the responsibility of a self-contradicting absurdity which it is one of the achievements of political economy to have exploded. It provokes one to see such ignorance of political economy in the whole body of its self-selected teachers. The Times joins in the chorus, notwithstanding M^r Courtney,⁴ who, I do hope, has no hand in the matter. Certainly no one who knows, even imperfectly, what the Ricardo political economy is, whether he agrees with it or not, can suppose this to be it. I hope you will come down upon it with all the weight of your clear scientific intellect, your remarkable power of exposition, and the authority of your name as a political economist.

I have done no work since our return but reading up arrears which had accumulated during our absence, but I am going to work immediately upon Mr Grote's Aristotle for the Fortnightly.⁵ I have not yet seen the book, and cannot foresee how far I shall be able to produce a generally useful or interesting article upon it, but I mean to try.

Helen sends her kind regards to M^{rs} Cairnes, and I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1749.

TO THOMAS SMITH¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 4. 1872

Dear Sir—

I have to acknowledge your letter of August 27 & to express through you my thanks to the Nottingham branch of the International W.M.A. for the copies of their programme & of your able pamphlet² which they have done me the favour to send.

In the principles of the Association as set forth in the Programme³ I find much that I warmly approve, & little, if anything from which I positively dissent though, from the generality with which those principles are laid down it is impossible for me to say to what extent I should concur in the practical measures which the association would propose in order to bring the principles into operation.

A remark however is suggested to me by some part of the phraseology both of the programme & of the pamphlet, which I sh^d think it wrong to withhold. What advantage is there in designating the doctrines of the Assⁿ by such a title as “the principles of the political & social revolution”? “The Revolution” as a name for any set of principles or opinions, is not English. A Revolution is a change of government effected by force, whether it be by a popular revolt or by a military usurpation, and as “the man” in English always means some particular man, so “the Revolution” means some particular revolution, such as the French Revolution, or the English revolution of 1688.

The meaning intended to be conveyed by “the principles of the Revolution” can only be guessed at from a knowledge of French in which language it seems to mean the political ideal of any person of democratic opinions who happens to be using it. I cannot think that it is good to adopt this mode of speech from the French. It proceeds from an infirmity of the French mind which has been one main cause of the miscarriages of the French nation in its pursuit of liberty & progress; that of being led away by phrases & treating abstractions as if they were realities which have a will & exert active power. Hitherto the character of English thought has been different: it has required propositions that express definite facts not vague words which only seem to

have a meaning. There is no real thing called “the Revolution”, nor any “principles of the Revolution.” There are maxims which your Assⁿ, in my opinion rightly, consider to be essential to just government, and there is a tendency, increasing as mankind advance in intelligence & education, towards the adoption of the doctrines of just government. Those are all the facts there are in the case, & the more clearly & unambiguously these, & nothing but these are stated, the better people will understand one another & the more distinctly they will see what they are disputing about & what they are concerned to prove: When instead of this men range themselves under banners as friends & enemies of “the Revolution,” the only important question, what is just & useful, is kept out of sight, & measures are judged not by their real worth but by the analogy they seem to have to an irrelevant abstraction.

The otherwise very salutary intercourse which has grown up of late years between portions of the English & French working classes will be dearly paid for if it causes the advanced politicians of this country to abandon one of the best characteristics of the English mind & replace it by one of the worst of the French.

I cannot conclude without expressing the great pleasure with which I have seen the full & thoroughgoing recognition by your body of the claims of women to equal rights in every respect with men, & of minorities, proportionally to their numbers, with majorities; & its advocacy of the Federal principle for the security of this last. As a further means to the same end, promoting at the same time other ends no less valuable, I would invite the attention of your Association to the importance of Proportional Representation.

1750.

TO WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON¹

A[vignon]

Oct. 5. 1872

Dear Thornton—

Your letter of Sept. 22 found us here after the conclusion of perhaps the most interesting & beautiful journey we ever made, the Greek journey alone excepted. The tamest part was the return home through Switzerland, from which you may imagine what the rest must have been. After leaving Udine from which I last wrote to you, we went right across the Dolomite country by the Ampezzo road, then round to Botzen taking the beautiful valley of the Eisack & the Luson Alp district by the way: from Botzen to the magnificent Stelvio pass, where we spent altogether six days, descending to Bormio on the Italian side & climbing to the summit of the Pressura mountain which surmounts the top of the pass. Helen I am happy to say was able to climb the pass on foot from Träfoi (low down on the Tyrol side) to the top & also to climb the Pressura without being worse for the exertion. We had the most splendid weather conceivable while near the Stelvio; but going on to the Arlberg pass we got

into rainy weather & we staid five days in that neighbourhood, of which only two were fine. We then returned home across Switzerland & part of Savoy, taking the opportunity of seeing Annecy & its lake which were new to us. The journey has quite restored my health & has improved Helen's though the improvement has not maintained itself at the height it seemed to have reached at the Stelvio.

We were sorry that your holiday had so unpleasant an interruption² but glad that when resumed it was still pleasant.

I congratulate you on so nearly having finished your book.³ It is sure to interest me whether I agree with it or not. I have not yet begun to write on Mr Grote's Aristotle,⁴ not having received the book, but I am expecting it daily. In what I said about Lewes's book⁵ I was purposely guarded, having hardly any knowledge of my own respecting those works of Aristotle to which it relates. I did not think it likely that any book by Lewes would be profound either in philosophy or scholarship; but it seemed to me on the whole a meritorious work; & this opinion was confirmed by Mr Grote when I asked him what he thought of it. I cannot doubt therefore that if you wish to read respecting Aristotle's physical writings, the book must be worth your reading.

I should like to have heard Louis Blanc expounding after his fashion the political state of France.⁶ We think with him that the French peasantry are becoming republican: but we do not think that it is in an unintelligent way. Helen attributes it, I believe with reason, to the great desire of the peasantry for thorough education, & their perceptions from experience that lay schoolmasters teach better than clerical. The Republicans being the only party who do not want to give education into the hands of the priests, this, more than anything else, is making the peasantry Republican.

1751.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Oct. 13. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

I have not received the letter you refer to, but have been surprised at not having heard from you any news of what has taken place in regard to the Committees.² However I did not like to write to you to ask, because I thought you must be busy, and felt sure you would write in good time. I am afraid, now, I shall be obliged to give you the trouble of writing again, because your letter must have been lost somewhere in the Austrian Alps. There have been allusions in several other letters we have received to something having taken place in the Committee, but not enough to let us guess what it is. One letter spoke of "amalgamation" between you and the new "Central."³ Of course I cannot judge what I should recommend until I know what has passed. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1752.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

Oct. 14. 1872

Dear Sir

Your letter addressed to Udine never reached me. But we should not have been able to arrange a meeting in Italy, for in three days from the time when I wrote to you from Udine, we left Italy by the Ampezzo road and returned into Austria. It was well that we did not appoint a rendezvous at Bozen, for the heat of that hot place was so great when we arrived, that we only remained there two hours.

I will write to let you know where we shall be in the early part of next year. At present we expect to be in England from about the middle of February to the middle of April.

I thank you for sending me your little book on Aristotle's various meanings of *ens*.² I find that it was well known to Mr. Grote, who refers to it several times. He calls it in one place an "able treatise", in another an "instructive" one, and in a third he says that in your "valuable chapter" (ch. 2) "the meanings of τ? συμβεβηκός³ in Aristotle are clearly set forth."⁴ Unfortunately he did not live to reach that part of the subject which corresponds to your book on the νοῦ? ζ ποιητικός⁵ but I feel little doubt that he must have read it.

I shall be happy to hear from you on the philosophical questions which you mention, in your own language, (though you write most excellent English). But as I do not read the German cursive character with facility, I hope your German will be written, like your English, in the general character of Europe, in which your handwriting is one of the clearest and most agreeable to read of all my correspondents. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1753.

TO PRESCOTT, GROTE & CO.[1](#)

A[vignon]

Oct. 17. 1872

Dear Sirs—

I have just received your letter of Oct. 10. Will you kindly inform me what would be the effect of my executing a power of attorney, & whether any further formalities would be necessary in order that you may receive the money for me if I did so.

1754.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON[1](#)

Avignon

Oct. 23. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

We are glad to hear that there is no foundation for the rumours which had reached us of a reconciliation between the two Committees,[2](#) effected at the general meeting of the members of the London Society.

I fully agree with you that it is most desirable that parliamentary action should at present be abstained from; and my daughter has from the first disapproved of the annual motion system, saying that it would infallibly lead to a falling off of numbers in the votes. But I should like to know what are the means by which you propose to “refuse to have anything more to do with the Bill during the present Parliament,” and “by abstaining bring” the Manchester people “to abstain from parliamentary action.” The end is excellent, and I have no doubt you will find good means of carrying it out, but I should like to know what they are.

At present, propagandism is all that can usefully be attempted, and for this purpose, lectures, if funds for the purpose can be obtained, are most desirable. We are glad to hear that a new lady lecturer of promise is available: who is she? It is a good plan to require a lecture to be drawn up for your judgment. What is the ground of your dissatisfaction with M^{rs} Ronniger?[3](#)

D^r Bennett[4](#) has great influence at Greenwich, and a reputation as a poet, I am told, among working men in general. He is not very zealous in the cause, and were he to lecture, the advantage would rather be his presenting the subject from the mild and

commonplace point of view; which is some advantage. He was willing to have lectured when my daughter proposed it. Whether he would be willing now is another question: but we think there would be no harm, but rather good, in proposing it to him. [He was, we know privately, very much displeased with M^{rs} Taylor, M^{rs} Pennington, *et hoc genus omne*; thinking them unbusinesslike, fussy, rude, &c. &c. and being rather susceptible on the question of his own dignity.][5](#)

I will send the cheques for our annual subscriptions, if you will let me know in whose name they are to be drawn. I should recommend your sending round a printed form to subscribers, giving name and address for cheques and post office orders. If this is omitted it will account for a great falling off in the subscriptions. It would be as well perhaps to head it with the name of the Society, and mine as that of the President, in order that those who entered in any degree on my account may know that yours is the real Simon Pure.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1755.

TO PRESCOTT, GROTE & CO.[1](#)

A[vignon]

Oct. 29. 1872

Dear Sirs—

I return the Power of Attorney attested by Monsieur Bracchice, notary at Avignon. I have filled the blank with the address only, without any “quality”, but if any is necessary I should be obliged by your inserting what is usually said in the case of persons of no profession.

I send also, duly signed by the same notary, the necessary form. I understood from your letter that if I gave a power of attorney I sh^d receive a parcel of these forms which I have not yet done. I sh^d be glad if you would apply for it & forward it to me here: otherwise I see no advantage in the power of attorney.

1756.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON[1](#)

Avignon

Nov. 5. 1872.

Dear Mr Robertson

We quite agree with you and M^F Hunter that the state of things which seemed to us to counsel abstinence is greatly changed by the line taken in the Tory papers.² It is evident that the word has been given by Disraeli, and we may now hope to see the bulk of the Tory party added to the voters for the bill. If this happens, it will compel Gladstone either to join too, or to bid for radical support by some other strong measure. If it is likely that Mr Ward Hunt³ or any Conservative of weight would be willing to undertake the bill, he should be invited to do so. It can probably be ascertained through M^F Eastwick⁴ or otherwise, by whom, either Conservative or Liberal, the Conservative leaders would prefer to have the bill introduced; and the vast importance of their cooperation will be so evident to all real friends of the cause, that there would probably be little difficulty in getting the subject into hands acceptable to them.

The time, moreover, is, I think now come when, at parliamentary elections, a Conservative who will vote for women's suffrage should be, in general, preferred to a professed Liberal who will not. Of course there may be reasons in particular cases for not acting on this rule; but the bare fact of supporting M^F Gladstone in office, certainly does not now give a man a claim to preference over one who will vote for the most important of all political improvements now under public discussion. I am

Dear Mr Robertson

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1757.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Nov. 5. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

You seem to us to underrate the value of "a pretty face"² in a lecturer on women's rights. As my daughter says, it is not for the sake of effect on men that it is important, but for the influence it has on the younger women. It shews them that the championship of women's cause is not confined to women who have no qualifications for success in the more beaten track, and that they would not, by joining in the movement, forfeit their chance of the ordinary objects of women's ambition. This is

an advantage which outweighs even some inferiority in lecturing powers. It is above all on the minds of women that we ought to work, for when the majority of them think the change right, it will come.

We have a strong impression that money is more usefully expended on lectures in the provinces than in and about London. In London and the suburbs nearly all who are likely to come to a lecture have at least heard of the subject, and are already either favourable or hostile: but in country places the lecturer often pierces into a quite fresh stratum of public opinion. It is often found that before any lecture had been delivered in a country town, nobody in the place had thought of the subject one way or the other, but that many are willing and ready to take the right view of it when presented to them. We should be sorry, therefore, to see provincial lectures neglected in favour of London ones. Indeed, our subscriptions to the former fund were made with the express view of lectures in the provinces. The general subscription arose out of my daughter's offering £100 to M^{rs} Taylor for country lectures.

There is much to be said for your idea of addressing Mr Jacob Bright against the reintroduction of his bill next year; and I should much like to see the sort of address you would think of sending, if you would put it on paper in a rough way. It is important however not to include Mr Eastwick in the same application with Mr Jacob Bright. You may remember that Mr Eastwick said, last session, that he thought the parliamentary conduct of the question should be placed in other hands. Any address, public or private, should be made exclusively to Mr Jacob Bright. We think that the great motive, and it is a powerful one, for making some sort of an address to him, is in order that we may influence members who are favourable to the suffrage, openly to stay away in considerable numbers if Mr Jacob Bright insists on a division. This is the only way we can see of breaking the fall which is sure to come: and if Mr Jacob Bright knows that your Committee recommends this policy, it will be more likely than anything else to check his folly, if anything would.

The decline of the annual subscriptions from £350 to £217 is less than I should have expected, and not at all discouraging, when we consider, on the one hand the general tendency of subscriptions to fall off somewhat after the first year or two, through negligence or forgetfulness, and on the other, the subscriptions likely to have been drawn off by the rival Committee, and the general damp to the hopes of supporters by the unfavourable division last summer.

I Am
Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1758.

TO EMILE DE LAVELEYE¹

A[vignon]

Nov. 17. 1872

Cher Monsieur—

J'ai lu vos articles dans la *Revue des 2 Mondes* des 1^{er} juillet, 1^{er} août et 1^{er} septembre.² Votre esquisse de l'histoire de la propriété territoriale, et votre description des différentes formes que cette institution a revêtues à différentes époques, et dont la plupart se conservent encore dans quelque endroit, me semblent très propres au but que vous avez en vue et que je poursuis aussi depuis longtemps, celui de faire voir que la propriété n'est pas chose fixe mais une institution multiforme, qui a subi de grandes modifications, et qui est susceptible d'en recevoir de nouvelles avec grand avantage. Vos trois articles appellent et font désirer une quatrième qui traiterait de l'application pratique de cette leçon à la société actuelle. C'est ce qu'on trouvera sans doute dans votre livre.³

Quant à l'institution des *Allmends*,⁴ du moins comme elle existe à présent, vous en avez si peu dit dans vos articles que je ne la connais jusqu'ici que par votre lettre. Il faudrait en avoir bien étudié l'opération pour être en état de juger de son applicabilité à l'Angleterre. Mais je ne crois pas qu'on puisse nier que les réformes à faire dans l'institution de la propriété consistent surtout à organiser quelque mode de propriété collective, en concurrence avec la propriété individuelle. Reste le problème de la manière de gérer cette propriété collective, et on ne peut trouver de meilleure manière qu'en essayant celles qui se présentent ailleurs; peut-être même est-il à désirer que plusieurs de ces modes existent ensemble, afin d'obtenir les avantages de chacun et d'en compenser les désavantages. Il me semble donc qu'à titre d'expérience, le système des *Allmends* constitué de la manière que vous proposez, pourrait être mis en pratique en Angleterre avec avantage. Jusqu'ici, les hommes politiques de la classe ouvrière anglaise ne se sont pas portés vers une pareille solution de la question: ils préfèrent que la propriété collective soit affermée, soit à des cultivateurs capitalistes, soit à des sociétés coopératives de travailleurs. Ce dernier mode a été essayé avec succès, et il jouit déjà d'une certaine faveur. La petite propriété, au contraire, n'a guère de partisans que quelques économistes et quelques philanthropes: la classe ouvrière paraît la repousser, comme une manière de multiplier le nombre de ceux qui seraient intéressés à s'opposer à une nouvelle constitution de la propriété territoriale. Pareil reproche ne peut guère s'adresser au système des *Allmends*, et j'espère que ce système sera pleinement exposé et discuté dans votre volume.

Je vois avec plaisir que vous prenez un peu l'habitude d'écrire pour l'Angleterre; vous y trouverez un public beaucoup mieux préparé qu'autrefois pour profiter de ce que vous avez à lui dire, et un penseur belge est dans une position de haute impartialité à l'égard des choses du continent d'Europe, qui le rend particulièrement propre à en

donner de saines appréciations à des lecteurs qui sont souvent réduits à croire sur parole.

Agréez, cher Monsieur, l'expression de ma haute considération et de ma sincère amitié.

J. S. Mill

1759.

TO WILLIAM TRANT¹

A[vignon]

Nov. 17. 1872

Dear Sir—

Your letter though dated Sept. 24 has only now reached me. My absence from England would in any case have prevented me from being present at your intended meeting,² but even had I been in England, I differ too much from many of the doctrines of the Financial Reform Association to admit of my presiding at a meeting called for their promotion.

I am glad to hear that the gifts of my books through you to associations of working men have proved useful.³

1760.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

November 21. 1872.

Dear Mr Robertson

M^{TS} Burbury's objections to your proposal do not give me a high idea of her judgment. I quite agree with you that M^{TS} Fawcett is so far from being indispensable, that she is quite as detrimental as useful; and if the policy of the Committee is to be in any degree regulated by a reference to what she may do or think, I must at once retire from the Committee and withdraw my name. M^{TS} Fawcett is an excellent woman, with plenty of sense and energy but no experience, and a great deal of self confidence; a person, therefore, admirably calculated to fall headlong into mistakes. She never originated this movement, and is not likely to originate any. She has neither a

speculative nor an organizing intelligence, and therefore, even supposing that she were twice her present age, she is quite unfit to be a leader, though an excellent guerilla partisan.² You are, I believe, quite right in thinking that neither her husband's nor her sister's³ opinion would guide her in the least.

I also am of opinion that M^{rs} Burbury is mistaken in thinking that M^{rs} Fawcett brings or guides any subscribers to the Society. We know that she brought in none when the Society was founded, and have heard of no names since brought in by her. I am afraid that if I speak frankly, it may seem as though I overestimated my own influence, but I think, and I have reason to believe that you agree with me in thinking, that the Society which adheres to your Committee is kept together principally by my name, and that, rightly or wrongly, the majority of those who go with us in this matter, do so, in a great measure, in reliance on my opinion. I feel bound, therefore, to justify their confidence to the best of my ability, by not allowing my name to be used to back up anything I think foolish or mischievous, and cannot therefore give my name to the Society unless my judgment, in things to which I attach importance, is in some degree to be followed.

As regards the matter of addressing M^r Jacob Bright,⁴ I look upon it as depending wholly upon how good an address to him can be got up: so that I am very sorry you have not written down your idea to shew me. I recommend discussing the matter among your trusted intimates, and letting me see what you suggest, so as to have the address practically prepared before suggesting the matter at all at a Committee meeting.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1761.

TO LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.¹

A[vignon]

Nov. 22. 1872

Dear Sirs—

No 8 Upper Hamilton Terrace is the latest address I have of Dr. Ward.² But his present address may be learnt from the London publishers of the Dublin Review, of which he is editor.

1762.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Nov. 30. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

Let me begin by expressing our sincere and hearty good wishes for the happiness of yourself and your intended wife, and for the fulfilment of all your hopes with regard to your married life.²

I shall be happy to see your draft address to Mr Jacob Bright as soon as your other occupations allow of your preparing it, although I should recommend taking no steps in the matter, even in regard to the Committee, until after we have M^{TS} Fawcett's scheme before us. Even if the parliamentary leadership were to pass into other hands, it might still be desirable to discourage any parliamentary action in the approaching session. With regard to M^{TS} Fawcett's move, I think we should in no way connect ourselves with it; nor make any movement in that direction until we see what comes of M^{TS} Fawcett's move, and until we know into what hands it is proposed to transfer the guidance.

We see no harm in your having consented to send a delegate to the Birmingham Conference, as Mr Hunter has always been judicious.

With regard to Miss Wedgwood's proposed publication,³ the thing in itself would not be a bad thing, but all depends, in the first place on what Miss Wedgwood would say, and in the next place on where it is published: and it seems to me that supplying her with information should be conditional on being allowed to see what she has said before it is published, and on knowing where it is to be published.

I Am

Dear Mr Robertson

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1763.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

December 3. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

The address² appears to us so good as quite to decide the question of the advisability of presenting it. But it seems to us more politic, and therefore more judicious, not to present it even to our own Committee until *after* Mrs Fawcett's proposal has been made and discussed. Until that time it will be best to state that I think there should be no parliamentary action at all next year; and for the members of the Committee who agree with me to say that they think so too; but to listen to, and consider, M^{rs} Fawcett's scheme and then adjourn before voting on Mrs Fawcett's. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1764.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

Avignon

Dec. 5. 1872

Dear Mr Plummer

We have been in England for a hurried visit of a few weeks on business since I last wrote to you, for my daughter has been suffering much from severe headaches (brought on I believe by overwork) and this year we spent the months we usually spend in England, in a town in the Austrian Alps.² The long rest has had the good effect upon my daughter's health which we hoped for, and we expect to be soon in England again, and hope to have the pleasure of seeing you and Mrs Plummer again, with our other English friends. But we will not be at Blackheath, for we have given up our house there, and have settled for the present in Victoria Street, Westminster, which we hope will not prove more inconvenient to you and Mrs Plummer than Blackheath was.

We are very glad to hear that both of you are in good health and that you are in good and pleasant employment. We both beg to be kindly remembered to Mrs Plummer and I am

Dear Mr Plummer
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1765.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Dec. 9. 1872

Dear Mr Cairnes

I am surprised to find how long it is since I last wrote to you, and even since I received a very interesting letter from you, which is still unacknowledged. The only excuse I can make, and it is a very insufficient one, is the temptation there is to put off letter writing whenever possible while one is occupied with other writing. I have now, I am glad to say, finished an article on Grote's Aristotle for the Fortnightly;² it is in the printer's hands, and will appear in the January number. I hope you are not expecting too much from it. Mr Grote unfortunately, scarcely got further in his review of Aristotle than the logical writings; he just made a beginning with the metaphysical; and I have not touched, except in the most general way, upon any of Aristotle's writings not treated of by Mr Grote. The Ethics, Politics, and Rhetoric would furnish matter for more than one interesting article, which perhaps I might have been able to write after having once more read them carefully through, but such matters would have had no pertinence to the contents of Mr Grote's book. The Physics, and for the most part the Metaphysics, I only know at second hand. You therefore will not find, what you seem to expect, a compendious account of all Aristotle, like that which I attempted to give of all Plato. I can only hope that I may have given a correct notion, as far as it goes, of what Aristotle did for Logic in its different branches.

There are two questions connected with the application of Political Economy, on which I should much like to compare notes with you. Have you ever turned your attention to the merits and demerits of a tax on property, i.e. land and capital, realized and unrealized, as a substitute for an income tax? The pros and cons are tolerably obvious, the pros consisting rather in the demerits of other direct taxes than in the recommendations of this. My attention has been drawn to the subject by an Italian correspondent of mine, Costantino Baer by name,³ a clever and sensible man, well versed in the best English political economy, and who has published a little book recommending, as the best system of taxation, a tax on land and capital, of a percentage on their pecuniary value, combined with taxes on such modes of expenditure as may be a fair test of a person's general scale of unproductive expenses. I have written, for the small print of the Fortnightly, a short notice of this book,⁴ but I should much like to have your opinion on its main position.

The other subject is that which has given rise to a controversy between The Times and Fawcett,⁵—the expediency of requiring corporations and endowed institutions to sell their lands and invest in the funds instead. I suppose we are both agreed that bodies which are constituted for the performance of other important duties, ought not to have their time and thoughts diverted from them to the management of landed estates. And it is perhaps not too soon to begin teaching this doctrine. But I confess I should be sorry that the teaching should soon be successful. It seems to me, that so long as it is certain that the lands, if brought onto the market, would be almost all bought up and added to the possessions of wealthy landed proprietors, or made the foundation of new large private estates, it is better that they should remain as they are; at least until the programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association, or something like it, has become the creed of the liberal party. Lands not yet appropriated by individuals should, I think, by no means be allowed to pass into private ownership but should be sacred to public purposes, and made a means of trying all promising modes of collective management, with a view of testing the practicability and the effects of these modes, and the capabilities of collective management in general. It is well that there is such a resource for experimental purposes without meddling at all with private property in land, until the advantage of doing so has been completely proved by sufficient trial.

I should like much to hear from you on these subjects, but only when it is consistent with your comfort and your occupations to write: and perhaps that may not be before I may have the pleasure of discussing them with you viva voce, for we expect to be in England in the early spring. I need hardly add that I should be glad to know how you are as to health—both you and your family. Our own report in that respect is a good one. Helen's health seems to be steadily though slowly improving, and I am perfectly well. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1766.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Avignon

Dec. 12. 1872

Dear Mr Robertson

I have only just received your letter.

As to a deputation, I have always disapproved of it, and disapproved of it still; but over and above my disapproval of it as a matter of judgment supposing it to proceed from any other Committee, I should wish to retire from the London Committee if it decides upon a deputation.

As to a private communication I think it a complete mistake to shew Gladstone our cards. I do not think this an occasion when a private communication with Mr Gladstone would be judicious, and even were it one I should not like to make a private communication with Mr Gladstone from a Committee of which I am the nominal head, unless through some members of the Committee itself.

I should disapprove of a deputation to Mr Disraeli less than of one to Mr Gladstone. Still I do not approve of it. I am

Dear Mr Robertson
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1767.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

Avignon

Dec. 18. 1872.

Dear Sir

I am sorry to hear of your nervous headache, and of the troubles caused you by the attempt to raise a religious cry against you.² Notwithstanding the progress of religious toleration, which even in my own country is surprisingly great, such appeals to prejudice are to be expected by any really free and rigorous [vigorous?] thinker; but when they do not prevent him from being listened to, nor cripple him in his means of subsistence, neither of which effects has fortunately been produced in your case, he has no need to mind them.

I am obliged to you for communicating to me in so clear a manner your new ideas on the mental operation of judgment.³ I have been much interested by them, and I think I can briefly express my opinion of them in three points, in two of which I agree with you, while in a third I differ.

1. I agree with you that Belief is the essential constituent in a Differentia of judgment, and that the putting together of two ideas is merely a prerequisite or antecedent condition.

2. I cannot, however, think that *one* idea is a sufficient prerequisite for a judgment. I cannot see how there can be Belief without both a subject and a predicate. If you say that the idea of an elephant suffices for belief in an elephant, belief in an elephant can only mean belief that there is such a thing as an elephant—that an elephant exists: or, in other words, that under some circumstances, and in some place known or unknown, I should perceive by my senses a thing answering the definition of an elephant. Now this, which is the truth really believed, is a fact, in two terms, not in one only. Existence, that is capacity, in some circumstances really to be found in Nature, of being seen or felt, is a real conception [or?] Idea and a real predicate. I therefore do not think that your modification of the received theory of judgment is sustainable. But,

3. Your practical alterations in the rules of the syllogism do not depend on that modification of the theory.

I have pointed out that propositions of all predicates, and of all quantities and qualities, may be transformed into exactly equivalent propositions, either affirmative or negative, with *exist* for their sole predicate. If this transformation (like the *reductions*, ostensive and *per impossible*, of the common logic) enables the syllogistic rules to be simplified, or further generalized, it is legitimate and desirable to do so; and though I doubt if the altered form and rules will or ought to supersede the old ones (the syllogistic logic being especially intended to guard against the fallacious use of the common forms of language) yet they may very usefully exist side by side with the old and afford an additional test of the correctness of reasoning, or more properly speaking, a different mode of applying the same test.

My article on Grote's Aristotle is in the printer's hands, and will be published in the Fortnightly Review on the 1st of next month.⁴ I have had an opportunity of making honourable mention of both the treatises which you did me the favour to send. If I do not hear from you to the contrary, I will address it to Aschaffenburg as usual.

I Am
Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1768.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Avignon

Dec. 28. 1872

Dear Chadwick

Many thanks for your letter and for the Journal of the Society of Arts. I have read your Berlin paper² with much interest, and am always glad to hear of anything you do. We are neither of us detained here by any reasons of health. My daughter is in improved health and I am quite well. We intend to be in London in time for the next meeting of the Political Economy Club,³ where I hope to meet you, and we shall hope to see you often during our stay in Victoria Street, where we shall be more easily accessible than we were at Blackheath.

Gladstone's Liverpool speech⁴ seems to me very poor: the best things in it are but vague generalities. He does not, however, seem to mean that any one is morally responsible for his belief, but only for not taking pains to instruct himself.

I Am

Dear Chadwick

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

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

1873

1769.

TO ALGERNON TAYLOR¹

[1873]

Dear Hajji—

The last time I saw Mr Gregson he expressed, without any suggestion from me, a very decided opinion that your marriage settlement, & the certificates of the securities in which the money is invested ought not, as a matter of business to be in the custody of one of the trustees, but sh^d be deposited in a solicitor's office. I have felt some hesitation in proposing to you that this opinion sh^d be acted upon because the proposal might seem to imply a distrust which we certainly do not feel, in Mr Gurney;² but in matters of business it is most right to act on business principles, such as experience has led people of business to adopt, as being on the whole, & in the long run best. It seems to me that the person who sh^d have the custody of the [deed ?] and securities is Mr Gregson himself, as the settlement was drawn up by him, as he is the solicitor of two of the three trustees, and also of yourself who stand first in order as cestui que trust;³ Pray let me know what you think of this. If you agree with me perhaps you would not mind communicating the opinion to Mr Gurney.

1770.

TO COSTANTINO BAER¹

A[vignon] Jan. 8. 1873

Monsieur—

J'ai attendu pour répondre à votre lettre du 26 Septembre, jusqu'à ce que j'aie eu le temps d'écrire un petit article sur "L'Avere et L'Imposta"² dans lequel, en rendant compte du livre de manière à en faire ressortir ma haute appréciation, j'exprime mon dissentiment sur le point en discussion entre nous deux, mais en réduisant ce dissentiment à ses justes limites. Quand cet article aura paru dans le Fortnightly Review, (ce qui sera probablement au 1^{er} février) je me donnerai le plaisir de vous en envoyer un exemplaire.

Les arguments que vous ajoutez dans votre dernière lettre à ceux qui se trouvent dans le livre, sont des *argumenta ad hominem*, se fondant sur une assimilation de l'impôt sur le capital à d'autres impôts que j'approuve, notamment aux impôts sur les

landlords et à celui des successeurs. Il est vrai que j'approuve ces impôts-là mais en avouant qu'ils sont contraires au principe financier de l'égalité. Quant aux impôts sur la terre il me paraît juste (et je vois avec plaisir que vous êtes de la même opinion) de retenir pour l'état le tout ou une partie de l'accroissement de la rente qui a lieu par des causes naturelles ou sociales indépendantes du travail ou des frais du propriétaire tandis que l'intérêt du capital tend plutôt à baisser. Et quant aux successions, je ne reconnais aux héritiers mêmes directs aucun droit moral à hériter au delà d'une légitime suffisante pour leur donner de bonnes chances dans la vie. Donc si la société permet d'hériter par delà cette limite, elle a le droit d'y mettre les conditions qu'elle veut; et elle peut user de ce droit dans le but de modérer l'inégalité de richesses ce qui est moins permis lorsqu'il s'agit d'ôter aux travailleurs leurs propres gains. Par là vous verrez qu'au moins je ne suis pas en contradiction avec mes propres principes.

1771.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

Avignon

Jan. 8. 1873

Dear Mr Cairnes

I thank you heartily for the way in which you have entered, in your last letter, into the two economical questions on which I asked your opinion.² On that which relates to the lands of endowed institutions I am happy to find that we are entirely agreed, and am glad to hear also that Mr Courtney is on our side of the question. If you see the Examiner, you will find in it next week an article with my signature in which our opinion on this point, and the grounds of it, are fully entered into.³ Both my daughter and I are occasionally sending articles to the Examiner, having been much solicited thereto by the proprietor Mr Bourne,⁴ and having reason to think that he is really desirous of making the paper an organ of opinion allied to our own.

On the other question, that of a tax on capital, I have also been writing, in the form of a short review of Mr Baer's book for the small print of the Fortnightly,⁵ of which I hope you will approve. I have urged against the proposed tax, the same objection which you make to it, though it is open to that objection in a somewhat less degree than you surmise: for, in the first place, Baer *does* propose that the plant and raw material of a manufacturer, in short all accumulated property whatever, should be subject to the tax. And to the objection that the professional classes would be spared, Baer would answer, that as a tax proportional to the value of every capital would only fall on that portion of the income from it which is pure interest, the capitalist would enjoy the same exemption as the professional man in so far as his situation is similar, that is, in virtue of as much of his income as is the result of his personal exertions and skill. The grand objection which remains unaffected is, that Savings would be taxed doubly and spendings only singly. I have condemned the tax as unjust, but have said that considering the very strong objections to an income tax, a country *may* possibly

have at some time or other to make its election for a moderate tax on capital and land as being on the whole the course of least injustice. This is the only point on which I am not confident that you will agree with me.

I look forward to seeing you as soon as possible after we arrive in England, and I hope to find you, if not better, at least not worse than when you wrote.

My daughter begs to be kindly remembered to Mrs Cairnes, and sends her best wishes for the new year. I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1772.

TO LILIAS S. ASHWORTH1

[After Jan. 27, 1873]

Dear Madam—

I beg to acknowledge your letter inviting me to attend & take part in the intended meeting at Bristol in favour of Women's Suffrage & to express my regret that my engagements & occupations will not allow me to be present at the meeting.

1773.

TO JOSEPH BICKLEY1

[After Feb. 4, 1873]

Dear Sir—

Owing to absence I did not receive your letter till now long after its date. I am glad that your club is so successful but it will not be in my power to deliver an address.

1774.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO1

Dijon

Feb. 6. 1873

Dear Sir

I thank you for your further elucidations of the point on which we differ.² You did not, however, as you seem to suppose, fail to convince me of the invariable convertibility of all categorical affirmative propositions into predications of existence. The suggestion was new to me, but I at once saw its truth when pointed out. It is not on that point that our difference hinges, as you will see by the remark I will now make on the new examples you have given.³

In the first of the three, "A Centaur is a fiction of the poets," the subject of the proposition when transformed in the manner you pointed out, is *ex professo* something merely imaginary; and therefore, as you justly observe, the proposition does *not* assert that under any conditions actually existing in Nature, it would be seen or felt. What this proves, however, is only that I, at least in terms, gave a too narrow definition of existence; expressing myself as if nothing existed but what is perceived by the external senses. You will not deny that a mere mental conception *exists*; and therefore a proposition which asserts that a fiction of the poets, answering to what we mean by a centaur, *is*, asserts this kind of existence. If no such mental conception had ever existed in the minds of poets, that is if a centaur, as a mental conception, had not existed, the proposition would have been false. Consequently the proposition does assert existence. And this holds, in whatever manner we define existence, provided we consider it to mean anything at all, and not to be (as Hegel says)⁴ identical with nothing.

Again, you instance the proposition "There are laws of nature," or "Laws of nature are." Laws of nature, you say, cannot be seen or felt. Certainly not as abstractions; but then, abstractions as such cannot be said to *be*, even in the mind. Law of nature is, as I understand it, simply an invariable order among phenomena: those phenomena can be seen and felt, either in external or internal consciousness: and if we see or feel the facts, we see or feel the order of the facts. When we see two facts succeed one another, we see their succession, which is as much as to say, we see them successively; for succession in any other sense than that, is nothing but a word.

You perceive, therefore, that you have not convinced me; but there is always instructiveness in such discussions, and I shall be very glad when I can see your idea worked out to its consequences in the improvement of the rules of syllogistic logic.

With many thanks for the kind and flattering expressions in your letter, and for the feelings of which they are the indication, I am

Dear Sir

Very Sincerely Your

J. S. Mill

P.S. I am now on my way to London, where I expect to remain till about the 4th of April. My address there is

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
London
S.W.

1775.

TO STUART COLMAN¹

Dijon

Feb. 6. 1873

Understanding that there is no chance of your brother Henry² remaining [*illegible word*] at Southampton I have undertaken to pay the cost of articling him to a surveyor in case it sh^d be decided that that would be the best thing for him in order that he may have another opportunity of a fair [start?] in life.

As to whether it would be best for you to take him into your employment & if so on what terms I can form no opinion whatever: & I consider that you are the best judge of whether that course would be either beneficial or fair to all concerned.

I understand that both his mother & himself would prefer his being with you but I think that you [are?] the only judge of whether that [would mean?] a favourable answer and to redeem my promise of articling him to a surveyor.

I hope that your school³ is making satisfactory progress & remain

Dear Mr S C

Yours Sincerely

29 [Clare?] Street Bristol

1776.

TO EDWIN RAY LANKESTER¹

Montbard

Feb. 8. 1873

Dear Sir—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Jan. 8. I sympathize strongly with the desire to render the revenues of the Universities more conducive than they as yet are to the purposes for which Universities do or ought to exist, & I agree with you & your associates in thinking it a great defect in the mode of disposing of those revenues that no part of them is employed in making the Universities places for the advancement of knowledge while so very large a part is expended in giving incomes as rewards for the mere acquisition of knowledge unaccompanied with any obligation for extending it, for teaching it, or even for keeping it up. What would be the best system to adopt for the correction of this defect is a question which I am happy to see discussed & which will probably require much discussion, but in the meanwhile I see very strong objections to some of the proposals mentioned in your letter. The abolition of the competitive examination for fellowships seems to me the reverse of an improvement. I quite understand that the object of this proposal is to prevent the appointments from being obtained by cramming. But it is not beyond the capacity of the Universities to take sufficient security that success in the examinations shall not depend on cram; nor is it understood that the high honours at either Cambridge or Oxford are generally so obtained. On the other hand I have the greatest distrust of all schemes for disposing of high & well paid employments by a nominating body. Such bodies, having only a collective responsibility, are often even more addicted to abusing their patronage than single functionaries; the members are apt to job for one another, & vote for each other's protégés. And even without the supposition of jobbing, a body like that which you have in view composed indeed of scientific persons but of persons whose position & reputation are already made, is not at all likely to look with favour on the striking out of new paths. Experience shows that Academies whether of literature or science generally prefer inoffensive mediocrities to men of original genius. Cuvier² was no ordinary man but neither Geoffroy St-Hilaire³ nor Darwin would have had a chance of obtaining his vote for a professorship. As a precise knowledge of what is already known is now an indispensable requisite for carrying knowledge farther, it seems to me necessary to retain a very strict competitive examination as the first condition for a fellowship. This would be no hindrance to requiring as an additional condition that the candidate should shew or have shewn, by some original investigation, that he has powers which are worth securing either for teaching or for the advancement of science. Indeed even the nominating body, if it did its duty would I think be obliged to institute some kind of competitive examination in order to ensure the possession of a sufficient quantity of positive knowledge by young men who could not in the nature of things have given as yet any considerable public proof of high scientific capacity.

The terms of the circular, which indicate the object you have in view without committing you to any particular plan, I have no fault to find with; & I agree in the main with the Resolutions passed at the Freemasons' Tavern, except that it appears to me desirable that the posts created for the prosecution of original research sh^d generally or always have some amount of teaching duties also annexed to them. But even if I were much more confident than I am that my views would be in accordance with those of the majority of the Association, I would rather not become a member,

unless I were able, which I am not, to take part in the proceedings of which by joining the Association I should assume a share of the responsibility.

I Am, Dear Sir, Yours Very Sincerely,

J. S. Mill

1777.

TO GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON¹

Montbard

Feb. 8. 1873

Dear Mr Robertson

I have been delaying my reply to your last letter, expecting to have been in London before this, and to have been able to discuss the subject of it with you viva voce. I am still not sure when we shall be in London, but our arrival cannot now be very long delayed; and I think I shall be better able to form a judgment a little time hence, than at present. I think it very likely that it may be well for some sort of communication to be entered into with the Conservatives,² but probably it may be better to do it, at least at first, through individuals, and not formally from the Committee. On these points we shall hope to be able to consult with you when we are in town.

If you should have occasion to write again before hearing from me, please address

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
London S.W.

I Am Dear Mr Robertson

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1778.

TO SAVILLE, EDWARDS & CO.¹

[After Feb. 24. 1873]

Mr. Mill begs to inform Messrs. Saville & Edwards that he does not wish to make any alterations at present in the People's Edition of Political Economy.

1779.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

A[lbert] M[ansions]

March 1. 1873

Dear Mary—

I will lend the money for Henry,² but it must be on one condition—that I have clear evidence that Mr Willcox³ knows of Henry's having taken money at Mr Hill's. The evidence I sh^d require is either to have it in writing from Mr Willcox, or from Stuart that he himself has spoken of it to Mr Willcox. Of course to this I must add that the money must be repaid to Mr Hill, as even if he is willing that it sh^d not be, that would be a disgrace to the family. I think Mr Colman⁴ quite right in insisting that Stuart sh^d not take Henry, & I am very glad that he has done so.

Helen asks me to say how much we both feel for you, & Minnie⁵ & Stuart, in this second terrible blow falling on you.⁶

1780.

TO SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE¹

10, Albert Mansions
Victoria Street, S.W.

March 9, 1873

Dear Sir Charles Dilke

We shall have much pleasure in dining with you and Lady Dilke on Saturday March 23.

I hardly know how to answer your very kind and flattering proposal regarding a portrait. I have hitherto disliked having my portrait taken, but I am unwilling to refuse the high compliment paid me by Mr Watts and yourself, and if sittings can be arranged within the limited time of my stay in London I shall be happy to make an appointment.

I inclose the cheques for our subscriptions for this year to the Radical Club,² but we neither of us have any remembrance of having paid anything last year, nor indeed for 1871. If we have not, will you let me know how much we owe.

I Am
Dear Sir Charles Dilke
Yours Very Truly,

J. S. Mill

1781.

TO JOHN PLUMMER^{[1](#)}

10, Albert Mansions,
Victoria Street.
S.W.

March 9, 1873

Dear Mr Plummer

Can you and Mrs Plummer do us the pleasure of dining with us next Wednesday,
March 12, at 7?

I think your idea of writing on the mode in which trades unions may be made the best
use of, a very good one.^{[2](#)}

I Am Dear Mr Plummer
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1782.

TO MONCURE D. CONWAY^{[1](#)}

March 13. 1873

Dear Mr. Conway

My daughter is better today, though still ailing. She promises herself the pleasure of
calling on Mrs. Conway the first day she is well enough to leave the house. We should
have much pleasure in accepting your kind invitation, but we are engaged on the days
you mention.

I could not find time to write the letter you suggest; but, in the manner and to the extent spoken of in your note, I should have no objection to your mentioning my name.

I am much obliged to you for the copy of your book,[2](#) which I have already begun reading, and will do what I can to fulfill your wishes respecting it.

I Am
Dear Mr. Conway
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1783.

TO ROWLAND G. HAZARD[1](#)

A[lbert] M[ansions]

March 14. 1873

Dear Sir—

Your letter to Avignon was sent on to us here. We are glad that there is a chance of our seeing you before you return to America & shall much regret if it miscarries. We shall be here in April but probably not beyond the first week, & as we propose seeing a little of Holland on our way to Avignon, we do not expect to be there till about the end of the month. Should your return be either early enough to find us here or late enough to join us at Avignon we shall be sincerely glad.

1784.

TO L. DE CHÉMENT[1](#)

A[lbert] M[ansions]

March 15. 1873

Monsieur—

J'ai eu l'honneur de recevoir votre lettre du 3 Mars.

Je crains bien que les articles tels que ceux dont il est question dans votre lettre, n'aient très peu de chances d'être acceptés par des revues anglaises quelconques,

soit scientifiques soit générales. Il y a bien un petit nombre des positivistes anglais, mais il n'y a pas de journal positiviste, et les revues sont généralement peu favorables au positivisme.

Je ne connais guère auxquelles cela vaudrait [?] la peine seulement d'offre des articles de philosophie positive comme cette philosophie a été introduite par M. Comte ou même par M. Littré.

1785.

TO JOHN ELLIOT CAIRNES¹

10, Albert Mansions
Victoria Street S.W.

March 16. 1873

Dear Mr Cairnes

Your MS.² has arrived safely, and instead of being alarmed at its bulk, I am very glad that there is so much of it. I had previously received the volume of Essays,³ and have read a good deal of it, with a pleasant refreshment of my recollections.

I hope you have received the Political Portraits,⁴ which I have returned by Parcels Company and for which we are much obliged.

Helen has had an attack of neuralgia, which has confined her to her room for some days, and obliged her so to defer engagements that we do not know when we can promise to come down again for an evening before this day fortnight, March 30. But I hope one or both of us will be able to come down for an hour in the afternoon some day before that.

Helen sends her kind regards to Mrs Cairnes, and I am

Dear Mr Cairnes
Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

1786.

TO HENRY FAWCETT¹

March 16. 1873

Dear Mr Fawcett

Can you and M^{rs} Fawcett dine with us on Friday the 28th at seven o'clock? I am

Dear Mr. Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1787.

TO HERBERT SPENCER^{[1](#)}

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street, S.W.

March 16. 1873

Dear Mr. Spencer

Can you do us the pleasure of dining with us here on Tuesday, April 1, at seven o'clock?

I Am
Dear Mr. Spencer
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1788.

TO HENRY FAWCETT^{[1](#)}

March 17, 1873

Dear Mr Fawcett

We shall have much pleasure in seeing you at dinner on Friday and shall be happy to dine with you and Mrs Fawcett on Wednesday April 2nd. I am

Dear Mr Fawcett
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1789.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
London S.W.

March 19. 1873

Dear Sir

I have just received your letter of March 15 containing the unexpected intelligence of your resignation of your Professorship.² I hope that your powers as a teacher of philosophy are only to be transformed to a still more advantageous scene of action.

We expect to leave England about the 14th of April, and taking a circuitous course, not through Paris, to arrive at Avignon about the first week in May. If you are inclined to use a part of your interval of liberty in visiting that place, it will give us much pleasure to receive you there for two or three days if agreeable to you.³ Or if you are in England at any time before the 14th of April, we shall hope to see you there. I am

Dear Sir
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1790.

TO DOUGLAS A. SPALDING¹

10, Albert Mansions
Victoria Street, S.W.

March 19. 1873

Dear Mr Spalding

Can you dine with us here on Tuesday week, April 1st, at seven o'clock? I am

Dear Mr Spalding
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1791.

TO AUBERON HERBERT [1](#)

[Before March 26, 1873]

Dear Mr Auberon Herbert—

We are here now & hope we may not miss seeing you as we have so often done before. Will you and Lady Florence Herbert do us the pleasure to dine with us on Wed^y March 26 at 7.

1792.

TO SIR HENRY MAINE [1](#)

[Before March 26, 1873]

Dear Sir Henry Maine—

Will you give us the pleasure of dining with us on Wed^y March 26 at 7.

1793.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN [1](#)

A[lbert] M[ansions]

March 28. 1873

Dear Mary—

I inclose a cheque for £25, & a letter which has been forwarded from Avignon.

We have not heard either from you or from Stuart since we saw Stuart. I mention this in case of the loss of a letter, that you may not think I am writing to answer it.

We have made enquiries & find that according to general opinion the Bedford College is the most suitable place for our purpose.² I will therefore arrange with Miss Thomas.³

Messrs Dent inform me that the cost of putting your watch in order will be £4 or 5 & they wait for further instructions.

Helen sends her kind remembrances to you and Minnie.

J.S.M.

1794.

TO ALEXANDER IRVINE¹

A[lbert] M[ansions]

March 30 [1873]

Dear Sir—

I am most happy that you feel equal to our projected excursion; but on the 10th of April I am unluckily engaged. I am disengaged on the 9th & if that day will suit you I will meet you at the Victoria Station at one as you propose.

1795.

TO WILLIAM SIMS PRATTEN¹

[After April 4, 1873]

Dear Sir—

I shall be very happy to have my name included in Sir Fowell Buxton's General Committee,² on the assumption that this does not imply my participation in the active management of his election, for which it is impossible for me to have time.

1796.

TO EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE¹

10, Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
S.W.

April 6. 1873

Dear Sir

I need hardly say that I wish all success to your undertaking, but to the best of my knowledge I do not possess a single letter of Mr Albany Fonblanque.

With regard to my own letters which you refer to, few of which, I should think, can be of either public or biographical interest, they were written so many years ago, that I should not be able to say, without seeing them, whether I should like them to be published or not. If you would kindly send me any of them which you would wish to make use of, with an indication of such parts of each letter as you propose to publish I will look through them without loss of time and give you an early answer. I am

Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1797.

TO [WILLIAM HENRY DUIGNAN][1](#)

A[ibert] M[ansions]

April 6, 1873

Dear Sir—

I thank you very much for the important particulars which you have been so good as to send me. I hope to make good use of them & will do so without giving any clue to the source from which they come.[2](#)

1798.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE[1](#)

Albert Mansions
10, Victoria Street, S.W.

April 6. 1873

Dear Sir

I have no information but what you are sure to possess on the early history of Cooperation.² My father knew Robert Owen well, and had frequent oral discussions with him: of written ones I know nothing. Cooperation had then only been proposed in the form of Owen's completely Communistic Associations. These my father thought could not succeed but he always said that they were entitled to a fair and complete trial. Cooperation in the Rochdale form he would, I have no doubt, have approved of and welcomed.

There is, I think, a paragraph on Mr Owen's plans in my father's "Elements of Political Economy."³ I am Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

G. J. Holyoake Esq.

1799.

TO MARY MILL COLMAN¹

A[lbert] M[ansions]

April 7. 1873

Dear Mary—

I will willingly pay to Stuart for articling Henry to him what I was willing to pay to Messrs Wilson & Willcox.² I will send the £100 at such time & in such manner as Stuart may prefer.

We have seen Minnie who seems very well, & I hope soon to see Miss Thomas & make the necessary arrangements with her.³ Helen sends her kind remembrances.

1800.

TO FREDERIC HARRISON¹

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street, S.W.

April 13, 1873

Dear Mr. Harrison

I have been having some conversation with the Editor of the Examiner² respecting a plan in which I am interested, which would be likely to give it a circulation among the working classes, as well as to give it a new character in some other respects. Your cooperation in this would be valuable, and if it were convenient to you, I should like much to have an opportunity of talking the matter over with you. Could you dine with me here on Wednesday next, at seven? If so I would ask the editor to meet you. I am

Dear Mr Harrison
Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1801.

TO JOHN PLUMMER¹

10, Albert Mansions,
Victoria Street.
S.W.

April 13, 1873

Dear Mr Plummer

Since we heard from you last, I have been too much engaged to write, but I now congratulate you on your release from work that is uncongenial to you, and hope that you will find other employment more agreeable and tying less strictly to hours.

We shall hope to be more fortunate in having an opportunity of seeing you and Mrs Plummer when we are next in town. We leave for Avignon this week, but expect to be back again in the course of the summer. In the meantime please address to me at Avignon after the 16th of April.

My daughter begs to be kindly remembered to Mrs Plummer and I am

Dear Mr Plummer
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1802.

TO FRANZ BRENTANO¹

10 Albert Mansions
Victoria Street
London S.W.

April 14. 1873

Dear Sir

I do not think that my summer stay in Avignon will be long this year; and it will certainly be much interrupted by excursions into the neighbouring country: So that if you think of coming there I shall beg of you to let me know sometime beforehand, that I may not be away.²

My present plans for the summer are as follows. From the first week in May to about the 15th of June I expect to be at Avignon; but shall often be away for many days at a time in the neighbouring mountains. From the 15th of June till the middle or end of July I expect to be in Switzerland; and I should much like, were it possible for me to manage it, to return to England through Germany so as to see you. In the middle or end of July I must be in England for some weeks. From the time of receiving this letter, I will beg of you to direct to me at Avignon, until you hear from me again. I am
Dear Sir

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1803.

TO WILLIAM MORTON¹

10, Albert Mansions,
Victoria Street
S.W.

April 17. 1873

Dear Sir

I have read (and return by this post) your paper on the Social Position of Women, and I think it a good paper, and quite worthy of publication. But I hardly know what periodical to recommend its being offered to. It is difficult to get an article which

demands complete justice for women into any review or magazine except the one or two which are already committed to the subject, and it is not there that such a paper is required; moreover those publications have generally their own writers, by whom they prefer to have such questions treated. I can only suggest watching for indications in periodicals of willingness to admit a free discussion of the subject, and when any such indications appear, to offer your article.

I Am
Dear Sir
Yours Very Sincerely,

J. S. Mill

W^m Morton Esq.

1804.

TO C. SHRIVES¹

A[vignon]

April 25. 1873

Dear Sir—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of 16 April. The attempt to improve the condition of a most deserving body of public servants has my full sympathy but I regret that it will not be in my power to attend the proposed meeting.

1805.

TO JEAN HENRI FABRE¹

A[vignon]

April 26. 1873

Cher Monsieur—

Me voici de retour, un peu plus tard que je ne m'y attendais, mais d'autant plus désireux de commencer des herborisations aux environs d'Orange sur les traces de vos explorations. Vous serait-il possible et agréable de fixer un jour où nous pourrions faire une course ensemble dans la matinée ou dans l'après-midi selon votre convenance. Au dernier cas je m'arrangerais de manière à rester à Orange jusqu'au

lendemain; et dans l'un ou dans l'autre cas je vous prierais de me faire le plaisir de
diner avec moi à l'hôtel.

1806.

TO JEAN HENRI FABRE¹

A[vignon]

April 30. 1873

Cher Monsieur

Merci de votre bonne lettre. S'il ne s'agissait que d'herbariser une seule fois à Orange
il voudrait mieux certainement ne le faire qu'à quelque temps d'ici; mais il me reste,
grâce à vos découvertes, tant d'espèces précieuses à recueillir dans cette région qui
toutes ne mûrissent pas en même temps, que j'ai envie d'y faire, ce printemps, plus
d'une course dont le plaisir comme le fruit sera beaucoup plus grand pour moi s'il
m'est permis de les faire avec vous. Je me propose donc de me rendre à Orange
Samedi prochain par le train qui y arrive à 11.46 (heure du chemin de fer) et de
revenir ici par le train qui passe par Orange à 5.40. Ne restant par la nuit je profiterais
de votre aimable hospitalité en partageant si vous le voulez bien votre déjeuner.

Appendix I

ADDITIONAL EARLIER LETTERS

The following Letters have been located since the publication of *Earlier Letters* in
1963. They have been numbered with reference to that edition. No. 21.1 here, for
instance, indicates that the Letter fits into sequence following Letter 21, to Benjamin
Keen, in *Earlier Letters*. In a few instances letters which appeared in that edition only
in excerpt are here published in full, or the omitted passages have been supplied; in
such cases the original number has been retained.

21.1.

TO THOMAS WIRGMAN¹

East India House

5 June 1828

My Dear Sir

I think that you have excelled yourself in this Essay, it conveys, to me at least, a clearer notion of what the System is, than I had before acquired; and, (what is a great advantage) you have expounded the Science analytically beginning with things as they appear, and proceeding gradually from the mental operations of which we are all conscious—to the discovery of those laws by which the philosopher finds them to be regulated. I think the part which treats of Sense to be executed in a very masterly manner; that of Understanding extremely good, though, not to my mind equally striking with the former. As to the Essay if my opinion is asked, I can only say that I think the execution extremely good.

23.1.

TO NASSAU SENIOR¹

5th January
[1829]

My Dear Sir

This note will be delivered to you by M^r E. Chadwick,² one of my most particular friends, who is desirous of contributing to the London Review,³ and who I am satisfied, would be on certain subjects a most valuable *collaborateur*. He has been a writer in the Westminster Review,⁴ but has seceded, like the rest of us, in consequence of the recent changes in that work.⁵ He had collected materials for an article on the London Police,⁶ a subject on which few people have thought more, or had greater opportunities of knowledge, and I believe that he would be glad to complete an article on that subject for the London Review if it be not preoccupied by some other contributor.

Believe Me

Yrs Ever

J. S. Mill

24.1.

TO THOMAS WIRGMAN¹

India House, London

[April, 1829?]

I have perused the “Account of the Philosophy of Kant”,² in manuscript, several times with attention, and am very grateful for the very large stock of information which I have derived from it. All the more elementary principles of Kant’s Philosophy, so far as I am acquainted with them, appear to me very forcibly stated and aptly illustrated in this “Treatise.”—The exposition is less technical and more familiar than any of the writings of Kant’s followers which are known to me, and the arguments by which the various doctrines are supported are stated in this treatise in a manner not only likely to convince, but which, it seems to me, ought to convince, many of those who have been trained up in the existing Systems of Metaphysics. I have no hesitation in declaring my firm conviction, founded on no small degree of consideration and reflection,—That if the “Table of the Elements of the Mind” have no archetype in the impressions derived from our senses,—there is no point at which a consistent and consecutive thinker can stop—short of the “Kantesian Philosophy”. And this will I think, be more clearly perceived, in proportion as that philosophy is better known, and more carefully studied—to which end the publication of this little treatise would in my opinion greatly contribute.

39.1.

TO FRANCIS PLACE¹

Thursday
evening
[Spring, 1831]

Dear Mr Place

My father has been in town today—I have not seen him, but he left word that he did not wish the books to be moved this week, and that if the vans are not yet ordered or could be countermanded, he should be much obliged to you to put it off. As I did not see him I do not know his reasons, but I suppose one of them to be that I cannot be in town on Saturday—and another, because he would wish that there should first be some place ready in the house at Kensington to receive me and the woman who takes care of the house.

Yours Ever Truly

J. S. Mill

I will call tomorrow morning to know how you arrange it.

J.S.M.

49.1.

TO WILLIAM TAIT¹

India House

23^d May 1832

Sir

I have the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your communication of the 18th which (by the way) appears to have been written under the idea that my father and myself are one and the same person.

Since you have thought my article² worthy of insertion it is very probable that I may place another or others at your disposal, though I cannot tell how soon, my other occupations seldom allowing me time for any contribution to a periodical work beyond the dimensions of a newspaper article. This will prevent me from *undertaking* to write either on the subject which you are so kind to suggest or on any other. I have written nothing in any review or magazine for the last four years, except the paper which you have done me the honour to insert.—Before that time I was a frequent contributor to the Westminster Review from its commencement.

I have heard with great pleasure from my friend Mr Roebuck, that your Magazine has met with great success, especially in the North.

I Remain

Sir,

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

72.1.

TO WILLIAM CABELL¹

Examiner's Office

22^d April
1833

My Dear Sir

We cannot trace any Treaty with Cochin China, but I send you the inclosed which may perhaps be of use.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill.

W^m Cabell Esq.

106.1.

TO WILLIAM TAIT¹

India House

7th July 1834

My Dear Sir

I have been very negligent in answering your letters, and I have not for a long time sent you any communications for your Magazine. The reason was that all my spare time has been taken up in writing various things for the Monthly Repository,² which, though a work of much smaller circulation, seemed to me to need any assistance which I could give it, more than yours did. The two Magazines stand in each other's way, however, for they are exactly of the same principles and each withdraws contributors from the other. I wish a junction were possible, but I do not see how it is to be effected.

In case I should have time to write something for you, what kind of article should you prefer?

I am going to take the liberty of sending a parcel of books to our friend Mr Nichol³ through you. I should have sent it by the packet to Montrose direct, but that it contains some books which I cannot easily replace.

The aspect of politics here is encouraging. Both the Ministry and the House have improved exceedingly in spirit since the late changes, & the decided breach with the Conservatives. This is not only my own opinion, but Roebuck's, who has hitherto thought much worse of them than I have. The collision with the Lords will certainly come next year. Our object should be to hearten up the popular portion of the ministry to go through it confidently.

Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

The Draft I had the pleasure of receiving from you was duly presented.

116.1.

TO HENRY LYTTON BULWER¹

[Dec. 1834?]²

My Dear Sir

allow me to introduce to you Monsieur Guilbert, one of the editors of “Le Bon Sens” who is desirous of your acquaintance & with whom you will I am sure have much pleasure in conversing

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

118.1.

TO MRS. [HENRY?] COLE¹

India House

26th December
1834

Dear Mrs Cole

Allow me to offer to you the accompanying music.² You are probably acquainted with other works of the same composer.

The March & August are the best, I think, in a high sense of the word. “July,” “October” & “November” are simpler, & extremely beautiful. “February” I admire exceedingly, & most of the others seem to me very good, each in its way.

Believe Me
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

119.1.

TO FORTUNATO PRANDI¹

I. H.

Saturday
[1835-39]²

Dear Prandi

I am sorry to say the article will not, with any conceivable degree of alteration, do for us—but I should think it might do for the British & Foreign—Pray oblige me by giving the poor fellow³ the inclosed trifle—I wish I could serve him—& I wish I could give him more—but I have given, like other people, to refugees of various sorts, quite as much as I can afford.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

127.1.

TO WILLIAM CABELL¹

Ex[aminer's] Off[ice]

20th March
1835

My Dear Sir

Can you give me any idea of the time when the P[olitical] C[orrespondence] 1403 in answer to Political Letters of 9th May 1833 & other dates, from Bengal, is likely to be returned?

Unless it will be returned immediately, I would suggest the insertion of the concluding paragraph of it, in the P.C. just returned, relating to the Delhi Family;² &

if you should agree with me I should be much obliged by your returning the
Collection to that paragraph.

Believe Me
My Dear Sir
Most Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

136.

TO JAMES MARTINEAU¹

India House

May 26, 1835

Nothing could give the conductors of the "London Review" greater pleasure than that you should undertake all the subjects w^h you have been so kind as to mention. The "2nd Travels"² would best suit the present N^o. [³ The article on "Young's Lectures" in the first N^o⁴ he agrees with me in condemning as "paltry" in its attack on the "association metaphysics", & not worth answering; it got in only through the imprudent promise of the editors to the writer. But a review of Young's book on its merits, without notice of the article, w^d give the opportunity of presenting the doctrine in its true light. For this] your paper on Priestley⁵ shows how eminently you are qualified. The last 2 pages of the concluding paper made an impression upon me which will never be effaced. In a subsequent paper of my own in the "Repository", headed "the 2 kinds of poetry" (Oct. 1833)⁶ I attempted to follow out your speculation into some of those ulterior consequences w^h you had rather indicated than stated. [J.S.M. expresses his agreement with me respecting a *Church Establishment*, for reasons which he proceeds to state. He is persuaded that the young clergy are quite prepared to go with Coleridge in his posthumous essay against the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible.⁷ If I review the "2nd Travels",⁸ M^r White will probably undertake to review the "Remains of Knox" in his correspondence with Jebb, bishop of Limerick.⁹ J.S.M. is much gratified by my appreciation of his paper on Sedgwick¹⁰ in the first N^o; w^h however presents only ½ of his view of the empirical metaphysics.]

136.1.

TO ARISTIDE GUILBERT¹

June 5, 1835

. . . I have become personally acquainted with M. de Tocqueville & like him exceedingly & I mean if possible to persuade him to write for the review.

169.1.

TO WILLIAM TAIT¹

India House

6th April
1836

My Dear Sir

The parties connected with the management of the London & Westminster Review are always glad to receive the freest remarks from all parties & especially from their subscribers. M^r Brown² need be under no apprehension that such sentiments as those relating to Prayer in No 2 of the London Review³ will be promulgated in the London & Westminster. The writer, using the latitude given by the plan of the London Review, expressed his individual sentiments, not those of the conductors of the review, & if the author had not been a very important contributor whom it was necessary for the review to stretch a point for, the editors would have required the suppression of those passages. The plan of the review hereafter will be to avoid controversy on points of religious belief—one point excepted which may perhaps be considered such by some persons but which it is impossible for the conductors of the review to waive their solemn convictions—they cannot forbear to contend that *man is not responsible for his belief*, but only for using his best endeavours to arrive at a true one. This, & the principle that it is not the opinions arrived at, but the *spirit* in which these opinions are sought & held, which alone procures acquittal at the divine tribunal—these principles, which involve the condemnation of all exclusiveness & sectarianism in religion as well as in philosophy, the L. & W. Review will maintain with the utmost earnestness & energy—but it will avoid the expression of any opinion on points of doctrine, & it expects to draw its contributors from persons of every religious belief who hold that belief in a truly catholic spirit.

I hope these explanations will be satisfactory to M^r Brown, & you are at liberty to communicate their substance to any person who may entertain the same feelings with this gentleman. I have not been authorized by the editor⁴ to say this, but I speak from a perfect knowledge of his sentiments & those of the proprietor⁵ & you are aware that my own influence with the review is considerable.⁶

I retain M^r Brown's letter to shew to all whom it may concern.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

171.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

26th April
1836

My Dear Sir

It is intended to have in the next number of the London & Westminster Review, an article on the present state of affairs in the north of Spain—of a mixed character, political & military, or I may rather say, political & personal—discussing, first, the question of the foreign policy of our ministers, & the general question of interference in the cause of free institutions abroad—this, which requires only a few pages, I am going to write myself²—but it is also extremely important that the prospects of the war itself, & the imputations which have been made upon the conduct of the Legion & of its commander,³ should be discussed, & for that purpose a good military critic is requisite. I need not say to whom, in such a case, I should most desire to address myself—but though I dare not go farther, in reference to yourself, than to say that nothing could exceed the service it would be to our review if you could be induced to undertake it—I venture to beg that if you cannot do so, you will be so kind as to favour us with your advice as to the quarter to which, next to yourself, it would be most desirable to apply—

Believe Me

Yours Most Truly

J. S. Mill

173.1.

TO HORACE GRANT¹

[Brighton]

Sunday
[May, 1836]

Dear Grant

I am certainly a good deal worse than I was three weeks ago—& do not seem to be getting better. How the place affects me I can scarcely tell, because I do not know

how I might have been in London after my feverish attack. But it is clear this place if it does me any good does me very little. I shall give it another week's trial, & if by that time I do not find myself getting better I shall come back. In the mean time of course I do not want to have any Collections sent.

My sisters say they & my father are surprised that they have seen nothing of you. If you cannot conveniently call on my father I wish you would write to him occasionally what passes at the India House—he seems to have been in wretched health ever since I saw him

Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

173.2.

TO JAMES MARTINEAU¹

May 23, 1836

[J. S. Mill acknowledges a letter of mine, correcting, on the authority of D^r Channing, a statement about D^r Follen² in an article on “German students” w^h appeared in the previous N^o of the London Review.³ The writer (himself a German) was probably misled by rumour prevalent in Germany; & shall be enabled to rectify his statements. J.S.M. is not surprised that from the continued non-appearance of my paper⁴ I conclude that it is not cared for; but assures me that it is not so, but the omission arises merely from the need of consulting variety in the cast of the subjects in each N^o. It will appear in the next. If I like to deal (as I had suggested) with *Phrenology*⁵ the article will be sure of acceptance for the next N^o. Acknowledges my “Rationale,”⁶—still unread, mainly in consequence of his father's tedious & distressing illness.]

177.1.

TO HORACE GRANT¹

Hotel Mirabeau
Rue de la Paix

3 November 1836

Dear Grant—

I have just arrived here & found three letters from you, which are the only ones (except the one to Geneva & one from Naples) that I have received. The one to Geneva I found on my return from Italy, the post office having neglected to forward it

according to my written instructions. Thanks for all the kindness of your letters & for the very great trouble you have had in a thousand and one ways about my affairs—you never think you can do enough for your friends. Those may think themselves very lucky whom you consider such for everything they would wish done is sure to be done for them with more zeal & energy than they would do it for themselves—and you never expect them to do anything for you in return—in addition to all this trouble you have lost your holidays which your own health so much needed, by my illness & absence—but it shall be repaid you twofold if ever I have the power.—As for my health, my head is much the same as before, that is, sometimes better sometimes worse; but there is hardly anything wrong now in my general health, & I am as strong as ever, so that it is evidently a mere local derangement, which may remain as it is for a long time, or may go off very soon—whatever it is, nothing I do seems to affect it, so there is no use in treating myself as an invalid & I do not mean to do so any longer. I shall live temperately, take a great deal of exercise, & avoid anything which I find by experience to be injurious—and so have it to itself. Pray give my best respects to the chairs—tell them I thank them most heartily for their kindness in prolonging my leave of absence but that in this severe weather I do not think any more travelling would be useful to me—rather the contrary. I should prefer returning to my work & if it does not make me worse I feel quite capable of performing it—before next spring the experiment will have been fairly tried & if either then or before it should be evidently better for me to take another interval of absence, I will ask for it. For the present I mean to stay a few days here as I am at liberty to do so & nothing appears urgently to require my presence—and perhaps by staying I may have better weather for crossing. Pray if you have time & you are not at last fairly tired out, write again—and if Falconer has not written (there is no letter from him here) ask him to write to me about the review. I shall see the number which has come out in my absence, tomorrow at Bennis's. I did not get either of your letters which contained something from Falconer, nor what I regret much more, the little word from Carlyle, & the Naples people though they sent with my letters twice as many more which were not for me, did not send Graham's, so I have had no letters at all except from you & from Kensington, but you have told me so fully what everybody is about, that I cannot have lost much. The only person you tell me nothing about is yourself—what are you doing? have you removed to Hickson's yet? have you ever time to read or write or walk or do any one thing whatever that is pleasant? are you no better? *well* I am sorry to see you are not—and I should wonder if you were, being so overworked. Mr Peacock² & Mr Hill³ too seem to have lost their holidays by my absence—but as Mr Peacock likes to take his at this season I hope he will still have them.

This journey will give us plenty to talk about in our winter walks—I have a store of pleasant things to tell of—but I cannot do it now—so good bye—

J. S. Mill

183.1.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

8th December 1836

Dear Molesworth—

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

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

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

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

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

184.1.

TO HENRY TAYLOR¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Monday
[1837]

My Dear Taylor

It has occurred to me since our conversation about Macaulay, that you might like to see a specimen of his statesmanship in India.² I therefore send you a draft of a despatch to India, prepared by myself, on one of his measures.³ The authorities at this house went entirely with me, but Hobhouse⁴ would not: the thing dropped, & nothing has been written to India on the subject at all.

Do not think that a style so controversial as that of this paper is what I think desirable or what I generally practise in official correspondence; it is by no means so—but this paper was written in ill health, in the domestic distress of last year, & I may add, *against time*, having to be written before I could get away, to go abroad for my health:⁵ I left it in hands quite capable of moderating the tone, & altering what seems polemical in its character; & we often find it necessary to write our despatches *first* for effect *here*, upon the Directors & the India Board, & *afterwards* shape them into something more suitable to the dignity of official authority exercised *over* gentlemen *by* gentlemen.

In any case you will sympathize in the annoyance of one having for years, (contrary to the instincts of his own nature, which are all for *rapid* change) assisted in nurturing & raising up a system of cautious & deliberate measures for a great public end, & having been rewarded with a success quite beyond expectation, finds them upset in a week by a coxcombical dilettante litterateur who never did a thing for a practical object in his life.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

200.1.

TO HENRY S. CHAPMAN¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Tuesday
[March, 1837?]

Dear Chapman

I am very glad indeed that Revans² is writing. I hope he will soon have the article ready, as we are sadly behind, & pressed for room.

I return the *first* copy you sent me, with some pencil marks.

Perhaps you will suggest to Revans or to me where you would like the *case* to be brought in.³

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

201.1.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Wednesday
[After March 1837]

My Dear Sir

I see there are numberless typographical errors in this proof but I send it to you at once, to save time. It may be returned either to this place or to Mr Hooper's²—directed either to Mr Robertson³ or to me.

I should not think of insisting on any of my emendations—& I hope you will consider them less as indicating the way in which I should like the passages to stand than as marking something in the original wording that seemed to require reconsideration.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

206.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

5th June 1837

My Dear Sir

You might well be surprised at my not having acknowledged the receipt of your most interesting & valuable letter, your kindness in writing which in such circumstances as you did merited certainly the warmest thanks—& it was not from want of a proper sense of that kindness, that I put off from day to day writing to you, but from want of time, & wishing to say more than could be said in a hurry. I have been a mere drudge all this winter & spring—but am beginning to see land.

It was a fatal objection to Col. Shaw as the writer of the article we want, that he was about to publish a book,² which would appear just at the same time, & of which the article could only be a repetition. But by the aid of your extreme kindness in giving us your opinion on the principal points in the conduct of the campaign—an opinion which we value much more than that of Col. Shaw or any one else—we are enabled to dispense with other military criticism & having selected the man who we thought could do the literary part best, we have given him your letter & he has incorporated all your views in his article.³ It is not yet quite finished—when it is so, we have an additional favour to ask—namely that you will, if time permits, allow us to send you the article in MS or in type, look through it, & strike out anything that appears to you erroneous or objectionable—if you would add anything, of course it would greatly enhance the obligation—the more recent events (for instance) may naturally suggest to you some remarks. It would be much to be regretted if an article which had the benefit of any suggestions of yours should go out of our hands with any silliness or crudity put in by somebody else

With renewed assurance of the sincerest thanks of all of us, believe me

Yours (Still In Haste)

J. S. Mill

214.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

10th August
1837

My Dear Sir

The London & Westminster Review ought to have a masterly article on the D. of Wellington's Despatches, published by Colonel Gurwood.² No one living could do such justice to the subject as yourself³—& we could give you any latitude as to space & time—except that if possible it would be desirable to anticipate the Quarterly⁴ as to some portion or other of the book, in order that the extracts may be fresh. It would be a credit to the whole radical party to speak of Wellington in the review as you would speak of him, shewing ourselves at the same time capable of sitting in judgment on him—& the article would establish for us a reputation for first rate military articles

If your health be not a hindrance which I most fervently hope it will not—pray do it for us—& you will greatly oblige every person connected with the review & especially

Yours Ever Faithfully

J. S. Mill

216.1.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH¹

India House

29th August 1837

My Dear Molesworth

It is impossible to be surprised, & quite out of the question to find any fault with your not being willing to go on year after year expending money on a concern which it was quite voluntary on your part to spend anything upon, & which has cost you, as you truly say, already much more than you at first intended.² It has been a great satisfaction to me all along, & is especially so now, to reflect that I had no hand whatever in inducing you to start the London Review, except by not refusing a most unexpected offer when spontaneously made by you to me, & that though I did advise

you to buy the West^r, I never advised you to pay so much for it. I should have been much mortified if I had induced you to stake so much money on your confidence in me, & then not succeeded—& the responsibility I have not incurred with you, I am determined never to incur with anyone else. I shall ask nobody to sink any more money in the Review.

I have now one question to ask, which I hope you will answer as frankly as I put it: Do you really wish to carry on the review till next April? I do not consider you at all bound to do so: neither I should think does Robertson:³ for as his plan has not yet had anything like a trial, he could sustain no injury in anybody's opinion by its abandonment now. Therefore if you would prefer giving up the review now, that is immediately after the appearance of the forthcoming number (which Hooper,⁴ Dilke,⁵ & others advise us to announce for the *end* of October, not the 1st) it had better be done then.

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

If the sale should not in April have improved sufficiently to render this course on my part consistent with prudence I shall then offer the review to Dilke, or to whatever person will give you the greatest price for it, & guarantee its being carried on upon radical principles. So much we owe to the radical cause, which must not if we can help it suffer the discredit of being unable to support an old established organ. I shall in that case withdraw entirely from all connexion with the review. It will be commonplace radical, which is all that the bulk of the supporters of our review require; & our particular section of the radicals must in that case renounce the pretension it has had ever since the Westminster started, of being the leading section: a position which I do not think it has any right to, by its numbers, or even its talents, for there are not above half a dozen men of talent in it, but solely by its having definite principles, which no other section of radicals except the Owenites have.

I differ from most of the sentiments you express about the review, but I am not much surprised that you should express them. The good articles (except your own)⁶ in the last number were literary,⁷ not political or metaphysical, & literary articles are not to your taste, as you admit. I do not believe however that you will find anybody, except Grote & Roebuck, thinks the number destitute of merit. Such as it is, it is not (nor can any single number be) a specimen of the new system, for the principle of that is, above all, variety. We wished this number to be chiefly literary because the time of year was unfavorable to politics, & because it was desirable at *first to overdo* the change of character of the review, in order that people might see there *was* a

change—which they never do unless it is perked in their faces. Those who liked us as we were before probably do not think this a good number, but I am persuaded that everybody else thinks it is a great improvement on our former ones. The next number, & perhaps the next after that will be much more political, as well as much more solid (though I hope equally readable) & may therefore be more to your taste. However that is a secondary question as you have such strong reasons, independent of the mode of management, for intending to give it up.

Neither do I agree with you in thinking the subject of the succession, & the King of Hanover, a bad one. It will be bad if badly treated, & if Robertson's article is not good it shall not be inserted.⁸ If that subject is bad, your subject of Orange Lodges⁹ was bad. Both seem to me to be legitimate engines of party warfare. The editorial errors you speak of must be those (very bad to be sure) in a portion of the article on Spain, which I wrote myself.¹⁰ These errors remained uncorrected, or rather were miscorrected because the proof came to my house when I was out of town & so was printed off before I saw it. This was not Robertson's fault, & I will take care it shall not happen again. Some such errors are inevitable when articles come in late, but I shall take care they do not happen frequently.

The elections¹¹ proved to me nothing except the decline of enthusiasm, & the certain victory of the Tories at the next general election if we have not the ballot. But it is evident to me from all signs, that the people of England are moderate radical. There are a great many new radical members, but they are all of the moderate-radical kind; & it is evident to me that the reformers generally disapprove of attacks on the ministry. Whenever there is a vacancy, whom do they talk of bringing forward? Whether it is Kilkenny, Lambeth, or Dumfriesshire, it is Ewart,¹² not Roebuck.—Ewart's opinions are as strong as Roebuck's, therefore it is not Roebuck's *opinions* that are objected to, but his *conduct*. I have been much disappointed by the fact, but I see clearly that very few people are sorry for his being out of Parliament. The Spectator too is injuring itself: I have been asked by radicals whether the Spectator is going to imitate the Times—& one radical, a writer in our review, told me that four persons in his knowledge, himself being one, had just given it up. Rintoul¹³ will have to change his tack. As for Fonblanque he is utterly disgusting: not one word to induce the ministers to do anything, even at this critical time, but the old slang about Tory radicals! I have done with him. My advice to the radicals is to be active & stirring, but not to attack the ministry at all—unless for Canadian measures or something positively bad. But I shall not say so in the review, nor do I think it should be avowed as a principle at all. My article¹⁴ will be full of speculations on all possible events without predicting any & the principle of it will be that now is the time for radical *men of business*. Make haste & shew yourself one. The Transportation Committee¹⁵ is an excellent beginning. I shall shew that our present straits have arisen because neither whigs nor radicals were men of action. Both have shewn the most signal incapacity & inactivity.

I had nearly forgotten to tell you that your intentions about giving up the review next April were told to Robertson above a week before I received your letter, by the "Great Metropolis" man¹⁶—& by this time it must be known to all the world. this is a great disadvantage added to the other difficulties we shall have to contend with between

this & April—if the secret has oozed out through any of those who were so angry with Robertson on account of something which they supposed that man had heard through him, it will be curious enough.

Ever Yours My Dear Molesworth

J. S. Mill.

217.1.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH¹

India House

22^d September
1837

Dear Molesworth

I am going out of town for a few weeks & before I go I wish to tell you what has been doing about the review. This approaching number will I think be the best we ever had, & as far as one number can, will be a fair specimen of our present system. I have written two long articles myself, one on Carrel,² involving incidentally the whole political & literary state of France; the other, a political manifesto,³ embracing the whole of the present position of the country, judging all parties, telling each what it has to do, & how far it has been wrong. The former article I know you will like, the latter I hope you will. Yourself, Buller, & Leader are the persons I am anxious to carry with me. If you would like to see the article before it is published, write to Robertson & he will send you a proof. It will not go to press quite yet, for I shall take it with me into the country in case something further should occur. Of our other articles, those to which I attach most consequence are two; one on the Dissenters,⁴ by Robertson, who knows them better than any other class, & better than any of us know [*sic*] them. I have seen a great deal of this article, & I think it extremely good, & well done, quite above anything Robertson ever wrote before: & without offending anybody, or compromising any of our own principles, I think it will give us for the first time a *footing* with the Dissenters: it will give us their ear, & be a beginning of making us their leaders instead of the whigs. The other article, which I consider the best literary article we ever had is on Italian literature since 1830,⁵ written by a refugee named Usiglio with the assistance of the celebrated Mazzini, the president of La Jeune Italie, & the most eminent conspirator & revolutionist now in Europe: the article is of the best school of continental criticism, the only good school of criticism now going; & is full, besides, of interesting novelties. We have put both Usiglio & Mazzini on our regular list, & we expect great help from them.

The paper on Carrel I have written *con amore* & those who have seen it think it the best thing I have yet done. I never admired any man as I did Carrel; he was to my

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

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

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

I had nearly forgotten to mention the Hanover.⁶ I shall be in constant communication with Robertson while I am out of town, shall see everything before it is inserted, & if there is a word in the article which from my knowledge of your sentiments I think you would not like, it shall not go in without your seeing it.

I look forward with great hopes to your Report on Transportation.⁷ Lord John Russell's official adoption of the Philadelphia system makes the whole question of secondary punishments plain sailing.⁸

Ever Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

If you could give us an article on Secondary punishments⁹ for January or April (as it may turn out) I should be exceedingly glad.

220.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

Saturday
[11 Nov. 1837]

My Dear Sir

I have not been able to write to you sooner, as the crowd on Thursday forced me to direct my steps anywhere rather than to the Athenæum, & I had less time yesterday for reading your article² than I expected. I have now finished reading it & I most heartily congratulate the review upon having such an article on such a subject as well as upon establishing so satisfactory a connexion between itself and you. The position you take up towards the Duke of Wellington is, I am satisfied, the just one, in every respect, & such as it is becoming for those radicals to assume, who desire as we do to recommend to admiration men of action instead of men of talk, & the qualities which fit men to *be* something instead of those which only enable them to *seem*. As friends of democracy which has no danger so much to apprehend as that of becoming *quackocracy*, we are most strongly interested in holding up such men as the Duke of Wellington as our models even when they are our enemies.

It is for this very reason that I am anxious we should state these views in such a way as to obtain most response from our own side—& as I have continually found in my own case that what I write from my own prompting may require a little modification to obviate chances of being misunderstood, so it occurs to me that the first few pages of your article, though not expressing one single idea or feeling but such as ought to be expressed, may expose us to misconstruction simply from the fact that they do not bear in their manner & tone sufficient evidence that it is a *radical* who is speaking—There is little difference between them & the very words which *might* be used by a Tory who was vindicating the D. of W. against the aspersions of radicals—& many radicals will take the censure to themselves, & combining this article with our attacks on the Whigs, will ask as I have heard asked about the Spectator, “are these people going to do like the Times”? If on reperusing those pages the same remark should not strike yourself, it would not create any difficulty about inserting the article, but it would oblige us to prefix to it an editorial note or introduction which would deprive the review of the credit it would derive from identifying itself with such an article, & deprive the article of that additional weight which even *your* writing like that of every one must in *some* degree however small, derive from being delivered as the sentiments not only of the writer but of a body who back him. It would be much more satisfactory to us if by the mere throwing in or taking out of a phrase here & there, you could give that slight turn to the introductory part which is all that is required. No other part seems to be liable to the same misconstruction—& the summing up near the end strikes me as quite perfect.

There are a few minor points which may be worth noticing in the proof, but not now—the only ones which occur to me at present are the following two: We have always hitherto avoid[ed]³ committing ourselves on the Russian question⁴ till we know more about it—& therefore are anxious if possible not to be committed [to] it by a side wind on an occasion when it [is] not absolutely called for. And secondly there are one or two sentences in which the East India Company⁵ are spoken of in a tone which might be very prejudicial to one in this house if they were printed in a review under my influence, & which I think more severe than is actually deserved.

I will read the article again very carefully & then put it into the hands of our editor, by con[ferring] with whom I may get some further suggestions, but I do not think they can affect anything in this letter.

Direct to me *India House*—

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

227.1.

TO JOHN HILL BURTON¹

India House

9th December
1837

My Dear Sir

In compliance with your request I have looked through the first two volumes of the *Rationale*, & all I wish to suppress in those volumes is the note at page 126 of the first volume.² But I should wish my signature, at the end of the preface, & all mention of my name, to be omitted. I never intended to put my name to the book in any shape,³ & only did so because Mr Bentham insisted on it, & I feared that if I persisted in my refusal he would think I had done my work so ill as to be ashamed to avow it.

I should also wish a paragraph to the effect of that on the opposite page, to be added in brackets, at the end of the preface.⁴

With thanks for the courtesy of your note

Believe Me
Your Obedient Servant

J. S. Mill

You shall hear from me again as soon as I have looked thro' the remaining volumes.

J. H. Burton Esq.

227.2.

TO JOHN HILL BURTON¹

India House

15th December
1837

My Dear Sir

I have looked through the remaining volumes of Bentham, & the following are the only alterations I think it worth while to make

vol. 3. p. 305. line 16, instead of "for a long time" read "at first."

vol. 3. p. 307. line 13. omit "in my conception."

vol. v. p. 104. line 3 of note. omit "the only sort of reason which a lawyer ever cares about"—& in line 5 of the same note, omit "pretended to be."

vol. v. p. 576. last line, after "everybody" insert "perhaps."²

Omit the last paragraph of the concluding note "On the Belgic Code."³

Believe Me
Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

J. H. Burton Esq.

229.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

5th January

1837

[*sic, recte* 1838]

My Dear Sir

After keeping you so long without your proof, it is with a bad grace that we ask you to return it quickly—but we are obliged to do so.

On reconsideration, I have resolved to ask your permission to revert to the plan you at one time were kind enough to consent to, of putting your signature *in full* to the article.² The more I think of it the more I dislike to publish an article with a note controverting or criticising it, prefixed. This would be unnecessary if your name were annexed to the article; which would also add greatly to the weight of all the statements & sentiments it contains.

The article is full of most valuable thoughts, & most powerful writing, & I must in vindication of my own common sense, entreat you to believe, that all which is said of the D[uke] of W[ellington] I fully agree in, so far as I have any right to an opinion at all. My fears were, & are, only that the *tone* would be misinterpreted—common readers take their idea of what a writer says, entirely from the tone—they carry away an impression derived from that & do not remember, or worse than that, misrecollect from never having really observed, what was *said*.

However your name at the foot will prevent any misinterpretation.³

On the Russian question⁴ I have nothing to say. On what is said of the E.I. Company my objection was not to anything affirmed as to the injustice & crime of many kinds by which their Indian empire was acquired,⁵ but to the apparent compliance with the popular prejudice which ascribes to the Company, & to their interest as a trading body, proceedings arising from the sinister interests (sometimes trading interests) of their *servants* in India, which they themselves partly from right feeling, partly from a view of those very interests of the Company as a trading body, steadily discountenanced. See my father's history, *passim*. I believe the E.I.C. to have always been, & I know it to be now, what my father represented it, the government which of all others (except perhaps the U.S. of America) wishes to do, & does, most for the people under its sway, & the *protector* of the natives of India against the avarice & domineering spirit of rapacious European adventurers—

Ever Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

229.2.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

Monday
[Jan. 8, 1838]

My Dear Sir

I never had for a moment the idea of suggesting to you to make any alterations because they would suit my views or those of the review, unless you should also think that they would be not only consistent with your own, but would enable them to be stated with even more effect, because less liable to be misunderstood.² The views themselves I should not have presumed, on such a subject, to object to, even if my own had been different—instead of being, as they are, exactly the same. I, also, wish all who do not do justice to the D[uke] of W[ellington] to be rebuked, whether they are radicals or not: only, as the review must not, & shall not, offend the great body of its supporters & injure or ruin its chances of success, not for the sake of telling wholesome truths but of telling them in a certain manner, without the explanations which that manner requires—it shall be my study to give those explanations in a note—which I would have preferred that the writer himself should have done—that is all. That the manner itself is either wrong, or in the least degree liable to misinterpretation if it were known to come from you, I neither said nor think.

Since I have not been able to induce you to enter into this view of the matter, I must do without: but I hope you do not think me so silly, if I wanted a “hired writer” to write what he did not think, as to apply to you for the purpose.

Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

229.3.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

Tuesday
[Jan. 9, 1838]

My Dear Sir

Nothing can be more satisfactory than your note. I do not think it will be needful to use the kind permission you give for publishing your name, but I will use so much of that permission as to indicate clearly in a note at the commencement,² what quarter the article comes from—which being understood by the public, will remove all the difficulties I took the liberty of expressing to you—& there is no difficulty in letting the authorship of the article transpire without directly stating it.

Believe Me
Ever Faithfully Yours

J. S. Mill

229.4.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

11th Jan^y 1837
[*sic, recte* 1838]

My Dear Sir

We accept your alternative of your initials & a note, if you will oblige us by leaving out the words “exempt from Editorial interference” which are a bad *precedent*, & allow it to run thus: “The following article is by agreement to be considered as the expression of the writer’s individual sentiments without involving the opinions of this review. Who the writer is may be easily discovered by the style, the sentiments, & the initials.”²

Should you have any objection to add to the words “especially the Whigs” a note, stating just what you say in your letter, as explanatory of the tone? It might begin thus: “Some of our readers may not recollect the tone of the Whigs towards the D[uke] of W[ellington] some years ago”—then adding the passage from Perry’s article, & (if it would be proper) the anecdote of Barry O’Meara.³ This would make a capital note, & by exciting indignation would put the reader into a fit state of mind for appreciating, & feeling with, your denunciation of such injustices.

This I think would put all perfectly right.

I quite agree in all you say in your letter concerning India.

Ever Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

230.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

26th January 1837
[*sic, recte* 1838]

My Dear Sir

I am exceedingly glad that the matter of the signature & note has been so satisfactorily arranged. We could not, of course, think of availing ourselves of your offer of your signature in full under the circumstances of the case—& I think it is altogether better as it is.

Mr Robertson, the editor, desires me to ask to whom he shall send a cheque?² to Mr Bonne?³ or to any banker?

What should you think of Washington⁴ as a subject for an article? His correspondence is now all published.

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

239.1.

TO COL. WILLIAM F. P. NAPIER¹

India House

23d March 1838

My Dear Sir

I am afraid I have been inexcusably negligent towards you, for if you ever mentioned to me your wish for separate copies of the article on the Duke of Wellington,² I

entirely forgot that you had done so. As the best atonement in my power I send you four copies made up from the waste, & shall be happy to make others from the sheets of unstitched copies if there are any, or to send you copies of the review itself. Orders for which, from you, to any one to whom you may have desired to give copies, shall be attended to by the publisher.

Ever Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

248.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH¹

India House

19th October
1838

My Dear Molesworth

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

I shall be happy to give you any assistance in my power in preparing for your edition of Hobbes,² but I am not aware that my father ever wrote anything respecting him except what is in the Fragment on Mackintosh.³ We will of course put in the prospectus for nothing. Tait's £17 is on every account yours;⁴ the review has no claim to it; only if you get it let Woolcombe⁵ know, so that he may include it in his statement of your disbursements for the review which I am sorry to say it goes but a little way to liquidate.

Our last number has sold very well: there are only about 150 remaining out of 2000, & I hear from Hooper that many have gone to *libraries*, where there is good hope of its leading to the review's being permanently taken. If it had not been for the cursed Canada business, which, I have now ascertained, reduced our then rapidly rising sale by full one fifth, it would have paid by this time. However I hope even this will profit us in the end, for the present turn in Canada affairs brings Lord Durham⁶ home incensed to the utmost (as Buller writes to me)⁷ with both Whigs & Tories, Whigs especially and in the best possible mood for setting up for himself, & if so the formation of an efficient party of moderate radicals, of which our review will be the organ, is certain—the Whigs will be kicked out never more to rise, & Lord D. will be head of the liberal party and ultimately prime minister. I am delighted with Buller; his letters to his father & mother & to me shew him in a nobler character than he ever appeared in before, & he & Wakefield⁸ seem to be acting completely as one man

speaking to Lord D. with the utmost plainness, giving him the most courageous and judicious advice, which he receives both generously & wisely. He is the man for us, & we shall have him & make a man of him yet.

I was sure you would admire Comte's book⁹ as I do myself, but it is rather too dry for the review *yet*. Have you seen the third volume, the philosophy of chemistry & physiology? I have been almost as much struck with it as with the others & have learnt as much from it, though there are more questionable things in the former two, but *even* on *those* he has shaken me. Pray read it.

I have received your 25 copies¹⁰ & will do all I can to circulate them where they will be useful. Pray bear the subject of Secondary Punishments¹¹ in mind for our February or Easter number.

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

Yours Most Truly

J. S. Mill

248.1.

TO JOHN HILL BURTON¹

India House

25th October
1838

My Dear Sir

I have referred to the note which you mention²—it is of very trifling importance, & so far as I am concerned I give my full consent to your omitting it or not as you may deem most for the interest of the work. I do not indeed feel the force of the objection to it—what is said about the incarceration of extraneous witnesses refers to the *expediency*, as a matter of principle, & I understand from you that my friend Doane's³ note refers to the *existing practice* of which I do not find that I said anything in my note. Nor do I see the inconsistency between it & p. 232. However it is very probable that you & Doane who have considered the matter much more & more recently are in the right, & that I should think so if I saw his note—& therefore once more I leave the matter to your discretion—

I am glad you are in communication with Theobald,[4](#) whom from what I have heard of him I should think fully competent—

Ever Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

249.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH[1](#)

I[ndia] H[ouse]

14 Nov. 1838

Dear Molesworth

What think you of all this rumpus in Canada? I find all the Whigs & moderates here blame Lord Durham for the Proclamation, & he has already the greater part of the real radicals against him for the Ordinance. But I think the liberal party in the country generally is with him. I mean to stand by him, as my letters from Buller, & Rintoul's from Wakefield convince me that he was quite right in resigning & that he comes home fully prepared (if the damned pseudo-radicals do not get round him & talk him over) to set up for himself. For the purpose of acting at once upon him & upon the country in that *sens*, I have written an elaborate defence of him which will be published in the review next week,[2](#) & will be in the newspapers before that. I hope exceedingly that you will approve of it for if this man really tries to put himself at the head of the liberals, your standing by him will do a world of good. What a pity Leader made such a damned fool of himself after you quitted town.

Write to me sometimes to say how you are. The Prospectus of Hobbes[3](#) is very well done but I am sorry the price of the book is to be so high, as I fear few will give so much for it except for making *libraries*—not for *bona fide* reading.

By the bye Nichol[4](#) who has been roaming about, finds that a letter to him franked by you, has miscarried, & he begs me to ask you whom you franked it for. I do not think it was for me, as he seems to have got all my letters.

When you write on Secondary Punishments[5](#) which I hope will be soon, & for us, I must shew you the Report of a Committee at Calcutta on Prisons & Prison Discipline in India.[6](#) It is full of good observations & the writer is up to the most advanced ideas on penal law. Though the subject is *prisons*, all the questions of secondary punishment are in fact included in it. I do not send you a copy, for only one has yet reached the India house.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

266.1.

TO GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT¹

India House

18th October
1839

My Dear Beaumont

You have been made acquainted by my friend Grant with my absence from England at the time when your letter was received here, & the cause of it—I did not return here till July, it was some time longer before your book² reached me, & as so much time had already elapsed I determined to delay writing to you until I should have thoroughly read & considered the book. I have only lately been able to do so, especially as the reading of such a book, the kind of book of all others the most delightful to me, an occupation which always, if I can, reserve for a moment, not only of leisure but of *pleasurable* leisure—a sort of intellectual luxury, to be enjoyed at ease.

I hardly know how to express to you the degree of my estimation of your book, in as measured terms as a sober man likes to use in expressing a deliberate judgment—but this I may say, in the confidence of being rather within than beside the mark—that the book not only displays a complete & easy mastery over all the social elements & agencies at work in Ireland, over the whole great [world?] of Irish history & Irish civilization; but th[at] it also manifests a degree of clear comprehension & accurate knowledge of the far more complicated & obscure phenom[en]a of *English* society, never before even *approached* by any foreigner whom I know of, & by very, *very* few Englishmen. Even those Englishmen who know their own country best, may learn much from the connected & enlarged mode of exhibiting what they know, which is characteristic of all good writers & thinkers of your country; & *that* benefit we were sure [to] receive, from the views of English affairs taken by a mind like yours; but what surprises me more, & contrasts more strikingly with the many gross blunders in matters of fact usual[ly] made by Frenchmen in writing about England, is, that in your two volumes I have not been able to detect *one* error of material importance in the statements [made] & very few indeed even of a trifling kind. To shew how few & how small they are I will just mention two of them, assuring you that they are quite the two greatest errors I have found in the book. The fictions of *fine & recovery*, so judiciously characterized by you, & which you say will not easily be abolished, *have been* abolished for the last two or three years³ by a bill emanating from the late Real Property Commission; carried through Parliament by the Attorney General;⁴ & by

which owners of land are now empowered to do directly what formerly they could only do in that circuitous manner. The other mistake is, that the Whigs have abandoned the Ballot. The fact is notorious here that every year more & more of the Whigs are converted *to* the Ballot, & none have ever been converted *from* it. I suppose you must have been led into this opinion by the fact that Lord Althorp⁵ & one or two others connected with the Whig ministry had voted for the Ballot formerly but that was *before the Reform Bill*, & the reason that they [announced?] that change was, that the R. Bill had done so much for the democratic principle that a fair trial ought to be given to it without any fur[ther?] [—?] that they were precluded by an implied promise at [the] time when the Bill passed from proposing any further reform. I should add that in those days, when Lord Althorp voted for the ballot he was not considered a Whig, & so hostile to the ballot were all the Whigs that the Ballot was considered ultra-Radicalism, the very *ne plus ultra* of Democracy. A few rational persons like Lord Althorp alone saw that it was not so.

Your book on the whole gives an impression, perhaps, too favorable to the English aristocracy in England, & suggests the idea that the evils & abuses in England are less than I think them; but this was an inevitable consequence of representing England in *contrast* with Ireland, where all the natural evil tendencies of our institutions are so much aggravated by the causes you so well point out; all the distinctions which you draw, really exist, & you have, especially in the latter half of the second volume, guarded as much perhaps as it was possible to do against the kind of impression which was in some degree inevitable.

In your views of what the different parties in England can do or are likely to do for Ireland, I entirely agree; as well as in your views of what ought to be done; with one exception: I think that more might be done by emigration, than you appear to consider possible. You ha[ve] probably not [adverted?] to the improved principles of Colonization first promulgated by Mr Wakefield⁶ (the son of the Wakefield who wrote on Ireland)⁷ & now generally adopted both by political writers & practical statesmen among us. I was nearly the first proselyte whom he made to them.⁸ I have in my turn helped to convince others that by *selling* all new land in the colonies, for such a price as shall prevent the usual dispersion of settlers all over the country (so incompatible with the combination & division of labour) & appropriating the produce to paying the expenses of emigration you may raise out of the wealth actually *created* by emigration a fund increasing by geometrical progression, to pay the expenses of further emigration. If indeed the expense had to be born by the state, I should agree with you in despairing of the attainment, although I do not think the number of persons necessary to be removed, so great as you do. I think the only instance in which you seem to me to have overvalued any article of testimony is that of the Irish Poor Law Commission Reports. That Commission was entirely led by Dr. Whately,⁹ who went into the enquiry with a strong preconceived opinion against Poor Laws—the biasing effect of which is easily seen; & the Secretary of the Commission, Revans,¹⁰ has pointed out the fallacy by which they were led greatly to overrate the number of destitute persons in Ireland—they computed all the itinerant poor who passed through a particular district in a given time, & then multiplied that number in the ratio which all Ireland bore to the size of the particular

district—forgetting that the beggars of Ireland ply *all over* Ireland, & that they would have met with the very same men successively in a great many places.

I have not a word more to say in dissent from any thing in the book; which goes to the very bottom of the subject it treats of, & must place you, in the mind of every competent judge, in a rank among European thinkers, which even the promise of your former writings excellent as they were, could scarcely have justified us in expecting. We have only now to hope that you may live long & write other such books.

Ever Yours Faithfully

J. S. Mill

270.1.

TO JOHN HILL BURTON¹

India House

15th Jan^y
1840

My Dear Sir

I have referred to two copies of the Rationale of Evidence in my possession, & I find neither of them has any errata. I have no recollection whatever of any such circumstance, nor can I recal to mind anything connected with the subject. It is therefore pretty certain that the alterations were not suggested by Mr Bentham himself, *to me* at least, or I should have remembered something about it.² He may have had a paper of Errata printed afterwards—or I may have done it myself—but in neither case can I account for the non appearance of the paper in most of the copies.

Unless Bowring³ can throw some light upon the subject, I fear it must remain in darkness.

It cannot I think be worth while to cancel anything on account of this oversight.

Robertson has read to me your letter on the Church quarrel,⁴ which interested me much—

Ever Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

270.2.

TO JOHN HILL BURTON¹

I[ndia] H[ouse].

23^d Jan^y
1840

My Dear Sir

From the nature & wording of your extract from the errata I should conjecture that they are Bentham's own.² If so, either Bowring or Doane, with both of whom you are in communication & I am not, are the only persons likely to be able to throw any light upon it. No doubt the errata were inserted after many of the copies were sold.

I purposely struck out of the opening chapter in the MS whatever was said about securing the *forthcomingness* of evidence, because there was nothing corresponding to it in the work itself. The author seemed to have intended to include that subject in the Treatise, but to have changed his views as he went on, & reserved it for Procedure—

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

270.3.

TO JOHN STERLING¹

India House

30th January
1840

My Dear Sterling

This is to introduce to you my brother Henry, my mother, & my sister Clara, who are bound for Madeira on account of Henry's health & for whom I know it is not necessary to solicit your kind offices.

Yours Ever Affectionately

J. S. Mill

Rev. John Sterling

298.

TO SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH¹

India House

19th Nov^r 1840

My Dear Molesworth

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

I think very much as you do about Whewell's book. His "History"² was of great use to me, by bringing before me all that had been done & the manner in which it had been done. I have got nothing new from his "Philosophy" though I think it likely to be a useful book—his theory is much better than no theory—& his "ideas" are really the metaphysical premisses of the sciences the only contestable point being their *a priori* origin. I shall have to dwell more upon that point in rewriting my book, than I have done & it is a great advantage to have the floating doctrines of the enemy *fixed* in a book of authority, because then one cannot be required to do more than answer what is said in the book.

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

Your Leeds demonstration³ seems to me a very proper thing, done in the very best way—& I think that is the general impression about it. I cannot but think that it has done & will do good, both in France & here & I am sure it has had a good effect in raising your public character.

Fonblanque has been doing admirably on this war question.⁴ It is the first time that he has thrown off his ministerial livery. The Times also has been rendering good service of late.

I hope to hear from you now & then

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

341.1.

TO WILLIAM LOVETT¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

15th Feb^y
1842

Dear Mr Lovett

I have been too long without sending an answer to your circular.² I think it very desirable that a place of meeting should exist for the purposes which the Circular refers to & I shall be quite ready to contribute my mite towards providing it.

Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

343.1.

TO [JOHN MURRAY]¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Sat^y
[After Feb. 24, 1842]

My Dear Sir

In returning my MS, you did not return to me the Preface & Table of Contents.² Would you oblige me by letting me have them?

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

344.1.

TO WILLIAM HENRY SMITH¹

[March ? 1842]

I showed your play² to the most superior woman I have ever known,³ and the most fastidious judge of poetry, and she writes to me about it: "I like the play very much. I think the subject an excellent one, and the mode of saying it natural, healthy, and quite free from the affectation of 'old dramatists', which is an affectation I, of all others, most nauseate. It is the only play, and almost the only poem, of the present time which I know without affected mannerism."

I think it worth while telling you of this opinion, because, if you were acquainted with the writer, I am sure you would attach real value to her judgment, and especially to her approbation.—

Ever Yours,

J. S. Mill

370.1.

TO FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE¹

India House

9th Sep^r 1842.

My Dear Maurice

Thank you very sincerely for your book,² which I have just now finished reading. As a production of intellect I could say much in admiration of it; but that I know is not what you would most like to hear. It is very pleasant to find oneself so much in sympathy, both morally and intellectually, with a writer from whose fundamental principles and from many of whose practical conclusions one is obliged to dissent.

I have also just finished a second and more careful reading of your Moral Philosophy in the Enc Metr.³ This is still more interesting to me than the other and I can assent to more of history being a subject on which we have more principles in common. I agree to a much greater extent than you would perhaps suppose, in your view, even of the historical position of the Jews. I believe I was cured of many of my crude notions about them by the writings of Salvador,⁴ a Jew by race and by national feeling, a Frenchman by birth, and a rationalist of the school of Paulus⁵ by opinion, whose book on the Mosaic institutions and on the Jewish people though somewhat ludicrous in its adaptation of Moses to a Voltairian public and in its attempts to prove that the Jews

were Constitutional Liberals and Utilitarians is yet so full of strong facts and even arguments that it made a great impression on me when I read it a year or two ago.

I shall have a book of my own to offer to you in a few months;⁶ though I am afraid you will not be able to look upon it or its tendency with any favour, as though I do not concern myself with ontological questions directly the whole effect of the book where it produces any, must be anti-ontological. However you will find in it if you read it, several opinions warmly contended for, which were perhaps never found before in writings of the school of Locke, and some which I believe I first learnt from yourself.

Ever Yours
(Whatever You May Think Of My Philosophy)

J. S. Mill

377.1.

TO HENRY COLE¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Tuesday
[Nov. 42]

Dear Cole

Can you help me to the enclosed information?

Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

443.1.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

India House

11th Nov^r 1844

Mr Mill presents his compliments to Mr Parker & requests him to have the goodness to send copies of the Political Economy Essays² to Thomas Carlyle Esq. 5 Cheyne Row Chelsea, & William Tait Esq. Edinburgh.

455.1.

TO DR. WILLIAM B. CARPENTER¹

India House

18th March 1845

Dear D^R Carpenter

My friend Bain, whom you have I believe met at my house, is thinking of becoming a candidate for the vacant Logic chair at St Andrews, & he tells me that one of the patrons is D^F Reid,² the professor of Anatomy, who is much quoted by you. Are you acquainted with D^F Reid? & if so could you in any way help Bain with him? His qualifications (Bain's I mean) for such a chair I should have no hesitation in vouching for—indeed there is no office requiring high speculative powers & knowledge of scientific methods, which he would not be entitled to aspire to—

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

479.1.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

India House

Wed^y

[After Jan. 16, 1846]

My Dear Chadwick

Thank you for sending me your paper on railway accidents &c.² I quite go with you in every point & I hope you will send copies to the members of the General Committee on railways.³

There is nobody like you for being practically useful.

Did you send the letter which you shewed me, or any similar one, to Morrison?⁴ or are you taking any steps to dispose of your Trust Company certificates? I should be much inclined to sell mine if I could get the terms you mentioned.

Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

495.1.

TO ARTHUR HELPS¹

[1847?]

My Dear Sir—

When I began reading your proofs I intended after the first reading to go through them a second time carefully, annotating as I went on, but when I came to the last two essays the minute criticisms which I thought of making, rather because you asked me than because they seemed to me of much importance, became merged in a radical difference of opinion & sentiment. I think I can best express this difference by saying that your mode of thinking is grounded on the supposition that the present constitution both of social & of domestic life is essentially right, while I think that there is in them both, much that is fundamentally wrong. So great a difference must lead to all sorts of minor ones on such subjects as “the art of living with others” & “education”. In my estimation the art of living with others consists first & chiefly in treating & being treated by them as equals. Of course nothing can be more contrary to your doctrine that differences of judgment or inclination should be settled not by the force of sufficient reason but by “some authorized will”. From your description & from others I must suppose that a great portion of mankind are so full of miserable pettiness, so tracassière, annoying, illtempered, interfering & unreasonable as to be entirely unfit to live together: I have never known such people among those with whom I have been in intimate companionship, but if people find it difficult to live together without “hating”, having “a [quiet?] distaste for” one another, in the first place their continuing living together at all seems to me an [immorality?] & in the next place the remedy would rather be a great cultivation of high principle & amiableness than a “just sway”. This being my opinion it follows of course that I do not consider the living together of men & women to be an exception to it nor can I think that relation will ever be other than a comparative failure while instead of being an association between equals, it is grounded on “sway” on one side, dependence on the other, & the dependent is systematically educated for feebleness of mind. The “petting” which you speak of is a wretched substitute for reason & justice, but it is the least that can be done where those are withheld.

In the essay on “Education” again it is assumed that inequality is a thing which should be cultivated, that people should be educated with a view to a “just progression of nice distinctions of rank.” As I look upon inequality as *in itself* always an evil, I do not agree with any one who would use the machinery of society for the purpose of promoting it. As much inequality as necessarily arises from protecting all persons in the free use of their faculties of body & mind & in the enjoyment of what these can

obtain for them, must be submitted to for the sake of a greater good: but I certainly see no necessity for artificially adding to it, while I see much for tempering it, impressing both on the laws & on the usages of mankind as far as possible the contrary tendency.

I regret much not having found time to consider & return the proofs sooner.

498.

TO GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE¹

India House

22nd Feb., 1847

Most people do not understand by morality a subject open to discussion as any other, and on which persons have different opinions, but think it a name for the set of opinions they have been accustomed to.

501.1.

TO GEORGE HENRY LEWES¹

I[ndia] H[ouse]

Monday
[May 1847]

My Dear Lewes

I ought to have written to you before about Ranthorpe² but I can say nothing that you would much care to hear until I have at least looked through it a second time, & Grote's two new volumes³ have come in the way & prevented that. I could say various minor things, but they are better *said* than written, & there is no hurry about them. However as you must be expecting to hear from me I will just say that I like the book on the whole decidedly *better* than I expected from your own account of it.

Ever Yours

J. S. Mill

Have you seen the eulogium in Blackwood of the Hist. of Philosophy?⁴ Is the article by Smith? N.D. I have not read it (the article) but the note caught my eye.

503.1.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

India House

10th May 1847

My Dear Sir

I ought to have much sooner answered your note which accompanied a copy of your paper on the Syllogism.² As soon as I was able to find time I read the paper through & have noted it for a second reading previously to any future reprint³ of what I have written on the same subject.

I have since received the pamphlet.⁴ I think the *tone* everything that could be wished for, & the *substance* I should call conclusive if it were ever safe to say so when one has not heard the last word of the other side. But I shall be much astonished if Sir W. H. is able to shake any part of what you have said.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

508.1.

TO SIR THOMAS ERSKINE PERRY¹

India House

24th June
1847

My Dear Perry

We are just about to send out two schoolmasters. They are young men well recommended & neither of them Scotchmen. How they will be found to answer, experience will decide. One of them seems to me to have a tinge of cockneyism, not however in his language or accent.

These two are all that you have officially applied for, but as you *unofficially* apply for five or six, I recommend making the application official without delay, especially as I yesterday had an interview on the subject with Abp. Whately² in consequence of your letter to him, & it appears you have applied to the right quarter, for (while his National Schools are the best possible *school* for what you want) he tells me that even

the *Inspectors*, though some of them are graduates of Trin. Coll. have a *smaller* salary than what you give—& as he will make known your requirements & conditions to them, there is no doubt we shall have no lack of applications.

I shall be very glad if you obtain the leave of absence you have applied for but I cannot in anyway aid your application, nor can the Court, as they never consider themselves or are considered to have a voice in anything relating to the Judges of the Supreme Court.

Yours In Haste

J. S. Mill

511.1.

TO AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN¹

India House

13 Sept. 1847

My Dear Sir

On coming to town today I find your note. I am very glad that you are prosecuting your speculations on the syllogism still further & I will postpone the reconsideration I intended giving to your ideas until the appearance of the book which I am glad to hear is so far advanced.² In any case I was not likely to return to the subject for the next two or three months as I am myself also finishing a book for publication on a quite different subject.³

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

511.2.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

India House

Friday. October 1, 1847²

My Dear Sir,

I much regret to find that you are suffering in health & I am sure you cannot too much abstain, while that is the case, from your really wearing occupation. Your question about the Essay on the Laws of Interchange³ is very natural, & it is one which I put to myself, with some doubt as to its result when I adopted my present opinions on Currency. But on carefully revising the ideas of the Essay I found in them nothing which clashed. You will observe that the speculations in that Essay do not relate to the effects of *fluctuations* but only of *permanent changes* in the amount of bullion in a country & *those* I imagine even Tooke⁴ would allow to have an effect on prices, governed as these changes must be by changes in the *costs* (not indeed of producing bullion at the mines—but) of purchasing & importing it into the country. *Au reste* I believe I have set all that matter in a clear light in the book I am now finishing & have adjusted the different segments of my opinions into one another with due attention to the *fitting*. There is a writer in the Chronicle who is a considerable master of good humoured raillery. He has written in today's paper on the Anti-gold League.⁵

Ever Truly Yours,

J. S. Mill

512.1.

TO JOHN WILLIAM PARKER¹

India House

Monday
[? November, 1847]

My Dear Sir

The title by which I should like the book to be announced, is, "Principles of Political Economy, with some of their applications to Social Philosophy."

I may as well take this opportunity of saying that I should wish, if you have no objection, to be allowed 25 free copies of this book. This is the only difference I wish to make in our conditions from those relating to the Logic.

I should think this book likely to be much more generally read & bought than the former one.

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

520.1.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

[1848]

My Dear Chadwick

I give this note of introduction to Dr Beke² whom you may know as the traveller in Abyssinia. He wishes to speak to you on certain matters connected with his father,³ who is or at least was Surveyor of Sewers in the Tower Hamlets District.

Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

520.2.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

India House

Monday

[1848]

Dear Sir—

In the absence of Mr John Parker I address you direct to say that the second vol. of the Pol. Economy is now in such forwardness that if you should think fit to put that in hand immediately I could keep the printer supplied. Mr Harrison² tells me that he could do it without inconvenience, & if you see no objection, we might in that way make up for lost time.

The printing is going on very well but I should like to see a sheet of the paper, as the specimen page is about half an inch shorter than the page of Strauss,³ which is exactly the size I prefer.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

520.3.

TO MR. WARREN¹

India House

21st Jan^y
1848

Dear Sir

I have now a copy of my father's "Analysis" which I can lend to you without any inconvenience if you will inform me in what way to send it.

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

521.1.

TO AN UNIDENTIFIED CORRESPONDENT¹

India House

3^d Feb^y 1848

Dear Sir

I hope the Auditors will excuse my declining the honour they propose conferring upon me—in the first place because any matter relating to the checking & controlling of accounts may easily be entrusted to a person much more qualified for it than myself—and secondly because my occupation at the India House during business hours would make it very difficult & inconvenient for me to fulfil any obligation which might require my attendance at the distance of University College.

Believe Me

Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

532.

TO JOHN JAY¹

Nov., 1848

I regret that accident should have prevented my meeting you on either of the times when you took the trouble to call on me at the India House. I should have been glad to have conversed with you on some of the topics in the Pol. Ec. as well as on others.

Appendix II

ADDITIONAL LATER LETTERS

The following letters were located too late to be included in the sequence of the foregoing volumes. They have been numbered here with reference to that sequence.

440A.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Blackheath

Feb. 7. 1860

Dear Chadwick

I am grieved to hear such an account of Miss Nightingale's health. I shall certainly read her book² at the first opportunity, not for any benefit to myself, for my ailments have never yet been of a kind to require nursing; but for the reasons you give as well as others that are obvious, I do not need it to enable me to share the admiration which is felt towards her more universally, I should think, than towards any other living person.

I am afraid I shall hardly be able, during the short time of my stay, to make out a visit to you. The ignorance and rawness of all ranks on the subject of representation are certainly amazing, and only equalled by their self-satisfied indifference to further knowledge. You will not get your inquiry,³ for everybody has made up his mind to do something this year without waiting either for knowledge or thought.

Yours Truly

J. S. Mill

467A.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK¹

Aug. 27, 1860

Dear Chadwick

I have had two notes from you which ought to have been answered, but what with occupation, and the weather which has been unfavourable to fixing beforehand any time for a walk, they have remained unanswered till now. I should have written directly if I could have told of anything that could be useful to you or Mr Bagehot on the subject treated of in your pamphlet.² But I could only have referred you and him to the Socialist writers, particularly in France, who have laid great stress upon the same class of considerations which you have brought forward. I should like to have a talk with you on the question, and to explain where I do and do not agree with you; and I hope to be able to arrange a meeting and a walk, but I am unable to do so just at present.

I beg you to thank Miss Nightingale very particularly for the new edition of her Notes.³ I have read the additional matter, and think it quite equal to the preceding. But I confess I wish the sentence we talked of were omitted.⁴ There is nobody that I know of who deserves the stigma it conveys; while it gives the sanction of Miss Nightingale's authority to the attempt to run down those who are contending that the only way in which either women or men can find out what they can and cannot do, is by being allowed to try; and that it is a gross injustice to women that men should pass sentence in the matter beforehand, by peremptorily excluding them from anything.

I Am Dear Chadwick

Yrs Very Truly

J. S. Mill

850A.

TO [GEORGE HOWELL?]¹

Blackheath Park

July 22. 1865

Dear Sir

I have had the pleasure of receiving your note. A letter of mine to M^r Potter,[2](#) which appeared in the newspapers about three months ago, and to which considerable attention was drawn by the Westminster contest, explained the differences of opinion which prevented, and still prevent me from becoming a member of the Reform League. But I do not the less confidently expect that I shall be found acting in general cooperation with the members of the League,[3](#) as my opinions on Reform, though in some respects different, are fully as radical as theirs. I think that the general promotion of the Reform cause is the main point at present, and that advanced reformers, without suppressing their opinions on the points on which they may still differ, should act together as one man in the common cause

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

862A.

TO EDWIN CHADWICK[1](#)

Blackheath Park

Aug. 12. 1865.

Dear Chadwick

The position in which I am, and which is the cause of my not having answered your last two letters, is that of being obliged to postpone absolutely every political or parliamentary subject till the meeting of Parliament. A great many things have fallen on me at once, to which I was pledged before my election, and which can only be done in the present recess, and I am at my wit's end to know how they are possibly to be got through. My attending any meeting is quite out of the question; almost as much so as my going to see schools or workhouses, or writing to the President of the Poor Law Board as you proposed. I cannot turn my thoughts to such things till next January.

In Haste
Yours Ever

J. S. Mill

881A.

TO [GEORGE HOWELL?][1](#)

Avignon

Oct. 30. 1865

Sir

Your letter of the 23^d instant has been forwarded to me here. As I do not expect to be in England until the meeting of Parliament, there will be no opportunity for the interview proposed by the Executive Council.[2](#) Neither is it probable that such an interview, if intended to invite my cooperation with the Reform League, would lead to any useful result. While I consider myself a fellow labourer with the League in the cause of democratic reform, considered generally, I have no former occasions stated the reasons[3](#) why I cannot join in a movement for the special objects proposed by the League, manhood suffrage and the Ballot: both which questions, moreover have been so largely discussed, and have necessarily been so long under consideration both by the members of the Executive Council and by myself, that it is not likely our opinions can be modified or any new arguments of importance suggested on either side by a short conversation.

I Am Sir

Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

911A.

TO [GEORGE HOWELL?][1](#)

Jan. 30. 1866

Dear Sir

I quite agree with those who think that the intended Reform Bill should include a lodger franchise,[2](#) but if I were to suggest beforehand all the provisions of a more or less novel character which I think it ought to include, I should have many others to propose besides that particular one. I would, therefore, rather not take any part in a separate movement for a lodger franchise, though I shall gladly give my adhesion and support to such a proposal if made in the House of Commons

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Faithfully

J. S. Mill

1025A.

TO EDMOND BEALES¹

[Feb., 1867]

The Reform Movement has thus far been conducted with great energy and judgment, and I have no doubt that the demonstration on Monday will be a signal and most valuable success. I feel it, however, on several grounds, better that I should not personally take part in it. In the first place the same evening has been chosen by the Government for the announcement of their plans for Reform, and this is likely to lead to a debate, from which I ought not to be absent. (Cheers.) Independent of this I do not feel capable of doing work of a great public meeting and in the House too. (Hear.) I think it best that my taking part in public meetings should be confined to exceptional cases, and your former great meeting at the Agricultural Hall² was an exceptional case, and you know what special reasons there were for the course I took on that occasion. (Cheers.) If at the present time there was the smallest probability of any attempt to interfere with your Demonstration, I would come at once, and take my share of whatever befell. (Loud cheers.)

1026A.

TO [GEORGE HOWELL?]¹

Feb. 6. 1867

Dear Sir

I received your letter this morning. I have written to Mr Beales,² in answer to a letter I received from him at Manchester, explaining my reasons for not taking any personal part in the noble demonstration which is to take place on Monday next.

I Am Dear Sir
Yours Very Truly

J. S. Mill

1087A.

TO LADY RUSSELL¹

Blackheath Park

May 26. 1867

Dear Lady Russell

The reputation of Lord Russell can need no aid from me to give it a lasting record, for what he has done would and must stand in history beyond the reach of dispute. Nor do I think that the country has forgotten what it owes to him, or that it will ever fail to pay him that respect which a nation—whatever may be the case with its upper classes—always feels towards honesty of purpose, whenever fortunate enough to find it in its statesmen. I think you will find that Lord Russell's name usually occupies the place of honour in the resolutions moved in the Reform meetings throughout the country; and when it is not mentioned in them, it is because they have especial reference to the incidents of the debates in the House of Commons.

Accept, I beg, dear Lady Russell, my sincere thanks for the great compliment which I feel your letter pays me, however much I think you overestimate my ability, and believe me

Very Truly Yours

J. S. Mill

1101A.

TO ARTHUR MARMADUKE HARDY¹

Blackheath Park

June 22. 1867

Dear Mr Hardy

I wrote to your uncle² some two years ago, telling him that I should be happy to see you at a time which I named, when I had leisure to be able to do so, but I have received no reply to my letter. I should still be very happy to see you, but think it very probable that I may be otherwise engaged at the time you mention this year. I will, however, write if I should find myself disengaged at the time you wish to see me, and if I should not be so, and you continue to wish to see me next year, there would be a better chance of your doing so if you were to write in time for me to fix any portion of

your holidays when I may be at leisure; because my time is too much occupied for you to be able to count on my being disengaged at any given moment.

Your cousin³ and myself desire to be kindly remembered to your father when you write to him.

I Am

Dear Mr. Hardy

[signature cut off]

1265A.

TO GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN¹

House of Commons

London, July 2, 1868

Dear Sir—

Before asking the question you wished me to put in the House of Commons respecting Warren and Costello,² I took measures to ascertain what was the answer I had to expect. I found it would be to this effect: That they were convicted not of words spoken in America, but of a political attempt to invade the United Kingdom, and that they had been selected from the crew of the Jackmel, for prosecution and punishment, not because the remainder had not incurred an equal liability to it, but because these two examples were deemed sufficient. When I heard this I thought that asking the question publicly would do the prisoners no good, and would only enable the government to claim and obtain credit for clemency.³

If, with this explanation, you still wish the question asked, and if the prisoners wish it, I have not the smallest objection to ask it, but I cannot undertake to carry the matter any further, and, whatever may be my friendly feeling to America, I could not maintain that American citizens, any more than other people, ought to be allowed without punishment to carry on private war against a country with which the United States are at peace.—I am, dear Sir, &c.,

J. S. Mill

1267A.

TO GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN¹

Blackheath Park, Kent, July 8, 1868

Dear Sir—

As you still desire it, I will give notice of a question respecting Warren and Costello.² But you are under a misapprehension in thinking that a discussion will be thereby produced. Discussion is not allowed in asking a question, and can only take place on a motion, and, for the reasons stated in my former note, I cannot undertake to bring forward any motion on the subject.—I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

J. S. Mill

G. F. Train, Esq.

1497A.

TO CATHERINE HELEN SPENCE¹

Avignon, November 28, 1869.

Dear Madam—

Your letter of August 16 has been sent to me here. The copy of my little book² was intended for you, and I had much pleasure in offering it. The movement against women's disabilities generally, and for the suffrage in particular, has made great progress in England since you were last there. It is likely, I think, to be successful in the colonies later than in England, because the want of equality in social advantages between women and men is less felt in the colonies owing, perhaps, to women's having less need of other occupations than those of married life.

I Am, Dear Madam, Yours Very Truly,

J. S. Mill

[¹.]MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot II, 172-73. In reply to Godwin's from Paris of Dec. 26, 1868, also at Yale.

[¹]MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Maine's letter of Nov. 1, 1868, to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 169-72.

Henry (later Sir Henry) James Summer Maine (1822-1888), comparative historian and jurist; law member of the Viceroy's Executive Council in India, 1862-69; Professor of Historical and Comparative Jurisprudence at Oxford, 1869-77; Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, 1877-87; Whewell Professor of International Law, Cambridge, 1887-88.

[².]Probably papers relating to the Oudh Rent Bill of 1868 and the Punjab Tenancy Act of the same year.

[3.] Upon his retirement from the East India Co. in 1858.

[4.] Charles Cornwallis, first Marquis and second Earl Cornwallis (1738-1805), governor-general of India and commander-in-chief in Bengal, 1786-93. By the legislation known as the Permanent Settlement of the Land Revenue, Cornwallis in 1793 gave perpetual land rights, on condition of the payment of a fixed land tax, to the *zamindars*, tax-collectors who had acquired quasi-proprietorship of estates entrusted to them by the government. The code was criticized as unjust to under-tenants and peasants.

[5.] The Bengal Rent Act of 1859 defined the rights of under-tenants and farmers, as well as those of the superior landholders. It extended some protection to the peasants.

[6.] The transferal of the government of India from the East India Co. to the Crown.

[7.] The spellings vary: Talookdars, Taluqdars, Talukdars; Oude is ordinarily spelled Oudh. They were the somewhat less than three hundred feudal barons who at the time of the annexation of Oudh in Feb., 1856, possessed two-thirds of the province. See Letter 314, n. 7.

[8.] Sir William Rose Mansfield, later first Baron Sandhurst, general, commander-in-chief in India and military member of the Council, 1865-70.

[9.] Sir John Laird Mair Lawrence, later 1st Baron Lawrence (1811-1879), viceroy of India, 1863-69.

[10.] Richard Southwell Bourke Mayo, 6th Earl of Mayo (1822-1872), statesman; chief secretary for Ireland in three administrations, he had just been appointed viceroy of India.

[11.] The Duke was secretary of state for India in the Gladstone cabinet, 1868-74. Possessed of vast holdings in the north of Scotland, the Duke had been responsible for the eviction of tens of thousands of “crofters,” in order to create immense pasturelands for sheep. Leone Levi (1821-1888), jurist and statistician, in June 1865, read a paper to the Statistical Society of London on “The Economic Condition of the Highlands and the Islands of Scotland” (*Journal of the Statistical Society*, XXVIII [1865], 372-401), in which he charged the Duke of Argyll and his predecessors with responsibility for the depopulation of Scotland. The Duke refuted the charges in a paper to the Society (*ibid.*, XXIX [Dec., 1866], 504-35), and took issue (p. 529) with JSM’s views of the ownership of land as evidenced in a recent debate on the Irish Tenure of Land Bill.

[12.] Settlement officers, i.e. assessors of land revenue, in the Punjab in 1865, for example, submitted a report favouring the claims of the landlords.

[13.] The figure had been calculated for the single district of Amritsar, in the Punjab. The former settlement in 1853, after the conquest of the province, had recorded existing rights in the land. Under the new proposals, former owners would become tenants at will, liable to rent increases and eviction.

[14.] A bill to amend the land tenancy law in the Punjab was debated at length in the Legislative Council on Oct. 19, 1868. The bill was enthusiastically supported by Maine, and passed. Maine's speech is published in *Sir Henry Maine, A brief Memoir by Sir M. E. Grant Duff. With some of his Indian Speeches and Minutes*, ed. Whitley Stokes (New York, 1892), pp. 268-85.

[15.] *Khoodkaust ryots*: hereditary, permanent farmers; *Pyekaust ryots*: temporary or transient farmers. See Sir George Campbell, "The Tenure of Land in India," in the Cobden Club volume, *System of Land Tenure in Various Countries* (London, 1870), pp. 145-227.

[16.] "Slip of the pen."

[17.] Established by acts of 1841 and 1852, this Commission worked to change copyhold, an ancient form of land tenure, into freehold. Maine had referred to the Commission in his speech of Oct. 19, 1868 (see *Sir Henry Maine* in n. 14 above, p. 282).

[18.] JSM may have made the acquaintance of Maine about 1857 when Maine had published articles opposing the Crown's taking over the government of India from the East India Co.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 173-74. In reply to McLaren's of Dec. 29, also at Yale.

Duncan McLaren (1800-1886), Scottish merchant and politician; MP for Edinburgh, 1865-81; with his wife, a strong supporter of women's suffrage.

[2.] Letter 1359 had been published in *The Times* on Dec. 23 and no doubt in other newspapers.

[3.] Notably Letters 1339 and 1361.

[4.] Of Letter 1359.

[1.] MS in the possession of Professor R. H. Coase of the University of Virginia.

Manton Marble (1835-1917), American journalist; proprietor and editor of the *New York World*, 1862-76.

[2.] Presumably the annual convention of the National Labor Union, held in New York City, Sept. 21, 1868. An estimated 600,000 organized workmen were represented; for the first time working women's organizations were included in the representation.

[3.] See Letter 1292, n. 5. In 1868 the Democratic Party, at the time generally proinflationary or at least anti-deflationary, in its platform adopted in July, 1868, had advocated the payment of bonds in greenbacks, though its unsuccessful candidate for the Presidency, Horatio Seymour, was generally regarded as a "hard-money" man.

[4.] Letter 1292.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Bears corrections and emendations in Helen Taylor's hand. Published in Elliot, II, 174-75. In reply to Smalley's of Dec. 31, 1868, also at Johns Hopkins.

George Washburn Smalley (1833-1916), American journalist; foreign correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, 1866-95. He had met JSM at Avignon, in the summer of 1866, with an introduction from Thomas Hughes. Smalley's account of JSM is reprinted in his *London Letters* (2 vols., New York, 1891), I, 232-40.

[2.] Smalley had sent two copies of the *New York Tribune* containing his account of JSM's defeat for Westminster: "The English Elections," Dec. 1, 1868, pp. 1-2, and "The Lesson of the English Elections," Dec. 2, 1868, p. 4.

[3.] He attributed the defeat as primarily due to Smith's lavish expenditure and the superior organization of the Tories, but Smalley also conceded that "No doubt . . . Mr. Mill was a hard man to keep in order during the canvass, and offended some thinskinners Liberals by his letters in behalf of Bradlaugh and Odger."

[4.] In the provisional government set up after the revolution of 1868, most wanted a monarchy though some favoured a federal republic. In 1869 the Cortes voted for a monarchy with a liberal democratic constitution.

[5.] A number of candidates, from various royal families, refused the offer. Finally, the Duke of Aosta, son of the King of Italy, accepted; after encountering much opposition, however, he abdicated early in 1873.

[6.] General Juan Prim, Marquis de los Castillejos, Count de Reus (1814-1870), had organized insurrections in Spain while in exile in 1866; after the revolution he became marshal and president of the Council. He was assassinated in 1870.

[7.] Napoleon III after gaining the presidency in France in 1848 subsequently made himself emperor.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

Edward Lyulph Stanley, later 4th Baron Stanley of Alderley and 4th Baron Sheffield (1839-1925), at this time a barrister; later a member of the London School Board, 1876-85, 1888-1904.

[2.] No such association has been identified.

[3.] For further comments of JSM on Gladstone's policy in forming his government at this time, see Letter 1380, n. 4.

[4.] For such advice to George Howell, see Letter 1369.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Nicholson's of Dec. 22, 1868, also at Johns Hopkins, as secretary of the Liverpool Philomathic Society.

Nicholson has not been otherwise identified.

[2.] See Letter 1366.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letters 1045 and 1367.

[1.] MS draft in Helen Taylor's hand at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Rathbone's of Dec. 31, 1868, also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 1366.

[3.] Rathbone in his letter had said that the managers of the Philomathic Society were unanimous in wishing to hear JSM's views on "either Trade Societies, the land question, or the employment of charitable endowments. . . . The only thing to avoid was to make the dinner into a strictly party demonstration."

[4.] *England and Ireland* (London, 1868).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 177-78. In reply to O'Grady's of Jan. 9, also at Johns Hopkins.

Of the several contemporaries bearing this name, the most likely recipient of this letter was Standish O'Grady (1846-1928), Irish historian, author, and publicist; a native of Cork, son of a protestant rector, and an 1868 graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. Later, owner and editor of the *All-Ireland Review*.

[2.] O'Grady in his letter had asked JSM for substantiation of his statement in his *Logic* ("Of the Grounds of Disbelief," Book III, chap. xxv, sec. 2): "If we do not already believe in supernatural agencies, no miracle can prove to us their existence."

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Ann J. Robertson. She later published *Women's Need of Representation: a lecture upon the necessity of giving women the Parliamentary Franchise* (Dublin, 1873). Her recently published novel was *Society in a Garrison Town* (3 vols., London, 1869), unfavourably reviewed in the *Athenaeum*, Feb. 20, 1869, p. 273.

[3.] No such review by Plummer has been located.

[4.] For Dec. 8, 1866, p. 746.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Thornton's letter of Jan. 8 to which this is a reply. Published, without the deleted passage, in Elliot, II, 175-77. Labelled by Elliot as "Partly by Helen Taylor."

[2.] *On Labour* (London, 1869). For JSM's later review, see Letter 1405, n. 2.

[3.] JSM's edition of his father's *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind*. See Letters 1150, n. 6 and 1161.

[4.] The 7th and definitive edition, 1871.

At this point in the draft the following paragraph was deleted by JSM:

The composition of the Ministry is much what we would have expected from the composition of the Parliament. Gladstone has evidently interpreted the elections as indicating that the advanced section of Liberals is not strong in the electoral body & he has therefore given the lion's share to the backward section, bestowing only minor appointments on the radicals, or reputed radicals, with the exception of Bright, whose opinions do not place him in what is *now* the advanced party. Gladstone has perhaps something of the deference of a *novus homo* for the old nobility & he may very reasonably think that the advanced liberals will be content if anything considerable is done for their opinions, while the others must have office to obtain their consent to *any* measures of a radical complexion. I never felt more uncertainty about the immediate future of politics: but I do not doubt that after a few years, & perhaps even at the next general election, the working classes will feel & use their strength; though probably they will not use it fully until the obstacles have been removed to a junction of the Conservatives of both sides of the House against them. One's feelings of uncertainty are increased by the element of uncertainty as to what, in any change of political circumstances, Gladstone would do. One feels pretty confident that he would do what his conscience dictated, but it is impossible to foresee what, in new circumstances its dictates would be.

[5.] See Letters 139, n. 6 and n. 7, and 141.

[6.] The Duke of Argyll replaced Northcote as secretary of state for India in the new cabinet.

[7.] John Bright had declined the office of secretary of state for India, but accepted that of president of the Board of Trade.

[8.] Charles Mills and Elliot Macnaghten, who had been members of the Board of Directors of the East India Co., at the time of its dissolution in 1858 had been appointed to the Council of India.

[9.] Thornton had recently revisited JSM at Avignon. For Thornton's account of his 1862 visit there, see his letter to Fawcett, in Elliot, I, 261-62.

[10.] A word adapted from Bentham, who called his favourite indoor exercise, in a similar covered walk, "vibrating." See Bain, *James Mill*, p. 133, and Bowring's *Memoir of Jeremy Bentham*, in *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, published under the superintendence of his executor, John Bowring (11 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1838-43), XI, 81.

[11.] Another Benthamism. Cf. *Justice and Codification Petition*, in *Bentham Works*, V, 479.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Jones's letter of Jan. 6 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 178-79.

Edward Jones (1823-1908), headmaster of the Hibernian Schools, Liverpool; hon. secretary and chief promoter of the Liverpool Spelling Reform Association.

[2.] One of Jones's pamphlets on spelling reform, but not identified.

[3.] Apparently not until 1948-49 was a bill brought in to set up a committee to introduce a rational system of spelling with a view to making English a world language and eliminating unnecessary drudgery and waste of time at school.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 179-80. In reply to Villard's of Dec. 21, 1868, as Recording Secretary of the American Social Science Association, MS also at Johns Hopkins. Part of this letter was published in a memorial article on JSM by James M. Barnard in the Association's *Journal of Social Science*, V (1873), 136-39.

Henry Villard (1835-1900), journalist. Born in Germany as F. H. G. Hilgard, he changed his name after emigrating to America in 1853. During the Civil War he had been a war correspondent for the *New York Herald* and the *New York Tribune*. In later years he became a successful railway promoter.

[2.] JSM had been elected a corresponding member of the Association in 1865, and had provided it with a bibliography of the literature of political and social science.

[3.] The Association had offered to reimburse all his expenses while in America and to pay him \$300 for each lecture.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In JSM's hand though evidently dictated by Helen Taylor. In reply to Mrs. Kyllmann's of Jan. 22, 1869, also at LSE.

Mrs. Kyllmann had resigned from the Manchester branch of the Women's Suffrage Society because of differences with Jacob Bright and Lydia Becker. See Letter 1347.

[2.] Mrs. Peter Taylor.

[3.] See Letters 1367 and 1376.

[1.] MS not located. Copied into the Minutes of the Senate of St. Andrews University, Feb. 13, 1869. Published by Dr. Anna J. Mill in the *Scottish Historical Review*, XLIII (Oct., 1964), 144. The copy is introduced in the Minutes thus: "The following Letter was read from the late Rector Mr. Mill in reference to the Essays given in for the Rector's Prize during the present Session." The letter is followed by this note: "The Essay bearing the motto *quaere verum* was found to be the production of Mr. W. Horne Student of Philosophy in the 4th Year." The subject JSM had set for the

competition was “To explain and illustrate the principle of Inseparable Association and its applications to the theory of more complex mental operations.”

[2.] This was the third prize of £25 that JSM had awarded for essays on subjects assigned by him. The first had been “The Sources of Fallacious Thinking, and of Opinion insufficiently grounded in fact, which lie in the original Constitution of the Human Mind; and on any modes of fortifying the Mind against the tendencies thus arising.” The second topic had been “The Logical and Psychological Questions involved in the Controversy between Nominalism and Realism; and on any Remains of Realism in the Schools of the present day.” See *Rectorial Addresses Delivered at the University of St Andrews . . . 1863-1893*, ed. W. Knight (London, 1894).

[1.] MS at UCLA. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Watson’s letter of Jan. 14 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 180-81.

Hewett Cottrell Watson (1804-1881), botanist, author of numerous works in his field.

[2.] The first part of Watson’s *A Compendium of the Cybele Britannica; or British Plants in their geographical relations* (London, 1870). The *Compendium* was printed in three successive parts (1868, 1869, 1870), and distributed free to all those Watson could find who owned his earlier work, *Cybele Britannica* (4 vols., London, 1847-59). After 1870 the *Compendium*, which superseded *Cybele*, was sold in the usual way. Both Watson and JSM were contributors to the botanical journal, *The Phytologist*.

[3.] In *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (London, 1859), Darwin, in his first edition, acknowledged his “deep obligation” to Watson, and in later editions devoted space to his criticisms. Watson discusses Darwin’s theory in the Introduction to the *Compendium*.

[4.] Introduction to *Compendium*, p. 56. See also Letter 1395.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 181-82. In reply to Logan’s of Jan. 23, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

Logan, who lived in Liverpool, has not been identified.

[1.] MS copy at Northwestern.

[2.] Francis E. Abbot, “Philosophical Biology,” *No. Am. Rev.*, CVII (Oct., 1868), 377-422. Spencer’s reply was not published by the Review. See Duncan, I, 189-91.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, in reply to Beal’s of Feb. 2, MS also at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 182-84.

[2.] Beal had been largely responsible for the drawing up of a measure introduced by JSM in the House of Commons on May 21, 1867, to establish separate municipal corporations in the several districts of London. From 1870 Beal was hon. secretary of the Metropolitan Municipal Association; he worked unceasingly for years to reorganize the government of London. His efforts finally succeeded in 1888 with the

establishment of the London County Council. See J. F. B. Firth, *The Reform of London Government* (London, 1888). See also Letter 1342, n. 4.

[3.] Letter 1361.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Leslie's letter of Jan. 17 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliott, II, 186-87.

[2.] "Changes in Prices," *Economist*, XXVII (Jan. 23, 1869), 90-91, the first of a series of four; the others appeared in the numbers for Feb. 13 (pp. 177-79), March 27 (pp. 355-56), and June 12 (pp. 688-90).

[3.] "A Visit to La Creuse, 1868," *Fraser's*, LXXIX (Feb., 1869), 245-52. Reprinted in Leslie's *Land Systems and Industrial Economy in Ireland, England, and Continental Countries* (London, 1870), pp. 265-82. JSM reviewed Leslie's volume of essays in *FR*, n.s. VII (June, 1870), 641-54; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 86-110, Am. ed. V, 95-121, and in *Collected Works*, V, 669-85.

[4.] Including "Westphalia and the Ruhr Basin," *FR*, n.s. V (March, 1869), 253-65, also reprinted in *Land Systems*, pp. 230-53.

[5.] *Traité de la procédure criminelle en Angleterre, en Écosse et dans l'Amérique du Nord*, a translation by A. Chauffard (Paris, 1868) of the first volume of Karl Joseph Anton Mittermaier, *Erfahrungen über die Wirksamkeit der Schwurgerichte in Europa . . .* (3 vols., Erlangen, 1864, 1865). At JSM's request Leslie reviewed Chauffard's translation in *FR*, n.s. V (June, 1869), 750-52.

[6.] JSM, it will be remembered, had edited Bentham's *Rationale of Judicial Evidence* (5 vols., London, 1827).

[7.] In Book III, "Of Induction." Bain had contributed examples to the 1st edition (1843) and to later editions.

[8.] The 8th and final ed. (1872) in JSM's lifetime, in the Preface to which JSM says (pp. x and xi), "The additions and corrections in the present edition, which are not very considerable, are chiefly such as have been suggested by Professor Bain's *Logic* [London, 1870], a book of great merit and value." For a list of places where JSM cites Bain's *Logic*, see Letter 1554, n. 4.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 185. In reply to letter of Feb. 1, also at Johns Hopkins, from Josiah Sherman, chairman, and J. P. McDowell, secretary, of an Amnesty Committee for Political Prisoners, inviting JSM to a meeting of the Committee and asking his opinion on a proposed address.

[2.] The meeting had been scheduled for Feb. 4, 1869, at the Essex Hotel, Bouverie St., London.

[3.] See Letter 1162, n. 3.

[4.] The Fenians attempted unsuccessfully an invasion of Canada in June, 1866.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, with omissions, in Elliot, II, 187-90.

Charles, later Sir Charles, Wentworth Dilke, 2nd baronet (1843-1911), liberal politician, son of Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke (1810-1869), and grandson of Charles Wentworth Dilke (1789-1864), proprietor and editor of the *Athenaeum*. Elected MP for Chelsea in 1868, a seat which he held until 1886, Dilke became one of the acknowledged leaders of the radical wing of the Liberal party. JSM's correspondence with him, which begins with this letter, led to a close association between the two. For Dilke's account of the relation, see Dilke, 629-41.

[2.] *Greater Britain: a Record of Travel in English-speaking countries during 1866 and 1867* (2 vols., London, 1868).

[3.] See Letter 1371.

[4.] Richard Southwell Bourke Mayo, 6th Earl of Mayo, who succeeded Sir John Laurence.

[5.] Incidents recorded in *Greater Britain*, II, pp. 194 and 331.

[6.] The chapter entitled "Government of Dependencies by a Free State."

[7.] *Greater Britain*, II, p. 320.

[8.] See Letter 998, n. 6.

[9.] In 1857.

[10.] Powerful, aggressive Indian rulers of the seventeenth century, notorious for raids and usurpations.

[11.] An eighteenth-century invader of Bengal and usurper of Mysore.

[12.] *Greater Britain*, II, p. 307.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The article was probably the one on "National Duty," which appeared in a revived "Independent Section" of the next *WR*, n.s. XXXV (April, 1869), 484-502.

[3.] The article on "National Duty" contains no mention of the French system of relief of the poor, though it does discuss the general question. Perhaps JSM's strictures here led to the omission of the discussion of French relief.

[4.] George Peabody, the American philanthropist.

[5.] Charles Loring Brace.

[6.] See Letter 1150, n. 6.

[7.] JSM's edition of his father's *Analysis* was reviewed in *WR*, n.s. XXXVI (July, 1869), 148-79.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Dilke's letter of Feb. 13 (MS at Johns Hopkins) thanking JSM for his letter of Feb. 9 (Letter 1391).

[2.] Tocqueville had died in 1859. Dilke had inquired as to "the present custodian of the MS of his 'Souvenirs' and of his notes for his English-in-India."

[3.] Probably a mistake for Jean Charles Rivet (1800-1872), statesman, and a close friend of Tocqueville.

[4.] *Œuvres complètes de Tocqueville*, ed. H. G. de Beaumont (9 vols., Paris, 1860-65).

[5.] Michel Lévy (1821-1875), founder of the Paris publishing firm Michel Lévy frères.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *Life of Frances Power Cobbe as Told by Herself*, Posthumous Edition (London, 1904), p. 457.

[2.] G. P. Putnam and Son, publisher of *Putnam's Magazine* from 1853.

[3.] Miss Cobbe contributed an article, "The Defects of Women, and How to Remedy Them," to *Putnam's*, n.s. IV (Aug., 1869), 226-33.

[4.] Isabella Beecher Hooker (1822-1907), American reformer, prominent in the women's rights movement.

[5.] Harriet Elizabeth Beecher Stowe (1811-1896), writer and humanitarian, best known as the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

[6.] Henry Ward Beecher (1813-1887), prominent American clergyman.

[7.] "From a Mother to her Daughter" (on women's suffrage), *Putnam's*, XII (Nov. and Dec., 1868), 603-606 and 701-711.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Watson's letter of Feb. 6. See Letter 1385.

[2.] Watson had written: "*Advergence* would better express my idea than does *Convergence*; but it is a form not in use, & so avoided. I am strongly imbued with the notion that here is the real counterpoise, at once to limit and to complete the Darwinian theory. It would seem that your own leaning is also that way; which could hardly be unless you had already felt a want of completeness & a want of check or

counterbalance in the theory, as it is put forth by Darwin, & is blindly belauded by Converted Zealots of the weathercock type like Dr. Hooker.”

[3.] Watson: “Fully I concur with you in not thinking it an objection ‘against Darwin’s theory,’ that it does not even hypothetically resolve the question of the first origin of life. My objection against it is just the other way; namely that he has made an origin in one or two types a part of the theory, without a tittle of evidence in support thereof;—& that he has adopted a misleading title, in pretending to account for the *origin* of species *by means of* natural selection. Read his title with the change of the one fatal word, as ‘The *Formation* of Species by means of’ etc. This is the real thing. *New* species are formed out of *older* species by the natural agency. But Darwin wanted an ad captandum book-title; & I doubt whether the falseness of the one selected was clearly known by him.”

[4.] *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication* (2 vols., London, 1868).

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood.

[2.] Odger’s letter has not been located.

[3.] Robert Hartwell (d. 1875), a London printer and a former Chartist who was closely associated with the left wing of the labour movement. He edited the *Beehive* for much of the 1860’s. Secretary of the London Working Men’s Association, he was one of the chief promoters of the movement for working class representation in Parliament. He had had to withdraw his candidacy for Stoke-on-Trent in 1868 for lack of funds.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in A. S. G. Butler, *Portrait of Josephine Butler* (London, 1954), p. 62.

Josephine Butler, née Grey (1828-1906), feminist, especially known for her long fight against the Contagious Diseases Acts. For JSM’s views, see Letter 1513.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. The correspondent is not named in the draft.

[2.] See Letters 1355 and 1356.

[3.] See Letter 1364.

[4.] The book was published in the week of May 24, 1869.

[5.] The following Letter.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Enclosed with the preceding undated letter.

[2.] See Letter 1364.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *New York Times*, April 10, 1869, from the *Toronto Globe*, with a letter from Laidlaw dated April 1, 1869. Laidlaw advocated the expansion of Canadian railroads with a view to developing a system of emigration that would bring a larger proportion of British emigrants to Canada.

George Laidlaw (*ca.* 1828-1889), native of Scotland, promoter and builder of Canadian railroads.

[2.] George Joachim Goschen, later 1st Viscount Goschen (1831-1907), statesman: MP for City of London (1863-79), for Ripon (1880-84), for East Edinburgh (1885-86); member, Board of Trade, 1865; president of Poor Law Board, 1868-71; First Lord of the Admiralty, 1871.

[3.] See *Hansard*, vol. CXCIV, col. 627; see also: Debate in the Lords on Pauperism and Emigration, and the restrictions presently placed on financial assistance by the Poor Law Board, *Hansard*, vol. CXCIV, cols. 943-71.

[1.] MS at the Imperial College of Science, London. In reply to Huxley's of March 7, MS at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Huxley had requested JSM's support for a "Sunday Lecture Society," which Huxley was helping to form. Huxley reported that the next step would be to establish secular Sunday schools.

[1.] MS not located. Letter "recently received by a gentleman in this City." Published in the *New York Times*, April 3, 1869.

[2.] See Letter 139, n. 6 and n. 7.

[3.] Thomas Allen Jenckes (1818-1875), American jurist and legislator, in 1865 had introduced a bill in Congress for the selection of government employees by competitive examinations. The bill was framed after a close study of the English system and after an extended correspondence with Sir Charles Trevelyan and Sir Stafford Northcote. When this bill was defeated, Jenckes obtained the appointment of a committee on civil service which he headed; another bill was presented to the House in 1868, but again was defeated.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1364.

[3.] Prescott, Grote, Cave, and Cave, bankers.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[2.] See Letter 1384.

[1.] MS in the Library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

[2.] Probably Letter 1186A rather than Letter 1208A.

[1.] MS not located. Printed copy at LSE. Reeve's reply of March 17 is at LSE. In a letter of March 28, 1898, MS at LSE, Professor J. K. Laughton requested permission of Helen Taylor to include three letters of JSM to Henry Reeve in the *Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve* (2 vols., London, 1898), and enclosed printed copies of the three: March 16, 18, and 22 [1869]. Helen Taylor in a letter of April 26, 1898, MS draft at LSE, refused to grant permission to publish the letters.

[2.] William Thomas Thornton, *On Labour* (London, 1869). JSM eventually rejected stipulations about the proposed review and withdrew his offer (see Letters 1407 and 1412). Instead, his review of Thornton, in which he made his famous reversal on the Wages-Fund Theory, appeared in *FR*, n.s. V (May and June, 1869), 505-18 and 680-700; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 25-85, Am. ed. V, 28-94, and in *Collected Works*, V, 633-68.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood.

[2.] The plan was to present petitions from time to time, not to present them all on one occasion (see Letter 1416).

[1.] MS not located. Printed copy at LSE. In reply to Reeve's of March 17, MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1405.

[3.] On p. 258. The reference is to "Trades' Unions," *ER*, CXXVI (Oct., 1867), 415-57, by George K. Rickards (1812-1889), barrister and political economist (identified in the *Wellesley Index*), counsel to the speaker of the House of Commons, 1851-82. Reeve in his letter of March 17 endorsed the views in Rickards's article. Later in 1869, after JSM's decision not to review Thornton in *ER* (see Letter 1412), Rickards wrote "Thornton on Labour," *ER*, CXXX (Oct., 1869), 390-417.

[4.] Rickards in his review of Thornton included the *Eleventh and Final Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Organisation and Rules of Trades' Unions and other Associations* (London, 1869).

[5.] See the leader in the *Daily News*, March 18, 1869, p. 4.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 190-92. In reply to Villari's of March 12, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] The death of Villari's mother in Jan., 1868.

[3.] *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind*.

[4.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Fawcett's of March 21 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 192-93.

[2.] Fawcett had written: "I am very anxious to know what you think of Mr Gladstone's scheme for the appropriation of the Revenues of the Irish Church. I have rather a strong opinion that too much is given to the landlords; the tithes are offered to them on most favourable terms, & a great portion of the £200,000 per annum given to the County Cess [rates] must ultimately go into their pockets. Do you think it would be advisable when the Bill is in Committee to make an attempt to get something for Irish education? £60,000 a year, might, with great advantage, be given to the Queen's Colleges, & a considerable sum might, most beneficially, be devoted to the establishment of secondary schools. . . ."

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 193-95.

Alfred Hyman Louis (1829-1915), barrister and author. Son of a Jewish merchant of Birmingham, he attended Trinity College, Cambridge, but, like the rest of his Jewish contemporaries, could not be graduated. After studies at Lincoln's Inn, he was called to the Bar in 1855. Author of a work on foreign policy, *England and Europe: a discussion of national policy* (London, 1861), which aroused Gladstone's wrath. He later spent a number of years in the United States, at various periods. For a sketch of his life, see W. Denham Sutcliffe, "The Original of [E.A.] Robinson's 'Captain Craig,'" *New England Quarterly*, XVI (1943), 407-31.

[2.] Guizot had been a member of the Academy since 1836.

[3.] Thiers, like Guizot, was elected to the Academy in 1836.

[4.] Victor Cousin (1792-1867), philosopher and educational reformer; minister of public instruction, 1840-48; elected to the Academy in 1840.

[5.] JSM had been elected as a corresponding member in 1860 (see Letter 1243, n. 2).

[6.] Emile Littré was rejected for membership in 1863, but was elected in 1871. His great work was his *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (4 vols., Paris, 1863-69).

[7.] Then still under negotiation, they were finally settled by treaty in May, 1871.

[8.] "Red Letter Day" (literally: a day to be marked on the white tablet [of the Pontifex]).

[9.] The Commons Preservation Society. See Letter 909.

[1.] MS not located. Printed copy at LSE. In reply to Reeve's of March 19, MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1407.

[3.] See Letter 1405, n. 2.

[1.] MS not located. Copy in typescript of the unpublished second volume of Heinrich Gomperz's biography of Theodor Gomperz. Vols. II and III, in carbon typescript, are at Harvard.

[2.] Of JSM's works.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Wilfrid Ward, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*, p. 299. In reply to W. G. Ward's letter of March 24 (published in Ward, pp. 298-99), inviting him to join the projected Metaphysical Society.

[2.] The plan of the Metaphysical Society was first conceived by James, later Sir James Knowles (1831-1908), Charles Pritchard (1808-1893), and Alfred Tennyson in Nov., 1868; the aim was "to bring together all shades of religious and theological opinion, from the Roman Catholic to the Unitarian, in an effort to counteract scientific materialism and unite warring theological factions as much as possible in a common cause." Alan Willard Brown, *The Metaphysical Society* (New York, 1947), p. 21.

[3.] Ward (*William George Ward*, p. 298) had written: "Certain Theists, who feel very strongly what they consider the evils more and more impending from such views as you, Mr. Bain, and others so ably advocate, are extremely desirous of promoting direct and personal discussion on the subject. They are of opinion, rightly or wrongly, that those on your side do not duly weigh what is said on ours, and that good of various kinds would ensue from a closer personal *rapprochement*."

[1.] MS at Cornell.

Edward, later Sir Edward Fithian (1845-1936), secretary to the Commons Preservation Society; later a barrister.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood.

[2.] See Letter 1406.

[3.] George Melly.

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of the Hon. Isaac Foot. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 195-97. In reply to Amberley's of March 23, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Amberley had also been defeated for Parliament in 1868.

[3.] Amberley wrote that he had begun reading Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*.

[4.] See Letter 826.

[5.] Such as the works of Livy, Horace, Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus, and Ovid.

[6.] The title given to Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (63 - 14), first of the Roman emperors.

[7.] Thomas Arnold, "Caius Octavius Caesar Augustus," *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, X (London, 1845), 295-336.

[8.] Jean Jacques Antoine Ampère, *L'Empire Romain à Rome* (2 vols., Paris, 1867).

[9.] The bill had its second reading in the Commons on March 15, 1869, and had been referred to a Select Committee. The bill was finally passed in 1870.

[10.] For William E. Forster's speech on March 15, see *Hansard*, CXCIV, cols. 1356-82.

[11.] This commission had been appointed in Dec., 1864, to inquire into schools not being investigated by the Popular Education Commission or the Public Schools Commission.

[12.] Frederick Temple (1821-1902), headmaster of Rugby, later Archbishop of Canterbury.

[13.] Thomas Dyke Acland. See Letter 1341.

[14.] The Amberleys did visit JSM at Avignon in the fall of 1869 on their way to Italy.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] JSM's edition of his father's book had appeared in March.

[3.] See Letter 1405, n. 2.

[4.] Particularly Thornton's *Over Population, and its remedy; or an enquiry into the extent and causes of the distress prevailing among the Labouring Classes . . .* (London, 1846).

[5.] "New Political Economy," *Sp.*, XLII (March 27, 1869), 393-94.

[6.] In an unheaded leader, *Daily News*, April 2, 1869, pp. 4-5, presumably by Frank Harrison Hill, the editor.

[7.] Gladstone had first proposed his bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church on March 1; the bill provided that the property of the Church of Ireland "should be held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any Church or clergy . . . nor for the teaching of religion." Some of the appropriated revenue was to be used to reduce the county "cess" (rates) levied in support of the poor. The bill passed its second reading on March 23 but was not finally adopted until July 22 and then in a very modified form, omitting disendowment.

[8.] Cf. Letter 1410.

[9.] *Sic.* William Johnston (1829-1902), a leader among the Irish Protestant or “Orange” politicians, MP for Belfast; his motion dealt with the “Act to restrain Party Processions in Ireland.”

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] Presumably, John MacLean, *Protection and Free Trade* (Montreal, 1867). For a summary of the pamphlet, see Orville J. McDiarmid, *Commercial Policy in the Canadian Economy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), p. 156.

[3.] Charles Dilke, *Greater Britain*, II, chap. vi, “Protection,” pp. 59-70.

[4.] See Letter 728, n. 4. Carey, though basically an advocate of free trade, was convinced that it could be achieved only after a period of protection. For his views see his *Principles of Social Science*, II, pp. 437-38, and III, pp. 409-44.

[5.] David Ames Wells, the American economist. See Letter 1140.

[6.] Joshua Leavitt (1794-1873), American reformer, lawyer, editor of the *New York Independent*, 1848-73. In 1869 he received the gold medal of the Cobden Club for his *An essay on the best way of developing improved political and commercial relations between Great Britain and the United States* (London, 1869).

[1.] MS and MS draft at NLS. In reply to Carlyle’s of March 16, apparently the last he ever wrote to JSM, published in A. Carlyle, pp. 186-87.

[2.] *Memoirs illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Evelyn, comprising his Diary from the year 1641 to 1705-6 . . .* ed. W. Bray (2 vols., London, 1818). The two volumes, which Carlyle thought had belonged to James Mill, may have been borrowed during the years Carlyle was working on his book on Cromwell (1845).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Fitch’s letter of April 10, also at Johns Hopkins, commenting on JSM’s article “Endowments,” *FR*, n.s. V (April, 1869), 377-90, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 1-24, Am. ed., V, 1-27, and in *Collected Works*, V, 615-29.

Joshua, later Sir Joshua Girling Fitch (1824-1903), inspector of schools and educational writer.

[2.] No such letter appears to have been published.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Transcription provided by Professor George Iggers.

[2.] L’Association pour l’encouragement des études grecques. See Letter 1109.

[3.] “L’Association pour l’encouragement des études grecques en France, et le peuple Grec,” *Le Temps*, Jan. 7, 1869, pp. 1-2; and “Voltaire et la question Grecque en 1770,” *ibid.*, March 20, 1869, p. 3. The latter is reprinted in Gustave d’Eichthal, *La Langue Grecque. Mémoires et Notices, 1864-1884 . . .* (Paris, 1887), pp. 321-31.

[4.] One of several insurrections staged by nationalist Greek inhabitants of Crete against Turkish rule, this did not receive support from the King of Greece, and it was crushed early in 1869. A conference at Paris in Jan., 1869, of the foreign powers (France, England, and Russia) then running the affairs of Greece, imposed a settlement of the Turkish dispute on Greece but took no steps on behalf of the Cretans.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of April 13, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] See Letter 1418, n. 7. Cairnes in his letter of April 13 had remarked: "I fully admit the force of what you have urged on the subject of the Irish Church bill; and, if the application of the funds to education would necessitate an immediate dealing with the education question, I acknowledge the consideration would be decisive. But this is what I do not see. As at present enlightened, it appears to me that the settlement of the Church question might have been kept distinct from the disposal of the property, which might have been temporarily invested pending the time when Parliament should have made up its mind on the principle on which Irish educational institutions should be remodeled. . . . During this time the fund might be made useful to facilitate the settlement of the land question by affording advances on easy terms to tenants desirous of purchasing their farms."

[1.] MS not located. Published in *The Revolution*, III and IV (May 13, 1869), 293.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902), American reformer and leader in the women's rights movement; wife of Henry Brewster Stanton, abolitionist; organizer with Lucretia Mott of a women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, N.Y., in 1848; from 1851 associated with Susan B. Anthony.

[2.] An Anniversary of the American Equal Rights Association, held at Steinway Hall, New York, on May 12 and 13, 1869. Mrs. Stanton was first vice-president of the Association. At the close of the Anniversary, the National Woman's Suffrage Association was founded, and Mrs. Stanton was elected president, an office she held until 1890.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] A Life Peerages Bill, presented by Earl Russell on April 4, 1869, proposed "that the number of life Peers should not, at any one time, exceed twenty-eight . . . [and] that not more than four should be created in any one year" (*Hansard*, CXCIV, cols. 452-61). The Bill had its second reading on April 27, 1869, and was committed to a Committee of the Whole House for May 11.

[3.] Chap. xiii, "Of a Second Chamber." JSM proposed an adaptation of Hare's plan, providing for proportional representation of the peers in a second chamber, but in general JSM opposed a second chamber of the traditional sort.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Lalande's letters of April 15 and 16 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 197-98.

François Louis Marie Armand Lalande (1820-1894), politician and business man; later the author of *L'Angleterre, l'agriculture anglaise et le libre-échange* (Paris, 1885).

[2.] Robert Lowe, who had been appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer in Gladstone's cabinet in Dec., 1868, in his first budget message of April 8, 1869, proposed abolishing the remaining corn duty of one shilling the quarter.

[3.] In 1846. JSM had written against the laws as early as 1825; see "The Corn Laws," *WR*, III (April, 1825), 394-420.

[4.] Whether it was ever published is not known. Three years later Lalande was the co-author (with A. Léon and Marc Maurel) of *Lettre en faveur du maintien du traité de commerce avec l'Angleterre* (Bordeaux, 1872).

[1.] MS at Arsenal.

[2.] Probably Georges rather than Eugène d'Eichthal. See Letter 1055, n. 5.

[3.] Thomas Bazley.

[4.] Thomas Bayley Potter.

[5.] The election of 1869 in France was scheduled for May 23. In the event, the liberal opposition increased its strength: the Government received four and a half million votes, the Opposition three and a half million; the Government retained two hundred seats in the Assembly, but the Opposition, with 92 seats, tripled the number it had won in 1863.

[6.] *De la Prononciation nationale du grec et de son introduction dans l'enseignement classique* (Paris, 1869).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to letter of Francis from Queensland, dated Feb. 14, 1869, also at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 200-202.

Francis has not been further identified.

[2.] Letter 1266.

[3.] The countryside was amply supplied with irrigation reservoirs, called "tanks" though they ranged from village ponds to lakes fifteen miles long. Most were of native construction, improved and enlarged under the British.

[4.] The Electric Telegraph Bill, introduced in Parliament on April 1, 1868, by Disraeli as Chancellor of the Exchequer, authorized the Postmaster General to

acquire, maintain, and operate the telegraph system. The Bill was finally adopted in July, 1868.

[5.] See Letter 262.

[6.] The importation and exploitation of Polynesian labourers, extensively carried on in Queensland, eventually had to be controlled by government legislation.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Leslie's letters of May 2 and 3 to which this is a reply. First paragraph published in Elliot, II, 199-200.

[2.] Leslie in his letter of May 2 had complained of J. A. Froude's editorial interference in articles written for *Fraser's*.

[3.] See Letter 1389.

[4.] John Morley, editor of *FR*, had postponed to the June number Leslie's article on Chauffard's translation of Mittermaier (see Letter 1389).

[5.] Stephen had been elected to the Political Economy Club in 1862.

[6.] Not located.

[7.] In Political Economy to the University of London for a five-year term.

[8.] On July 2, 1869, Leslie presented to the Political Economy Club the question, "Is the doctrine of the equality of the Rate of Profits well founded?"

[9.] "The Franco-Belgian Incident," signed Emile de Laveleye, *Economist*, XXVII (April 17 and 24, 1869), 442-43, and 471.

[10.] Leslie had reported that de Laveleye was going to those countries and would no doubt write about them in a review.

[11.] U.S. Senator Charles Sumner in the Senate debate on April 13, 1869, attacked the proposed treaty to settle the Alabama Claims. The treaty was rejected. Sumner's speech was reported in *The Times*, April 29, 1869, and discussed in a leader, May 3, 1869, p. 8.

[12.] Reverdy Johnson (1796-1876), American constitutional lawyer and diplomat: successor to Charles Francis Adams as Minister to England, 1868-69. Johnson had been accused of resorting to sawder ("flattery") and of being pro-British.

[13.] Frederick Temple Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, 1st Marquis Dufferin and Ava (1826-1902), diplomatist; under-secretary for India, 1864-66; under-secretary for war, 1866-68; governor-general of Canada, 1872-78; ambassador to Russia, 1879, and to Turkey, 1881. Between 1868 and 1881 he wrote much on behalf of Irish landlordism, in opposition to JSM's views.

In his letter of May 3, Leslie wrote that Lord Dufferin had requested him to ask JSM for a presentation copy of *England and Ireland*, to be inscribed "Lord Dufferin from J.S.Mill."

[1.] MS in 1964 in the possession of Professor Iring Fetscher of the University of Frankfurt-am-Main.

[2.] The Bankruptcy Bill was adopted in Aug., 1869.

[3.] Graham was an official assignee in bankruptcy court.

[4.] One of JSM's closest friends in youth, Graham had once planned with JSM a work on political economy (see *Earlier Letters*, p. 79).

[5.] In 1829. Sun Court adjoined the Grote banking house in Threadneedle St.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Thomas S. Cree, *Criticism of the Theory of Trades Unions* (2nd ed., Glasgow, 1891), p. 38. Cree's pamphlet was originally written as a paper read on Nov. 12, 1890, before the Economic Section of the Philosophical Society of Glasgow; in the main it is concerned with refuting JSM's two articles on Thornton's *On Labour* (see Letter 1405).

Thomas Cree was also the author of *Evils of Collective Bargaining in Trades' Unions* (Glasgow, 1898) and of *Business Men and Modern Economics* (Glasgow, 1903).

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Published, except for postscript, in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 215-16.

[2.] See Letter 1427, n. 6.

[3.] See *ibid.*, n. 5.

[4.] The remaining lines after this are not in JSM's hand.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Taylor's letter of May 14 to which this is a reply.

[2.] The Jamaica Committee had voted to award £200 to Frederick W. Chesson in recognition of his services as hon. secretary to the Committee.

[3.] The case concerned one Alexander Phillips who, it was charged, had been illegally arrested on orders by Governor Eyre in Jamaica in 1865 and flogged without trial. The case had been dismissed by Mr. Justice Blackburn, but now an effort was being made to press it again.

[4.] Daniel O'Sullivan, mayor of Cork and a Fenian supporter, was the target of a bill introduced on May 5, 1869, by the Attorney General for Ireland. It was proposed to disable O'Sullivan from holding any office in Ireland because of his seditious language and activities. The second reading of the bill was deferred to June 8, and

was then withdrawn. See *Hansard*, CXCVI, cols. 185-244, 575-84. JSM in Letter 1437 reports that the bill has been dropped even earlier.

[1.] MS in Bodleian. The MS does not bear the recipient's name. The first sentence of the letter is reproduced in Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner, *Charles Bradlaugh: A Record of his Life and Work* (2 vols., London, 1894), I, 149.

[2.] Beginning in the spring of 1868 the Government had been seeking to suppress Bradlaugh's *The National Reformer* under the Act of 60 Geo. III, cap. 69 which had been enacted in 1819 to eliminate cheap democratic and freethought publications. Bradlaugh's resistance to prosecution aroused liberal opinion, and a bill introduced in the Commons on April 22, 1869, by A. S. Ayrton to repeal the Act was adopted on April 26 and in the House of Lords on June 21. For a detailed account of the matter see chap. xiv, "The 'National Reformer' and its Government Prosecutions" in Hypatia Bonner, *Charles Bradlaugh*, I, 137-51. See also Letter 1293.

[3.] Probably the petitions for women's suffrage (see Letter 1406).

[4.] Presumably Helen.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 202-203. See Letter 1426.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. See Letters 1433 and 1437.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Taylor's letter of May 25 to which this is a reply. Partly published in Elliot, II, 203-204.

[2.] The preceding Letter.

[3.] See Letter 1433, n. 4.

[4.] Cf. *The Politics of Aristotle*, trans. B. Jowett (2 vols., Oxford, 1885), I, 99-102.

[5.] Taylor had written: "It seems to me that one of the blessings of a really popular [democratic] Government is that, as in Lincoln's case, it can afford to step over paper Constitutions when need arises." As JSM replies, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation as a war measure necessary to suppress the rebellion.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] Blanc's series of "Lettres de Londres."

[3.] Victor Henri Rochefort (1830-1913), French writer and politician, was elected *député*, 1869.

[4.] This invitation had to be cancelled because of JSM's illness. See Letter 1456.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 204-205. In reply to Cazelles's of May 18, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Paris, 1869.

[3.] Pierre Lanfrey (1828-1877), writer and politician; frequent contributor to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*; his major work was his *Histoire de Napoléon 1er* (5 vols., Paris, 1867-75).

[4.] “The Enfranchisement of Women,” see Letter 28.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Published in part in *D’Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 217-18.

[2.] [Sir Richard Davies Hanson], *The Jesus of History* (London, Hertford, 1869).

[3.] *Les Evangiles* (2 vols., Paris, 1863).

[4.] JSM was mistaken; the author of *The Elements of Social Science, or physical, sexual, and natural religion*, first published in London in 1854, was Dr. George R. Drysdale (1825-1904). It was republished in many large editions, always anonymously (until the 35th edition [1905], which the British Museum Catalogue lists under the name of the author). It also sold widely in German and French translations. D’Eichthal probably had referred to the French translation which appeared in 1869, from the seventh edition (London, 1867).

Charles Robert Drysdale (1829-1907), the brother of George Drysdale, was also a physician; he wrote on medical topics, social aspects of prostitution, and the population question, including an essay on *The population question according to T. R. Malthus and J. S. Mill* (London, 1892).

[5.] See Letter 1427, n. 5.

[6.] Lazare Hippolyte Carnot.

[7.] Pierre Emile Levasseur, *Cours d’économie rurale, industrielle et commerciale . . .* (Paris, 1868).

[8.] JSM had perhaps used the title in letters of introduction he had written for d’Eichthal’s son (see Letter 1427).

[1.] MS not located. Published in Frederic Harrison, *Autobiographic Memoirs* (2 vols., London, 1911), I, 301-302. The bracketed portion is Harrison’s introduction to the excerpt.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Cazelles’s of June 3, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 1439.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, with one omission, in Elliot, II, 206-207. In reply to Bain’s of May 28, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] John Veitch (1829-1894), man of letters, from 1864 professor of logic and rhetoric at the University of Glasgow. He had just published his *Memoir of Sir William Hamilton, Bart.* (Edinburgh and London, 1869).

[3.] See JSM, *Hamilton*, 4th ed. (London, 1872), xi: "As regards Sir W. Hamilton's interpretation of Aristotle, Professor Veitch has convicted me of a mistake in treating a citation made by his editors as if it had been made by himself. . . . I have corrected [this error], and it will be found that [it] did not affect anything of importance in the criticism then made upon Sir W. Hamilton." The correction occurs at 648n-649n. See also Veitch, *Hamilton*, p. 446.

[4.] *Activity, operation.* It is used in Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachia*, 1098b 33 ff.

[5.] Bain had said: "The general impression of Hamilton, with all the laboured attempt to make him an interesting character, is not favourable."

[6.] Chap. xi, "Belief."

[7.] Cairnes's objections in his letter of May 23, 1869 (MS copy at LSE) were directed chiefly against some of Bain's notes on the subject.

[8.] *The Subjection of Women.*

[9.] An education bill for Scotland did not pass until 1872.

[10.] The Lords in July finally agreed to a reluctant compromise on the Irish Church Bill.

[1.] MS at Indiana.

[2.] Presumably relating to financial support for the *WR*.

[3.] See Letter 1144.

[1.] MS draft and MS copy at Northwestern. In reply to Spencer's of June 9, MS at Northwestern, partly published in Duncan, I, 183.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women.*

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women.*

[1.] MS not located. From the typescript of Gomperz, II, not published, now at Harvard. See letter 1413, n. 1.

[2.] Probably the Dr. Richard Nathan Heinemann listed in the Post Office Directory for 1871 as professor of languages, and military and civil service tutor. No such

translation seems to have appeared. The first German translation was by Jenny Hirsch, *Die Hörigkeit der Frau* (Berlin, 1869).

[3.] The collected edition of JSM's works.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Cairnes's of May 23, MS copy also at LSE. Excerpt published in *Economica*, n.s. X (Nov., 1943), 284-85, and in Elliot, II, 207-208.

[2.] See Letter 1405, n. 2.

[3.] See Letter 1443.

[4.] Possibly on the question of women's suffrage.

[5.] In the following year Cairnes moved to Blackheath.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1444.

[1.] MS at Harvard. Published in Mass. Hist. Soc. *Proceedings*, L (1916-17), pp. 23-24.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] The bill passed in the Commons on June 11, in the Lords on July 22, 1869.

[4.] The bill passed in the Commons on July 21, but was given only two readings in the Lords before the session ended. It was adopted, however, in the following session.

[5.] Norton had left England before the end of May, and was established in Lausanne with his family.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to Mrs. Huth's of June 23 [1869] to Helen Taylor, also at Yale. The draft is in JSM's hand; it may have been dictated by Helen.

[2.] See Letter 1250.

[1.] MS copy at Northwestern.

[1.] MS at King's.

[2.] These may have been rights inherited under the will of James Mill, of which JSM was administrator.

[1.] MS copy at Northwestern. First paragraph published in Spencer's *Autobiography*, II, 249.

[2.] See Letter 1452.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Presumably Jane Dalzell Finlay Hill (d. 1904), wife of Frank Harrison Hill, editor of the *Daily News*. Mrs. Hill had recently reviewed JSM's *The Subjection of Women* in *SR*, XXVII (June 19, 1869), 811-13.

[1.] MS at Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2.] Helen Taylor's letter of July 1, 1869, advising Blanc of JSM's delay in returning to England because of a sudden illness, is also at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

[1.] MS in the possession of Professor John M. Robson.

[2.] *Eleven Reports of the Royal Commission on the Organization and Rules of Trades Unions and other Associations; Evidence and Appendices*. 12 parts (P. S. King & Son, Westminster, 1867-69).

[1.] MS at Somerville. Published in Martha Somerville, *Personal Recollections, from early life to old age, of Mary Somerville. With selections from her correspondence* (London, 1873), p. 345.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] See Letters 1214 and 1231.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 209-10. In reply to Bain's of July 10, also at Yale.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] Bain had written that his first impression was "that the premises contended for as to women's aptitudes are larger than the conclusion required. It is obvious that there are two stages in the adjustment of the problem of women: the first is political and points merely to the removal of restrictions; the second is private, referring to the exercise of individual discretion in embarking upon the wide sea of occupations, wherein men have hitherto had the monopoly." Bain was especially concerned about the problem of women's education for the higher professions, particularly medicine.

[4.] See Letter 1450, n. 3.

[5.] See *ibid.*, n. 4.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] Rae subsequently published a book on his observations in America: *Westward by Rail: the new route to the East* (London, 1870).

[3.] The first public meeting in London in support of women's suffrage was held at the headquarters of the Architectural Society in Conduit Street on July 17, 1869. The speakers included JSM, Thomas Hare, Boyd Kinnear, Charles Kingsley, Henry Fawcett, Lord Houghton, Sir Charles Dilke, John Morley, Peter Taylor, and David Masson.

[4.] Not located.

[1.] MS at LSE. The year is marked in a different hand.

[2.] Presumably the compromise reached on July 22 in the Lords with the Liberals on the Irish Church Bill, which then was passed.

[1.] MS at King's.

Sir Alexander Cornwall Duff-Gordon (1811-1872), a commissioner of the inland revenue; assistant gentleman usher of the Privy Chamber to Her Majesty.

[2.] Lady Lucie Duff-Gordon, daughter of John and Sarah Austin, had died in Cairo on July 14.

[3.] John Austin, *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, 3rd ed., revised and ed. by Robert Campbell (2 vols., London, 1869). See Letter 576.

[1.] MS in 1965 in the possession of Mr. Joseph H. Schaffner of New York.

[2.] See Letter 1382.

[3.] In 1869 the U.S. Congress enacted a law which set an eight-hour day for all persons employed by or on behalf of the Federal Government. The law proved to be largely ineffective since it did not prohibit agreements to work overtime.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] *Livre Jaune* (Yellowbook), an annual collection of official documents of the Foreign Ministry of France published since 1852. The Italian counterpart JSM had in mind may have been either *Camera dei Deputati. Documenti diplomatici presentati al Parlamento . . .* (Firenze, Roma [since 1861]), or *Ministero dell'Estero—Commissione per la Pubblicazione dei Documenti Diplomatici: I Documenti diplomatici italiani*, ser. 1, 1861-70 (Rome).

[3.] See Letter 1460, n. 3.

[4.] Mrs. Peter A. Taylor.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published by Laveleye in "Lettres inédites de Stuart Mill," *Revue de Belgique*, Jan. 15, 1885, pp. 5-25. In reply to Laveleye's of July 25, also at LSE.

Emile Louis Victor baron de Laveleye (1822-1892), Belgian political economist and writer.

[2.] Laveleye's three volumes published this year were: *La Question du grec et la réforme de l'enseignement moyen . . .* (Bruxelles, 1869); *Etudes d'Economie rurale. La Lombardie et la Suisse* (Paris, 1869); *Etudes et essais. . .* (Paris, 1869).

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts.

[2.] On July 22 JSM, working with a group of radical MP's, had issued invitations to a private conference to establish the Land Tenure Reform Association. The meeting of Aug. 3 referred to here was evidently the second private meeting of the group. A printed draft copy, marked [Private], of the resolutions adopted at this meeting is in the Howell Collection, Bishopsgate Institute, London. The first public meeting of the Association did not take place until May 15, 1871.

[3.] Walter Morrison, MP for Plymouth.

[4.] The printed draft referred to in n. 2 has *promote* rather than *procure*.

[5.] As eventually adopted, *The Programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association with an explanatory statement by John Stuart Mill* was not published until 1871. It is reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 239-50, Am. ed. V, 225-37, and in *Collected Works*, V, 689-95.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Arthur, later Baron Hobhouse (1819-1904), judge; Q.C., 1862; charity commissioner, 1866; one of three commissioners for reorganizing the endowed schools, 1869-72; law member of the council for India, 1872-77.

On July 5, 1869, Hobhouse had read to a joint meeting of the Royal Society of Arts and the NAPSS a paper "On the Limitations which should be placed on Dispositions of Property to Public Uses," subsequently published in *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XVII (July 16, 1869), 675-83. Much of the paper was directed against JSM's views as expressed in his article "Endowments," *FR*, n.s. V (April, 1869), 377-90.

In the discussion of Hobhouse's paper continued on July 9, Chadwick defended JSM's views (see *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XVII [July 16, 1869], 686-89).

[3.] Possibly the MS of an address Chadwick was soon to give on the means of economizing military expenditure, at a special meeting of the International Statistical Congress at The Hague. The address was published in *ibid.*, XVII (Oct. 8, 1869), 855-58.

[4.] Chadwick on July 17 had given a "garden tea party" to the committee of the Ladies' Sanitary Association, the Council of the Society of Arts, and others, at his house at East Sheen, to show some new forms of construction as embodied in a new

model cottage attached to his house and used as a gardener's lodge. Chadwick's address was published in *ibid.*, XVII (July 30, 1869), 720-22.

[1.] MS in the possession of Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. MS draft at LSE, as is also Holyoake's letter of Aug. 1 to which this is a reply. Published in *Daily News*, April 25, 1882. *Envelope addressed*: G. J. Holyoake Esq. / Waterloo Chambers / 20 Cockspur Street SW. *Postmark*: LONDON / S.E.2. / AU 9 / 69.

[2.] The Evidence Bill, one provision of which was to permit the substitution of an affirmation for an oath in the swearing in of witnesses in legal cases, had been passed on Aug. 3.

[3.] Holyoake had asked on what grounds JSM had been able to take the oath as an MP.

[4.] The following passage was cancelled in the draft at LSE: "Perhaps however your question refers to the words which I think are in the parliamentary oath 'on the true faith of a Christian'. On this point my answer would be that I am as much entitled to call my own opinion about Christ the true faith of a Christian, as any other person is entitled to call his so."

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS draft at John Hopkins, as is also Nichol's letter of July 20 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 211-12, and in part in "Unpublished Letters from John Stuart Mill to Professor [John Pringle] Nichol," ed. William Knight, *FR*, n.s. LXI (May, 1897), 677-78.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] Nichol had written: "I must confess that my own limited experience has not found the administrative ability in women that is spoken of & I don't derive much encouragement from the example of sovereigns. Kings are perhaps superfluous in highly civilized countries but, with very few exceptions, have not Queens been for a longer period either superfluous or worse? It is difficult to read Mr Motley's volumes or the more reluctant testimony of Mr Froude & preserve much admiration for the character of Elizabeth. . . ."

[4.] James Anthony Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth* (12 vols., London, 1856-70). All but the last two volumes had appeared at the time of this letter.

[5.] The Pope had excommunicated Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn in 1538.

[6.] Mary, Queen of Scots.

[7.] Froude discusses the ambivalence of the position of King Philip II of Spain with reference to England in his *History*, X, chaps. xix-xxi, and xxiii.

[8.] John Lothrop Motley, *History of the United Netherlands; from the death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce-1609* (4 vols., London, 1860-67). Vols. III and IV were published in 1867.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 212-13, except for last paragraph. In reply to Robertson's of July 2, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] In a long footnote to chap. iii JSM points to the outstanding success of Hindu women rulers.

[4.] In chap. i.

[5.] Robertson had written (in part): "Upon the argument of Ch. 3, that women as they are best correct what is excessive, & best apply what is good, in the speculation of men, might not an opponent argue, that it would be a pity thus to destroy this balance of the mutual forces? If women fulfil so important a function because, being not trained as men, they are what they are, would they not, if trained as men (which is the object of the argument), fall into the errors of men & all alike, men and women, henceforth be uncontrolled? The argument of this chapter seems to me a very delicate one. . . . In such an argument it is difficult to hold the balance even: to ascribe enough and not to ascribe too much to women as they are; in placing them under men as regards certain kinds of achievement, to show that there is no proof of their inferior faculty for these, without claiming for them what must amount to special superiority of a different kind. I suspect that the only true way out of the difficulty is to declare that if men have needed help from women as women are, it is because they, the men, have not been properly trained; is to attest, that, by throwing down the barriers before women, in all probability the type of mental action to which the one sex would henceforth not be debarred from approaching more than the other, would be a better type than the favoured sex has hitherto sought or been able to attain to. . . ."

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood. The end of the page has been cut off, and the signature is missing.

[2.] For women's suffrage. See Letters 1406, 1416, 1483, and 1484.

[3.] See Letter 1460.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published in Laveleye, *Revue de Belgique*, Jan. 15, 1885, pp. 12-13, 17. In reply to Laveleye's of Aug. 7, also at LSE.

[2.] Bettina von Arnim (1785-1859), sister of Clemens Brentano; artist, writer, friend of Goethe.

[3.] Rahel Varnhagen von Ense (1771-1833), one of the most sophisticated women of her time and among the first in Berlin to have a salon where intellectuals met to discuss new works of literature, especially the writings of Goethe.

[4.] Ida von Hahn-Hahn (1805-1880), writer of novels, travelogues, and, after her conversion to catholicism, religious poetry.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. The draft bears no indication of the intended recipient, but is indexed in the Hopkins collection: To / Horace White (?), (U.S.A.). There is also in the Hopkins collection, however, a letter from D. Watson of Hawick, N.B., of Sept. 1, 1869, asking for the kind of information JSM is here supplying. Furthermore, a memorial article in the *Journal of Social Science* (of the American Social Science Assoc.), V (1873) notes that in 1869 the Association provided for JSM, "at his special request, for his friend, Mr. David Watson, a very careful report on the practical working of vote by ballot in this country . . ." See also Letters 1488, 1491, and 1495.

David McBurnie Watson (d. Sept. 18, 1902), a native of Hawick, business man, an original member of the Hawick Parliamentary Debating Society, and active in liberal political causes, especially on the land question.

[2.] Arthur, later Sir Arthur Arnold (1833-1902), radical politician and writer. His discussion of balloting practices in Greece is in his *From the Levant, the Black Sea, and the Danube* (2 vols., London, 1868), I, 192-98.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 213-14, and in Mrs. Hooker's *Womanhood: Its Sanctities and Fidelities* (Boston, 1874), pp. 36-37, along with her letter of Aug. 10, MS also at Yale, to which this is a reply.

[1.] Photocopy supplied by Mr. L. S. Johnson, of Copman Thorpe, York, of the MS in his possession.

John Wycliffe Thompson, retired (1862) Lieutenant-Colonel, son of General Thomas Perronet Thompson, who died at Blackheath on Sept. 6, 1869.

[1.] MS in the Boston Public Library.

George Makepeace Towle (1841-1893), American journalist, prolific writer, lecturer; lived in England, 1868-70. Frequent contributor to Charles Dickens's *All the Year Round*, and after his return to Boston, correspondent for the *Athenaeum*.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Leslie's letters of Aug. 31 and Sept. 20 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 215-17, with first and last paragraphs omitted. Envelope filed with the letters bears note: "Chiefly by H. T. . . . Helen's part of the letter for publication as hers, J. S. Mill."

[2.] Especially in 1854. See Letters 166 ff.

[3.] Jacques Victor Bonnet (1814-1885), political economist and publicist, author of numerous works on credit, money, and banking.

[4.] “La Variation des Prix dans les choses de la vie,” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, LXXXII (Aug. 15, 1869), 935-56.

[5.] Madame de Lavergne, wife of Louis Gabriel Léonce Guilhaud de Lavergne, and Madame de Laveleye, wife of Emile de Laveleye.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Reid’s letter of Sept. 29 to which this is a reply. First paragraph published in Elliot, II, 214-15.

Andrew Reid was one of the founders of the Land Tenure Reform Association and an active political writer in the 80s and 90s.

[2.] George Odger was shortly to be associated with a new organization, the Land and Labour League, a leftist group which favoured nationalization of the land. For details on the struggle over the next few years between the Land Tenure Reform Association and the League, see “The Republicans: a Study of the Proletarian Left, 1869-73,” in Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists, Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861-1881* (London, 1965), chap. v.

[3.] As finally worded in the Programme of the Association (July, 1870), article 5 read as follows: “To promote a policy of Encouragement to Co-operative Agriculture, through the purchase by the State, from time to time, of Estates which are in the market, and the Letting of them, under proper regulations, to such Co-operative Associations, as afford sufficient evidence of spontaneity and promise of efficiency.”

[4.] See *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 239-50, Am. ed. V, 225-37, and *Collected Works*, V, 689-95. See also Letters 1487 and 1493.

[5.] William Rossiter (d. 1897), originally a portmanteau maker, joined the Working Men’s College in 1854, became head of the Adult School in 1857; after teaching for some time in Cornwall, he returned to London in 1865 as English master at the pioneer middle-class school, Bruce Castle, Tottenham; in 1868 he established the South London Working Men’s College, with Thomas Huxley as Principal and himself as Secretary.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Mistral’s letter of Sept. 12, to which this is a reply. Published with omissions in Elliot, II, 217-18.

Frédéric Joseph Etienne Mistral (1830-1914), Provençal poet, later a winner of the Nobel Prize, Fréderi is the Provençal spelling of his name.

[2.] E. Cazelle’s translation of *The Subjection of Women*.

[3.] Mistral had been awarded a medal by the Académie Française in 1861 for his poem *Mirèio* (Avignon, 1859), and in 1863 he had received the award of the Légion d’Honneur.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood.

[2.] See Letter 1474.

[3.] See next two Letters.

[1.] MS at Women's Service Library, London.

[2.] For a listing of various translations of *The Subjection of Women* see Keitaro Amano, *Bibliography of the Classical Economics, Vol. III, Part 4, John Stuart Mill* (Tokyo, Japan, 1964), pp. 340-42.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, II, 218-19.

[2.] See the preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at LSE. *Labelled in pencil at end:* "To W. H. Duignan / Rushall Hall / Walsall."

William Henry Duignan (d. 1914), attorney and antiquarian, writer on place names.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Reid's letter of Oct. 14 to which this is a reply.

[2.] The Land Tenure Reform Association. See Letters 1466 and 1481.

[3.] Founded in the month of this Letter, the National Education League evolved from the Birmingham Education Society. The League sought to co-ordinate and strengthen the work of the many local societies with a view to the establishment of a national system to provide education for every child in England and Wales. The League by the time of its first meeting this month had enlisted as members 2500 persons, including 40 members of Parliament.

[4.] The Land and Labour League, which included such working class leaders as John Hales, George Eccarius, Thomas Mottershead, George Odger, and W. R. Cremer. Karl Marx hoped that the League might forward some of the purposes of the International. See Letter 1481, and Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement* (London, 1965).

[1.] MS in 1968 in the possession of Mr. Richard A. Ehrlich of Braintree, Mass.

[2.] David M. Watson. See Letters 1476, 1491, and 1495.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 221-22. In reply to Cazelles's of Oct. 17, also at Yale.

[2.] The number for Oct. 12, 1869 contained a review by Hippolyte Taine of Cazelles's *La philosophie de Hamilton* (Paris, 1869), a translation of JSM's *Hamilton*. The review is quoted in part in Victor Giraud, *Essai sur Taine* (Paris, 1901), p. 248.

[3.] Paul Alexandre René Janet (1823-1899), philosopher, reviewed the same book: “Mill et Hamilton. Le problème de l’existence des corps,” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, LXXXIII (Oct., 1869), 944-72.

[4.] Charles Bernard Joseph Renouvier (1815-1903), philosopher. The work referred to was probably his “Critique Générale: L’Infini, la Substance et la Liberté” in *L’Année philosophique, études critiques sur le mouvement des idées générales*, II (for 1868, published 1869), 1-180.

[5.] “The Scientific Aspects of Positivism,” *FR*, n.s. V (June, 1869), 653-70; reprinted in Huxley’s *Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews* (London, 1870), pp. 162-91. Huxley here was answering an article by Richard Congreve, leader of the English positivists. “Mr. Huxley on M. Comte,” *FR*, n.s. V (April, 1869), 407-18, which in turn was an answer to Huxley’s Nov. 1868 lay sermon at Edinburgh, published as “On the Physical Basis of Life,” *FR*, n.s. V (Feb., 1869), 129-45, later reprinted in *Lay Sermons*, pp. 132-61, and in *Methods and Results* (New York, 1897), pp. 130-65. The controversy is discussed in Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley* (2 vols., New York, 1900), I, 321-24.

[6.] Auguste Comte, *Philosophie chimique et philosophie biologique*, vol. III of the *Cours de philosophie positive* (6 vols., Paris, 1830-42).

[1.] MS at NYP, MS draft at LSE as is also George’s letter of Aug. 22 to which this is a reply. Published by George in the Oakland, Cal., *Transcript*, Nov. 20, 1869, and reprinted in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 21, and in Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (New York, 1960), pp. 198-200, and in G. R. Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York, 1933), pp. 201-203.

Henry George (1839-1897), American economist, reformer, later best known as advocate of the single tax.

[2.] “The Chinese in California,” *New York Tribune*, May 1, 1869, pp. 1-2. Excerpts are printed in George, Jr., *Life of Henry George*, pp. 194-97.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Part published in Stamp.

[2.] Gomperz had married Elise Sichrovsky on Aug 8, 1869.

[3.] See Letter 1476.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Thornton’s letter of Oct. 10 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 219-21.

[2.] On a holiday spent in Belgium, Holland, and western Germany. Thornton had spent a good deal of time observing peasant properties.

[3.] Thornton had written: “I wish I could think that the small farmers in North Holland—between the Helder and Alkmaar—are proprietors of their own farms—I do not know whether they are or not—but if they are it would be they that we should cite

in confirmation of our theories. They realize my ideal even better I think than the Channel Islanders. . . .”

[4.] Thornton had commented at some length on the low standard of physical comfort in rural housing. “This miserable mode of living really proves nothing but a very low standard of comfort, for the peasants who are thus lodged have very likely twenty head of cattle & sheep in proportion, and one farmer’s widow who in one case was pointed out as the greatest proprietress, and whose dress & skin were worse than those of the dirtiest of English charwomen, was we were told worth 60000 florins—or between £5 & 6000 in cash. . . .”

[5.] Thornton: “Almost the only book I had with me was the first vol. of Carlyle’s French Revolution which I had scarcely looked at since I first read it nearly twenty years ago, I suppose. Some time ago I heard [Frank Harrison] Hill of the Daily News say that Carlyle was to be read at one period of every one’s life, but that as one matured, that period passed and did not return. If this be correct I am myself very far from maturity, for I think I enjoy Carlyle—his French Revolution, that is—more if possible than ever. He irritates me every now and then by his perversity . . . but I think him almost without an equal for his specialty of placing in the strongest light the hidden meaning of familiar truths. . . .”

[6.] See *Autobiog.*, chap. v, and letters to Carlyle in *Earlier Letters*.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, with omissions, in Elliot, II, 223-24.

[2.] Not located.

[3.] See Letter 1484.

[4.] Probably *The Subjection of Women*.

[5.] At the first conference of the National Education League, held in Birmingham, on Oct. 12-13, Fawcett’s motion was adopted that a bill embodying the principles of the League be introduced into Parliament.

[6.] George, later Sir George Campbell (1824-1892), Indian administrator; MP, 1875-92; author, particularly on subjects relating to India. The pamphlet referred to was probably *The Irish Land* (London and Dublin, 1869).

[7.] His essay, “Tenure of Land in India,” appeared in the Cobden Club-sponsored volume, *Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries* (London, 1870), pp. 145-227.

[8.] See Letter 1481.

[9.] The Land and Labour League. See *ibid.*, n. 2.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Wilkinson’s letter of Oct. 18 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 224-25.

Identified only as then resident at 6 Gurney St., Walworth, SE, and employed in business. No published work by Wilkinson has been located.

[2.] Chap. xi, “An affectionate exhortation to those who in early life feel themselves disposed to become authors.”

[3.] The most famous of the Victorian circulating libraries, started by Charles Edward Mudie in 1842.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 226-27. In reply to Barnard’s of Oct. 3, also at Yale. A part of the letter was published in the memorial article on JSM in the *Journal of Social Science*, V (1873), 137-38.

[2.] Probably Edward Kyllmann, a brother of the late Max Kyllmann, who had emigrated to the United States.

[3.] Letter 1361.

[4.] The Habitual Criminals Bill received Royal Assent on Aug. 11, 1869.

[5.] Barnard had written of a plan to place casts of classical works of sculpture in some of the public schools, in the hope of gradually improving American taste in art.

[6.] Ford Abbey, in Somersetshire. See *Earlier Letters*, p. 4.

[7.] See Letter 1476.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Wilkinson’s letter of Oct. 28 to which this is a reply. See Letter 1494.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Part published in Elliot, II, 228-30. In reply to Cairnes’s of Nov. 9, MS at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 1452.

[3.] Cairnes had announced his intention to publish a new, thoroughly revised edition of his *The Character and Logical Method of Political Economy* (1857). The new edition was not published until shortly before Cairnes’s death in 1875.

[4.] Cairnes’s article, “M. Comte and Political Economy,” originally planned as a preliminary chapter to the new edition of the *Logical Method*, was first published in *FR*, n.s. VII (May, 1870), 579-602, and was reprinted in his *Essays in Political Economy, Theoretical and Applied* (London, 1873), pp. 265-311.

[5.] Jean Baptiste Say (1767-1832), often ranked with Adam Smith and David Ricardo as among the founders of economic science. For JSM’s early connections with the Say family, see *Earlier Letters*, p. 12.

- [6.] Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, baron de l'Aulne (1727-1781), economist and statesman, comptroller-general (1774-76) under Louis XVI.
- [7.] Joseph Garnier (1813-1881), editor of several economics journals and author of many works in the field, perhaps the most notable of which was his *Traité d'économie politique* (Paris, 1860, and later editions).
- [8.] 2 vols., Paris, 1858, and later editions.
- [9.] Marie Roch Louis Reybaud (1799-1879), economist, journalist, novelist, and politician; author of *Economistes Modernes* (Paris, 1862), which includes studies of Cobden and JSM.
- [10.] Michel Chevalier (1806-1879), economist and politician. For references to his activities as a Saint Simonian, see *Earlier Letters*.
- [11.] Frédéric Bastiat (1801-1850), economist, a friend of Cobden. Cairnes in the following year published an essay, "Bastiat," in *FR*, n.s. VIII (Oct., 1870), 411-28, reprinted in his *Essays in Political Economy*, pp. 312-44.
- [12.] An incomplete edition was published in Paris shortly before the author's death in 1850. JSM refers to the complete edition, published in 1851.
- [13.] Published in Paris from 1842.
- [14.] Cairnes, after a visit to the Fawcetts at Cambridge, had reported that Mrs. Fawcett was at work on a book on political economy (her *Political Economy for Beginners* [Cambridge, 1870]).
- [15.] In the House of Commons, May 17, 1868. See *Hansard*, CXC, cols. 1516-32.
- [16.] The other speech was given on May 17, 1866. See *Hansard*, CLXXXIII, cols. 1087-97.
- [17.] Book II, esp. chaps. vi-x, and xvi.
- [18.] *Chapters and Speeches on the Irish Land Question* (London, 1870).
- [19.] *England and Ireland* (London, 1868).
- [20.] See Letter 1493, n. 6 and n. 7.
- [1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in the *National Reformer*, Jan. 2, 1870, p. 8.
- [1.] MS at LSE.
- [2.] See Letter 1497.
- [3.] *Ibid.*, n. 7.

[4.] See Letter 1493, n. 6.

[5.] “The Irish Land Question,” *Daily News*, Nov. 30, 1869, p. 5.

[6.] “Assuming that the State undertake to settle by legislation the relation of Landlord and Tenant, can any criterion be suggested for determining Agricultural Rent in conformity with the moral basis of property, and consistently with public policy?” The question was discussed on April 1, 1870.

[7.] See Letter 1497, n. 18.

[8.] Antoine Louis Claude Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836), philosopher.

[9.] *Eléments d'idéologie* (5 parts in 4 vols., Paris, 1801, 1803, 1805, 1815). The section on political economy was republished as *Traité d'économie politique* (Paris, 1822).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to letter of Mrs. Fawcett of Dec. 4, 1869, to Helen Taylor, MS also at Johns Hopkins. This collection contains two other letters of Mrs. Fawcett to Helen Taylor, March 4 and Nov. 8, 1870.

[2.] Mrs. Fawcett in her letter of Dec. 4 described a plan, originated by Henry Sidgwick, for having members of the faculty give courses of lectures for women at Cambridge.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Index*, IV (May 24, 1873), 217.

Included in a memorial article on JSM by Abbot, who at the time of the founding of this American, liberal, freethinking weekly had sent JSM a copy of the Prospectus and expressed the hope that he would “assist the enterprise with a letter to be inserted in the first number.”

Francis Ellingwood Abbot (1836-1903), American Unitarian clergyman, philosopher; founder, in 1867, of the Free Religious Association. He believed that “Free Religion must replace ‘God in Christ’ with ‘God in Humanity.’ ” Doubting his ministerial prospects, he sought a chair of philosophy at Cornell, but failed despite strong recommendations. In Sept., 1869, he went to Toledo, Ohio, as minister of the Independent Church: there he founded and edited the *Index* (1870-86).

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale. Read by Mrs. Davis at the Woman Suffrage Convention which opened in Washington, D.C., on Jan. 19, 1870, and published in Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *et al.*, eds., *The History of Woman Suffrage* (6 vols., New York, 1881-[1922]), II, 419.

Paulina Kellogg Wright Davis (1813-1876), editor, suffragist. With her first husband, Francis Wright, of Utica, N.Y., she took an active part in the anti-slavery convention held in Utica in 1835. After the early death of Francis Wright, she lectured to women on anatomy and physiology; her efforts helped to open the medical profession to women. When her second husband, Thomas Davis, of Providence, R.I., was elected to

Congress in 1853, she accompanied him to Washington. There she established *Una* (1853-55), the first woman's rights paper published in the United States. She took charge of the arrangements for the meeting of the National Woman Suffrage Movement held in New York in 1870.

[2.] Lucretia Coffin Mott (1793-1880), Quaker, reformer, active in woman's rights and anti-slavery movement. Chief promoter, together with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, of the first woman's rights convention, held at Seneca Falls, N.Y., in 1848.

[3.] At the Woman Suffrage Convention at Newport, R.I., on Aug. 25, Mrs. Davis had introduced resolutions thanking JSM for his support of women's rights and paying tribute to the memory of Mrs. Mill and of Margaret Fuller. JSM's *The Subjection of Women* was sold at the Convention.

[4.] "The Enfranchisement of Women."

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 230-31.

Brewster and Co., a firm of carriage manufacturers in New York, had originally been established in New Haven, Conn., by James Brewster (1788-1866). His son Henry (1824-1887) established the New York firm in 1856. Following the example set by the founder, the Company maintained a policy of very generous treatment of employees, including, as this letter indicates, some sharing in the profits of the enterprise.

[1.] MS at Indiana.

[2.] A pirated edition published in New York.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. George Arthur Wood.

[2.] About petitions for woman suffrage. See Letter 1483.

[3.] See Letters 1483 and 1484.

[4.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[5.] Founded in 1869 to organize the working classes as an elective power and to secure the election of working men to Parliament. The secretary was Lloyd Jones, veteran co-operator and one-time Chartist. JSM subscribed to the League. Howell was on its Executive.

[6.] See Letter 536, n. 14.

[1.] MS not located. Published in W. R. W. Stephens. *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vols., London, 1895), I, 373-74.

[2.] Edward Augustus Freeman (1823-1892), historian, had attacked hunting as inflicting unjustifiable suffering on animals in "The Morality of Field Sports," *FR*, n.s. VI (Oct., 1869), 353-85.

[3.] See *Daily Telegraph*, Nov. 3, 1868, p. 2.

[1.] MS at NLS.

George William, 4th Baron Lyttelton (1817-1876); a zealous advocate and patron of night schools and working men's colleges, he became in 1845 principal of Queens College, Birmingham; in 1853 the first president of the Birmingham and Midland Institution; and was one of the founders and for many years the president of Saltley Trinity College. Undersecretary of state for the colonies, 1846; chairman of Canterbury Association, a corporation conceived by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, on the principles of which Canterbury, New Zealand, was founded in 1850. Chief Commissioner of endowed schools, 1869.

[2.] Founded in 1853 for the education of working men, it established the first Free Library in Birmingham in 1856. Charles Dickens, who had given three readings in Dec., 1853, to help raise money for the Institute, became its president in 1869. For a history of the Institute, see *Modern Birmingham and its Institutions from 1841-1871*, compiled and ed. by John A. Langford (2 vols., Birmingham, 1873), I, 248-304.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 231-32.

Victoria Adelaide Mary Louise (1840-1901), eldest daughter of Queen Victoria; married to Prince Frederick William (the Crown Prince) of Prussia, 1858 (later Emperor Frederick III for four months in 1888). The Prince wrote: "On the 26th [of Dec., 1869] we went, in a three days journey, by Avignon and Dijon to Paris" (*Diary of the Emperor Frederick*, ed. Margarethe von Poschinger, trans. Frances A. Welby [London, 1902], p. 188).

[1.] MS at LSE. MS copy of Cairnes's reply of Jan. 13 is also at LSE.

[2.] Cairnes's article, "Political Economy and Land," *FR*, n.s. VII (Jan., 1870), 41-63 (reprinted in his *Essays in Political Economy, Theoretical and Applied*, pp. 187-231), was reviewed by Henry Maine, *Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 6, 1870, pp. 6-7.

[3.] George Campbell's proposals for a solution of the Irish land problem, as advanced in his *The Irish Land* (1869), are discussed by Cairnes in his article, pp. 58-61. See Letters 1493 and 1499.

[4.] Campbell had proposed the creation by Parliament of a court or commission with large discretionary powers to adjudicate questions of rents and tenant rights.

[5.] See Letters 1497 and 1499.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 233-34. Two replies by Sir Robert, of Jan. 26 and Feb. 21, are also at Johns Hopkins.

Sir Robert Porrett Collier, at this time attorney-general.

[2.] Probably the account printed in the *Daily News* of Dec. 25, 1869, p. 4. See next Letter.

[3.] Ralph Augustus Benson (1828-1886), barrister, magistrate of the Thames police court, 1867-69, and of Southwark police court, 1869-79.

[4.] Then Henry Austin Bruce.

[5.] Probably Sir John Duke Coleridge, at this time solicitor-general, rather than his father, Sir John Taylor Coleridge (1790-1876), justice of the King's Bench, 1835-58.

[6.] Russell Gurney (1804-1878), lawyer, judge, recorder of the City of London, 1857-78.

[1.] MS in the Berg Collection of NYP.

In addition to this and the preceding letter on the case of William Smith, there is a MS draft at Yale of an undated letter addressed to the Editor of the *Daily News* and enclosing £5 "as the commencement of a subscription for the benefit of the police constable William Smith."

[2.] The *Daily News* on Jan. 18, 1870, pp. 4-5, devoted a long leader to the case. Smith was not restored to the service (see Letter 1537).

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to O'Connell's letter of Jan. 6, also at LSE.

Possibly the John O'Connell listed by the *Wellesley Index* as the author in 1858-59 of articles in the *North British Review* on the philosophy of history and of language, and in *ER* for 1860 on Grotius and the sources of international law.

[2.] "The Science of Logic or Method constituted; with Illustrative Applications of the System to Jurisprudence." No such book appears to have been published.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Daily News*, Jan. 17, 1870, p. 5.

[2.] These Acts, adopted in 1864, 1866, and 1869, empowered the police in towns where there were military establishments to round up for enforced medical inspection women suspected of prostitution. Two organizations had been founded in 1869 to agitate for repeal of the Acts: the National Association for the Abolition of State Regulation of Vice, and the Ladies' National Association, which was headed by Mrs. Josephine Butler. A "Women's Manifesto," directed against the Acts and signed by two thousand women, appeared in the *Daily News* on Dec. 31, 1869. JSM later in the year gave evidence before a Royal Commission on the subject, and his evidence was reprinted as a pamphlet by the National Association. Final repeal of the Acts was not achieved until 1886.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

Robert Dalglish (1808-1880), MP for Glasgow, 1857-74. JSM misspelled the name.

[2.] See Letter 1055.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Published in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 219-20.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[3.] William Graham (1816-1885), also MP for Glasgow, 1865-74.

[4.] John Nichol.

[5.] Georges d'Eichthal. See Letters 1427 and 1432.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Fourth paragraph published in Elliot, II, 235. In reply to Villari's of Oct. 18, 1869, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Aristide Gabelli (1830-1891), Italian educator and positivist philosopher. The work referred to was probably *L'uomo e le scienze morali* (Milan, 1869).

[3.] Villari in 1869 had been appointed undersecretary for education.

[4.] *The Subjection of Women*.

[5.] See Letter 1464, n. 2.

[1.] MS in the possession of W. Rosenberg, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for last three paragraphs, in Elliot, II, 237-38.

[2.] Chapman was about to return to New Zealand after a visit to England.

[3.] Sir George Edward Grey (1812-1898), colonial statesman and land reformer; governor of Cape Colony and high commissioner of South Africa, 1854-61; governor of New Zealand, 1845-53 and 1861-68. An anti-little-Englander, Grey, while in England from 1868 to 1870, had campaigned unsuccessfully for Parliament on a platform urging closer union with the colonies, state-aided emigration, the ballot, reclamation of waste lands, and free education. For his acquaintance with JSM, see James Collier, *Sir George Grey, an Historical Biography* (Christchurch and London, 1909), p. 177.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Mrs. Manning's letter of Oct. 18, 1869, to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 235-37.

Charlotte Speir Manning (1803-1871), educator and author. She had lived in India with her first husband, Dr. William Speir, whom she married in 1835. Her second husband was James Manning (1781-1866), Serjeant-at-law. In the fall of 1869 she had

served as Mistress of the women's college which became Girton at Cambridge during its first term at Hitchin.

[2.] *Ancient and Medieval India* (2 vols., London, 1869).

[3.] By the Act of 1858, which transferred the rule of India from the East India Co. to the Crown.

[4.] Sekunder Begum (also spelled Sikandar Begam), ruler of Bhopal from 1844 to her death in 1868. She was created Commander of the Star of India for her loyal services to the Crown. The same honour was eventually conferred upon her daughter, who succeeded her and likewise proved to be an excellent administrator.

[1.] MS draft in Helen Taylor's hand at Johns Hopkins, where also is Malleeson's letter of Jan. 14 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 238-39. Malleeson had requested JSM to bring influence to bear upon George Odger to support repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

[2.] George Odger was then campaigning for the seat for Southwark. JSM contributed £25 to Odger's expenses in the election, which on Feb. 16 he lost by a fairly narrow margin to Col. Marcus Beresford.

[3.] See Letter 1513.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *New York Times*, Feb. 25, 1870, from the San Francisco *Bulletin*.

[2.] Letter 1490.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Letter 1519.

[3.] Probably Letter 1513.

[4.] *Ibid.*, n. 2.

[1.] MS not located. Published in a memorial notice of JSM, signed J. M. B[arnard], in the *Journal of Social Science*, V (1873), 138. The same notice also includes a portion of JSM's letter to Barnard of Oct. 28, 1869.

[2.] See the last paragraph of "The Contest in America," *Fraser's*, LXV (Feb., 1862), 258-68, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. III, 179-205, Am. ed., I, 1-27.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Possibly the petition presented on Feb. 15, 1870, signed by over 100,000 of the working men of London, praying the attention of Her Majesty and the Government to

the great importance of maintaining the existing relations between England and her colonies.

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of the Hon. Isaac Foot. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Amberley's of Jan. 22 from Naples, MS also at Johns Hopkins. Published, with omissions, in Elliot, II, 239-42, and attributed to Helen Taylor.

[2.] William Edward Hartpole Lecky (1838-1903), historian and essayist, the previous year had published his *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (2 vols., London, 1869). A friend of Amberley, the two had met at Rome during their travels this winter in Italy. Amberley had reported that Lecky considered prostitution a necessity and thought it could not be eradicated.

[3.] Lecky had written of the prostitute: "Herself the supreme type of vice, she is ultimately the most efficient guardian of virtue. But for her, the unchallenged purity of countless happy homes would be polluted. . . . On that one degraded and ignoble form are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame. She remains, while creeds and civilisations rise and fall, the eternal priestess of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people." (*History of European Morals*, II, 300.)

[4.] Probably Henry Selfe Page Winterbotham (1837-1873), barrister, MP for Stroud, 1867-73; rather than his brother Arthur Brend Winterbotham (1838-1892), woollen cloth manufacturer, who did not enter Parliament until 1885.

[5.] Edmond About. Amberley had requested these letters of introduction.

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of the Hon. Isaac Foot.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[3.] Amberley's father had decided to sell Rodborough Manor.

[4.] See preceding Letter, n. 4.

[5.] Helen had invited the Amberleys to stay at Blackheath Park. See her letter at LSE.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to White's letter of Nov. 23, 1869, also at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 242-43, except for last paragraph.

[2.] See the editorial, "John Stuart Mill and the Chinese," *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 14, 1869, p. [2].

[3.] See Letter 1490.

[4.] See Letters 1476 and 1491.

[5.] See Letter 1495.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Identified only as president of the Working Men's National Emigration Association. The *Beehive* on April 2, 1870, p. 121, reported that the Association had sent its first group of 250 emigrants to Canada at the end of March.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Beehive*, Feb. 13, 1875, p. 7, and reprinted in Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism* (London, 1911), pp. 271-72, but incorrectly dated 1871.

[2.] Odger as the working man, Radical candidate had received 4,382 votes to 2,996 for the Liberal candidate, Sir Sydney Waterlow, but the Conservative, Col. Marcus Beresford, had won with 4,686 votes.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to Mrs. Taylor's letter of Feb. 10, also at LSE.

[2.] Of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage. The meeting was finally held at the Hanover Square Rooms on March 26, 1870, with Mrs. Taylor presiding. JSM spoke, as well as Cairnes, Mrs. Grote, Mrs. Fawcett, Lord Amberley, Helen Taylor, Katherine Hare, Sir Charles Dilke, and others. A report of the meeting was published as a pamphlet.

[3.] The first had been held on July 17, 1869. See Letter 1460.

[4.] A bill for the removal of the political disabilities of women had been introduced in the Commons on Feb. 16 by Jacob Bright. The second reading did not take place until May 4.

[5.] Katherine Hare (later Mrs. Clayton), daughter of Thomas Hare.

[6.] Caroline Ashurst Biggs (1840-1889), editor of the *Englishwoman's Review of Social and Industrial Questions*, published from 1866 to 1910. Miss Biggs was a member of the Central Executive Committee of the National Society.

[7.] MS at LSE.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. Last paragraph largely quoted in Dilke, p. 634.

[2.] The Radical Club, founded this year at the suggestion of Fawcett, with Dilke as secretary. The plan was to meet for dinner in London every other Sunday during the Parliamentary session. JSM was among the original members, which included Cairnes, Morley, Frank Harrison Hill, Leslie Stephen, Leonard Courtney, Henry Sidgwick, W. C. Sidgwick, and McCullagh Torrens. Helen had already been informed about the Club in a letter of Jan. 6, 1870, from Mrs. Fawcett (MS at Yale): "It is proposed that the club should comprise about 20 or 30 members, about half of whom would be the most radical of the Liberal party in the House of Commons; the remainder composed of representatives of the Radical press, and the leaders of advanced liberal thought from the Universities & elsewhere. The first rule of the club will be that women are eligible to become members of it."

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 2.

[4.] The Government's Education Bill, introduced by W. E. Forster on Feb. 17, 1870, allowed each school board to determine the kind of religious instruction to be given in its district and thereby made it possible for denominational teaching to be financed by the rates.

[1.] MS in Brandes Archives, Royal Library, Copenhagen. Published in Paul Kruger, ed., *Correspondance de Georg Brandes* (2 vols., Copenhagen, 1952), II, 5-6.

Georg Morris Cohen Brandes (1842-1927), the well-known Danish critic and scholar. Brandes had arranged for a translation into Danish of *The Subjection of Women* published in Nov., 1869. In July, 1870, JSM called upon Brandes in Paris, and the latter visited Blackheath Park in the same month: for an account of their conversations see Brandes's "John Stuart Mill" in *Eminent Authors of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. by R. B. Anderson (New York, 1886), pp. 123-46.

[2.] This volume, edited by Josephine Butler and published in 1869, included essays by, among others, Frances Power Cobbe, Jessie Boucherett, George Butler, Sophia Jex-Blake, James Stuart, Elizabeth C. Wolstenholme, and John Boyd Kinnear.

[3.] See Letter 1535.

[4.] Published by the London National Society for Women's Suffrage.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Jan. 13. MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1529, n. 2.

[3.] Cairnes, who had once been fond of the sport, wrote that it had been an accident while hunting which had first brought on his lameness.

[4.] Helen Taylor, "A Few Words on Mr. Trollope's Defence of Fox-Hunting," *FR*, n.s. VII (Jan., 1870), 63-68, a reply to Anthony Trollope's "Mr. Freeman on the Morality of Hunting," *FR*, n.s. VI (Dec., 1869), 616-25. For Freeman's article see Letter 1506.

[5.] See Letter 1497, n. 4.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in Elliot, II, 243. In reply to Campbell's letter of Feb. 14, 1870, MS at Johns Hopkins; his rejoinder of March 3 is at Yale.

Campbell identifies himself as a young man living at 318 Parliamentary Road, Glasgow, who received from JSM in 1869 advice about a course of reading for self-improvement. Most of his letter is devoted to a description of his progress in reading.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Yale. Partly published in Elliot, II, 243-44; portions of the first paragraph in Dilke, p. 634. In reply to Dilke's of Feb. 25, MS at Yale.

[2.] Dilke was president of the London branch of the National Education League, which opposed the portions of the Government's Education Bill which threatened to bring about the spread of denominational education. See Letter 1530. The headquarters of the League in Birmingham had come out for Bible reading in the schools. The London branch held that instruction in public schools during school hours should be entirely secular, and that any religious instruction within the school buildings should be given out of regular school hours by arrangement with the ministers of various creeds.

[3.] JSM delivered a long speech at the meeting of the National Education League in London on March 25, 1870, on proposed amendments to the Education Bill (see *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 26, 1870, p. 2).

[4.] No such Congress was held until nearly forty years later.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 244.

Fanny Lewald-Stahr (1811-1889), German writer who ordinarily published under the name of Fanny Lewald.

[2.] *Für und wider die Frauen* (Berlin, 1870), which was dedicated to JSM with an appreciative essay on his work on behalf of women's rights.

[3.] “. . . Germany and Italy—countries in which, both in point of special and of general cultivation, women have remained far behind France and England, being generally (it may be said without exaggeration) very little educated, and having scarcely cultivated at all any of the higher faculties of mind” (*The Subjection of Women*, chap. iii).

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Feb. 28, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1532.

[3.] See Letter 1509.

[4.] See Letters 1497 and 1499.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, and a short (preliminary?) MS draft at Yale. Published, except for second paragraph, in Elliot, II, 245. In reply to Sir Robert's of Jan. 26 and Feb. 21, MSS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1510 and 1511.

[3.] “Assize Intelligence: Joyner and wife v. Dashwood and others,” *Daily News*, March 2, 1870, p. 6.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably a proposal to strengthen the agitation against the Contagious Diseases Acts. Chapman's *Westminster Review* published four articles on state control of prostitution between July, 1869, and April, 1870.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Leslie's letter of March 4 to which this is a reply.

[2.] Leslie had written that the protest against the Contagious Diseases Acts "assumes apparently that all the vice comes from men. . . . Any generalization which blends all women together in this respect I look upon as a new form of the old fallacy of distinguishing moral and intellectual character and capacity by sex."

[3.] In the *Daily News*, Dec. 31, 1869. See Letter 1513, n. 2.

[4.] T. E. Cliffe Leslie, *Land Systems and Industrial Economy of Ireland, England, and Continental Countries*. See Letter 1389, n. 4.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

Probably John Shortt (1840-1932), graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, 1860, and of London University, 1865; barrister and author of works on copyright law. The Society he represented has not been identified.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] See Letter 1529.

[3.] In the Report of the meeting neither Odger nor Rae is listed as a speaker.

[4.] Rae had published two series of letters on his observations in America, *Daily News*, Dec., 1869-Jan., 1870. They were revised to constitute the book *Westward by Rail: The New Route to the East* (Longman, London, 1870).

[1.] MS at LSE. The address [Blackheath Park] has been torn off.

[2.] The meeting of the Political Economy Club on April 1, at which Cairnes was to present the question, "Assuming that the State undertake to settle by legislation the relation of Landlord and Tenant, can any criterion be suggested for determining Agricultural Rent in conformity with the moral basis of property, and consistently with public policy?"

[3.] Probably the plan advanced by Mountford Longfield in his essay "The Tenure of Land in Ireland," included in the Cobden Club volume, *Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries* (London, 1870), pp. 1-91.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 245-46, and in *Correspondence of Sir Arthur Helps*, ed. E. A. Helps (London and New York, 1917), pp. 282-83. In reply to Helps's letter of Feb. 8, also at Yale.

[2.] *Casimir Maremma* (2 vols., London, 1870).

[3.] JSM reviewed Helps's *Thoughts in the Cloister and the Crowd* (London, 1835) in *WR*, XXVI (Jan., 1837), 348-57, reprinted in part (omitting any mention of Helps's book) in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., I, 206-10, Am. ed., I, 232-36. He also reviewed Helps's *The Claims of Labour* (London, 1844) in *ER*, LXXXI (April, 1845), 498-525; reprinted in *Collected Works*, IV, 363-89.

[4.] *Realmah* (2 vols., London, 1868).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 246-47.

[2.] This letter of Wilhelmina Hickson, née von Einem, dated March 23 [1870] is at Johns Hopkins, as well as her reply of March 29. Hickson had died on March 22.

[3.] Caroline Lindley, of 10 Kidbrook Terrace, Blackheath. LSE has an extensive correspondence between her and Helen Taylor, 1866-82.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See Letter 1530.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is Taine's of April 2, to which this is a reply.

[2.] *De l'Intelligence* (2 vols., Paris, 1870). For JSM's review of it, see Letter 1583, n. 2.

[3.] See Letter 486.

[4.] "La philosophie de Hamilton de Stuart Mill" (*Journal des Débats*, Oct. 12, 1869).

[5.] See Letter 1548.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] JSM was attempting to forecast the votes for the Women's Political Disabilities Bill. For the result, see Letter 1559.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is Taine's of April 13, to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 247-48, as by Helen Taylor.

[2.] James Mill's *Analysis of the Mind* was first published in 1829, and JSM's revised and annotated edition of it in 1869.

[3.] Taine, after receiving a copy of *The Subjection of Women* from JSM, had commented in his letter on the position of women in France.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of April 17, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1497.

[3.] See Letter 1419.

[4.] It was held on July 9, 1870.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Revolution*, V (June 2, 1870), 356, as from a Paris newspaper. Presumably written and first published in French.

Julie Victoire Daubié (1824-1874), writer on women's causes; first woman in France to receive the *baccalauréat* (1862, Lyon).

[2.] *La Femme pauvre au XIXe siècle, par une femme pauvre* (Mémoire couronné par l'Académie de Lyon, 1859). Published in Paris, 1866, and later editions.

[3.] See Letter 1513, n. 2.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, II, 249.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Dilke's letter of May 7, to which this is a reply.

[2.] The pertinent clause of the Programme adopted was No. V: "To promote a policy of Encouragement to Co-operative Agriculture, through the purchase by the State, from time to time, of Estates which are in the market, and the Letting of them, under proper regulations, to such Co-operative Associations, as afford sufficient evidence of spontaneity and promise of efficiency."

[3.] Thomas George Snell in 1868 had been Chairman of the Central Liberal Committee for Chelsea. On Feb. 27, 1880, he wrote to Helen Taylor (MS at LSE): "In 1869 I inaugurated a movement for the admission of Working Class Representatives to the House of Commons. These meetings were held at my house, 13 Holland Park Road, Kensington, each of which Mr Mill attended." For ten years Snell was a member of the Vestry and Board of Trustees of the Parish of Kensington. In 1870 he was the Radical candidate to represent Chelsea on the London School Board.

[4.] Dilke had written: "Fawcett has decided to refuse to join the Committee formed by Mr. Snell at the meeting at which we were present. He does this upon the ground that if the Committee receives any such support as to give it an appearance of some strength it will probably end in our being committed by persons over whom we have no control of a Policy of which we cannot approve. I feel myself that with you at Avignon and those of us who are in the House too busy to attend there would be a considerable danger that Snell might deliver us into the hands of Glyn [presumably George G. Glyn, the chief Liberal whip], not because he founded the movement with the intention of so doing, but because his end is very far short of ours. . . ."

"In reference to the Land [and Labour] League, Fawcett says that he cannot join in the proposed programme on account of the suggestion which is involved in several of the paragraphs that co-operation shall be carried on under the control of Government. . . . It might for the present be advisable to narrow our task to the assertion and demonstration of the principle that the community should receive the benefit of what

may be called the accidental increase of rents. Upon this point we should carry with us both Fawcett and the working men.”

[5.] Probably the Representative Reform Association.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 220-21, and in *Cosmopolis*, p. 787. In reply to D'Eichthal's of May 2, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 1557.

[3.] D'Eichthal in his letter of May 2 had observed that the Emperor by his appeals to the people was driving the nation towards a Republic more than the Republicans were, and that the bourgeoisie was too devoid of common sense and political courage to stop the movement.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 250-53.

[2.] *Logic* (London, 1870).

[3.] Part I was devoted to Deduction.

[4.] JSM's extensive use of Bain's *Logic* may be seen by the following list of places where it is quoted in the 8th edition (1872): I, 40, n, 51 n, 83 n, 89, 94 n, 95, 106 n, 112 n, 116-17, 160 n-161 n, 182, 190 n, 191 n, 207 n, 261 n, 272, 322 n, 406, 433 n, 435 n, 522 n, 525, 527 n; II, 7, 125 n, 227 n.

[5.] Peter Guthrie Tait, who in his opening lecture at the University of Edinburgh on Nov. 2, 1870, had been very critical of Bain's imprecision in scientific language in the *Logic*; an extract entitled "Energy, and Prof. Bain's Logic" was published in *Nature*, III (Dec. 1, 1870), 89-90.

[6.] The Oxford English Dictionary cites an earlier instance of Bain's incorrect use of the word.

[1.] MS at the Rhode Island Historical Society. MS copy at Columbia University. The second paragraph was published in the preface to R. G. Hazard, *Causation and Freedom in Willing . . .*, ed. Caroline Hazard (Boston and New York, 1889).

[2.] See Letter 831, n. 5.

[3.] See Letters 738 and 748.

[4.] Francis Bowen.

[5.] Part II of the book is entitled "The Will."

[6.] Chap. xxiv, "The Will," II, 327-95.

[7.] Probably Hazard's elder son Rowland (1829-1898), who, with his brother Newbold, took over the management of their father's woollen mill in Peacedale, R.I.

[8.] See Letter 1476.

[9.] The secret ballot was finally adopted in 1872.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Presumably relating to the Education Bill before Parliament, but not located.

[3.] Robert Applegarth (1834-1924), working class and trade union leader; secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, 1862-71. He had been active in the Reform League and in forming the Education League in 1868.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in part in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 226-27, and in *Cosmopolis*, pp. 787-88. In reply to D'Eichthal's of May 17, MS also at Johns Hopkins, published in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 222-25.

[2.] Identified only as President of the Société littéraire hellénique de Constantinople. Portions of this discourse written for the eighth anniversary of the founding of that Society, are reprinted in Gustave d'Eichthal, *La Langue Grecque. Mémoires et Notices, 1864-1884* (Paris, 1887), pp. 282-306.

[3.] "Observations sur la réforme progressive et sur l'état actuel de la langue grecque, pour servir d'Introduction au Discours de M. Basiadis," *Annuaire de l'Association pour l'encouragement des études Grecques en France*, IV (1870), 104-49, and reprinted in *La Langue Grecque*, pp. 235-74.

[4.] See Letter 1553.

[5.] D'Eichthal had sent a copy of JSM's letter to him of Nov. 30, 1831, MS copy now at Johns Hopkins. See *Earlier Letters*, pp. 88-89.

[6.] Anthony John Mundella (1825-1897), statesman; radical MP for Sheffield, 1868-85, and for Brightside division of Sheffield, 1885-97; a leader in causes dealing with labour and education. See W. H. G. Armytage, *A. G. Mundella, 1825-1897. The Liberal Background to the Labour Movement* (London, 1951).

[7.] Thomas Hughes.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Le Hardy de Beaulieu's letter of May 16, also at Johns Hopkins.

Charles Le Hardy de Beaulieu (1816-1871), Belgian economist.

[2.] Founded in 1839, the Society still maintains a *Mémoires et Publications* Series. JSM was elected a corresponding member in June, 1870.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Dilke's of May 23 to which this is a reply. First two paragraphs published in Elliot, II, 254-55, and in Dilke, pp. 638-39.

[2.] The Women's Disabilities Bill had passed its second reading on May 4 by a vote of 124 to 91. Before the Bill went into committee on May 12, the Government exerted pressure to crush it, and on the division for going into committee the vote was 220 against and 94 in favour.

[3.] By contrast, Dilke's letter had been pessimistic: "Since our defeat on women's suffrage I have begun to think that it is not clear that we should not do better to go for universal suffrage than for the admission of widows and spinsters arbitrarily selected [by a property qualification]. I doubt our carrying this bill for a great time—now that we have once been well beaten—because there is no force at the back of the movement except that of justice, which in this country is not worth much except in the long run. I almost think we could, with the force which would be at the back of universal suffrage, carry it just as soon."

[4.] Dilke reported that the Cobden Club was planning to sponsor another volume of essays for Jan., 1872, this time on International Relations. JSM was invited to undertake the essay on relations with India.

[5.] Perhaps Henry Marsh Pratt (b. 1838), an officer in the Indian army; retired 1889.

[6.] Sir Henry Bartle Edward Frere (1815-1884), Governor of Bombay, 1862-67.

[7.] Sir William Robert Seymour Vesey Fitzgerald (1818-1885), Governor of Bombay, 1867-72.

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of Mrs. K. E. Roberts. *Envelope addressed:* Thomas Hare Esq. / Gosbury Hill / Kingston on Thames / Surrey / Angleterre. *Postmark:* AVIGNON / 29 / MAI / 70.

[2.] Probably W. R. Ware (see Letter 1043, n. 3).

[3.] Vol. LXXXVII, pp. 375-404.

[4.] Cf. the preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Dilke's letter of May 30 to which this is a reply. Published in Dilke, pp. 639-40.

[2.] Gerard James Noel (1823-1911), Tory MP for Rutland, 1847-83.

[3.] Thomas Edward Taylor (1811-1883), Tory MP for Dublin, 1841-83.

[1.] MS at Northwestern.

[2.] The proposed commission has not been identified.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Dilke's letter of June 4 to which this is a reply. Published in Dilke, p. 640.

[2.] With reference to the progress of Forster's Education Bill, Dilke had written: "Vernon Harcourt has given notice that on the motion for going into committee on the Education Bill he shall move a resolution declaring that 'provision should be made under the control of the Education Department to [require] that in all schools assisted by public rates such religious teaching as may be given therein should be undenominational in its character and confined to unsectarian instruction in the Bible.' "

Harcourt, convinced that the secularists could not defeat the denominationalists, had chosen to fall back upon a second line of defence by proposing undenominational instruction in the Bible. See his letter to Dilke, published in Stephen Gwynn and G. M. Tuckwell, *Life of Sir Charles W. Dilke* (2 vols., New York, 1917), I, 95.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also three letters by Cowper of May 30, [May 31 ?], and June 1.

Thomas Alexander Cowper (1819-1902), colonel in the Bombay army, had retired in 1864.

[2.] Probably the pamphlet by Cowper listed in *Catalogue of the London Library*, entitled *Bank of Bombay: Summary of parliamentary papers* (Folkestone, 1868).

[3.] The Bank of Bombay, which included in its board of directors representatives of the government, had failed in 1865 as a result of gross mismanagement in a highly speculative period. A parliamentary investigation was subsequently conducted; see the "Report from the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the failure of the Bank of Bombay," *Parl. Papers, Dec. 10, 1868-Aug. 11, 1869*, XV. The Report is dated Feb. 10, 1869. See also Letters 1568, 1720, 1722, 1723, 1725, and 1732.

[1.] MS copy at UCL. Excerpt contained in a letter of Norris to Augustus De Morgan of June 20, 1870.

Presumably Norris was the person later listed in the *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*, XIX (1897-98) as "Non-Resident Fellow, Mining Commissioner, Gwelo, Rhodesia," and the author of an article "The Richest Goldfields in the World," *Macmillan's*, LXXXII (Aug., 1900), 294-99.

[2.] Of the *Logic*, 7th ed., 1868.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Adcroft's letter of June 10, 1870. Published in Elliot, II, 256-57.

Adcroft wrote from 28 Bentinck St., Ashton-under-Lyne. His pamphlet has not been located.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for first paragraph, in Elliot, II, 255-56. In reply to Le Hardy de Beaulieu's of June 6, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] The half-time plan, of which Edwin Chadwick was a leading advocate, provided half-day schooling for child workers.

[3.] Originally a successful mining engineer, Le Hardy de Beaulieu after becoming blind at the age of 42 had turned to moral and political science.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 258-62. In reply to Cowper's of June 19, MS at Johns Hopkins, as is also Cowper's answer of June 30. Two paragraphs were published in the *Echo*, April 24, 1872, p. 5.

[2.] See Letter 1564.

[3.] *Ibid.*, n. 3.

[4.] Premchund Roychund, a broker.

[5.] James Blair, secretary and treasurer to the Bank.

[6.] Sylvester Douglas Birch, who resigned Feb. 27, 1865.

[1.] MS at Harvard. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Norton's letter of June 17, to which this is a reply. Published in Mass. Hist. Soc. *Proceedings*, L (1916-17), 24-25.

[2.] Norton's discussion of limitations on the right of property had been occasioned by his reading JSM's article, "Professor Leslie on the Land Question," in the June, 1870, *FR*.

[3.] Chauncey Wright (1830-1875), American mathematician and philosopher.

Norton had quoted from a letter to him by Wright of March 21, 1870, the following passage: "Looked at from the utilitarian point of view, the rights of private ownership, (the protection of the individual in the possession, accumulation, consumption, administration, & posthumous disposal of his surplus gains), are founded simply and solely in the motives they afford to his making such gains as shall be, in spite of his seeming private appropriation of them, an addition to the store of public wealth." Wright's letter to Norton is published in *Letters of Chauncey Wright*, ed. James B. Thayer (Cambridge, Mass., 1878), pp. 169-75.

[4.] Cf. *Pol. Econ.*, Book II, sec. 4 ("Should the right of bequest be limited, and how?"), and Book V, chap. ix, sec. 1 ("Laws of Inheritance").

[5.] Norton had invited them to the Villa Spannocchi, near Siena, Italy, where he and his family were spending the summer.

[6.] The conference of the Council and delegates of the National Education League held in Willis's Rooms on June 15 to consider amendments to the Government's Education Bill. The meeting was reported in the *Daily News*, June 16, 1870, p. 3.

[7.] Charles Dickens had died on June 9.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt quoted in A. R. Wallace, *My Life: A Record of Events and Opinions* (2 vols., New York, 1905), II, 254.

Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913), naturalist, who in an essay sent to Charles Darwin in 1858 anticipated the idea of natural selection as the method of evolution advanced by Darwin in *The Origin of Species* (1859).

Wallace records (p. 253) that on reading his attack on private property in his *Malay Archipelago* (1869) JSM had written to him from Avignon on May 19, 1870, enclosing the programme of his proposed Land Tenure Reform Association and inviting Wallace to become a member of the General Committee. Wallace accepted the invitation and became active in the cause; eventually he became president of the Land Nationalization Society. Wallace records that on the Sunday following this letter he dined at JSM's home at Blackheath Park with Helen Taylor, George Grote, and Auberon Herbert.

[2.] A general meeting of the Land Tenure Reform Association, held at the Freemasons' Tavern on July 9, 1870 (see *The Times*, July 12, p. 12). JSM presided at the meeting.

[3.] Wallace's proposal was adopted as article X of the Programme.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] The Radical Club.

[3.] JSM has presumably misdated the letter. The meeting of the Land Tenure Reform Association was on July 9.

[4.] See preceding Letter.

[5.] Probably Christopher Nevile (or Nevill) (1806-1877), vicar of Thorney, 1830-62, who relinquished holy orders in 1870.

[1.] MS in the Mitchell Library, Sydney. Published in the *Australian Quarterly*, XVIII (Dec., 1946), 30-34, ed. J. A. La Nauze. Apparently in reply to the undated letter from Kingsley published in *Charles Kingsley, His Letters and Memories of his Life*, ed. by his wife (2 vols., London, 1877), II, 327-30. Kingsley had been requested by JSM to give his reasons for more or less withdrawing his support from the women's suffrage movement.

[2.] See Letter 1529.

[3.] See Letter 1559.

[4.] Against the Contagious Diseases Acts. See Letter 1513.

[5.] In the following November Sir Henry Storks, a Liberal, was defeated in a byelection at Colchester, mainly because of his enthusiastic support of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

[6.] Kingsley had recently moved from Eversley, where he had been rector for many years, to Chester, where he had been appointed a Canon of the Cathedral.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] "Sir Thomas More on the Politics of To-Day," *FR*, n.s. VIII (Aug., 1870), 125-37.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] The Radical Club.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

Wallace had recently visited JSM at Blackheath. See Letter 1570, n. 1.

[2.] *Education* (London, 1861).

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] The Radical Club.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Published with the title "A Note" in *FR*, n.s. VIII (Aug., 1870), pp. 246-48, this was an answer to Frederic Harrison's criticism ("Professor Cairnes on M. Comte and Political Economy," *FR*, n.s. VIII [July, 1870], 39-58) of Cairnes's article in the May, 1870, *FR*. The note is reprinted in Cairnes's *Essays in Political Economy* (London, 1873), pp. 308-11, with no correction of the ambiguity JSM refers to.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *The Revolution*, VI (Nov. 17, 1870), 316, and in Elizabeth Cady Stanton *et al.*, *History of Woman Suffrage* (2 vols., New York, 1881), I, 219-20.

[2.] See Letter 1502, n. 4.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Of the Radical Club. See Letter 1577.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Kinnear's letter of July 1 (posted July 8) to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 263-65.

[2.] Of the Land Tenure Reform Association. Kinnear was unable to attend the adjourned meeting of the Committee on Easter Monday and the meeting of July 9. He objected chiefly to the proposed Articles V and VI which recommended that the State purchase land for the development of co-operative agriculture and for letting to small cultivators. See "Land Tenure Reform," *Collected Works*, V, 689-95.

[3.] As advocated by the Land and Labour League.

[4.] Kinnear also objected to Article IV, which sought "To claim, for the benefit of the State, the Interception by Taxation of the Future Unearned Increase of the Rent of Land. . . ."

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, II, 265-66. In reply to Rusden's of May 21, MS at Yale; another letter by Rusden of Sept. 9, 1870, is at LSE.

Henry Keylock Rusden (b. 1826), of Melbourne, an employee of the Victoria civil service (police department), secretary of the Royal Society of Victoria, author of many pamphlets of advanced views.

[2.] Rusden had sent two essays delivered to the local debating association, one on the rights of women and one on suicide.

[3.] Rusden had written: "I imagine that you restricted your book on The Subjection of Women within limits which rendered it admissible to everybody's drawing room as well as library—intentionally—although quite prepared to go as far as myself."

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, II, 262-63.

[2.] JSM reviewed Taine's *De l'Intelligence* (2 vols., Paris, 1870) in *FR*, n.s. VIII (July, 1870), 121-24. The review was reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 111-18, Am. ed. V, 122-30.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Envelope containing it bears note in JSM's hand: New valuation of house / & appeal against it / July 25, 1870 / answer from E. L. Burnett / July 26, & onto same date, to the Clerk / of the Assessment Committee / N.B. valuation reduced to / £ 150 gross £ 125 rateable. [This last sentence may indicate the result of JSM's appeal.]

Accompanying the letter is the draft of a covering note: "Mr Mill begs to inclose his appeal against the new valuation of his house. Mr Mill would be much obliged if Mr Burnett would write him a letter to say whether he should bring with him to Woolwich on the 28th, the vouchers necessary to prove the statements made in his appeal.

B.P.

July 25. 1870”

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Fawcett’s of July 23 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 266-67.

[2.] Fawcett in his letter had called for a public expression of opinion in favour of Prussia. The war had been begun officially by France on July 19.

[3.] JSM made at least *one* public declaration on the Franco-Prussian war when he wrote to the general council of the International Working Men’s Association in approval of Karl Marx’s address of July 23, 1870, on the war. JSM wrote that he was “highly pleased with the address. There was not one word in it that ought not to be there; it could not have been done with fewer words.” See Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement* (London, 1965), pp. 178-79.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] Plummer held an editorial position on the new daily evening journal, the *London Figaro*.

[3.] “The Working Men’s International Exhibition,” *Nonconformist*, July 20, 1870, pp. 689-90. Plummer had made a specialty of reporting working men’s exhibitions.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Bain’s of July 19, MS at Johns Hopkins, as is also Bain’s rejoinder of Aug. 16.

[2.] The whole correspondence on the theory of force culminated in separate statements, one by JSM and the other by Bain. The MSS of these statements, which are not letters, are at Johns Hopkins. JSM’s statement was published in Elliot, II, 321-25. JSM added a section on the Conservation of Force to the 8th edition of his *Logic* (1872); see *Logic*, I, 402-409 (III, v, 10).

[3.] See Letter 1554, n. 6.

[4.] Bain had written of a report that the Medical School of the College of Surgeons, Edinburgh, was to be opened to women, without any restrictions. “This move, however, will be effectually frustrated if the new medical bill pointedly excludes women from the license to practise. All the old corporations will lose their licensing power, and unless the bill admits women, they will be in a worse state than ever.”

[5.] See Letter 1581.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Trant’s of Aug. 2 to which this is a reply.

Trant, who wrote from 51 Storks Road, Bermondsey, was associated with the working men's clubs movement. His letter noted that the regular edition of the *Logic* was "too expensive for working men to purchase for themselves."

[1.] MS at NYP.

[2.] Letter 1490.

[3.] See Letter 1520.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Kinnear's letter of Aug. 4 to which this is a reply. See also Letter 1581.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Dated in a marginal note on the verso.

Grant Duff was undersecretary of state for India, 1868-74.

[2.] See Letters 1564 and 1568.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Kilgour's letter of Aug. 10 to which this is a reply and his rejoinder of Aug. 18. Published in Elliot, II, 267-68.

Kilgour, writing from 55 Cumberland St., Edinburgh, has been identified only as the probable author of two publications on chemical subjects which are listed in the Brit. Mus. *Catalogue*.

[2.] *The British Empire. Proposed Institution of a Joint Committee of the Legislatures and Governments of the Empire, having periodical meetings in Great Britain* (London, 1869).

[3.] Both of Kilgour's letters contain bitter attacks upon George Odger as a possible MP. JSM had supported Odger's bid for election earlier this year (see Letters 1519, n. 2, and 1528).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Taylor's letter of Aug. 21 to which this is a reply. Draft is in JSM's hand, but is initialled H.T. Published in Elliot, II, 269-70.

[2.] For many years under sentence of death and in exile, Mazzini had been included in the general amnesty of 1866. Earlier in 1870 he had set out for Sicily, but was arrested at sea off Palermo on Aug. 14 and imprisoned at Gaeta. Fears for his life were aroused among his friends, among whom Peter Taylor had long been numbered. Taylor in his letter of Aug. 21 had urged JSM as one who could speak with authority to protest on Mazzini's behalf, perhaps by a letter to *The Times*. In the event, Mazzini was released in Oct., and returned to exile.

[3.] Taylor seems to have plotted a rescue of Mazzini which somehow fell through. Emilie Venturi, friend of the Taylors, did journey to Gaeta to visit Mazzini.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Hennessey's letter of Aug. 25 to which this is a reply. Published in part in Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists* (London and Toronto, 1965), pp. 230-31.

Hennessey in his letter of Aug. 25 as President of the Land and Labour League had invited JSM to attend a public meeting to be held within a fortnight to protest against England's being brought into the war on the Continent, to call for the abolition of standing armies, "and to demand that all able-bodied men in the country shall have a thorough military training as the best Safeguard of Peace and best defence in War."

Hennessey has been identified only as a tailor and an Irish trade unionist active in a number of left-wing organizations. He and his associates very soon abandoned their stand for neutrality and called for English recognition of the new French republic.

[1.] MS at Arsenal; MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 270-71, in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 228-30, and in *Cosmopolis*, pp. 788-89. In reply to D'Eichthal's of Aug. 8, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] On July 19.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Westlake's letter of Sept. 3 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 271-73.

John Westlake (1823-1913), jurist; a co-founder in 1869 of the first periodical of international law, *Revue de Droit Internationale et de Legislation Comparée*; later Whewell Professor of international law at Cambridge, succeeding Henry Maine.

[2.] Westlake had written that he was to give a paper at the Sept. meeting of the NAPSS at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on "Is it desirable to prohibit the export of Contraband of War?" (see NAPSS, *Transactions* for 1870, pp. 109-25). See also Westlake's "Est-il désirable de prohiber l'exportation de la contrebande de guerre?" *Revue de Droit Internationale*, II (1870), 614-35.

[3.] Westlake had written: "I feel very gloomy about the probable results of this war. If the unity of Germany could have been secured by a war carried on against France under normal circumstances and therefore with no more success than necessary for that object, I should have rejoiced; but as France cannot be expected to acquiesce in an extreme humiliation suffered under exceptional circumstances, & she will not in general want allies to aid her, I fear that no peace now to be made can be any thing more than a truce."

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Sept. 10, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] "Bastiat." *FR*, n.s. VIII (Oct., 1870), 411-28, reprinted in *Essays in Political Economy*, pp. 312-44.

[3.] James Sprent Virtue (1829-1892), publisher. *FR* was printed by Virtue and Co.

[4.] W. T. Thornton, "Anti-Utilitarianism." *FR*, n.s. VIII (Sept. 1870), 314-37. The article contains criticism of JSM. See Letter 1616.

[5.] Cairnes had written: "He [Thornton] might at least have mastered the distinction between 'intention' and 'motive' before undertaking to refute utilitarianism."

[6.] Jeremy Bentham, *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (London, 1789).

[7.] James Mill, *Fragment on Mackintosh* (London, 1835).

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Trant's of Sept. 12 to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letter 1589. In his reply of Oct. 30, Trant recommended the Eleusis Club of Chelsea, the Working Men's Club and Institute of Newcastle-on-Tyne, the London Artizans' Club of Oxford St., the Working Men's Club and Institute Union in the Strand, and the Cobden Working Men's Club of Bermondsey Square. Trant reported that the copy of the *Logic* given by JSM to the library of the National Sunday League was in constant use by working men.

[3.] Trant recommended a price as close as possible to that of the cheap edition of the *Pol. Econ.* (5s.). The Library edition of the *Logic* sold for 25s.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 273-75, and several sentences in Dilke, p. 641. In reply to Dilke's of Sept. 26, MS at Johns Hopkins. *Envelope marked in JSM's hand: last paragraph & passages / by H.T.*

[2.] After the disastrous defeat of the French at Sedan on Sept. 2, a Government of National Defence was proclaimed on Sept. 4, marking the end of the second Empire and the establishment of the third Republic.

[3.] The new government of the Republic in France was not officially recognized by England until the beginning of Feb., and then in concert with four other powers.

[4.] Palmerston gave recognition and support to Lamartine's provisional government once the Parisian chaos of the Feb., 1848, revolution had subsided.

[5.] A large deputation organized under the auspices of the Labour Representation League and consisting of officers and representatives of about a hundred principal London and provincial Trades Societies had waited upon the Prime Minister at Downing St. on Sept. 27, 1870. The deputation urged formal recognition of the new French Republic and greater activity in behalf of peace by the English government. Gladstone maintained that the situation in France was too uncertain as yet to warrant formal recognition. See *The Times*, Sept. 28, p. 9.

[6.] Dilke in his letter had said that the government should be urged "to declare against the transfer of territory without any consent on the part of the people being given or sought for." Germany was demanding the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine.

[1.] MS not located. Published in F. W. Soutter, *Recollections of a Labour Pioneer* (London, 1923), p. 84.

[2.] The new education law of this year provided for popular election of school boards. Six years later Helen Taylor was elected to the London School Board with the support of the Association.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *Christianity v: Secularism. Report of a public discussion, between D. King . . . and C. Bradlaugh* (Birmingham, 1870), App. No. 5. Reprinted in Henry Varley, *Mr Bradlaugh Proved Utterly Unfit to Represent any English Constituency . . .* (London, 1884), p. 9, and by Norman Himes, "John Stuart Mill's Attitude Toward Neo-Malthusianism," Supplement to *The Economic Journal*, Economic History Series No. 4 (Jan., 1929), p. 479.

David King (1819-1894), Birmingham evangelist and publisher, in debating with Charles Bradlaugh this year challenged Bradlaugh's implicit assumption that JSM approved the controversial Neo-Malthusian work *The Elements of Social Science* (see Letter 1440). King wrote JSM for a statement.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 275-76, as to Jean Arlès-Dufour. In reply to Arlès-Dufour's of Sept. 26, MS at Johns Hopkins, as is also his reply to JSM of Nov. 15.

François Barthélemy Arlès-Dufour, originally Arlès (1797-1872), an early disciple of Saint-Simon, became a leading businessman at Lyon, active in government affairs. With Frédéric Passy, he founded, in 1867, the Ligue Internationale et Permanente de la Paix. After the fall of the second Empire in Sept., 1870, he wrote letters to Gladstone and John Bright urging England's intervention in the Franco-Prussian War. *The Times*, on Oct. 19, p. 7, published an "Appeal to England" by Arlès-Dufour, written from Lyon, Oct. 12. Professor Max Müller of Oxford commented at length on the letter in "Is Peace Possible?" (*ibid.*, Oct. 25, 1870, p. 12). JSM had been acquainted with Arlès-Dufour for many years (see *Earlier Letters*, p. 90).

[2.] *The Times*, Oct. 26, p. 9, reported on propositions for an armistice made simultaneously by Lord Lyons at Tours and Lord Augustus Loftus at Berlin, and on the day of this letter (p. 10) published a dispatch from its Berlin correspondent dated Oct. 26, on Lord Granville's "suggestions respecting an armistice." Nothing, however, came of these initial peace feelers.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Not located. See Letter 1601, n. 2.

[3.] William Ellis.

[4.] At the meeting of the Representative Reform Association, successor to the Reform League, on Oct. 22 at 9, Buckingham St., Strand, with Thomas Hare presiding, JSM had advocated cumulative voting for the election of the London

School Board. See the *Daily News*, Oct. 24, 1870, p. 4, and the *Beehive*, Oct. 29, 1870, p. 580.

[5.] Thomas Mottershead (1826-1884), silk weaver, a member of the General Council of the International, 1869-72. In the latter year he broke with Karl Marx and fought his revolutionary policies.

[6.] Lloyd Jones (1811-1886), disciple of Robert Owen; for many years a leader of the co-operative movement; journalist active in labour causes.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Adrian H. Joline, *Rambles in Autograph Land* (New York and London, 1913), p. 176.

Riddle has not been identified.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 276-77. In reply to Booker's letter of Oct. 30, also at Johns Hopkins, as is his further letter of Nov. 18. JSM's letter is marked, "Chiefly by H. T."

Booker, a working man of Manchester, was interested in running for election to the newly established school board, but was concerned with the problem of financial support if the duties of the office required absence from his usual work.

[2.] The Education Act of 1870.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Trant's of Oct. 30 to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letter 1599.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[2.] Dr. Elizabeth Garrett (later Mrs. Anderson) led the poll for the newly established London School Board in the election on Nov. 30, 1870.

[3.] JSM may have been influenced by Miss Garrett's known opposition to the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as are also Trant's of Nov. 13 to which this is a reply, and his rejoinder of Nov. 18. See Letter 1599.

[2.] Trant in his reply of Nov. 18 promised to distribute the books to working men's club libraries and to work for admitting women to the libraries.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Morley's reply of Nov. 17, 1870. Published in part in Elliot, II, 277-78. In JSM's hand but initialled: "H.T."

[2.] Her lecture had been given at Stroud on May 25, 1870, under the auspices of the Mechanics' Institute (see *Amberley Papers*, II, 329-30) and as a result of Helen

Taylor's persuasion. With the title "The Claims of Women" it appeared in *FR*, n.s. IX (Jan., 1871), 95-110.

[3.] The following cancelled passage appears in the draft after this opening clause: "as you seemed to agree with me in thinking well of it & as it is important not to let pass a *good* opportunity of occasionally returning to the charge on the subject of women's emancipation. Her name & position are of great use to the cause as may be seen from the attacks which are continually made on her for her support of it. We should therefore take all the advantage we can of that support & it will give me very great pleasure if you will print it in the next number."

[4.] JSM is probably referring to Morley's editorial, "England and the War," in the *FR*, n.s. VIII (Oct., 1870), 479-88.

[5.] Both territories were ceded by France to Germany in the peace treaty of March 3, 1871.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Courtney's reply of Nov. 18. In JSM's hand but initialed "H.T."

Courtney had been a leader-writer for *The Times* since 1865.

[2.] JSM's letter, under the heading "Mr. Mill on the Treaty of 1856," appeared in *The Times* the next day, Nov. 19, 1870, p. 5. It argued that Russia's declaration on Oct. 31 repudiating the neutralization of the Black Sea as required by the Treaty of Paris (1856) was not a sufficient ground for England to go to war with Russia. The same day's *Times* also printed a letter on the same subject by James Anthony Froude. *The Times* leader for that day (evidently by Courtney), p. 9, attacked JSM's and Froude's positions. JSM's letter was further attacked by Lord Shaftesbury (*ibid.*, Nov. 22, p. 3) and Lord Russell (*ibid.*, Nov. 23, p. 3); JSM's answer to Shaftesbury was published on Nov. 24, p. 3, and was criticized in a leader of the same day, p. 7. JSM also contributed an article on the subject, "Treaty Obligations," to the *FR*, n.s. VIII (Dec., 1870), 715-20, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 119-29, Am. ed. V, 131-42. See also Letters 1612, 1613, 1614, and 1616.

The war scare was eventually quieted by a conference, held in London from Dec., 1870, to March, 1871, which issued a declaration against the unilateral repudiation of treaties.

[3.] Probably the leaders in *The Times* of Nov. 16, p. 8; Nov. 17, p. 8; and Nov. 18, p. 7.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. All but first paragraph published in Elliot, II, 279-80.

[2.] For a good account of Fawcett's efforts from 1869 to prevent the further enclosure of Commons, see Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett*, chap. vii, "Commons Preservation."

[3.] See Letters 1611 and 1613.

[4.] The Franco-Prussian War.

[1.] MS draft by Helen Taylor at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 278-79. In reply to Morley's of Nov. 17, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] To Rose Ayling, in May, 1870.

[3.] See the two preceding Letters.

[4.] Over the Alabama claims.

[5.] France was a co-signatory of the Treaty of 1856, at the close of the Crimean War.

[6.] See next Letter.

[7.] Charing Cross Station.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Courtney's letter of Nov. 18, answering Letter 1611, both also at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, II, 281-82.

[2.] See Letter 1611.

[3.] *Ibid.*, n. 2.

[4.] The second Treaty of Paris of Nov. 20, 1815, provided that no member of the Bonaparte family might henceforth occupy the throne of France. Louis Napoleon's *coup* of Dec., 1852, overturned the Treaty.

[5.] The republic of Cracow, established by the Congress of Vienna of 1815, was annexed by Austria in 1846.

[6.] William E. Forster had been reared a Friend, but had to leave the Society upon his marriage to Matthew Arnold's sister in 1850. Courtney in his letter of Nov. 18 had reported Forster as eager to have England go to war if necessary to prevent Russia's abrogating the Treaty of 1856.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] See Letter 1611.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for last two paragraphs, in Elliot, II, 282-84. Last paragraph by Helen Taylor.

[2.] See Letters 1610, 1611, and 1613.

[3.] No such letter has been located.

[4.] This sentence is marked by JSM as by Helen Taylor.

[5.] "The Russian Note," *Economist*, Nov. 19, 1870, pp. 1393-94.

[6.] See Letter 1598, n. 4.

[7.] London, 1789.

[8.] London, 1835.

[9.] As letters from Lady Amberley to Helen Taylor (MSS at LSE) indicate, JSM and Helen had visited the Amberleys in their new home, Ravenscroft, near Chepstow and Tintern Abbey in late September or early October, and then had travelled to Geneva by way of Belgium and Germany. Travel through France was, of course, imperilled by the war with Prussia.

[1.] MS and MS draft at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1612.

[3.] John Poyntz Spencer, 5th Earl Spencer (1835-1910), then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

[4.] "The Cry for War with Russia," *Daily News*, Nov. 22, 1870, p. 3.

[5.] See Letter 1611, n. 2.

[6.] It was held in Town Hall to protest against the interference of England in the difficulties between Russia and Turkey. Jacob Bright and J. A. Froude were among the speakers. See *Daily News*, Dec. 3, 1870, p. 3.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

Joseph Sturge (1847-1934), only son of the more famous pacifist leader of the same name (1793-1859); Birmingham business man, managing director (1875-1922) of the Montserrat Co., founded in the West Indies by his father to demonstrate the practicability of employing free labour; from 1906 a magistrate in Birmingham.

[2.] See preceding Letter, n. 6.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Laveleye's reply of Nov. 27 is at LSE.

[2.] Permission was granted, and *The Times* on Nov. 30, p. 6, published it under the title "M. de Laveleye on the Eastern Question," with a covering letter by JSM.

[1.] MS draft, in JSM's hand but initialed "H.T.," at Johns Hopkins, as is also Morley's reply of Nov. 30. Published in Elliot, II, 284-85.

[2.] Henry Thomas Buckle, *Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works*.

[3.] Paris was still under siege by the Germans.

[4.] See Letter 1611, n. 2.

[1.] MS at one time in the possession of Myers and Co., 102 New Broad St., London, present location unknown.

[2.] Presumably Ann Robertson, who was active in the women's suffrage movement.

[3.] Julia Ward Howe (1819-1910), American author and reformer, in Sept., 1870, had published an "Appeal to Womanhood throughout the World," calling for an international congress of women to promote the causes of peace. For the "Appeal" see Laura E. Richards and Maud Howe Elliott, *Julia Ward Howe* (2 vols., Boston and New York, 1916), I, 302-303. The first meeting of the World's Congress of Women in behalf of International Peace was held at Union League Hall, New York, on Dec. 23, 1870; among others, a letter from JSM was read in opposition to the plan. A MS letter of Mrs. Howe to JSM of May 7, 1873, on further plans for women's peace congresses is at LSE.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Muston's letter of Oct. 4 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 286-87.

Alexis Jean Baptiste Muston (1810-1888), protestant pastor at Bourdeaux (Drôme); poet under the pseudonym of A. M. de Mornans; author of a number of historical works on the Waldensians, including *L'Israël des Alpes, première histoire complète des Vaudois et de leur colonies* (4 vols., Paris, 1851), trans. into English and German.

[2.] See Letters 1546 and 1583.

[3.] Muston had written (trans.): ". . . It seems to me, that, in spite of his [Taine's] logic, this is only a hypothesis; and I have asked myself whether the laws of logic have more weight in guiding us to the truth, than our ways of feeling.—By *feel* I do not mean the result of a definite sensation, but what is meant when one says: I *feel* that I am; I *feel* that ingratitude is no virtue. . . ."

[4.] JSM's *Utilitarianism*, translated into French as by P. E. de la Friche, had been published in the *Revue Nationale*, XXII (Aug., Sept., and Oct., 1865), 5-31, 263-78, and 482-506. But for JSM's identification of the translator, see Letter 1744.

[1.] MS at Arsenal, Published in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 230-31.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] "Our Best Military Model," *The Echo*, Dec. 17, 1870, p. 1. A comparison of Swiss and Prussian military systems, and a suggestion that the British government follow the Swiss example.

[3.] "Our Best Military Model," *The Times*, Dec. 20, 1870, p. 8.

[1.] MS at Pierpont Morgan Library. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 287-90. In reply to Nichol's of Dec. 26, 1870, MS at Johns Hopkins, as is also Nichol's rejoinder of Jan. 7, 1871.

[2.] See Letter 1513.

[3.] A Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill had been passed on Aug. 3, 1869 (*Hansard*, CXCVIII, col. 1137), and received Royal Assent on Aug. 9.

[1.] MS at UCL. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Chadwick's letter of Dec. 26, to which this is a reply. Published, except for first two sentences, in Elliot, II, 291.

[2.] *Draft Resolutions, as the Foundation for a Memorial, proposed for the consideration of the Special Committee of the National Association for Promotion of Social Science, appointed after the reading and discussion of Mr. Frederic Hill's paper on the Military Policy of this Country* (London, 1871). The British Museum has also a copy of the revised resolutions of the special committee, May, 1871.

Hill's paper, "The Policy of England in Regard to War," had been read at a meeting of the Jurisprudence Section of the NAPSS on Nov. 21, 1870. The paper was published separately, London, 1870; it contains, pp. 19-21, Chadwick's comments at the meeting.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in P. J. and A. E. Dobell's Catalogue No. 24 (1923).

Mrs. Fanny Hertz, a resident of Bradford, active in women's causes. For a paper by her on "Mechanics' Institutes for Working Women," see NAPSS, *Transactions*, 1859 (London, 1860), pp. 347-54.

[2.] A public meeting on the Contagious Diseases Acts was held in St. George's Hall, Bradford, on Jan. 18, 1871. For a report of it, see the *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 19, 1871, p. 4.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Morley's letter of Jan. 3, also at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 292-93.

[2.] See Letter 1620.

[3.] As Morley had invited him to do for the *Fortnightly Review*.

[4.] Including such men as Edward Beesly and Frederic Harrison. For an account, see “The Positivists: A Study of Labour’s Intellectuals,” chap. vi in Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists*.

[5.] Morley had reported that Cairnes was going to write on the question of national defence. Cairnes’s article, “Our Defences: A National or a Standing Army,” appeared in *FR*, n.s. IX (Feb., 1871), 167-98.

[6.] Comte Agénor Étienne de Gasparin, *La République neutre d’Alsace* (Geneva, 1870).

[1.] MS at Arsenal.

[2.] JSM was to address a women’s suffrage meeting in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, on Jan. 12, 1871. His speech was subsequently printed as a pamphlet (Edinburgh, 1873). For a contemporary account, see *The Times*, Jan. 13, 1871, p. 3.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Chadwick’s of Jan. 13 to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letter 1626.

[3.] See Letter 1631, n. 5.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. In reply to Dilke’s of Jan. 16, MS at Yale.

[2.] The Roll of the Club to 1920 does not record the names of any women members.

[3.] William Newmarch was Treasurer of the Club from 1855 to 1882.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Brace’s of Dec. 11, 1870, MS also at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 294-97.

[2.] Elizabeth Garrett (Anderson) and Emily Davies.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Mrs. Halsted’s letter of Dec. 29 to which this is a reply. Published in Elliot, II, 293-94.

Mrs. Halsted in her letter identified herself only as an American, resident in Florence.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Willcox’s of Oct. 11, 1870, but with a postscript dated Nov. 11, also at Johns Hopkins. Partly published in Elliot, II, 303. *Bears note in JSM’s hand:* From New York Liberal Club, with diploma of membership and reply Jan. 20, 1871 (letter on protection). For publication. J.S. Mill.

J. K. Hamilton Willcox (1842-1898), American insurance broker and politician, prominent in the woman suffrage movement. He had visited JSM at Avignon in Sept., 1869.

[2.] JSM had been elected a member of the New York Liberal Club, an organization founded in 1869 on the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Alexander von Humboldt, for the discussion of papers on both political and non-political subjects. See next Letter.

[3.] Including a synopsis of a lecture delivered by Willcox to the New York Liberal Club on Aug. 19, 1870, headed "Women's Sphere—Population and Suffrage—New Views," in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*, Aug. 27, 1870.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in *New York Tribune*, Feb. 13, 1871, p. 2, and in Elliot, II, 298-302. In reply to the letter of the Secretary of the New York Liberal Club of Oct. 11, 1870, announcing JSM's election as a corresponding member.

[2.] See preceding Letter, n. 2.

[3.] David Ames Wells, a recent convert to free trade, in his Report of 1869 as Special Commissioner of the Revenue took such an extreme free-trade point of view that President U. S. Grant abolished the office of Special Commissioner in 1870.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Leslie's letter of Jan. 22 to which this is a reply and his rejoinder of Feb. 7, 1871. Published in part in Elliot, II, 303-304.

[2.] The meeting was on Feb. 3, with Sir Charles Dilke leading on the question, "Would the institution of Free Schools have a tendency to pauperize the parents of the children who might be taught in them?"

[3.] At St James's Hall on March 25, 1871.

[4.] Sir Robert Anstruther (1834-1886), lord lieutenant and sheriff principal of Fifeshire from 1864; MP for Fifeshire, 1864-80.

[5.] "The Military Systems of Europe in 1867," *North British Rev.*, n.s. VIII (Dec., 1867), 404-40, reprinted in Leslie's *Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 128-47.

[6.] In Switzerland every male citizen between the ages of nineteen and forty-four was required to serve in the army each year, but for very short periods in time of peace.

[7.] Edwin Chadwick was an ardent advocate of military drill in schools as part of his half-time scheme of education.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for last paragraph, in Elliot, II, 304-305.

[2.] Italy had occupied Rome by force on Sept. 20, 1870.

[3.] The preliminary peace treaty between France and Germany was signed on Feb. 26, and the final treaty ending the War, on May 10, 1871.

[4.] Villari had been appointed undersecretary for education in 1869.

[5.] Eventually published as *Niccolò Machiavelli e i suoi tempi* (3 vols., Florence, 1877-82).

[6.] See Letter 1516.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. The year is pencilled in in another hand.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in S. H. Harris, *Auberon Herbert: Crusader for Liberty* (London, 1943), p. 123.

Auberon Edward William Molyneux Herbert (1838-1906), third son of the Earl of Carnarvon; political philosopher and author; MP, Nottingham, 1870-74. He had become acquainted with JSM in 1866.

[2.] Herbert had endorsed the Swiss system of universal military training in the debate in the House of Commons on March 13, 1871. See *Hansard*, CCIV, cols. 1947-48.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's reply of March 16, agreeing to publish the pamphlet.

[2.] See Letter 1466, n. 5.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's reply of March 20. See preceding Letter.

[1.] MS not located. Published in Elliot, II, 306. Attributed by Elliot to Helen Taylor.

Mark Hayler Judge (1847-1927), architect, writer on socialism, trades unions and the law, and health conditions.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's of March 20.

[2.] See Letter 1643.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] See Letter 1653.

[3.] See Letter 1650.

[1.] MS at the Women's Service Library, London.

[2.] Rhoda Garrett (1841-1882), a cousin of Mrs. Fawcett, and by profession a house decorator.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also their letter of March 24 to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letters 1643 and 1646.

[1.] MS at Huntington. See Letter 1647.

[2.] *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. John Bowring (11 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1838-43).

[1.] MS in 1944 in the possession of Professor Harold Laski.

[2.] *Village Communities in the East and West* (London, 1871).

[3.] "Mr. Maine on Village Communities," *FR*, n.s. IX (May, 1871), 543-56, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., IV, 130-53, Am. ed., V, 143-68.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in A. R. Wallace, *My Life: A Record of Events and Opinions* (2 vols., New York, 1905), II, 256.

[2.] The first public meeting of the Land Tenure Reform Association, originally scheduled for May 3, 1871, was held at Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen St., London, on May 15, with JSM as Chairman and principal speaker (see *The Times*, May 17, 1871, p. 7).

[3.] See Letters 1570 and 1571.

[1.] MS at Huntington.

[2.] See Letters 1647 and 1650.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as are Holyoake's of March 24, to which this is a reply, and of April 12.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's of April 18.

[2.] Longman had reported that, although the agreement with respect to *On Liberty* had expired the previous November, they had inadvertently printed 1,000 in January.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Kelsall's letter of March 20 to which this is a reply. Partly published in Elliot, II, 306-307. The original of this letter in 1935 was in the possession of Kelsall's granddaughters, the Misses E. W. and F. E. Kelsall; see H. W. Donner, *The Browning Box* (London, 1935), pp. lxiv-lxv.

Thomas Forbes Kelsall (1799-1872), solicitor who lived at Fareham; close friend and literary executor of the poet Thomas Lovell Beddoes.

Kelsall had written to protest against JSM's remark in his "Explanatory Statement of the Programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association" that the game found on common lands was the property of the lord of the manor.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt quoted in Frederic Harrison, *Autobiographic Memoirs*, I, 302. The portion in brackets is Harrison's introduction to the quotation.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Odger's reply of May 19. The draft also contains a covering note to d'Eichthal to accompany the letter of introduction: "Mon cher d'Eichthal, Tiens un mot d'introduction à M. Odger. Son adresse est. . . . May 1, 1871." D'Eichthal was then visiting London.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as are also Charles and Duncan McLaren's letters of April 23 and 24.

[2.] Charles Benjamin Bright McLaren (1850-1934), in later life a highly successful barrister and man of business; MP for Stafford, 1880-86, and for the Bosworth division of Leicestershire, 1892-1910; created first Baron of Aberconway, 1911. No copy of Charles McLaren's printed but not published volume of essays has been located. At this time he wanted a testimonial to support his application for an examinership in philosophy at Edinburgh.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The issues with which JSM was chiefly to concern himself in his correspondence with Robertson over the following year with reference to the split in the woman suffrage movement remain obscure. One wing of the movement, led by the Manchester group which included Lydia Becker and Jacob Bright, sought to supplant the London committee of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage (with which JSM had been closely associated since its founding in July, 1867) by setting up a Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage in which the London Society would be represented but would no longer be dominant. The agitation led this year to a breaking off of a new "Central Committee" from the London Society. An important reason for the split was the desire of JSM and his supporters to avoid linking the women suffrage movement with the agitation for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. JSM strongly favoured the repeal of these Acts but believed that the cause of women's suffrage would be seriously injured if it became involved in the highly controversial movement led by Josephine Butler. See Letters 1669 and 1680. In 1877, four years after JSM's death, the London Committee amalgamated with the Central Committee.

[3.] Thomas Hare and William Alexander Hunter were both members of the London Committee.

[4.] Mrs. Peter Taylor had been a leading member of the London Committee from the first.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[2.] The following has been cancelled in the draft: "The book itself was intended to be intelligible to beginners, & was made full & minute in its explanations on purpose

that it might be so. I think I have done enough in publishing a very cheap edition of it, & I am afraid of anything which might tend to make it available for cram." No abridgement of the *Pol. Econ.* appears to have been published before the one prepared as a college textbook by J. L. Laughlin (New York, 1884).

Possibly William Howitt (1792-1879), miscellaneous writer.

[3.] Not otherwise identified.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 1661.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's of May 15, to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letter 1662.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's of May 19.

[2.] In Aug., 1870, the Germans had laid siege to Strasbourg and for three nights (Aug. 23-26) heavily bombarded the city. Among the many public buildings destroyed was the Bibliothèque municipale, with its 200,000 volumes, 5,000 incunabula, and 1,600 manuscripts. Shortly after the capitulation of Strasbourg on Oct. 5, 1870, the victors launched an appeal, signed by many German publishers and librarians, for a fund to rebuild the Library. Committees were formed all over the world to collect money and books. The new University Library was inaugurated in 1871, but was not installed in a new building until 1895.

[1.] MS at Arsenal. Largely published in *D'Eichthal Corresp.*, pp. 232-33, and in *Cosmopolis*, pp. 789-90. In reply to d'Eichthal's of May 16, MS at Johns Hopkins. D'Eichthal, then visiting London, dated his letter from Queen's Road, Bayswater.

[2.] The Land Tenure Reform Association, of which the first public meeting had been held on May 15, with JSM presiding.

[3.] See Letter 1658. Odger's letter of May 19 is at LSE.

[4.] Louis François Michel Raymond Wolowski, French economist and politician, elected this year a member of the national assembly.

[5.] A revolution by the working class and the National Guard against the conservative national assembly led by Thiers had broken out on March 18 in an effort to establish the Commune de Paris. Government troops under General MacMahon marched on Paris from Versailles in May, and defeated the Commune in savage street battles, May 21-25. It has been estimated that 80,000 Parisians lost their lives in the revolution.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Hales's of May 27 to which this is a reply.

John Hales (b. 1839), by trade an elastic web weaver, active in the International Working Men's Association since 1866, had succeeded J. G. Eccarius as secretary to its General Council on May 16, 1871.

[2.] Hales had written that a committee had been formed to see whether something could be done "to stay the brutalities of the Versailles Government." On May 31 a meeting of representatives of various republican and democratic societies in London, convened by the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, was held at the Association Rooms, 256 High Holborn, to consider steps to be taken to prevent the English Government's extraditing any French Communist refugees who might seek refuge in England. This letter by JSM was read at the meeting. See *The Times*, June 1, 1871, p. 6, and *Daily News* of same day, p. 3.

[3.] See preceding Letter, n. 5.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt published in S. H. Harris, *Auberon Herbert*, p. 131.

Herbert's engagement to Lady Florence Amabel Cowper had been announced on May 22.

[1.] MS in a collection of Ward's papers in the Library of the University of Texas. Ward's name is pencilled on the MS in an unknown hand.

Thomas Humphry Ward (1845-1926), man of letters and a member of *The Times* staff; husband of the novelist Mrs. Humphry Ward.

[2.] Two letters, signed "A Hertfordshire Incumbent," on JSM and the land question with reference to the meeting of the Land Tenure Reform Association on May 15, had appeared in *The Times*, May 19, p. 9, and May 23, p. 12.

[3.] "Mr. Mill and the Land Question," *Daily News*, May 29, 1871, p. 5.

[4.] Joseph Williams Blakesley (1808-1885), author, Vicar of Ware, Herts., 1845-72; widely known as the "Hertfordshire Incumbent," who contributed many letters to *The Times* on social questions.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Caroline Ashurst Biggs became secretary of the new Central Committee several years later.

[3.] Joseph Biggs, a well-known radical of Leicester, who married Matilda Ashurst, sister of James Stansfeld's wife.

[4.] Probably Eliza Orme, who in 1875 became perhaps the first woman lawyer in England.

[5.] Mrs. John Westlake.

[6.] Mrs. Charlotte A. M. Burbury.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See preceding Letter.

[3.] Thomas Hare and his daughter Katherine, afterwards Mrs. Clayton.

[4.] William Thomas Thornton.

[1.] MS at Cornell.

[2.] Christie's *A Life of Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621-1683* (2 vols., London, 1871).

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Longman's of June 26, agreeing to publish Bissett's essays.

[2.] Published later this year by Longman: Andrew Bissett, *Essays on Historical Truth*. The volume contains an essay on James Mill.

[3.] *History of the Commonwealth of England from the death of Charles I to the expulsion of the Long Parliament by Cromwell* (2 vols., London, 1864-67).

[1.] MS at LSE.

Dated by JSM's botanical notebook at LSE and by the reference to *The Times*.

[2.] The richest of the Scottish mountains for botanizing.

[3.] See "Floods in the Tyrol," *The Times*, July 11, 1871, p. 11, a letter from a correspondent about floods and avalanches in the Alps, particularly in the Engadine Pass, where in June the walls of snow were twenty feet high.

[1.] MS at LSE. Cairnes's reply of Aug. 25 is in MS copy at LSE.

[2.] "Berkeley's Life and Writings," *FR*, n.s. X (Nov., 1871), 505-24, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. IV, 151-87.

[3.] Officers of H.M.S. *Agincourt* were convicted on July 26 of negligence in the stranding of the ship on Pearl Rock, Gibraltar, and on Aug. 19 the Admiralty superseded Vice-Admiral Wellesley and Rear-Admiral Wilmot for negligence in plotting the course of the squadron of which the *Agincourt* was a member. On June 17, H.M.S. *Megaera* was grounded on St. Paul's Island and abandoned.

[4.] Eyre's legal expenses were paid by Gladstone's government in 1872, and in 1874 he was awarded a pension by Disraeli's.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Giles's letter of May 10, 1870, also at Johns Hopkins. Published, with one omission, in Elliot, II, 308.

Joseph Giles, of Westport, N.Z. (1832-1930), physician, editor, later magistrate and farmer. He had sent JSM a copy of an essay on the need of higher education for women and a review of a lecture by a Judge Richmond on man's place in creation. Giles had asked JSM, "How far is a strict and logical philosophy consistent with religious faith?"

[2.] Probably Christopher William Richmond (1821-1895), from 1862 a judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand.

[3.] Giles had written: "Your letter to Mr. Pharazyn [Letter 991] places all our views upon such subjects on the basis of an hypothesis, but what I want to know is whether the fact that this hypothesis when assumed solves more problems, and produces more human excellence, than any other, does not in your opinion warrant a considerable degree of confidence in it."

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in W. M. Wood, "Octroi Taxes and J. S. Mill's Opinion Thereon," in *"Things of India" Made Plain; or a Journalist's Retrospect* (Part 1-3, London, 1884-89), pp. 380-82, from *The Times of India*, Sept. 22, 1871; and in Elliot, II, 307.

William Martin Wood (b. 1828), then editor of *The Times of India*.

[2.] Wood had called JSM's attention to a letter by one R. Knight, Indian economist, of Bombay.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Arnould Frémy (b. 1809), French novelist and journalist.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 308-10.

Emile Acollas (1826-1891), French jurisconsult and politician, then professor of French law at the University of Berne.

[2.] *Manuel de droit civil à l'usage des étudiants, contenant l'exégèse du Code Napoléon* (3 vols., Paris, 1869).

[3.] A letter of Aug. 3, 1871, to Charles Mismar, published with Mismar's reply, under the heading "Le Problème Social," in *The Levant Times and Shipping Gazette*, Aug. 19, 1871, p. 787.

[4.] *La République et la contre-révolution* (a letter to the *Journal de Genève*, April 21, 1871), republished at Geneva, 1871.

[5.] JSM was mistaken as to the date; the reference is to his review, "Scott's *Life of Napoleon*," *WR*, IX (April, 1828), 251-313.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of Aug. 25, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] Cairnes had written: "I remember telling you how much struck I was by a remark in your *Logic* to the effect that there was no necessary law of coexistence, as there are laws of succession. It has since occurred to me that this is only true of inorganic science, and that in the case of organisms the presence of certain elements implies the presence or absence of others. Thus in animals teeth of a certain kind imply a certain sort of stomach, claws or hoofs as the case may be, and so forth: so that we may conceive the 'form' of an organism in Bacon's sense of the word. And similarly, it seems to me, we find necessary laws of coexistence in the social organism: certain moral conditions implying certain complementary conditions in the political religious and aesthetic spheres: indeed this is the meaning of society being organic. The same law holds very obviously in the economic domain. Given conditions of productive industry and a given state of rent implies certain facts as to profits and wages; and vice versa profits and wages within certain limits determine rent and the productiveness of industry. These are the sort of relations which I think Comte had in view when he spoke of the statistical [copyist's error for *statical* ?] treatment of the social science as opposed to the Dynamical; and what my point comes to is this, that the true analogy for the distinction in question is not that between statics and dynamics, but that between laws of succession and laws of coexistence, which distinction runs pretty nearly parallel with that between the inorganic and organic method of study."

[3.] See *Logic*, Book III, chap. xxii, "Of Uniformities of Coexistence not dependent on Causation."

[4.] See Letter 1674, n. 2.

[5.] Of July 4, 1871, MS at Johns Hopkins.

[6.] Which speech of Senator Charles Sumner is referred to is not clear. It may have been his famous speech of April 13, 1869, which led to the rejection of the Johnson-Clarendon treaty to settle the Alabama Claims. Sumner supported, however, the Washington Treaty of 1871 in a speech on May 19.

[1.] MS at UCL. *Bears note*: "read to Committee."

[2.] For JSM's alterations in the wording, see the next Letter, a private one to Robertson.

[3.] See Letter 1661, n. 2.

[1.] MS at UCL. *Bears note*: Private.

[2.] William Alexander Hunter, a member of the London Committee.

[3.] See preceding Letter.

[4.] Caroline Ashurst Biggs.

[5.] Mrs. Peter A. Taylor.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for final paragraph, in Elliot, II, 310-12. In reply to Brace's of July 4, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Quoted from Brace's letter of July 4.

[3.] Brace had written: "Thus far in this country, in recent struggles between Labor and Capital, Labor has had the advantage—in shortening hours of work and in keeping up wages—for which I am rejoiced—as certainly the employing class has had most of the good things of life in the past. Large fortunes can not be made as easily as once—the gains of the capitalist being smaller relatively. Working men seem in a very prosperous condition, though they feel the tariff much."

[4.] The Treaty of Washington, signed on May 8, 1871, provided for four separate arbitrations of the disputes between England and America, the most ambitious arbitral undertaking in world history up to that time. The principal arbitration was that of the Alabama Claims, concluded on Sept. 14, 1872.

[5.] Brace was one of the founders of the Children's Aid Society in New York, and for many years its executive officer.

[6.] Vol. LXXXIX, pp. 73-100.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Robinson's letter of Sept. 28, to which this is a reply, and his rejoinder of Oct. 21. Published in Elliot, II, 312-13.

Robinson (d. 1877) identified himself as trade accountant of the West Riding Prison, Wakefield, then the largest manufacturing prison in the kingdom.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Stapleton's letter of Aug. 19 to which this is a reply.

Stapleton, a resident of Plymouth, was an advocate of nationalization of the land. See also Letter 1690.

[2.] Apparently never published.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *New York Tribune*, November 18, 1871, p. 5, with the remark that it "was read to the Liberal Club last night." Though the published letter bears no indication of the recipient, it is highly probable that he was Willcox. See Letters 1637 and 1638.

[2.] Letter 1638.

[3.] Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*, on the same day that he published JSM's letter of Jan. 20, 1871, vigorously attacked its free-trade views: "Mill on Protection," Feb. 13, 1871, p. 4. Further attacks were published by the *Tribune*: "Mill's Logic," Feb. 15, p. 4, and "Intentions in Statesmanship," Feb. 17, p.

4. Greeley also attacked this letter of JSM in an editorial in the *Tribune*, Nov. 20, 1871, p. 4.

Willcox in his article, "A Visit to John Stuart Mill at Avignon," *Appleton's Journal*, IX (June 14, 1873), 785-88, reported that in reply to Willcox's question whether Greeley and Carlyle did not have much in common, JSM replied that "in intensity of purpose, doggedness of opinion, sincerity of character, one-sidedness of judgment, and blind hatred for the higher forms of liberty, they are much alike." In reply to Willcox's question, "But has Carlyle been of any real use in the world as Greeley has?" JSM replied: "Yes, though he has usually advocated objectionable ideas, he has been so sincere that he has compelled sincerity in others. Where he has not convinced people of the truth of his beliefs, he has forced them to re-examine the grounds of their own beliefs, and has obliged them to believe much more sincerely, and thus has accomplished great good. He has materially aided also to break up a large amount of pretence and imposture."

[1.] MS at UCL. *Bears note*: Private.

[2.] See Letter 1681.

[3.] The Manchester Women's Suffrage Society, led by Lydia E. Becker and Jacob Bright.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. Last paragraph in Dilke, p. 638.

[2.] William Newmarch, "Address on Economy and Trade," delivered Oct. 11, 1871, at a meeting of the NAPSS at Leeds. See NAPSS, *Transactions* for 1871 (London, 1872), pp. 109-33. *The Times* has a long report of it, Oct. 12, 1871, p. 10.

[3.] Newmarch opposed articles 7-10 of the programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association, which he thought threatened private property.

[4.] Newmarch pointed to four or five Land and Building Societies that had become wealthy and powerful, and maintained that their owners would resist appropriation of future increases of income of rent.

[5.] He mentioned the mismanagement of the Jarndyce estate by the Court of Chancery in Dickens' *Bleak House* as exemplifying what might happen if government were to own or manage land.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably William Dougal Christie.

[3.] The movement for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

[1.] MS at UCL. *Bears note*: "Read to Committee, except last half page."

[2.] The last half page, which JSM did not want to have read to the Committee, begins here.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Stapleton's letter of Oct. 18 (to which this is a reply) and a rejoinder of Nov. 10. Published in Elliot, II, 313-15. See Letter 1684.

[2.] This was the year of the exposure of widespread corruption in New York City under the rule of William M. ("Boss") Tweed and Tammany Hall.

[3.] The MS is illegible at this point.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Mr. and Mrs. Peter A. Taylor. See Letter 1681.

[3.] Mrs. James Stansfeld.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The crisis within the Committee of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage had been surmounted. Miss Carolyn Biggs resigned as Secretary, and her supporters withdrew from the Committee.

[3.] JSM subsequently consented to serve as Honorary President.

[8.] Mrs. Peter Taylor.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] In Oct., 1871, a great flurry of interest arose in England over the question of international copyright. In response to a number of letters to the Editor, *The Times* on Oct. 14, p. 9, in a leader urged American acceptance of a copyright law which would protect foreign authors. On Oct. 20, p. 10, *The Times* published a reply by William H. Appleton, a partner in the New York firm of D. Appleton & Co., stating that "an International Copyright Law, rigorously in the author's interest, requiring him to make contracts for American republication directly with American publishers, and taking effect only with books entirely manufactured in the United States, would be acceptable to the [American] people."

Efforts to pass an international copyright law in the U.S. Congress in 1872 failed as did ten other efforts between 1843 and 1886, and it was not until 1891 that the American Copyright Acts were passed.

[3.] William Appleton drafted a bill incorporating the principles of his letter to *The Times* of Oct. 20. A Memorial favouring this bill was presented on Feb. 7, 1872, by Appleton to the Library Committee of the House in Washington, signed by fifty British authors, including JSM, Carlyle, Darwin, Morley, Ruskin, Froude, G. H. Lewes, and Thomas Hughes.

[1.] MS at UCL.

There is also at UCL the MS of a second letter to Robertson of the same date, bearing the note: "*Read to Committee.*" The second letter is virtually identical with this one, except that the first paragraph is omitted and these two relative clauses are added to the last sentence of this letter: "which would be glad to have her among them again, and which acceded to her own wish to retire because they understood her wish to be grounded on the desire to keep free of personal ill will."

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Frederick Pennington (1819-1914), a member of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage; later (1874-85) MP for Stockford.

[3.] See Letter 1692.

[4.] See Letter 1661.

[5.] Katherine Hare, daughter of Thomas Hare, married the Rev. Lewis Clayton, of St. James's, Northampton, on Jan. 2, 1872.

[6.] Maria Georgina Grey (1816-1906), sister of Emily Shirreff; wife of William Thomas Grey, a nephew of the second Earl Grey. In 1870 she was defeated by a few votes in the first election for the London School Board when she ran as a candidate for Chelsea. In 1871 she formed the National Union for the Education of Women. She was a frequent contributor on social and educational subjects to *Fraser's*, *Contemporary Review*, *The Nineteenth Century*, and *The Fortnightly Review*.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as are also Leslie's letter of Nov. 1 to which this is a reply, and his rejoinder of Jan. 3, 1872. Published in Elliot, II, 315-18.

[2.] "Financial Reform," *Cobden Club Essays, Second Series, 1871-2* (London, Paris, and New York, 1872), pp. 185-259.

[3.] An income tax had first been imposed by Pitt in April, 1799, and abolished at the end of the war with France. The tax was reinstated by Peel in 1842.

[4.] Established in Liverpool in 1848, it favoured economy in government, free trade, and direct taxation: it published occasional papers and pamphlets.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letters 1661 and 1692.

[3.] Included with this letter at UCL is an undated note (probably the same date as the note in Letter 1692, n. 4) signed Charlotte A. M. Burbury: "The Lecture Fund of £500 was fully accounted for by Mr Biggs. When I became Treasurer the balance then remaining was handed over to me."

[4.] The draft was as follows:

“The Committee much regrets that in consequence of some differences of opinion, some of its members should not merely have decided to retire from it, but to establish another Committee: because it is possible that the mere facts of the existence of the other Committee may in some quarters give rise to the impression of grave dissensions. So long however as the new Committee disclaims all hostile feelings and intentions, and professes merely to desire to occupy ground different from that of our Committee, it appears to us that an appeal to the general body of the subscribers would be calculated to make generally public differences of opinion which since they must exist, had better, if possible, be confined to the knowledge of the Executive Bodies and of such persons only as are intimately acquainted with the working of the movement.

“Should the new Committee place itself in any degree in a hostile position towards the original Committee, or take any measures at all calculated to attract public attention to disagreements of opinion, it might become the duty of the original Committee to appeal to the general body of the Society for support. But we are of opinion that it is not impossible that the two Committees should co-exist without hostile feeling, working upon different plans undoubtedly but with the same object: and we think that such a division of labour would be more consistent with the objects we all have in view, than any concession, on our part, of the principle upon which we have taken our stand, viz. a careful avoidance of even apparent mingling of any other agitation with that which we are engaged in for women’s suffrage. We hold it to be important that no person conspicuously engaged, either as officer or as lecturer, in some other agitations now proceeding, to which we will not further allude, should hold any conspicuous place in the movement for Women’s Suffrage. In this opinion the founders of the new Committee totally disagree; in proof of which we have merely to refer to the names of its Honorary Secretaries. We believe that there are many who will agree with them, as well as many who will agree with us. We see no occasion for unfriendly or personal feeling in the matter: but we have arrived deliberately at the opinion that it would be better that two Committees should coexist than that one only should exist exposed to the reasonable dissatisfaction of those friends of Women’s Suffrage strongly opposed to some other movements now on foot: inasmuch as if there existed no executive body entirely disconnected with those other movements, many friends of Women’s Suffrage might find themselves compelled to withdraw their support.”

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Oct. 23, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1679.

[3.] The 8th ed., 1872.

[4.] William Stanley Jevons, *The Theory of Political Economy* (London and New York, 1871). Jevons (1835-1882), economist and logician, then professor of logic and political economy at Owens College, Manchester; later (1876-81) professor of

political economy at University College, London. He was probably the most acute of JSM's contemporary critics in both economics and logic.

[5.] Jevons in 1865 had sent JSM a copy of his *Pure Logic, or the Logic of Quality apart from Quantity, with remarks on Boole's System and on the Relation of Logic to Mathematics* (1864). In a letter of May 8, 1865 (MS at Johns Hopkins) Jevons upbraided JSM for ignoring Boole's writings, particularly on the question of the quantification of the predication in both the *Logic* and the *Hamilton*. Johns Hopkins also has a letter by Jevons to JSM of March 16, 1868, but no replies by JSM have been located.

[6.] George Boole (1815-1864), mathematician and logician, from 1849 professor of mathematics at Queen's College, Cork.

[7.] "New Theories in Political Economy," *FR*, n.s. XI (Jan., 1872), 71-76.

[8.] Sir John Macdonell, *A Survey of Political Economy* (Edinburgh, 1871).

[9.] Pierre Lanfrey, *Histoire de Napoléon Ier* (5 vols., Paris, 1867-75).

[10.] See Letter 1679, n. 6.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 318-20. *Last sheet marked: Dupont White / Dec. 6. 1871 / For publication / J.S.Mill.*

[2.] Presumably Dupont-White's pamphlet *République ou Monarchie* (Paris, 1871), reprinted with alterations in his *Politique Actuelle* (Paris, 1875).

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letters 1692 and 1695.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[1.] MS in the Osborn Collection, Yale.

The MS bears no mention of the correspondent, but he probably was Francis E. Abbot, founder of the Free Religious Association, with whom JSM had earlier corresponded (see Letter 1501).

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 330-32, and in part in W. B. Carpenter, *Principles of Mental Physiology* (New York, 1874), p. 486, and in his *Nature and Man. Essays Scientific and Philosophical* (New York, 1889), pp. 197-98.

[2.] JSM and Helen Taylor had left Blackheath Park and taken a flat at 10, Albert Mansions, Victoria Street.

[3.] These were lectures delivered to audiences of working men in Manchester. The first, "The Unconscious Action of the Brain," given on Dec. 1, 1871, is included in

Half-Hour Recreations in Popular Science, First Series, ed. Dana Estes (Boston, 1874), pp. 191-220; the second, "Epidemic Delusions," given on Dec. 8, 1871, is in *ibid.*, pp. 221-52.

[4.] As sent, a paper written for discussion at the Metaphysical Club meeting of Jan. 17, 1872; in a somewhat amplified form it appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, XIX (Feb., 1872), 401-18, with the title, "What is Common Sense?" and later as chap. xi, "Of Common Sense," in Carpenter's *Principles of Mental Physiology*.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins as is also Herbert's letter of Dec. 26, 1871, which is printed in S. H. Harris, *Auberon Herbert: Crusader for Liberty* (London, 1943), p. 147. Published in Elliot, II, 328-30.

[2.] Herbert had written: "They [the working men] seem to me to be singularly open to plain & simple claims made in the name of what is right—Justice, truth, toleration are words that have not palled on them, as they have on the ear of classes who have set fashions of living and thinking and who shrink from all general ideas that may be larger than these. No one can fail to be struck with the simplicity of the instincts of our workmen, like those of children, ready to be guided into good."

[3.] Herbert had delineated the needs of working men as the need "to have their lives enriched with the interest of some scientific pursuit and intellectual thought" and the need for "the moral content which comes from living under a bond to help each other, and trying to make what one is gaining for oneself of use to others." He proposed enlisting workmen into a society which would have as its purpose: "To pursue some science or art—be it geology, botany, chemistry—be it history or the archæology of the district in wh. they live—be it the study of architecture or drawing—and in pursuing it to do so with the object ever present to them of helping others and teaching again what they can learn themselves. . . . I feel that the lives of the workmen are without a high and satisfying moral purpose—yet of this I believe them to be more capable than the most of us. The simplest remedy seems to me one of the best—to lead them to develop some one faculty and then to assist others by what they have learnt; to lead them to form a continually rising conception of moral obligations; and through such a simple & loose organisation as is practicable . . . to make them help each other in learning and doing. . . ."

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] For the many amendments moved by JSM to the Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, see Index, *Hansard*, CXCIII (1868). His amendment to declare illegal the employment of paid canvassers was presented on July 22 (see *ibid.*, cols. 1640-41).

[3.] Dilke had married Miss Katherine Sheil on Jan. 30, 1872.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 332-34. In reply to Villari's of Jan. 5, 1872, MS also at Yale.

[2.] George Grote had died on June 18, 1871, at the age of 77.

[3.] Villari had written: “The politic in Italy follows allways [*sic*] the same way. We have not men who understand that the great problem is a moral and intellectual regeneration. They compromise every day, they find the way of paying debts for a year. Après moi le déluge, that is their policy. Still the people understand great interests much better, and we go forwards slowly, but surely. The work of establishing the Italian Govt. in Rome is very difficult, and the Italian ministers succeed with shrewdness, when they have not ideas.”

[4.] See Letter 1641.

[5.] *Aristotle*, ed. Alexander Bain and G. Croom Robertson (2 vols., London, 1872). It was reviewed by JSM in *FR*, n.s. XIII (Jan., 1873), 27-50; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., IV, 188-230, Am. ed., V, 169-215.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Barrett’s of Feb. 8, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

Thomas Squire Barrett (b. 1842), philosophical writer, contributor to the *National Reformer*, 1865-70.

[2.] *A New View of Causation* (London, 1871).

[1.] MS in Brandes Archives. Royal Library, Copenhagen. MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Brandes’s letter of January 9, to which this is a reply. Published in Paul Kruger, ed., *Correspondance de Georg Brandes* (2 vols., Copenhagen, 1952) II, 7-8, and in Elliot, II, 334-35.

[2.] Founded in London in 1864 as the International Working Men’s Association. See Letter 1586, n. 3.

[3.] Including: John Grote, *An Examination of the Utilitarian Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1870); W. G. Ward, “Mr. Mill’s Denial of Necessary Truth,” *Dublin Rev.*, n.s. XVII (Oct., 1871), 285-308, and “Mr. Mill on the Foundation of Morality,” *Dublin Rev.*, n.s. XVIII (Jan., 1872), 44-76.

[1.] MS not located. The text of this and other letters to Franz Brentano is from copies supplied by Professor Roderick M. Chisholm of Brown University of typed transcripts in his possession. The identity of the transcriber is not known. Since the transcriber’s command of English seems to have been imperfect, we have silently corrected or emended where necessary. Professor Chisholm also supplied a copy of Brentano’s first letter (n.d.) to JSM, to which this is a reply.

Franz Clemens Brentano (1838-1917), German philosopher; Catholic priest, 1864-73; teacher of philosophy at Würzburg University, 1866-73, and at Vienna, 1874-80, 1881-95.

[2.] Brentano in his letter expressed his debt to JSM for many stimulating ideas, and for bringing to his attention the work of other English thinkers, and also of Auguste Comte, all of which gave him new hope for the state of philosophy. He said, in part

(translated): “For philosophy as taught and practised in Germany for quite some time seems to have gone astray. . . . From the first I have been speculating how it could be reformed in the way the natural sciences have been reformed; and I am happy to say that my own ideas conform to yours in more than one point regarding the character of inquiries as well as certain doctrines. After I became acquainted with your writings I began a series of new studies which, though I had given a good deal of serious thought to them, I had not felt ready to publish because of what I felt to be their premature nature.”

Brentano’s “Auguste Comte und die positive Philosophie” had been published in “*Chilianeum*”, *Blätter für katholische Philosophie, Kunst und Leben* (Neue Folge. Bd. 2, 1869); reprinted in *Phasen der Philosophie* (Oskar Kraus, ed.), Philosophische Bibliothek vol. 195 (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 99-133.

[3.] Brentano had written that he planned to visit England about the middle of March.

[4.] Presumably *Die Psychologie des Aristoteles, insbesondere seine Lehre vom νοῦς ποιητικός* (Mainz, 1867).

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is Holyoake’s letter of Feb. 4 to which this is a reply.

[2.] Holyoake’s latest revival of the *Reasoner* had occurred in Jan., 1871; it ceased with the July number of 1872. For a bibliography of Holyoake’s many periodicals, see Joseph McCabe, *Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake* (2 vols., London, 1908), II, 340-44.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Broadwood’s of Feb. 21 to which this is a reply.

Broadwood & Sons, the long established firm of pianoforte manufacturers, 33 Great Pulteney St.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

Robert S. Gregson, solicitor, of 8 Angel Court, Bank E.C.

[2.] Née Ellen Gurney, she was a sister of Dr. Cecil Gurney of Nice.

[3.] Presumably the father of Ellen Gurney.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

Smitzio has not been identified.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Mrs. Grote was preparing her *Personal Life of George Grote* (London, 1873), which contains many letters.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] Mazzini had died at Pisa on March 10. The funeral was at Pisa on March 14, and long, solemn demonstrations were held in Rome on March 17 and at Naples on March 18.

[1.] MS at LSE. Cairnes's reply (MS copy) is also at LSE.

[2.] The 8th ed., 1872.

[3.] The 4th ed., 1872.

[4.] Mazzini had died on March 10, and F. D. Maurice on April 1.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The Committee of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage.

[1.] MS in the Library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

[2.] It is not evident what position Venn was interested in applying for; possibly it was the chair of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge held by Frederick Denison Maurice from 1866 until his death on April 1, 1872.

[3.] Not identified.

[4.] Presumably Kant's famous "Categorical Imperative": "Act on Maxims which can at the same time have for their object themselves as universal laws of nature."

[5.] See William Paley, Book II, chaps. vii and viii, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1785, and many later editions), long used as a textbook at Cambridge.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Barry's letter of April 20 as Secretary of a Society for the Relief and Employment of Political Refugees, about to be organized.

M. Maltman Barry (1842-1909), a Tory political agent and a correspondent of the conservative *Standard*, was nevertheless deeply involved in the affairs of the International Workingmen's Association.

[2.] The Third Article of the draft of the proposed Constitution of the Society specified: "That such help be extended to all, irrespective of race, nationality, or political creed, who are unstained by civil crime, and whose distressed condition is solely due to their political principles."

Barry reported that Thomas Brassey, Sir Charles Dilke, Henry Fawcett, Peter A. Taylor, W. M. Torrens, and Sir David Wedderburn were on the Committee.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1564, 1568, and 1720.

[3.] On May 3. See *Hansard*, cxxi, cols. 204-47.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Cowper's letter of April 18 to which this is a reply. One paragraph published in Elliot, II, 336.

[2.] The manager of *The Times* from 1847 to 1873 was Mowbray Morris (1819-1874); the Editor from 1841 to 1877 was John Thaddeus Delane (1817-1879).

[3.] Leonard H. Courtney.

[4.] See Letter 1564.

[5.] The preceding Letter.

[6.] See Letters 1722, 1723, and 1732.

[7.] Howard Evans (1839-1915), the working secretary of the Association. Later, editor at various times of the *English Labourer*, the *Echo*, the *Liberator*, and the *Arbitrator*, organ of the International Arbitration League. See his *Radical Fights of Forty Years* (London and Manchester [1913]).

[8.] Andrew Johnston (1835-1922), MP for South Essex, 1868-74.

[9.] See Letter 1374A.

[10.] Somerset Archibald Beaumont (1836-1921), son of Thomas Wentworth Beaumont, one of the founders of the *WR* in 1824; banker; MP for Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1860-65, and for Wakefield, 1868-74.

[11.] Francis W. Newman was active in land reform movements, and in 1882 he published a pamphlet on *The Land as National Property* (no. 7, Land Nationalisation Society Tracts).

[12.] Col. Henry Aimé Ouvry, C.B. (1813-1899), author of *The Land Question in England Popularly Explained* (London, 1871) and of *Stein and his Reforms in Prussia, with reference to the Land Question in England; and an Appendix containing the Views of R. Cobden and J. S. Mill's Advice to Land Reformers* (London, 1873).

[13.] See Letters 1643, 1644, 1646, and 1649.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 1717.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1564, 1568, and 1720.

[3.] The *Echo*, of which Arthur Arnold was the Editor, supported the case for the shareholders on April 24.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1564, 1568, and 1720.

[3.] The *Daily Telegraph*, of which Edwin Arnold was one of the chief writers, published a long leader on May 1 supporting the shareholders' claims for indemnification.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes's of April 9, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] The professorship of political economy at University College, London, which he had held since 1866.

[3.] His new address was 13, Kidbrook Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.

[4.] See Letter 1250.

[5.] René Millet, "Le Parti Radical en Angleterre: un manifeste de M. Stuart Mill" (a review of the *Programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association*), *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XCVII (Feb. 15, 1872), 932-59.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1722 and 1723.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1709, n. 4.

[3.] See Letter 1706, n. 5.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to Morley's of April 28, also at Yale.

Morley had decided to offer himself as a candidate for the professorship of political economy that Cairnes had resigned at University College.

[2.] Despite JSM's support, Leslie did not gain the appointment, which went to Leonard Courtney.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in part in Elliot, II, 338. Barrett's of Feb. 8, March 7, and April 11 are at Johns Hopkins, as is also his reply of May 14 to this letter.

[2.] See Letter 1707.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. The questions were published in Elliot, II, 336-37, and reprinted in *Collected Works*, V, 764-65, from Elliot. In reply to request of Miss Davies, dated April 26, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

Emily Davies (1830-1921), promoter of women's education; with Bessie Parkes and Barbara Bodichon revised the petition for women's suffrage drawn up by Helen Taylor and presented by JSM to Parliament in 1866; helped in the founding of a college for women at Hitchin (1869), later Girton College, Cambridge (1873), and was its mistress (1873-75); pioneer in women's suffrage movement.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Second paragraph published in Elliot, II, 338-39. First paragraph is in Helen Taylor's hand and bears her initials. In reply to Morley's of May 6, also at Yale.

[2.] See Letter 1727.

[3.] See Letters 868, 872, 904, 1104, 1145, 1248, 1410, and 1418. Morley had written: "I find myself unable to agree with most of my friends on the subject of Irish education; of wh. I cannot at all accept Fawcett's Bill as any kind of solution. Surely the Irish nation must decide the matter, and if they choose by a decisive and unmistakable majority to have Catholic colleges, ought not the state to accept such a desire and place these colleges in an equally advantageous position with the Queen's colleges and Trinity? I don't mean that denominational teaching is a thing wh. a government shd. meddle with as a rule, but Ireland is in a kind of abnormal seventeenth century, and seems to demand a special set of maxims in a statesman who has to deal with her. Anyhow, I cannot reconcile it with my conception of national self-government to force the Irish either to lose the advantages of a degree and an equal chance of prizes and emoluments, or else to send their sons to places of education wh. they wholly dislike."

[4.] Since 1867 Henry Fawcett had annually moved a resolution in favour of removing all tests which excluded Catholics from membership in the governing body of Dublin University. In revised form his bill was finally passed in May, 1873.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Second paragraph published in Elliot, II, 339. In reply to Arnold's of May 8, also at Yale.

[2.] See Letter 1723.

[3.] An undated clipping of a newspaper leader commenting on a speech by the physicist John Tyndall is with the Yale MS of Arnold's letter. Tyndall had spoken on May 4 at an anniversary dinner of the Royal Academy. The leader read, in part, as follows: "Never again can men think and believe as they once did. The march of science and of thought has left behind institutions which are dead without knowing it, and burdens of the human mind, which seem still borne only because the ache of the place where they pressed is still felt. . . . But men must have something to believe, something to explain to them the beauty of Nature as well as her order and her truth—something to restore to them in the new world opening outside the little old-

fashioned universe their faith in a Source of all that beauty, and in a Centre of all that love and worship, the endless insatiable hope and aspiration which will not be satisfied with 'force and matter.' The cry of humanity today to the men of science is, 'Give us back something to believe,' in return for that which has been taken away. Science ought not to respond with a cold refusal to care for anything but facts. Emotions, affections, aspirations, as Professor Tyndall himself said, are 'part and parcel' of human nature; and there must be a religion—there must be a morality and a creed—to satisfy such desires.”

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. In reply to Cairnes's of May 2, MS at Johns Hopkins, and of May 6, MS copy at LSE. Parts published in *Economica*, n.s. X (Nov., 1943), 274, and in Elliot II, 340.

[2.] Cairnes had been working on his theory of value, later published as Part I of his *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy Newly Expounded* (London, 1874). Cairnes had questioned JSM's definition of "Demand" as "quantity demanded" in *Pol. Econ.*, Book III, chap 2, "Of Demand and Supply in their Relation to Value"; and his conception of "Cost of Production" set forth in *Pol. Econ.*, Book III, chap. 4, "Ultimate Analysis of Cost of Production." His disagreement with JSM on these points is set forth in *Some Leading Principles*, Part I, chaps. 2 and 3.

[3.] Cairnes, in his letter of May 2, had noted that Jacob Bright's bill for women's suffrage had been defeated on its second reading on May 1 by a larger margin than in the previous year, and that "in one case a vote was lost by the association of the subject with the C.D. Acts.”

[4.] See Letter 1694.

[5.] The following passage appears only in the MS draft: "The success which the movement had during the four years that it was mainly under my daughter's guidance was due to the care with which it was kept disconnected from anything vulgar, fussy, pushing. Under the original management to keep it clear from all these associations was a sine qua non. But when it began to be thought that credit & consequence might be gained by means of this movement the sort of people who had not thought of doing anything before pushed their way in. My daughter's ill health leaving the way open to Mrs Taylor's visible weakness, the Jacob Brights and their set have become prominent in London & have already thrown back the question into that refrain of feminine contempt & ridicule out of which it was raised a few years ago.”

[6.] Bright in his speech in the Commons on May 1 had said in part: "There is nothing at this moment but the consciences of women standing between this country and a gigantic system of prostitution supported and controlled by the State. . . . Having no part in the election of Members of Parliament, women have failed to exert their full influence upon the question. . . . The legislation to which I have been referring has given an impulse to the movement in favour of women's suffrage greater than it has received from any other cause.” *Hansard*, CCXI, col. 8.

[7.] See Letter 1727, n. 2.

[8.] Charles Loring Brace's article, presumably on the arbitration of the *Alabama* claims, has not been located.

[9.] See Letter 1250.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] Where Brentano at this time was teaching at the University.

[1.] MS not located. These excerpts published in J. F. Maurice, *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice* (2 vols., London. 1884), I, 61, 74.

Charles Edmund Maurice (1843-1927), second son of Frederick Denison Maurice, who had died on April 1; barrister, historian, and novelist.

[2.] F. D. Maurice was one of the editors of this magazine which first appeared in Nov., 1825, and survived for only four numbers.

[3.] "A Supplementary Sheet to Bentham's Book of Fallacies," *Metropolitan Quarterly Mag.*, I (1826), 353-77.

[4.] See "On the Word Conscience," pp. 41-42, in *The Conscience: Lectures on Casuistry*, first published in 1869 (3rd. ed., London, 1883).

[5.] "The New School of Cockneyism," *Metropolitan Quarterly Mag.*, I (1826), 35-62, and II (1826), 219-30.

[6.] *WR*, VIII (Oct., 1827), 303-28.

[7.] *WR*, IX (Jan., 1828), 71-98.

[8.] See Letter to John Sterling, *Earlier Letters*, pp. 28-30.

[9.] For Maurice's and Sterling's connections with the *Athenaeum*, see Leslie A. Marchand, *The Athenaeum, A Mirror of Victorian Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1941).

[10.] For JSM's considered evaluation of Maurice, see *Autobiog.*, chap. v.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except for first paragraph, in Elliot, II, 340-41.

[2.] Paris publisher of maps.

[3.] Presumably the *Carta geologica d'Italia* (1846) by Giacinto Provana di Collegno (1794-1856), Italian politician, diplomat, and geologist.

[4.] See Letter 1643, n. 2.

[5.] See Letter 1724, n. 5.

[6.] See Letters 1481 and 1487.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The professorship of political economy vacated by Cairnes at University College. See Letter 1727, n. 2.

[3.] In the event, Leslie remained at Queen's College, Belfast, till his death in 1882.

[4.] The group led by Jacob Bright and Lydia Becker; see Letter 1661.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published in Elliot, II, 341-42. In reply to Baer's letter of Jan. 2, 1872, also at Yale. See Letter 267.

[2.] *L'Avere e l'Imposta* ["Property and Taxation"] (Rome, Turin and Florence, 1872), reviewed by JSM in *FR*, n. s. XIX (March, 1873), 396-98, reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., IV, 231-36, Am. ed., V, 216-22; and in *Collected Works*, V, 699-702.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1709.

[3.] See Letter 1726.

[1.] MS at LSE. MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in part in Elliot, II, 343. In reply to Cairnes's of June 16, MS copy at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1733.

[3.] Cairnes had written that he had supported Courtney as his successor with reluctance because of JSM's strong support of Leslie.

[4.] The following paragraph is in the MS draft but not in the letter sent: "You may be sure that we shall not be long in London without going to see you & Mrs Cairnes. It will however be some time before we have that pleasure as our journey in the Alps during the last months stands instead of our usual summer sojourn in England, & we propose passing the autumn at Avignon as usual & not returning to England this year. One of the poor points in this plan which are not pleasant to us is that we shall in consequence be longer before seeing you."

[5.] Cairnes had commented thus on E. A. Freeman's *The Growth of the English Constitution from the Earliest Times* (London, 1872): "The grand point insisted on in the first two chapters is the high credit due to Englishmen from the fact that their Constitution has been a growth, that nothing has been done in deference to theory. If sometimes a remedy has been sought for a practical evil Englishmen have been careful never to look beyond the particular evil. How unlike Frenchmen, always recasting their Constitution in conformity with some abstract theory! Now is it not vexatious to find an able man like Freeman lending his authority to the diffusion of

such rubbish, and doing his utmost to strengthen the particular mental perversities that stand most in the way of all progressive improvement?"

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1734.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 343-44. In reply to Baer's of June 5, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letter 1738, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. MS draft at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] The Commission des monuments historiques, established in 1837, was in charge of the selection of monuments of national interest, both historical and artistic, to be protected and maintained.

[3.] L'Administration des Ponts et Chaussées in the Ministry of Public Works was responsible for the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges throughout France.

[4.] Lubbock introduced his Ancient Monuments Bill on Feb. 7, 1873. See *Hansard*, CCXIV, col. 181.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] The 3rd ed. of the French translation of the *Pol. Econ.* (2 vols., 1873) was based on the 7th English ed. (1871).

[3.] Laura de Peyronnet (d. 1910), eldest daughter of the Vicomte de Peyronnet, was married to Lord Arthur John Edward Russell (1825-1892) in 1865. The translation of *Utilitarianism* was published as by P. E. de la Friche, probably a pseudonym for Mlle. de Peyronnet. See Letter 1622, n. 4.

[4.] Gervais Charpentier (1805-1871), editor and publisher.

[5.] See Letter 763, n. 3.

[6.] See Letter 1010, n. 2.

[1.] MS in Wellesley College Library.

[2.] See Letter 740.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] In his review of Grote's *Aristotle*, *FR*, n.s. XIII (Jan., 1873), 27-50, JSM refers (p. 40) to the "acute work of Dr. Franz Brentano, on the different meanings of *ens*,

according to Aristotle; a book often cited and highly appreciated by Mr. Grote. . . .”
See Letter 1726.

[3.] Brentano’s home town, not far from Würzburg.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 345-46. In answer to
Sergeant’s of Sept. 14, MS also at Johns Hopkins, as is his rejoinder of Oct. 12.

Lewis Sergeant (1841-1902), journalist and author.

[2.] Sergeant was editor of the *Circular*, which was the organ of the Anti-Game-Law
League.

[3.] JSM had written on the subject many years earlier: “Game Laws,” *WR*, V (Jan.,
1826), 1-22.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] *Political Essays* (London, 1873) and *Essays in Political Economy, Theoretical
and Applied* (London, 1873).

[3.] See Letter 1733, n. 2.

[4.] Leonard Courtney was a leader writer for *The Times*.

[5.] See Letter 1706, n. 5.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published in Elliot, II, 347-48. In reply to Thomas
Smith’s letter of Aug. 27 as Secretary of the International Working Men’s Association
of Nottingham (MS at Johns Hopkins). At the instance of the Association, Smith sent
JSM a copy of his pamphlet *The Law of the Revolution*, which is also at Johns
Hopkins. Smith had presided at the first annual congress of the British section of the
International Working Men’s Association which opened in Nottingham on July 21,
1872. For a report, see the *Beehive*, July 27, p. 12.

According to Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British
Labour Movement* (London, 1965), p. 269, this letter by JSM was published in the
International Herald, Oct. 26, 1872, and was praised in leaders in the *Daily News* and
Daily Telegraph on Oct. 28. The *Beehive* likewise praised the letter in a leader on
Nov. 9, 1872, p. 9.

[2.] *Letters on the Commune. The Law of the Revolution; or the Logical Development
of Human Society* (Nottingham, March 1872).

[3.] The programme of the Nottingham branch called for “political and social
revolution”; its main demands were for freedom of expression and education,
abolition of class and sex privileges, “emancipation of the land,” universal suffrage,
national and racial equality, and “the protection of the rights of minorities by the

principle of federalism and by decentralization of power.” See Collins and Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement*, p. 248.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. Published, in part, in Elliot II, 348-49. In answer to Thornton’s of Sept. 22, MS also at Yale.

[2.] Thornton had been called back to London by the mortal illness of an old friend.

[3.] *Old-Fashioned Ethics and Common-Sense Metaphysics, with some of their applications* (London, 1873), the first chapter of which is his essay “Anti-Utilitarianism.”

[4.] See Letter 1748, n. 5.

[5.] Thornton had asked JSM what he had meant in his *Auguste Comte and Positivism* (*Collected Works*, X, 301) by his phrase “by no means superficial” as applied to G. H. Lewes’s *Aristotle, A Chapter from the History of Science* (London, 1864).

[6.] Thornton had reported that Blanc in a short visit to England in early Sept. had called on him and had delivered “an exceedingly interesting lecture on l’état politique which I believe lasted near an hour and a half but did not seem at all too long. One point of importance is that he considers the mass of the peasantry are becoming rapidly republican in the same un-intelligent way in which they were lately imperialists.”

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The Committee of the London National Society for Women’s Suffrage and the new Jacob Bright-Lydia Becker “Central” Committee. See Letter 1661, n. 2.

[3.] See Letter 1754.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles* (Freiburg, 1862).

[3.] The Accidental.

[4.] See Grote, *Aristotle*, I, 86, n. b; II, 139, n. a; I, 142, n. a.

[5.] The Active Intellect. See Letter 1709, n. 4.

[1.] MS draft at Yale.

[1.] MS at UCL. Robertson’s reply of Oct. 28 is at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1751.

[3.] Probably Mrs. Jane Ronniger, later (1876-80) editor of the *Aesthetic Review*. Robertson in his reply of Oct. 28 said: “Mrs. Ronniger brings nothing to the advocacy of the cause but a pretty face. She has only one lecture, which is a very poor one, and she has no power of fence when troublesome people get up at the end and cross-question her” (MS at LSE).

[4.] William Cox Bennett.

[5.] The brackets are in the MS.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to the Company’s letter of Oct. 24, also at Yale. See Letter 1753.

[1.] MS at UCL. In reply to Robertson’s of Oct. 28, MS at LSE.

[2.] See, for example, the unheaded leader the following month in the *Standard*, Dec. 2, p. 5. In the event, however, no major shift of the Tories to the support of women’s suffrage occurred.

[3.] George Ward Hunt (1825-1877), barrister, MP for North Northamptonshire, 1857-77.

[4.] Edward Backhouse Eastwick (1814-1883), orientalist and diplomatist, MP for Penryn and Falmouth, 1868-74. Eastwick had sponsored with Jacob Bright the latest bill for women’s suffrage.

[1.] MS at UCL. MS draft at LSE. In reply to Robertson’s letter of Oct. 28, also at LSE. Published in Elliot, II, 349-51. Elliot attributes it chiefly to Helen Taylor.

[2.] See Letter 1754, n. 3.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In reply to de Lavaleye’s of Nov. 5, also at LSE. Published in de Laveleye, pp. 6-7, and also in his book, *De la Propriété et de ses formes primitives* (Paris, 1874), pp. xiii-xiv.

[2.] “Les Formes Primitives de la Propriété,” July 1, pp. 135-63; Aug. 1, pp. 505-40: Sept. 1, 1872, pp. 38-67. A review of Sir Henry Maine’s *Village Communities in the East and West* (1871) and his *Ancient Law, its connection with the early history of society* (5th ed., 1870).

[3.] See n. 1.

[4.] De Laveleye published an additional article, “La Propriété Primitive et les Allmends en Suisse,” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, 1873, pp. 598-627. *Allmends* were the lands of the communes of Switzerland—the common domain of all.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Trant’s of Sept. 24 to which this is a reply.

[2.] Trant, who was engaged in organizing meetings for the Financial Reform Association, had asked JSM to chair such a meeting in Greenwich in late September to “agitate for direct taxation and a reduction in the national expenditure.”

[3.] See Letter 1609.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] JSM was wrong; in time Mrs. Fawcett became a very influential leader of women’s causes for many years. See Ray Strachey, *Millicent Garrett Fawcett* (London, 1931).

[3.] Elizabeth Garrett Anderson.

[4.] See Letter 1757.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also their letter of Nov. 19 to which this is a reply.

[2.] William George Ward.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Robertson married (Dec. 14, 1872) Carolina Anna Crompton (d. 1892), daughter of Justice Charles Crompton.

[3.] Frances Julia Wedgwood (1833-1913), miscellaneous writer, friend and correspondent of Robert Browning. She had published the preceding summer an article on “Female Suffrage in its Influence on Married Life,” *Contemporary Rev.*, XX (Aug., 1872), 360-70.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] The address, in an unidentified hand, is enclosed in the letter: “The Executive Committee of the London National Society for Women’s Suffrage has after much deliberation come to a resolution, which it desires to submit to you as charged of late years with the conduct of the W[omen’s] D[isabilities] B[ill] in parliament. The resolution is, that in the next session, and until the assembling of a new House of Commons, it is expedient to refrain from re-introducing the Bill.

“The Committee is far from being discouraged by the actual position of the question before the public. In the constituencies the progress made is quite as great as could be hoped for and the prospects are encouraging. In parliament also, though not as rapidly as at first, there has been steady advance, to which the less favourable division of last session was a check more apparent than real. But the Committee cannot close its eyes to the fact that by the present House of Commons the question has been definitively judged and judged adversely. It is vain to hope for any division so much more favourable as to have any practical effect in determining the question; while through accident or caprice a serious reverse, or what could plausibly be interpreted as such, might on the next occasion be experienced. In the opinion of the Committee it would

be wise, so far as the existing parliament is concerned, to rest content with the signal progress that has already been made, and the most effective course in the immediate future is to bend all efforts towards enlightening the constituencies from which a new parliament must soon receive its mandate.

“Supporters of Women’s Suffrage, in proportion to their conviction that upon all grounds of reason their case has been made out, must be aware that henceforth it is chiefly a social prejudice which they have to overcome. Now the worst way of surmounting a sentimental or wilful resistance is to resort to an importunate advocacy. Our opponents, in their entrenched position, are exceedingly powerful, and are least likely to give ground, if they are incessantly being faced to no purpose in parliament. When they see that the friends of W[omen’s] S[uffrage], without bating a jot of their purpose or their activity, are content to bide their time, and, foiled in one direction, turn into the other which leads more surely, if less directly, to the goal, those who have decided the movement as transient and not serious may begin to discover their mistake.”

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[2.] See Letter 1740.

[1.] MS at LSE; MS draft at Yale. Published in part in Elliot, II, 351-52.

[2.] See Letter 1748, n. 5.

[3.] See Letters 1742 and 1770.

[4.] See Letter 1738.

[5.] Fawcett’s Letter, “Corporate Property in Land,” *The Times*, Nov. 29, 1872, p. 5, refers to a *Times* leader of Nov. 22, p. 7, and was answered in a leader of Nov. 29, p. 7.

[1.] MS at UCL. Accompanying this Letter at UCL is the following telegram of the same date from JSM to Robertson: “I must retire from the committee if a deputation to G. is decided on. I disprove of any communication to him at all. I write by this post to say so.”

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1. In reply to an undated letter from Brentano, which may have been a covering letter accompanying a discussion of the philosophical questions referred to in JSM’s reply. Brentano’s correspondence with JSM at this time is in part paraphrased in his *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, Buch 2, Kap. 7 (vol. 193 of *Philosophische Bibliothek* [Leipzig, 1925]), pp. 60-62.

[2.] Brentano had written (translated): “A number of ultra-montane zealots got busy to decry me as an atheist, just as they had decried M. Comte at one time,—though with even less justification; the only basis for their accusations was that I were no faithful follower of Christianity, and maybe that I mentioned your name and the names of

other adherents of the school of exact sciences in my lectures more often than they liked. They tried to instigate the students against me, but were unsuccessful in this; my lectures continued to be among the most popular ones at the university; but I have had a great deal of vexation which brought on severe nervous headaches that afflict me day and night.”

Brentano attracted a great following of students at Würzburg by his novel approach, applying strict scientific methods in the study of philosophy, as opposed to the mystical-speculative methods of the dominant school of German philosophers. As a consequence, Church and faculty denounced him as an atheist. In 1873 he renounced his priesthood, though not his catholicism, and resigned his professorship at Würzburg. From 1874 to 1880 he taught at the University of Vienna.

[3.] See *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, pp. 38-65.

[4.] See Letter 1746.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] “The Sanitary Condition of Berlin, and Works for its Improvement,” *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XXI (Dec. 20, 1872), 86-90.

[3.] On Feb. 7, 1873.

[4.] Probably Gladstone’s speech “On Education,” delivered at Liverpool College, reported in *The Times*, Dec. 23, 1872, p. 8.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. In JSM’s hand but probably written for Helen Taylor, since she was one of the trustees of Algernon Taylor’s marriage settlement. On verso is written in what appears to be Helen Taylor’s hand: “never sent/written 1873.”

[2.] The father of Algernon Taylor’s wife Ellen, who had died in 1864.

[3.] The person for whose benefit the trust is created.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins. Published, except first paragraph, in Elliot, II, 352-53. In reply to Baer’s of Sept. 26, 1872, MS also at Johns Hopkins.

[2.] See Letters 1742 and 1765.

[1.] MS at LSE. In reply to Cairnes’s of Dec. 20, MS copy also at LSE.

[2.] See Letter 1765.

[3.] JSM contributed two articles to the *Examiner* this month: “Advice to Land Reformers,” Jan. 4, 1873, pp. 1-2; and “Should Public Bodies Be Required to Sell Their Lands?,” Jan. 11, pp. 29-30. The two articles were combined and reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., IV, 266-77, Am. ed., V, 255-68. A third article, “The Right of Property in Land,” written for the Land Tenure Reform Association in April, 1873,

was posthumously published in the *Examiner*, July 19, 1873, pp. 725-28, and reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed., IV, 288-302, Am. ed., V, 279-94.

[4.] Henry Richard Fox Bourne (1837-1909), social reformer and writer. Bourne had bought the *Examiner* in 1870, but did not succeed with it and disposed of it in 1873. JSM, much of whose earliest writing was for the *Examiner* under Albany Fonblanque (see *Earlier Letters*), was hoping at this time to expand its influence as a paper for the working classes.

[5.] See Letter 1738, n. 2.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also her letter of Jan. 27 as Hon. Secretary of the Bristol and West of England branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage.

Lilias Ashworth, daughter of Cobden's associate, Henry Ashworth, and niece of John Bright. She was active in the cause of women's suffrage from 1866 to the early twentieth century. In 1877 she married a Professor Hallett, and thereafter she wrote under the name Lilias A. Hallett.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Bickley's letter of Feb. 4 on behalf of the Eleusis Club, a working men's society of Chelsea.

Bickley has not been otherwise identified.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1767.

[3.] The three previous sentences here are published in Brentano's *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1874). See Letter 1767.

[4.] Possibly in *Wissenschaft der Logik* (first published, 1812-16), I, Book II, sec. II (transl. by W. H. Johnston and L. G. Struthers [2 vols., London, 1929], vol. II, pp. 107-57: "Appearance"; sub-headings I. Existence; II. Appearance; III. Essential Relations).

[1.] MS draft in pencil at LSE, as is also Colman's reply of Feb. 14.

Son of Mrs. Mary Colman, JSM's sister.

[2.] Henry Colman had lost his job for stealing from his employer, a Mr. Hill.

[3.] Stuart Colman, as a surveyor, provided instruction for articulated apprentices.

[1.] MS draft at Johns Hopkins, as is also Lankester's letter of Jan. 8 to which this is a reply. Published by Lankester in the *Athenaeum*, Nov. 1, 1873, p. 563, and in Elliot, II, 353-55.

Edwin (later Sir Edwin) Lankester (1847-1929), zoologist; at this time fellow and

tutor at Exeter College, Oxford; later professor of zoology at University College, London; afterwards professor of comparative anatomy at Oxford.

A meeting of scholars and scientists held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Nov. 16, 1872, formed the nucleus of an Association for the Reorganization of Academical Study. Among those present were Sir Benjamin Brodie, professor of chemistry at Oxford; W. B. Carpenter; Henry Sidgwick; George Rolleston, professor of anatomy and physiology at Oxford; and T. H. Huxley. The purpose of the Association was to gain greater support for research in the universities. Lankester had invited JSM to join. For an account of the meeting, see "The Reorganization of Academic Study," *Athenaeum*, Nov. 23, 1872, pp. 665-66.

[2.] Baron Jean Léopold Nicolas Frédéric Cuvier, called Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), palaeontologist; permanent secretary of the French Academy of Sciences, 1803-32.

[3.] Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1772-1844), naturalist and philosophical opponent of Cuvier.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] See Letter 1756.

[1.] MS at LSE, as is also their letter of Feb. 24 to which this is a reply.

Saville, Edwards & Co., printers, 4 Chandos St., Covent Garden.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Mrs. Colman's letter, undated, to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letter 1775.

[3.] Probably John Willcox of the firm of Wilson and Willcox, Architects, 17 King William St., Strand, W.C. See Letter 1799.

[4.] Mary's husband, Charles Frederick Colman.

[5.] Mary's daughter Marion. See Letter 1793, n. 2.

[6.] She had recently lost at sea a son who was a sailor.

[1.] MS in the Westminster Public Library, London, in a portfolio entitled "Correspondence relating to the portrait of John Stuart Mill." Second paragraph published in M. S. Watts, *George Frederic Watts* (3 vols., London, 1912), I, 273.

Dilke, a great admirer of JSM, had arranged with the prominent painter George Frederic Watts (1817-1904) to do a portrait of JSM if he could be persuaded to sit for it. JSM's consent, recorded in this letter, resulted in the painting of the most widely known portrait of him, the copy exhibited in the National Portrait Gallery in London. The original portrait, which for years hung in the Westminster City Hall, has been stored in the basement of that building, almost opposite the National Portrait Gallery,

since the building of the new City Hall in Victoria Street.

The correspondence about the portrait was assembled by Dilke when he arranged in 1905 to bequeath the original to the City of Westminster. The correspondence reveals that Dilke paid Watts £315 for the painting. The first sitting to Watts appears to have occurred on March 17, 1873, and according to Dilke the portrait was delivered to his home on the day of JSM's death.

In a letter of July 14, 1905, to the Town Clerk of Westminster, Dilke in expressing his intent to bequeath the original portrait to the City of Westminster summarized the later history of the painting: "Watts asked my leave to paint the replica, and after this was finished I had both in my possession for a considerable time, during which they were seen by the friends of Mill, and Watts having given me my choice, I chose, on the advice of Mill's friends, the original painted from life. The two portraits are, however, very similar, and there is much difficulty in distinguishing them apart. The one which you will inherit is that which was exhibited at the Royal Academy Exhibition, & which has subsequently been shown at various exhibitions, down to but not including the Watts Exhibition of 1905. At this exhibition of the present year the replica from the National Portrait Gallery was that exhibited: and I put these facts on record because the "Times" reviewer of the Exhibition of 1905 assumed that the portrait exhibited in 1905 was the same which he had previously seen at other exhibitions."

The copy given to the National Portrait Gallery by Watts was completed by August 3, 1873, for on that date the painter invited Sir Charles and Lady Dilke to his studio to see the copy side by side with the original. In a letter of March 1, 1906, to Captain Herbert M. Jessel, MP, Dilke claimed that it is "the only portrait for which Mill ever sat and the only portrait executed during his life by anyone." [But see Frontispiece to Vol. XVI of *Collected Works*.] Dilke also wrote Jessel that Watts "concurred in my judgment that apart from interest the original picture was the better of the two—though I do not know that I expressed that opinion. All I said was that I preferred to keep it." Richard Ormond of the staff of the National Portrait Gallery concurs in Dilke's preference, describing it as "a much stronger and more vital characterization."

Watts reserved the copyright on the painting. It was subsequently engraved by M. Paul Adolphe Rajon (1843-1888), French draughtsman and etcher who after 1865 made annual visits to England to do engravings. The painting and the engraving are described in an appreciative criticism by Philip G. Hamerton, "Portrait of John Stuart Mill," *Portfolio*, VI (1875), ii, and reproduced in R. J. Wickenden, "Paul Adolphe Rajon," *Print Collector's Quarterly*, VI (1916), 411-34. According to Wickenden, it was Rajon's first great success; publishing it himself, he made £600 by it in a few months, and it remained a constant source of income for the rest of his life.

There was also a second copy of the portrait made by Watts, apparently from the copy now at the National Portrait Gallery. This third version, clearly the weakest of the three, is now in the Watts Gallery, Compton.

[2.] See Letter 1530, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Melbourne. Plummer's undated reply, declining the invitation because of his hours of work, is at LSE.

[2.] In a letter of March 4 (MS at LSE) Plummer said that he had been thinking of writing a book on "The Utilisation of Trades Unions."

[1.] MS at Harvard.

[2.] Probably *Republican Superstitions as Illustrated in the Political History of America* (London, 1872).

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is Hazard's letter of March 7 to which this is a reply.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also de Chément's of March 3 to which this is a reply.

Chément has not been identified. A letter by him to Helen Taylor from Angoulême dated May 18, 1873, MS at LSE, reported that he was preserving JSM's letters to him.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Probably of the book *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy Newly Expounded* (London, 1874).

[3.] Published March 15, *Essays in Political Economy, Theoretical and Applied* (London, 1873).

[4.] *Political Portraits, reprinted from the Daily News* (Strahan & Co., London, 1873).

[1.] MS at the Women's Service Library, London.

[1.] MS copy at Northwestern. LSE has a letter of March 21 from John Morley to JSM accepting an invitation to dinner on the same evening, and complimenting him on his speech on the land tenure question at Exeter Hall on March 18. For a description of JSM's last visit to Morley at Pitfield on April 5, see Morley's letters of April 6 in F. W. Hirst, *Early Life and Letters of John Morley* (2 vols., London, 1927), I, 236-38.

[1.] MS at Yale.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1767.

[3.] Brentano visited both England and France to confer with fellow philosophers, but did not arrive in Avignon until after JSM's death on May 7.

[1.] MS in the possession of Prof. Edward Alexander, University of Washington.

Spalding had written a letter to JSM on Feb. 5, 1873, MS at LSE, about his paper "Instinct. With Original Observations on Young Animals," originally delivered at the meetings of the British Association in Aug., 1872, and published in *Macmillan's*, XXVII (1872-73), 282-93. Spalding was an intimate friend of the Amberleys. See *The Amberley Papers*, ed. Bertrand and Patricia Russell (2 vols., London, 1937), II, 533; also *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1872-1914 (London and Boston, 1967), p. 10.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, on same page as the preceding Letter.

[1.] MS draft at LSE.

[2.] JSM had agreed to help finance Mary's daughter Marion ("Minnie") in attending Bedford College, founded in 1849. See Margaret J. Tuke, *History of Bedford College for Women, 1849-1937* (London, New York, 1939).

[3.] Miss Rachel Thomas was matron of the boarding house for Bedford students from 1854 to 1879.

[1.] MS draft at Yale. In reply to Irvine's of March 29, 1873, MS also at Yale, accepting JSM's invitation for an excursion to Wimbledon Park.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Pratten's letter of April 4 in behalf of the Westminster Liberal Registration Society. Buxton had decided to contest Westminster at the next election.

[2.] Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, 3rd baronet (1837-1915), Liberal MP for King's Lynn, 1865-68; defeated for Westminster, 1874; later, 1895-98, governor of South Australia.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Edward Barrington de Fonblanque (1821-1895), nephew of Albany Fonblanque, and editor of *The Life and Labours of Albany Fonblanque* (London, 1874). He included in the book parts of four letters by JSM; see *Earlier Letters*, nos. 118, 165, 194, and 231.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. The draft bears no indication of the intended recipient, but he was almost certainly W. H. Duignan, a solicitor of Walsall who had a London office at 15 Bedford Row, W.C. On March 31 Duignan had written to JSM a long letter, MS at LSE, on the abuses of the land laws, particularly the operation of the enclosure acts with respect to mineral rights.

[2.] Duignan in his letter of March 31 had twice requested that both his name and his location not be disclosed.

[1.] MS in the possession of the Co-operative Union Ltd., Holyoake House, Manchester. MS draft at LSE, as is also Holyoake's letter of March 27 to which this is a reply.

[2.] Holyoake was engaged in preparing his *History of Co-operation in England, I, The Pioneer Period, 1812 to 1844* (London, 1875).

[3.] James Mill, *Elements of Political Economy* (London, 1821), pp. 52-53.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Mrs. Colman's undated letter to which this is a reply.

[2.] See Letters 1775 and 1779.

[3.] See Letter 1793.

[1.] MS at Cornell. *Note in another hand on verso of letter*: "Last letter, written immediately before his death, on quitting England." *Note by Harrison on verso of letter*: "I went to the dinner at which only Fox Bourne came. I was unable to accept the proposed work. See my own memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 302-303, F.H."

[2.] See Letter 1771.

[1.] MS at Melbourne.

[1.] MS not located. For source of text, see Letter 1709, n. 1.

[2.] See Letter 1789, n. 3.

[1.] MS at NLS.

Morton has not been identified.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Shrivess's letter of April 16 as secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, inviting him to attend a public meeting on Wednesday, April 30, at Arundel Hall, Arundel Street, Strand. The meeting passed a resolution favouring a ten-hour workday and a six-day week. See *The Times*, May 2, 1873, p. 10, and the *Beehive*, May 3, 1873, p. 5.

[1.] MS draft at LSE, as is also Fabre's reply of April 29. Fabre's reply is translated in Packe, p. 506.

Jean Henri Fabre (1823-1915), later the internationally known entomologist. From 1852 to 1871 he had been a teacher of science in the lycée at Avignon, but lost his position there because of clerical agitation against him for admitting girls to science classes. During his troubles JSM assisted him financially. Before making a permanent settlement at Sérignan, Fabre lived for a time near Orange.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. Published in translation in Packe, pp. 506-507.

This appears to be the last letter written by JSM. On Saturday, May 3, he and Fabre made a fifteen-mile botanizing expedition. After returning to Avignon, JSM caught a chill, and by Monday was running a fever. The local physician, Dr. Chauffard, diagnosed the illness as erysipelas, and telegraphed Dr. Cecil Gurney of Nice to come at once. Gurney arrived on Tuesday but could do nothing. JSM died at 7 a.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 1873. It is reported that just before his death he murmured to Helen, "You know that I have done my work."

[1.] The original has not been located. Quoted in a letter of June 6, 1828, by Wirgman to Henry Brougham, MS at UCL.

Wirgman's letter, dated from Timberham Lodge nr Crawley, Sussex, begins: "By this day's post I am favored with a letter from my favorite [*sic*] pupil and excellent and keen reasoner Mr John Mill those parts which relate to the *treatise* I had the honor to prepare for the 'Society of Useful Knowledge.' I have taken the liberty to send you a copy of Extract of a letter from Mr John Mill to Mr T Wirgman." In what sense JSM was a "pupil" of Wirgman is not known.

Thomas Wirgman (1769-1840), by vocation a jeweller, by avocation a disciple of Immanuel Kant; the most prolific English writer on Kant in his generation; author of *Principles of the Kantian or Transcendental Philosophy (Principes de la Philosophie* etc) (English and French, London, 1824), and other works. For the fullest account of Wirgman, see René Wellek, *Immanuel Kant in England, 1793-1838* (Princeton, 1931), chap. 5. Wellek gives his dates as 1777-1840; ours are based on the entry of Wirgman's death in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, n.s. XV (Feb., 1841) p. 215, and in *The Times*, Jan. 1, 1841, p. 8.

Wirgman at this point and for some years tried unsuccessfully to get the Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge to publish his "Account of the Philosophy of Kant." As a later letter to Brougham at UCL indicates, he thought that James Mill was responsible for blocking the publication.

[1.] MS at the University of Liverpool Library. *Bears note in another hand on verso:* London Review/ Mr Mill Junr to Mr Senior.

[2.] This appears to have been the beginning of Chadwick's association with Senior, which became close when Chadwick, in 1832, was appointed assistant commissioner to the Poor Law Enquiry of which Senior was the most active commissioner. The enquiry led to the adoption of the Poor Law of 1834.

[3.] A short-lived review begun by Senior and Archbishop Richard Whateley, with the Rev. Joseph Blanco White as the nominal editor.

[4.] Chadwick had contributed one article to *WR*: "Life Assurances," IX (April, 1828), 384-421.

[5.] For a full account of the break of JSM and other Benthamites from *WR* when Thomas Perronet Thompson became proprietor with John Bowring as editor, see G. L. Nesbitt, *Benthamite Reviewing* (New York, 1934), chap. vi.

[6.] The article, “On a Preventive Police,” was accepted and appeared in the first number of the *London Review* (May, 1829). It attracted the attention of Bentham and led to his intimate friendship with Chadwick.

[1.] MS not located. Quoted in a letter by Wirgman of April 29, 1829, to Henry Crabb Robinson, MS at Dr. William’s Library, London. See also Letter 21.1.

[2.] See Letter 21.1, n. 1.

[1.] MS at UCLA. *Bears note in another hand*: 1831 / John Mill / respecting the house at Kensington.

James Mill moved his family to Kensington this spring.

[1.] MS at Cornell. *Addressed*: William Tait Esq. / 78 Princes Street / Edinburgh.

[2.] “Use and Abuse of Political Terms,” *Tait’s*, I (May, 1832), 164-72.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

William Cabell (1786-1853), an employee of the East India Company, later a member of the India Board of Control. Presumably a son of the better known William Cabell (1745-1800), secretary to Lord Dundas, and called the “walking Index of the Board of Control.”

[1.] MS at Columbia University. *Addressed*: Wm Tait / Bookseller / Edinburgh. *Franked by* Wm Molesworth / London / July eleven. *Postmarks*: FREE / JY 11 / 1834 and JUL 13 / 1834.

[2.] For a discussion of JSM’s contributions to this periodical, see F. E. Mineka, *The Dissidence of Dissent: the Monthly Repository, 1806-1838* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1944), esp. pp. 271-83.

[3.] John Pringle Nichol.

[1.] MS at the University of Bergen, Norway. The envelope, which has not gone through the post, is addressed: Henry Lytton Bulwer Esq. M.P.

William Henry Lytton Earle Bulwer, later (1871) Baron Dalling and Bulwer (1801-1872), better known as Sir Henry Bulwer, diplomat, politician, and man of letters, brother of the novelist Edward Bulwer Lytton.

[2.] Presumably about the same date as a similar letter of introduction for Guilbert to Edwin Chadwick (*Earlier Letters*, p. 244). *Earlier Letters* contains fourteen letters to Guilbert, who in 1835 became the Paris correspondent for JSM’s *London Review*.

[1.] MS in 1965 in the possession of Joseph H. Schaffner of New York.

[2.] *The Monthly Repository* published each month in 1834 one of a series of “Songs of the Months,” music by Eliza Flower, verses by various writers. JSM wrote a favourable notice of the first four songs in the *Examiner*, April 20, 1834, p. 244.

[1.] MS at the University of Uppsala, Sweden.

Fortunato Prandi (d. 1868), exile in London, 1821-42; friend of Sarah Austin; contributor to various English periodicals; after return to Italy, elected to the first Subalpine Parliament.

[2.] Presumably during JSM’s editorship of the *LWR*.

[3.] Not identified.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] That of the King, Akbar Shah II, who ruled from 1806 to 1837. In 1833 he had begun negotiations with the East India Company for an increase in his “Allowances” or “Tributes.” Presumably the Political Correspondence referred to these negotiations, which continued into the summer of 1835.

[1.] MS not located. From a MS transcript of an original shorthand record by James Martineau of his correspondence, now at Manchester College, Oxford. Excerpts printed in two biographies of Martineau are in *Earlier Letters* as Nos. 119 and 136.

[2.] See *Earlier Letters*, p. 264, n. 5.

[3.] Passages in brackets are Martineau’s summary of portions of the letter.

[4.] John Young (d. 1829), professor of moral philosophy at Belfast College. His Lectures on *Intellectual Philosophy*, ed. W. Cairnes (Glasgow, 1835) were not reviewed in the *London Rev.* as this statement seems to say. The only review of Young’s lectures located is in *ER*, LXI (April, 1835), 52-63.

[5.] See *Earlier Letters*, No. 119, n. 2.

[6.] The preceding two sentences appear as Letter 119 in *Earlier Letters*.

[7.] This sentence is a summary of what appears as Letter 136 in *Earlier Letters*, pp. 264-65.

[8.] See *Earlier Letters*, p. 264, n. 5.

[9.] No record has been found of a review by Joseph Blanco White of either the *Remains of Alexander Knox*, ed. J. J. Hornby (4 vols., London, 1834-37) or *Thirty Years Correspondence between John Jebb and Alexander Knox*, ed. Rev. C. Forster (2 vols., London, 1834).

[10.] “Professor Sedgwick’s Discourse—State of Philosophy in England,” *London Rev.*, I (April, 1835), 94-135; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. I, 95-159, Am. ed. I, 121-85.

[1.] MS location now not known. Excerpt quoted in Catalogue 21 (1964) of Alta California Bookstore, Berkeley, Calif.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale. *Addressed*: William Tait Esq. / Bookseller / Edinburgh.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] “The Church and its Reform,” *London Rev.*, I (July, 1835), 257-95. The article, signed P.Q., was by JSM’s father, James Mill. A few excerpts indicate the nature of his remarks on prayer (p. 262):

“The tendency of the Church of England prayers is to give a wrong notion of the Divine attributes; and instead of the idea of a Being of perfect wisdom and goodness, to present the ideas of a being very imperfect in both. . . . Perpetually to be asking God for things which we want, believing that this is a way to obtain them, implies the belief that God is imperfect both in wisdom and goodness. . . .

“In like manner in regard to praise . . . : first, what use can there be in our telling the Divine Being, that he has such and such qualities; as if he was like to mistake his own qualities, by some imperfection in his knowledge, which we supply? next, what a mean and gross conception of the Divine nature is implied in supposing that, like the meanest of men, God is delighted in listening to his own praises! . . .

“The Divine Author of our religion every where indicates his opinion, that praying is nothing but a ceremony. . . .”

[4.] Thomas Falconer was the nominal editor.

[5.] Sir William Molesworth.

[6.] JSM was, of course, the real editor.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian.

William, later Sir William, Francis Patrick Napier (1785-1860), later General, author of the classic *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the south of France* . . . (6 vols., London, 1828-40).

[2.] No such article appeared in the July, 1836, *LWR*. JSM apparently did not write on the British intervention in the Spanish civil war provoked by the pretender Don Carlos until the following year, when he contributed a part of the article “The Spanish Question,” *LWR*, XXVII (July, 1837), 165-94, signed T.E. The article contains a letter by Col. Napier. JSM defended the intervention.

[3.] In 1835, England, departing from its usual non-intervention policy, suspended its Foreign Enlistment Act to permit the Spanish government to raise a British Legion for service against the Carlist forces. The Legion was commanded by Sir George de Lacy Evans (1787-1870), veteran of the Peninsular War.

[1.] MS in the possession of Mr. E. Liggett of Hornby. *On verso in another hand*: Brighton May 1836 / J. S. Mill.

[1.] MS not located. From a MS transcript of an original shorthand record of his correspondence by James Martineau, now at Manchester College, Oxford. This is Martineau's summary of the letter.

[2.] Karl Follen (1796-1840), a German liberal who sought refuge in America, after being falsely accused of inciting Karl Ludwig Sand to murder the German dramatist Kotzebue in 1819. Follen became the first professor of German at Harvard, a Unitarian preacher, and a staunch abolitionist. He was a close friend and correspondent of Dr. Channing.

[3.] "Character and Manners of the German Students." *London Rev.*, II (Oct., 1835), 159-64; by J. H. Garnier. After repeating the charge against Follen, the article (p. 189) reported that he had gone to America, "where he is now a religious quack and acts the part of a mystic pietist."

[4.] See *Earlier Letters*, No. 170.

[5.] No such article appears to have been written.

[6.] *The Rationale of Religious Inquiry*, first published in April, 1836.

[1.] MS at Central Reference Library, Manchester. *Addressed*: Horace Grant Esq. / Examiner's Office / India House. *Postmarks*: 4 / NOV / 1836 and LONDON / 7 / NOV / 1836. *Endorsed*: Recd 7 / Ansd 8 Nov.

[2.] Thomas Love Peacock.

[3.] David Hill.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn. Published in "New Letters of J. S. Mill to Sir William Molesworth," ed. William E. S. Thomas and Francis E. Mineka, *The Mill News Letter*, VI (Fall, 1970), 2.

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

[3.] Charles Buller had attacked the Established Church Reform Bill on its third reading, July 19, 1836 (see *Hansard*, XXXV, cols. 350-52).

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

[5.] Fonblanque, though sharing many of the Philosophical Radicals' views, had become increasingly critical of their tactics. JSM's complimentary footnote was published in Molesworth's "Terms of Alliance" article, p. 283.

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

[6.] Henry George Grey, Viscount Howick, later 3rd Earl Grey (1802-1894), then privy councillor and secretary-at-war.

[7.] Nassau Senior.

[8.] Sir Henry Brooke Parnell.

[9.] "Aphorisms" (a review of *Thoughts in the Cloister and the Crowd*), *LWR*, XXVI (Jan., 1837), 348-57, reprinted in part in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. I, 206-10, Am. ed. I, 232-36.

[10.] John Temple Leader.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Paper bears watermark: 1837.*

[2.] Macaulay had gone to India in 1834 as a member of its supreme council, on which he served until 1838. He concerned himself there chiefly with the drafting of a new penal code and of a new system of national education, both of which were eventually adopted. It was Macaulay's famous Minute of Feb. 2, 1835, on Indian education (printed in part in *Speeches by Lord Macaulay, with his Minute on Indian Education*, ed. G. M. Young [Oxford, 1935], pp. 345-61), that aroused JSM's scorn. The Minute was an eloquent plea for substituting English for Arabic and Sanskrit as the language for instruction. Lord William Bentinck, the governor-general of India, notified the East India Co. that such a policy was to be followed in the future. For a study of the opposition in the Company to this policy, see K. A. Ballhatchet, "The Home Government and Bentinck's Educational Policy," *Cambridge Historical Journal*, X, No. 2 (1951), pp. 224-29.

[3.] JSM in his draft of a despatch on the “Recent Changes in Native Education” expressed the opinion of the directors of the Company in condemning the new measures and calling for a restoration of the previous system while at the same time encouraging the study of English. JSM wrote that it was “altogether chimerical to expect that the main portion of the mental cultivation of a people can take place through the medium of a foreign language. . . . It is through the vernacular languages only that instruction can be diffused among the people; but the vernacular languages can only be rendered adequate to this purpose by persons who can introduce into them from the Sanskrit or the Arabic the requisite words and terms of expression. . . . What we may hope to do by means of English tuition is to teach the teachers; to raise up a class of persons who having derived from an intimate acquaintance with European literature the improved ideas and feelings which are derivable from that source will make it their occupation to spread those ideas and feelings among their countrymen” (excerpts quoted by Ballhatchet, p. 226). The draft was approved by the “Chairs” and submitted to the board of control in Oct., 1836. See also Abram L. Harris, “John Stuart Mill: Servant to the East India Company,” *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XXX (May, 1964), pp. 185-202.

[4.] John Cam Hobhouse, later Baron Broughton (1786-1869), friend of Byron, statesman, and writer; at this time president of the board of control, in charge of the affairs of India. Hobhouse rejected the proposed draft and it was never sent to India.

[5.] JSM had undergone a breakdown in health in the spring of 1836, preceding the death of his father that June. He left for the Continent on July 30 and returned to England on Nov. 12.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] Probably Samuel rather than John Revans. The April, 1837, *LWR* (pp. 226-32) contained an article signed S.R. on Chapman’s as yet unpublished pamphlet “The Safety Principle of Joint-Stock Banks.” Chapman and Samuel Revans were close friends and associates.

[3.] The above mentioned article has appended to it a statement of a New York State law case tried on Feb. 18, 1837.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] Henry Hooper, bookseller, had recently become publisher of *LWR*.

[3.] John Robertson, the nominal editor of *LWR* from April, 1837, to March, 1840.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Addressed*: Colonel Napier / &c &c &c. The letter has not been through the post.

[2.] Colonel Charles Shaw, *Personal Memoirs and Correspondence of Col. C. Shaw, comprising a narrative of the war for Constitutional Liberty in Portugal and Spain from its commencement in 1831 to . . . 1837* (2 vols., London, 1837).

[3.] See Letter 171.1, n.2.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Addressed*: Colonel Napier / Freshford / Bath. *Postmark*: L? / 10 AU 10 / 1837.

[2.] *The Dispatches of the Duke of Wellington*, ed. John Gurwood (12 vols., London 1834-38).

[3.] Napier accepted the invitation, and his review of the nine volumes that had thus far been published appeared with the title “The Duke of Wellington,” *LWR*, XXVIII (Jan., 1838), 367-436, signed W.F.P.N. See also Letters 220.1, and 229.2.

[4.] John Wilson Croker had reviewed vol. I in *QR*, LI (March, 1834), 399-426, and vols. II and III in *ibid.*, LVIII (Feb., 1837), 82-107. No further reviews of the later volumes appeared in *QR*.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn. Published in *Mill News Letter*, VI (Fall, 1970), 3-5.

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

[3.] John Robertson, the nominal editor of *LWR*. For Robertson’s plans to enliven the *Review* and thereby increase its circulation, see Packe, pp. 211-12. Molesworth gave up the *Review* at the end of 1837, and JSM assumed proprietorship.

[4.] Henry Hooper, bookseller, the publisher of *LWR*.

[5.] Charles Wentworth Dilke (1789-1864).

[6.] “Life in the Penal Colonies,” *LWR*, XXVII (July, 1837), 78-94, signed B.L.

Molesworth had used the same initials as a signature for an article on “New South Wales” in the first number of the *London Rev.* (April, 1835), and one on “Sierra Leone,” *LWR*, III and XXV (April, 1836). He was deeply interested in abolishing transportation as a punishment, and in 1837 chaired a select committee of Parliament to investigate the problem. See Mrs. Fawcett, *Life of Sir William Molesworth* (London, 1901), pp. 140-53.

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

[8.] “History of Hanover,” signed S.R.T., *LWR*, XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 198-216.

[9.] “Orange Societies in Great Britain—their Illegality and Criminality,” *London Rev.*, II (Jan., 1836), 480-513; and “Orange Conspiracy,” *LWR*, XXV (April, 1836), 181-201.

[10.] "The Spanish Question," *LWR*, XXII (July, 1837), 165-94.

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

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

[13.] Robert S. Rintoul.

[14.] "Parties and the Ministry," *LWR*, XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 1-26.

[15.] See n. 6 above.

[16.] James Grant (1802-1879), journalist, author of *The Great Metropolis* (2 vols., London, 1836) and other gossip books.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn.

[2.] "Armand Carrel, his Life and Character," *LWR*, XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 66-111; reprinted in *Dissertations*, Brit. ed. I, 211-83, Am. ed. I, 237-308.

[3.] See Letter 216.1, n. 14.

[4.] "Congregational Dissenters," *LWR*, XXVIII (Oct., 1837), 217-60.

[5.] See *Earlier Letters*, No. 217.

[6.] See Letter 216.1, n. 8.

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

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

[9.] No such article appeared in *LWR*.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Addressed*: Colonel William Napier / Athenæum. *Postmark*: 7 NT 7 / NO 11 / 1837.

[2.] See Letter 214.1.

[3.] Brackets in the remainder of the letter indicate defects in the MS.

[4.] Napier in his article on Wellington (pp. 398-99) warned against the menace of Russia to both Europe and India: “We hear a great deal of the innate weakness of Russia; we see her wickedness, and we know her ambition: but we are told that she has no money; that it is impossible for her to invade India; that she cannot march her large armies into Europe. Strange infatuation! These are the paradoxes of folly, to cover the want of provident energy.”

[5.] In commenting on Wellington (then Sir Arthur Wellesley) and his first campaign as commander-in-chief in India to quell a revolt led by Dhoondiah Waugh, a Marhatta adventurer, Napier referred (*ibid.*, p. 386) with heavy irony to the activities of the East India Company: “For this he [Dhoondiah] was to be hanged on the nearest tree, and by whom? By the general of the East India Company of merchants; a company whose power and empire, in the native country of Dhoondiah Waugh, was no doubt commenced and established with the most perfect regard to justice and decorum. No undue ambition, no love of lucre, no base unworthy acts, no ravages, no murders had ever marked the career of the Honourable Company. All was fair, just, wise, moderate, and religious in their advancement, from a licensed counting house on the coast to the absolute dominion of the East.”

[1.] MS at NLS, as are also now Letters 226 and 230 to Burton in *Earlier Letters*, on the reprinting of JSM’s edition of the *Rationale of Judicial Evidence* in Bentham’s collected *Works*.

[2.] A long note in Book I, chap. vii, expanding upon Bentham’s attack on the use of such terms as “Law of nations, moral sense, common sense, understanding, rule of right, fitness of things, law of reason, right reason, natural justice, natural equity, good order, truth, will of God, repugnancy to nature.” JSM’s note ended thus: “The moralists, or pretended moralists, who make use of these words, may be said to belong to the *dogmatical school* of ethics: since they give their own approbation or disapprobation, as a reason for itself, and a standard for the approbation or disapprobation of every one else. This appellation will distinguish them from those who think that morality is not the province of dogmatism, but of reason, and that propositions in ethics need proof, as much as propositions in mathematics.”

[3.] See Letter 13, *Earlier Letters*.

[4.] For the added paragraph see *Earlier Letters*, Letter 226, n. 2.

[1.] MS at NLS.

[2.] The foregoing corrections were made in the collected *Works*, as follows: Vol. VII, p. 91, par. 1; p. 91, col. 2, par. 1; p. 414, 2nd note; p. 553, 1.2.

[3.] This paragraph was not omitted; see Vol. VII, p. 600.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian.

[2.] See Letter 214.1, n.3.

[3.] The article finally appeared with Napier's initials only.

[4.] See Letter 220.1., n.4.

[5.] See *ibid.*, n. 5.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian.

[2.] See Letter 229.1.

[1.] MS at the Bodleian.

[2.] See the two preceding Letters. JSM added this note at the beginning of the article (p. 367): "The following article is, by agreement, to be considered as the expression of the writer's sentiments, without involving the opinions of the Review. Who the writer is, may be easily discovered by the style, the sentiments, and the initials.—*Ed.*"

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Addressed:* to be forwarded immediately / Col. William Napier / care of Mr Boone / bookseller / Bond Street. *Postmark:* 6 EV 6 / JA 11 / 1838.

[2.] Except for one word, this note was published *verbatim*. See Letter 229.3, n. 2.

[3.] The note, substantially as suggested here, was published at the beginning of the article (p. 367): "Some of our readers may recollect the tone of the Whigs towards the Duke some years ago. A leading article of the 'Morning Chronicle,' in Perry's day, began somewhat in this style: 'The Duke of Wellington's head is continually thrust into our faces; at every corner we meet it in plaister, looking as empty and as dull as emptiness and dulness can make the original look!' We would ask also, whether Mr Barry O'Meara, the friend of the Whigs, had not in his possession Napoleon's detailed and highly favourable opinions of the Duke of Wellington's campaigns, and refrained from publishing them because they would do him too much honour? We heard this from a gentleman who assured us that he had it from Mr O'Meara himself."

[1.] MS at the Bodleian. *Addressed:* Colonel Napier / Freshford / Bath. *Postmark:* L.S. / JA 26 / 1838.

[2.] In payment for Napier's article on the Duke of Wellington.

[3.] William Boone (1795?-1870), London bookseller.

[4.] Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* (12 vols., Boston, 1834-37).

[1.] MS at the Bodleian.

[2.] In the Jan., 1838, *LWR*. See Letter 214.1.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn includes the excerpts from Mrs. Fawcett's biography of Molesworth that were published in *Earlier Letters* as Nos. 246 and 248. The full letter was published in *Mill News Letter*, VI (Fall, 1970), 7-8.

[2.] See *Earlier Letters*, p. 581, n. 3.

[3.] James Mill, *A Fragment on Mackintosh* (London, 1835), pp. 19-68.

[4.] William Tait. The sum mentioned probably was from his sales of *LWR*.

[5.] Thomas Woolcombe, Sir William's solicitor.

[6.] JSM had already published one article on Durham's mission, "Lord Durham and his Assailants," *LWR*, XXIX (Aug., 1838), 507-12. In the December number, pp. 241-60, JSM defended Durham's policy in Canada, in "Lord Durham's Return." See *Earlier Letters*, Nos. 228, n. 14, and 249.

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

[8.] Edward Gibbon Wakefield.

[9.] Auguste Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive* (6 vols., Paris, 1830-42). The third volume was entitled *Philosophie chimique et philosophie biologique*.

[10.] Presumably of Molesworth's report on Transportation. See Letter 217.1, n. 7.

[11.] See *ibid.*, n. 8 and n. 9.

[1.] MS at NLS.

[2.] The note on p. 236, Vol. II, of the original edition of the *Rationale of Judicial Evidence* has been omitted in the collected *Works*, Vol. VI, 451.

[3.] Richard Doane.

[4.] Presumably William Theobald. See Letter 1070.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn. This is the complete text of No. 249, *Earlier Letters*, which was published from Mrs. Fawcett's excerpts. We have not repeated the annotation of the first paragraph in *Earlier Letters*. The full letter was published in *Mill News Letter*, VI (Fall, 1970), 8-9.

[2.] See Letter 248, n. 6.

[3.] See *Earlier Letters*, p. 581, n. 3. The English works sold at £5. 10s, the Latin at £2. 10s.

[4.] John Pringle Nichol.

[5.] See Letter 217.1, n. 8 and n. 9.

[6.] Not identified.

[1.] MS in the Tocqueville Collection, Yale. *Addressed*: Monsieur / M. Gustave de Beaumont / Rue d'Anjou St Honoré / à Paris: *forwarded to*: à Rosoy-en-Brie à la Grange Rosoy-en-Brie. S et M. *Postmarks*: LONDON / 18 / 1839; ANGL / 20 OCT / 39 / CALAIS; and ROSOY-EN-BRIE / 21 / The bracketed emendations in the text indicate the many defects in the MS.

[2.] *L'Irlande sociale, politique et religieuse* (2 vols., Paris, 1839).

[3.] JSM underestimated the time; the Fines and Recoveries Abolition Act had been adopted in 1833.

[4.] John Campbell, later first Baron Campbell (1779-1861) had been Solicitor General in 1833; he served as Attorney General from 1834 to 1841. In 1859 he became Lord Chancellor of Great Britain.

[5.] John Charles Spencer, Viscount Althorp and 3rd Earl Spencer (1782-1845), Whig political leader.

[6.] Edward Gibbon Wakefield.

[7.] Edward Wakefield (1774-1854), economist, author of *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political* (2 vols., London, 1812).

[8.] See *Earlier Letters*, p. 87.

[9.] Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, had been chairman of the Irish Poor Law Commission appointed in 1833. The Commission had issued three reports in 1835-36. The Irish Poor Law adopted in 1838 was administered under the English Poor Law Commission. For JSM's later more favourable opinion of Whately's views on the Poor Law, see *Earlier Letters*, pp. 711, 715.

[10.] John Revans, *Evils of the State of Ireland, their Causes and the Remedy—a Poor Law* (London, 1837). JSM had sent Beaumont a copy of this pamphlet on Jan. 7, 1837 (see *Earlier Letters*, p. 317).

[1.] MS at NLS. *Envelope addressed*: J. H. Burton Esq. / 9 Warriston Crescent / Edinburgh /. *Postmarks*: PAID / 16 JA 16 / 1840 and JAN / C 18 M / 1840.

[2.] But see Letter 270.2.

[3.] John Bowring.

[4.] The “Ten Years Conflict” in the Church of Scotland which led to the Disruption of 1843. Robertson in Sept. of this year published an article on the controversy, “Rebellion in the Kirk,” *WR*, XXXIV (1840), 461-88.

[1.] MS at NLS.

[2.] See Letter 270.1.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus. *Addressed*: Rev. John Sterling / Madeira.

Sterling had gone to Falmouth in January to embark for Madeira, but instead stayed on until spring in Falmouth, where JSM saw him in March. See *Earlier Letters*, Nos. 272 and 283.

[1.] MS in the possession of Sir John Molesworth-St. Aubyn. This is the full letter which includes the excerpt from Mrs. Fawcett’s biography which was published in *Earlier Letters* as No. 298. The full letter was published in the *Mill News Letter*, VI (Fall, 1970), 9-10.

[2.] William Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences* (3 vols., London, 1837). The next referred to is his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, founded upon their history* (2 vols., London, 1840).

[3.] See *Earlier Letters*, No. 298, n. 1.

[4.] See, for example, his leading articles in the *Examiner* for Nov. 8, 1840, p. 705, and for Nov. 15, p. 721.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

[2.] Presumably a circular of the National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Improvement of the People, inaugurated by Lovett and his Chartist associates in 1841. See *Earlier Letters*, No. 364, esp. n. 2.

[1.] MS at the University of Illinois.

[2.] Of the *Logic*. See *Earlier Letters*, Nos. 337, 340, 343.

[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. 39. This is the letter referred to in Letter 349, n. 2, *Earlier Letters*.

[2.] *Athelwold* (London and Edinburgh, 1842), produced by Macready in 1843.

[3.] Harriet Taylor, of course.

[1.] From photograph of a MS copy in the possession of Mr. Michael Maurice.

[2.] *The Kingdom of Christ*. See *Earlier Letters*, No. 370, last paragraph.

[3.] See *ibid.*, n. 4.

[4.] See *Earlier Letters*, No. 312, last paragraph.

[5.] Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus (1761-1851), German rationalistic theologian.

[6.] *The Logic*.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale. The date is in another hand.

[1.] MS in the Norman and Charlotte Strouse Collection of Thomas Carlyle, at the University of California, Santa Cruz. It was removed from a copy of the first edition of JSM's *Principles of Political Economy* bearing the bookplate of Carlyle.

[2.] *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*. See *Earlier Letters*, Nos. 427 and 444.

[1.] MS in St. Andrews University Library.

[2.] John Reid (1809-1849), Chandos Professor of Anatomy, St. Andrews University, from 1841.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Chadwick's paper was read by a friend to the Manchester Statistical Society on Jan. 16, 1846: *Papers read before the Statistical Society of Manchester on the Demoralization and Injuries occasioned by the want of proper regulations of Labourers engaged in the Construction and Working of Railways*. Chadwick had 2000 copies printed at his own expense for distribution to Parliament and the press. For details, see R. A. Lewis, "Edwin Chadwick and the Railway Labourers," *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, III (1950-51), 107-118.

[3.] The Classification Committee on Railway Bills, created by a series of resolutions, on March 4, 1845. Its task was to allot the many bills for the authorization of railroads to select committees for particular consideration. See *Hansard*, LXXVIII, cols. 271-308.

[4.] James Morrison (1790-1857), wealthy draper, director of railroads, writer of pamphlets on railroad problems, and MP. 1830-35, 1840-47. As such he was instrumental in the setting up, April 30, 1846, of a Select Committee . . . to inquire into the condition of the Labourers employed in the construction of Railways, and other public works. . . . Chadwick gave evidence to this committee.

[1.] MS draft at LSE. *Bears note in JSM's hand*: To Arthur Helps / date unknown. (I suppose the draft in pencil was the one sent.)

JSM had reviewed two earlier works by Helps (see *Earlier Letters*, p. 322, n. 2, and p.

643, n. 2). This time JSM had evidently been requested to read proofs of Helps's *Friends in Council: a Series of Readings, and Discourses thereon. Book the First*, published in early May, 1847. The volume contains the two essays mentioned here: "The Art of Living with Others" and "Education," but the quoted words here from the proof copy do not appear in the published version. Probably Helps revised his essays after receiving JSM's criticism.

The verso of the MS draft carries the following fragments:

[*In pencil*] that the worthy & sufficient, & if not sufficient, the only aim that shall be permitted to one half of the race is to devote their lives to the exercise of the sexual functions—

This is at the bottom of all the commonplaces about women—& of all that is said on the subject by persons who fancy themselves not commonplace.

[*In ink*] as for what women write on the subject of women once they have expressed the opinion that the intellect of women is inferior to that of men—this opinion if a true one puts them out of court as evidence on the subject in opposition to the opinion of men.

Accompanying the draft at LSE is another MS draft to Helps in Harriet Taylor's hand:

My dear Sir—

It is as I partly surmised when I answered your former note—Our disagreement is *radical*; and I believe I dissent from your standards, your tests, & your conclusions. This being so shall I be right to take as permission, or rather as invitation, your first essay, and seeing (?), that as I of course should not make any annotations or remarks on your book unless I thought they would improve it, for this very reason I prefer to make none, because I should always feel it something like a matter of conscience to hinder the reception of its social doctrines, and to express by any means open to me my deep rooted opinion of their mischievous tendency. You will perhaps think this somewhat strong expression à propos of essays so little dogmatical as yours: but tho they do not *urge*, they yet decidedly express with approval opinions & sentiments which appear to me to lie near and to supply the root of the monstrous evils and immoralities of our social system. To pass from generalities to particulars: The people I have lived among and known intimately have been high minded people—people whose pettinesses of all kinds—not so much from high breeding in the common acceptance of the term as from the consequences of much education and developed intellect. In the society of such people none of the misères you describe (and I daresay describe truly of ordinary people in the essay called 'On the Art of living with others') do or could exist—such persons would as soon think of doing any impossible thing as being *tracassière* annoying illtempered interfering & unreasonable as you describe every body as being. They would regard such conduct & the habits of mind from which it must spring, either as monstrous, or as that of persons too far beneath them to need or be capable of having with them any other relation than that of moral instruction. But if the occasion could arise, which high minded & principled

amiability makes all but impossible, these people would most certainly rather “settle every thing by the force of sufficient reason” than by “some authorized will” or by “tossing up”! In my very humble opinion “the force of sufficient reason” *is* infinitely a higher motive and power than either “authorized will” or even “tossing up”. But it is but right to say why are these people what I have described—because they are treated & treat every body *as equals*—because there is no authorized will—no recognition of superiority but that of mental and moral superiority—above all no recognition of superiority of *sex*—to my mind the basest & lowest ground of assumption that can be conceived, & which I am sure no man ever assumes but from a secret consciousness of his inability to maintain any other. It follows as a matter of course that these people are like myself absolute unbelievers. Indeed I do not believe that lofty character is in these times consistent with the utter prostration or indolence of intellect requisite for belief in the low puerilities which now usurp the name of religion. [*Rest in pencil*] From all this I think you will perceive that few things would be less in harmony with your views than any strictures of mine. I regret much not having found time to consider and return the proofs sooner.

[1.] MS not located. Excerpt quoted in George Jacob Holyoake, “John Stuart Mill as Some of the Working Classes Knew Him,” *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, Sept. 13, 1873, and reprinted in pamphlet with same title (London, 1873), p. 26. Holyoake says that the letter was the first he ever received from JSM. One other sentence of the Letter is in *Earlier Letters*, p. 707. The conjecture advanced in n. 2 to that letter is invalidated by Holyoake’s dating of it here.

[1.] MS in the possession of Francis E. Mineka.

[2.] A novel by Lewes (London, 1847).

[3.] Vols. III and IV of Grote’s *History of Greece*.

[4.] An article, “The Visible and Tangible,” identifiable as by William Henry Smith, in *Blackwood’s*, LXI (May, 1847), 580-88, in a footnote (p. 587) praised Lewes’s *Biographical History of Philosophy*, first published in serial numbers, 1845-46: “In every way a remarkable work. Written with great vivacity and clearness, comprising a world of matter in the briefest possible space—and . . . at the least possible cost.”

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] Probably “On the Structure of the Syllogism, and on the Application of the Theory of Probabilities to Questions of Argument and Authority,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, VII (1849), 379-408. The paper had been read on Nov. 9, 1846, and an addition had been made on Feb. 27, 1847. It was the basis for what was expanded into chaps. iv, v, viii, and x of De Morgan’s *Formal Logic: or, The Calculus of Inference, Necessary and Probable* (London, 1847). A portion of the original paper is reprinted in Augustus De Morgan, *On the Syllogism and Other Logical Writings*, ed. Peter Heath (New Haven, 1966), pp. 1-21.

[3.] JSM in the next, the 3rd, edition of the *Logic* (1851) added a long, somewhat depreciatory note on De Morgan's contribution (Vol. I, Book II, chap. 2, pp. 193-95).

[4.] De Morgan's "Statement in answer to an assertion made by Sir William Hamilton. . . ." (London, April 30, 1847). For an account of the controversy between De Morgan and Hamilton over who was the first to develop the principle of the quantification of the predicate, see De Morgan's *Formal Logic*, pp. 297-323, and Heath's introduction to De Morgan's *On the Syllogism*, cited above.

[1.] MS in Osborn Collection, Yale.

Sir Thomas Erskine Perry (1806-1882), a judge of the Bombay Supreme Court, 1841; chief justice, 1847-52; president of the Board of Education for ten years; MP for Devonport, 1854-59; member of the Council of India, 1859-82; Privy Councillor, 1882.

[2.] Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, presided over commissions to administer "united national education" in Protestant and Roman Catholic schools, 1831-53.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[2.] *Formal Logic*. See Letter 503.1, n. 1 and n. 2.

[3.] *Pol. Econ.*, published in 1848.

[1.] MS at the Taylor Institution Library, University of Oxford.

[2.] Dated by the reference to the book he is finishing (*Pol. Econ.*) and the leader on the Anti-Gold Law League mentioned in the last sentence (*Morning Chronicle*, Oct. 1, 1847, p. [2]). See also *ibid.*, Oct. 15, 1847, p. [2].

[3.] "Of the Laws of Interchange Between Nations," the first essay in his *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*, reprinted in *Collected Works*, vol. IV.

[4.] Thomas Tooke, the authority on currency and prices.

[5.] See n. 2 above.

[1.] MS in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

[1.] MS at UCL. *Paper watermark*: 1848.

[2.] Charles Tiltstone Beke (1800-1874), archaeologist and explorer in Abyssinia, 1840-43. Author of *The Sources of the Nile* (London, 1860) and *The British Captives in Abyssinia* (London, 1865).

[3.] James Beke.

[1.] MS in 1965 in the possession of Joseph H. Schaffner of New York.

[2.] Of Harrison & Co., St. Martin's Lane, printers of the 1st ed.

[3.] Perhaps the translation by Mary Ann Evans ("George Eliot") of David Friedrich Strauss's *The Life of Jesus critically examined* (3 vols., London, 1846).

[1.] MS at Cornell. *Envelope addressed*: Mr Warren / Bookseller / Royston / Herts. Postmark illegible.

The recipient has not been otherwise identified.

[1.] MS at UCL.

[1.] The MS draft of the whole letter, of which this is the portion omitted by Elliot, I, 138-39, is at Leeds. The remainder of the letter (No. 532) is in *Earlier Letters*, pp. 740-41.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Florence Nightingale's *Notes on Nursing* was first published in December, 1859.

[3.] Possibly the enquiry referred to in Letter 360.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[2.] Not identified.

[3.] A revised and enlarged edition of her *Notes on Nursing* (see Letter 440A above).

[4.] See Letter 472, n. 3.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Letter 772.

[3.] The reorganized Reform League; see *ibid.*, n. 2.

[1.] MS at Brit. Mus.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Of the Reform League of which Howell was Secretary.

[3.] See Letter 772, and Letter 850A in Appendix II.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] The Reform Bill introduced by Gladstone in March, 1866, extended the franchise to lodgers who paid rental of £10 a year.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *The Times*, Feb. 12, 1867, p. 12, in its report of the Reform League Demonstration on Feb. 11 in the Agricultural Hall, Islington. The letter was read by Beales to the meeting. The inserted parentheses are the reporter's indications of the reception accorded the letter.

[2.] On July 30, 1866. See Letter 977, n. 2.

[1.] MS at LSE.

[2.] Letter 1025A above.

[1.] MS at Public Record Office, London.

Frances Anna Maria Elliot Russell (1815-1898), second wife of Lord John Russell, and mother of Lord Amberley.

[1.] MS at LSE.

Son of Harriet Mill's brother, Arthur Hardy.

[2.] Which of two uncles, Edward Hardy (1811-1869) and Alfred Hardy (1813-1870), both of Birksgate, is not known.

[3.] Helen Taylor.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Irishman*, July 16, 1868. In reply to Train's letter of June 29, published *ibid*.

George Francis Train (1829-1904), American merchant, promoter, author, and self-styled "Champion Crank." At this time he was visiting Britain and working on behalf of imprisoned Fenians. According to his letter of June 29, Train had been introduced by Col. L. S. Dickson to JSM in the House of Commons on June 9, and had gained his consent to put a question in the House to the Home Secretary, "What the Government intended to do in the case of the two American citizens, Costello and Warren, of the *Jackmel*?"

[2.] John Warren and Augustine E. Costello were members of a group of Fenians who had sailed from New York on April 12, 1867, in the *Jackmel* (renamed the *Erin's Hope* during the voyage) to bring arms and ammunition to the Fenians in Ireland. On June 1, 1867, when the group landed in Ireland, twenty-eight of the American Fenians were arrested. Subsequently Warren and Costello were tried, convicted, and sentenced to long prison terms. Some of the others, also imprisoned, were released in 1868. Warren and Costello were finally released early in 1869. For a recent discussion of the affair, and the repercussions in the United States, see Brian Jenkins, *Fenians and Anglo-American Relations during Reconstruction* (Ithaca, 1969), pp. 236-41.

At the further request of Train (see Letter 1267A), JSM on July 16 in the Commons addressed a question on Warren and Costello to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Earl of Mayo. See *Hansard*, CXCIII, col. 1282.

[3.] On July 21, J. Vance, MP for Armagh City, in the Commons questioned JSM whether he had written this sentence to a Mr. Nevin, JSM denied writing to a Mr. Nevin but admitted having written a letter to a friend of Warren and Costello “which contained some words bearing some resemblance to those here quoted.” Denying that he was unwilling that the government should claim or obtain any credit, he said: “I desire extremely that the Government should both claim and obtain credit for everything meritorious that they have done.” See *Hansard*, CXCIII, cols. 1556-57. On Vance’s naming of a fictitious Mr. Nevin as JSM’s correspondent, see a letter by Train in the *Revolution*, II (Aug. 20, 1868), 103.

[1.] MS not located. Published in the *Irishman*, July 16, 1868, in reply to Train’s further letter, published *ibid*.

[2.] See Letter 1265A., n.2.

[1.] MS not located. Published in *Catherine Helen Spence, An Autobiography* (Reprinted from *The Register*, Adelaide, 1910).

Catherine Helen Spence (1825-1910), Australian advocate of proportional representation, novelist, journalist, and sociologist. On a visit to England in 1865 Miss Spence had met both JSM and Thomas Hare. She had earlier become an advocate of proportional representation, and in 1861 had published a pamphlet on it, *Plea for Pure Democracy*.

[2.] *The Subjection of Women*.